

RAW FILE
DCCG Meeting #94
Wednesday, February 12, 2025
12:00 p.m. UTC

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
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 the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello. Markus here. It's top of the hour. Let's wait another minute or two. Good to see there are quite a few people on the call. Welcome to you all.

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Good afternoon, Markus. Hi, good afternoon, Roman.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Hi, everybody.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Hello, hello.

>> Hello, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hello, everyone. Yes. We have, as I see it, 10 people or more on the call. So, we never actually went to the formality of asking for a quorum. But the discussion we had at the last meeting on the gamification also attendance list may lead us to a way that we say we will have at least a number of active DCs on the call to make it a call.

But, okay. It's, according to my computer, a minute over the hour. It's still very early for the people in the western hemisphere, and I think there are a few apologies. But at the next call will be then later hour to make it easier for the people in the western hemisphere to join us. But maybe more difficult for the people in the east hemisphere.

But with that, can we get started and have an official start of the meeting? We have an agenda sent out by Roman. Many thanks for that. Can you post the agenda on the chat so that we all have the same?

There. Okay. It's a very formal agenda. And one thing I

noticed, again, thanks to the Secretariat for providing draft records of the meeting but we never went through the process of adopting reports and so on, and I don't think it's necessary to do that. It's still -- we may get there at one point. But we are still fairly informal and loose gathering.

But nevertheless, I would like to point out, please read the summary record of each meeting the Secretariat provides. And if you have any comments, suggestions for improvement, send it to the Secretariat.

And one thing we noticed, and you will see in the summary record Roman sent out, there were a few people listed without any affiliation to the respective DC. And Roman tried hard to find out and Googled whatever, but it's not always that easy to find.

So, the very easiest thing to do is that we actually make a requirement for whoever joins the call that you indicate when you give your name, at the same time the affiliation of your dynamic coalition. It doesn't take much time for you to do that. You can do that on the template we have on the Zoom, but it's -- okay. If you don't find yourself being reflected, after the meeting you can always go back and send your comment to the Secretariat.

And one question I would then have when we may come to the accountability issue, we could also ask additional people and their behavior. But I see there's already a hand up in the floor. Judith, please.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. Judith Hellerstein for the record. Problem here lies sometimes if someone is a member of the DC but is not the representative, and so having them assign a DC gets confusing because if there are comments are made, the comments should only be from the representative of the DC and not from a general member.

So, maybe we could say representative and general member to differentiate who is the coordinators of, who is responsible for it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for the comment. But I just wonder whether we are not making it overcomplicated. All we want to know is the affiliation of the people on the call.

And if somebody is not the officially designated representative of the DC on the call makes a comment, he or she could say so, that he or she is speaking in the individual capacity, but not on behalf of the DC.

Jutta, please, help me out.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus. I'm just wondering, when we use Zoom, we always are not allowed to change our name in the participants list. It's just not possible. Although

usually allows for that. So could we probably just use another format of Zoom where all participants are allowed to change their name and then put just Jutta for dynamic coalition on children's rights, for example, Wout on 3S and so on.

But in this format of Zoom, it's only, I think, possible for the host to change the names of the participants.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. That said --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Now nobody can change their names?

>> JUTTA CROLL: No. In the participants' list, there is just, yeah, not the option to change it.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, no.

>> JUTTA CROLL: And that would make it much easier if we can click on change my name and put the name and the affiliation.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You could change -- it's Judith again. Roman, if you adjust the settings on the website part, you could do it.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: But I don't know if IGF has it set up, the Secretariat has it set up that way for a reason.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Let's not spend too much time discussing the technical details. But let's make sure the Secretariat will sort it out. And in the meantime, you can always say in the chat, you can give an individual chat to Roman, please make sure you list me as Judith from DCAD C or whatever.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Yeah, I think that's how you can do it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Carol has her hand up.

>> CAROL ROACH: I was going to comment, think I did.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We are all sorted on that, excellent. And welcome, Carol, very much appreciate you in your capacity as MAG chair actually choose to attend our DC Coordination Group meetings. Thank you very much.

And actually, you may regret it, because I may ask you then to report on the agenda item where we reflect on last week's open consultation and MAG meeting.

But, okay, with that and can we agree that we adopt the agenda as it was proposed? And, again, adoption of the draft agenda, outcome of the first open consultation at MAG meetings, preparation of the DC webinars, DC accountability and any other business.

Do we have agreement on that, or are there any comments?

And I take silence for agreement and I take it, then, that we adopt the agenda as proposed.

And with that, we come to the agenda item 2, outcomes of the first consultation MAG meeting, and I think here we are extremely well placed as we have the MAG chair on the call. My

apologies, Carol, to put you on the spot, but I think there's no one better placed than you to brief us on the meetings we had last week. My personal opinion was it went very well. But over to you.

>> CAROL ROACH: Thank you, Markus for putting me on the spot. Yes, the meeting did go extremely well. We were able to come up with a theme and subtheme. So, that was the main topic.

I don't know, Roman, do you have access to the document that was produced that has the theme, subthemes and descriptions? I don't know if you can post that there.

>> CAROL ROACH: Yeah. So that was completed. Of course, the DCs and NRIs were a topic of discussion. As we discussed in Saudi Arabia, we really want to strengthen the collaborations between DCs, NRIs and the MAG itself. I know when we left off in Saudi Arabia, I think, the DC Coordination Team to come up with ways in which you would like to see the interactions, because you know how you operate, and that would be the best thing.

