

RAW FILE

IGF
DC COORDINATION MEETING #66
OCTOBER 3, 2022
1500 UTC

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

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

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorina, can you give us an update of who cannot make it?

>> SORINA TELEANU: Only Adam, that's all I've got.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So they may or may not join. With that, then, can we get started, and I think our main business will be to work on preparing the main session. There's not that much time left. And again, Sorina, do we have firm deadlines set by the MAG, when should have what ready? I think the sooner the better would be the answers.

>> That is indeed the answer. As soon as possible.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The next MAG meeting will be when?

>> SORINA TELEANU: Not yet scheduled.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. The last MAG meeting, we did say that we were well on track and we had the basic idea, but with that, then,

at the last meeting we also -- Mark agreed to be volunteered to work on a concept. He sent out the concept note just ahead of the call. But with that, I would invite you Mark to walk us through your concept note and also give us your thinking behind it. And maybe can we make it available on the screen?

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you, Markus, I'll try to share it. Is it there? Can you see it?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. We can see it.

>> MARK CARVELL: Okay. Yeah. Thanks very much. At the last meeting, we talked about the main session, and I threw in some ideas, and we've gone ahead now and developed an outline of the agenda. and I thank you, Markus, Sorina, for developing this. We did a team call to explore our thinking and to recount the decision which the coordination group had on the main session, opportunity and what it should cover.

And colleagues may recall we talked about the evolution of the IGF and the role of the Dynamic Coalitions, and the paper which was developed and submitted to the MAG, which the group has discussed in part on the future path for Dynamic Coalitions. We talked about that and we considered that in the context of the opportunity of the main session for Dynamic Coalitions to pick up some of those elements of that paper that circulated.

And we also talked about the context of the -- what was happening in the big picture world of internet governance with the proposals,

including -- we thought, then, immediately, the Global Digital Compact, which would be the focus of the digital technology track of the summit of the future. We now know that the member states of the U.N. have postponed the summit until 2024, by a year. Many of us envisioned September of next year. But, we know also that there's no decision yet about the timeline for the compact.

And as I understand it still, the tech envoy's office are staying with the -- their timeline to consultation for stakeholders, which has a deadline at the end of December. So the Global Digital Compact initiative also provides important valuable context for the Dynamic Coalitions, and there was another point we talked about briefly, was the WSIS+ 20 review in 2025, which is getting under way now. The timeline for that, there will be an IGF session with a focus on the WSIS+20 review, including review of the mandate of the IGF.

And that will take into account all the intersessional activity of the IGF, including not only Dynamic Coalitions, but the policy networks and the best practice forums. So, thinking started to emerge in our discussions that the main session for Dynamic Coalitions should focus mainly on the evolution of the IGF and the role of the Dynamic Coalitions as we progress to what we're calling for convenience the IGF+, in terms of tangible outcomes, and also being strengthened as a result of the reporting on digital corporation, the roadmap, and more involvement of governments, parliamentarians, senior people from industry, and, of course, the creation of the

leadership panel as a sort of strategic entity that will have an important advocacy role for the IGF outcomes.

So, on the basis of all of that, I've put together this note -- this document of an outline of what the main session would look like as a proposed agenda, which you see on the screen and which I circulated a short while ago. A very short while, apologies if you haven't seen it before now, really. And I've added a kind of working title, as you'll see, at the top of the document, which really picks up on the linkage to the Global Digital Compact.

Hopefully the session will also touch on the WSIS+20 review, but I think the title has to be quite short. And I think if we give it the Global Digital Compact as the main focus in the title, that will attract attention, and also of course it's about how the -- this session is about how the Dynamic Coalitions can support the compact. So, that's very much a working title and I'm open to comments to come up with their own thoughts on the title.

But it's got to attract attention. It's got to explain what DCs are, Dynamic Coalitions, so people will immediately connect with this intersessional track of the IGF with so many important groups of stakeholders looking at various things and the context of the compact, and the focus of a lot of effort of the IGF community, including Dynamic Coalitions on the Global Digital Compact. I've provided description about the context in the opening paragraph, I've emphasized the course we the community as a whole have taken to

strengthen the IGF, and the more tangible outcomes objective so that the IGF has more impact, and that this is contributing to all the big agendas on sustainable development and digital transformation, enhancing social welfare, and so on.

