

RAW FILE
DCCG Meeting Number 87
Wednesday, August 7, 2024
12:30 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.

>> CELINE BAL: Hi, Mark. Thank you for joining.
>> MARK CARVELL: Hi, Celine. Great to be back.
>> CELINE BAL: Hi, Markus, can you hear us?
>> MARKUS KUMMER: I can hear you loud and clear. Can you hear me?
>> CELINE BAL: Yes, fantastic. Thank you so much.
Hi, Dino.
>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Hello, Celine. Good afternoon, good morning, everybody. Celine, thank you very much for your reply. Thank you.
>> CELINE BAL: Of course.
Markus, I'm not sure if you already saw the email of (?). She is going to join us a little bit of delay.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: I haven't checked the latest emails.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are we enough to get started? It's three minutes above the time.
>> CELINE BAL: I think we can start. Yes, indeed.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Celine sent out an agenda. Is that posted in the link or in the chat?
>> CELINE BAL: I just posted it in the chat.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, yeah. Okay. Can we adopt the agenda as proposed? It's fairly classical. No sensations there. It's fairly updated essentially the main piece of resistance, as the French say, would be the preparation of the main session.
Yes, I can see a thumbs up from Dino and I cannot hear any

voice speaking against it. So I safely assume that the agenda is adopted as proposed.

And that brings us then to the second agenda item, status of IGF 2024 DC sessions, and that's over to Celine, who is managing this masterfully. Please, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much. Markus. This agenda item I wanted to provide a short update about the status on the various IGF 2024 DC session submissions. So, as a lot of you know we have reached out to all of the sessions, DC session submitters and kindly asked them to collaborate together on joint submissions. Why? Just because we have a reduced capacity this year. We are considerably reducing the number of sessions that we have on the programme and this does not only affect DC sessions but also other session types. As I mentioned also during last meeting. So it includes launches and awards, networking sessions, open forums, et cetera, et cetera.

So, for now, to keep you in the loop, what we have done is because we are still waiting for some DCs to come back, is that we kind of blocked up to 12 DC sessions for 90 minutes in the programme. And we have received so far eight joint DC proposals. From the eight, already two submitted joint proposals before the submission deadline. So we welcome that very much.

And it was our intention, actually, since the start to have more collaboration amongst the Dynamic Coalitions and we are still waiting for a few other Dynamic Coalitions to come back. So, to be precise, actually, 10 Dynamic Coalitions. So, we are expecting around four, max five additional Dynamic Coalition joint sessions.

For your information, we took note of the dissatisfaction from quite a few Dynamic Coalitions to collaborate on joint proposals this year. And we will be informing the MAG we have a virtual meeting on the 20th of August, where we will not only let the MAG know that we need to have a proper discussion with MAG members and with DC representatives on the way forward.

So, we will ask MAG members to also convene a meeting in Riyadh, if it's not possible in Riyadh then simply online or prior to the IGF 2024 to really discuss the way forward on how to best integrate Dynamic Coalitions at future IGFs.

And for your information, next steps are, so as of next week, we will be informing all IGF session organizers about the status of their proposal. So, this is besides the DC sessions.

So, all the remaining ones, namely open forum organizers, launches and awards, networking sessions, lightning talk organizers and, in parallel to that, we are also going to release the draft schedule for organizers to come back and let us know

about any major clashes while scheduling the various sessions.

And we would ask Dynamic Coalitions who did not yet submit joint proposals to come back by the end of the month, by the end of August so that we can also, you know, allocate the sessions in the draft schedule accordingly.

So, let me know if you have any questions so far, but this is just to provide you an overall status. Thank you so much. Maarten.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Hey, Celine. Thanks for that -- for the DCIT, we are talking at the moment with two other DCs. Now what seems to make sense is to make the sessions less DC business type and more subject focused. And in that way, I can see that a good way forward would be maybe even to contribute the work of both. But also to have what you refer to last time, there's an opportunity to have a kind of administrative session with the DC in the backroom, right? And the question is whether that backroom would also be facilitated in a hybrid way.

And then for me going forward, in reflection, it seems to me that things like chair appointments, paper adoption and that kind of things could take place in those locations rather than the subject matter sessions. Would that make sense?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Maarten, for the contribution. Yes, absolutely it would truly make sense, and this was a little bit behind the idea, perhaps Markus wants to add a few comments there.

Now, when it comes to the hybrid option, let's say, for these kind of annual meetings in meeting rooms, yes. We will only book these meeting room slots in the meeting rooms that have the hybrid component. I think there should be three out of the 10 meeting rooms that we will have at our disposal. And the only thing is that it should be then managed by the organizer themselves because it is a meeting room. So, for example, the link or, you know, access to the virtual platform, et cetera, would be done by the organizer themselves. So, that's it. Thank you.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And I may try --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If I may, Maarten made a very important point. You know, we did say every DC would get a room for their (muffled audio) annual general meeting. There are the matters that are important to each DC to be dealt with because we said like adoption of a chair, adoption of a report, which are not maybe particularly exciting for the bigger world outside, but which are, nevertheless, important for the DC. And you will get that room. It will be not part of the main programme.

And the main programme would then indeed be focusing on more

substantive sessions. And hopefully people will take advantage of the knowledge of the combined DC brainpower that we -- that's part of the ambition that we have joint sessions of various DCs where they have points of conversions or overlap and can really produce something that is of interest to the larger IGF community. Thank you.

Back to you, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. I was just finalizing a message that I just sent in the chat.

So, the only thing is, as soon as you know that you would like to have a separate room for DC meeting during the week of the IGF, please write to me or the IGF Secretariat, because in that case we will make sure to schedule that meeting room slot before we open the meeting room platform to all the other IGF stakeholders. So that will be it, actually,.

Any other questions regarding agenda item 2? Mark?