And also what was top of the list as well is how we can incorporate getting input or feedback from DCs and NRIs with regards to any of the GDC action lines, this is action lines that affect you. We want to see that coming from you. That could be in the form of a document that you could present to the MAG. That was critical to us as well.

Anything else? I don't know. It was a question I can put to you besides myself trying to attend our meetings. Would you want -- because there are MAG members here. But would you want another assigned MAG member to attend these coordinating meetings? That might be one of your requests. I'm not sure.

Did I leave out anything else of importance, Markus, with regards to the DCs?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. I think it was a very comprehensive overview. And, yes, one of our asks was, indeed, to have a MAG liaison. Obviously having the MAG chair herself taking on this role is, shall we say, better than -- it's more than we asked for. The question is, would you always have the time to do that?

And the DCs, I think really would like to have a MAG member following closely the calls and being intermediary between the two worlds, bringing the DC feelings into the MAG and also the MAG concerns into the DCs. So, that is still a question. But you think also the Secretariat has promised to do some behind the scenes work approaching potential MAG members who could do that and reporting back on that.

I don't know, Roman, would you have anything to add to that?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: No. Maybe just that soon we will learn

the call for workshops and session proposals. But I think we can also discuss it in more detail, how do we want to submit the sessions. So, for instance, or if I can continue with this now and to briefly say what we discussed with colleagues.

We would encourage, as always, everyone to merge and to propose the sessions together so that we do not have to do it ourselves, you know, and to leave someone unhappy.

So, the more, let's say, so those DCs who are working on the same subject, they can just make a collective proposal, because due to some venue constraints, we will certainly have several times less amount of sessions than in previous year. And that's why I believe that totally for DC sessions it can be not 14, but it probably will be five to eight sessions. This is what I heard from the programme capacity.

So, that's why this is a kind request to merge. You know, there are two ways. The first way is we discussed that in this logic of webinars to submit it on this broad, like, GDC topics. But, again, if you just want to find some maybe DC doing similar things or from similar sphere, it's your choice. You can still also apply individually and it will be MAG to consider those sessions. And also, first, you should not forget to apply as other workshop proposals, maybe not DC session, but also like a workshop and see. Maybe this is how a session gets accepted. So, yeah, this is what I wanted to share.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yeah, and I see Carol shared already the official four themes. And it's, obviously, a very high-level discussion. And what you already, Roman, is it's clear from the capacity of the organizers, it's not thinkable, but every -- I mean, like previously, every DC will get the session. So, we will have to streamline.

But I also made the point at the MAG meeting that the DCs would like to have an opportunity, if they have something to present, to present that outcome. And that might not be as part of a DC session, but might be part of another platform within the venue, like last year in Riyadh, there was the platform right in the middle of the village where there were sessions taking place. It could be, you know, whatever format it is, but at least that you get a 10-minute slot to present the outcome. That is something that I think is high on the priority list.

And thanks to Wout, who has his hand up already, and it was his initiative that we presented what is in the pipeline of the DCs. And I think that was very well received. It was a very short time frame we had to present that. And, obviously, it's not the end of all. It should be part of a living document. And that is an ongoing process. But, Wout, you asked for the floor,

please.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. I think you said most of what I wanted to say. There are two things that came to mind on the MAG meeting. That in the workshop proposal document, the question on intersessional work will be posed in a more direct way. How exactly I haven't read yet because it's not out. But chairs part of the MAG said they would change the question into a more direct way, how are you involved in intersessional work so that the link between the workshop proposal and intersessional work, so including the dynamic coalitions, will become more apparent. Not that the MAG will score it worse or better, but at least it makes it far easier to put workshop proposals in connection with the intersessional activities. So, that is one.

The other is that we did ask, like Markus said, for the possibility to present an outcome at the IGF because that would also make it far more obvious that it's going to be reported on in the IGF outcomes. Because we produce these outcomes and then they are mentioned in the programme, et cetera.

Where the MAG meeting is concerned, I was part of most of it. It was so fast moving compared to a physical session. But perhaps the first MAG meeting is better to do online than physically, except you have to get to know each other and I understand that. But it was extremely efficient compared to other years. And that is something that I came home with how fast everything moves, sometimes even ahead of the schedule, that topics were decided on.

So, I think that that was something that I took away from the MAG meeting as well.

And Roman, a final question on the workshop proposals is the date of -- I thought it was to be today but is it going to be today or is it later?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I hope so. I think it's going to be today.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Okay. That's it. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, and I was also going to mention that the change in the template for providing workshop proposals is different now, and the idea is also to give more points to accessing the intersessional work. So if DCs in that sense it changes a little bit the mechanics from what we had in the past 10, 15 years, that DCs are encouraged, actually, to submit workshop proposals and they, obviously, would have to look for other partners. It will not be a DC proposal. But it will be joint proposals. But the DCs would get extra points because they are part of the intersessional work. And that will be part of the scoring list, which was agreed on by the MAG, that whoever, any workshop that partners with an existing DC

would actually get a better starting point.