So I've kind of put those points together in that very short, succinct paragraph. And then a description of what kind of session this is. We agreed at our last meeting that it should be interactive. It shouldn't be just downloading blocks of information about Dynamic Coalitions, but we should have a much more discussive event which will bring in the attendees and allow a lot of time for a lot of interaction.

But we will have a panel, and I'll explain a little bit later the thinking about the composition of the panel. So that's just the second paragraph on the description. The agenda will be two parts. We thought we'd delineate the two elements. The integration of the Dynamic Coalitions in the IGF+ ecosystem. So, allowing 40 minutes for that, which will pick up on some of the points, as I mentioned earlier, from the discussion about the place of Dynamic Coalitions in the evolving IGF ecosystem, points which were made, and also allow time for discussion of maybe other elements to be brought into that part of the agenda.

And then the second part we would get on to the big picture context of the Global Digital Compact. And I think if time allows, we could go on to the -- allow a bit of time for discussing the

relevance of the WSIS+20 review and the -- how Dynamic Coalitions and what they do in terms of year-round intersessional activity should be taken into account when the review looks in particular at the IGF and what it does, how it goes about its work, and how -- what kind of outcomes come out of the IGF's work, and the Dynamic Coalitions can expect, really, to be recognized as a critical and important part of the IGF.

We're working up, bottom up, multistakeholder, non-decisional, but contributing to tangible outcomes. And we usually talk about policy recommendations, options, policy-makers and decision-takers in industry, and toolkits, guidelines, and so on. So, again, equal time for that, another 40 minutes, but allowing as also for the first part significant amount of time for interaction with the audience.

I'm suggesting 15 minutes. So, we have a panel. After the two parts the chair will want to bring things together from both parts and summarize the outcomes of the discussion. So, for both parts we've got a panel.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Mark, may I interrupt you? I think it would be good maybe to have a first discussion on the basic concepts before going to the nitty-gritty of how to set up the panels and so on.

>> MARK CARVELL: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: If nobody has any comments, and if everybody is in deep agreement with you on the concept, then we can move on. But I would nevertheless like to open the discussion. And also welcome

people who joined a little bit later. I noticed our co-facilitator, Jutta, has also joined the call. Welcome, all. But would anyone like to take the floor at this stage on the very basic concept? And thanks again, Mark, for developing this and presenting it so eloquently.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you. I just raised my hand to comment. May I?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> JUTTA CROLL: First of all, thanks to you, Mark, for drawing this together. (Clearing throat) Just one question came up to my mind, and that is wouldn't it be more logic to do it just the other way around, and talk first what the DCs can contribute, and then discuss their role and their integration into the IGF Plus? I don't want to confuse anybody, but it came to my mind that it might be more logical.

If you can scroll up again a bit, so just let me see. So I thought that the contribution of DCs, priorities, and so on and so on, would build the basis for talking about the integration of DCs in the IGF Plus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thoughts, anyone, on that? Mark, do you have a reaction? I have to say I did not think about that when Mark presented it to me. It made sense. But I think your suggestion also makes sense. (Chuckling)

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, if I react quickly, I think this is the opportunity to pull together some of the thinking about the IGF as a forum and how it has evolved to become much more intersessional

activity, in this case, as provided by the Dynamic Coalitions. So that I think is a kind of architectural discussion. How the community of stakeholders who are working very hard in the Dynamic Coalitions are also contributing to the evolution of the IGF.

That to me sounded like, as I say, a kind of architectural system issue which we've touched on in discussions. And then my thinking was to move, then, to how do we apply this to what is going on in the U.N. and how stakeholders might look to Dynamic Coalitions as ongoing focuses -- focus of activities, connect and contribute to these important overarching structural issues as instruments within the IGF ecosystem.

