IGF
DCCG MEETING #95

FEBRUARY 20TH, 2025
9:30 AM TO 11:30 AM CST

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So it's not quite 5:00 yet but just for housekeeping and for the good of all, can I ask you again to add in the list of participants which dynamic collisions you are affiliated too.   It makes life easier to the secretariat when they have to produce the list of participants, okay?

You can -- yes, Maarten just did it.   Excellent, and you can please do it in your in the chat list or in the list of participants you can add after your name and which dynamic coalitions you belong to.   I see appearing slowly but steadily so thank you for that.

>> Yes, thank you, Markus.   It's really important and when we prepare the summary report, it's always such an exercise to match people and their DCs so if everyone can rename themselves, it would save a bit of time.

(Laugh.)

>> Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I see there's a few still not listed.   Elena.

>> This is Roberto, how can you do it.

>> And you add it -- when you click on participants you click your name, and then there's a place to rename.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you forgiving instructions.   I would have been unable to explain it as well.

>> I didn't know just by putting over your picture you can get the rename prompt too. That's cool, so a couple ways to get it to happen.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   Getting there.   In the

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Can you maybe add something like the name, and we never actually voted but -- I mean, it's clear that every dynamic coalition only have one vote if you ask a show of hands or something.

>> By the way, you might want to repeat your requests for all the people that came in after you made your requests.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   Thank you, Avri, yes, we would like every participant to add behind the name which dynamic coalition you're affiliated to, and you can do that by clicking on your name or on the picture, and then you can edit the name and just add the dynamic coalition.

Did I say it correctly, Judith?   Not quite as good as you but --

>> Judith: Yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I can see Ray hasn't added his name -- yes, now he has done it.   Yes.   Okay.   That is something.   It's housekeeping, and I know it may be tedious, but it makes life easier for the secretariat, so I think you will understand that for sure, and in everybody's interests in terms of enhancing the transparency of the process, so we know who does what when.

With that can we turn our attention to the agenda?   Roman has circulated a draft agenda.   Roman, can you show it in the chat or on the -- or share your screen, and it's in the chat.   Okay.

Can we adopt the draft agenda as it is?

>> Marcus, this is Wout.   I sent an email --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Hand up, Wout.

>> Yes, thank you.   I sent an email to the group earlier this week or late last week I don't remember what was working in the workgroup strategy, and there's a lot being discussed about the future of the IGF and dynamic coalitions are mentioned quite a few times in the document that they are using internationally at this moment, so I think it would be good that we discuss how we plan to contribute to this process and if you want to deliver some text as a group to this process, so that it's not being written for us.

So I would like to add that to the agenda at some point to discuss this to create a team on -- on -- on this topic.   Thanks.

>> Well, let's -- any other business -- yes, I remember we've seen your email and that gives me a natural link to an item that is not on the agenda but, which I would like to introduce and the item is actually not -- it is a person who you all know well has agreed Po serve as liaison for the future and Anriette is very active, and I believe she would be the natural person, the natural link to make up this issue.

Anriette?

>> I'm here, thank you very much.   Thanks for accepting me.   I was volunteered, but I was very happy to be volunteered.   Thank you, Anriette for accepting this role, and we have presented her to the MAG Chair who would happily agrees to that proposal, and I don't think the MAG needs to approve it, but we'll ask the MAG -- and I see there are some comments in the chat that people say -- which dynamic coalition they are but our request was actually to put them directly in the chat.   It's much easier for the -- sorry, put it in the list of participants by your name.   It makes it much easier.

Avri has her hand up.

>> Yeah, quick question, Avri the liaison it's a bidirectionally liaison; right?   So it is -- speaks for the other one at each of them.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct.

>> Okay.   Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   With that can we then go to the agenda?   And the first agenda item is indeed the exercise we started at our last call.   And, which, I think, went amazingly well as -- what I learned when working for the UN -- what you say in UN meeting it exceeded expectations, I think.   It clearly exceeded by expectations, and Roman, who was the engineer behind it all put it together.

You have the floor.   Explain where we are right now.

>> Roman: Dear colleagues, do you see the screen?

>> Yes, we did Roman.

>> Roman: Thank you.   This is basically to show that we have almost everyone who voted, and so there are a couple of duplications, but it's okay.   We see that we have quite equal distribution around the clusters, and I see that that's me and Dr. Rajendra can work on the following days to structure this for webinar serious as well as the preparation of that -- the DC sessions within those clusters, so thanks, everyone.   Who participated in this exercise.

And I do believe that this is important that he were -- was given a chance to give two options, so we will give the priority which let's see in case we have any questions of whether you better fits to that or this cluster but as of now it seems like we have a perfect plan, and we should just stick to that.   Back to you Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, so we have -- can you give me the broad picture how many dynamic coalitions responded.   34 responses, yes?

>> Roman: Out of 32 dynamic coalitions -- by the way, maybe later dino would be interested in to present the new dynamic coalitions on the emergent coalition, which is the 36th dynamic coalition so basically we just need to clean it up.   And see maybe what some duplications we still missed one or two DCs, but the picture looks fine.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No this is really is fantastic, and I see two hasn't.   Maarten first.

>> Maarten: It's good to see the balance.   It was difficult because depends from which angle you look as to which of the four priorities and to which of the SDGs that you relate to.

And, of course, we also are seeking to see with which other coalitions we could work together to organize joint sessions.   I like I will the indication, and it helps.

I hope we don't use this as a limitation but more as input to on working together.   Is that correct?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, that is a good question.   And there have been questions also in the mailing list on what exactly, but it was my understanding and Carol on the last call confirmed this is my understanding, that we would propose to have 4 sessions based on these four clusters, so that the dynamic coalitions could as a group in these clusters each prepare a session.