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Sorry, Celine. This is Dino. Regarding this, just a question. Would that room have the facility for remote connectivity? Because many of our members are, of course, not participating in person. So if that meeting would need to support connection, we would like to know whether that would be possible.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, that is exactly. That is what I was responding to Maarten just before. The rooms that would book for individual DC meetings would indeed be in a room that has hybrid -- a hybrid component. The only thing is that you would have to take care of the virtual meeting yourself. So, you would have to just create a link and then connect via your computer et cetera, et cetera.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Perfect. Now it's clear. Thank you so much, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Celine. Hello, everybody.

I think it's important that the joint DC sessions do focus on the substance, and in particular progress to delivering concrete outcomes. So, it's important for the AGMs and so on to be handled separately as Maarten has underlined.

I'm wondering, how to ensure that the outcomes of the joint DC sessions are broadcast effectively during or at the conclusion of the IGF.

I just fear, you know, it's, sort of, siloing DC activity risk again if that is not effectively handled, the communication of the outcomes. And I just -- maybe this was discussed at the previous meeting in which I was -- I didn't attend because I was away.

But what is the thinking about that, about collating the outcomes of these important substantive joint DC sessions in a way that is then able to be communicated to the IGF community, to the Leadership Panel, to potential donors and so on of IGF activities? I think that's so important. And it will underline this ambition, which I think we are inching towards, of integration and interaction between DC activities and core strategic objectives of the IGF. So, I just make that point.

And, I mean, this may well be something also to discuss at the meeting with the MAG. This is so important, too, I think, for that meeting to be held.

I think, ideally, although the pressures will be on, I'm sure during the IGF in Riyadh, but if the MAG is well seized of the critical importance of this in terms of effective integration and delivery of concrete outcomes of the IGF, that this discussion will push that agenda forward and enhance the position of the IGF as one that delivers outcomes year around through focused intersessional actively, pulling of expertise and so on. That's my second point.

Please keep the pressure on the MAG to get this discussion well set in the time frame, ideally within Riyadh. Thanks very much.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. Thank you, Mark. Regarding your first question, so there, nothing changed compared to last year. So at the end of every session of the IGF, the session organizer has a possibility to first provide at least two key takeaways, I think within the first 24 hours after the session ended. These key takeaways are usually the basis, let's say, for the IGF key messages that will then be drafted and published right after the IGF ends. So, that is already the first possibility.

And then there is, as always, the request of uploading session report, also on the website. So, this is then public, and, of course, Dynamic Coalitions can also decide to create a more, I don't know, a more formal session report in a PDF format that we can then, of course, also upload on the respective DC sessions. If it is, of course, a joint DC session, this report that would be drafted would, of course, be published on the several DCs that are collaborating on a joint proposal.

And, yes, regarding the MAG meeting, we will keep the MAG informed, especially because since last year, we haven't had a MAG liaison officer -- MAG listens to the DCs in general, and this is also something that we will be asking again in the upcoming meeting on the 20th of August, so that they nominate at least one MAG member who will regularly attend the Dynamic Coalition sessions and then report back to the MAG.

Markus, I don't know if you want to add something. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, no, I mean Mark's question is very relevant. I think part of the (muffled audio) was it two years back or so? It was an oversight, but the DCs were barely mentioned, I think in the final report, and I think that was not deliberate. That was just a mistake, oversight. That will not happen again. And I think at the very high level, the DC sessions will be treated like any other session as Celine has just pointed out with the details how that will be done.

But I think also a lot of the reporting was done by the Diplo team and they will also have to be alerted to treat all the DC joint sessions and the sessions that are in the programme as integral part of the IGF meeting.

Beauty Judith is waiting patiently. She also has her hand up. Please, Judith.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, Judith Hellerstein, for the record.

So, question is, DCAD we are working to try to create our joint sessions with another group, and is there a deadline that we have to get by to hand those in?

And two, what's the deadline for letting you know about whether we want an annual meeting room in the hybrid format so that just -- just so that we have those in line to make sure that we get those in on time? Thanks so much.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Judith. I'm not so sure if I understood the first question. But the first question was the deadline regarding the joint DC session proposal; is that correct?

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes. So, we would ask Dynamic Coalitions to submit the joint DC proposal by the end of this month. The reason is next week we are going to inform all session organizers about the status of their sessions. So besides DC session organizers and also release the draft schedule. And we will get some responses from the various session organizers, and by the end of the month we will ask everyone to confirm, reconfirm their session.

By then, by the end of this month, we will have more clarity on the schedule of the IGF 2024 because there are always some that will, perhaps, already cancel their sessions, et cetera, so that's why by the end of this month, of August, we would ask all the DC organizers to submit the joint proposals.

When it comes to the DC meeting room slots, we intend to publish the meeting room platform on the 1st of October. So, then it's going to be public and everyone who is interested in

having a meeting room slot will be able to do so via our system.

So, that's why I would actually ask all the DCs, in order to guarantee a meeting room slot, all the DCs to come back to us by the 1st of October.

Then, of course, the system is online and everyone can, of course, schedule their own meeting. But we can't guarantee any more that you will get a slot because generally the meeting room requests are pretty high. I hope this answers your question. Thank you.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks. Thanks so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: My take would be the sooner, the better you request a room, then you are safe.

Are there any other questions to this agenda item?

If not, then we can move on --

>> CELINE BAL: Mark. Mark.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, sorry to come back in. Very briefly. The reporting and the messaging and soon, yes, that's so important. I was also thinking if there is an opportunity on the final day when things are wrapping up, a normal report of the 12 DC joint sessions to be communicated, to be presented orally.

Is there an opportunity for that? It could be quite brief. You know, if there were 12 joint DC sessions and then the principals or the outcomes of those sessions were reports of -- I don't know, research to be published, policy recommendations to be made on this topic and that topic. You know, it could be quite concise, but punchy, but it ensures the visibility is there.

And then the reference could be made to more detail in the written reports from the IGF meeting.

Is that -- is there an opportunity for that, I wonder? I would propose.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's an interesting idea. But my concern would be would that be special treatment to the DCs? Because the -- in the rise of joint sessions and they are not given the same opportunity and the same -- you know, the workshops don't come back in at the end. I mean, it's just, that went through my mind. If we have to bear in mind that people will look at sort of equal treatment of the various components. And what you are suggesting sounds like special treatment to the DCs.