So, that was the, kind of, logic I was thinking to apply, but I'm open to comments. And I see Wout has put his hand up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> WOUT: Yes. Thank you, Markus and Mark and Jutta, it is a good comment. I would like to reflect on the following -- part one and part two may seem to be somewhat contradictory at this point in time, and which one should be discussed first. But I've got another question. First, Mark, I think that you did a great job and the synthesis you wrote down is exactly what we need to be discussing.

What I would like to point to is the following, is that I think there may actually be a third part, and that has to do with the following. First we have the integration of the DCs. That's what we've been talking about since January/February in our coordination group.

So that is what is central in the discussion so far. But if people in the MAG, which we noticed in the MAG meeting, don't have any idea of how to deal with the DCs and perhaps don't even see a role for themselves at all in the way that the IGF currently is based, we may invite the next -- we know where we stand, or we know where you are.

That was the synthesis of our discussion in July. You know where you are. So, in other words, that would not solve anything. Having the tech envoy having the leadership panel is a very good idea, because we may have have to deal with them more than the MAG, but perhaps the same goes for the secretariat and perhaps the same goes for U.N. itself. Perhaps they should be invited to this discussion also, because they may have to change the rules for the MAG.

The MAG will not do that themselves. So, let's look at it -- that's point one. Then, point two goes in the direction of my third part that yes, we could contribute to this, but first we have to know where we are. How are we going to be integrated in the IGF Plus before anybody can contribute to outcomes. And then my third part is that if this IGF Plus system is going to be enacted anytime soon, perhaps in 2023 already, it may well be that certain questions come from the top.

How does the IGF think about, I don't know, let's call up an example, internet fragmentation. And can you give us an answer a year from now how we should look at it from a policy point of view at the global level? So, if that is a question that comes out of the top,

and asked from the bottom-up community can you give us guidelines or toolkits, we would have to start a Dynamic Coalition or a working group or a best practice forum or whatever we call it to come up with an answer in a year time.

So that may be the third idea that has not been considered in this work so far. So that could be a question to the panel. How do you look at the system of the IGF at this point in time, and do you see it as something that could actually assist us in getting the views out at the global level from the bottom-up kind of way. So that also would be a different sort of integration of perhaps a Dynamic Coalition, or perhaps Dynamic Coalitions, because maybe the topic could be divided among a few that already exist, ask and then come up with a bottom-up answer.

So that, going back to part one, what do we expect of the panelists? What questions do we provide them with up front? Otherwise they will come to listen. And then we tell our story and then they may conclude this has nothing to do with us. It has to be clear that this is about them showing us how they see Dynamic Coalitions in the IGF Plus ecosystem. That makes it a little bit more complex than has been presented so far. Let me stop there for now, because I've been talking a long time.

But I think this is more complex than we are facing at this moment. Thank you, Markus, for the record, sorry.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout. This is Markus speaking again.

But I think what you said is not incompatible with the concept Mark has presented, because the thought was having something, a first element more inward-looking, how the DCs fit into the IGF. Then the second part will be more outward-looking into the broader architecture of digital compact, WSIS+20 and all the elements you mentioned will fit in under the big headings. And again, Mark rightly emphasized the importance of having an interactive meeting.

And we only have 90 minutes at our disposal. And I think reducing the level of complexity of anything is helpful to a meeting that is focused. If you make it overcomplex, then we might -- we risk getting lost in that. But all these thoughts are very helpful and can feed in into the panels. But Jutta's question, she wants to reverse the order. And I listened to both Jutta and Mark, and I think both make sense.

One would be what Mark presented is going from inward out. The other one would be looking at the broad picture first, looking inward after at how can we fill in with the broad picture. I think both approaches have merit. I don't think there's a right or wrong there. It's more a question of what do we choose. Are we more comfortable and what flows better. So I would be -- welcome other views on that, but we can obviously also park that shift if you have other ideas after it.

But -- and also there were some comments in the chat. I would also encourage people to make comments in the chat to take the floor.

