

FINISHED FILE

IGFSA

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION

DC COORDINATION MEETING XXI

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2018

9:00 A.M. CT

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. It's Markus again. It's just over the hour. I would suggest we get started. We have, I think, 15 people that announced they would be able to join the call. We are not there yet, so I presume others will join as we are going along. But I would suggest that maybe Jutta or Eleonora would brief us where we are from the last call that took place last Wednesday. I was,

myself, unable to participate. So Jutta, would you like to brief us on the last call?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, of course I would like to do that. Thank you, Markus, for giving me the floor.

So during the call of the last MAG virtual meeting on Wednesday, all the thematic main sessions were asked to give follow-up or re-follow-up on their preparations for their session. And so it was merely Temea (phonetic), I think, informed the MAG on what has already been done and that we have our call with the Dynamic Coalition representatives today in order to proceed with the preparation of the thematic main session based on the work of the Dynamic Coalitions in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals. So that, I do think, is our task for today to move a step further with the preparation.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta, for this update, and indeed, I think at the last call I was a little bit premature when I said we move all the actions to the new list. We felt there was a need for an intermediate step

and have this call with the Dynamic Coalitions beforehand, and I think that's where we are now.

Just at a technical level, we have real-time transcription. You can see that if you press on your window right at the bottom, there is a Multimedia Viewer, and if you expand the panel, then you can see the realtime transcription popping up.

I don't know, it might be easier if you have it more visible on the main screen. We have on the main screen now the agenda displayed, which is fairly simple agenda, I. DC papers on the SDGs. II. Ideas for DCs IGF advantage booth, and number III. AOB. My suggestion would be we place the realtime transcription more prominently on there. I don't know whether Luis can do that in the background.

Anyway, back to the first agenda item, as you will recall, the past two years we only had these main sessions on DCs. We made it a precondition for the DCs to produce a paper if they wanted to be part of the main session. Now, this year, the format has been changed, and we do have code production, so to speak, with interested MAG

members and the DCs, but the DCs, nevertheless, have a very specific contribution. They have their year-long ongoing work, and there we think it will make sense as in past years that each DC that wants to be part of this main session produces a short paper, and we really say short. We think one page may well be enough to say where is their angle on SDGs, and also that would be, I think, invaluable help to whoever will be the moderator of the session in order to navigate through the meeting.

I just had a notice from Luis inside the Chat. I don't know, actually, this seems to be a bit complex. I wonder, Luis, whether you could come in and have this technical explanation on the transcription, just to give us an instruction to really make it easy for everyone.

Luis, could you jump in quickly and explain to us what we need to do? You said we can hover with the mouse to the top right of the central presentation window and select floating panel view. This, to me, sounds extremely complicated.

I don't want to put you on the spot, Luis, but can you

hear us?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. It's Eleonora. Sorry. I am signaling to Luis that you were asking him if possible to give a short verbal explanation. He is actually not connected to audio. He was giving us information in the Chat, but he couldn't hear that you were asking him to do that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And Olivier has a question: Why do we spend half the time on each call talking about the transcripts? As you know, it has been quite an issue for especially the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility to really make it work, and the transcripts are a great help to people who have accessibility issues. So if you can make it as easy as possible, all the better, but I agree, it should not be the main issue of our call.

Back to the papers, as we just suggested, are there any comments on how you see it how to make this work best?

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Markus, this is Nigel here. Good afternoon.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, hi, Nigel.

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Hi. So I guess really we need to be in a -- in terms of the papers, we -- two things have to happen in parallel, I would have thought. One is the submission of the papers, and then the group that are considering the format and the process for the thematic session need to discuss how the contributors to those papers can take part in the session, as we discussed on our last call. So I mean, I think we need to move that conversation forward. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Yes, the idea is can we all agree on the very basic principle that a precondition of participation for the DCs in this main session is the submission of a short paper explaining the respective DCs' contribution to the SDGs. And from then on we take it to the next step, where the organizers of the main session -- and you are all invited to be part of that process -- then decide how best to integrate their work into the DCs, and what we also discussed is we cannot assume that each DC would have a guaranteed speaking slot, and it certainly would not be a long speaking slot. It

will be more of a question asked by the moderator, but I think based on the previous experience we had with the main sessions, that seemed to have worked well, and I think all DCs looked rather competent and professional in this process.

