



IGF Dynamic Coalitions: Digital cooperation in practice

December 2021

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Secretariat. The designations and terminology employed may not conform to United Nations practice and do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Organization.

Table of contents

About this report	2
I. Dynamic Coalitions: an introduction	4
1. DCs history	4
2. Forming a Dynamic Coalition	3
3. DC guidelines	5
II. Dynamic Coalitions under the magnifying glass	7
1. DCs objectives, membership, governance	7
1.1. Objectives and focus	7
1.2. Membership	8
1.3. Governance mechanisms	10
1.4. Resources	12
2. DCs activities and outputs	14
2.1. Activities	14
2.2. Outputs	15
2.3. Visibility of DCs and their outputs within and beyond the IGF	18
3. DCs achievements and impact	21
4. DC coordination and cooperation activities	25
5. Relations with the MAG and the IGF Secretariat	27
III. Dynamic Coalitions' wider integration into IGF processes	30
1. Participation in annual IGF meetings	30
1.1. DC sessions at IGF meetings	30
1.2. Expand the contribution of DCs to annual IGF meetings	31
2. Relations with other IGF intersessional workstreams	34
3. Relations with IGF initiatives (NRIs)	36
IV. Dynamic Coalitions and the future of the IGF	37
1. DCs' contribution to the future development of the IGF	37
2. DCs' contribution to a better integration of the IGF programme and intersessional work	38
Annex 1: Dynamic Coalitions	41
Annex 2: Acronyms	42

An [abridged version of the report](#), containing only key findings and issues to explore, is also available.

About this report

Dynamic Coalitions (DCs) emerged at the first Internet Governance Forum (IGF) meeting in Athens in 2006 and represent the original effort to conduct intersessional work between the annual IGF meetings. The DCs are multistakeholder, bottom-up and self-organised groups that work to deepen the understanding and analysis of Internet policy issues, to identify specific policy problems and to provide targeted policy solutions. The DCs operate outside the operative IGF decision-making structures. They are autonomous, but they abide by some basic agreed-upon principles.¹

The Dynamic Coalitions are not always well understood in the broader IGF community. Their bottom-up nature, with a wide variety of focus, objectives and different forms of outputs, has made it difficult to gain a general overview of their work. Yet the richness of types and styles of collaboration that the DCs encompass, and the variety of issues addressed by them, as well as the value they offer, make them a unique and valuable part of the IGF ecosystem. Over the years, DCs have made a considerable impact in helping progress Internet policy discussions at the IGF and also in other national and international forums and settings.

In view of the ongoing deliberations about the implementation of the UN Secretary-General's [Roadmap for Digital Cooperation](#), the DCs represent a key element in any future 'IGF Plus' model, providing intersessional linkages and progressing discussions between IGF annual meetings. The question was also raised on whether DCs could make recommendations for IGF outcomes.

It is in this context that DCs, through the DC Coordination Group (DCCG) and with the support of the IGF Secretariat, have embarked on a journey to collaboratively develop a report documenting the history of Dynamic Coalitions, providing insight into their work and processes, and analysing their further potential. This report is intended to contribute to a better understanding of the worth of coalitions and their contribution to current IGF processes, as well as to shaping the future of the IGF.

This report builds on:

- ❖ Responses to a survey conducted among DCs
- ❖ Input collected through a series of 1:1 discussions with DCs
- ❖ Responses to a public survey dedicated to members of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) and the IGF community
- ❖ Discussions within the DCCG

The report is structured into four main sections:

- ❖ Section I – *Dynamic Coalitions: an introduction* – provides a brief historical overview of DCs and describes the requirements to form a Dynamic Coalition (including the guidelines they are expected to follow).

¹ See *Guidelines for Dynamic Coalition work*, available at <https://www.intgovforum.org/en/content/dynamic-coalitions>

- ❖ Section II – *Dynamic Coalitions under the magnifying glass* – looks closer into how DCs work by exploring the diversity of DCs in terms of objectives and focus, as well as the internal working modalities and governance mechanisms. It then dives into the activities DCs undertake to achieve their goals and the impacts that they make. A significant portion of this section is dedicated to looking at DC outputs and achievements. The final two subsections look at how DCs work together and the relationship they have with the MAG and the IGF Secretariat.
- ❖ Section III – *Dynamic Coalitions' wider integration into IGF processes* – covers how DCs contribute to IGF annual meetings and their relationship with other IGF intersessional workstreams (Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and Policy Networks (PNs)), and with national, regional, subregional and youth IGF initiatives (NRIs).
- ❖ Section IV – *Dynamic Coalitions and the future of the IGF* – explores how DCs could contribute to shaping the future of the IGF and building a more focused, relevant and outcome-oriented forum for the benefit of Internet policymakers and stakeholders around the world.

This report not only documents the current state of affairs related to the work of DCs and their role within the IGF ecosystem. It also looks forward by highlighting suggestions and recommendations that could contribute to strengthening DCs and enhancing their contribution to the IGF.

As such, at the end of the various subsections, a summary of the key findings is presented, as well as a list of ***Issues to explore***. These *Issues to explore* are suggestions and recommendations that have been collected through the aforementioned surveys and discussions. They should not be read as representing the consensus view of coalitions or contributors to the public survey. Instead, they should be seen as elements to inform further debates; it would be up to DCs, the IGF Secretariat and the MAG, in their respective roles, to decide whether and how they could take up such suggestions. The *Issues to explore* are also accompanied by an indication of who could take up the issues to further discuss and, potentially, implement them (e.g. the DCs themselves, the DCCG, the IGF Secretariat, the MAG).

I. Dynamic Coalitions: an introduction

1. DCs history

The concept of the Dynamic Coalitions first emerged at the IGF's inaugural meeting in Athens in 2006. Several coalitions established themselves with the goal to continue discussions on certain Internet governance (IG) issues in the time between IGF annual meetings. DCs, therefore, laid the foundation for IGF intersessional activities.

DCs are open, multistakeholder and community-driven groups dedicated to an IG issue or set of issues. In line with the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance, anyone interested is welcome to join and contribute to DC activities.

Since 2006, the number of active DCs has been in flux; while some DCs retired their work, others were formed to cover emerging IG issues. Among the early DCs that remain active are the DC on Accessibility and Disability, the DC on Core Internet Values, the DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment (formerly DC on Child Online Safety) and the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition. As at October 2021, there are [22 active DCs](#) covering a wide set of issues (e.g. from Domain Name System issues to schools of IG, and from the sustainability of journalism and news media to data and trust).²

➤ See [Annex 1: Dynamic Coalitions](#)

2. Forming a Dynamic Coalition

DCs are bottom-up initiatives, formed when individuals and/or organisations decide to coalesce around an IG issue of common interest. To function within the IGF framework, **DCs need to be recognised by the IGF Secretariat**. To achieve this, DCs are required to submit a written statement to the Secretariat, which outlines:

- ❖ The need for the proposed DC
- ❖ An action plan
- ❖ A mailing list³
- ❖ The name and contact details of the contact person(s)
- ❖ A list of DC members representing at least three different stakeholder groups⁴

² According to [IGF Secretariat records](#), 15 DCs have become inactive in the period since they were recognised.

³ The IGF Secretariat can provide support to DCs in establishing mailing lists.

⁴ Traditionally, the IGF considers the following stakeholder groups: civil society; governments; intergovernmental organisations; private sector; technical community.

Once a DC is recognised by the IGF Secretariat, it is added to the [active DCs section](#) on the IGF website. While DCs are encouraged to develop their own websites, they are also provided with dedicated webpages on the IGF website, updated in coordination with the IGF Secretariat. These pages include basic information about the DCs (focus and objectives, action plans, stakeholders involved, documents, reports, etc.) and details about how one can join the DC (e.g. links to subscribe to DCs' mailing lists).

3. DC guidelines

Dynamic Coalitions have developed a set of guidelines they commit to following throughout their work.

► **Open membership, mailing lists and archives**

Once established, DCs must follow three basic principles of inclusiveness and transparency in their work:

- ❖ **Open membership.** Anyone interested in the DC's work can join the group.
- ❖ **Open mailing lists.** A DC mailing list must be open and inclusive; a subscription list must be clear and accessible.
- ❖ **Open archives.** The archives of a DC mailing list must be accessible to the public.

A DC mailing list acts as the space where information on DC activities (meetings, development of output documents, etc.) is usually disseminated, substantive issues are raised for discussion and news is shared. For many DCs, subscription to the mailing list constitutes membership in the coalition.

DCs are expected to adhere to a set of [guidelines for managing their individual mailing lists](#) (these guidelines have been developed by the DCs themselves). The [IGF Code of Conduct](#) is also applicable to DC activities.

► **Documenting minority and dissenting viewpoints**

Another important rule that DCs are expected to follow is to ensure that their statements and outputs reflect not only areas of agreement, but also minority and dissenting viewpoints.

► **Annual reports**

DCs are required to submit an annual report to the IGF Secretariat, as an update on their activities and to demonstrate that they are active. Submission of the annual report is also a condition for DCs to be considered for an individual session slot at the annual IGF meeting.

In terms of content, the annual reports outline the activities carried out by the DC over the previous year: any events organised/attended; DC meetings held; and substantive outputs produced by the DCs in line with their missions and objectives.