Amali made a few comments. I don't know, would you like to take the floor? And also WSIS is mentioned. And since the last meeting we had, ITU has changed considerably. We have a new secretary general, a new deputy secretary general, and I would describe both of them as being more friendly towards multistakeholder cooperation and more responsive to the needs the IGF might ask for the IT to accommodate.

So I think the basic environment would be easier for us working towards WSIS+20, but I see Jutta, you have your hand up again.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Yes. Thank you. So, due to another meeting, I only had a few minutes to read Mark's proposal before we started this meeting. And I do think it's necessary to consider what we expect as an outcome of our session. And for a long time we've had discussions about the role of Dynamic Coalitions, whether they get enough support, whether they are accepted in the way they wanted to be accepted in the IGF ecosystem.

So therefore, I think we can -- if we have a clear understanding and a common understanding among Dynamic Coalitions what the outcome should be and how we can achieve a clearer image of the role Dynamic Coalitions take, then it's easy to say whether it's the one way, like Mark suggested, or the other way. How would it work better that we achieve what we have as a common goal for the session.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Jutta. And Avri suggests parking. This makes sense, it could depend on how each of the two sub-sessions evolve. So with that, then maybe I would assume there

are no more comments regarding the broad concept and we can then dive into the nitty-gritty of how to set up the panels and what questions. And that is by far the most complex part of our task. Back to you, Mark.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you very much. And thank you, everybody, for your comments. And as I say, actually, I can just reflect on the comments as I describe this part of today's agenda with regard to who do we involve in this session, because I talked about a panel, and here I've basically set out the main constituencies for the panel. As Wout has pointed out, we need to have the engagement of the leadership.

I don't know how the leadership panel is going to operate, whether they will allocate responsibilities to individual members or what, but hopefully we can request leadership panel to nominate a representative. It could be a minister. For me, that would be ideal, somebody from government perspective of the leadership panel who's involved in the strategic development of the panel's thinking, how to be -- serve the best interest of the community, including Dynamic Coalitions.

Somebody representing the tech envoy's office, because they are integral now in the evolution of -- the implementation, rather, of the roadmap and the IGF's element of the roadmap. Of course we need to have a liaison to the MAG. And then we need representation from the Dynamic Coalitions. And also, I haven't mentioned specifically,

but it's vital that we have a use voice. So we have the use coalition on internet governance, a representative from that coalition, but also representatives from Dynamic Coalitions on thematic issues.

That will be a process, I think, to seek nominations, bearing in mind the purpose of this session. We can't have a big panel. This is a no-no. We know this in all our history of the IGF. Huge panels are out. They turn off the audience and they inevitably consume all the precious time available to us. So we've got to keep the panel fairly tight. And I'm thinking three representatives of Dynamic Coalitions, ideally, that will also provide agenda, geographical balance, and sectoral thematic balance for the panel.

Somebody from the use coalition, in addition to the leadership panel and the bank. So that's about seven people. And I wanted to reflect back on our earlier discussion in a sense that what are the questions that we're looking to the panel to respond to. And this is where the chair is going to be so important, because the kind of points that Wout made are highly relevant.

What would somebody, a representative from the leadership panel, what are they expecting from the Dynamic Coalitions? I've heard Jason from the tech envoy's office saying the IGF has got to move from an annual event focus to year-round activity, so what does the tech envoy's office think that the Dynamic Coalitions can contribute in terms of a year-round platform for multistakeholder advance on key issues.

So, we can choreograph some discussion with these critical questions around the panel, but then we've got to allow sufficient time for interaction with the people on-site in the audience, in the room, and also virtually. So, that's my thinking on the panel. Just quickly picking up on Jutta's point, yes. My model of the agenda I think provides the opportunity for some agreement to be recorded that this panel thinks this is what the Dynamic Coalitions can do.

This is the merit. This is the focus and commitment the stakeholders can provide to the Dynamic Coalitions. So, outcomes from discussions will capture that, is what my thinking was. In addition to simply awareness-raising for total new comers of what Dynamic Coalitions are, we have some greater sense of what the Dynamic Coalitions can contribute. And then likewise on the second part, what and how are the modalities for Dynamic Coalitions to contribute to the Global Digital Compact and in longer time, the WSIS+20 review.