Judith, you have a question.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. My question is, are we doing the same -- besides the regular workshop, are we doing the same structure we did last year where DCs partner with another DC and get a session that's like we had last year. I think she had like 10 sessions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's a good question. But as Roman said, based on the availability of sessions, and I think the Norwegians are very precise in their planning and that there is not that much extra room. And I think it's -- well, Roman said at the beginning, how many, do you think, sessions might there be room. I think we tried to go with this clustering and that may well be the limit. But I don't think there will be -- I mean, listening to the Norwegian organizers, there will be very limited room. But there will be room for meetings, if a DC wants to meet at their annual, the AGM, I think a room will be provided. But, again, I turn to Roman, please.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: As I said, I think that totally no more than five to eight sessions will be allocated for DCs. So that's why, yes, think of how better to use this opportunity. Either to go together and align with the clusters or just submit it individually or together by several DCs and just let the MAG decide which sessions should be.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, that's also -- my feeling is if DCs are very attached to a theme, whatever that is, that they might be best placed to submit it as a workshop proposal. But that changes the dynamic, because then they will be subject to approval by the MAG and they will find other partners. But in that sense, at the same time, when they submit a proposal, they would get very positive first appraisal.

But I see Carol has her hand up to clarify. Please, Carol.

>> CAROL ROACH: I'm not clarifying. I'm just commenting on how I enjoyed the sessions where you had the DCs clustered. And I think it went very well. The host country has really taken the time to put in the SDGs, the WSIS Action lines, the GDC action lines as well, along with each topic. And you may wish to, once again, focus around the DCs around these groupings.

But I thought it went well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And I think that was essentially also what we felt collectively, that it went very well with the clusters. And that's why we decided to move on with the same clusters.

One question I may have, as we now have, shall we call it the official clusters approved by the MAG, should we align totally

with MAG clusters, that is, again, building digital trust and resilience, sustainable and responsible innovation, universal access and digital rights and digital cooperation.

There was, I would like to recall, also the question that some DCs felt they didn't fit in into any of the clusters we had before, whether there was a need to create a cluster for others. And creating the cluster for others might very well be the digital cooperation cluster, which was approved by the MAG. But that is really something I would like to open to the floor for discussion.

But I think what we ought to do, ought to do the same thing as the MAG, that we have a reference to the GDC, WSIS and SDGs with each of the clusters as a minimum.

But my question will be a very binary one. Should we reshift and realign totally with the MAG clusters, or shall we stick to the clusters we have identified for the 24 meeting.

And I see Jutta is on my screen big for some reason. And Jutta was very much the digital architect of last year's clusters. I'm sure she would have comments. But I see hands up, there's Maarten and then Rajendra. Maarten first.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Your question was good. I appreciate the four focus areas, it makes sense. My question is related to each focus areas has certain SDGs. And in particular if I look to the area of sustainable and responsible innovation, area 2, one of the things is agriculture. Yet SDG2 is with theme 3. So, is there no combinable or can -- is it just guidance and should we go by four areas first and take the rest as input and ideas and suggestions, but more binary binding? I hope for the latter, because there's a good argument to see food also in the sustainability cluster.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: All good question and comments. But I think, again, then we would have to go back to Carol and ask for her guidance. But I think I see that more as an open menu that can still be adjusted.

But, okay, we have various hands up. Rajendra, Mohamed, and Jutta. Rajendra.

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Thank you. Given the last year's experience of hosting the various combinations. Since we did it, we tried our best. We did have issues in terms of meeting, getting other DCs to participate in those clusters. I think we should rework them. And we have enough time. Maybe give them an option saying these are the thematic areas, where you find your fitment. I think going that route, I think we will have people who will participate because they have chosen the clusters they want to be a part of. I think that will be much more helpful

for us in shaping the sessions.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry. I'm not sure I fully got it. Maybe I --

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Let me --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: In a binary way are you in favor of keeping last year's clusters or realigning with this --

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Realigning.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: To answer your question, Markus, first, I am not strongly vetted to the clusters that we created last year. So, it did work well. And I am open to new clusters. But my concern is a little bit different one. On one hand, whereas some DCs are concerned that they do not fall into any of the clusters that we build, my concern as the coordinator of dynamic coalition on accessibility and disability is that we fall in number of areas.

So, what do we pick? Because from the accessibility perspective, if I see these four clusters created by MAG, each one is crucial and important and needs to have disability perspective. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, that's, then, another -- I mean, that's an old issue. I do remember it started with the gender inclusion, we call it horizontal and there are the people too horizontally, then it's not treated anywhere. But I think I get your point that ability is very much a horizontal issue that should fit in all of the clusters and how do we deal with that. But that's also something to be addressed.

Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, thank you, Markus, for giving me the floor. I do agree with Muhammad. We have cross-cutting issues in many of the dynamic coalitions, not only in DCAD and therefore, it must be a process to find a way to the right sorting.

When we look at the issues that are grouped under the subthemes, there are already overlaps, for example, rights and freedoms in subtheme 1 and subtheme 3 and several others are in more than one of the subthemes.

I do think the grouping or sorting also needs to consider which dynamic coalitions group themselves under one of these subthemes. So, the mixture of the dynamic coalitions also might make sense and might have an impact on whether one dynamic coalition feels themselves better located in digital and resilience than in digital rights and universal access, for example. It depends on which dynamic coalitions come together under one subtheme.

So, I would suggest that we have a two-step approach. Firstly dynamic coalitions should have a look at the four subthemes,

considering whether they find them best placed. And that could not be best placed in all four of them, but I need to decide for the dynamic coalition.