Annual reports – usually required to be submitted by 31 January for the previous year – are different from a DC session report (submitted at the end of a DC session held in the framework of an IGF annual meeting and summarising the discussions held during the session) and from DC substantive output documents.

If a DC cannot submit an annual report nor otherwise demonstrate that it is active, this leads to it being listed among inactive coalitions.

Key findings

As indicated throughout this report, Dynamic Coalitions are strongly committed to their bottom-up, independent and autonomous nature, and believe that this needs to be maintained. As such, guidelines for DCs are not intended to be a form of control, but rather a way to establish clear expectations for DCs in their governance and practice. Moreover, the guidelines serve to provide predictability for the conduct of the work of a DC and help prevent it deviating from the established DC model.

Issues to explore

1. Encourage awareness of existing guidelines and rules applicable to DCs' work (including the IGF Code of Conduct (e.g., the *no ad hominem attacks* rule). Consider a stricter scrutiny of DCs' compliance with these guidelines. (DCCG, IGF Secretariat)⁵

Some DCs are of the view that more needs to be done to ensure that all coalitions are fully aware of the guidelines.

Some coalitions argue that they could generally benefit from a stricter scrutiny and some level of 'quality control'⁶ from the IGF Secretariat side. For instance, ensuring that the DCs which are listed as active are indeed engaged in some activities throughout the year would help maintain the overall credibility of coalitions.

One suggestion was made to consider including additional principles in the DC guidelines, such as balance, fairness and transparency.

2. Provide more clarity on what is expected from DCs throughout a year. (IGF Secretariat)

Some DCs felt that it is not always clear what is expected from them throughout a year, in terms of individual work and contribution to IGF processes. More clarity from this early in the IGF planning cycle would be helpful. Also, when DCs are requested to contribute to something, it would be useful to share information with them as early as possible (even only as a heads-up that something will happen and they will be invited to contribute) and offer broader timeframes for contributions.

At the same time, it is important to **find a balance between what is asked from DCs and what they can deliver**. Since DCs rely largely on voluntary work, attention needs to be paid to not overloading them with requests and tasks.

⁵ These brackets offer an indication of who could take up the issues to further discuss and, potentially, implement them (e.g. DCs themselves, the DCCG, IGF Secretariat, MAG).

⁶ Quotes included throughout this report come from responses to the DC survey, responses to the public survey or discussions with DCs

3. Devise mechanisms to support the transition of retiring DCs when they are near the end of their project or have become inactive. (DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

One option could be to have an outlined roadmap for the DC retirement process. Such a process would include steps for information sharing with active DCs, so the work of the retiring DC can be relayed on and put to use effectively.

II. Dynamic Coalitions under the magnifying glass

1. DCs objectives, membership, governance

1.1. Objectives and focus

The DCs are diverse in terms of their policy issue focus and objectives.

The Internet governance policy issue **focus** varies from DC to DC: digital rights, trust, security, accessibility and disability, blockchain and the Internet of things (IoT), youth participation in IG, and IG schools are examples.

The **objectives** of DCs vary as well. Some are focused on raising awareness on certain IG issues and providing spaces for multistakeholder and open dialogue and cooperation on such issues (e.g. sustainability of journalism and news media, core Internet values and Internet rights and principles). Others aim to contribute to advancing certain issues (e.g. promoting children rights, mitigating threats to online trust, security and safety, expanding meaningful digital inclusion and promoting the use of Internet universality indicators).

There are also DCs dedicated to fostering inclusivity of disadvantaged communities and voices in IG processes (e.g. gender perspectives, youth, small island developing states (SIDS) and persons with disabilities). Several coalitions have also made it a goal to showcase examples of good practices in addressing certain Internet and digital policy issues (e.g. the role of libraries in advancing public Internet access and making IoT secure) and/or to develop specific recommendations (e.g. to achieve more widespread and rapid deployment of security-related Internet standards).

Key finding

DCs are diverse in terms of their respective focus and objectives. Some DCs are primarily for stakeholders to share information and/or undertake research or analysis on certain Internet policy issues, while others have specific aims to deliver outputs in the form of policy recommendations or guidelines.

1.2. Membership

There is no clear definition or agreement among coalitions as to what constitutes membership. However, DC membership is usually understood as membership of a DC mailing list.

The number of members within a coalition varies considerably, from around 20 members (in particular for newer DCs) to over 200 members. In general, there is stakeholder and regional diversity among the members of a particular DC.

Some coalitions add new members on a more or less regular basis. To achieve this, they proactively engage in outreach efforts, such as promoting their work at different events (e.g. NRI meetings), advertising their activities via various networks that their members are engaged in, and conducting outreach through social media channels. There seems to be a tendency for new members to join DCs after their sessions at the annual IGF meetings or their participation in other major events. **For some DCs, however, membership has been relatively steady in recent years** and they only occasionally acquire new members.

DCs have different experiences when it comes to the level of **engagement among their members**. For some DCs, there is a mix of members' attitudes: while some are very active and contribute to DC work, others tend to act merely as observers, receiving updates via the mailing lists and participating in the DCs' annual meetings, but only intervening 'if something happens'. In some cases, there seem to be core groups of members who are engaged on a more consistent and continuous basis, while the rest tend to take more of an observer's seat.

Some DCs reported that there is no sustained regular activity. Instead, they see consistent activity during periods of two-three months, followed by periods of relatively low level of activity during the rest of the year. Likewise, some DC members tend to be more engaged when asked to contribute to specific activities, such as answering concrete questions or planning for and participating in various DC events (such as the DC sessions at the IGF meeting).

Some DCs experience low levels of traffic on their mailing list, which implies that engagement in their activities is limited. It was suggested that this can be explained by the fact that DC members work on a purely voluntary basis, without being specifically dedicated to the DC work, and that they have capacity constraints.

Most DCs acknowledge that **more could be done to encourage wider participation and more active engagement of their members**. They note, however, that the voluntary nature of DCs work is a key factor in this regard.

Key findings

1. DC membership is usually understood as membership of DC mailing lists. There is, however, no clear definition or agreement among coalitions as to what constitutes membership.

2. Most DCs experience challenges with membership engagement. Often it is the coordination team that is the most active.

Issues to explore

1. Clarify what DC membership means. (DCCG, DCs)

The DCCG could develop guidelines regarding DC membership. For instance, is it simply about being subscribed to a mailing list? Is it more? It would be up to individual DCs to decide whether they apply such guidelines to their own understanding of membership.

2. Establish minimum standards of engagement for DC members. (DCCG, DCs)

The DCCG could develop a set of options for DCs to consider as minimum standards of engagement for their members. It would be up to individual DCs to decide whether and how they apply such standards to their members.

One suggestion was to introduce a rule that would lead to the automatic exclusion of a member if he/she has no activity in the DC for a number of years (e.g. two years). An opposing view was that members cannot be forced to contribute. Some join a DC list because they want to know what happens in a particular area, not necessarily because they want to contribute to the work.

Alternatively, other ideas that draw from current governance frameworks employed by active DCs (e.g. the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance⁷) include giving individuals interested in a particular DC the option of having full member or observer status and/or adding a yearly 'check in' exercise to take stock of who is actively participating or passively receiving information. This way, no one who wants to merely receive updates would be penalised if they are not actively engaging.

3. Explore options that could help DCs attract more engagement from their members, on a more consistent basis. (DCs)

Building on the observation that DC members tend to react/engage when they are invited to contribute to a specific activity, it was suggested that one way to keep members engaged is to make sure there are ongoing activities/projects/initiatives they can contribute to. Here, however, it is essential to have a coordinator (of the full DC or of a specific work track within a DC) that can dedicate time and resources to keeping the activity going. Most of the time people don't know how they can contribute, so clear guidance from a dedicated coordinator would be key.

⁷ See the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance's charter for information on how this process is conducted: <https://ycigweb.wordpress.com/charter/>

1.3. Governance mechanisms

► Governance frameworks

Some DCs have **written frameworks that govern their work**, such as terms of reference and charters. Most, however, work on a more ad-hoc basis, while being bound by the general DC Guidelines.

Examples of governing documents include:

- ❖ The [Terms of Reference](#) of the DC on Data Driven Health Technologies
- ❖ The [Governance Framework](#) of the DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety
- ❖ The [Charter](#) of the DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media
- ❖ The [Charter](#) of the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance
- ❖ The [Guidelines for Steering Committee Elections Process](#) of the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition

These cover issues such as mission and goals, membership, roles and responsibilities of members, outputs/deliverables, decision-making procedures, governing bodies and working modalities.

► Governance structures

DCs have different governance structures. Some have formal **coordinators⁸ or chairs⁹** responsible for organising the coalitions' activities, with or without set terms of office. There are also DCs with one or two coordinators for the overall coalition, and chairs and vice-chairs for working groups inside the coalition. Other DCs have specific structures in place, such as **elected steering committees¹⁰**, with term limitations. In some cases, the **appointment or election** of governing bodies are detailed in governing documents. In other cases, the structure and appointment processes are not formally defined and they happen on a more ad-hoc basis (for instance, some coalitions have the practice of having their coordinators/chairs appointed by the founding organisation(s)).

There are also coalitions with **'flat structures'** and no pre-assigned leadership/coordination positions¹¹, where sometimes the founding organisations (or other members) can take on unofficial coordinator tasks for a specific project or initiative, as needed.

