

RAW FILE

DYNAMIC COALITION (DC) COORDINATION MEETING XXXVI

MAY 08, 2019

10:00 A.M. CT

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

+001-719-481-9835

www.captionfirst.com

\* \* \*

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

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

\* \* \*

>> Hi, Markus. It's Michael. I hear you just fine.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> Hi, I hope you're doing well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Likewise yours

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, again. It's Markus speaking. It's top of the hour. And I presume some people will still join us as we go on. But let's start at least with some of the more administrative announcements. I see Jutta, my co-facilitator, has also joined us. She will then take over on briefing on what's happening in the MAG. Just two things I was going to say. There was some misunderstanding with the transcription and unfortunately we won't have scribe for the entire duration of the call but at least for the first 45 minutes so that why I thought I might as well start and make use of the scribe so we can have transcription as much as possible. The second announcement, as you will recall, there have been persistent complaints about WebEx as it was not friendly for people with disabilities, and hopefully if everything goes well, thanks for the efforts of the Secretariat, this may well be the last time we use WebEx for one of our coordination calls, if everything goes according to plan the next call a new system should be in place. That will be friendlier for people with disabilities. I just wanted these two announcements to get out of the way.

Eleanora can you display the agenda you sent out earlier? We thought we would like to start with, again, with asking, giving you the opportunity, to give us updates from the various DC's.

Some of you may not have had the opportunity last time. There were quite substantive updates. If you have given us an update last time, you have given us an update on what has happened since. But mainly we

would invite those who have not been able to give us an update on their activities last time to take the lead. And then obviously, we're going to discuss the outcomes of the open consultations and this closely linked to the third agenda item, the DC engagement in the annual meetings.

I don't know whether Jutta has anything to add at this stage? Or should we go straight to the updates from the DC's?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I don't have anything to add at this moment, Markus, thank you for asking.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thank you, Jutta. Then we go directly to the DC's. Who would like to get us started to break the ice?

>> I can go, Markus. This is Michael. I don't mind breaking the ice.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, Michael, please go ahead.

>> Sure. Everyone, I'm calling on behalf of the Dynamic Coalition for the sustainability in news media. And I honestly don't have so much to update you on. It's been a very busy time and frankly after we were approved, at the beginning of April, which we thank the Secretariat for all of its work and for everyone here that supported us, we have not -- we have not lost momentum for anything like that, but there are some steps, internal administrative steps, that we need to take. For instance, we still need to share the announcement with global forums, with our members, as we're acting as the Secretariat for the Dynamic Coalition. We need to share the news with our members, but due to a lot of travel and some other events I've not been able to sit down and focus on this. Over the next two weeks, this is a priority for me. And otherwise, you know, we've been kind of really building partnerships as much as possible within the journalism and news media community, the media development community, letting people know this is something we're doing, and across the board we've gotten really good support, and it seems that sustainability for journalism and, you know, addressing the internet economy is really something that a lot of people seem to be understanding the importance of, and that's something that definitely encourages us.

And yeah, so I think that's plenty for now. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Who else? You can also shave that agenda item to the end. We don't need to push you for that. We have plenty to discuss on the agenda item two and three. This is an opportunity for you to tell us what has happened and what you've been working on, and I think the last time it was actually very interesting. We had quite a lot of substantive work being carried out by the DC's.

Is there anyone else who would like to comment at this stage or shall we move to agenda item two?

As I don't hear anyone with a violent desire to speak, I can take it then that you agree that we move on.

The outcomes of the second open consultations and MAG meetings and the expectations for the third MAG meeting which will take place next month in June. We did, as we promised, make a strong claim for your 90 minutes slot you wanted to get back, but nothing has been approved at this stage, and everything is a little bit in an overall context under consideration, but I would say the opportunity is here and, I think, the probability is much higher than last year that you will get a full slot.

