Raw File.
IGF.
January 29, 2025.
UTC DCCG meeting.
10:00 a.m. ET.

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
+1-719-941-9557
Www.captionfirst.com

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The co-facilitator says in the chat that
she tries to stay connected, but she is somewhere in the
Austrian mountains on a well-deserved winter holiday. We have
the agenda in the chat. Can we approve the agenda as proposed?
>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: I hear no objection. Is the agenda is
approved as proposed. The second Agenda Item will be the DC's
accountability, and we had hoped to have the pilot project from
the dynamic coalition on gaming. Is he on the call? I can't see
him.
>> I am here. I don't know if you can see my video, but I
am here.
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Over to you then.
>> REYANSH GUPTA: I won't take any time. I just, can I
share my screen because I have it ready. I'll get started with
it. Basically this is the website I could build in two weeks,
I'm sorry if it's it behaves in a way it's not supposed to, but
this is something I made in the last two weeks since our last
call, and this is basically the landing page. We have a photo
all of us who were at Riyadh, and the main feature I wanted to
show that could lead us to be accountable and more engaged is
the leader board page. So as a DC coordinator I see this. This
is unique for everyone. I share this link for you on the
Whatsapp chat and on email as well so everyone can sign up and

see it.

Right now since no one is on the platform, we see that the leader board is still static. It's all of the DCs and I think it's these top three, but what will happen eventually is as we keep joining these meetings, we gain some points and this is a whole leader board of all of the Dynamic Coalitions and you can actually see how the end points and more details interact.

This is a website that works very well and captures the engagement part of things in terms of joining the meetings and eventually once you get to submit the report, it acts as a -- you get more points and it's completely gamified. And everything would be done in simple interface on the website itself, and then when more things was the forums, so let's say I'm leading the Dynamic Coalition gaming for purpose and someone said this is a cool idea.

This is where I can see it, anyone can suggest the ideas, and this is where we have our engagement and our community going. So the more you are engaged, the more points you get. I think that has covered most of the things I have for this pilot, but, of course, there is more scope in terms of how we can keep people engaged and have more Dynamic Coalitions and you have the score leader board to go along with it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It wasn't very quick for me, but that doesn't mean anything because I'm not a digital native, but I do get it's a point system and a football league, whatever, the more points you have, the more you move to the top and, okay, again, maybe you need to be a bit slower for me, and I don't know but the others may get it. How do you get the points. If you are on a call today, you get the point, and the other engagement points, can it be more in detail how we envisage this.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: As you said, if I join a call, we have a report coming out, right, so what happens is you have these reports, and I joined the call so my Dynamic Coalition that is DCG4P gets 100 points and that goes to the leader board. So eventually what happens is you have these calls, we are joining the calls, whoever joins the call gains like 100 points for their DC and there is a whole leader board going on and we have annual reports, so once I submit that report, I also get a few points for that. So what is happening is basically the more actions I take towards something, the more meetings I join, I gain points, so something along those lines.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Are there questions? And I'm sure there are people on this call who are more attuned to this gaming notion than I am, but I rather like it. Judith has raised hand, yes.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, but I think Dr. Shabir is going

to can my question so I will let him do it.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: I can ask my question after you.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is on accessibility, but Dr. Shabbir has to answer that and whether this website is accessible for Persons with Disabilities.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Well, I will get onto that a little bit later because I am on my mobile device and I prefer that I would see it on my computer to comment on its accessibility or no not, but for now my questions relate to somewhat what Markus was referring to. The website schemes very interesting and on the face of it, I like the idea, but my question is how many variables have you added so far because my accountability for DC would need to agree by this group on the variables.

For instance, one variable could be attendance to the meeting, another variable could be submission of annual reports et cetera, et cetera. So how many variables are in the system, number one. And number two, do all of the variables get the same number of points or, for instance, one variable would have more points than the others because this would impact the actual number of points that one or other DCs would get and, of course, the points system gets you at the top.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: I agree, that's a great question. Since this was a pilot project right now it's just the meetings that we attend, but this is something that we will have to discuss on and add more variables. And this would be after we consider everyone who is participating in this. So as of now, as it stands right now, it's just the meetings that we join and each meeting that we join gets us 100 points and that's also something we can change. So, of course, I think we can have a variable weight and multiple variables as well.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. But that would be up to the coordination group to decide what they want to put on the variables they want to put on.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: Right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I have other hands up. I can see Wout and Ayden Ferdeline.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus, and thank you for showing this. My first comment was the same as Muhammad's that what are the variables that go in there, and the second question is who puts them in there, and who checks whether that is correct. That's the question with gaming the system, but it's also a question that I had who checks what is put in there.

And I think the third one is that there are differences between Dynamic Coalitions, and some do not put in any reports because they only do a general meeting once a year, for example, as we have been explained through the past years in the coordination group.

So how do we deal with that, because when people do have regular meetings or whatever they would like to put in this system, they will gain a lot more points and people who attend this meeting, and then have the general meeting at the IGF. So that is something that needs to be taken in account as well that there are differences between Dynamic Coalitions. Thanks.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: Absolutely.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Let's have just the questions and then you can answer all of them, Ayden next.

>> AYDEN FERDELINE: Thanks. It's not so much a question, but a comment, and it was to an extent plus-one-ing the comment by Avery in the chat around are we incentivizing the right behavior here or could we potentially see a situation where people begin to optimize for the tracked metrics rather than the overall goals of the individual Dynamic Coalitions. So on the face of it, I love the idea of trying something new. I do like to rethink what performance looks like and how we measure our performance, but I want to flag and be mindful of the limitations and the blind spots and that leader boards like this show a narrow view of performance and can miss really essential skills and behavior that we might want to be fostering within the IGF ecosystem.