Some DCs are working on (re)defining or strengthening their governance structures, for instance with the goal of clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of the coordinators/chairs.

⁸ Examples of DCs with formal coordinators roles: DC on Accessibility and Disability, DC on Data Driven Health Technologies, DC on Gender and Internet Governance, DC on Internet Universality Indicators, DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media.

⁹ Examples of DCs with chairs: DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment, DC on Core Internet Values, DC on Small Island Developing States in the Internet Economy.

¹⁰ Examples of DCs with elected steering committees: Internet Rights and Principles Coalition, Youth Coalition on Internet Governance.

¹¹ One such coalition is the DC on Public Access in Libraries.

► Governance challenges

Discussions with DCs have revealed several challenges related to their governance mechanisms.

- ❖ Expectations not being met when it comes to sharing the responsibility of coordinating the DC work.
- ❖ Challenges with the engagement of members of the governing/coordination body.
- ❖ Challenges to secure new chairs/coordinators when the roles became vacant.
- ❖ Challenges with representation of certain regional groups (e.g., not enough candidates from certain regions), in the case of DCs whose governing bodies have regional diversity rules.

Some DCs have indicated that, in order to avoid such challenges, they were looking into developing clear terms of reference and codes of conduct.

Key findings

1. Some DCs have written frameworks (e.g. terms of reference, charters) to articulate the ways they work, but most function on a more ad-hoc basis, while being bound by the general DC Guidelines.
2. DCs have various types of governance structures, including coordinators, chairs, steering committees (with or without limited terms). Some run elections for these roles, others have more ad-hoc processes for appointing holders of such roles. There are also DCs with no clear leadership/coordination roles.
3. Governance challenges sometimes occur (e.g. commitments not fulfilled, difficulties in securing new chairs/coordinators when roles become vacant).

Issues to explore

1. Recommend that DCs develop written governance frameworks. (DCCG)

Such a recommendation could be included in the DC Guidelines.

It was argued that having governance frameworks in place would provide clarity for DC members and others outside of the coalition on how the coalition is run and how work is expected to happen. It would also contribute to the credibility of DCs.

2. Develop a blueprint for DC governance frameworks, to serve as a source of inspiration for DCs that want to develop such frameworks. (DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

The blueprint would be based on the experience of DCs which already have governance frameworks in place, and would list options for interested coalitions to consider if they intend to develop such frameworks. The blueprint would not impose obligations on how DCs should govern their work, but rather list aspects that governance frameworks could cover: how the

work is conducted, how coordinators/chairs/etc. are appointed, how outputs are developed, etc.

1.4. Resources

Most DCs conduct their work on a completely **voluntary basis**, relying on the voluntary involvement of their members and without benefiting from the support of a certain organisation.

Some DCs are, however, **supported by one or several organisations** that dedicate time and/or resources to the DC work.¹² Such support includes in-kind contributions (e.g. human resources to engage in the DC work), assisting the DC coordinators and providing various forms of administrative support (e.g. managing web resources such as websites and mailing lists).

► Financial resources

In terms of financial resources, **most DCs have never benefited from forms of structural, dedicated funds and rely solely on voluntary work**. For some, key operational costs (in particular for issues such as web resources) are covered by the organisation supporting them.¹³ In some cases, these organisations also financially support the work of the DC coordinator.¹⁴ A few coalitions have managed to secure funding for some activities, such as the publication and/or translation of certain outputs.¹⁵

Most DCs say they would benefit from funding, but are unable to find it. Others have deliberately decided not to seek funding, out of concerns that such funding might come with strings attached.

Key findings

1. Most DCs conduct their work on a completely voluntary basis. This brings some challenges when it comes to the continuity and consistency of DC work. Some DCs benefit from support

¹² Examples include: DC on Accessibility and Disability, DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment, DC on Data and Trust, DC on Gender and Internet Governance, DC on Internet Universality Indicators, DC on Public Access in Libraries, DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media.

¹³ Examples include: DC on Accessibility and Disability, DC on Data and trust, DC on Schools of Internet Governance, DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media.

¹⁴ One example is the DC on Data and Trust. Thanks to funding from EURid, the DC has a coordinator to ensure that regular calls are held, agendas are set, and that the group is regularly engaged in online and in person meetings.

¹⁵ For instance, the DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media benefited from funding from one of its founding members and the organisation of one of its coordinators to support the production of the coalition's inaugural report. Likewise, the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition raised project-focused funding for the publication of its Charter; the funds came through crowdfunding or via various organisations. One particular case is that of the DC on Accessibility and Disability, which created a travel sponsorship programme to enable persons with disabilities to attend and participate in IGF activities; the fund is supported by a grant from a private company.

for various organisations (e.g. human resources to engage in DC work, administrative support).

2. Most DCs do not benefit from dedicated funds to support their substantive work. Some coalitions have managed to secure funds for activities such as production and translation of key documents.

3. Most DCs consider that they would benefit from funding, but are unable to find it. Others have deliberately decided not to seek funding, out of concerns that such funding might come with strings attached.

Issues to explore

1. Set up a working group to explore fundraising options for DCs. (DCCG)

The working group could start from documenting the experiences of those coalitions which have managed to secure some funds. It could also build a repository of potential funding sources individual DCs could look into when in search for funds.

2. Open a discussion on whether and how the IGF could offer some financial support to DCs or assist them in their fundraising efforts. (DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

While acknowledging the financial constraints the IGF is dealing with, a few DCs have suggested that coalitions would benefit from some financial support from the IGF. One suggestion was for the IGF to do some fundraising specifically for DCs. Other coalitions, however, noted that caution would be needed in this regard, as funds from the IGF might have implications for the independent nature of DCs.

Another suggestion was for the IGF to consider allocating some funds to support the participation of DC members in annual IGF meetings. Should this be implemented, a mechanism for the allocation of such funds would be devised together with the DCCG.

3. Consider introducing a requirement in the DC recognition process for a new DC to indicate how it plans to ensure the coalition's sustainability. (IGF Secretariat, DCCG)

This process would make the financial wellbeing of Dynamic Coalitions more transparent from the beginning and allow for a better understanding of the financial needs and shortcomings of future DCs. This would provide clarity on whether and how the DC will be funded, by whom and for how long. It could also sensitise both the IGF and the DC organisers to the issues of financing as they think about setting up a dynamic coalition.

2. DCs activities and outputs

2.1. Activities

► Mechanisms to conduct work

DCs conduct most of their work through mailing lists (be they provided by the IGF Secretariat or set up independently). Some DCs hold more or less regular online meetings, in addition to the annual sessions they host at the IGF. There are also a few cases of DCs which have set up working groups to carry out certain activities.¹⁶

► Activities undertaken

DCs undertake different types of activities, aligned with their objectives and goals. Some coalitions are focused on bringing together people who have a common interest and facilitating cooperation among them, through online exchanges and various events. For instance, the DC on Schools of Internet Governance is dedicated to enabling schools of Internet governance (SIGs) to exchange experiences, find areas of cooperation and support one another; their outputs are toolkits and collections of good practices for SIGs.

Several DCs host webinars from time to time, sometimes in cooperation with other entities (e.g. Internet Society chapters), or facilitate advocacy meetings with partners and other stakeholders. Some coalitions have made it a practice to host sessions in the context of events such as NRIs, meetings of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and RightsCon.

There are also DCs which focus on producing papers, books or other publications on certain Internet policy issues.

➤ See the section on [DC outputs](#)

In discussions with coalitions, a concern was raised that sometimes the main activity of certain DCs is represented by the sessions they host at the annual IGF. While this might be explained by challenges faced with regard to membership involvement, such a practice seems to be contrary to the dynamic nature of coalitions, and their status of intersessional work tracks, expected to carry out activities year-long.

➤ See the section on [DC sessions at IGF meetings](#)

► Challenges met in DC work

Challenges reported by the DCs include:

- ❖ Maintaining the DC as truly 'dynamic' by proactive member engagement.
- ❖ Volunteer burnout. Challenges with mobilising resources and membership.
- ❖ The lack of a dedicated team to keep the DC working on a continuous basis and the

¹⁶ Examples include: DC on Public Access in Libraries, DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety, Youth Coalition on Internet Governance.

lack of dedicated funding to support DC activities (not only those of administrative nature, but also the coordination of more permanent activities and the development and dissemination of outputs).

Key findings

1. DCs conduct most of their work through mailing lists. Some hold more or less regular online meetings. A few have working groups to carry out certain activities.
2. The most common types of activities carried out by coalitions include the hosting of events (webinars, meetings with various stakeholders, meetings on the margins of NRIs and other events, etc.) and the publication of various documents (papers, reports, newsletters, etc.).
3. There is a concern that sometimes the main activity of certain DCs is represented by the sessions they host at the annual IGF. This seems to be contrary to the dynamic nature of coalitions and their status of intersessional work tracks, expected to carry out activities year-long.

Issues to explore

1. Develop guidelines on what constitutes DC activities. (DCCG)

Such guidelines could help provide more clarity to DCs as to what is expected from them. For instance, is the exchange of updates on the DC mailing list considered an activity?