Jutta, can I hand over to you to report on the MAG discussions and the outcomes of the last meeting in April? I'm looking forward to the June meeting. Please, Jutta, take over.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Of course, I can do so. Thank you, Marcus, for giving me the floor. I try to concentrate mainly on -- it was a three-day meeting, so many things were said there. But I try to concentrate and focus on the things that are most pressing. I do think, between the second face-to-face meeting, and the third face-to-face meeting. And this is -- sorry. I got a Skype message and I was a little bit distracted.

Eleanora has written there are two call-in users and we would like to ask them to identify themselves to know who is there on the line. Can we do that first? Who are the call-in users in this call?

>> Oh, good afternoon. I am certainly one of them, I think. This is Nigel Hixon. I'll go on mute as I'm in a very crowded station. But anyway, thanks.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Nigel. Do we have another call-in user?

>> Hi, Jutta, it's Eleanora. Story for the misunderstanding. There was just one call-in user, and that was Nigel.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you. Thank you. So trying to focus on the process between the second face-to-face meeting and the third face-to-face meeting. This was mainly the discussion about how we proceed once we have all the results from all the calls that were -- all calls were due on April the 12th, I think, that were for the workshops, for open forums, for Dynamic Coalition sessions, and for sessions on day zero. I think they all

had the same deadline. We were discussing how the MAG would proceed with the workshop proposals or session proposals that were in the responsibility of the MAG.

And probably, it's interesting for all the Dynamic Coalitions to know the statistics for all these calls. Eleanora, do you have them that you can report them? I have only rough figures. I don't have them truly.

>> Hi, Jutta, hi, everyone. Yes, I can give some initial figures for what we received for each session type. So we -- we had a total of 298 workshop proposals. We have 45 requests for open forums. We received 18 requests for Dynamic Coalition sessions. And 52 for day zero events. Now, these are the total submission figures. We're in the process of finalizing a review to see which ones actually meet all the requirements in each session category. And we can speak about this a little bit later, specifically, what the status is for DC sessions, but, I mean, it should not come as a surprise to DC's if they met the requirements, making their requests, then they will, you know, they will necessarily have their session in the programme.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay, thank you, Eleanora. So the main discussion during the face-to-face meeting by MAG members was about how we deal with the number of workshop proposals, how would the assessment process be run, and how decisions will be made. And the process is slightly different from last year. It was agreed that workshop proposals should be assigned to MAG members on a random basis, not by expertise as it was last year. Last year, MAG members announced which area of expertise they would feel comfortable to assess workshop proposals, and then MAG members got only proposals that were related to their area of expertise.

And somehow, the MAG felt that this could also, of course, more cases of conflict of interest, on the one hand, and that it would be more reasonable and fair to allocate proposals randomly.

So the three main themes that we already had decided on, data governance, digital inclusion, and security, safety, stability, and (?) were there three buckets the proposals went in and then MAG members were assigned randomly to these buckets.

The allocation of proposals to the three themes was not even, but close to even. So that one bucket was -- I think was more than 100 proposals while the other two were around 90 proposals.

And the second thing that is different from last year is that it was agreed that after this initial scoring process and assessment, MAG members will convene within these three groups and discuss where the threshold of proposals that pass will be set, and what about the other proposals. So it would not be based only on mere scoring value, but also a discussion shall take place and probably I do think the meetings of the three groups shall be appointed at the end of next week. I'm not sure whether we can keep that schedule because due to the -- to the high work load assessing all the proposals, the deadline for the assessment was a little bit extended until Sunday, midnight.

So that makes open the question when the three groups of MAG members will meet to discuss each of their buckets.

That was more or less what was agreed on the workshop assessment process for this year.

And what we can also report, it was first impression that then became -- we became more confident in that, that the quality of workshop proposals is really high this year, that the idea of asking workshop proposals to phrase policy questions seems to be very successful. So it seems that proposals firstly thought about what are the policy questions that are related to the topic I'm proposing, and that's resulted in more considerate workshop proposals. At least I can confirm that for the bucket I'm working on, but I have some feedback from other MAG members for the other themes, as well.