I'm not saying -- I'm sort of the devil's advocate here, there might be questions of why should the DCs be given privilege.

The idea is attractive. And we could also think about maybe creating ways of reporting into the main sessions, which are relevant, just to show the DCs have something to contribute and look at the programme as it will evolve and is there a relevant

main session where the joint DC sessions could contribute. Just thinking on.

But coming in right at the end, that is usually the, sort of, stocktaking. I'm not sure that would fit well. And that I also fear there might be voices that would speak against it, as they might feel that DC want special treatment. That's my initial reaction.

But, again, I'm not dismissing your suggestion. It sounds attractive, as it is.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, I'm just thinking, quite often this is the way conferences work. You know, a lot of hard work is done and then there's a summation of the outcomes at the end of the conference.

And maybe the NRIs and the other entities, respecters for policy networks would also like their 10 minutes to report.

I'm not saying this is going to be an extensive, wordy report. It's just a mechanism, a device to demonstrate that this forum is producing outcomes. And some of those outcomes are founded on year-around activity.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, I know
(Overlapping speakers)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The way you framed it now, I think that will be a creative way of putting it. It's not just about DCs. But about the whole conference that we have, sort of, a session where we produce the results, that could include workshops, BPFs, policy networks and something to report on the way forward.

But I think that would be a proposal to be put forward to the MAG or allowing for this. I think that could be an attractive proposal. And I think, (?) you wanted to say something?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I thought, Maarten, did you have your hand up or is it down again?

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I put it down again because Mark continued and said exactly what I wanted to say. Yes, no, this doesn't need to be a privilege for DCs. But it makes so much sense in particular for all networks that have intersessional work, because that is the value that we need to demonstrate to the world as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I like it like that. As I said, my initial reaction was more what felt like DCs asking for a privilege. But if you present it differently, then -- Avri, you had your hand up? Is your hand down.

>> AVRI DORIA: (Muffled audio)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The sound is not very good.

>> AVRI DORIA: I have to turn off the air-conditioner before I talk. Apologies. I keep forgetting to do that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now it's good. Now it's good.

>> AVRI DORIA: I turned my air-conditioner off.

Is this something you are thinking of doing a month or two after the thing? Because if this is actually attached to part of the IGF, I worry it just becomes a burden and it becomes, sort of, sloppy. We have seen people try to do that, that quickly at the end.

Now, if this is something that, you know, two months later, come January, there is an intersessional, as it were, that goes through these kinds of messages, that would be great.

I worry that if you try to cram it into yet another last-day thing, it gets lost, it gets whipped together quickly. Because people are focused on the doing, not the summing up.

So, I would just worry about it as yet another session. I think it's a great idea for what we are trying to show is that the IGF goes on all year long, that there's stuff working all year long. So, having something like that as sort of a way to kick off the year, you know, this is the recap of all the outcomes from last year, and rah, rah, let's move forward, makes more sense.

But I would really not be strongly in favor of just tacking it onto the last day as yet another thing that people lose while they travel early because they have an early flight. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's another idea to be considered. It could be a kickoff session of the new cycle. It could be linked maybe to the first MAG meeting, open consultations that we have. It could be a physical meeting, a one-day meeting which, obviously, could also be hybrid, but we could add an extra day to the MAG meeting open consultation, having taking stock of the previous meeting, which could kick off the new cycle. That's another option to be considered.

But I think -- I sense there's a very strong support to the idea to, sort of, have a summing-up element, and I can hear Avri's concern and it's true that the last day, many people are already leaving and awaiting. There are pros and cons to have it done the last day. But Avri's proposal sounds to me also very attractive if we could put it (muffled audio) forward. I don't know what the general feeling is here among the people on this call, which option will be better, the last day option or the option in the new year as part of a kickoff of the new cycle.

Yes, Celine, you have the hand up for quite a while. You are patiently waiting.

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, thank you, Markus. So, to be honest, I am not sure if we would have even like the capacity, you know, in the schedule to allocate time for kind of like DC summary

on the 19th of December.

But one thing that I wanted to say is that we always have this IGF summary report that we are drafting where we also have a dedicated section for the IGF 2023, now 2024, intersessional work where we highlight the work of the policy networks, Best Practice Forums and also, of course, Dynamic Coalitions.

This is, perhaps, a way of integrating the key takeaways from the Dynamic Coalitions from the IGF 2024, but also of what's been done in the past.

So, this is actually something that we can, perhaps, work on ahead of the IGF and then after so that we publish it in this report. This is an idea.

Of course, that's not an oral intervention, but at least an alternative to have something written down in our summary report.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. I just -- I do sympathize with what Avri has said, that this can be, first of all, a challenge here to put together.

But I just wonder online, it's a very brief heads-up, you know, kind of oral report. We may encourage people to stay on until the last day to hear what actually has come out of this event.

But anyway, so it can be compiled quickly. It could be 10 to 15 minutes, along the lines I suggested earlier. There were 12 -- our element, BPF and PN will do something their own way, I guess. But our element would be like a brief report of the 12 joint workshops and frank-up the key main three messages from each of those. So it would be very short, concise, but punchy and impactful. That's the -- that's my concept for it.

Not an elaborate, time consuming Proto session. Whoever is chairing the wrap-up event, I will turn maybe to you, Markus, as the coordinator and say, let's have a brief report on what the Dynamic Coalitions have done, similar to the NRI coordinator, whoever it is, and the BPF, PN.

With everybody still in the room, it just has an impact, I feel. But anyway, that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah. Thank you. No. Its question is how the shortest time is to cram it in one hour of intersessional, BPS, NRIs, DCs and it could be -- proceed the taking stock session, key takeaways during this year's IGF.

But I think it would also need to allow the workshops as well to come in. I'm not sure we would find enough -- the workshops are not part of the intersessional work.

But what would be the minimum? I'm thinking about, could

it be done in one hour? And Celine said she would find it very difficult to find this time in the schedule, which is already fairly tight.