Are we going to tracking do Dynamic Coalitions interact with one another? Do we have team work? Are they doing substantive work? I mean, to me that is more important than me joining this call, for example, a Dynamic Coalition is meeting but other members of the Dynamic Coalition who contribute much more than I do, how would that be measured by this sort of gamified version?

The fact that I could join this call every two weeks or sometimes I don't shouldn't down rank our Dynamic Coalition on some kind of leader board because other people are contributing work there.

So we can, we certainly haven't agreed on the metrics or anything, so maybe we can think of ways to assess that, but I wanted to put it there that when we create leader boards like this, we can consciously or subconsciously give weight or less weight to certain types of contributions or even individuals, and just want to be really mindful of that. Thanks. And thanks again also for this proposal and for bringing something new for us to see.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And, again, I would like to circle back how we started it, and the idea was we had this discussion on accountability of DCs in Riyadh on Sunday morning, I think it was, and I think Dino started the discussion, and the question came up, there are Dynamic Coalitions that never join the calls.

So, well, it could be then maybe a very limited scope. I mean, all of the comments are very valid, but let's think it through, but there are more comments, more hands up. I see Zeynep and Omor,.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: Perhaps this is a basic question, but what do you win when you whip the game? And why does it matter? It's not really a game. It's sort of like a decentralized attendance system. There is no playing involves. What's the point? That's what I'm asking. I understand the need for accountability, but is this really the way that we could do this? Accountability in what manner? Maybe there is a need to really discuss what is the action, what is the intention? What is the behavior that needs to be more encouraged? Presence at the meetings? Work done within the Dynamic Coalitions, because whatever there is ...

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Avery repeats the question in the chat. Her first reaction is how can it get gamed?

So, okay, Omor next, and then Dino and Muhammad would like to come up.

>> OMOR FARUGUE: Since Mr. Reyansh Gupta mentioned it is a pilot program focused on meeting attendance. I have question about its future. Regarding points allocation, are activities beyond direct IGF involvements occurred, for example, our Dynamic Coalition has attended initiatives beyond UN and IGF, so will they be considered as well in the future? So that was my question. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. These are indeed open questions. And Dino next.

>> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you, Markus for giving me the floor. I totally agree with the observation made by Zeynep, if we want to be serious and disciplined we should use criteria such as you alluded to. Are the representatives of Dynamic Coalitions participating in meeting, actively responding, are they submitting their report agenda after each session, et cetera, et cetera.

My understanding is there was a, if I may be very transparent and honest, there was some sort of a practical understanding that we don't want to go to the extent of terminating Dynamic Coalition that do not comply with the terms of reference of the Dynamic Coalition. Hence there was this proposal to try to be less rigid or less formalistic and try to gamify this process so gamify this process so at least create a mechanism where the participation, the activity, the engagement of Dynamic Coalition is somehow is reflected.

I appreciate it. I totally understand, especially coming from the UN world where everything is formal that this may sound silly, if you will, but I think that in our context, maybe this

is the best informal and flexible approach to start creating a little bit of accountability mechanism among ourselves. If it was for me, I can tell you, I'm a former auditor. So I definitely appreciate criteria, parameters, conditions, cause, consequence, and so forth, so on, but I don't think that we want to go to that extent. Thank you. Will.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Muhammad again.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: So I was speaking muted. I think, Markus, it would be good if under Gupta responds to some of the questions that colleagues have asked here. It's grown quite a list, so since what I have to say is relates somewhat to the proposal that we should do next, so I would hold my comments for now.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Then back to you, Reyansh Gupta.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: Thank you, I appreciate the questions, I think these are some questions that we definitely need to answer, especially in terms of the parameters, but on the question of what do we, I mean, why do we need it? I think the primary concern back in December was that we need to hold ourselves accountable, and this was one way to do it in terms of gamification. I personally believe that gamification in any sense could lead you to do something to see something changing on a leader board. I mean, of course, you can have multiple parameters. That's something we need to discuss. This was just one part of it. Eventually it could also be that you have your initiatives that you do outside of UN as, I think, Omor mentioned, and, of course, that needs to be considered because that's a thing that we are they are doing as a part of their DC.

So this is something we all need to answer and discuss. This isn't something that should be just punting gamify. It should be multiple parameters across multiple things and we need to make sure we consider if not all, majority of things we do as part of our DCs.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And you have not answered the question Avery asked several times in the chat, can the system we gamed, the gamification system?

>> REYANSH GUPTA: That's a good question. I think I need more time to answer that, but I mean the point being this is something we all need to discuss of how to set this up so we can have the least amount of gaming with the game system, but, yes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And also comment Roberto in the chat about we cannot check whether people read the emails. Yes, there are limits.

But, again, back to I reacted spontaneously and positively to your proposal back in December, and from my personal experience, I try to learn the language with Duolingo and think have also a gamification system you go up the league or down the

league, if you miss the lesson, you go down the league. And it is actually a playful incentive to do your homework.

And we could start with that as a pilot just on attending the call and see would it be actually an incentive for those DCs who never attend the call to attend the call.

Just asking a question. I mean, all of the comments are very extremely valuable, and obviously if we go further, we would have to be very careful on how to fix the parameters.

I mean, some obligations, Dynamic Coalitions already subscribe to have an open list, an open archive to submit an annual activity property, so these are the basics, so we don't, I think, no need to gamify the basics, but we could build on that. Wout has the hand up again.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus. I think what's being missed is the reason we have this discussion that we have been discussing what do we do with DCs that are not active or are active but do not participate in what we you do to make sure everything is streamlined and we have sessions at the IGF, et cetera, but on top of that DCs do not have individual sessions anymore. So what we have discussed and I want to reiterate this is that we discussed how do we manage this process and how can we ensure that DCs that don't show up to any of these meetings all of a sudden do have a fine slot at the IGF because they have sent in a nice proposal, but they have not added anything to the processes that we have been into in organising the main session or whatever.