Okay. I've spoken a lot, so, Markus, back to you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Mark. And there are comments in the chat. Wout, the questions should lead to a discussion so there's no traditional panel in the sense of everybody makes a statement. And Avri did the math, seven on a panel uses 35 minutes if you assume they talk twice and are restricted to three minutes and two minutes followup. Not much time for participation from the floor. Not to mention chair and moderator speaking.

So that's a cautious note that we don't really have that much

time at our disposal, and we have to be extremely cognizant of the fact if you want an interactive discussion, then we have to bear that into mind. Other people would like to take the floor at this juncture? Amali had quite a few comments in the chat, but said she cannot take the floor. But other people, comments, first thoughts on the concept Mark outlined with the caveats made by both Wout and Avri?

Well, one comment -- I mean, in the past, the Dynamic Coalition main sessions were mainly driven by the Dynamic Coalition themselves. Here the concept is different. We invite other people who would interact with Dynamic Coalitions and at the Dynamic Coalitions and would also provide guidance for the future of the Dynamic Coalitions. It is different from past DC main sessions. Comments? Yes, please, Avri.

>> AVRI DORIA: Hi. Avri speaking. Yeah. First of all, on the numbers, I'm wondering if we want interactive going beyond three or four panelists is probably going to mean no participation from the floor. I'm still avoiding the word audience. Indeed, the floor has become an audience. The other thing I'm thinking -- and you mentioned it in terms of the presentations. And this is something that I'm thinking of in terms of the content line of it, or the outcome line is are the DCs in a sense surrendering a certain amount of their bottom-up control and if so are they doing it intentionally, are they understand what that means, etc.

We're sort of saying fold us in, include us, guide us. And in

another sense we have a history of saying we are independent, we are what we are. So -- and I'm not making a value judgment whether we should progress from one to the other. But if we are doing that, that seems to be something that would be part of an outcome statement that says we are making such a change, that the DCs are suggesting such a change in surrendering part of the bottom-up for more inclusion and organization. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, Avri. That's obviously a very big meta-question. I'm not sure whether we have to go as far as thinking that surrendering the autonomy of the DCs, but just thinking aloud. When I looked at it, I thought more of how can the DCs contribute to the bigger good, so to speak, of the broader IGF community and do that still in a bottom-up manner.

But this is obviously a matter for discussion. And I will be very much interested what other people think about that. And I see Wout has his hand up.

>> WOUT: Yes. Thank you, Markus. And also, thank you Avri for the comment, because it's extremely relevant. And I think that the problem that we have in this discussion so far that most of the Dynamic Coalition do not show up in this meeting. And we are the few that discuss this. And most so far that have given a view said we would like to have -- be a part of the tangible outcomes of the IGF in one way or another, and recognized as an IGF outcome.

But a few others have said we are totally happy with what we

are. We discuss the topic among each other and that is as far as it goes. But perhaps it is time to make some sort of inventory. And we know there are a few Dynamic Coalitions that want to have a higher level of output -- not so much surrendering their independence, but be recognized for their output. But there may be some that don't. Mark pointed out there could be three different sorts of the Dynamic Coalitions.

But there also are a few which I think are not even active for a couple of years but are still in this list. And -- but we don't know. So, perhaps there's an idea for Polly to send out a very short question to the Dynamic Coalitions, are you active, are you happy the way you are. And that places us in the discussion we have now. Some Dynamic Coalitions are not part of what we're discussing here and do not want to be part of it.

And I think that that is something we need to find out, because otherwise let's suggest that something comes out of the meeting we are discussing here and say yes, Dynamic Coalitions will be a part of the IGF and we put ideas to them on the Global Digital Compact and we have 15 Dynamic Coalitions saying what has been happening here. And that is something we definitely would want to avoid, because then we would look probably pretty amateuristic.