So what we can assume is that we -- there will be a space for more workshops than we had last year, and there will also be space for the other sessions, the other types of sessions, that Eleanora just named.

But still, it's the question how many sessions shall be run in parallel? Because it's not only a question of space, but also a question of quality of the programme and whether participants really understand how the programme is composed and where to turn their attention to, to which sessions to go, and to get a good overview over all the sessions and not to get lost in IGF space, I would say.

Yeah, that's for all this, for the process.

Probably, Markus, you can add something from the third day, because unfortunately I couldn't attend the face-to-face meeting on the third day, so if you can add something discussed on the third day, I would be glad to hand it over to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I would be happy to. Again, I would focus only the Dynamic Coalitions, how they're concerned, you have said a lot of that. I also try to make the point saying that the Dynamic Coalitions, we do understand the concern of the MAG to shape a coherent programme, and to have these tracks and these themes, but the meetings of the Dynamic Coalitions have their own dynamics and they have also their own

history and it's not the same sense as a meeting like a workshop. It is a working meeting. We can't consider it a general meeting of the Dynamic Coalition where they have it's a one-a-year meeting where they meet and they have substantive issues to discuss, the progress of their work, and to drive it further, and obviously there will be also presentations to explore the issues, but it is somewhat different from the normal workshops.

And maybe also, for consideration of the MAG, that they can be -- a lot depends on how the programme is presented, that there are meetings that are essentially a combination of intercessional work, and they're slightly different and also have a different color code, not to create confusion for the average IGF participant.

But all this is still, I think, very much in the air.

One issue I was signaled that the Dynamic Coalitions were hoping, again, to be able to host, to organize a main session, but they were also willing to consider joining other main sessions and bringing in their expertise on any given theme, as you have a lot of expertise to offer.

But then one suggestion came up and that was made by the Chair as this is, and I wonder whether Eleanora you can display the tract from the transcript of the MAG meeting. This is a bit smaller. Can you make it a bit bigger? Yes.

Where I did point out -- can you scroll down a bit so we can see Lynn's response? She was then thinking about more in terms of what is particular about the Dynamic Coalitions is that they are a network of networks, and whether they could consider a session to look at this networking, and you see it in the second paragraph there, whether or not there's something we could draw together in terms of what makes successful network of networks or what are some of the success factors of networks?

And that was more thinking aloud, a suggestion by the Chair, and I said, okay, I will take it back to the Dynamic Coalitions for consideration.

And I think it's an interesting idea, but you don't -- we were thinking about focusing on a common theme, as we did last year together, then, at the main session with the businesspeople, the ICC basis folks, and that worked reasonably well, but there was on the sustainable development theme.

Here, it's more to have a process-related theme. This is something I would throw open for discussion, whether there will be any appetite by the Dynamic Coalitions to develop this further.

With this, Eleanora, if I missed out anything, please feel free to fill in.

>> Thank you, Markus, thank you, Jutta. No, I think you both covered parts of the discussion relevant to Dynamic Coalition's very well. I would add a few actually nonprogrammic things announced in the second MAG meeting, the first which we were all very, you know, pleased and excited to hear was that the German government announced that chancellor Merckel has decided to speak in the opening of the IGF. So that was -- that announcement was made in the MAG meeting.

And also, that the Secretariat, thanks to funding from the German government, is accepting applications for funding support to attend the IGF.

So we've made some announcements about this through our mailing list and it's on our website, but this was -- this was first shared in the MAG meeting. So I thought it was worth reiterating.

And finally, also, not related to the programme necessarily, our MAG nomination process is open for next year. So we have started this much earlier than in previous cycles, so as to ensure that we actually have a MAG in place by the end of this next IGF, which has always been the aim, really, that, you know, once one IGF closes than you have a new MAG come in, or a rotated MAG.

So that nomination process is open and I would be happy to share the relevant links in the chat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Eleanora, for this. Yes, I think we have already noticed this year there's less of a hiatus between the meetings and a more seamless process and it's definitely a positive development.