And then in a second step, the dynamic coalitions who have sorted themselves to one of the subthemes should come together to try out whether they have a common understanding how to together they can if substance to the subtheme they have grouped themselves to. And that is all -- we had a debate in the session, the main session I remember, and afterwards as well, whether we are asking what can we bring forward to have an impact in the area of the subtheme or whether we are expecting that the themes give us something back. And that is -- that might be crucial for the decision whether you are grouped under one or the other subtheme in this context. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I think, actually, that echoes a bit the remark Roberto put in the chat. I don't see any problem having a DC participating in multiple clusters as they see fit. And you could say our, sort of, main cluster is this one, but we are also active in the other one. And then as you suggested, sort it out with the other colleagues.

Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. Also up front, I don't care how we cluster ourselves, to be honest, as long as we have a stage to share our messages. We do have two discussions at this moment I would like to bring into reminder, that we decided to remain as we are for the webinars from now until June, because that is the way we decided to organize ourselves in the coming months. So, it's also fine to organize ourselves in a different way for the IGF, but it may be a bit confusing.

But I think what is important is what is the message that we want to share in these sessions. And that is in the webinar and in the sessions we organize at the IGF. And it will probably become logical that one DC is involved in multiple of these clusters, like they probably are if you look at the way we are organized in 2024.

So, what I would suggest is that we do some sort of an inventory about what is it exactly that we want to share at the IGF, and from there, set up a proposal. Because we only have four weeks and a couple of workdays, that is it, I think, to bring a proposal to the MAG.

So, that does not give us a lot of time to organize ourselves. So, my suggestion is to do that today and to make sure that we have the organization to actually do the work. Because if we do this voluntarily, there will be two weeks gone before somebody starts putting a pen to paper. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And, yes, Roberto and then Carol will sort us out. Roberto first.

>> ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. A couple of things. First, I have probably said that already in a different meeting, but I think that we have to be aware that we have, given the short time, we need to work on two parallel levels. One is the short term for the next IGF in a few months, but also not neglecting to have a longer-term view in order to have a different assessment.

If we want to have this groupings the dynamic coalitions, I think that we have to take more helicopter view and view in the medium, long term what this is going to mean.

My personal opinion is that we have to keep this grouping as flexible as possible. We have also to wonder what are the reasons why we are trying to group and what are the benefits that we can take out of it.

I am under the impression that we had this grouping under pressure because we have too many dynamic coalitions and we cannot have a single meeting for every dynamic coalition. That is a contingent thing and this is driven by circumstances rather than driven by design and driven by strategy.

I think that there is a strategic reason to group dynamic coalitions, and that is in order to find synergies among dynamic coalitions that operate on the same or on similar topic. Maybe as well from the 20 plus dynamic coalitions, I don't know all of them, it might well be that there is something, that there is one that I didn't think about that has something similar to our dynamic coalition. And the fact of having a flexible grouping with possibility of multiple participation in different groups will give us the flexibility that can also foster more collaboration on different dynamic coalitions that maybe, given the title, you would not imagine that have something in common.

So, in summary, yes, I agree with you. We have a short-term need. But don't forget that we need to think also in terms of a long-term for the future. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Carol now.

>> CAROL ROACH: Thank you very much. I am actually going to jump off of what Roberto and Markus said. Markus put in a very good point in the chat that this year it's critical that we show how our intersessional work is very much aligned to GDC and WSIS. So, I think that should be our focus this year.

I'm sure that if you look at the different action lines that your DC contributes to one of those or maybe multiple of these, so it may not be topicwise in terms of what you see listed there, but I want you to look at the GDC, to look at the WSIS and see where you best contribute as a DC and put your effort into these.

It's very critical for us this year that we show our alignment of our intersessional work with things that have been identified in the GDC and the WSIS.

You know, people think, oh, GDC is so new. But it's really not. We have already been working on these things. I mean, we need to show that we work on these things all the time. And here's your chance to shine and say, hey, yeah, this is what I do. This is what we do. Do you want us to help you measure? Do you want us to help you monitor? So, it's your time to really shine and come forward. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Carol, again, for giving the big picture. I totally agree with you (muffled audio) show the potential contribution DCs can have on the GDC implementation. But, yes, we should also broaden the horizon, also look at the WSIS Action lines and also at the SDGs, how we can help with their implementation. We have been at it for many years. Maarten.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, no, exactly and thank you for emphasizing that, Carol. We would like to have more IGFs happening and being as flexible as possible and contributing as well as possible is, of course, what we need to do.

Now, you think it's important to distinguish one of two things. One is what issue (?) do, and two, what do you want to bring to Oslo or the place next to Oslo. And you think that can be two things.

I think your session can be very much focused on one of the four themes and you may be part of multiple sessions to contribute from your DC.

One of the good things I really appreciated in Saudi Arabia was that they also had the opportunity to have a DC annual meeting, which is more about, so what did we do and what we are going to do moving forward. But that's not of general IGF interest. Merely using the opportunity of having many people coming at the same location and being able to sit together.

So, if you can do that in the cluster, that may open the minds focusing on session proposals and rather than DCs clusters. Session proposals and DCs from their perspective could contribute very well to it. We just need to have a couple of people starting to come with session proposals.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Maarten. Practice Dino has his hand up.

>> DINO: I'm in a noisy environment. I'm back at Riyadh 2025 and I can answer the question that Carol asked what is the involvement of DC with NRI. So, I just met with Abdouramane, and established contact with the IGF Saudi Arabia. So, just to

confirm that indeed at least in my case, we have been very actively in doing so.