And they will represent that to the MAG and hope that it will be accepted as a concept, and we would also then present a main session where we would, like last year, discuss all the four clusters in one main session, but that would be prepared then with all the 4 clusters together.

Now, the question that came up do the dynamic coalitions have the possibility of having their own session?   And the answer is that would be very difficult, if not highly unlikely, because the limitations on the sessions is very high.

The Norwegian hosts made it clear there was to reduce the number of sessions, and then we thought if we have wrong expectations if we keep the traditional DC form up but DCs are encouraged to use to use the workshop proposal form and there is a change in the situation that the workshop proposal form has a section in the form will be where it says: Do you work together with an intercessional component?   And as a DC you are an intercessional component and that will get a positive bonus points so to speak

When you submit the proposal.

You can, of course, submit a proposal as a single dynamic coalition but then you have to be aware that the chances the sessions would be accepted would be rather slim.

But if you turn to other groups or with other partners or with other dynamic coalitions is it a workshop proposal, then your chances are much higher.   That is my reading of the situation, but I turn also to you Anriette to fill me in.   I see a follow-up question.

>> Maarten: So we got the 4 -- we may have the 4 cluster segs.   If I'm in it cluster 1 -- and I take it in it midterm it would do we report back to each other about the progress of these.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct.

>> Maarten: After the first feedback it turns out that actually I could much better contribute to the cluster 4 than to cluster 1 because of things prevalent, I think we should keep at least a little bit of flexibility there and flow and commonsense, rather, rather than --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That is also an extremely valid point.   You need to work with a certain number of flexibility.   You cannot be rigid on that.   It is a first -- last year we pioneered the clustering we found it changed it, but it was mainly based on speaker availability and other criteria such as diversity, geographic diversity so to speak the global, but it's by far more clustered than earlier on, okay, time is also much shorter.   The meeting is around the corner and such that we have to hurry.

But there are more questions.   I see

>> Wout: I had a differently recollection.   I heard Roman say the DCs could have 5 to 8 sessions, and then we discussed clustering, and then we brought it down to 4 but not with the intention to scratch the other 1-4 which could be joint proposals because it will now never be single, but we discussed 5-8 slots at first, so I would not like to limit ourselves to 4 at this point because there may be topics that people want to discuss.

The other topic is that we should find room in the program to really present an outcome, which we can't do in joint sessions or in the main session that takes on a certain topic, so that's something that we need to fight for.

Then to Roman's numbers that we just showed because 34 for 32 was totally new.

Is the 34 because -- for example, we signed up in it two topics because -- actually we fit in 3 topics if we look at it in that way.   Is that because we have several or DCs that have put in 2 -- 2 clusters -- I mean, added up double?   Or is there a mistake there somewhere.

>> Roman: Yeah, I can answer that straight away.   It's because some people answered several times --

>> Wout: Okay.

>> Roman: No worries, no worries here, but also a comment from your previous question.   Now after more or less general confirmation of this approach with clustering and 4 subtopics we are already raising our concerns to the secretariat that there will be at least 4 DC sessions and 1 session as usual.

Another approach would be to try to find a short time slot for all the DCs to present very, very practical outcomes, so in it case some of the DCs would need that, meaning that they did not -- they did not propose their own workshop.   They somehow got not selected so -- in this case, I think, it's manageable, so we will not leave anyone behind.   That's for sure.   And, of course, the cluster work will be absolutely inclusive and as Maarten also asked about this flexibility, yes, certainly, there should be and there will be flexibility even to change everything.

And the last point and me and Dr. Rajendra will now be, like, closely coordinating on this to make sure that everything goes smoothly.

Yeah, but this is more or less everything is moving smoothly, and I thank everyone who suggested the cluster choices, so -- thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman.   I was also coming to that.   About presenting outcomes.   We discussed that at the last month, and I also strongly suggested that maybe we need to find a different platform in the lightning talks and the vendor will be organized.

I think what worked really well in Riyadh was the stage right in the middle of the village where you could have sessions and the host country used it for some things or something like that, but it needs to be explored or divided.   Anriette, you've been waiting a long-time, but your turn.

(Avri).

>> Avri, yeah, I had two questions that come up in the suggestions.   One I wanted to ask about day 0 rules, and I'm actually trying to we had a meeting of our DC and talked about what we wanted to do.

I want to do something slightly different during a day 0, for example, like a Hackathon or something like that, and, therefore, can a DC apply for a day 0 as long as it's a day 0 kind of thing while still participating in all of the other, you know, group and associated stuff and even, you know-- so that was one question is.

And can they actually do it themselves or do they need to find a group of co -- you know, cosponsors for day 0, so that was, so that was my first question.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent question, and my gut reaction -- it might be better chances if you find a cosponsor for an event, but I think -- it should not restrict DCs to do something, you know, with other parts, but I think to move a little bit out of silos but to have a more comprehensive approach with all the -- all the parts of the IGF ecosystem.

Do you have another question?

>> Avri: Yes, I had another question and that related to -- a DC participating in an application for a regular workshop -- in other words, to come through in the regular whole group of applicants.

I thought you indicated that they really shouldn't be a cosponsor.   They should just be in that other, yes, we are connected to a SIG as opposed to them being actual sponsors of the thing and coincidentally associated with, so I just want to check that.   That DCs can't be cosponsors of a regular workshop.   They just need to be a check item.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, they can be cosponsors.   You can -- as a DC workshop proposal --

>> Avri: With others?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If you do on your own, your chances are very low that they'll be accepted, but if you do it with others --

>> Avri: Oh, okay, Yes.   I understand alone there's no winning.   I had of missed that. Okay.   Thank you.

>> Xianhong: Thank you, can you hear me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you.   Good to see you.   It's great wire discussing the IGF this year, and I want to share some experience from last year talking about the clustering.   I thought the last year we were quite successful in clustering dynamic coalitions on a voluntary basis.   In the beginning we were a bit of resistant but then I realized we have so many partners and dynamic coalitions, and it indeed worked well last year to have a substantial sessions.