And that then, Reyansh came up with the idea to find out what do DCs do during the year, and I think that attending this meeting is only one part of it. Another part is do you actively participate in organising things. Do you have, can we come up with any criteria that show, yes, you are contributing in a constructive way to make sure the DCs come across. Yes, you have a report or not, but you have announced the report.

Have you published it? You have to do certain things that are in the DC let's call it an agreement that we have with the IGF. Are you actually delivering what you have promised on. I think that that are criteria that in the end should say, sorry, but you are not getting a slot this year at the IGF because others have worked in this system. And that is a criteria that you can measure. And that's why I think what I think is important is that somebody has to have control over what goes into the system.

So perhaps that should be IGF Secretariat, yes, they have submitted their report for this year. You get a point in the system. You have had. You have participated 12 times of the 24 sessions and you get 12 points and you have delivered your report as promised, you get a point. You have participated in

the organisation. You get a point.

And that determines and that prevents that people get important slots but haven't been contributing to what we have been trying to do together. That may sound a little bit unfriendly. It's not meant unfriendly it's just that we have been discussing this as a matter of organisation among ourselves. So let me end is there and see how people think about this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Muhammad has raised a hand and Avri said she does not agree making the Secretariat oversight over the DCs and I'm not sure whether the Secretariat would like to do that. But what one says, I think, we are going in the same direction. I think the idea was to not make it as an oversight, but more as an incentive thing. You mentioned the report, the activity report, the annual report. We don't need to give points there because if you don't submit the report, the Dynamic Coalition would automatically be delisted as a Dynamic Coalition. That's a basic requirement.

But what you are saying I think goes the same way, that we are trying to find a way to measure whether Dynamic Coalitions are actually contributing and you approaching it from a more Secretariat way, and I think what we are trying to do with this gamification is more from within the Dynamic Coalitions to find a way.

But, I'm sorry, I have talked too much and Muhammad would like to come back in, please, Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you, Markus, so just a quick reminder to all of us who were there in Riyadh on that Sunday morning in December in the room. Actually the accountability discussion was prefaced by a comment on a comment about the main session that some of the DCs who were put into certain groups were not responding to the moderators or facilitators' emails or calls.

So totally degree with Wout when he says there has to be an oversight. Of course, we cannot put this on Secretariat. So there has to be a criteria. We all agree on that so now I would, I think let's move forward onto number one, establishing certain criteria, and finding certain indicators that what to put in that criteria for being active and in case if we want to retire or whatever we call that, use the word for that retire or dilute or whatever for certain DCs.

So number one. Number two, then we can discuss the oversight that who gets to decide.

And the decision could not be just one or two persons, it could be a group of persons or it could be a group of persons plus Secretariat.

I'm just loud thinking here. So there has to be a criteria,

has to be an oversight because without that we would just be going in circles.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that, and, again, all of these issues were raised in the paper we had when was it, three or four years ago, issues to be explored, but we always shied away from doing that, but here now the question what Wout proposed was give that to the Secretariat, and Avri said in the chat it should be that DC coordination group or a subset chosen by the coordination group that it would be kind of a peer review, peer control of the coordination group. And to be frank, I think it would be more in line with the bottom up nature of the Dynamic Coalition that we organize ourselves how we want to do that. And I don't think it's in contribution what this gamification proposal is, but obviously it is a first step and that's on the attendance only.

You could have a simple attendance list and say these Dynamic Coalitions never attended. Yes, that could work as well. But I wonder whether Reyansh would like to get back to it as he is the one who launched the idea of having gamification. You heard the comments. There are quite a few.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: I think I agree that we need to have fixed steps of going forward with this. This was supposed to be more of a pilot idea of what we could do for accountability, but, of course, after everyone's additions on this I think there are multiple things we need to consider before we actually adopt the system.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Right, and Avri in the chat, you don't want to talk today, Avri, you have a lot to say in the chat. But the comment is very valid. I was thinking along the same lines. If you go that way, we could then propose to the MAG, no, it's a DC coordination group that actually says which Dynamic Coalition is entitled to get the slot.

No more comments? Avri has raised her hand.

>> AVRI DORIA: I'm being very polite. No, I think, I have always argued since the beginning of DC coordination that the Dynamic Coalitions while obviously have to be attached to the Secretariat for functional purposes, that we needed to keep our structure independent, that we needed to do it our own selves. That's one of the reasons we have created the structure we've got now with the Chair and the Co-Chair and others.

And if we think a new mechanism is necessary, then we need to create it and create it ourselves in a bottom up fashion.

And I think that the presumption that if you are involved with a DC, you are obviously going to be pressured to pick your own as opposed to the others is we see lots of occasions where leadership knows how to pull themselves out neutrally. In fact, usually you find that having something on a Leadership Group is

to a group's detriment because they have to be neutral. So they can't represent you.

I think using the game is fine, but it has to be more complex than an attendance sheet.

And because the game we've got now is pretty much an attendance sheet. So we would need to figure out what was significant to the DCCG in terms of being a viable good DC. And we need to figure it out together. We need to figure out a way to pick the neutral people to take the task this year for following it through, for looking at it.

We need to talk about criteria. We need to have some of us who think of ourselves as gamers against games to try and break the game and to figure out how we would because there is always gaming. Anything can be gamed. My participation in some groups that I'm involved in now has taught me there is nothing the smartest among us can't game. Nothing.

So we have to figure out how to know when it's happening, how to see it, how to deal with it and such. So I kind of can get into the idea, but I think it's a lot bigger project than the pilot. And I think that it has to involve some of us.

And this is why I don't talk. I talk too much. This is why I write stuff. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. No, I thought that was very helpful. And, again, with your experience, it's also insightful. Every system can be gamed.

I see Maureen you have a comment, you would like to talk?

>> MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I mean the reason I hadn't been attending meetings is, and I did put in my apologies, but, 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning for me is not a good time, sorry. I do appreciate that this is being held at 5:00 which is really nearly wake up time for me. But I mean, I can see the point with regards to just like keeping some kind of record, for example, of it's like, of participation.