The comment that I wanted to make is this. I did not have the possibility to attend the open consultation at the MAG. But I did watch the entire session on YouTube. And I did notice, and please, Carol, correct me if I'm wrong, that there was a strong conversation and debate of whether or not the IGF of this year and its various working groups should have a dedicated focus initiative on aligning and demonstrating the (muffled audio) or whether the IGF should demonstrate it indeed. There is the GDC but there is also the WSIS and there is the sense of the IGF itself that fundamentally, if I understood correctly, please correct, apologies if my interpretation is not correct, but, basically, the IGF transcends the GDC. And ultimately as dynamic coalition, should we consider and interpret the theme and subthemes as dedication of this analysis that the MAG already did because it's aligned with the GDC, or is that should we keep and maintain the goal that we set for ourselves last year in trying to demonstrate a direct relationship between what we do as a DC and the GDC, because for me last year was very clear. We had clear objective, clear goals and then we created the cluster and we went to the session and we each one, I mean collaboratively, we demonstrated our alignment.

Now, this year, I'm not sure whether that clarity is there. So I would like to have some sort of a feedback as to vis-a-vis we should interpret the themes and subthemes as already the result of that analysis or whether we should still consider the GDC as our benchmark, if you will. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Carol, please.

>> CAROL ROACH: Dino, even though I said yes, I think initially the thought was to have a consultant to review all of the policy networks and the VPF in terms of amalgamating all the points that meet the GDC and the WSIS timelines and the SDGs. Maybe we can consider expanding the terms of reference to include our works from the DCs.

So, thanks for bringing that up, Dino. I think I sent a note to Roman so he can follow up on that as well. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Carol. No, that was also my sense, that last year the GDC was totally new and we were, sort of, all struck and realigned with the GDC.

But now WSIS+20 is coming up and actually people seem to think there's more than the GDC, and that WSIS was here before the GDC and we need to look at everything in a comprehensive way. And that's why I liked what we now have on the table with the MAG alignment. And I think it would be personally and I have

heard some pivots on that, that we totally align with the MAG and see where we have actually commonalities with GDC, WSIS Action lines and also the SDGs and align totally with MAG priorities so that we see we are actually part of the mainstream IGF and align ourselves with these common efforts and contribute to these common efforts.

But that is my reading of last week's meeting. And I think it's not too far away from Carol readings, Carol readings, who is, after all, the chair of the MAG, and that we actually maybe realign a little bit and move away from the total focus on the GDCs and broaden the horizon and include the WSIS Action lines at the SDGs.

But please correct me if that is a wrong reading of where we are now. But I think that's a fundamental decision we have to take. In a way, it might make it simpler if we just have four objectives instead of six. Then we have to question how does it interfere with the webinars. But Jutta has her hand up. Please.

>> JUTTACROLL: Okay. Yes, thank you, Markus. The alignment with SDGs and WSIS and the GDC, if we can achieve that, I do think it would just be an opportunity to show how dynamic dynamic coalitions are able to be. And I may remind those who have been involved in dynamic coalitions earlier that we already had for two years an alignment with the SDGs of the dynamic coalitions work and that turned out very well. Then we choose that approach with the GDC. And if we can bring it all together for IGF 2025, I do think it's a really good approach.

Although, it might be a bit of -- need a bit of consideration for each dynamic coalition where it fits best. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Can we rally around this approach? I mean, if we are building on some past work and tweaking a bit with what we had done last year. But I like Jutta's concept of showing the dynamism of dynamic coalitions by actually readjusting to changing priorities, and I think also our main partner in this context is the MAG. And actually by showing that we -- okay, we follow your lead. You came up with four great tracks and we realign ourselves and follow the same tracks, I think it would a positive signal to the MAG that we are team players in that sense and we are contributing to the same objectives.

Can we agree on that, or are there dissenting voices? It will need some tweaking, we all agree on that, and some work. But the broad principle that we shift away from last year's clusters and align ourselves with four tracks created by the MAG, which takes into account not only the GDC, but also the WSIS Action

lines and the SDGs. Would that be the basis for a broad consensus among all the DCs?

I saw some hands up. But I took from that yes hands and not objection hands. And I see a thumb up and a thumb up is a clear positive. Another hands up to these people. Okay. I see more thumbs up.

There's a hand up by Wout and by Judith. Are these hand ups or they are --

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No. They are questions.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: They are questions. Okay, okay, please.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Judith Hellerstein. So, the question we have here is when, as Dr. Shabbir has with DCAD be aligned with all the sessions, how do we choose one? Because when we don't -- when it's only, like, four minutes for each of the DCs, it would be too much to have too many DCs and one group. So we have to be divided by other ones.

So, it was just problematic on that and how we do --
(Background noise).

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Could the person who is not muted please mute themselves? Thank you.

Roman, can you mute the person? Thank you.

So, how is it going to work with that issue?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you. It's a legitimate question. But I think that can be sorted out when we go to the fine-tuning. You can say assuming you have a speaker of V CAT in track 2 saying I'm here, but we actually have major contributions with track 1, 3 and 4 because what we do, our work is horizontal to all the tracks in one way or another. And I don't think that should be a major impediment. But, I mean, it is -- I recognize this as a clear concern and an issue that would need to be sorted out.

Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. Yes. Now I'm unmuted.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You are muted again. Don't hit your space bar.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Somebody keeps muting me. I think it works now.