Are there other comments? Again, I turn to Jutta as the co-facilitator. I think Jutta is also strongly in favor of this approach. Whether you want any additional comments?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, thank you, Markus.

From my point of view, I do think that if -- and I do think we all pay agree that it would be necessary to have a thematic main session that participants will be able to follow a thread, and that is to achieve that it would be necessary to have this relation between the SDGs and the themes that are worked in the Dynamic Coalitions -- how do I say that? -- that everybody in the session will be able to follow that, to understand how the work of the DCs is related to the SDGs, and why that is important for the -- for the topic that we will address in this thematic session.

So in order for us and for the moderator of the session, it would be helpful if we could have these one-pagers as an overview, and it would be helpful if these one-pagers would relate the SDGs to the work of the Dynamic Coalitions.

We have also the metrics that Eleonora has prepared with the help of the Dynamic Coalitions, and in order to make this more comprehensible, more visible to the participants in the session, this would be a very useful approach from my point of view.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Hanane has her hand up. You are next, please.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Hi. Thank you, Markus. It's Hanane speaking. Can you hear me?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can hear you.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Well, it's Hanane Boujemi from IRPC.

Thank you. I agree that the DCs would prepare a pager. I just need to know whether there is a deadline by which we can submit these papers.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. You anticipated my

next question. Indeed, we need to agree on a common deadline. And my gut feeling is the earlier the better as it would also help the substantive preparation of the main session. I am here to listen to your suggestion. Also I know everybody is very busy, and you may also have constraint. What would be the earliest time? And owe legislative yea also had his hand up, I see. Please, Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks so much, Markus. Can you hear me?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks.

I was going to ask then whether -- so the main session is going to be then solely really based on those papers and on the SDGs. Is that what we have established? Because I was under the impression that the session was also going to be about the work of what the Dynamic Coalitions have been doing, and some of the Dynamic Coalitions may have not necessarily done work that supports the SDGs specifically but are looking at their field of activity that

might not be directly related to the SDGs. So I am not sure how to bring the two together.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's an excellent question, and I may also turn to Eleonora and Jutta to help me out there, but my understanding was that the MAG specifically decided to have a session on this development aspect and asked the DCs what they contribute to that.

Now, we have this matrix Eleonora has produced, so that gives me a natural segue to ask her for her explanations.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Thank you, Markus, and thank you for the explanation. I see Jutta also wants to come in, so I will be short.

I should say that actually, it was DCs themselves that came up with the idea of having this session on the SDGs. We had a couple of calls on this some months back, and it was felt that the SDGs would be sufficiently broad and inclusive to encompass most if not all of the issues that DCs are working on.

In this matrix that I got started but that DCs really

developed on quite a bit, there are areas of convergence for all of the DCs. I don't know, Olivier, if you and DC-CIV had the chance to really look at it and see if those convergences really do make sense to you and if you see yourself see the work of your DC in that. But the focus of the session will very much be the SDGs and not just how DCs relate to the SDGs, but also how innovation and some specific development policy ideas also play into this in the sense that the contributions to the session will not be just be coming from DCs but also the MAG co-organizers, which in our case happen to be mostly from the private sector, which I think will actually be an excellent opportunity to have a true multistakeholder main session in the sense that we do not have too many DC representatives from the private sector. So I think we will have a good melding of different stakeholder groups in that sense.

But given that, given that we have contributions coming from different places, from DCs, from interested MAG members who we will see in future planning calls, are thinking of good expert speakers to also bring into the

session. This will also mean that time will be rather limited for DCs and that limited time should really focus on the theme of the session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, and thank you, Eleonora, also for recalling that it was actually a proposal made by the DCs that it would focus on a thematic session related to SDGs. But we are now a step further, and the session approved by the MAG was co-production with some interested MAG members and the DCs that we come up with this session, and I see a new comment, Olivier, on the Chat, that it looks like fitting square pegs into round holes. I get the point, but then as Eleonora also said, the SDGs are very, very high level, and I think the DCs felt when they originally came up with the proposal was that this was the high level theme that fit best to all their activities, but Jutta also wanted to jump in.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, Markus, I could not have said it better than you did before. It was exactly what I wanted to say. In effort to find this thread through the thematic session, the DCs came up with the idea that somehow the

work they do is related to some of the SDGs, so that was the common header for the work, and I do agree with Olivier that not everything that the Dynamic Coalitions do is related to the SDGs. But on the other hand, some of the things that DCs do are related to the SDGs. So in the main session, it would be a goal to focus exactly on this relationship between what the DCs do and what the -- what this can achieve in regard of the SDGs. So I do think, remembering last year's thematic main session on the DCs, we had taken that into account, and we thought it useful that what the DCs bring forward to the table of this thematic session needs to be related -- there needs to be interrelations between the different DCs, and that was the SDGs for this year's thematic session. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

I see that Hanane and Olivier, your hands are still up. They may be old hands, but if they are not old hands --

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Thank you, Markus. My hand is a new point.