For example, last year, my dynamic coalition did an inclusion, gender equality week, jointly with another dynamic coalition called the Public Access and my DCs has many months and that DC has many members to re-enforce the discussion by channeling the new stakeholder -- for example, we have the labyrinth in our session.   We also have the

national government of Saudi Arabia in the session as well as UNESCO and DC inclusion network, so it ended up being very successful.

So this year I must thinking -- I already voted on that form, but also if we would have some flexibility to voluntarily connect with DC.   I ran a workshop from last year to have the cluster in addition to the vote already built up around.   Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, and it's good to hear also the positive feedback that it's fantastic news, and I think this year we are -- last year the structure was more sort of last-minute and also based as I said speaker availability whereas, this time it's really all the DCs and the link we followed the Norwegian lead have to link with the GDC lines and to the SDGs and that makes it really very comprehensive, and it shows actually how well the DCs fit well in the overall scheme of things.

Again, yes, of course, you are -- one thing -- what we are aiming is to get granted by the MAG that we can collectively prepare these four sessions under these four cluster headings, and that would be prepared by us, and that would be waived through by the MAG in support that we would be given these slots.

In addition you as a DC, are able to partner with others to propose a workshop but then it would go through the regular approval process by the MAG.   But again, as a DC, you would be given favorable consideration and the partners you have the chances are for approval, so I hope that we have cleared any misunderstanding that that may have been floating around.   I see Anriette is having her hand up and please, Anriette.

>> Anriette: Yes, please, Markus, just to affirm, what, Celine has posted in the chat and that DCs can apply for day 0 events, in fact, they do quite often so Avri, absolutely you can do that.

And then I think just to add what Markus had said about DCs applying for workshops. I think just makers that it really is a workshop.   That it addresses a topic and that it brings in other -- other participants and speakers and that it works as a workshop.

I think the one thing we'll remember when the MAG does the evaluation, they don't actually see who the organizers are.   The initial -- the initial rating of workshop proposals by the MAG is based on the content of the workshop and on -- the questions, how it's designed, how the participants are going to be and not based on who -- who's organizing it, so just make sure it's a workshop.

'Cause the one thing the MAG does look out for is session organizers using workshops to -- or using modalities to get in when they couldn't get in on what they wanted -- I'm sorry.   I'm not sure I'm making it very clear.   If they feel the workshop proposal is actually from a DC who's submitting a workshop proposal because they couldn't get a DC session for their DC, I think that would not -- if that's obvious, that could count against that proposal, but I think a stand-alone workshop proposal that makes sense, that asks questions and is will have interesting discussion and is linked to a particular DC, I think would stand a very good chance.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for this clarification as well, and Celine also posted in the chat the link to the website where you can find more on the workshop proposals.

Yes -- and as we talk about gaming -- one thing that doesn't go well if people try to game the system, so Anriette made a very valid point and the proposal should be

stand-alone interesting proposal and when they look at who proposed it, you will get additional points as a DC proposal.

Are there any more questions SDGs.   And to the list of clusters, obviously that is -- can still be tweaked on, and I think we don't need to go through the list to look at each dynamic coalition, whether that's in the right place.   I think it's a self-selection.

And my suggestion would be that you check where you are and if you have any proposal for change, address them directly to Roman and the secretariat.   If you find maybe there's a link to a -- with the action line missing or maybe another SDG or another GDC, it would be relevant can be adjusted as we move along.

If there are no more questions to this agenda item, then I think we have a common understanding of where we are and where are we heading.

So the next agenda item would then be these webinars that are closely linked.

Obviously, it would be the training sessions for the cluster sessions at the IGF itself, and Roman, it's up to you and the question was also asked: Do we have the dates for all the webinars?

>> Roman: Oh, yes.   We are still to discuss it with Dr. Rajendra and hopefully, next week we can discuss the structure and dates for all webinars.

As I suggested before my logic one in March, one in April and probably two at the end of May and maybe at the beginning of June.   That also works.   Let's see we need to do some research on some other parallel events and consult with colleagues and the secretariat, so we don't have any overlap.

And by the way, yes, knowing how difficult it might be to arrange for time zones, it's another question at what time to host these webinars, so this is something to be discussed.

If anyone has any idea, let's please discuss them.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, one question would be -- if you put a webinar together, whether you have two sessions basis -- two different time zones, so we can bring Asia a bit more, have it later in the day -- no, earlier in the day or later in the day if you want to bring in the Americas and particularly the West Coast.

One suggestion could also be to ask the policy network started having webinars last year and asked a little bit on their experience but personally I'm absolutely open and listening to suggestions people may have.

>> Roman: Do you think we need to discuss their experience.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's -- it's certainly worthwhile just getting in touch with whoever organized them from the PNI.

>> Roman: Sure, sure.   I'll do this part from the secretariat.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> Side, of course, and we need some interim discussion also on how to promote these webinars.   How to make sure that they -- the IGF community receives this in our social media and maybe in some email newsletter, so, yeah, this is something planned and, yes, we also do understand the date should be defined as soon as possible but, yes, again, given that we need to move step-by-step, so now we have more or less defined these four topics more in line with the main subthemes, we understand to which cluster all to what they commit, and it's flexible and can Chafin their time, and this is where we start this

serious preparatory cluster thematic group sessions, so we will have these thematic goals within the cluster, so that's one or two DCs -- I don't know, who will be the most active there.   Will volunteer to help draft a good description and let's say the logic of this session, so that we can start already collecting the relevant content and cases to present.

So basically, again, the webinar should be the preliminary -- preshow, preacts before the DC session in the IGF Norway, so, yeah, this is the logic for now.