2. Set more expectations for DCs regarding their dynamic and intersessional nature. (DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

One option could be to **require DCs to demonstrate that they are truly active intersessionally**, for instance by producing a substantive output document on the focus issue (other than the annual report), running a project, hosting various events, etc. It would be up to DCs to choose how to demonstrate their dynamic and intersessional nature, as long as they can show that they do more than simply hosting a session at the annual IGF.

Such a requirement could have other implications as well, such as pushing DC members into being more active or raising the profile of DCs and, implicitly, of the IGF.

2.2. Outputs

Just as DCs have different work modalities and undertake different activities, they also have distinct experiences when it comes to whether and how often they produce outputs and what those outputs entail.

Some coalitions publish rich, substantive reports with various contributions from their community and across the IGF and beyond, while others conduct research, contribute to intersessional work or collect case studies. There are also DCs which develop sets of principles (e.g. Internet rights and principles), gather policy advice and share it with decision-makers or carry out advocacy missions to bring attention to sensitive issues (such

as child safety). Some DCs contribute to advancing improvements to the IGF itself, for instance when it comes to gender diversity, youth participation and the inclusion of persons with disabilities.

When DCs produce outputs, they do not necessarily do this on a yearly basis.

Unlike other IGF intersessional workstreams, which benefit from IGF Secretariat support in developing their outputs¹⁷, DCs develop their outputs in a completely independent and autonomous manner. It is in this context that, historically, DC outputs have not been included in the official IGF outcomes prepared at the end of an IGF yearly cycle.¹⁸ However, DC outputs are publicised via DC webpages on the IGF website.

Some DCs, due to the nature of their work or because of challenges they are facing (e.g. limited members engagement), do not produce any specific outputs, beyond the compulsory annual reports and the reports due after the sessions they hold at the annual IGF.

► Examples of outputs

Some coalitions develop **papers, studies and reports on topics within their focus**. For instance, the DC on Data Driven Health Technologies is working on a collection of essays related to technologies driving change in healthcare, while the DC on Gender and Internet Governance has been compiling Gender Report Cards,¹⁹ monitoring and assessing the level of gender inclusion and diversity at the IGF. The Youth Coalition on Internet Governance is focusing on publications aimed to assist the youth navigate the IG(F) ecosystem.²⁰ The DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media has produced a [report](#) comprising case studies and analyses that examine the interplay between journalism, news media sustainability, Internet governance and digital policy.

The DC on Network Neutrality has developed a [Net Neutrality Compendium](#) dedicated to various net neutrality themes, national net neutrality legislations and regulatory models, and business models and human rights issues related to Internet openness.

The DC on Community Connectivity has developed four annual volumes, [exploring community network governance](#) models, [policy and regulations](#), and a [Community Network Manual](#) providing guidance on how to develop community networks (published in partnership with the International Telecommunication Union and the Internet Society). The DC on Platform Responsibility has published a collection of essays on [platform regulations](#), and a special issue of the Computers Law and Security Review dedicated to [Platform Values: Conflicting Rights, Artificial Intelligence and Tax Avoidance](#) and a [Glossary on Platform Law and Policy](#).

¹⁷ Typically, in the case of Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and Policy Networks (PNs), consultants are contracted to assist in the development of output documents.

¹⁸ One exception is constituted by the reports of individual sessions and main sessions hosted by DCs in the framework of IGF annual meetings. These reports – together with reports from other IGF sessions (e.g., workshops, other main sessions, BPF sessions) – serve as input for the development of IGF Messages, published at the end of each annual IGF meeting.

¹⁹ Overviews of Gender Report Cards are available on the [DC's webpage](#).

²⁰ See, for example, the [IGF ABCs for Newbies](#).

Other DCs focus on the **development of policy guides, recommendations or compilations of good practices**. The DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety, for instance, intends to produce policy recommendations in the field of security standards and is also looking into developing blueprints of training sessions outlining options for the development of standards and good practices. Members of the DC on Public Access in Libraries have developed a [diagnostic toolkit](#) for public access policy environments and a [compilation of key principles of public access in libraries](#), as well as an [overview](#) of public access and related issues in national broadband policies, and several case studies on the implementation of public access policy initiatives.

The DC on Accessibility and Disability has been developing [guidelines](#) to help ensure that IGF resources and activities are accessible to people with disabilities. The DC on the Internet of Things has been collecting and highlighting IoT good practice policies.²¹ The cornerstone document of the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition is the [Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet](#), the Charter Booklet language editions and the *Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet Educational Resource Guide*. The DC on Network Neutrality has developed a *Model Framework on Net Neutrality* which was [annexed into an expert report for the Council of Europe](#). The DC on Community Connectivity has developed a [Declaration on Community Connectivity](#) with recommendations highlighting what policy elements facilitate these alternative connectivity models. The DC on Platform Responsibility has produced [Recommendations on Terms of Service and Human Rights](#), as well as [Best Practices on Platforms' Implementation on the Right to Effective Remedy](#). The DC on Core Internet Values coordinated the preparation of a *Statement on Excessive Controls* (endorsed by several other DCs).²² The DC on Blockchain Technologies has undertaken work on the development of 'model frameworks' in relation to blockchain technologies, with the primary focus on the development of a model law in relation to decentralised autonomous organisations that offer new forms of participatory governance and economic activity.

► Development and promotion of outputs by DCs

There are various practices that DCs follow when producing their outputs.

Usually, the drafting of the documents is led by the DC coordinator(s) or the steering teams, sometimes with the support of several members. The draft documents are then subject to review by DC members (either via the mailing list or during meetings).

Some DCs have more detailed procedures for developing their outputs. In some cases,²³ working groups take the lead on developing draft outputs, which are then made available for further feedback from the entire DC membership. Decisions are usually made on the basis of consensus. Some DCs share their draft outputs for feedback also beyond their membership (e.g. stakeholders from the networks of the DC members).²⁴ Sometimes polls, surveys and interviews are used to collect input and feedback for DC outputs.

²¹ These are available on the [DC's webpage](#), under Document/Reports.

²² The statement is available in the [DC's 2020 report](#).

²³ For instance, DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety and DC on Public Access in Libraries.

²⁴ Examples include DC on Public Access in Libraries and DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media.

Only in very few cases are there written procedures/guidelines on how DC documents/outputs are developed.

DCs promote their outputs both within and beyond their membership, through different means: emails, DC webpages/websites and websites of member/supporting organisations, social media, newsletters and at various events (e.g. webinars and outreach events organised by the DCs, NRI meetings, other regional and international events). It is also customary for DCs to showcase their outputs at the sessions they host in the framework of IGF annual meetings.

2.3. Visibility of DCs and their outputs within and beyond the IGF

Many DCs are of the view that more needs to be done to promote their work and outputs within and beyond the IGF ecosystem: DCs, and IGF intersessional work in general, should have more visibility and the outputs they produce should be seen as responses to the calls for a more outcome-oriented IGF. They need to be given more centre-stage within the IGF (be better integrated within the IGF), as a way to demonstrate that the forum is indeed a year-round process. As one survey respondent noted, 'DCs – by their nature – are "preaching to converters", so their value within the global IGF is all in the fact that their ideas or recommendations are taken over by global IGF. If these ideas remain within DC, their added value is missed.'

Improved visibility is something that both DCs themselves and the IGF could work on, and a series of suggestions in this regard are outlined below.

When it comes to their visibility outside of the IGF ecosystem, some coalitions have managed to actively contribute to various processes or cooperate with various actors. For example, the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition has collaborated with the #Youth4DigitalSustainability project, and is an observer to the Council of Europe's Steering Committee on Media and Information Society (CDMSI), regularly contributing to the Council's consultations. The coalition also intends to partner with schools of Internet governance to include the IRPC Charter in their curriculum. The DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment has contributed to the development of [General Comment 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment](#) at the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.

A few DCs have argued that, sometimes, their work seems to be more visible outside of the IGF, despite them functioning within the IGF ecosystem.

Key findings

1. DCs have different experiences when it comes to whether, how often and what kind of outputs they produce.
2. When DCs produce outputs, these take various forms: papers, studies and reports on focus

topics, policy guides, recommendations, compilations of good practices, statements.

3. Usually, output documents are drafted by DC coordinators/chair/steering teams and are then subject to review by the broader membership. Some DCs form working groups to take the lead in drafting documents, which are later open for discussion within the membership. In a few cases, DCs share their draft outputs for feedback beyond their membership.

Only a few DCs have written procedures on how their outputs are developed.

4. DCs feel that more could be done – both by themselves and the MAG/IGF Secretariat – to promote coalitions and their outputs within and beyond the IGF ecosystem.

Issues to explore

1. Develop guidelines on what constitutes DC outputs. (DCCG)

For instance, such guidelines – dedicated to those DCs that develop outputs – would look into how to make a difference between DC outputs and work produced by DC member organisations.

2. Encourage DCs to have written procedures on how their output documents are developed. (DCCG)

A recommendation to this aim could be included in the DC Guidelines.

It was said that transparent, inclusive and consensus-based procedures for taking decisions about DC outputs would offer clarity and predictability both to DC members and to the outputs' target audiences.

3. Create a working group to develop recommendations on what can be done to improve the visibility of DCs and their work. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat, MAG)

The group could start by exploring the following suggestions.

For DCs themselves:

- ❑ Develop strategic plans with key events and engagements on a yearly basis.
- ❑ Run awareness campaigns on the focus issues; organise press and online media updates/briefings.
- ❑ Promote DCs output in other fora, events and meetings outside the IGF.