But I see Amali has her hand up.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Yeah, this is awl from data coalition on data driven health technologies.

I want to say that this reduction of the presence of Dynamic Coalitions is actually extremely boring. And for several reasons. And one of the main reasons is that we will find it difficult to attract membership to the Dynamic Coalitions. If members think that Dynamic Coalitions are being sidelined. Members come together into a Dynamic Coalition because they think there is a need to develop policy on a specific matter. And especially as we see ICTs proliferate, we are seeing the increasing various subject matter areas that require detailed analysis, especially risk analysis.

And I am very concerned if dynamics coalitions don't have the opportunities that we have had showing that we do carry out intersessional work, we have been very active and we want to share, we want to collaborate, and also to gain their inputs from those attending the conference to enhance our subject matter policymaking, that we will see the DCs, sort of, dissolve away. You know, members will probably think, you know, we put in a lot of effort. I know my members are very active. They put a lot of effort. And then they feel very disappointed that we don't have our own session.

They get to collaborate from time to time. But if collaboration is going to be the main way forward, I am very conscious that we might not be able to share the detail that really needs to be developed now for the Internet. We are just going to meet very broad policy, that's great. But that's possibly the MAG, not us.

So, I just want to say that I'm just really concerned for the membership of the DCs if we get a, sort of, second or third place at IGF. Because we have been working extremely hard over the year and we want to share our thoughts. We want to get that input. And we won't be able to do that.

So, I just want to make a statement, please. And I just want to say that, you know, we are scrutinized throughout the year by the IGF. But these workshop people who are coming in, wonderful to have them there, but they don't have that level of scrutiny that we have on us. And I just want to mention that. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No. I mean, we are taking note of the various statements of dissatisfaction of the DCs,

and, thus, Celine said at the outset it will pass on to the MAG.

Allow me just one comment. You don't really get scrutinized. There is just a basic level of discipline. We are asking if we have built up these rules over the years to say that we can't have just (?) there needs to be a certain level of discipline. But this is just essentially a formality. You have to present an annual report. You have to present a list of members. You have to have open archives, open membership and open lists. But the content of what you do is not be scrutinized.

Whereas the workshops, the people that present the workshops, these proposals do get scrutinized in terms of content. So there is a distinction there.

And I think what the MAG expressed was a bit the desire to have more oversight also of the content of Dynamic Coalitions. And I can hear you, as we all agree the importance of intersessional work you all do, but you will still be able to do that. You will be given a room where you can work together and you will have a meeting and we discussed that at the beginning, that I think the tendency is now to go towards more integration of all the various components of intersessional work as the feeling is collectively that would make us stronger.

But these are just my thoughts and comments to this. And essentially, the MAG has been appointed to be the guard of the programme and we will bring it to their attention and as Celine said, we are also proposing to have a joint meeting in Riyadh in December to discuss the way forward. And there has always been, shall I say, a little bit of ill intention, it has a long history with the Dynamic Coalitions are very bottom-up and to begin with, yes, you can all have a session, but that is simply not possible (muffled audio) in many ways are the victim of their success. So many more people want to be part of this movement and it's physically not important -- not possible to give each Dynamic Coalition a slot automatically. So, that's where we are.

But it's not the final word. And we have to discuss somehow to improve it. Maybe we can also learn a little bit from how the NRIs do it with regular calls, as they go along to present their various sessions.

Now, NRIs are a completely different animal from the DCs. But nevertheless, not every NRI get an automation and that would again be totally impossible as there are so many of them. But the NRIs work together collectively quite well and they (muffled audio) the NRIs collectively that we more upstream discuss on what could be sessions that are of interest. That's the kind of discussion we had at the last meeting, where are the commonalities and that will lead us to segue into the next agenda

item when we discuss how do we approach the DC main session.

And we are given this main session by the MAG. So that's something that gives us visibility.

But I see Celine has her hand up. Please, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much, Markus. No, thank you, Amali. As Markus said and as I mentioned earlier, we took note of the DCs' dissatisfaction and we will bring it back to the MAG because this is an issue, actually, that we have been discussing and thinking about, actually, since quite some time, since a couple of months on how to best integrate Dynamic Coalitions, a growing number of Dynamic Coalitions with especially less sessions on the schedule.

It's by no means that we want to sideline Dynamic Coalitions. It is truly a problem of not having enough slots. And also taking into consideration that this year's overarching theme is actually building a multistakeholder digital future. We are actually thinking that collaboration is the best option for this year.

And, again, we sent a survey amongst all Dynamic Coalitions asking what would be their preferred alternatives to an individual session. And it was indeed by far a joint DC session proposal.

We asked the dynamic coalitions to collaborate amongst each other before they submit a proposal. And out of the 24, actually now 26 proposals that we have received, only two Dynamic Coalitions submitted a joint proposal, right?

So, it is, again, a new field for us. We have to figure out how to best start with the approach and this is why we will also ask for a meeting with the MAG so that we can actually really constructively discuss a way forward.

And now, coming to the workshops, Amali, I received your email and I still owe you a reply but let me just answer you here in the call. Workshops are being evaluated by MAG members anonymously, and very thoroughly. For example, last year we received over 400 workshops. And only 80 were taking on the programme. There were at least 10 MAG members per group, you know, there are 40 MAG members, that met first individually, evaluated each, so at least 100 workshops. And then came together to finalize, again, anonymous selection of the 80 best.

What I want to say by that is that Dynamic Coalitions until now have had far better chances to have a proposal. It was, I wouldn't say guaranteed, but it was given that Dynamic Coalitions have a slot on the programme.

We have now over 32 Dynamic Coalitions. We have a reduced number of session slots. So, it is, of course, more difficult for us to just automatically provide a session slot.

Our preferred alternative, you know, that was given by the

DCs is a joint proposal and this is why we are doing this exercise. It is a lot of work. It is a lot of work for the Dynamic Coalitions who have already put a lot of work into creating an individual session proposal. It's a lot of work for the IGF Secretariat having to go back and try to find better solutions.