Two points, Markus. Thank you. The first one is on the clustering, the new clustering that I will reiterate myself and coming back to what Judith is saying, we need to organize ourselves today to make sure that this works. Otherwise, we are going to lose very valuable time to write a proposal, to agree on what to do within the cluster, et cetera.

Point 2 is more practical towards the GDC and WSIS Action lines. Not all dynamic coalitions may, perhaps, even know what's in the DC or GDC or in the action lines, et cetera. I think it's important that we all get some sort of an overview what exactly to look for so that we can put that in documents, et cetera, because I know something of the GDC. I don't know anything about WSIS Action lines and I don't have a lot of time to go into all of it because this is also something we all do voluntarily.

I think it's important to know what to look for and what the IGF exactly is looking for and that makes it far easier to translate DCs' actions into comments in the documents that are needed. So, I think that that is a step that would be very welcomed with probably most DCs.

But the most important one I think is to organize ourselves on this clustering and start working together as soon as possible. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, that indeed. But, I mean, it's all public domain. It doesn't take -- it's really not huge research to look at the actions saying is there anything for me, yes or no. I think it takes half an hour at the most. And the action lines have been around for 20 years.

But essentially, the question for discussion here was, can we agree to refocus on the clusters defined by the MAG? It was building on the Norwegians as a host country made a very good job and there was a link in the WSIS Action lines and the SDGs and to bring it all together. And now we have what is on the table approved by the MAG, and do we want to be part of that, yes or no, and I take it the answer is yes.

Of course there are some questions. And of course there are some details that need to be worked out. But I think, yes, there's not that much time until June, a little bit more than four months. But I see that actually also as a positive factor, but it means we can -- we are forced to move forward. We cannot kick the can down the road, oh, well, there's another month and then we have five more months.

No. We have to, as Wout says, we have to really burst into action. But I don't think we can do it all today. I think each DC needs to be given time to analyze where they feel they fit in most. Are there more cross-cutting DCs, like the DCAD, but, okay. If you are cross-cutting, there maybe still be one of these clusters where you feel more at home.

And then, is the fourth cluster, digital cooperation, a catchall cluster? I mean, we have -- I don't think Avri is on the call today. It's very early for the Americans. But she made the point, the schools on Internet Governance don't fit in anywhere.

Now, would the fourth cluster, digital cooperation, be a catchall cluster also for you? Question. But you have to look at it as a dynamic coalition and say yes or no or "yes, but" or whatever, but I don't think we can conclude all the details today. But if you can conclude on the broad principles, that's already a great step forward. And I think it will be a very positive sign that the DCs are really keen to collaborate with the MAG and the Norwegian host to make the meeting a success.

Can we conclude on that or do we have -- and I see Carol's hand is up. Please, Carol. Or was that an old hand?

>> CAROL ROACH: No. I was talking a lot without turning on the mic. I'm agreeing with Wout and yourself with regards to timeline. However, I think you should set a deadline, whether it's by UTC 15 tomorrow, the DCs need to decide. Even though we can't decide today, we need to decide what is the deadline to choose what you are going to -- which session you are going to be -- or cluster you are going to be associated with. You have to give persons a time, a date and time so that it doesn't linger and go on.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct, yes. Thank you. It's very good to have you on the call to give us a sense of direction and purpose. And you are very strict headmistress. I mean that in a positive way. We need strict headmistress.

Okay. Can we agree on that and give a deadline, a very tight deadline. Carol suggested that was 24 hour deadline. That might be a bit tight, no?

>> CAROL ROACH: It's up to you. I just threw it out. It's up to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. My suggestion would be a little bit more lenient and what is a reasonable deadline for all DCs to comply with. Jutta, what would you like to suggest? You are also strict headmistress. Please unmute yourself.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Sorry. I have a bad cough, so it's difficult to --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Oh, sorry. Put it in the chat. What is your suggestion? And we take it. I mean, you are a part of an active dynamic coalition. You obviously would have to consult your members and what is a reasonable deadline to give? For after all, it is an important decision to take.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I'm not sure whether I got it right. But Carol said we already have a tough deadline or do we still have time?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, no. We have tough deadlines for, you know, overall. But okay if we want as dynamic coalitions to fit in, into the tough deadlines, what can we give the dynamic

coalitions -- okay, we have to report, obviously. We have this discussion. And please find yourself and where would you belong to, how long does it take. You need to consult your members. Well, the call is open also to other members of the Coordination Group.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I do think it would be useful to get a short feedback whether the people who are on the meeting today feel up to take a decision very soon or whether they all get the feeling they need to go back to their members, just to get an impression are we able to take a quick decision or do we really need more time like one or two weeks. I just need to remind that most of the dynamic coalitions are already kind of under time pressure to deliver their annual report by the end of March, to consider workshop proposals with their members or as a DC.

So, there are many things that need to be done in a very short time. And the quicker we are, the better, I would say.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think we all agree on that and I think you mentioned one week or two weeks, two weeks I would consider definitely too long. One week already on the long side, I would have hoped for a slightly shorter deadline. Can we say till Sunday or whatever? Okay, it's Wednesday today. Or the end of the week or... Roberto suggests 48 hours. We could say maybe Friday --

>> JUTTA CROLL: By the end of the week? To give them time for different timezones.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Friday end of business? Okay?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. This is Muhammad Shabbir for the record. I think it's not just that we need to give time to dynamic coalitions. But one thing, so here is my proposal. Consider this. We also need volunteers to coordinate these four groups. If we have decided that we would cluster this year around the four subthemes set by the MAG. So like last year, we need volunteers who would coordinate these groups.