But again, everything is still in the makings so, please, if you do have any creative ideas, share because everything is being done by us together.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Roman, and as you said it's in a way -- it will be the training session for the session in Norway.

My suggestion would be to have it exactly the same duration of the session in Norway.

Do we already know if the session has been 90 minutes in Norway?   Do we know that?

>> Roman: They will be as long as we want them to be.   Please tell me how long they should be -- not IGF meeting --

>> Roman: Once again, if we need 40 minutes it will be 40 minutes.   If we need an hour and a half it will be hour and a half.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I think the shorter session will always be possible, but the shorter session will not always be possible.

>> Roman: Yeah there's no point in having a session no more than hour and a half; right?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct.

>> Roman: People will leave the session because it's hard take the attention for the audience.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can also have -- we can have --

(Inaudible.)

>> If you are given four 90-minute sessions let the webinar speak but if they're 60 minutes let's have the same duration of the webinars, but we don't know that yet, I think.

>> Roman: Thank you for raising this.   I really do think the webinar should be shorter, and, so it will be mostly -- because maybe not everyone will in the end commit to these webinars and commit because -- but I'm sure these sessions will be more attended with more interest of the them and put more consideration because the IGF session more or less robust whereas, webinar is a -- that way 45 minute to one hour, I think, is the maximum for webinar, otherwise, it's -- we risk it not being interesting.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I would agree with it.   The last goal, I think, some people suggested a two-hour webinar, which I definitely think would be too long.   Okay.

>> Roman: Sorry, two hours is not recommended for anything because it just hard --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes.

>> Roman: Hard to make people inspired and active.   Again, it's all raiding awareness and raising the availabilities and the DCs is doing amazing work, and we need to be very concise and interesting for people.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I agree.   Okay.   With that can we move to the next agenda item? That would be -- yes, I see a hand up.   Wout.

>> Wout: Thank you, Marcus.

I think I agree with the webinar because that's a sound bite but where the IGF itself and concerned, we're already clustering 8 or maybe 10s DCs in a session that will all want an opportunity to send some sort of message so 90 minutes will already be totally crammed in my machine, so we -- in my opinion, so we gave away four sessions at this point because we started 5-8.   We're down to 4, so it would not be overasking to asking for 90 minutes, I think, for the 4 DC sessions.   I think that's a fair request.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, no, I think I agree, and I thought we had general agreement on that.   That we ask for a 90-minute session for the 4 sessions at the IGF meeting, so I think we take that as a given that -- I mean, we have to ask for it, and then we'll see whether the MAG agrees to it, but we asked for 90 minutes for these 4 cluster sessions for sure.

The webinar is another story.   That will be decided by the organizers of the webinar, but I think we also have an agreement that that they should be shorter than the session at the IGF.

Okay.   Do we have agreement with that?   Can we then go to the accountability and there we have the basic proposal that we used gamification -- gamification, and we had a mailing list some people of concerned the time factor and with that I give over have to our gaming specialist.   Please, you have the floor.

>> Reyansh: Yeah.   With the gaming platform at the last meeting we will be using it just for the attendance list as of now, but gin that many people are not --   But again, that many maybe we could have a few experiential people outside but something along those lining but something be we join the platform because we don't have all the DCs on the platform yet and with that we can get started with the gamification and, of course, figure out where we can include everyone to that platform.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.   Are there questions to Reyansh?   I think everybody from the last call were not happy and there were concerns what is the value-added to that as opposed to a traditional list of participants, and Reyanshi, but it is something very boring that is a list of participants -- the attendance list and make it more behalf and also create an incentive as there will be in the end a league of the best performers so to speak of dynamic coalitions, and that would be my understanding why this could be the way to approach this question from a gaming point of view but maybe you are more in the gaming and philosophy of gaming.   Maybe you can explain it than I explain it.

>> Reyansh: I completely agree.   The name of the platform actually summarizes gamification activities and measuring engagement, so you gamify your regular route you make it more interesting.   You give people more -- and also you measure your impact, and you have and get points and, of course, we get behind and, of course, we need to figure out more parameters we can have to make this more interesting and to have more points coming in for each DC and how they can contribute, so, yeah, that is something we need to figure out together.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, and Avri asked whether we would get -- how did she put it. Would we get pretty ribbon prizes like in a dog and pony show?   The answer is yes. (Laugh.)

What's the price given to the winners, a ribbon?

>> Avri: As long as it's a pretty ribbon, and we also have a ribbon for the also-rans so

nobody feels hurt.   I think it would be grand.   Be absolutely wonderful.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Excellent.   I like your enthusiasm.   Thank you.

(Laugh.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, as I mentioned, I think, before I sort of -- I started learning language using a gaming approach then.   It's very stressful you could relegated to a lower you divisions if you don't work and be promoted to a higher division if you do your work.   It sounds silly but somehow it works.

Can we then agree to get it -- if people are really unhappy they can still move out of it, but that really would encourage all DCs to be -- to be good gamers and get started with the gaming.   Judith, please?

>> Judith: Yes, I'm not sure I don't know if it matters what we gets points for because some DCs may have more meetings than other DCs, and then also if we're only getting it for coming to the thing or helping organize one of the DC sessions or during other things where you can maybe get points but if just -- if the other points are like: How many times you played or how many times you had a meeting or -- I think the criteria of where you get the points might be a problem for some people, so that's one thing.

And the other thing is, like what -- what Avri was saying, maybe if the secretariat has any small SWAG to give away to the winners, that could also be good or maybe in DESA has SWAG.   Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The SWAGs I doubt the UN has any presents to give away but maybe we could approach open sponsors to do that.

To your more content of your question, right now we're just talking about attendance list but, obviously, we could expand it then and say: You know, those who are actively preparing a session gets points, but that obviously is yet another discussion to have.   It needs to be -- would have to be agreed by all.

Avri?