So, could we do some sort of a poll, finding out where Dynamic Coalitions are in this discussion? Because then we know who are on what side of the equation. Thank you, Mark.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout. And in the chat I have a comment. Minda said is it not more like a conversation rather than asking for guidance? I think I used the term asking for guidance and again, maybe that was not the right term I chose. And I think it's a good discussion to have. And thanks for reminding us that there are various types of Dynamic Coalitions and there are some Dynamic Coalitions who might not wish to contribute to Global Digital Compact and so on, who are happy with the work they're doing in their own little limited area.

That's perfectly okay. But yes, we do have, I think, a problem here. We have very limited participation of Dynamic Coalitions in the coordination group. Does that mean that the other Dynamic Coalitions who are not involved, they don't care either way? Sorina did work checking if they fulfilled obligations. Sorina, could you recall how many Dynamic Coalitions are actually fully active on your last count?

>> SORINA TELEANU: Thanks, Markus. Well, I did check the compliance with the principles, but not so much their level of being active. And there we have quite huge differences between Dynamic Coalitions. Only looking at the meeting lists, some are active and there are exchanges and in other cases, there's not so much activity, at least last time I looked when I was going through the compliance with those three principles. But if we want to really assess to what extent they are active, focus on that only and define what we mean

by active.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. That brings us back to the paper we produced when we had taken as a basis for our discussion in the coordination group, in a way, how to tighten the coordination among Dynamic Coalitions. But Mark, you have your hand up.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yeah, thanks. Just to come in very briefly, I'm cognizant of this issue and that's why I talked in the past about different kinds of coalitions, all equally valid in their own way. And so I tend to approach this as a kind of -- what we're doing now in terms of the GDC and the WSIS+20 as the opportunity of the Dynamic Coalitions. And gauging how the leadership panel, the tech envoy's office in particular, may wish to look to Dynamic Coalitions to assist with these processes is going to be interesting to hear.

You know. And for example, the leadership panel may turn around and say this is a big issue the GDC is talking about on, I don't know, digital commons or data misinformation, for example. What's going on at the IGF? There's nothing going on. But how about setting up a Dynamic Coalition to investigate this? So another kind of Dynamic Coalition is what is being requested from the leadership panel in terms of what the opportunity.

A team of stakeholders would look at at the request of the leadership panel. That's another possibility that we should bear in mind. So, the roster of different kinds could be quite varied and it's not the intention to constrain the ambition of coalitions and

steer them into a particular direction, or a particular U.N. initiative. That's not -- certainly not our objective and we should make that clear.

But there is the opportunity of the Dynamic Coalitions to contribute. And some coalitions may jump at that opportunity to contribute to the GDC and deliver specific, concrete, tangible outcomes for the IGF to pick up and promote. So those are my thoughts on that. And these are contextual issues which need to be made clear in the preparation for the session, perhaps in the opening remarks of the session. We're not setting some kind of governance system for Dynamic Coalitions.

That's certainly not our intention.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Wout?

>> Wout: Yes, jumping at what Mark is saying, that is actually what may be drawing us to the WSIS+20 discussion, because that is also about showing how effective the IGF can be, what sort of outcomes IGF can deliver. And if Dynamic Coalitions are able to contribute to that, it makes it much easier, perhaps, for many countries to support the IGF going through to 2030 or 2035. So in that sense, there's also an opportunity for us to prove how valuable we are.

So let me stop there. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Other comments, thoughts?

>> POLLY: Do you want me to send out emails to try and gather more information?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: What's the general feeling of the group? Does that make sense? And thank you, Polly, for being proactive and asking for work. (Laughing) Or volunteering to do some work. Wout has a hand up. Well, I think is there any objection to Polly picking up on this suggestion?

>> I don't think it can do any harm.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's what I thought. Could you maybe again, just to frame it to make sure that we're all on the same page? Can you repeat how you understood it, Polly, or should we ask Wout to repeat it again?