But, again, we are informing the MAG about it and hopefully as of next year we can find a better way in the future. So, I hope this answers a little bit your question. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Muhammad has his hand up. Please, Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: I have heard this discussion going on so far, and I have been thinking probably for a long time the kind of the work that DC, Dynamic Coalitions do and their relevance to the actual IGF its functioning and the messages that go out from IGF.

And at the first place wanted to raise the concern and joint advice of other DCs, those already flagged the kind of sessions. So, there are about three sessions so far I could find out of the selected 86 that relate to accessibility and disability. And at least I won't name it here, but I can speak about one session. If I were the one, as person with the experience of disability, I would not frame it as it was framed in the workshops.

So this shows that the Dynamic Coalitions work in the IGF system and the people that Dynamic Coalitions bring in, they have history, they have experience and they know the issues. And I am speaking from the accessibility perspective. I'm sure I cannot speak about other Dynamics Coalitions, if we have seen the sessions related to their area of work, how they were framed and if they will do something different with those sessions. But I feel this is a concern for the DCAD.

And there is a second suggestion and I know I am going to make myself very popular amongst the -- amongst my colleagues in the DCs. But I think as the number of Dynamic Coalitions grow, we should also have a way or a mechanism where we would -- how to put it delicately? We could retire some of the DCs which are not functioning or which are not relevant. I'm not saying that the DCs currently working and functioning, they are relevant, or they are irrelevant.

But what I am trying to say is that at some times there are more subjects which are more relevant, but at the same time, some subjects may be considered that it is time to let those go.

So should there be a mechanism, this is my questions to all of you. I don't have definitive answer as yet.

Lastly, we have tried, and I have fielded this question a

number of times on my emails since the Dynamic Coalition on accessibility and disability launched the call for fellowship for persons with disabilities.

I'm sure that this year persons with disabilities the registration for now would be a huge number, considering two previous years, the people who have registered for the IGF programme. And this is because there is a dedicated fellowship programme for persons with disabilities and we have tried to increase the participation of people with disabilities in the IGF programme.

Now, this remains to be seen that how many of them, those who have registered would be able to come to the IGF. Of course, we have limited budgets with which we can support people.

So, am I audible?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, you are.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you, Celine. So, it would be interesting to see the stats of people who registered, particularly people with disabilities and the people actually who join those sessions, either online or in person.

Certainly we cannot take every person with disability, those who have applied to IGF because of the limited budgets. But certainly, we will try to do -- to do our maximum best.

So, this is -- these are the three points that I wanted to flag before this community. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Muhammad. You make important points to the first one. I think this is also very relevant and that, again, shows that the DCs should be better integrated, you know, if the MAG makes a selection, they should automatically okay their workshops on accessibility. Why don't we ask the colleagues from the DCAD to help us to select the workshop. That's a very low-hanging fruit and seems to be fairly obvious that we better make use of the expertise of the DCs. And that's something which does not cost any money, but it just is a question of linking up the community.

The second point about sunseting some DCs, we have also been discussing also the other way around, maybe a DC may apply to become a Best Practice Forum where they will benefit from more Secretariat support to have a more fluid passage between the various categories of intersessional work, and that would also include sunset clause. But I think it's -- again, I don't think we would like the MAG to say you are not relevant anymore. That should be more come from within the Dynamic Coalition.

To the last point, fellowships. That's, again, very helpful suggestions, but I have any comments on that.

I see there are three more hands. But we also should go

to our next agenda item, which is actually preparing the main session. Can we close that agenda item after listening to Amali and Jutta?

Amali, have you put your hand down?

>> AMADO ESPINOSA: I'm aware about the time constraint. I can only say Celine is doing a great job. You are somebody with the greatest experience at the IGF, and I think you are part of the stronger wise people confirming the IGF. And I think we will have to look altogether how to make the IGF, as such, more relevant by taking advantage of the experience of the people participating at the DCs, at the networks, at the NRIs and so on.

I mean, it's also kind of a proposal of how to make these work not only analyzing the workshops that Celine already mentioned by the MAG, but also taking advantage of the -- all the different components of the IGFs to make IGF more relevant.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.

>> AMALI DE SILVA MITCHELL: Markus, if you may, this is Amali. I have to say I agree with DCAD and really support the points they made.

I also wanted to ask. Is it possible for the DCs to have its own conference? And I would say a virtual conference, rather than on site. But is it possible to have a DC conference, perhaps, as a day 0 to a future IGF that we can really share in detail our work, but we will do this virtual so we would need the host country to support a virtual DC conference.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: One point taken to be assessed by the Secretariat whether that's possible.

And I see Dennis -- well, I say we close the discussion on this issue. But is it still on the overall? Please comment shortly.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I will have Dennis comment directly, and I will wait. Please go ahead.

>> DENNIS REDEKER: Yes, I wanted to comment directly. Dennis Redeker, (?) coalition. I would say it's fantastic thing to actually have a DC kind of conference or also to have an exchange about the practicalities of working as a DC and that's in addition to these wonderful calls that we have which I think is very helpful but on occasion in a way I'm not sure how to organize it, but in a short session with people who are active in DCs and talk about the important things, about funding, about visibility, about how to get your websites out, how to integrate into the IGF system and intersessional -- your own intersessional plans.

So, we have all these practicalities that we discuss here. But it's just a very kind of high level between the DCs and not

everyone is here. It would be great to integrate this into the IGF in some form and whether that's the last day kind of meeting, it doesn't have to be -- it should be hybrid, it doesn't have to be on the programme. It's just a way of us to actually exchange on best practices, learn from each other because especially as we grow in numbers, that's important to see how we can do work better together and also work better individually.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We did have in the past a DC stocktaking session but for some reason we dropped that. I think the last one, was it in Berlin?

>> JUTTA CROLL: No. I think we had one later on.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But obviously we had the elude of the pandemic and a virtual meeting. I got lost. But definitely we should revive that and that's clearly a session with no interest outside the DC world. For us, maybe we could consider we have such a session again in Riyadh.