For the IGF:

- ❑ **Enhance the visibility of DCs** and their activities and outputs on the IGF website, as well as their promotion via IGF social media channels. One suggestion was to set up a DC Twitter account to share DC news and outputs.
- ❑ Include the DCs in the **development, implementation and periodic review of IGF communications strategies**.

- ❑ **Facilitate dialogue between DCs and other processes and initiatives within and beyond the IGF.** For instance, regular meetings between the DCCG and NRIs could help make DCs work and outputs more visible among NRIs. Identifying opportunities for connecting DCs with relevant UN processes, bodies and initiatives was also suggested.²⁵ Another point was related to the envisioned creation of an IGF Multistakeholder High-Level Body: It was said that having a communication channel with such a body could be useful to DCs and help increase the visibility of their outputs.
- ❑ Support the development of a **booklet with short summaries of DC outputs**, to be published as a stand-alone document – with a note explaining that the outputs are independently produced by DCs. The summaries could be produced by DCs themselves and ‘verified’ by the Secretariat to ensure compliance with the IGF Code of Conduct.
- ❑ Devise a **framework for the IGF to showcase major DC achievements**. For instance, an award scheme could be instituted to highlight achievement, similar to the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) prizes.
- ❑ Devise a **framework for the IGF to ‘endorse’ some DC work and make it a formal part of IGF outcomes**, in line with some predetermined criteria.
 - ❑ While a few DCs have called for their outputs to be integrated into the main output documents of the IGF, others noted that, should there be a desire to change the current approach, a discussion involving DCs, the MAG, the IGF Secretariat and the general community would need to be started, to fully understand and assess the conditions and implications of such a change.

One recurring argument coming up in discussions with DC was that, if outputs are given more weight and visibility, this could act as an incentive for coalitions to be more active and for members to be more engaged.

²⁵ For example, the DC on Small Island Developing States in the Internet Economy said they would benefit from linkages with the UN system’s work on small island developing states.

3. DCs achievements and impact

This section highlights several examples²⁶ of achievements that DCs have reached and how their work has made an impact within or beyond the IGF. It shows that, despite the challenges they meet, coalitions have the potential to advance dialogue on certain Internet policy issues and to help inform and inspire relevant policy making processes. Looking forward, it would be worthwhile to identify ways to make the achievements of DCs more visible.

Dynamic Coalitions: examples of achievements and impact	
DC on Community Connectivity	<p>The Community Network Manual (published in partnership with the International Telecommunication Union and the Internet Society) is currently utilised by the Brazilian Telecoms Regulator (ANATEL) to provide guidance on what community networks are and how to build them.</p> <p>The French telecoms regulator (ARCEP) referred to community networks in its official 2021 report on The State of the Internet. The section on <i>The value of Internet openness in times of crisis: Net neutrality, community networks and digital self-determination</i> draws on the joint report of the DC on Community Connectivity and the DC on Network Neutrality on The value of Internet openness in times of crisis.</p>
DC on Accessibility and Disability	<p>The coalition has contributed to the decision made by the IGF to switch from Webex to Zoom as an online participation platform.</p> <p>It has assisted the IGF with advice on how to ensure that the online tools, the new website, documents and other presentations, as well as meetings and schedules are accessible to people with disabilities.</p>
DB on Blockchain Technologies	<p>The coalition has undertaken several activities to advance its mandate of promoting education and the dissemination of information on current trends and policy developments with regard to blockchain development and regulation.</p> <p>To this end, the DC has undertaken significant work on the development of ‘model frameworks’ in relation to blockchain technologies, with the primary focus on the development of a model law in relation to decentralised autonomous organisations that offer new forms of participatory governance and economic activity. The model law received input from a multifaceted group of experts spanning diverse stakeholders in academia, technology, law and social science, and has been circulated among the wider stakeholder community for feedback.</p>

²⁶ Shared by the DCs themselves.

DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment	<p>Through its work, the coalition has contributed to ensuring that child rights and child protection on the Internet were put, and stayed, on the IGF agenda.</p> <p>DC members were actively engaged in the elaboration of the General Comment 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment at the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child.</p>
DC on Core Internet Values	<p>The coalition has raised awareness about core Internet values, having organised high-level roundtables on the topic over the years.</p> <p>It has also managed to gain support from other DCs for its Statement on Excessive Controls, released before IGF 2020.</p> <p>DC members have gone back home from some meetings with increased awareness about issues like interoperability in the early years of Internet protocol version 6 (IPv6) adoption and contributed to stimulate IPv6 adoption and other interoperability initiatives, mostly through interactions with governments, regulators, Internet service providers and other operators, managers of country code top-level domains and technical organisations.</p>
DC on Data Driven Health Technologies	<p>The DC and its members have received recognition (e.g. in the framework of the WSIS Forum) for highlighting emerging tech for health.</p>
DC on Data and Trust	<p>The coalition has opened a discussion platform about data and trust within the IGF environment.</p>
DC on Gender and Internet Governance	<p>Gender reporting has been institutionalised at the IGF as part of its reporting formats each year because of DC-Gender's work on the Gender Report Cards.</p> <p>The coalition's recommendations were sought by the Stakeholder Engagement Committee of the Asia Pacific Regional IGF (APrIGF) on gender participation and reporting at APrIGF.</p> <p>The DC's thematic sessions on gender issues have received good feedback. For instance, a researcher who attended the DC session at IGF 2020 shared that they were going to incorporate the learnings from the session on data and bodies in their work.</p>
DC on the Internet of Things	<p>The coalition's main achievement is the best practice document on IoT policies, which continues to evolve.</p>
DC on Internet Universality Indicators	<p>The coalition, relatively new, is recognised as a unique platform to advance human rights and foster digital collaboration, with a focus on</p>

	<p>Internet universality indicators (IUIs) developed by the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).</p> <p>Follow-up committees are being composed to implement IUIs recommendations emerged from the national assessments in Brazil, Kenya, Senegal, etc. New projects have been initiated in Argentina, Ethiopia, etc.</p>
DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety	<p>The coalition has one goal: making online activity and interaction more secure and safer by achieving more widespread and rapid deployment of existing, security related Internet standards and ICT best practices.</p> <p>In its first year the coalition has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created three working groups: Security by design – Internet of Things; Education and skills and; Procurement, supply chain management and business case. • Collated data on existing (best)practices in all three WGs; • Published or is in the process of writing research proposals within each WG. • Raised its profile by presenting on its goals at the African, Asian-Pacific and African level. • Established internal governance documentation and secured cooperation on the financial, administrative and communications level.
DC on Network Neutrality	<p>The coalition's <i>Model Framework on Net Neutrality</i> was utilised by the Council of Europe as a base for the elaboration of the Council of Europe Recommendation on Net Neutrality.</p> <p>The <i>Zero Rating Map</i>, mapping zero rating regulations and business models in 100 countries, was featured in the 2018 French telecom regulator's (ARCEP's) annual report on the State of the Internet. In 2021, ARCEP featured again in its official annual report a section discussing the findings of the joint joint report of the DC on Community Connectivity and the DC on Network Neutrality on The value of Internet openness in times of crisis.</p>
DC on Platform Responsibility	<p>The Recommendations on Terms of Service and Human Rights have been included into an expert report on Terms of Service and Human Rights (published in partnership by the Council of Europe and Fundação Getulio Vargas) and used by the Council of Europe as a background material for the elaboration of its <i>Recommendation on the roles and responsibilities of Internet intermediaries</i>.</p> <p>In 2021, the Council of Europe (CoE) adopted the Best practices on regulatory mechanisms of content moderation, quoting on several occasions the coalitions' output report on Platform regulations: how platforms are regulated and how they regulate us. The CoE best</p>

	practices also take inspiration from the abovementioned <i>Recommendations on Terms of Service and Human Rights</i> .
DC on Public Access in Libraries	<p>The DC has supported the continued inclusion of public access in the broader Internet governance agenda, bringing together stakeholders from different backgrounds to the table to facilitate dialogue and action around this. It has also brought new voices to the dialogue (e.g., from the library field) who previously have not engaged with the IGF and Internet governance discussions.</p> <p>Feedback shared with the DC showed that the coalition's outputs have been used as a reference for public sector stakeholders in policy design, as well as being referenced in relevant policy discussions.</p>
DC on Small Island Developing States in the Internet Economy	The coalition has served as a regular space to have SIDS actors engage and collaborate on the issues that uniquely impact these territories. It has also raised visibility on issues facing the SIDS in the Internet governance space, within and beyond the IGF (for instance, it helped raise the attention of organisations such as Internet Society and DiploFoundation towards such issues).
DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media	<p>The coalition has been successful in articulating why journalism and media sustainability are Internet governance issues, becoming a critical venue for discussion, debate and consultation.</p> <p>As an example of impact, it has gathered data to give voice to a long-standing problem felt anecdotally by its members; it then shared the information and a series of recommendations with the public policy team at Facebook.</p> <p>A government regulator expressed how helpful the discussions on the listserv are and requested input from members into their regulatory process.</p>
DC on Internet Rights and Principles Coalition	<p>The major achievement of the coalition is the Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet – now at its 10th anniversary and available in 10 different languages, and the 10 Principles, which have been translated into 26 languages.</p> <p>The Charter and its 10 principles have worked as a framework and inspiration for local and regional initiatives such as the Cities Coalition for Digital Rights, a NZ Green Party proposal for a Internet Bill of Rights, the African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms, and the Click Rights Campaign of the Hivos IG MENA²⁷ programme. The Charter has been presented at the Spanish Senate, in an initiative driven by the Asociación de Usuarios de Internet. The Charter has also been used for research and</p>