>> POLLY: How about I say how I understood it, so I can be more certain. So, I understood that there are different levels of engagement among the DCs and different desires for engagement. And this is kind of what you wanted to look into, the extent to which they're involved in the larger DC group meetings such as this, for example. Correct?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Does that sum up your idea, Wout?

>> WOUT: Perhaps ask Mark to formulate it better than mine, but I think the first question would be to ask the Dynamic Coalitions on the basis of what we are discussing here, which is are you interested to be part of an IGF Plus system where tangible outcomes, your DC's outcomes would become an IGF outcome, tangible outcome. I think that is the main question.

And if the answer is no, then we know that they are not interested

to discuss further. And the second one is more in the background. Is anything happening in these DCs? And that is perhaps not all DCs have requested for a session, I understand. So if you then look at the email group if anything has been happening in the past year, it could be quite telling, perhaps.

But perhaps, Mark, you can formulate the question a little bit better. I see Jutta is on-screen. Perhaps she would like to add as well. So, let me -- I think that's the only question that we have at this point. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And maybe a third element could be do you as a Dynamic Coalition feel you contribute to parts of the proposed Global Digital Compact. Mark, do you have more precise ideas?

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, I was thinking along the lines just as you have now as a kind of third element so we have some sense, appreciation of the opportunity by Dynamic Coalitions to contribute to the GDC.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Could help in selection of the DCs that would be an active part of the session, if they coherently explain what element of the proposed GDC they contribute. That could be helpful in actually framing the session.

>> MARK CARVELL: Yes. I think that's a nice segue into planning for the session, actually, because to focus on the GDC it would be good to involve coalitions that actually are operating on one of

those -- at least one of those seven topics that the tech envoy has set out as potential issues for the scope of the GDC and connectivity, human rights, AI, and connectivity and so on, those seven elements that are in the questionnaire survey from the tech envoy.

So, this would be a useful mechanism, as you say, for that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And someone Sivan put their hand up, please. Unmute yourself.

>> It's more of a question. What is the shape of the Global Digital Compact and what are the components? If we look at it, we can very clearly say how we can contribute and why it's important for the DCs to take a role. How is it evolving, in other words. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Mark?

>> MARK CARVELL: Well, it's very much at the start of a process to develop it. I mentioned just now the Tech Envoy has issued a questionnaire survey, and that has identified seven thematic areas for the Global Digital Compact, plus an eighth question is what else should the compact include. So we're very much at the start of -- as a global stakeholder community in developing the content of the compact.

So there's nothing in place at the moment. Our common agenda, which the secretary general published, identified a number of issues, and they've been translated into the survey which you can find on the Tech Envoy's Office website. And that is an open consultation

through this, running until the end of December. So it's really a very consultive process to develop the basic structure.

Ultimately, it will be signed off by the member states of the U.N. as part of the outcomes of the Summit of the Future. But it's starting off with a very open, consultative process for stakeholders to submit their views on what the compact should include within the scope. Markus, is that clear?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That sounds very much -- you have a followup?

>> SIVAN: Yes. One thing that the DCs can bring to the idea of Global Digital Compact is to emphasize that a Global Digital Compact, while it is global, and all-encompassing. Rather than narrow it down on AI, health, security, it should take a completely global perspective. Internet is something that has happened to us in the last 30 years. And it is an ecosystem that can be a bridge across functional areas, across areas of development, across geographies.

And so it is possible to govern the internet in such a manner that a range of global problems can be addressed through the internet. And that is something that we can essentially take to the Global Digital Compact.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And one other point I would like to make is that the Global Digital Compact will be, as Mark said, in the end negotiated by the U.N.'s member state. And that happens in New York. And New York is traditionally less friendly towards nongovernmental stakeholders. So if you have the opportunity early

on to share our views on the process, the better it is.

I think we should really make use of this opportunity. But, we are reaching the top of the hour, and I think we had a very interesting discussion. And we take as a concrete step now that we reach out to all the DCs. And as I see it, also an opting in for the DCs who want to be part of the session, that they have to react and say how they would contribute. In the past years we made an entry ticket that had to present a paper summing up their work.