I know some DCs are more participative than others, and, for example, the (?) DC which is all over the place and we need to get an opportunity to meet together at all except online. So there is lots of variables that need to be taken into account. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. We discussed that briefly at the last call that the time factor is also something. And it could be factored in. You should be given extra time. That's for you an easy time, but it's 5:00 in the morning. I think that deserved more than 100 points for attending the call.

But, yes, this is, these are issues are more complex than they appear to be, but I think also the point Avery made would be the beginning of a bigger complex, that we would be trying to build control of assessment of accountability as a peer, a peer

assessment. And Wout suggests we send suggestions for criteria, that's a start. Dino raised a hand, please.

          >> DINO DELL'ACCIO: Thank you, Markus. I think going back to what Avri said, I totally agree. I complete support of being very serious about this approach, and you, Markus, you alluded to the, what I consider very good document, and I don't know whether this document, it is being read by all of the attendees to this meeting. So in December 2021 there was indeed this document, the Dynamic Coalition in action. That has a series of recommendations.

          These are how a Dynamic Coalition should or could be run, and there were, for example, also good observation, the fact that participation or active participation is actually not a must. There was a recognition that people can participate just as an observer, just to be informed, just to be aware about what is being discussed in the Dynamic Coalition meeting or in the IGF.

          So I felt that that document was very balanced, and was reflecting a very good picture, a very realistic picture of our environment. So I think that rather than reinventing the wheel, a good exercise, a good homework for all of us will be to read and study this document, which, again, is my personal opinion is an excellent document, and start from there and see what we can take to create those criteria and parameters that have been alluded to. With regard to the concept of gamifying, gaming the game. There is no perfect system. Any system, any ERP system, any Artificial Intelligence system, any more sophisticated, again, I was an ICT auditor for ten years in the UN I can tell you that there is no such a thing as a perfect system, secure, 100% secure system. Any system is subject to vulnerability.

          However, this does not mean or should prevent us from designing, implementing and continuously improving what we have and what we can use. So that's my two cents. Thank you.

          >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And what you said is music in my ears. I tried last year to bring us back to the document we had and we were very careful then, we did actually not even make recommendations, but it says issues to be explored, and they are various of these issues.

          So I think, I wonder whether we could send the document back to Reyansh and ask him to maybe take a look at it and to see whether he could, I mean, the gamification is just one way of making it a more easy way to implement in a way what we all want to do, and back again to Maureen's, the time zone issue, we also discussed at the last call that the Dynamic Coalitions could also make sure that they send different people to different calls.

          We try to rotate the calls a bit. Now, I can see Amali is

on the call. She is on the West Coast so when we have an early
call, it's too early for her and that's understood. But this is
another incentive, you know, if you can activate somebody else
from your Dynamic Coalitions to attend the call, and then you
get your points, why not? Muhammad, you would like to come back,
please.
        >> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Just quickly, and I'm sorry in advance
if it seems like that I am taking this discussion a step
backwards, but I think before we send that document to Reynansh
for having a look a bottom up approach would be to send the
document to this group, because not -- I remember I saw that
document and it has wonderful issues is that have been raised
but what we need to decide first is the criteria. And once this
group has decided the criteria, we can ask our friend from the
gaming group to gamify it.
        But before we do that we need to do our homework instead of
having our friend from the gaming coalition having look at that.
        This is my personal suggestion. People may differ with
that.
        >> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I am not disagreeing. I just
thought maybe a gaming trained mind might find this or that is
easier to implement than others, but obviously we would not ask
him to go ahead with anything without actually agreeing to it.
        But I thought it more as an input and idea. But any way,
Amali, you have your hand up, please. Sill of.
        >> AMALI DE SILVA: Thank you for thinking about the time
zones. I support that. I want to say that Yao is representing
us from DDT and there is also June. And please welcome them for
us.
        >> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, that would be another criteria,
that would be one way of gaming the system if you get triple
points, but I don't think it will work that way, yes.
        The paper is on the IGF website. Roman could you send the
link to the paper. I have problems finding it myself actually on
the website. It's sort of not.
        >> ROMAN CHUKOV: I will ask someone to send it.
        >> MARKUS KUMMER: We had a good discussion. I'm not sure we
have concluded but I wonder if we could as a sort of go ahead to
see what it looks like as a trial period with just the gamified
attendance sheet and see what it looks like, what people think
and also share within the Dynamic Coalitions that those who
don't participate see it actually. I would not call it naming
and shaming, but as an incentive for them to participate in our
calls. Could that be a way forward or would that be too rushed?
        You should have done it the other way around, are there
major objections to use it as an internal process, test, see
what they think about without going beyond the DC mailing list?

Somebody says Avri is right. I don't know what Avri said.

I see no objections, we can agree that we use it as a test phase, as a test pilot project, and then Reyansh, can you then incorporate the Dynamic Coalitions who are on today's call and show us what it would look like.

>> REYANSH GUPTA: Absolutely. I will share the link to the website. Everyone who is part of the Whatsapp group and the mailing list can sign up to it, and, yes, we can take it forward. Sounds good.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: And then we also again the homework would be to look again at the paper which we published in 21 and go through that paper again and I would at the same time ask you to look from your simple sort of gamification perspective what would be easy implementable suggestions, but obviously to be discussed with us and we take that as a next step.

So the paper in 21 was based on extensive interviews with all Dynamic Coalitions, then, yes, the world has changed since quite a bit, but I think it's still valid in terms of the very basics.

So with that, many thanks to you, Reyansh, and we take it from there. And we can go to the next Agenda Item.