I see the point now, you said we moved on from

deciding whether the main DC session should be about the work of DCs or the SDGs. I had actually more or less the same concern, and I put a comment forward which Eleonora addressed, I think kindly, yesterday. I do agree that the majority of the session would be dedicated to the SDGs as per the agreement, but I wonder if there is some room, you know, to accommodate the DCs' interest in pitching the work that they are doing along the year. Maybe one minute, if it rhymes with the coordination of the whole meeting. But it would be entirely up to the moderator. It depends on the circumstance on the day. But I think that there should be a balance between the two to be fair. You know, we should link to the SDGs, but I feel like we need to give the opportunity to the DCs to present their work just in one minute if possible. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's a fair point, and I think that is something we need to address once we move into the organization mode of the main session, and also I think a lot will also depend on the moderator or moderators. As

it's a co-production, I think -- and again, I am thinking aloud -- it might make sense to have two moderators, one moderator who has more DC background who could then elegantly bring in the DCs a bit more. And the other co-moderator coming more as the session has also been proposed by the business community coming in from the economic side of things. But as I said, it's not up to us to decide, but that is something to look at when we decide how to set up the session.

I see that Sharada has a hand up, please.

>> SHARADA SRINIVASAN: Markus? Yes, I just wanted to echo Hanane and say that DCs having an opportunity to present their work over the last year might be useful, especially if it's synergistic to the work already being presented. Particularly, (?) works directly on SDG side, so we would be pleased to have an opportunity to present work that we have been doing and tie it directly, obviously, to the main goal of the session, which is to discuss the SDGs.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Again, this is a fairly delicate

issue, and I don't think it would be up to us to take any decision on that, but we can register the desire, and it will be up to whoever will be moderating the session in how to navigate this through. But bear in mind it will not be a long session. It's half of the three-hour slot, which will be less than 90 minutes realistically speaking, 85 minutes max, and there you cannot do everything. You have to be focused.

I notice there is in the Chat Nadia from YCIG -- that's Youth Coalition on Internet Governance, presumably -- I am following the conversation here, but -- would you like to jump in and ask your question yourself? Nadia?

>> NADIA TJAHA: Can you hear me?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can hear you.

>> NADIA TJAHA: Hi, I am sorry. I am from YCIG. My question was I have been following the conversation, and that's all clear to me, but I also saw in the main session draft documents that there were proposed policy questions. So if we are talking about the session, is that anyhow interlinked? Are we supposed to answer these

proposed policy questions in our papers, for example, or am I talking about two completely separate things?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That, I have to admit, Nadia, you have caught me in the air on that. I have not given much thought to that. The policy questions are more what the policy questions that the session wants to answer. But should the papers address these policy questions, yes or no, to me that's an open question, but it's an excellent question. I don't know whether Jutta or Eleonora has an answer to that or other people would like to voice their opinion. Or Eleonora? Is

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Hi, everyone. It's Eleonora.

I will say that the inclusion of policy questions, you know, having a section in that main session document where we identify policy questions, comes out of the IGF main session guidelines that any individuals organizing a main session should be following, and one of the asks in there is that you have specific policy questions to answer during the session. So they are specific to the session in

that sense; however, this does not prevent us from suggesting that those same questions be answered in these papers. I mean, they could also be a good way of framing these individual papers.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yeah, I think it's a good question. It was part the suggestions coming up that the main sessions should answer policy questions, but that was totally unrelated from input papers what we are discussing here. So unless we want to make a firm recommendation that each individual paper should address these policy questions, we can leave it up to the Dynamic Coalitions whether they want to take them as possible signposts for their papers, but -- and we can be flexible about this.

But I see that Olivier is asking for the floor, and Nigel after him. Olivier?