>> Avri: Thanks.   Yeah, I mean, I'm sort of agreeing with what Judith was saying if we're going to be collecting points, then perhaps need to be many ways to collect them given the diversity.

Now, if it's just an attendance and perhaps: Did you do your homework-type of points, then perhaps it's okay to restrict it to just, you know, the -- and then, sure, it's like -- you know, it's like home room where, you know, I got best attendance because I made it every day, and that's, you know, a really good thing, and I'm still attend of my best attendance award.

An attendance award could be good.

Now, if you went start using it for judging things and for saying: You get relegated or you get fewer session points, you know, or saying: Check, I'm working with this DC -- it doesn't really count if you've got a bad attendance record, then we need to be careful of how we're doing it and what we're measuring, but we really have to be clear about what we're measuring.

And we have to be clear that at a certain point, as in teaching to the test, we will start behaving, so if you get lots of points for something, maybe we'll do more of that.   It's easy for me to have more meetings, but is it reasonable?   Does it -- so I think if we're going to really do it -- if it just attendance, that's easy.   You know, but as you said it just a happy

way of doing an attendance sheet but if we're going to start measuring on more things, we really got to be careful to make sure that we that that still with the diversity of who we are and that we don't let the collecting those points dictate how we behave.   Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well put.   I think we had the beginning of the discussion last week when people actually said what are we measuring?   That's why the proposal on the table would be: Let's see how that works with the attendance list and whether that's fair to do that or not, and then we can discuss at a later stage to discuss whether or not to discuss and include other factors, but I think we can all agree it gets much more difficult. We have Wout and Rajendra put their hand's up.

>> Wout: Yes, thank you, Marcus.

I think going back where we started this discussion, it was about measuring, so because what starting having less sessions as DCs who should get preference that to be part of the session?   And if somebody never joins any discussion, never -- is never present and really never without any work and doesn't give their report in time, and then say: But we want to be part of the -- one hour we get, then perhaps they don't because of their behavior in the past, and that was the starting point.

Where -- if I look at the discussion now, there are I'm fine the way it goes.   It's that simple, but we do have some things we can measure, and they are part of the agreement greet you sign -- agreement you sign with the secretariat when we become a DC, and that is you have to deliver reports.   If you do that in time or not -- they ask for an extension, that's all fine, but the report is there.

There's some other things that you have to do as a DC, and that is something that is measurable and, which is measurable in a very neutral way, yes, I've done that.   See, here's the report that we've done it here.   Here's the meeting we organized here.   Here's the report of it, and then you get a little tick and being present here is one of the -- one of the access with one of the time zones excluded.   With the teen lady who said: I can't participate because it's in the middle of the night, but at least you show that that you can't participate, and you would like to.

So those are the things that are measurable, and I think that could be part of the gaming system and in the end, how we deal with the outcome and whether there is a restriction to number last I don't think that's the real message.   I think the message is to get people interested at least to live up to the expectations when the DC signed in the agreement.

So let's see what's in the official -- in the official list that the secretariat has that you signed and make that a part of the gaming process.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I mean, the annual report -- if you don't deliver it, then you're delisted as an active DC.   I mean, that's --

(Laugh.)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: But I mean, we can include that into the ranking.   That doesn't cost anything but Rajendra, please.   While gamification would be about engagement but also involve with time, so this could have

(Rajendra) what is the activities that were done, so I think it could have multiple vectors leading to finally encourage people to have outcomes, I think, at the end of the day.

Sometimes what gets measures is a award and what activities a DC is doing *vis-a-vis* other DCs I think it could encourage others we could have points of innovation, so I think it would bring in more than just measurement over time but has -- this is the very early phase. I think measuring just the coming -- I think has increased since we announced gaming in I think it's a coincidence we are not still measuring and the number of calls a person tops wait, and I think the precursor is encouraging what people can do and with more activity getting listed and more innovation, but that dashboard sets off the gamification.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that comment.   Well, it's one -- the fact last week we gave a very tight deadline for this clustering process, and we had 100 percent response would mean you all would have all have deserved points in the gamification platform website.   That's -- but we did not have it in place but -- I mean, it's a very good example that you all really were very good citizens and played the game, so that is, I think, very encouraging, and I think because we came up with this idea also and put some pressure on you to come back, and that's why it increased, I think, also the interest in our activity and the -- what was said the fact -- the positive experience of last year's main session where you actually were forced to work -- to partner with other DCs, I think, also enhanced this interest, and I think -- in that sense I would not see that as a sort of -- I think, some comment made in a chat that we -- it wasn't loudly in the call now as DCs we lost over the years slots.   I wouldn't see it that way.   We may have lost individual slots as such, but I think we gained -- I think also in it visibility and credibility, and I think that these are also tangible values.

But, Reyanshi, do you have a comment?   I want to make it clear that we strongly encourage all DCs to sign up to this platform get it started as an attendance list with this platform, and those -- those who don't sign up, they don't show up in the platform.   It's as simple as we.

So if they are okay with that, it's their choice, but we will not -- they will not have any consequences, but it will show up.   These are DCs that opted out of the collectively agreed gamification plan, so that is my take on that.

Can we agree on that?   Ray I can't think do you ever any comments -- Reyanshi?   I see Avri has her hand up.

>> Avri: Yes, I think it's nice to include an opt-out but what punishment -- but what happens to those people who opt out.   Is it just: Oh, you're free it of the rules or you're free that of whatever judgments -- you're a lone wolf which sounds good too.   Or is there some kind of punishment for it or some kind of deducting points.   I'm curious if we're going to let people opt out we have to figure out the consequences being a nonplayer in a player's world.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, it's a very good point, but I think we cannot -- well, at least as I see it cannot give any punishment to these lonely wolves as you call them.   Those are the guys who don't want to play with the others.   Whatever -- Jutta, please?