That will be the webinar, if I'm right? Can I hand it over to you, Roman Chukov, as you are preparing it?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: We have Celine who raises her hand.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much, and it's apologies for joining in. I wish I could be joining more DC meetings, but we are busy with IGF 2025. I need to leave in ten minutes for another meeting, but I wanted to give you some updates also regarding the program development, but also the MAG meetings that are coming up. Because I think that would be very beneficial also for you.

So as you may know, there is a new IGF 20 MAG. It is a different IGF 2525 MAG. It is a special one announced on the 16th of January. Why is it special is because it is 2025, a special year, 20th anniversary of the IGF, but also review of the WSIS+20, and this MAG is composed of previous and experience and pretty efficient MAG members.

Tomorrow they will have their first call where they will also discuss amongst others the IGF 2025 timeline, and also the first open consultation MAG meeting that is supposed to take place next week. Why am I mentioning this? As soon as the open consultation day will be announced, that would be for you a very good opportunity to actually join the call and provide some, as usual, some of your comments, what we would be discussing is amongst others the summary of the call for thematic input.

I'm sharing it here in the chat in case it hasn't been done before. And the overarching theme of the 2025 IGF and also the

sub themes, and the program structure.

That could be very interesting for you because this is where the MAG will kind of agree on the program structure that will be proposed to them, but also the types of sessions and last but not least what they will also be discussing is the IGF strategic vision and the contribution of the IGF to, for example, the Global Digital Compact or the WSIS+20 review. So as soon as the open consultation day is confirmed, we will publish it on the IGF website sometime next week.

And this is just a strong recommendation to you to also join this call and make yourself heard.

Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you Celine. Question in the chat, is tomorrow's MAG meeting not open to observers?

>> CELINE BAL: This is one of the usual virtual meetings that they have. We are sending it to the public MAG mailing list for those who are part, for example, of the public MAG mailing list, of course, they get the link right away, otherwise the public MAG mailing list is also available to, so it is open. Yes, and it's, for example, also published in the IGF calendar as June says. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there more questions addressed to Celine.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's Judith, I posting this some the chat. I was wondering whether that PowerPoint, do you have an accessible version of that one?

>> Thank you, Judith, we, we have one and we will make it available. Thank you for that.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I see a comment by Avri. I think there is a distinction tomorrow's call is just a MAG call, and then there will be in February I think an open consultation which provides the opportunity for all stakeholders to participate active, is that correct, Celine?

>> CELINE BAL: Yes, exactly, so there are the usual IGF virtual MAG meetings that are taking place rather regularly on a bimonthly basis, and tomorrow is going to be the first one, but what I was referring to is the first open consultation and MAG meeting, the one that is normally taking place physically and also online. This time it will be fully virtual just because we do not have a lot of time for preparations, and it will take place next week. Only after tomorrow's meeting with the MAG we will be able to confirm the dates and times. I hope this helps.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And Celine, I have a question. I heard on another call on the NOI call that the dates for the panel, for the suggestions and the other one for the DCs and the others is also coming up really closely and maybe you could

update us on that.

>> CELINE BAL: I'm sorry, Judith.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Talking about the sessions. We have to, I think Anya had said that they will be done by end of March or something like that, so we have to put, we should be getting started.

>> Yes, so what's important to us is that we, in the suggested IGF 2025 timeline that we will be discussing with the MAG, it's important to us not to have the call for session submissions too heart because we do know it does take some time also to have some quality submissions, and we will most probably open it for four to five weeks from mid-February to mid-March. The.

But, again, this can only become firmed once we have also some clarity from the MAG. This is advanced information.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus and thank you, Celine. What I understand is the open consultation now co-lies with the preparation of the EuroDIG meeting and that is quite a problem. Is there a solution for that that's being thought of at this moment.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you, Wout. We are not very flexible when it comes unfortunately to MAG meetings. Again, the dates aren't fixed because they will be first discussed during tomorrow's meeting. We have over 117 National and Regional IGF initiatives. We do also have other events that we need to take into consideration. So not only IGF related, but also other events that we need to take into consideration when making the proposals, and we also need the availability of our two Chair and Co-Chairs.

So because this is a very special open consultation and open MAG meeting because it will be online, we will be discussing it more thoroughly with the MAG just because we also need to agree on the timing, just because there will be MAG members coming from the West Coast of the U.S. versus those, for example, from China or also located in Australia and the Pacific. So this is something that we will be discussing also during tomorrow's meeting.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Quick question, Celine. I heard from Vint Cerf and some people that there was a Secretariat plus local host accessibility of IGF 2025 meeting planned. I was wondering whether it has already been done. Is it being planned? If it was possible, we as Dynamic Coalition on accessibility and disability would like to join that. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Muhammad. So Vint Cerf informed the current country representative. He is the coast Chair host country MAG,

apologies. For now, we haven't received an official Leadership
Panel member from Norway, but long story cut short what I wanted
to say is Vint Cerf raised this issue. For now, there hasn't
been a specific meeting, but Norway is aware and is it extremely
advanced when it comes to accessibility and we will reach out to
you and to Decat in case there is such a meeting taking place
and would require also your support, but we definitely have it
on the radar. Thank you.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much for that. Thank
you. We appreciate that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Amali has her and up.

>> Could we, DDHT also be included in that meeting, please,
because we are dealing with people and there are other things
like mobility and so forth that we would like to talk to.

>> Thank you, Amali, I'm not sure exactly about whether we
will, what we would rather do, I can imagine is consult just
because we have it entirely a meeting actually between the IGF
Secretariat, other UN colleagues and the host country, but if
such a meeting takes place, we will definitely reach out to you
and also worse case consult.

>> AMALI DE SILVA: Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Are there any other questions to Celine
on the Secretariat update? If not, can we go back to our regular
agenda? That will be the webinar we have planned and Rajendra
had agreed to take care of that, but he said he has a
conflicting other meeting and I can't see him on the call. So
Roman Chukov, can you report back to where we are.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Okay. So I shared in the chat the link to
the draft which Rajendra shared so we can have a look. Basically
the idea is to have the first webinar on global AI governance
for humanity benefit. The idea is it will take no more than two
hours on 18 to 21 February. Speakers, as we discussed, the
representatives of those DCs who will find it interesting for
them to participate some of them Rajendra put in the brackets so
the document is open for edits. Everyone is welcome to leave any
comments, volunteer and put your names as speakers. So this is
just the beginning.