²⁷ Middle East and North Africa

	<p>teaching purposes at universities around the world, and as a guideline for municipalities and like-minded human rights-based projects for Internet policy-makers.</p> <p>Since 2014, the IRPC has been an observer to the Council of Europe Steering Committee on Media and Information Society (CDMSI).</p>
Youth Coalition on Internet Governance	<p>Achieving ten years of being an active DC, supporting and championing youth and young professionals, including newcomers, and having managed to increase awareness and visibility of the youth community within the IG space are the coalition's main achievements.</p> <p>In 2020, the DC signed a memorandum of understanding with the Internet Society to collaborate on the mentorship of IGF Youth Ambassadors. The DC recruited mentors for 30 Youth IGF Ambassadors to guide them during the creation of their projects in different themes under the umbrella of the Internet Society action plan. The initiative was repeated for IGF 2021 as well.</p> <p>Moreover, the coalition has collaborated with UN DESA and the UN Major Group for Children and Youth's Youth Science Policy Interface Platform on the elaboration of a policy brief titled <i>Towards social contract: Reducing inequalities through digital public goods and youth collaboration for the sustainable development goals</i>.</p>

4. DC coordination and cooperation activities

The idea of establishing a [Dynamic Coalitions Coordination Group \(DCCG\)](#) emerged at the 10th IGF in João Pessoa, Brazil, during the first-ever main session dedicated to DCs. The idea found broad support among members of the different coalitions, many of whom were exchanging views and good practices for the first time.

The DCCG was formed with the main tasks to (a) develop a framework for all DCs with some common principles and recommended rules of procedures, and (b) act as a convener of coalitions and create synergies among them. The overall tasks and procedures of the group are described in its [Terms of Reference](#).

DCs are invited to have one or two members serving as representatives on the DCCG, whose meetings are open to other DC members as well.

Since its establishment, the DCCG has produced significant results, including:

- ❖ Adopting the group's Terms of Reference, both as a framework for coordination and guidance for coalitions' internal mechanisms.

- ❖ Adopting the three key principles for DCs: open membership, open mailing lists and open archives.
- ❖ Adopting the principle according to which DCs must ensure that their outputs also reflect minority and dissenting viewpoints, for maximum inclusivity.
- ❖ Developing and adopting a set of guidelines regarding DC mailing lists, using as a basis the IGF Code of Conduct.
- ❖ Coordinating the preparations for DC main sessions at the annual IGF meetings.
- ❖ Coordinating the preparation of DCs' responses to various IGF calls for contributions (such as the tacking stock processes launched at the end of each IGF annual meeting).

Coalitions generally see the DCCG as a useful cooperation mechanism, in particular as it allows them to join forces to achieve certain objectives (such as plan their involvement in IGF processes or clarify certain issues related to DC work). Looking forward, they would like to group meetings to offer more opportunities for DCs to exchange information about their substantive work. At the same time, encouraging more DCs to contribute to the group's work was seen as an objective to pursue in the near future. Other suggestions on how to strengthen the cooperation between DCs are listed below.

Beyond the DCCG, coalitions also **collaborate on topics of common interest**. For instance, there have been cases of DCs organising joint sessions at the annual IGF (e.g. DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment and DC on the Internet of Things; DC on Core Internet Values and DC on the Internet of Things). Multiple DCs have endorsed the *Statement on excessive controls* coordinated by the DC on Core Internet Values. The DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media has been working with DC on Platform Responsibility on their annual output. The DC on Accessibility and Disability is considering having liaisons to other DCs to promote accessibility standards. It is also not uncommon for members of one DC to also be active in other DCs, contributing to enabling more synergies between their activities.

Key findings

1. The DCCG is generally seen as an important cooperation mechanism for DCs, allowing them to advance common objectives, strengthen cooperation, better understand IGF processes and coordinate DCs participation in IGF processes.
2. DCs sometimes also cooperate on topics of common interest, for instance through organising joint sessions, issuing joint statements and collaborating in the framework of various projects.

Issues to explore

1. Identify additional modalities to strengthen cooperation between DCs. (DCs, DCCG)

- ❑ Host online collaborative sessions a few times a year where several DCs come together and discuss crossover issues.

- ❑ At the annual IGF, have both a formal session for DC coordinators and some social engagement/informal network opportunities for DCs to get together, share good practices and build a stronger sense of a community.
- ❑ Have regular calls for DC coordinators/chairs to exchange experiences and discuss what they do. These could happen in the framework of DCCG calls or in addition to them.
- ❑ Enable DCCG meetings to offer more opportunities for DCs to talk about their own substantive work. Encourage all DCs to actively contribute to DCCG work.

5. Relations with the MAG and the IGF Secretariat

► Relations with the MAG

As DCs are independent groups, the **MAG does not exercise any organisational function in relation to them**. One MAG member typically volunteers to act as liaison between the MAG and the DCCG. Individual MAG members can join DCs of their interest, in a personal capacity. When it comes to the participation of DCs in annual IGF meetings, the MAG advises on how to integrate them into the overall meeting programme, and it encourages links with other IGF intersessional activities and programme elements as appropriate.

Discussions with DCs and the public survey have shown that there seems to be a need for more clarity on how the MAG perceives DCs and whether the group 'in its entirety supports and appreciates DCs'. As one DC noted, 'in the past there was a perception that the work of the DCs was not understood or the MAG was not entirely convinced of the value of their outputs'. And while the situation may have changed meanwhile, and 'a closer relationship between the MAG and the DCs has developed, more needs to be done to foster this collaboration'. Encouraging MAG members to learn more about DCs could be a start point in this direction. Another suggestion was to consider having a DC liaison to the MAG (complementing the MAG liaison to the DCCG role).

Overall, coalitions appreciate the fact that the MAG 'gives [DCs] plenty of space to exist on [their] own without being overbearing', but they also note that the MAG 'could sometimes advocate more' for the inclusion of coalitions in the broader IGF processes.

► Relations with the IGF Secretariat

DCs receive some support from the IGF Secretariat, most recently through a dedicated focal point. While this support is mainly channelled through the DCCG (i.e. assisting DCs in coordinating their collective work, including with regard to their participation in IGF annual meetings and other IGF activities), individual DCs can also be supported by the Secretariat

on matters such as web resources (e.g. spaces on the IGF website, mailing lists), creating connections with various stakeholders, promoting DCs activities and outputs²⁸, etc.

The Secretariat is also responsible for verifying whether coalitions adhere to the key principles applicable to their work. Unlike BPFs and PNs, individual DCs do not receive support from the IGF Secretariat in developing their output documents. This is largely because DCs are expected to be self-organising, in-line with their independent nature.

Generally, DCs appreciate that Secretariat support – in particular for the DCCG – has been streamlined in recent years, showing the usefulness of having a dedicated focal point within the Secretariat. Notwithstanding this and noting the importance of maintaining a flexible relation between DCs and the IGF Secretariat, several suggestions have been made on how coalitions could benefit from further support from the Secretariat (listed below).

At the same time, several DCs have been cautious in noting that they need to be careful not to ask for too much support from the Secretariat/MAG, as this could in turn lead to more being asked of DCs, with potential negative implications for their autonomous and independent nature.

Key findings

1. DCs are relatively satisfied with their relations with the Secretariat, noting that Secretariat support has improved in recent years and highlighting the usefulness of a dedicated focal point for DCs.
2. Notwithstanding the independent nature of DCs, many would welcome seeing the MAG and the coalitions work closer together on certain issues. More clarity on how the MAG generally perceives DCs would also be welcome.

Issues to explore

1. Maintain, and, where possible, expand IGF Secretariat support for DCs. Foster closer relations between the two. (IGF Secretariat, DCs)

- ❑ Continue to have a focal point for DCs within the Secretariat.
- ❑ Make it a practice to have 1:1 calls between Secretariat and DCs, maybe once or twice a year.
- ❑ Considering that the IGF ecosystem can be difficult to understand and navigate, support from the Secretariat in this regard would be welcome. Such support could take the form of intro guides explaining the IGF processes and/or regular calls where the Secretariat can provide updates on what else is happening at the IGF and how DCs could contribute.
- ❑ Consider ways in which the Secretariat could support (for instance, through capacity development initiatives) DCs to strengthen their internal capacities and widen their impact, including beyond the IGF.

²⁸ DCs are offered the opportunity to share news about their activities and to announce their meetings via the IGF website.

2. Foster a closer relationship between the MAG and DCs. (MAG, DCCG, DCs)

- ❑ Improve the communication between the MAG and DCs. Encourage MAG members to learn more about DCs and to provide more clarity on how the group generally perceives DCs.
- ❑ The MAG to consider 'advocating' for more inclusion of DCs in IGF processes.
- ❑ Encourage MAG members to join and actively participate in the DCs that are working on issues relevant to their interests and expertise.
- ❑ Consider a system of liaisons between the MAG and DCs that could assist DCs in reaching out to specific communities and stakeholder groups.
- ❑ An additional suggestion was to explore a potential role for the MAG in the process of recognising DCs.