With that, over to you, Jutta and I will ask you to take over for me for the main session.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you so much for letting me taking the store. I remember good stocktaking or debriefing sessions with the Dynamic Coalitions and I appreciate the idea of expanding that a bit more, trying to make out of the stocktaking the plans for the next IGF in the next year, considering how we can improve the whole process of Dynamic Coalition sessions, instead of ending up with mergers that some people at least don't like or they could be beneficial for the whole programme.

I just wanted to make a comment to Muhammad's thoughts about the relevance of the issues that Dynamic Coalitions are dealing with. I do think that is individually very differing among the Dynamic Coalitions and I do think all Dynamic Coalitions have been built and come together because they think they have to deal with a very important issue that is not properly addressed on the one hand. And that the IGF built a good platform for to bring stakeholders from various perspectives together to build such a Dynamic Coalition.

And I won't stop to remind us that it's a Dynamic Coalition. That means we need to develop further and to consider how the issues that some of us have started 15, 16 years ago a Dynamic Coalition, and that things have developed further on. I do think that is very important.

And I don't think that -- I couldn't think of a mechanism where someone else could decide whether a Dynamic Coalition's issues are relevant or not relevant. The only -- only the MAG could probably be in that role to deciding on what is relevant and what not. But that was a clear decision that Dynamic

Coalitions are bottom-up and are not part of the decision-making process by the MAG. So, I couldn't think of any other mechanism where someone else would decide what is important, what is relevant, and what is not.

Having said that, I do think we can turn directly to the next topic, which is the main session. And it's definitely our task to decide what Dynamic Coalitions as such think is important enough, is relevant enough to be brought into a main session which has both benefits, one is the interpretation of the other languages which we usually don't have in our other workshop sessions. And secondly, usually we have a broader audience for that main session. But that's up to us to decide on the title and on the description of the session, on the content of the session to make it as relevant as possible. And I do think we have made some steps but Celine, correct me if I'm wrong. We are a bit lagging behind because we need to have a title at least and a short description before the next MAG meeting and that would mean we need it by the 19th of August.

>> CELINE BAL: This is correct. I shared the link in the chat. What I'm going to do also is I'm going to share my screen so that everyone has the working document of the DC main session proposal in front of them.

So, as already mentioned last time, we allocated 75 minutes to DC main session. So, the DC main session would still have to be approved by the MAG, a proposal. So, at their next meeting on the 20th of August, this is where we would, you know, introduce the DC main session proposal that we would be working on.

Ideally we would have the proposal ready already on the 19th, so that they have the document prior to the meeting.

But we did and as agreed last time during the call, we prepared a short DC survey, not only to indicate the preferred topics and also to indicate some additional ones that may not be in the survey, but also to let us know about any DC reports or reports or research are projects that your dynamics coalition is currently working on, not only for 2024, but also for 2025. So that will probably help also with the preparations of the Dynamic Coalition main session.

For now we haven't decided on a date and time for the Dynamic Coalition main session, but this will be provided to you once the MAG agrees on the Dynamic Coalition main session proposal.

Here also what we indicated, just for your information in order not to duplicate any main session topics, are the four main session topics that the MAG is working on. As you know, the MAG is always working on a set of main sessions. Here this year we have four topics. One actually under each IGF subtheme,

so as you can see, one is protecting Internet infrastructure and general access during times of practices and conflicts. The other one is the imperative of connectivity for inclusive digital transformation. One main session will be around the topic of Internet and elections. Last one empowering IGF's role in Internet Governance.

And as you know, the IGF normally also has a main session for the other intersessional work. So we do have the NRI that's going to have a main session. The Best Practice Forum on mainstream and capacity building for cybersecurity. Policy Network on Artificial Intelligence. Meaningful access and Internet fragmentation.

And as you remember, last meeting we had some input given actually by Maarten and also by and by other members on inclusion and the digital divide, innovation and risk. And Internet rights principles and core values.

These are the three potential DC main session topics that we also indicated in the survey.

For now, , of course, we sent the survey yesterday so we haven't received many responses for now. But perhaps now is a chance to kind of discuss a little bit further the -- at least topic and to agree on a draft title.

So that will be it from my side. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. If I shall moderate, a see Judith.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. It's Judith, for the record.

We filled out your survey yesterday. But the question I have is that sometime, especially on this topic, we are -- we would like to see -- see all three or two of them, but we could only -- there was only ability to select one choice. And I am wondering whether we could do more than -- if we could have done more than one on here.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Judith. Actually, on the forum you can select multiple answers.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, because when I tried, it deselected the other one.

>> CELINE BAL: Okay, because here in the forum, the multiple answer function has been enabled. So, you should have been able to select, actually, more. But if you want, you can also resend another form or just let us know and we are going to add it to our meeting.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I will just let you know. Thanks.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Judith.

Do we have any further comments in regard to title and description or do we need to wait until all or nearly all Dynamic

Coalitions have filled in their form? Celine, what do you think?

>> CELINE BAL: So, as also suggested by Maarten last time, is it would be important to identify a topic that, you know, is relevant for as many Dynamic Coalitions as possible and one of the reason actually why we wanted also to indicate the topics of the other main session is that ideally we wouldn't want to have anything that duplicates or repeats whatever exactly has been discussed in another main session.

So, perhaps what we can take out of this meeting today is at least agree on a certain direction.

Keeping in mind, of course, the overarching theme of this year's IGF is building our multistakeholder digital future and I don't know to what extent Dynamic Coalitions would like to touch upon, for example, the Global Digital Compacts that will then be released and, perhaps, agreed upon in September. Again, just throwing out here some ideas.

But the three main sessions or, let's say, topics that were suggested last time were inclusion and the digital divide, innovation and risk and Internet divides and core values. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I see a hand from Mark.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, but I want to -- if it went back --

>> JUTTA CROLL: Judith, it's first Mark and then you. You are second in a row. Mark, we can't hear you.

>> MARK CARVELL: I was looking for the switch to unmute. Okay.

Yes. Thank you, thank you, Jutta, and thank you, Celine and Judith.