I see this document is more about substantive context of
the topic you it's not really somehow further explored the idea
of the webinar, but still it sets up some objectives.

So to my mind, this is a good start, and please let's use
this opportunity to discuss it or anyone is welcome to give
their comments next week.

>> MARKUS KUMAR: Did you say two hours, two hour seminar?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: It's 120 minutes. It's maximum that can be
dedicated for presentations and Q and A sessions. What I think
is important, sorry about the background noise which may be

here, but we plan to invite sister UN organisations and UN missions to this as well as widely promote it on the IGF resources, so it's quite responsible thing on our behalf. So I think that we, we can all work together to make the first edition of this webinar a success, and then we continue in the same manner, so Rajendra agreed to be a volunteer to do that, but substantively every time there should be one curator from one or several DCs who will be basically helping to set up the context, content, speakers and all of the things.

So, again, the proposal is to look at this current draft do all possible comments, edits throughout the next week so that we would be able, maybe not the full week, maybe let's limit the time before next Wednesday so we have a couple of days to work on the necessary edits with Rajendra, and then we will send the final version to everyone on the list.

After that, of course, again if we have some urgent things to be corrected, we will take everything into consideration. Let's see this as an opportunity of global reach out, and showcasing how this this work is relevant, how DC members are top experts in their fields as we discussed initially, this was the big idea behind it, and in case the webinar is a success, we can continue and do it once a month so that before the annual meeting we could have no more than five preliminaries and then let's see.

I think this is all from my end, I see two hands.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman. Can you share the document on the screen? That was one of the questions and Muhammad has her hand up and Judy made the comment that she suggest the seminar be 90 minutes instead of 120. Muhammad, please.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Quickly, thank you, Roman from this update, and with regards to timing, I would also agree that 120 minutes would be a little bit long for an online webinar, but I leave that decision to the organizers.

My quick comment is about the accessibility, I due to funding and other issues, I won't expect that to make it accessible there would be international sign interpretation, but I would expect that at least human Captioning would be made available to make this webinar accessible for people who are deaf and hard of hearing. Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: That's for sure, yes, I think that we can do that. I mean, we can ask our partners for human Captioning, and at least this is what we can do. I'm sorry, I cannot screen share right now, but I shared the link in the chat so everyone can go and check.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Judith has her hand up, not anymore.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, no, you answered my thing. I

said 90 minutes.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there other questions, comments? I think it's good that we have one already set for February, but we should also think about following months to have a webinar in March and I wonder whether there are volunteers coming forward suggesting the next webinar. But we don't need to decide now.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Are we divided in the same way as we were at the main session at the IGF? Because then group 2 is in March and 3 in April, et cetera?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, we have not taken a decision on which sequence we follow. But it depends more on who feels ready to burst into action. There is no -- and we also said the membership or the assessment to the various groups can be reassessed. That was comments made at the last call and, yes, we are fully aware that it was not, it was, a lot of it was last minute and not necessarily the ultimate rationale, so if there are Dynamic Coalitions who would like to be assigned to another theme, that's still all possible.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: It makes sense to me to keep it for now as it is, and just invite the group that was in number 2. They can have March, and number 3 in April, and if people want to join another group, then they can, just like they can in this document say, okay, I want to have a part in it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's also one way forward. Can we agree on that? That would make life easier for everyone if we keep it as it is. Okay.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: We are speaking on behalf of the OER Dynamic Coalition. We really don't agree with where we have been placed on that table. It's really, really, really not okay. I will send to Celine and yourself and Roman another proposal, but it's really not okay. I'm sorry, we don't want to stay -- it's completely wrong, so.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No, I mean, we went through that at the last call and the explanation was sometimes questions because of the speaker needed was speaker balanced geographical, gender balanced, whatever.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: We have nothing to do with where we are put. That's wrong.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That can be adjusted. That's no problem.
ZEYNEP VAROGLU: We will send another proposal.

>> MARKUS KUMAR: That can be, what we said, you know, this is not cast in stone forever f.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: Will be.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: It's a work in progress.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: Great.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: So it can be assigned under another

theme. That's no problem.

>> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: Thanks.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Markus where are the listing of the themes?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Do we have a document easily available. I'm turning to Roman.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't see where we, because the link you put on is just Google Doc, but it's first webinar.

>> AVRI DORIA: Just quickly, I agree with, we really need to review that. If you missed one meeting at the last one, you missed the chance to pick your group, and what we are really doing is entrenching a last-minute as status quo. So I think that this group really needs to devote, you know, at least a little point where it goes through it and it's discussed and it's discussed more in a meeting, more than one meeting where if you miss it, all of a sudden you find out, wow, they set this up. And I missed it.

So I really think it's a good thing to have it reviewed and perhaps as a practice to review it yearly, good time to review it yearly. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Well, we can put it as a main Agenda Item on our next call then and invite everyone actually to look where they are, and where they ought to be.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Markus, are we using the same grouping as we had for the DC session or is this a new grouping?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's the starting point, but Jutta who was the big manager has her hand up and she will shed light on the matter. Jute.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you for giving me the floor. I hope my connection works well. I just wanted to say that the grouping we did for the main session was initially done based on what we already know from the Dynamic Coalitions and what is on their page on the Internet Governance Forum website. And then it was an open process, so it was not only one meeting where this sorting was done, but there were several emails on the mailing list for the Dynamic Coalitions saying please have a look, check whether you find you correctly sorted, whether you want to go to another group, so I do think we can obviously continue with that, with that process, but it was not that it was decided on only on one meeting and then everything was set. It was a process that took at least four weeks before we went for that main session of Dynamic Coalitions at the IGF 2024.