3. Ensure there is a balance between what DCs ask from the Secretariat and the MAG and what they are ready to 'offer in return', keeping in mind the autonomous and independent nature of DCs. (DCs)

III. Dynamic Coalitions' wider integration into IGF processes

1. Participation in annual IGF meetings

1.1. DC sessions at IGF meetings

► Individual DC sessions

Historically, DCs have had the opportunity to hold individual sessions during IGF annual meetings. During these sessions, DCs usually entertain discussions on their output documents or on IG issues within their focus. Requests for such sessions are sent to the IGF Secretariat, which approves them if the associated requirements (e.g. submission of an annual report) are met.

► DC main sessions

Since 2015, DCs have been co-organising and hosting collaborative main sessions at the annual IGF meetings. These sessions have evolved over time, and the focus is now usually placed on discussing issues of joint interest to all contributing DCs.

DCs interested in participating in the main session are typically required to submit substantive papers in advance of the session. In recent years, these papers have been intended to give a brief overview of how the work of each DC is related to the main session's focus issue.²⁹

In 2015 and 2016, DCs' substantive papers were put for public comment in a coordinated manner, via idea rating sheets (2015), [DC issue surveys](#) (2016) and an online review platform (2017).

Year	DC main session focus
2015	Eight DCs presented their work and received feedback from the community. Two additional DCs introduced their work to the community.
2016	In an 'interview style format', the session allowed the 12 participating DCs to highlight their most significant areas of work.
2017	Held in a Q&A format and having <i>Contribute to the digital future</i> as an overarching theme, the session featured the work of 13 DCs.
2018	The session was co-organised together with interested MAG members. Under the

²⁹ Usually, guiding questions or paper templates are developed to assist the DCs in producing these substantive papers.

	<p>theme <i>Effective policies for inclusive and prosperous digital transformation</i>, 11 DCs showcased the connections between their work and the sustainable development goals (SDGs).</p> <p>DCs involved in the main session produced papers on the same theme (the relation between their work and SDGs).</p>
2019	<p>Continuing the discussion from 2018, the main session looked at how DCs work is related to SDGs, what DCs have achieved in relation to those SDGs, and what their plans are towards 2025. The overarching theme was <i>Dynamic Coalitions – Joint efforts to achieve the SDGs</i>. The session saw participation from 13 DCs.</p> <p>Continuing the 2018 practice, DCs produced papers on the same theme (the intersection between DCs' focus areas and SDGs).</p>
2020	<p>Under the theme <i>Socio-economic recovery after the COVID-19 crisis – Dynamic Coalitions' role</i>, the main session featured ten DCs which highlighted the relevance of their work for socio-economic recovery during and after the pandemic.</p> <p>In advance of the session, DCs focused their substantive papers on the COVID-19 pandemic, impact and lessons learnt.</p>

► How DC sessions are perceived

For DCs, the main sessions they host annually are a good opportunity to facilitate collaboration, while individual sessions are helpful in benchmarking and bringing visibility to the work of the coalitions. However, there is always room for improvement, and DCs have made a series of suggestions on how to better plan and run such sessions in order to make them more substantive and attract more participation (detailed below).

IGF community members who have been aware of and have attended DC sessions also find value in them, especially because of the diversity of views presented and the depth and openness of discussions. While the main sessions are seen as 'useful overviews of how different DC perspectives complement each other', individual sessions are praised for 'often offering an early indicator of new topics, or new and emerging positions within current topics'.

1.2. Expand the contribution of DCs to annual IGF meetings

While DCs already bring their contributions to IGF annual meetings (through their individual and main sessions), **further integrating them into the preparatory processes and programme planning** could benefit the community at large. As one survey respondent noted, 'leveraging the diversity [of DCs] is a net-gain for the IGF as a whole', which is why working in a more concerted way to link them with other IGF activities would be welcome. Suggestions on how this could be achieved are listed below.

There are also some views according to which **the planning of annual IGF meetings could be made more inclusive of DCs**, as their input could bring added value to these processes: Given the nature of their work, coalitions could help ‘identify key topics of urgent importance in terms of global Internet policies through a multistakeholder lens’.

A note of caution was also added: It could be difficult for DCs, as a group, to ‘agree on a general direction’ regarding their input/contribution to the planning process of an IGF meeting.

Key findings

1. Both DCs and community members generally see value in the individual sessions and the main sessions that DCs host at the annual IGF. The coalitions are aware, however, that improvements are needed to increase the visibility of such sessions and attract more participation.
2. Many believe that more can be done to enhance the presence of DCs at the annual IGF and further integrate them into the annual programme.

Issues to explore

1. Improve the planning, running and promotion of DC sessions. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

- ❑ Better promote DC sessions. For instance, the participation of DCs in the newcomers track and in the IGF Village (e.g. through a joint booth) could offer an opportunity to raise visibility on their IGF sessions and their work in general.
- ❑ Make DC sessions more attractive so they secure more participation from beyond the coalition network. For instance, the sessions should not only showcase how DCs have tackled certain IG issues to date, but also highlight further actions and approaches.
- ❑ Encourage each DC session to remind participants about the broader network of DCs and point them towards more information.
- ❑ Encourage DCs to attend each other’s sessions – in particular when they cover similar or related topics – and support each other.
- ❑ Foster more cooperation between DCs with regard to the sessions they host at the IGF, to avoid duplication and explore synergies/complementarity. DCCG calls could be used to facilitate discussions on these sessions and encourage DCs to work together on topics of joint interest.

2. Create more opportunities for DCs to make use of the IGF meetings to advance their work. (IGF Secretariat, MAG, DCCG)

For instance, additional space could be provided for DCs to run interviews, hold break-out sessions, allow their working groups to meet, etc. As an argument, it was said that ‘the need to gather data and to attain the expert input and reach consensus on a sensitive topic may take more than the one hour a DC receives’.

3. Enhance the presence of DCs at the annual IGF meetings. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat)

This could be done through further integrating DCs into other elements of the IGF meeting programme, to 'break down silos and foster collaboration between actors working in adjacent areas'. Options to consider include:

- ❑ Encourage DCs to have joint sessions at the IGF meeting (beyond the main session), 'to emphasise and explore the reality that issues do not exist in silos'.
- ❑ Foster more connections between DCs and other IGF sessions. For instance, inform organisers of workshops and other sessions that they can reach out to DCs for expertise in certain areas.
- ❑ Create linkages between DCs and the main sessions, the high-level leaders track and the parliamentary track. For instance, host a session for parliamentarians to meet DCs.
- ❑ Encourage and support joint sessions between DCs, BPFs, PNs and NRIs when they tackle similar or connected topics.

4. Consider approaches to increase the involvement and contributions of DCs in the planning of IGF annual meetings. (DCs, DCCG, MAG)

- ❑ Encourage and enable a more active participation of DCs in MAG meetings, so they could contribute their views and experiences to the discussions.
- ❑ Seek input from DCs on the selection of themes, emerging issues, policy questions, tracks and format of sessions. This could be done, for instance, through consultations with DC representatives; surveys/polling the DCs for issues; and having representatives of the DCCG contribute actively throughout the year to the MAG working groups that define these issues. This would be especially important when the major themes of the IGF specifically reflect the subject matter of one or more DCs.
- ❑ Invite relevant DCs to contribute to the shaping of other main sessions and support the MAG in this regard.

2. Relations with other IGF intersessional workstreams

DCs are one component of the IGF intersessional workstreams. Other streams include Best Practice Forums (BPFs)³⁰ and Policy Networks (PNs)³¹. The difference between DCs, BPFs and PNs is explained in [this overview document](#) produced by the IGF Secretariat.

³⁰ The BPFs provide a platform to exchange experiences in addressing Internet policy issues. The objective is to collect existing and emerging good practices from community experience, not to develop new policies or practices. More details at <https://www.intgovforum.org/en/content/best-practice-forums-bpfs>

³¹ The PNs are dedicated to identifying status quo and current issues including the policy gaps, existing capacity and conditions, local specificities, good and bad practices and possible ways forward through actionable activities led by identified implementation parties. More details at <https://www.intgovforum.org/en/content/policy-networks>

► What makes DCs different from other IGF intersessional activities

In the coalitions' view, there are several elements that make them different from other IGF intersessional work:

- ❖ Continuity over the years. DCs are not time-dependent.
- ❖ DCs act as 'universal connectors', offering an opportunity for stakeholders around the world to coalesce around topics of interest, establish new networks and contacts, and share experiences, interests and concerns. They also allow for the exploration of emerging issues that may otherwise go unaddressed within the IGF ecosystem.
- ❖ Their bottom-up and open nature: 'They tap the input from grassroots and there is therefore no agenda control from above. They open up new issues in a more agile way than any other IGF structure.'
- ❖ Their independent nature, which gives them more flexibility in how to approach their work (for instance, flexibility in choosing the types of outputs to produce, in line with their communities' needs and interests).
 - Here it was said that the fact that the MAG has no say in DC work can act both to the advantage and disadvantage of DCs. It is good for the independent nature of the IGF. But on more sensitive topics, the detachment from other IGF tracks (which are more closely 'connected' to the MAG) might be a disadvantage, as it is 'easier to ignore a DC [and] harder to share its messages'. Here too, however, there is the caveat that 'the topic might never move forward if a full MAG consensus is sought'.