>> Jutta: Thank you, Markus for giving me the floor, but I wouldn't see it as a punishment that the reports have to be delivered in time, and there's a -- if the report are not done they will not be recognized as a dynamic coalition.   That's enough on my side.   Yo say we find a punishment for the gamification process, but the consequence would be if you don't deliver your report and the engagement in the dynamic coalition coordination group as a

dynamic coalition team.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, the report is a is precondition and agreed and the secretariat is administering it whether or not you want to include it into our gamification should be another story? As it's a mandatory requirement we can do that without any loss, but I think most of them, because it's required, so they would score well on that particular item but, yeah, you know, my thing would be we strongly encourage all dynamic coalitions to participate, and we don't need to say: If you don't want to don't do it. You don't want to encourage them not to sign up but up to them to see and the secretariat could also chase them up a bit if they don't sign up, and we have designed you have not shown up in the gamification list.

But again, this was only a small bit of the accountability discussion. Tending meetings was very much part of the project we did 4 years ago, years' ago -- 2021 and Anriette was actually -- I see she has her hand up. I was turning to you, Anriette, as you were the instigator of the paper we had, which is still posted on the website and Dino at the last call suggested revisiting it again, and I had suggested it before and as you had commissioned that paper, Anriette, I would like you to comment on that and any other comment that you have is most welcome.

>> Anriette: Thank you for giving me the floor, Markus. Just to close on this gaming platform, I just want to ask if it has not yet been created just an email message with simple instructions about how to participate, how to use it, how coordinators of DCs use it, how participants in DCs use it because it's not in entirely clear to me and other people might be in the same position. That they can benefit from -- you know, just guidelines on we can use it.

And I think there's nothing wrong with also trying this on a trial basis. If after a few months we feel it's not working -- you know, then we can re-assess, but it sounds to me as if you've already made the decision to try this out, so I think, yes, we should -- we should definitely try it out.

And on the document it and on accountability, I think that there is -- you know, what the document that we commissioned and that Markus and Serina from the secretariat produced, it's really looked at accountability as part of governance structure of DCs, and, you know, what we learned from that process was that different DCs have different structures. Have different governance processes, and deal with accountability differently, and I think, you know, the assessment was that that's -- that's fine. That as long as DCs meet the criteria and the charter the IGF secretariat has developed that they are free to have different -- different governance structures and different processes.

So, you know, I don't think -- I would just urge everyone to look at that document. I think it is a useful document, but also it doesn't mean that we shouldn't go back and re-assess and also share experiences among DCs about different processes that that work for them and that work well for them.

So, you know, I'm not -- you know, I'm not going to say much more than that, Markus. I think that there's a lot of diversity in if DCs and that always has been a strength. That mean the issue of participation and accountability and process and clarity is not important. It certainly is, but I think that the flexible approach that has been adopted to DCs is certainly something that I think has worked mostly, but I'll -- you know, I'm also

getting back into this process, and I think there's a lot to -- for me to learn and to listen to DCs about what has changed.   Since 2021 because I think a lot has might have changed as well.

I don't know if -- obviously, this is part of what you do but, you know, we might also want to consider looking at that document and identifying parts of it that could be adopted knew if that would be of value.

Back to you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, and that's very helpful comments.

>> Thank you, for my perspective of.   I think my participation is the largest factor on this unification process.   I don't I don't really see any need for punishment because the main (AMrith) is how involved these DCs are with these initiatives we have going on, so at the end of the day if we're improving accountability and involvement as Dr. Rajendra just said, I think it's a win-win situation, and also there's a lot of flexibility and variance in the systems per DC so as long as they're meeting these criterias at the end of the day, I see no need for a punishment in my opinion.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.   Well, yeah, I think the punishment idea is definitely not in the center of the proposal.   It's seen, and I think that was sort of reflected in the chat, I think, since several colleagues also thought of it more as an incentive to participate, and I think I strongly feel the same.   That, you know, it's a fun way of creating an incentive and as Anriette said, we could try it on a trial basis.   And if we really think after a few months, it didn't help that much of, then we can revisit it, but we can also then think: Do we expand it to other factors already mentioned and the proposal to revisit the paper we produced in '21 and see which particular issues we could revisit could be worthwhile.

Okay, right, okay.   Some of the comments in the chat.   Also, punishment is not the incentive, but there is such a thing as group behavior and can be seen as punishment. But again, I think it depends on how you sell it.   If you sell it as a way to -- I mean, you know, participation in the in the call was identified as an important factor of DC behavior.

And if you sell it as that way, instead of -- you know, we could publish a list of an -- an attendance list, an Excel sheet or whatever, but I think to have a ranking makes it somewhat more dynamic.   And, again, more fun and maybe also -- it may be no surprise that the DC teen coalition -- it's pretty much, I think, speaks the way younger people feel. I'm not a young person anymore, but I think it's fun so, but my belief would be strongly to go for it, and I can't follow all the comments in the chat, but the comments I heard were all very valid, but I think they are -- they should not prevent us from giving it a try.

One comment I did take, obviously, we should talk seriously is the time zone factor and there were some suggestions on that, but my other suggestion would be please in each dynamic coalition -- I think the comment was also made in the chat you should also aim for membership that is spread across the time zones.   Don't all be in Australia or on the West Coast of the United States but make sure you spread out a bit a bit, so you can ask a colleague I can do it, for instance, D cat motion to amend said: I cannot make it today but Judith will be on the call.   That's perfect fine, so D cat is perfectly represented, and I think that could also be an incentive for the dynamic coalitions to make sure that they -- the work should not always be done by the same person.   That they work more collectively and share the burden among their dynamic coalition.

That is my take on that.   I don't know -- I can see you thinking, Jutta, if you would like to give your take on this?