And I pretty much think that it's starting point for now, and I'm really happy about so many Dynamic Coalitions have joined the call today to reflect on that, and it could probably be the main focus of our next meeting to further discuss why the sorting was done in that way, whether it could be done better in

another way, and to find similarities how we work towards the
main objective of the GDC.

    That was the whole purpose of the process. Thank you for
listening.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Jutta. I see three hands,
Muhammad, Wout, and Zeynep. Muhammad was first.

    >> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, quickly, thank you, Markus. And
Jutta for explaining the process how this -- am I audible.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, you are.

    >> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Okay. Thank you. Thanks Jutta for
explaining the process and actually I disagree with the
assumption that if you, if you missed one meeting, you find out
that you have missed the bus.

    All of the meetings that are happening here, they are
recorded. The sessions are transcribed and shared. So if you
missed the meeting, you can follow it up, and if you have
comments or insertions or any feedback, you can follow it up on
the emails. So it's not just like that if you miss the meeting,
you miss the bus. Thank you.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout?

    >> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Markus, I totally agree where
Muhammad. It's always possible to find out what happens because
we are totally transparent in this group, I think, but my
suggestion was only to have a starting point because if we have
to reconfigure everything the second meeting is over, the second
webinar is over. I would say stick with what we have, and if you
want to be in another group, just like DC, ISVC, it's find that
we meet this way but we can't be in this group as we are not
affiliated with anything happening there. We transition to
another team. And that worked out fine and thank you, Olivia for
representing us in a fantastic way in that session. But we need
a starting point. And the starting point is the invitation to
the ones in group 2, start organising yourself. Group 3, start
organising for April.

    And if you want to change, that's the question of an email.
And if you want to participate in group 1, you can see that
everybody can join group 1 saying I would like to present there
as well. So, in other words, nothing is cast in stone, but we
need to have an organisation to start ourselves and not to lose
another four weeks because then the second webinar is already
sort of scheduled. So that's why I think we should continue and
everybody wants change indicated and do it. Thanks.

    >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

    >> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: An email to whom? There is a question
of an email, but an email to whom to change?

    >> WOUT DE NATRIS: To Roman.

    >> ZEYNEP VAROGLU: I have sent an email to Roman, I will

send a second one. Thanks.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. And Wout, you are right, I mean, we don't have much time. The meeting is in June, and the ambition is now to have a webinar once a month to one of the five themes. So let's get on with the job. Can we close this Agenda Item then?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Just to summarize, Olivier shared for the main section and Jutta also said that the idea was to basically continue the same work which we have already done previously while preparing for the last year's main session, and I believe this is much better and much more fruitful rather than to start from scratch every year, and this is why we gave this sort of volunteer freedom to Rajendra to draft as he sees because the topic, the DC composition objectives, so on so on, and not set in stone, of course, so I ask everyone to see this as an opportunity, not as obligation, not as something which is not in your favor.

This is to show how good and relevant the work of the DCs is to the wider community. Who wants to participate, welcome. Who doesn't want to participate, feel free not to participate.

So, please, use it as an opportunity to show your results, your best people, best thinkers, and the opportunities to show to the audience why this DCs work is relevant.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Judith raised a hand.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. My question is can, so this is group 1 going, and then group 2 is next month? So group 1 is going to be in February and group 2 is going to be in March? Is that what the plan is?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: That's the idea, and group 3 will be in April, and group 4 will be in May. And group 5 will be then more or less just ahead of the annual meeting.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. And then we have to talk about within our group what the topic is going to be and what the structure is.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct, yes.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. And then also on the other thing, could we make sure, and Roman, that the website is updated with the transcript and the summary shortly after the call so that we can all have a chance to review if people miss the meetings, they can go to the DCCG website and find the transcript and the summary and don't have to wait for you to send it out. That would be great.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: It's, I'm sorry, am an audible? Yes. So this has usually been done within a week after the meeting because it's still some time needed for that obviously. And I'm sorry for the last time update was a bit delayed and thank you for raising it in Whatsapp group.

Another time showed the relevance of this group, and this communication you see, so after your question, we did it in like five, ten minutes. So, yes, please don't hesitate to draw our attention if something is missed, but, yes, usually we receive the transcript quite right after the meeting, so we can send it right away if you prefer, but for the meeting summary, it takes some time, of course, for us to make it, to review it, to kind of confirm it to be sent. So that's why it takes some time.

      >> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Roman. Can we close this Agenda Item and my conclusion from this discussion is that we need to put this issue on the agenda of our next call that we review the whole grouping. I mean, what Jutta did a fantastic job organising the main session, but that was then done for the main session, and now we discuss carrying over the groups in this year and in providing input into the annual meeting with a view to the GDC implementation, and so we have to, we can revise it and also allow other DCs that were not involved in the main session to come forward and to say where they see themselves in this clustering.

      Is that a fair summing up and can we then look at it all with fresh minds and open eyes and each DC can say, no, I don't want to be there, I want to be here, and the other way around. So we consider this as an open process, and it's self -- we don't tell people where they belong. You opt where you want to be.

      And with that, can we go to the next Agenda Item, and what is that, Roman? Is that the first MAG meeting? That is tomorrow.

      The DCs were actually in the agenda that was sent out, the DCs were not mentioned, nor were the NRIs, and I got back to the Secretariat and said that would not make sense. I think it would be important to at least inform the MAG members of what the plans are of the NRIs and the DCs.

      The NRIs are also talking very much in terms of GDC implementation WSIS+20, and we need to inform at least so that the MAG members and there are many new old MAG members who have not been involved in recent years that much. So they need to have an update before they actually discuss their own processes. So I made this proposal to the MAG list and I hope receive some support, and I hope that at least we are given the opportunity to give a very short update to the MAG. It's understandable the agenda is very rich and long, and it's a big agenda to go through.