This time it's slightly different. It will be more, okay, we send out this questionnaire and ask for the DCs to react and to say how they feel they can contribute to the process and to this session. I see Sivan and Wout have their hands up.

>> WOUT: I would not wait to invite the people that we want to have in the session, because they will be very busy at the IGF. And the earlier we are with inviting them, the bigger the chances that they will show up. So that's all. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, the point I made referred to the Dynamic Coalitions, of which Dynamic Coalitions will be part. But that doesn't -- and I assume there is broad agreement that we should invite these people that Mark had mentioned. Leadership panel, as we know, the Chair is one person who has actively participated in the IGF for many years, so he knows the IGF. And I think approaching him is also relatively easy. He is responsive.

Either he himself or he could then delegate somebody else from

the leadership panel. The same with the Office of the Tech Envoy. We have easy contact to this office. And I think, at one of the last sessions, was it the last MAG session, invited to actively approach the leadership panel to participate in the session. That can be done. And also obviously the MAG and the MAG chair.

This is sort of very easy to do that. But the other, the rest will depend to a large extent to the survey Polly kindly volunteered to send out. And I think you will work out the wording with Mark together, the details, how exactly to word it. And I'm also happy to take a look at it. But I don't think it will be necessary that we give that to the full group for approval.

But it's good to send out something to the DCs to get their feedback and to also make sure that they are on board and are behind the main session. Is this summing up more or less reflecting the discussion? And please, Jutta, as co-facilitator, feel free to give your comments, or also Mark, as you were the person who was driving this process. Anything I have left out, forgotten, overlooked? Mark, please.

>> MARK CARVELL: Thank you very much, Markus, for chairing today. And all colleagues have discussed, being the agenda and so on, has been very helpful. There's just one other point. We have to think about who's going to chair this session, the main session. In my immediate group, my preference would be for you, Markus, to chair it, given your role in terms of coordination of the Dynamic Coalitions

and also your vast experience going right back to the start of the IGF and WSIS and so on.

That's my nomination to be the chair, for you to be the chair of the session. But the other thing is the title. That still has to be worked out. We need to get a good title that can be posted now on the schedule so people start to factor that into their navigation of the very, as usual, the very intense and busy IGF schedule. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I don't know whether I should thank you for the nomination as chair or not, but I see there is some support in the chat. And if we can't come up with anybody else, I'm happy to do that. But my suggestion, nevertheless, would be that we also ask Tatiana at least to be some kind of co-facilitator, as she is very good at provoking discussion. But I would be ready to assume this task, should you so wish.

And the second point as to the title . . . Yes, let's try and make it as sexy as possible. And that reminds me of -- used to say, an average person using the internet, they talk about internet governance, then their eyes glaze over. (Chuckling) And this is a little bit, I think, we are very much in our bubble, yes, okay. We now look towards the Global Digital Compact and so on.

And to us, this means something. But can we think of something that would also mean something to people who are outside the bubble that would attract them to the session. I'm just raising the question. I don't have the answer to that. But we think a little bit outside

the box.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you, Markus. (Clearing throat) I would also put thumbs-up for you as a chair of the session. I can volunteer to think about the title. And I have nothing to add to the discussion for today right now.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, thank you. And with that, I think, okay, we have some food for thought. We have not concluded on everything, but we have set in motion a process. And let's get started on that. And I think we may have to increase the frequency of our meetings leading up to the annual meeting, every two weeks, maybe. May be not a bad idea to keep track and keep going.

If we wait for a month and things fall between the cracks, it might not be taken up. So, I would suggest then that we look with Polly, we send out with a Doodle poll that we find a meeting not next week, but in two weeks time. That would be the week starting on I think 17th of October that we look for a meeting then, as we get closer to the meeting. With that, I thank you all for your active participation, in particular Mark for driving this.

I think it was a very good meeting, a very good discussion to have. And I think it will help us moving forward. Thank you all.

>> Thank you, Markus. Bye-bye.

>> Have a good day. Thank you.

>> Bye.

(Session concluded at 1608 UTC)

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is 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.