>> Jutta: No, Markus thank you.   I think your comments are valid so nothing from my side.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay, with that can we go to any other business and to or any other item that was linking to the IGF strategy group?   So we conclude this item.   Let's go ahead with this and let's encourage all dynamic coalitions sign up and ask anerb to give us instructions on how it works to make it clear or work it out with Roman and Roman will send an email to the group with the detailed instructions what they need to do and when and how.   Can we conclude with that.

And with that I then give over to Wout on his separate issue on any other business. That is the IGF strategy group.

>> Wout: Yes, thank you, Markus.   Maybe most of you don't even know that it I say ands, but it's a working group that's been in existence for years and talks about the future of the IGF at this point and also represented in the WSIS plus 20 process in the GDC process *et cetera*, *et cetera*.

There are 6 action points at this moment, and that's why I thought as dynamic coalitions we should perhaps agree on -- to find a common text that we can contribute to this working group because.   Because especially we mentioned in No. 3 that is hosted dialog within the office of the tech envoy, whatever it's exactly called ODET and other UN agencies on the ump shen of Paragraph 1 of the GDP and together with DCs, NRIs and other intercessional work, and under No. 4 is host a webinar on the implementation on the NetMundial+10 dynamic coalitions and from there on there are a few other things that perhaps we could share a line or two with, but I think it's important that we voice what it is that we can do and want to do in this discussion, and that is not decided for us by people who are not know exactly what dynamic coalitions do.

So under the leadership of you, Markus, and Jutta, that a few people come together and look at what exactly is happening and that we propose a short text in the coming weeks because we will have to be fast, we have extreme extremely tight deadlines in these processes, so we know exactly what we have to do and not be surprised what we have to do.

So if anybody is very knowledgeable about policy and about the global digital compact of the WSIS plus 20 processes, then I would like that you volunteer with me to set this up and that Marcus then can, on our behalf, submit a text, so that's the proposal.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.   And Anriette, if you will forgive me if I turn to you.   As you are an active member of the strategy group.   I tune in to the calls, but I'm more of a hanger-on in this group.

>> Anriette: Hi, Markus, and Markus, thank you, and Wout thank you for that raising that. I think it is a very significant group.   It's a MAG working group, so that's the one thing to keep in mind.   It's open to nonMAG members so anyone here can also participate, in fact, many of are already participating in the working group strategy.

And ultimately any recommendation or decision or output of the working group strategy has to go to the MAG, and then the MAG tops review it and approve it.

And I think what has been really good is that the MAG Chair -- Carol has actually been very active and supportive of the working group.   I think Wout idea is great.   I think having dynamic coalitions individually but also through this coordination group participate in working group strategy activities is a good idea, and there's an action plan that's now being discussed that involves one -- I think there's 6 different actions that is being discussed.   I think, one is a paper on WSIS in the IGF that can be kind of a stand-alone -- you know, there's been so many input to WSIS.   Part of the DCs as a title community put together how the IGF has been part of and contributed and enabled implementation of the WSIS.   There's also an activity it's called the sociologists event, and I think again having DCs participate in organizing that session would be certainly valuable.

There's also an activity on strengthening government participation and liaison, and in the IGF either through a track -- well, that's up for discussion, and then there's also an activity around convening an online discussion, a webinar on the WSIS process and on the final activity I think it's a new one that's been added produce a letter one that accompanies a paper that I mentioned to the cofacilitators of the WSIS process, so many of these activity that the working group strategy will undertake this year do come from the MAG of it and from the MAG Chair who is seeking support from the working group strategy.

Ultimately, I would say IGF renewal and a IGF renewal extras, and that's very much a part of the WSIS process.

Wout, I don't have more to add.   I think it's worth thinking about how to draw this group in.   You know, I haven't thought more of this group, and I'm happy to support you in this process, but I think it's very important that DCs are part of the working group strategy in general, but I think more specifically contribute to the working strategy work plan for 2025 because it is so linked to the renewal of the IGF, which is part of WSIS, and I think for dynamic coalitions it's important because I think even as DCs contribute as stand-alone groups if they're no longer part of the IGF, then that certainly is going to detract from the impact of the DCs as well as the credibility of the status of them as peel being part of this global IGF stakeholder opportunity.   I'm sorry I took a bit long, and I know we're over time but maybe we could talk more about this one-on-one, and you can let me know how we can operational this, but I think it's a good decision.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Anriette, and I saw Avri in the chat saying I'm happy to help.   I think we definitely have a team of about 5 people that we are able to come up with a generic message how dynamic coalitions can contribute.   I think that one is easy to make but also perhaps some individual examples that show the work that is being done and the impact it could potentially have, and thank you for explaining all the official process around it, Anriette.   I think that is very important to understand.

And, yes, let's discuss and hopefully a few people will volunteer and get an extra point in the gaming system but let's try and do this, so that we're not being discussed about, but that we 2 actually contribute in a way that we -- that we can actually contribute the way we feel in this process, so thank you for that.

And let's have this meeting pass with Markus in attendance, and then discuss it further, Anriette also.   What, is the --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I'm sorry, I was not unmuted.   I thank you for that Wout and thank you, Anriette, for reacting and explaining all the background for those who have not followed the IGF strategy.

I think we already seem to have a core team with Wout, Anriette, and I think Avri had her hand up too to volunteer to be part of that.

And, obviously, it would not be a closed team.   It would be open to other volunteers to join but may we agree to give the three of you Monday to get started, and I don't need to be part of that, but I'm happy if it works, but I think you can get started without me but if necessary, I'm happy to join on that call.

And Anriette, we usually have 90-minute sessions, so we're not over time as of now, so we still have a few minutes left.

The question if there's nothing else on any other of the business, then we would have to assess the next steps -- obviously, one of the next steps is to finalize the webinar that is in Roman's safe hands, and then we need to meet to discuss when to have our next call and -- well, we had two calls very short one after each other.   Can we wait another month or so.   Is that okay?   Or what's the feeling?