      And the idea was to give us more time in the open consultations that will be then a meeting next week. We don't have the dates yet, but for tomorrow there will be at the most a very short briefing of what we are planning to do.

Anything to add there, Roman? I missed out? Or are there any questions? Yes, Wout.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Yes, thank you, Markus.

On the open consultation, again, I come back to the point I've been make for a couple of months, if we want to present ourselves in a convincing way, we need to know what can be expected of the DCs in June. And I would strongly recommend that every Dynamic Coalition sends in what they expect to be able to present in June so that it's clear where that fits in the GDC process and all of the other topics that are being discussed because if we don't have that sort of inventory, we are just talking air. We need to be convincing. This is what we are going to do, and this is why we want it in the IGF program. Like we discussed in Riyadh with the Chair and other MAG members, so that is a part of the session proposals, the Dynamic Coalitions are being considered in a serious way in the session proposals.

That has to be matched by what we do. And if we keep that open, we are not convincing. So my suggestion is that a question goes out asking each Dynamic Coalition to answer before the open consultation which is probably on the 5th of February to indicate this is our plan for 2025. This report we are going to present or this recommendation or whatever you call it is going to be our topic at the IGF in Norway. And I have been asking this for a while. I'm not getting responses. If it's not been done by you, I will do it voluntarily and ask this question to the group, unless it is clear that nobody wants to answer this question or doesn't see the added value, but somebody needs to do this. If we with want to present on the fifth in a convincing way. So where are we on this?

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Generally I think this is brilliant idea that probably to understand from what we are shaping our expectations and deliverables for the Norway forums DC main session. This is very important so you see if each DC now outlines what they can deliver, they can do it throughout this series of webinars on the relevant DC session at the annual forum, and to report all of the results on the main session. So the sequence will in this short period of time would make it efficient and to my mind at least a little bit fair when you share your expectations, plans and the things you plan to deliver on the podium, you present them throughout the several occasions we jointly reduce, so I think, yes, Wout, you can just maybe tell more how do you think this feedback should be arranged because the idea of having this I think is very necessary.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Thank you, Roman.

I think that is a matter of opening a Google Doc in which each DC is invited to present their outcome, expected outcome in

Norway, and if we have that by next Wednesday when the open consultation is, it's something we can put to the MAG saying this is our contribution to the IGF 2025. And I think we've never done that before to be so concrete. And that makes the MAG I think understand what the added value of the Dynamic Coalitions is.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: I'm happy to circulate such Google Doc tomorrow in case everyone here agrees that this is a good idea, let's do it, but, yes, please, be informed that this is a very short notice because, yes, it might be relevant before the open consultations to have this feedback because as far as I understand, Dynamic Coalitions still want to have a liaison, and this is one of the questions we plan to address during the open consultations and it's having our expectations outlined in a document, a very draft one, let's try it. Of course, it cannot be 100% illustrative of each DC maybe by the moment of the end of open consultations some people will just open these emails. This is life, this is normal.

But at least some expectations might be shared and we can also build upon this while preparing other webinars because you see even the first one caused many questions. Unfortunately Dr. Rajendra is not with us today and I cannot fully answer the questions in the chat if this team number 1 is aligned with topic number 1 according to our allocation from the main session work, but I believe so. So the idea was that, yes, we take this same sequence, the same order, and we slightly vary the naming to make it interesting and let's say for in terms of PR purposes something we should be happy to join and listen. So, yes, but, again, I think there should be some level of forgiveness for the first edition, and I believe we probably may need the same file as a file getting all of the ideas of next webinars because we shouldn't wait for end of next month to start brainstorming from scratch before the second webinar so people understand that they belong to the second cluster, they can already start doing that, and, again, unfortunately Dr. Rajendra is not with us, maybe he had some other view, but let's try to do it this way, and in case we can ask him to share some more detailed feedback by email or in the chat. So stay tuned.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you Roman. We are over time already. Do we have a date for the webinar? Hello, Roman, do we have a date for the webinar.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: As it's stated in the document, it's still flexible from 18 to 21st of February, and this was the question to be discussed also today. What could be the best date for our next DCCG team? What will be the best time zone so that we are not, again, accused of being not inclusive, which is not the case, as you know, and then we need to set up the date of the

webinar.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Well, we rotate. I mean, it's the intention to rotate every time, but we have not been that correct, I think. So next time will be presumably then a morning session which, but morning is very difficult for our American friends, and everything is difficult for Maureen. But and when should it be. I will suppose send out the Doodle Poll again and it should be ahead of the webinar. Sometime between the 17th and 20th or what? No, hang on, February. Could we envisage 16 or 17 of February?

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Sixteenth is a Sunday, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: I'm in January here, yes.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: Wasn't the webinar planned between the 18th and the 21st, then we need to be in the week before.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's what I was going to say.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: 12, 13, 14, something like that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, 12, 13, 14 maybe. These are the action items then we have to send out a Doodle Poll for 12, 13, 14 and --

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: What about time zone. This time it will be morning UTC, correct?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Correct.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Roman, could you also put in the 11:00, 11 a.m. UTC time and the 12 UTC.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: So 10, 11 and 12:00 UTC.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That would be great.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: 12, 13 or 14. And next week presumably we have the open consultation, and Roman will open a Google Doc with the DCs can put in their expected output at the IGF.

Have we concluded then? Is there anything else under any other business apart from next meetings? That does not seem to be the case. With that, then I thank you all for participating and I will see some of you then tomorrow.

>> JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: On the MAG call. Thank you.

>> ROMAN CHUKOV: Thank you for your moderation, Markus. Thanks, everyone. Have a nice day, evening.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Bye-bye, everyone.

>> WOUT DE NATRIS: See you next time, bye-bye.

(Meeting concluded at 11:35 a.m. IT).