Any comments? Suggestions? Questions?

>> Markus, if I may, I would like to --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, of course.

>> -- take upon the point that you made about what makes a successful network of networks. So this would be kind of a metalevel discussing what the network of Dynamic Coalitions means, two the Dynamic Coalitions, but also to the IGF community. I do think this is probably a very good idea. What I was considering is that many people, it seems, do not know what makes a Dynamic Coalition. It's those people who are engaged in the Dynamic Coalition, of course, they know what they do and why they are there, but

many people who take part in the IGF just don't understand what is different between a Dynamic Coalition session and any other session in the programme.

And I do think it would be really useful to give some more explanation, since the IGF takes place this year in Germany I was asked by many, many people, as well as by organizations "could you explain a little bit more what is IGF? How does it work? Who is invited? Who is going there? Who is speaking there? What are the different types of sessions and organizations and all around?"

And when I explained about Dynamic Coalitions, I got a lot of attention. People were really curious to learn what does it mean that it's not only going to, like, a conference, attend one session, and that's it, more or less, but that a Dynamic Coalition is something that is working throughout the whole of the year on a specific issue that they've decided on, and then they have their session at the IGF, but that's, like said before, also the one opportunity to meet once in a year with all their people that you're working around the year, but only by virtual means.

And I do think there is so much room for more people and organizations to join the Dynamic Coalitions, but still it needs to be explained. They need to learn what is the Dynamic Coalition and how can I join and what commitment is asked from me.

So I was wondering whether we could find some space, maybe in such a session, network of networks, or anywhere else, to explain what makes a Dynamic Coalition, besides that it is on the website, of course, on the IGF website, but we all know that if you're a newcomer you just get lost and you won't find the right information at the time you need it. That's my two cents.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta. That's very good points. It also ties up with what I tried to say maybe representing the programme. It could also make it a bit clearer that this is a different kind of session. And you also thinking of having a more introductory session, a marketing session, for the Dynamic Coalitions, we did have a main session in (?) which turned out to be more inward-looking which is not really of much interest to the outcomers, but what you are saying is that we should try to reach out and explain who we are. And listening to the MAG discussion, I felt that also many of the, especially, the newer MAG members, were not sufficiently aware what the Dynamic Coalitions are.

But you would like to jump in, please, Olivier.

>> Yes, Markus, can you hear me?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can.

>> This is something not very well known, this whole intercessional coalition. I was at an internet meeting a few weeks ago, maybe months, and someone from the audience asked what is the difference between a Dynamic Coalition and a best practice forum? And unfortunately, there was a MAG member present, and again I don't remember their name, because there was quite a few weeks, and the response was, well, the best practice forum does intercessional work but the Dynamic Coalitions do not. Of course, that's not the right answer. So I sort of corrected them afterwards, but it is some kind of a confusion for people, and maybe there needs to be an explanation of the difference between the best practice forum and the Dynamic Coalition, but at the same time I would really also urge to stop this perceived rivalry between the two types of intercessional work. You know? We're all trying to get people involved in between the different IGF's and I don't know how to bridge that gap, but I'd really be interested in finding out ways for this. Thank you.

And just to let you know, I'm involved in best practice forum and the Dynamic Coalitions, as well. This is why I do feel the necessity. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, thank you. You're quite right there. There should not be a rivalry, as someone said, they complement each other. That's exactly how it is. But the difference is the best practice forums is something where the MAG takes a decision and approves a best practice forum. This year, we want, and says it, the DC's are bottom up and the rest are top down. That's a very simple description of how it is. Top down is maybe -- needs to be a little more nuanced, top down in the approval, but once they're underway they're not top down anymore. The work is also very much bottom up and network work, but there is an approval process through the MAG. Whereas, the DC's are, as you all know, of course, self-constituted and bottom up and autonomous.