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Markus. Olivia Crepin-Leblond speaking, and yeah, it was just a follow-up on the discussion we were having earlier. I mentioned square pegs in round holes or round pegs in

square holes. The thing is I went and saw the matrix and saw the couple of ticks that we had for our Dynamic Coalition, shared it with the people on our mailing list, and a number of people came back and said, oh, but we are also with this and that, and this one as well, and this one. And I am just concerned that this doesn't start becoming, then, you know, a tick-the-box exercise, where the Dynamic Coalitions claim to end world poverty and end up with zero hunger and this sort of stuff. We need to be careful on that. Otherwise it's going to make the session look a little silly. That's all. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Valid point.

Nigel? Jutta would also -- I just realized I overlooked Jutta. Can we --

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, of course, let's Jutta go first, please.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Jutta, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I just wanted to add something in regard of the DCs presenting their work in the thematic main session. I agree with Sharada and Hanane that the

main session should provide for an opportunity for the DCs to present themselves, but still I do think this needs to be somehow gathered and not 17 DCs presenting each one minute.

All the DCs will have their slot where they can (?) a particular part of their work to the IGF. In their main session, I do think we need to bind that together somehow. And I really do believe that once we get these one-pagers, it will be much easier to find out how the DCs works can be grouped maybe, and then -- or clustered around the SDGs, and then we will have a good basis for using these 80 to 85 minutes very efficiently to inform participants about the work of the DCs, but also in regard of the SDGs. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Excellent comments again. It also confirms me in my view that it really would be helpful to have a moderator or co-moderator who is familiar with the work of the DCs and their processes and has had interaction with the DCs over the years so in order to do that in an elegant way. But Nigel, thank you very

much for being so elegant to let Jutta go first. You are obviously a real gentleman. Now you have the floor.

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Ha-ha. I am just old.

Three things. One, absolutely, Markus, I agree on the moderator and I agree with what Jutta said earlier. So I think for the main session, you don't want just each DC giving an update and then somehow sort of trying to link their update to an SDG. I mean, I think that would sound a bit false. So I think what we have to work on, we have to work on the moderator asking questions where each DC can, if you like, present their work. I hope it's more than 60 seconds, more like a couple minutes, can present their work in relation to the SDG, and then any wider policy point. So if we were presenting on, I don't know, accessibility, we would say yes, well, it links to this SDG, but we've also been looking at real policy implications for, you know, the regulation of spectrum or whatever, which obviously doesn't link to an SDG necessarily.

So I think you need that sort of high-level -- that high-level pitch, and that really does come through good

moderation. Yeah. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I do recall what the Americans call an elevator pitch, when you have the opportunity to meet your CEO in the elevator, you have to explain in 30 minutes why what you are doing is the most important issue for the company you are working for, and that's in a way similar elevator pitch for the DCs. Maybe a little bit more than 30 seconds, but in a succinct way that we do need a moderator to tease that out of the participants.

Anyone else in the queue?

>> Markus?

>> I have a point as well, but I will just give the floor to whoever wants it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hang on. There was somebody. Who is that, please?

>> GERRY ELLIS: Hello, Markus. This is Gerry Ellis. I hope you can hear me well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, it's great at this moment it's working.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Great. However, I can't use the hands-up option, so apologize for the jumping in. The screen reading software doesn't work with the hands-up option.

I am a little concern that had we are trying to fit too many things into one session, and it will go et so diluted that everyone's message will be lost. And I wonder what the people think about that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, and that's definitely a very valid concern, and the same thing, a very valid challenge. And I hear listening to various people on the call, I think that was also part of these concerns. There's on one hand the desire by the DCs to present their work and, at the same time, the recognition that there is also a need for focus, and that is a real challenge, and I definitely would also be interested in hearing what other people think, but right now I think we have Hanane and Nadia who would like to take the floor, Hanane first, then Nadia.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: Thank you, Markus.

My understanding is now DCs really have to go back to

the board and draft how the work relates to the SDGs. And I disagree with Olivier. It is not going to be just superficially a listing how the work is linked to the SDGs. So I think there should be some effort in compiling how the work is linked to these SDGs. I find it really as an opportunity for the work of the IGF or the WSIS process as a whole to be in synergy with the high-level, you know, objectives like the SDGs, and I was actually thinking of proposing, if there is a way, that we can track how we actually advance in our work in the IGF, linking the work of the workshops of our inter-sessional work or DCs to the SDGs at a high-level manner; that we can track the impact in the future and have solid metrics to say that we are working in line with high-level objectives. So I really think this exercise will help us all kind of find some synergies with other work that is happening at the UN level. The start is difficult. We just have to figure it out. That's my feeling. So I wish we can, you know, have a long-term vision on how we can contribute to achieving the SDGs in the long-term.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for your comments. I think that is shared by many who thought it actually would be a good opportunity also for the IGF, the broader IGF community to align themselves and find focus with the SDGs. But just my understanding of what Olivier said was actually more of a warning that we should not try and twist too much the activities of the SDGs -- of the DCs as solving all the problems of the world. It was more a cautionary warning. That was at least the way I heard it. But these are all excellent comments.