You mentioned those topics, inclusion, digital and connectivity, was it, and, I mean, these are all elements covered by the Global Digital Compact. And the Global Digital Compact has a primary objective, and that is to contribute to sustainable development.

So, my thinking is along that line, in that direction for the DCs main session. If we can construct an agenda that picks up on those elements of the Digital Global Compact, and with a strong thread on sustainable development, going through all the elements of the agenda, this would resonate well within the UN community. It would demonstrate that the IGF does have within its architecture, mechanisms for examining issues that are critical to these elements of the Global Digital Compact. And I well remember the (?) saying that he really saw the opportunity for the DCs to contribute to the implementation of the Global Digital Compact.

So, if we pick this direction of the context provided by the Global Digital Compact, I think it will be very timely, having gone through the Summit of the Future and the delivery of the Global Digital Compact in September, for the DCs to marshal its expertise in a session that really picks up on this, on those elements, rights, including rights, of course. A big part of the compact is on rights, as well as evolving technologies and emerging technologies and AI.

So, there's a lot of elements we can work with to construct an agenda. Was it 90 minutes? Or 75 minutes. It's a challenge in terms of how much time available.

But the key result that I would hope would be to be a message to the UN that you've got these coalitions within the architecture of the IGF who are doing stuff that are going to help deliver on the compact and also help pave the way for the review of the World Summit on Information Society, which the compact effectively does, it paves that way for the renewal of the IGF and so on in a couple of years' time.

Those are my thoughts. That's all. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Mark. If I may, just a short question. Celine, could you scroll up a little bit? I'm not sure whether, how do we differentiate that to the session empowering the IGF's role in Internet Governance? Would that be overlaps or could we consider it --

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. Yeah. No. I think it is a good question, Jutta. So the content of that main session is not finalized yet. But it will definitely also touch upon WSIS, so not only about the GDC outcome, but also WSIS.

So, depending on the real focus, if, for example, the Dynamic Coalitions would only focus on the Global Digital Compact with the content that has been negotiated and agreed upon at the Summit of the Future, in that case that would be pretty special if it touches also upon WSIS and future business where there might be a pretty strong overlap, actually, with other main session, empowering the IGF's role in Internet Governance.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you. Judith, it's now your turn.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it's Judith Hellerstein. Going back to the survey. On the survey, I think we may want to make it clearer for people that they could choose multiple topics. And it's not here clear that way. So, maybe we could tell people in all the topics that, you know, that you can choose more than one option. So, that way we, you know, we will make it clear to everyone that they could even check a box and then even indicate ideas.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. I just updated the form and it

now reads you can choose more than one option.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Any other comments? Probably also to Mark's suggestion. And Mark, would it work for you if we refrain from business and other processes and only concentrate on the GDC?

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes, I mentioned WSIS because that's part of the trajectory, yes, through the GDC to the WSIS.

So, for our purposes of the IGF, I mean, our session, an agenda that pulls together elements from the GDC, I think is -- that would be manageable.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Maarten, please.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I can see that the GDC and its recent appearance at that time is relevant, whatever it turns out to be. As you know, there's discussion going on. You know that better than I do.

But, again, the GDC covers a lot of ground. And if we try to cover everything, we still will need to focus, I think. And rather than try to comment on the entire GDC.

>> JUTTA CROLL: You are right. On the other hand, the GDC could provide for all kind of any of our Dynamic Coalitions to hook into the GDC. And if we know what is in it in September, then we have at least two months for all Dynamic Coalitions to look at that and it's a bit related to the question of relevance of the issues that we have just been talking, that probably issues of Dynamic Coalitions get more relevance when they are related to the GDC. It's kind of an effort that we have to undertake, then, to make it clear that the work of a certain Dynamic Coalition is related to the GDC and will help the GDC to better implementation.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: In 75 minutes.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yeah.

>> MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: With 30 plus DCs.

>> JUTTA CROLL: We will need a paper, definitely. Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah. Just to jump in. I think the elements we choose, inclusivity, I think rights, and maybe one other within the context of advancing sustainable development and opportunity and so on. That, I think, is an approach that is practicable. I agree. I mean, the GDC is a very extensive range of issues and we have got to be very selective. Bearing in mind what -- sorry. Bearing in mind what is happening amongst DCs and I think the thread of sustainable development. So three or four elements. Yeah. That's my suggestion.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Olivier, I think your hand was next.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much. Would it be worth doing an exercise of looking at the current GDC version

and identifying in there what segments of that pertain to what DC, for each DC to be looking at what they could bring forward in relation to the GDC discussion?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Very good suggestion, from my perspective. What does -- do the other participants think? We expect that it will change until September.

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, I agree with Olivier. As I said, we have got to bear in mind what DCs are doing.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Uh-huh.

>> MARK CARVELL: So there may be chunks of the GDC where DC activity is rather tangential but not central. A quick exercise might determine, narrow it down to three or four elements, as I said.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks. Olivier Crepin-Leblond. This is pure explanation on my part. But I would expect that the GDC itself, the final paper will potentially have the same topics being discussed but with different positions being expressed on those different topics.

So, that's where I'm saying the earlier we get into it, as all the different groups get into it, the earlier we know who can comment and contribute on what. And then when we will have the final results, no matter what it has in the final paper that comes out of the GDC process, we already know who is doing what and I guess we will probably be quite well prepared for a very interesting session, hopefully.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Sounds good.

>> MARK CARVELL: Just to jump in. Sorry, I'm doing a lot of work on the GDC for EuroDIG. And the basic structure of the GDC is robust. It's not -- has not been -- is not vulnerable to the recent silence breaking objections. So the range of objectives and the principles and the structure of the GDC is pretty much set. There are discussions about the -- which will take place on the 19th about elements of the content of the text. Typical UN situation.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Shall we then put at least the word GDC in the title of our session? Celine, what do you think?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much. So, here are just a few proposals: So, what I can do is amend shortly the form that we sent to Dynamic Coalitions not that long ago so that we actually include a part where the Dynamic Coalition can indicate under which category of the GDC, and Judith, of course, of the version Number 3 and not the version Number 2 like on the Tech Envoy office.