>> Jutta: Marcus, we would need to set the dates for the webinars, so probably the next call would probably be before the next webinar.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we don't have the date yet so.   So can we agree on that once we have the dates that Roman will send out a Doodle poll to fix the call ahead of the session?

>> Roman: So let's say before first of March me and Mr. Rajendra will finalize, and then put before the final discussion to put together the webinar structure team and dates, then we can send out a Doodle poll from 10th to 15th of March for the next call?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> Roman: And which time zone next time?   Earlier?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, can we have -- can we have the lunchtime in Europe time zone?   Was it 12:00UTC --

>> Roman: Last time it was 12:00 UTC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's sort of in the middle.

>> Roman: 12:00, I think, is fine, and so we had some positive reaction.   I don't know. Maybe people will correct me now.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   Let's go for that 12:00 U U-TC in the week starting March 10th.

>> Roman: Uh-huh, so that's probably 11, 12 or 13 of March.   I think we'll propose those three days.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I already know I can't do 13, but he can with do 12.

>> Roman: Okay.

>> Judith: Can we move it for the next if we're doing 12:00 UTC.   Some of you might be at the ICANN meeting, and we'll be --

>> Avri: Yeah the meeting would be at 3:00 AM, so it wouldn't conflict with anything.

>> Judith: Yeah, I don't know --

(Laugh.)

\>\>

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   Let's have it the following week.

\>\> Judith: Okay.   That'll --

\>\> Roman: Once again, which week do you mean again?

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: 17, 18 or 19?

\>\> Roman: Of March.   Okay.   So coming back to a monthly meeting?

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: It would happen to be yes.

\>\> Roman: All right.   Okay.

\>\> Wout: Is that -- is that -- sorry, to cut in this with the webinars.   Can we fast forward to not have something in between?   Not everybody is involved --

\>\> Roman: Let's be flexible.   I also share your --

\>\> Wout: We learn from each other here probably.

\>\> Roman: I share your expectations, and I think that's probably -- we would need one more general meeting but let me remind you we will -- in between this month, we'll have group meetings because it's impossible to start preparing the webinars without having meetings, so we will have enough --

(Laugh.)

\>\> Roman: Time to spend with each other so don't worry.

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.   Oliver has his hand up.

\>\> Olivier: I don't know if we have time, but I wanted to look back -- I've been looking at the workshop proposal of before and my understanding the DCs no longer have this separate tract to submitting workshops, and so two DCs would have a high chance if two DCs came together and submitted a workshop proposal using the workshop proposal track, that'd be a high chance they would get accepted because there would be this box to take additional things saying this is part of additional things for the work of the IGF is that correct?

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct, yes.   DC also with another group can --

\>\> Oliver: And other groups.   The only thing that's currently going in my head, of course, as you know all DCs are doing a whole lot of activities and some of the work of the DC relates to the SDGs.   Some of it doesn't and in the workshop proposal form, it does ask for the alignment to be with the -- you know, in the way that the workshops would be looked at, and so on.   It needs to be aligned with the -- with the overarching themes and subthemes of the IGF 2025.

And so before DCs could have their own track which was not directly related in their session to the overarching theme and subtheme because it was part of their work.   Is that is that going to count against them now that they would be making their proposal through a general workshop proposal form?

\>\> MARKUS KUMMER: That's again, an excellent question.   I think you would not get extra points.   I think the idea is to streamline the program, and it was very much the wish of the Norwegian hosts and also the link -- I think you would have to tweak whatever you propose to make it fit in -- into that -- into these clusters, and I think because we have these clusters, we're already in a very good position also for the strategy group, you know -- we show we contribute to the greater objectives of GDCs, SDGs with the action lines so pick one of them, and you don't have to bend over backwards I'm sure you'll find something.

They are fairly broad, you know, the WSIS action lines -- but just the way you frame whatever you protested, try and frame it in line -- aligned with these priorities set by the MAG based on an original host country proposal.

Jutta?

>> Jutta: Yes, thank you, Marcus for giving me the floor and also for the question, Oliver.

I think we learned in the past that that dynamic coalitions really benefit from considering their relation to -- we started with the SDGs.   We did it with the GDCs objective last year, but you just reflect on the work that you're doing to find the bond with these different activities and also with the WSIS, so I do think it's a good idea for all dynamic coalitions to review their own work and try to find the parallels and similarities, and then it will be easy to fill in the form for the workshop proposal.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.   Oliver, have we answered your questions?

>> Oliver: Yeah, it was just an objection and point.   I'm not saying we are in this position.   But there are some DCs that are much more limited in what they do.   They're much more focused -- not limited, but their focus is much more focused on one thing.

In being able he to relate to the SDGs, some of them might have compromised their focus and said: Well, let's broaden it a little bit more for this SDG, and now they're thinking: Well, okay.   We can't have a focus just on what we're doing.   We're going to have to relate it to an SDG.   I'm sure they'll be able to work it out and might be seeing problems in places where there are no problems.

But I certainly note that a few years ago, there was more independence in whether DCs were doing, and we've had this discussion on so many times, and we are slowly being brought into a box where the UN is dictating what is meant to happen.

I'm not saying it's good or bad.   I'm just saying that's what I'm noticing.   That's all. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for your comment, and with that I think we reached slowly but steadily the end of our allotted time of our 90 minutes.

There's 3 minutes to go, and I think I can give you back 3 minutes of your life if you conclude the meeting here.

Thank you very much for attending.   We have an action plan ahead of us, and my suggestion would also be as homework, look again at this page produced under Anriette's chairmanship and pick some of the items out of that.   Maybe I will send an email up to the group which would be my proposal that we pick it up at our next call, but we already have quite a bit on our menu, so there's plenty of work ahead.

Well, thank you all for attending and I wish you an excellent rest of the day and see you online.