But there is definitely a need, and that is maybe also something we can give back to the MAG when it comes to the final programme design, that that needs to be made clearer in the programme, that the Dynamic Coalitions -- and the same also goes for the best practice forums, which, again, need to have a slightly different track, that this is intercessional work, but it's not the same kind of intercessional work. It's a different type of intercessional work.

Any other comments?

But that essentially leads us into the agenda item three, the DC engagement in the annual meeting. There is individual sessions. And the chance -- nothing has been decided yet firmly. It was, I think, a decision by the Chair to look at everything in the overall context. So it's of the old negotiation that nothing is decided until everything is decided, but the chances that the Dynamic Coalitions get their 90-minute slot, I think, are very high. But then, the other forms of engagement is obviously the possibility of contributing to the main sessions. We don't know yet exactly what they are, but there I would need also an update from Jutta or Eleanora who followed MAG discussions much closer.

And the possibility of having a main session, and this suggestion by the Chair of networking of networks is something, I think, that deserves consideration. And I would presume, as it came from the Chair, that the Chair would have a positive bias if the Dynamic Coalitions picked it up. But, of course, you are also free to say, "Yeah, interesting, but we would like to do something else."

But this is something which deserves discussion.

Are there opinions? Comments? And Eleanora, Jutta, again, did I miss out anything?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Hi, Marcus, hi, all. I do think that with regard to the main sessions, the MAG also discussed whether there should be main sessions that are grouped to the three themes. So that we would have main session on data governance, on digital inclusion, and on security safety stability. That was discussed, at least, but I don't think there was any decision so far. I do think there was debate how we could probably start with the workshops, the sessions that were proposed, and then try to have conclusive sessions on the three main themes. So that firstly we have all the different sessions and workshops, and then somehow bring forward the messages from the workshop sessions into the main sessions.

That was one idea that was suggested, but as I remember it was not decided on that point, and that not usually must affect the type of session that the Dynamic Coalitions run as a joint effort, it could also somehow feed into these conclusive sessions on the main themes, but it must not be the case. I do think this is completely open to the Dynamic Coalitions to decide whether they would follow the idea on a session on the structure of their work, or whether they decide to have thematic main session, and then also whether this thematic main session falls under one of the three main themes, or whether it's something else.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So many balls still in the air. Eleanora, anything else to add?

>> Hi, Markus, hi, Jutta, thanks for giving me the floor. Yeah, I think Jutta covered very well the discussion on main sessions as it stands so far. There is no conclusion yet as to whether the main sessions will be strictly tied to the three main themes or will possibly feature other themes, and there is this notion floating around that has a lot of support for a so-called topping and tailing structure, where you would have the three thematic tracts essentially book-ended by introductory and conclusion sessions in the programme. So I think we have to see where the MAG discussions take us on that.

But certainly, I think, Marcus, this topic you introduced, potential topic of a network of networks main session that DC's could contribute to or take a lead in organizing is very interesting and we should keep it on the table.

I wanted to say earlier, unfortunately, even as the host of the meeting, you have trouble unmuting yourself sometimes, and I wanted to just, in the previous agenda item, add something to the short discussion we had on BPF's and DC's. I've been trying to raise it in MAG meetings, too, that from the Secretariat perspective we see a lot more collaboration between DC's and BPF's in a very, very positive way, and I -- and I think it's just worth saying that here for all DC's to know and, or if they do know, to be reminded of, that, for instance, the DC on internet of things made, you know, a tremendous contribution to the BPF last year on IOT, artificial intelligence, and big data. There's been a lot of good collaboration between the DC on gender and the BPF on gender and also a good collaboration between the DC on connecting the unconnected, and the connecting and enabling the next billions intercessional work stream, which is similar to a BPF that was running for the last three years.

So I just felt it might be worth pointing that out for the record.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Those are welcome comments and it's worthwhile noticing.

Are there other comments? Suggestions? And reactions, also, to the proposal from the Chair on the theme for a potential DC, more on a metatheme on network on networks?

>> Hi, everybody, this is Michael.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Michael, please.