And then also indicate under the selected GDC focus, what

kind of input the DC can actually really provide in addition to the Dynamic Coalition main session. So, that could be something.

And just keeping in mind the various deadlines. So, if we want to submit a proposal by the 19th of August for the MAG meeting on the 20th, I would say that the Secretariat can do this exercise, propose then by the 14th of August when it got the various responses from the Dynamic Coalitions, a draft title and description. Of course, all of that will remain draft.

And then gather inputs, I would say, from Dynamic Coalitions until the 16th of August so that we have at least a title and some key input that we can then develop as part of the main description of the session to the MAG by the 19th of August.

Again, I would update the form, ask all Dynamic Coalitions to respond by the 14th of August, then the Secretariat would come up with a draft title and draft description, share it with the Dynamic Coalitions so they can provide input by the 16th or latest 19th. And then the Secretariat would present it to the MAG on the 20th of August.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you so much, Celine, for that precise timeline to ending up with the good proposal at the next MAG meeting.

Maarten has commented in the chat that we could do something like we did for relating to the SDGs, what we did for previous DC main session. And we could now have more or less the same exercise with the GDC. I do think that would be very helpful and help us also to sharp our own view on the issues we are dealing with.

Muhammad, you have the floor.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, thank you, Jutta. And thank you, Celine, for being ahead of, because this was my first point we need to amend the form. So thank you for doing that, and outlining the timelines as well. These are really important.

I support this idea of GDC and this reminds me one of the exercise that I did on behalf of DCAD, and we published a sort of communication in March on the GDC from the perspective of persons with disabilities, on the DCAD website.

The only concern I would have is already flagged but I would want to reiterate, that GDC is a huge document and it contains a number of elements. So, in a 75-minute session if we want to do a very effective session which, sort of, creates an impact, we would have to really work to sharp focus -- sharpen our focus where we want to work in that area of GDC. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Muhammad.

In terms of time, I think we need to come to an end. We

are only gathering until 4:00 p.m., I think. And we have any other business on the agenda as well.

And just to give you an early start Markus, I would be happy if you could do the wrap-up of the session at the end, because I had to miss the first 35 minutes due to financial audit at the foundation, which was very important for us.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No problem.

>> JUTTA CROLL: I see Muhammad. You have your hand up. Is that an old hand?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, that's an old hand. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Then we have Dino on the list and then we will head to the final point on our agenda.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you very much. I just wanted to make the comment. So, I do agree with the proposed approach, just in practical terms, who is going to do what, how is this going to be implemented vis-a-vis the preparation of the agenda, the discussion, the topic, as it was alluded to the GDC document. It is a pretty extensive document, there are different elements, different parts. So, what is the intention in terms of redistribution of work?

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes, very good question. But I think we will only be able to answer that question once the MAG has accepted our proposal for the DC main session. So, we need to have a meeting close after the 20th of August to then decide who is doing what to prepare the whole proposal.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Okay. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Then we can go to any other business. What's on the agenda? Do we have any other business at all?

I don't see any hand. Celine, something from you?

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you so much. I was thinking something that is already mentioned in today's meeting but, again. I will be asking for the MAG DC liaison. Will also submit that on the 20th of the DC main session proposal for the MAG's approval and last but not least, we will be asking the MAG for a meeting in Riyadh or, if not possible in Riyadh, then at least online to discuss the way forward with Dynamic Coalitions.

And I don't know if you also want to schedule already another DC meeting in about a month time. We can, of course, also send the Doodle poll, as usual. Thank you.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, just quickly. Is there -- can you remind me if there's a terms of reference for the liaison? I think it's important, for example, that the liaison reports to the MAG on DC coordination activity.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Mark --

>> MARK CARVELL: Of that setting in the thinking at least. If not in terms of reference. Thank you.

>> CELINE BAL: Yeah. No, there aren't any terms of reference. But this is, basically, the main rule, to attend Dynamic Coalition meetings regularly and then once we have virtual MAG sessions or in person also to be the one reporting back to the MAG about DC activities. There aren't any terms of reference, per se. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And also if I may, to relate to the MAG, talking within the deliberations of the -- tell the DC Coordination Group what's being discussed in the MAG. I mean, it's a two ways role of communication. But we have not in writing, and I would be a little reluctant going down that path because we might frighten them off any more if you make it too formal and make it more onerous. We want some person from the MAG to attend our meeting, the reference point in the (muffled audio).

>> JUTTA CROLL: Okay. Thank you, then. Over to you, Markus, for wrapping up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think Celine has already wrapped up the first part of our discussion, which is an ongoing based on discussion, DC, what is our role in the broader universe of the IGF. And there have been some concerns and there are some DC members who feel that the DCs get increasingly sidelined and these concerns are selling promise, bringing attention to the MAG. But I think we should not go into a confrontation with the MAG, but, rather, show, as we have done at the intersessional work we had in June it was, yes, that we actually want to be team players and we have something to contribute, but we are here discussing how best to do this, and several very valid points were raised in this discussion. I was particularly impressed with Muhammad's point about point to some workshops where the MAG would have been able to benefit from the input of the DCAD because they are experts on accessibility. And I think this is something we ought to bring to the attention of the MAG, that we are a resource they can use in their work and they should be more also proactively thinking about, hey, is there expertise in the DC community we can use in preparing this or that session or scrutinize some workshop proposals. This is really not rocket science, but we do need to connect the various elements of the intersessional work closely together. And I think there we have broad agreement among all of the DCs.

And on the way forward with the DC main session, I think you have wrapped that up nicely. And I hand back to you so you can conclude the session. Thank you.

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

for your support. And thanks to all who have participated today. I think we had a great discussion. And we have made a step forward to remaining session and hopefully we will also end up with good DC sessions in the programme of this year's IGF. Thank you. And see you soon. Bye-bye.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much. Bye-bye
(Thank yous and goodbyes.)
(Session was concluded at 2:00 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.