And there is still Nadia, and then Jutta, and then Nigel.

>> NADIA TJAHJA: Thank you very much. I just wanted to clarify that when we are talking about the SDGs, we are only referring to the ones that are in the matrix and only moving forward with those rather than specifically related to the policy proposals that we've made. Because what I understood earlier is that the papers we would be writing would be to identify the speakers that would continue speaking on kind of the roles of SDGs, or would these speakers be -- supposed to present to the topics that

you would like to raise later through these policy questions? Or have we now forgone the complete role of these policy recommendations, either/or?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think the policy questions are there for you to pick up or not. The matrix was an attempt by the Secretariat show the relevance of the SDGs to the DCs, but I don't think they are prescriptive. If you as a DC identify another SDG that you think is relevant to your work, in my mind, that's up to you. But there again, maybe Jutta or Eleonora might come in, but shall we listen to -- well, Jutta is next in line anyway, and then Nigel, and then maybe I would like to ask Eleonora, as she was the author of the matrix, what she thinks in regard to your question.

But please, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Sorry, this was an old hand. I do think it's best if Nigel and then Eleonora can explain a little.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Nigel, or was that an old hand as well?

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, actually, Markus, that was an old hand.

Just, I think we have all come to this in slightly different ways, but I think we've reached a common understanding. And really, the hard work now is to discuss the format of the session, which is going to be done in the smaller group, as I understand it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Eleonora?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Just to quickly answer Nadia's question or try to answer it, I think the best way to look at the content of these papers in relation to the matrix is maybe from the perspective of someone who is not necessarily very familiar with the DCs or from potential participant in the main session. They have in front of them this visual grid where they see that there are areas where DCs converge with SDGs, meaning their work is relevant to a number of the SDGs. An individual paper produced by a DC should explain that. That was, I think, the idea behind suggesting these papers.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

Are there more questions regarding the substance of these papers? I think at the same time, we should not be too prescriptive. I think yes, one part is they should be short papers, around one page, but what you do with that, along the lines of what Eleonora has said, and you can also let your creativity flow and write what makes sense from your point of view. And again, what Eleonora said I think is also very important. You have to bear in mind that the papers -- the reader of the papers are people who are not familiar with your work, so you really have to take a high-level approach to that.

One thing we have not yet agreed on would be the deadline. That was, I think, the first question that was asked. And there is what would be realistic for you? Would two weeks from now be realistic? Do you need more time? Can you do it quicker? I mean, again, you are all very familiar with the work you are doing, and we are not asking you to write a huge thesis, but just first input into the organization of the main session.

My feeling is the sooner the paper the better because if

the papers are here once we then meet and we are trying to set up a call, a joint call with the DCs and the MAG for this new list created, and I think if there were a first version of the paper already for that call it might be helpful. And it can also be a first draft, not a definitive version.

Sharada, please, you had a hand up. Sharada, can you hear me?

>> SHARADA SRINIVASAN: One second. Am I audible now? Hello?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, you are audible.

>> SHARADA SRINIVASAN: My comment was in relation to the deadline. I agree with the comments in the Chat that say it might be useful to have a longer time period, but I also think that it would be useful to have like the deadlines mentioned on the sheet, the Google document, because the way I saw it was that these papers that we produce could be used in publicity in the run-up to the main session of the DC. So every now and then the DCs who are active on social media could, like, link to the paper

but also say, well, we will be talking about this in the main session. And that timeline might be useful to do like 19th of October. So that was my contribution.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you. So I have to admit I did not actually look at this Google document, so maybe, Eleonora, could you walk us through this, and I take it the 19th of October was proposed as a deadline?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Hi, everyone. Yes. So in this pretty simple document, there is a suggested timeline that tries to balance, obviously, you know, the need for DCs to come up with content that they are satisfied with in these very short papers, but also the need to use these papers to promote the sessions, to really get the most out of them. So what we have outlined here is that the Secretariat would make an initial call for the papers on this Monday, provided that we agreed on making this call in this virtual meeting. So on Monday, first of October, a call would go out, and the deadline set for DCs to submit their one-page papers would be Friday, the 19th of October, after which that Monday immediately

thereafter, the Secretariat would post them and disseminate them as widely as possible on our social media channels and clearly link them to the content of the main session, which will be in the program and schedule for the IGF meeting.