>> I'm a little -- I don't know how to express this, because it's not a criticism at all. I think it's a good idea. I also just want to add that especially this past year, and I shared this before in a previous meeting, that somebody who works closely with us and they're part of our network, he was a bit disappointed that he wasn't

able to kind of hear from each of the DC's, like what had happened in Geneva. And so I don't know if that would be -- if that idea would be kind of, you know, side-lined completely.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can you be more specific. You mean at Geneva at the previous annual meeting?

>> Michael: Sorry. I'll speak up. I guess my allergies have been acting up. Yeah, the way it was organized in Geneva, at the IGF, where each DC was given some time to update the audience about what they were doing. He had said that was useful for him. At the same time, I also see the utility of doing something a bit more kind of maybe addressing more about what DC's do or something. At the same time, it seems -- well, it's fortunate that that seems to be something that we have to do, but regardless, I just wanted to ask if there would be any kind of space for DC's to also inform about what they're doing and what they do. I mean perhaps they could complement each other, because, you know, a good way to explain what the DC's are at a meta level is to also explain what each one is doing for the past year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, the Geneva session was, I think, very successful in terms of content. It depended to a large extent on the moderator. She was really excellent, Tatiana. She said she would not like to do it again. I'm not sure whether we would find anyone who would be as good as Tatiana was, because she really prepared it well, and she moderated it in a very dynamic way. We gave her the task, and she took the challenge very well.

After Geneva, we decided maybe it's better not to try and repeat it, and we focused on something else, but this is obviously an option to go back to that model and maybe try to convince Tatiana to do it once again. That definitely could be another option.

Don't get me wrong. We are not obliged to take on the theme that was suggested by the Chair. It was more thinking aloud. But I thought we would be well-advised, at least, to give it due consideration, discuss it, and if we come to the conclusion, no, it's not for us, then fair enough. We can report back that we decided it would not be the best idea, but we also need to give reasons why when reporting back, why we would try to go for something else.

Are there other comments? Agreements? Disagreements?

>> Markus, sorry for jumping in. I see a comment from Marilo (phonetic) in the chat. She says the network of networks does sound interesting, however, this is very generic and we would need to find an angle where we highlight its value in the context of the IGF.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's a very good point. Any idea what the angle could be? What this angle could be? Where we add value to a discussion? I mean the starting point, I think, for Lynn was there's a lot of talk about network of networks, also, in different fora. We've now been working together for how many years? Three years or so? Trying to come closer together. So we have definitely some experience. I wonder whether Avri, who was my co-coordinator at the beginning, whether she might have some idea? But anybody is welcome, obviously, to jump in.

>> JUTTA CROLL: It's Jutta once again speaking with regard to the Dynamic Coalitions. I do think we can only explain the value for the IGF community of a network of networks once we have explained what Dynamic Coalitions mean, as I said before. From my perspective, it's like if I go to the IGF, and I see, okay, there is a session of the Dynamic Coalitions, Dynamic Coalition of library, maybe I'm from a library going for the first or second time to the IGF and I think, of course, this might be interesting for me to go there because they talk about public access in libraries.

But still, I wouldn't have a clue that I could join this Dynamic Coalition, that my organization would probably be a good member of a Dynamic Coalition that is dealing with this question.

And if I don't know that, and I only go to the session and learn about public access and libraries, I won't know what it means to join a Dynamic Coalition. For me, it's a precondition that people learn to understand what it means to become a member of a Dynamic Coalition, and then it's easier to explain why, as a member of a certain Dynamic Coalition, I take part in this whole IGF ecosystem. I can have -- my work can have impact on the work that this Dynamic Coalition does, but also on that joint collaboration.