My proposal revolves around these two. So, why don't we give a one-week deadline, say next Wednesday, for the two things. One for the dynamic coalitions to let the guys know, Roman, perhaps, can start the Google doc, in which the Dynamic Coalitions let everyone know which cluster they will want to belong to. And also for the people to volunteer for the coordination of these groups, like the last year.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Well, yes, that is -- you collapsed I think two steps into one process. I think I would rather keep them separately. Let's first sort out the clusters, which dynamic coalitions belong to which cluster, and

then take a next step, look who will coordinate what and look for the volunteers. I think by collapsing the two into one step, you might add more complexity to the process at this stage. But I'm, obviously, in your hands. And while we can also do what the MAG quite successfully, having sort of pause and see who is in favor of what. But I see there's a hand up and Wout has a hand up.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes. Thank you, Markus. I think that as we are here, we can decide in which cluster we want to be. We don't have to ask our members that.

The next is, when there are volunteers, most likely they will come from the Coordination Group and not from individual member. But that is, of course, an option. But that is something somebody will have to ask to somebody else. And that will take time.

But we can decide here and now, I think I belong best in this cluster or two clusters.

The third is the content and that's where I am afraid that we are going to lose very valuable time. But if we have a deadline of 16 March, that is of today, one month and two working days because it will be on a Friday. So that is incredibly little time to decide among each other what it is that we want to do and make a group proposal and make everybody agree on it.

So, I can't stress enough that we are on very, very tight deadline here. And two weeks or three weeks short of the usual. So, we need to speed this up. We don't have the end of this week or the end of next week because then we may not get an agreement on what it is exactly that we want to do.

And if we put in the document here saying, in the chat here, we belong to this group, this cluster, and, yes, I am willing to work with it, then that is the first step. And then we can see who actually contributes.

But we can't lose more than a week, Markus. We are going to be too stressful at the end. And we have to reports and everything, like Jutta is saying. But this is the yes or no phase to having a representative workshop at the IGF, unless the MAG agrees that we are going to have four slots because we are talking about four clusters. That you can fill it in later. You have four slots. And then if DC wants to have another one, then they have a deadline for 16 March U but if that is something we can agree on, there are four slots and perhaps two or three others because we are between five and eight, that will be separate, separate proposals. That would make it less stressful. Can the Secretariat and Carol agree to it, that we have a little bit more time to organize ourself for four sessions that will be

clustered according to the MAG, the MAG's themes. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No. I mean, you raise various issues. And they all equally important.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please, Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: If you allow a quick question. Because my understanding about the clustering was that we are discussing the main session by the DC Coordination Group. But what Wout has just said, if this is so, I understand the whole discussion that we were just having in the wrong way. So, please correct me. Are we discussing the main session for, the clustering for the main session or clustering for the clustering for the dynamic coalitions workshop sessions?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think it's a bit of both. I think the idea of the clustering was that we agree to work collectively under these four headings and then that could mean what Wout suggested, we ask for four sessions collective DC sessions, which are not the main session, but separate sessions under these headings, and we would go also have a DC main session where we would bring all these streams together and that would be a combination of the two. But we would focus our work under these headings.

So, it's not an either/or. It's a bit of both. It will be mutually enhancing and we would actually show that we are working to enhance these tracks defined by the MAG.

And then the point Wout raised was whether we could, I don't know when the next MAG meeting is, but we could then make this proposal to the MAG, say, look, the DCs have -- there is somebody who has the microphone still on. Can you, Roman, make sure that it gets muted?

But we would agree that we collectively propose, then we have four DC sessions which would be under this heading and we would also have then the same main session, which would follow the same headings.

That's my reading of Wout's comments and also something I would like to ask Carol to comment on that, whether that would be a correct way forward, a correct reading of the situation. Carol.

>> CAROL ROACH: Yes, I agree with you, Markus. That's a perfect reading of the situation.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. That gives me confidence, Carol. Thank you for that. So I'm not off the mark.

So, if that's the question, that may also be a little bit of less pressure on us deciding now on Jutta's work. But you think that's also a comment to Wout. I really don't think we

can decide for the dynamic coalitions that are not on the call today, and we need to give them also the possibility of commenting and seeing where they are and opting in into one of the clusters.

So, that's why I would be very reluctant to make decisions on behalf of people who are not on the call. We should give them the possibility to get back to us.

Okay. With Carol's clarifications and my comments, can we agree on that way forward, give a deadline until Friday, close of business, to each dynamic coalitions to say where they see themselves, in which cluster, and also indicate, you know, like the DCAD said, we don't really belong -- we belong in all of them. But, okay. Maybe have a predominant cluster and make sure you designate yourself as a cross-cutting dynamic coalition who has more than one cluster, but with one preponderant affiliation to one of the clusters and then we will take it from there to see who will take on the task of coordinating the four clusters.

And I see Jutta is already volunteering. Please, Jutta.

>> JUTTA CROLL: (laughter) I was volunteering to make a suggestion, Markus, to ease the process, because I am wondering how those dynamic coalitions who have not been able to attend the meeting today will react to what we are asking them to do within a very short period of time. And I am looking a bit, too, to Roman whether it might be possible to give a very short summary why we came to the conclusion that this approach with the clustering to the four subthemes related to WSIS, to GDC and to the SDGs is the best way forward. Just, I do think four, five, six sentences. And then have probably a survey where we allow the dynamic coalitions to click and say, yes, I do think predominantly we belong to one, two, three or four, and probably we also belong to a second one or something. So, to get a quicker overview.