So I think by the 22nd of October, then, according to this timeline, all the papers will be out for the public, and we hope to help people draw people into the session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. I see in the Chat both Marie-Laure and Smita would prefer a three-week timeline to allow sharing with members and back-and-forth process. The final document and the draft is another thing as a working document, but bearing in mind the IGF this year is really around the corner. It's how many weeks? Not that many. We have October -- it's six weeks; correct? Is

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: We are six weeks away. The deadline proposed here would be three weeks from now.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, a little bit under.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: A little bit under. To be fair, a little bit under.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: A little bit under three weeks, but it's -- again, the UN rule normally is for papers to be ready six weeks ahead of the meeting, and that's already where we are. So I think 19th of October for a final version, that will be three weeks ahead of the meeting proper, I think that sounds like a reasonable proposition. And also -- well, should it be for a draft or a final version? I think three weeks ahead of the meeting we should have a final version ready. But what I tried to get at earlier is it could be helpful to have first drafts being circulated for the preparation of the main session as working documents so that the people who prepare the main session would actually know a little bit of what to expect from the input. That was something I think that might be helpful. I am not saying we really need that, but I just wanted to flag this as a possible approach that the DCs present first working drafts which have not been cleared by the DCs and which would be subject to change, but so that the

organizers of the main session have some substantive input for discussing how to stage and orchestrate the main session.

Are there thoughts on that?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, it's Jutta speaking, if I may.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Of course.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I strongly (audio breaking up)

because if we only get these papers in final version in three weeks' time, I think that's too short before the IGF will take place to prepare for this thematic session, so I strongly believe that the earlier we use at least draft papers to give an idea for the main session would be very, very helpful. Thank you.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Gerry again. Sorry again that I didn't use the hands-up, but I can't use it.

The idea, I think, is to give the people organizing a bit of time, so it might make sense if we said that by this time next week you have to declare that you want -- that you

are going to write a paper. Then in two weeks' time you have a substantially finished paper. Then you have a couple weeks where you can come up with the final version. But I would agree with Jutta. I would say in a week's time declare that you are going to do it. In two weeks' time you have an almost finished paper. That would be my suggestion.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I would like to take this -- your suggestion, Gerry, a step further and not just say you are going to prepare a paper. Let's maybe have a brief outline of your paper, kind of executive summary, which will not be the final version, but which gives an idea of the thrust of your -- the general direction of what you are driving to. Again, it would be helpful, then, you have to put yourself into the shoes of the MAG members who will be part of this process. And they need a little bit more than just the name and title of a Dynamic Coalition. So it will be helpful to have a few sentences explaining a little bit of what you are hoping to achieve in this.

Can we kind of agree on that?

Yes, please.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Eleonora. To just add more concretely to what you just said, which is very important, if there were some, as you said, outlines or executive summary-type text ready by next week, it would be very helpful not just for MAG members contributing to this session in general, but specifically for a planning call that we will have with everyone involved in the main sessionCs and the relevant MAG members, around that time. So if those papers could feed into that planning call, that would also be great.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Yes, that was my original idea that I had. It would really be great to have something as an input into the planning call.

Jutta just says she has to leave on top of the hour for another call, and we still have -- I think we have a sort of general consensus on that yes, we have this proposed deadline for the final version, that we would be grateful to get a brief outline as soon as possible, and if possible,

ahead of the planning call, then that we know that the respective Dynamic Coalitions are on board and wish to contribute.

We still have the Village Booth we haven't discussed, but I don't think we have much time. I would just like to flag the past was it two or three years there was a joint Dynamic Coalition Village Booth, which has not always been very successful. One of the difficulties is, obviously, people run around our meetings, and it's -- the difficulty is to find volunteers who agree to sit at the booth. And then again, they should not be there just to promote one Dynamic Coalition, but to promote all the Dynamic Coalitions. The question is should we ask the Secretariat maybe to send out a spreadsheet trying to find volunteers, and then take a decision based on that? My gut feeling is better not to have a booth unless we are really willing to put in some effort. But again, it's your booth, and the Dynamic Coalitions in the past have expressed the desire to have a booth. But Eleonora, can you maybe quickly say a few words on how you see this from a Secretariat point

of view?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus.