So it's a two-step thing from my perspective.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, thank you. I mean that's impeccable logic, but whenever we have a Dynamic Coalition session, the very first part of that session could be devoted to the basics, to explaining what the Dynamic Coalition is, and explaining that they are open and they're welcoming newcomers and pointing to the individual sessions and then go into the meta discussion, and at the same time, I think, also, the programme would benefit from having that made clearer, the different type of sessions. Here are the sessions that are approved, selected by the MAG, like the workshops, the main sessions, organized by the MAG, the best practice forums approved by the MAG, and here are the Dynamic Coalitions as a bottom-up autonomous spontaneous sessions, and that they are working throughout the year and welcoming newcomers. And it

doesn't need that long explanation, but I think the programme would benefit from having that made clearer. Made clearer with different colors in the tract, but also there needs to be something in writing to make that clear, but that does not replace Jutta's point that there needs to be a more proactive outreach of the Dynamic Coalitions where they explain the very basics, and that also brings us to the issue of the village, whether or not Dynamic Coalitions should take part in the village.

In the past, I think we had not altogether made successful experiences with the IGF village, but that was also intended to be a sort of point of entry for newcomers and explain to participants what the Dynamic Coalitions are.

But it obviously, I feel, may not have met that prime objectives.

But I don't know whether -- Eleanora, would you like to briefly jump in on the village? And also give the necessary deadlines by when we should decide whether or not we want to have a presence in the IGF village?

>> Hi, Markus. Hi, everyone. Yes. So there is, actually, a booth on reserve for DC's should they choose to have one, but we would definitely have to decide on this within, I would say, the next few weeks. I mean it's - it's, you know, a little bit tough doing this on the mailing list. I don't know whether or not we could, you know, reach a conclusion or a decision on this call. It would be better maybe to have more DC's present to make a final, final decision.

But I mean it is for the time being, I think, good for everyone to know that the opportunity is there. But I would not -- I would not take longer than a few weeks to decide.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. I agree. I don't think we would be in a position to come to a conclusion at this session.

But I would like to urge you to think about it and, also, I'm not sure for how many more minutes we would have the captioning as there was I think talk we might not have the full hour. So if the captioning disappears, that you are aware they will not be able to provide the service for the full hour.

Jutta made the point in the chat that we should have a joint DC session at the very beginning of this year's IGF. And also, there are sessions for newcomers every year. I don't know where we are in the planning of such a session this year, that we should also make it clear, maybe that the newcomer session will have a reserved corner for the DC's, whether they can explain what they are.

Jutta, do you have anymore indications on the newcomer session?

>> JUTTA CROLL: I just wrote it in the chat that I think that is a very good idea, to explain to newcomers, as well, what Dynamic Coalition means. And the only point that I made was if we go for a network of networks subject session, then it would probably be a good idea to have that at the beginning of the programme, so that more or less people that attend the session understand the network of networks Dynamic Coalitions and then go with a different perspective and attitude to Dynamic Coalition sessions, because they will then have understood the whole system.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Again, that's a very valid point. And another question, I think, that was some discussion, maybe not in the main meeting, but when it comes to networks, there's also the network of the national regional IGF's. That has developed into quite a vibrant network, maybe could that be an option to have a joint session on the theme of network of networks? With the NRI's? I know many of you are also involved in the national and regional IGF's.

And I think Olivier made the comment in the chat, the internet is a network of networks, to a network of networks is very, obviously, it lends itself to an internet governance forum meeting.

These are other thoughts. Other further comments? Thoughts?

>> Hi, Markus, it's Eleanora. I just wanted to point out that, I mean, I think what Jutta has said, what Michael said earlier, and also some thoughts that emerged in the MAG meeting itself seem to me to my ears be sort of converging on a similar -- a similar -- a similar need that is for DC's to have a session in the programme that explains what they are, and that gives them a chance to present themselves to participants in one way or another.

And so I'm wondering if maybe one solution might be to take the traditional kind of inward-facing DC coordination session we've had and maybe use that instead to have a much more kind of public-facing introductory session on DC's that would also, at the same time, maybe given each DC the opportunity to, you know, give a brief presentation on their work? I don't know if maybe that's combining too many things in one session, but it seems to me that the suggestions being made are sort of moving in that direction.

(Captioner must stop now.)

Copyright © 2019 Show/Hide Header Show/Hide Chat