Considering that maybe 30 different dynamic coalitions send an email where they explain this or that might be a bit difficult to sort it out in the end. What do you think about that?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That sounds like an excellent suggestion. Maybe we have to ask Roman what can be done in reasonable time. Please, Roman.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: We need to think about it. I really do think that the sooner we send this call for action, the better. I would incline that maybe it would be better if Jutta or Markus sent this as copious teachers with my help to prepare everything. Maybe we can have another call after this and to quickly decide what to do.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Let's take this offline. We can handle that. And with Jutta and Roman's help, I think we can do something informing the DCs and hoping for the best.

Now it's already 20 past 2:00. It took quite a lot of time to discuss this first agenda item. And we have not touched on the others. But you think it was a very important time, important issue and an important decision to come to.

And my suggestion, then, would be to maybe put all the other agenda items we had on the agenda on hold and call for a meeting relatively soon when we already then will have the feedback from the dynamic coalitions on the clusters, and as time is short, then have a next meeting next week.

But we still have the webinars and there's one webinar right around the corner, and we would have to also discuss whether we would realign the webinars with the new clusters.

And I see Muhammad has their hand up. Please, Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. I support your point of putting the other agenda items on hold.

With regards to webinar, it would be logical if we are redoing the clusters. We do the webinars around the same clusters. I say this with consciousness of the fact that Rajendra has already spent considerable time planning for the first webinar.

Second, I would say if we are giving very short time to the DCs to respond to the question, which clusters do they want to fall into, and to those who are not on this call, the call for this should be tagged subjected separately and it should go out today. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, the question is we have, I think, one webinar which is scheduled this month. And I think, and as Roman has said, the agenda has done quite a bit of work, and I think it may be too late to change that one. But then the other webinars could be realigned to the new clusters. And I am maybe putting Rajendra on the spot.

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: No, Markus. It's welcome. I'm open to both ideas. I'm open to doing it on 28th Feb 2:00 p.m. UTC. This will kick start the process of others get activated, I guess. But I'm open to wait for the realignment as well. But I think good start is (?). So I still say let's do it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hang on. Could you change the programme of the webinar you have prepared or should we go ahead and --

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: We can change it. We can change it. It's not an issue. If you all agree, we can change it and wait for realignment.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for your amazing flexibility.

>> REJENDRA PRATAP GUPTA: Okay. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Let's do it that way. Let's revisit the webinars. And let's then send out a note to the list and ask for this reclustering, and when you give Friday close of

business essentially means the weekend. So it will be Sunday included. And we would look at the list on Monday.

Jutta, would you like to say something, or was --

>> JUTTA CROLL: So far, nothing to add from my side. I was just going to prepare a few sentences that we can send to the dynamic coalitions list as a follow-up to this call to give them as much time as possible.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. So, are we all good? Then there's -- I think that was extremely productive and also important meeting that we proved to be very dynamic in a very short time. As Jutta said, very dynamic Dynamic Coalitions, but we actually refocus our activity for this year and we realign totally with the MAG priorities and host country clusters. So, we are realigning ourself. So, that's an excellent productive outcome.

Is there anything under any other business?

>> WOUTDE NATRIS: This is Wout. Just clarification, Markus. We will have most likely a meeting next week, so we will get Doodle poll today to try and plan for that; is that correct?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's the idea. So, I don't know whether it's within half an hour we get the Doodle poll or whatever. And I see Amali has her hand up. And welcome, it's very early for you, I know. And Carol has her hand up.

>> AMALIA SILVAMITCHELL: Was there anyone that participated at the Paris AI summit, please, was there anyone?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Not that I know of, but are there anyone on the call who was in the AI summit in Paris? And just looking at the list of people present on the call and they are not all listed, the Dynamic Coalitions, their affiliation. It's just to facilitate the work of the Secretariat. Please, and you still have a few minutes' time, and you have been enabled by the Secretariat. You can change your appearance on the Zoom list. Please add your dynamic coalition behind your name.

And I see that, for instance, somebody put a friend's name, Dynamic Coalition friend, which is also totally acceptable. And, yes, we do know some of you but we don't know all of you. And please, it's good if you are consistent and everyone adds his or her affiliation after their name. It really makes the work easier of the Secretariat.

Now, the last word goes to Carol. Please, Carol.

>> CAROL ROACH: No. I'm just saying that the themes and subthemes have been posted to the website. And I have just put the link in the chat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you for that.

>> CAROL ROACH: Great meeting. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. And thank you, Carol, for attending. It really is very much appreciated that you as a MAG chair attends our meeting and shows the appreciation and the importance you attach to our activities, and it helps us also to give guidance. You have been, in a way, a luxury liaison, and we cannot count on you to do that every meeting. But it shows how important it is to have this connection to the MAG.

With that, it's 28 minutes past 2:00. We have two minutes to spare. But I think I would like to give these two minutes back to your lives. So, thank you all. And we meet again next week to build up on this meeting. And I think the rhythm of our meetings may well have to accelerate in view of the short time frame we have.

Thank you all for your attendance and your constructive participation. Thank you and goodbye

(Thank yous and goodbyes.)

>> Recording stopped.

(Session was concluded at 1:30 p.m. UTC)

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 the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.