I would only reemphasize what you just said. Maybe the most practical approach would be to really engage this booth would be for the Secretariat start a sign-up sheet. Really, if a lot of people are signing up to contribute to the booth, to say that they commit to being at the booth for certain periods of time, then we'll have a good sense that this is something that DCs want to take advantage of.

I think what has happened in past years is that there are maybe like two or three DCs who really want to make use of the booth, and then others who are just too busy during the meeting and who don't necessarily have an interest in using one. So it ends up being a little underpopulated. So unless there is one sort of, you know, big idea for how to use or manage the booth that would make it consistently attractive throughout the meeting, I think we need a lot of DC buy-in for it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, and Marie-Laure on the Chat, based on experience over the last years,

attendance has been very low, and I do not see a value in having this booth. That's, I think, a fair point. But can we --

>> JUTTA CROLL: Markus, if I may?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I do think it's right, what Eleonora said. If we have the booth, then we have to have people from the DCs present there. The booth last year gave the false impression that it was neglected by DCs, and if it's flagged as the Dynamic Coalition booth and if people walk around there in order to meet someone from Dynamic Coalitions to ask what is a Dynamic Coalition, how may I join a Dynamic Coalition on this or that topic, and nobody is there because it's useless because no one turned up there, then this is really not -- it doesn't give a good impression of the DCs' work. So either we have a schedule with people committed to be at the booth and then inform about the work of Dynamic Coalitions, or we should just not have a booth at all. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, and Nigel

echoes that, tend to agree that we should perhaps not have one; there is so much else to do.

So I take it there's Marie-Laure, there's Jutta, there's Nigel, and I also tend to be on this side, unless we have a firm commitment it may not be worthwhile. But as a next step, can we then agree to ask Eleonora from the Secretariat to send out a sign-up sheet, and based on that we will be able to gauge whether we have enough volunteers who would be able to populate the booth, and based on that we can then take a final decision whether or not.

Is there any other comments? Is there anything under any other business we need to address? And I take it that Jutta will soon be leaving us, as she says she has a hard stop top of the hour.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Markus, it's Eleonora. I just wanted to make sure that we didn't close the meeting without it being clear to everyone here what the deadline for the first draft of this paper. We can call it a first draft or, as you said, an executive summary or an outline. It

could be even more basic than a first draft. But just something, a product that gives an indication of the DC's interest in participating in the main session and, of course, on what SDGs they will be covering.

We were discussing one week from now, next Friday. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear because there were still some questions in the Chat on that, and we should also make clear that submitting this draft, even a basic one, by next week will be taken as an indication that that DC will intervene in the main session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, yes. That's basically Gerry's suggestion, that we give one week for each DC to declare their interest of participating. We are asking for a little bit more than just a declaration of intent, but just a basic outline of what the contribution would be. That is far less than a one-pager, which will be the final paper, which we ask the DCs to produce by 19th of October.

>> GERRY ELLIS: Markus? Sorry, Gerry again.

Let's call it an abstract. Wouldn't that be the normal --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Abstract sounds good, yes.

>> GERRY ELLIS: I have to run. I am in Frankfurt, have to go run for an aircraft. So thanks to everyone, and I will talk to you next time.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you, and we are so glad that you are able to make it this time. Thanks a lot, Gerry. Bye-bye.

And Jutta has already said her goodbyes, and she has to jump off for another call.

But I think we are good. Is there anything I forgot in the summary? We have a firm deadline next Friday, your abstract, your declaration of intent to participate in the main session, and at the same time, provide an abstract of what your contribution will be. And the second decision we agreed on is that Secretariat will send out to the list a sign-up sheet for the Village Booth, and based on the response, we will take a final decision whether or not it's worth pushing ahead with a Village Booth. But I also noted there was a strong skepticism whether it was worthwhile unless we really have firm commitment to make it work.

And with that, I think we have come to the end of our call. And all in all, I think we came quite a long way, and I thank you all for your active and constructive participation and wish you an excellent weekend. Bye-bye, all.

(End of session, 10:01 a.m. CT.)