➤ See the section on [DC relations with the MAG](#)

► DCs collaboration with Best Practice Forums and Policy Networks

There have been some forms of collaboration between DCs and other IGF intersessional workstreams over the years. For example, the DC on Gender and Internet Governance collaborated with the BPF on Gender (with no formal/structured processes, but rather in virtue of the fact that members of the DC have also contributed to BPF work). Likewise, members of the DC on Public Access in Libraries have contributed to the work of the BPF on Local Content. In the past, the DC was also actively engaged in the [Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion\(s\)](#) policy process.

Several DCs plan to engage with BPFs, including the DC on Internet Standards, Security and Safety with the BPF on Cybersecurity; the DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media with the BPF on Local Content (now integrated within the PN on Meaningful Access); the DC on Core Internet Values with the BPF on Cybersecurity.

Coalitions have also expressed interest in interacting and engaging with the recently created Policy Networks (PNs). As one survey respondent noted, 'cross fertilisation and mutually reinforcing dynamics between them would increase the impact of both'.

Some DCs have indicated that they have not had sufficient resources to enable their engagement with other IGF intersessional workstreams; however, they understand the value of such collaboration and acknowledge the need to improve on this.

Key findings

DCs generally welcome collaboration with other IGF intersessional workstreams, acknowledging the related benefits. However, such collaboration often requires additional resources, which DCs may not have.

Issues to explore

Actively encourage more collaboration between DCs and other IGF intersessional workstreams. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat, BPFs, PNs)

This could be done through offering more opportunities for the workstreams to interact with one another.

- ❑ Regularly share relevant information about the work of BPFs/PNs across DC channels, and the other way around. Include clear information on how DCs can contribute to BPFs/PNs work (while ensuring that such opportunities exist in the first place).
- ❑ Invite BPFs and PNs to DCCG meetings, to enable exchanges between these groups. Or organise separate meetings (e.g. DCs–BPFs, DCs–PNs) to raise awareness about each other's work and foster more collaboration.
- ❑ PNs and BPFs, which benefit from dedicated Secretariat support on an individual basis, could proactively reach out to DCs and suggest forms of collaboration (e.g. joint events/webinars, jointly responding to consultations, organising a workshop together).

3. Relations with IGF initiatives

Given their diversity, NRIs offer valuable opportunities for DCs not only to promote their work, but also to gather input and contributions to such work. This is why many coalitions have made it a custom to contribute to NRIs meetings.

For instance, the DC on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment, the DC on the Internet of Things, the DC on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media, the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition and the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance have held sessions at annual meetings of the European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG). The Youth Coalition on Internet Governance has contributed to the Youth Latin America and Caribbean IGF, Asia Youth IGF and Youth IGF Argentina. The DC on Accessibility and Disability and the DC on Internet Universality Indicators have been present at APriIGF meetings, EuroDIG, African IGF and national IGFs. Members of the DC on Small Island Developing States in the Internet Economy have been involved in the Caribbean IGF and in national and youth initiatives across the region. The DC on Core Internet Values and the Internet Rights and Principles Coalition have invited Youth IGF representatives to take part in its events. The on

Accessibility and Disability has worked with several NRIs on increasing accessibility at their events. The Dynamic Coalition on Internet Standards, Security and Safety has held dedicated sessions at EuroDIG and the APriIGF.

Although DCs are generally interested in fostering more linkages with NRIs, the limitations they have in terms of resources and capacities makes this challenging.

Key findings

Generally, DCs are interested in cooperating with NRIs, and some linkages have already been established in this regard. However, the challenges DCs face in terms of resources and members engagement also have implications for their ability to engage more with NRIs.

Issues to explore

Actively encourage more collaboration between DCs and NRIs. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat, NRIs)

- ❑ Encourage NRIs to provide timely information about the timing of their meetings, and to include slots for DCs in their agendas (for instance, as part of the 'Day 0' which most NRIs host before the formal start of their meetings).
- ❑ Encourage DCs to use NRIs events to extend their outreach and promote awareness, to invite new members and enhance their diversity, and to gather input and data for their work.
- ❑ Facilitate meetings between DC coordinators and NRIs coordinators, allowing them to exchange information about their work and discuss opportunities for cooperation.
- ❑ Regularly share relevant information about NRIs activities across DC channels and the other way around.

IV. Dynamic Coalitions and the future of the IGF

The [UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation](#), the [Roadmap for Digital Cooperation](#) and the [Our Common Agenda](#) report have re-ignited debates on how to move towards a more focused, relevant, issue-driven and outcome-oriented IGF, possibly in the context of the proposed 'IGF Plus' model.³² Within these debates, there have been calls for a more effective integration of the IGF programme and the intersessional activities, as well as for a re-orientation of the IGF from a single annual event with intersessional activities towards a year-round forum.

What could be the role of DCs in shaping the future of the IGF? How could the multistakeholder, community-based and issue-driven nature of DCs be leveraged in the process of making the IGF 'more responsive and relevant to current digital issues'?³³

The following pages attempt to provide some initial answers to these questions, taking into account views and opinions shared by coalitions themselves, IGF community members and MAG members (in particular the Working Group on IGF strengthening and strategy – WG-Strategy).

1. DCs' contribution to the future development of the IGF

Coalitions in general support the idea that they could contribute to efforts dedicated to strengthening the IGF and making it more focused, relevant and outcome-oriented.

One way to achieve this could be to have **DCs more involved in the planning of IGF meetings** (as [covered before in the report](#)) **and in identifying the topics of the year**. As noted by the MAG WG-Strategy, DCs can be seen as 'long-term think tank reserves of the IGF process, dedicated to one or more Internet governance issues, and driven by a desire for collaboration among a set of IGF community members'.³⁴ They are well-positioned to flag key current trends, achievements and challenges in their respective fields, making them suitable to contribute to defining the IGF's policy questions of the year and to aligning the broader IGF programme to current development.

DCs could **act as a resource and knowledge hub for the MAG and wider IGF community** to draw upon. In addition to leveraging and extending current work happening within the IGF ecosystem, DCs could also act as **think tanks or research/policy incubators** to explore new(er) digital issues and help inform related policymaking processes.

³² The IGF Plus model is one of the three architectures for digital cooperation suggested in the High-level Panel's report [The age of digital interdependence](#).

³³ Paragraph 93 of the Roadmap for Digital Cooperation

³⁴ [MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy \(WG-Strategy\) proposals on strategic improvements to the IGF and operational measures in 2021](#), January 2021

DCs could also **be leveraged to disseminate IGF outputs across their members and networks**. **Having more actionable outputs of the DCs themselves** could be another way for coalitions to contribute to a more outcome-oriented IGF. Raising the visibility of these outputs and building on them to start a dialogue within the IGF community could be a way to further maximise their impacts.

Further, if the IGF moves towards developing policy recommendations, DCs could have a role here as well. As noted by one DC, 'the MAG could seek policy inputs on the themes related to that year from different stakeholders around the world through a structured process, such as a survey; each DC could contribute to this by rolling out the survey to its members and feeding these back into the process of developing the recommendations.'

DCs also have a role to play in making the IGF more visible and enhancing its profile. They often serve as entry points for newcomers, inviting new stakeholders to contribute to their work (and, thus, the IGF) and broadening the dialogue. Similarly, sometimes the coalitions act as liaisons between the IGF and groups that would otherwise not take part in IGF processes. As highlighted in a survey response, 'many people engage with the IGF through initial contact with the work of a DC'. Coalitions can thus help strengthen the IGF by reaching out to the wider community.

2. DCs' contribution to a better integration of the IGF programme and intersessional work

As noted above, DCs' expertise could be better leveraged to shape the annual IGF programme. This could be done, for example, through identifying links between the work of DCs and the IGF tracks/themes and then **integrating DCs within the relevant tracks**.

This would not only entail inviting DCs to focus their individual and main sessions on the IGF tracks of the year, but also connecting DC work with main sessions, high-level sessions, workshops, etc. As highlighted by the MAG-WG Strategy, feeding in DCs – and IGF intersessional work in general – into the annual programme 'can enrich the discussions, and, in return raise awareness of their outputs, improve the feedback-loop between intersessional expert discussions and more high-level discussions, [and] increase the chances that intersessional work outputs find their way to other fora and decision-making bodies. In addition, intersessional activities could be a suitable place to continue topical discussions or further explore issues raised at the annual meeting. Intersessional work can be an opportunity for exploring policy questions in more detail and to report back to the subsequent IGF.'³⁵

Coalitions would also generally welcome the opportunity to **contribute the proposed multi-year plan/strategy for the IGF** (brought forward by the MAG-WG Strategy). Such a plan/strategy would anticipate key policy areas for the IGF to address across several years and enable continuity and further engagement on topics of the previous year(s). But DCs would also benefit from more clarity as to what such a contribution could look like. For

³⁵ [MAG Working Group on IGF Strengthening and Strategy \(WG-Strategy\) proposals on strategic improvements to the IGF and operational measures in 2021](#), January 2021

instance, would new proposals for DCs be considered and ‘evaluated’ in relation to the multi-year strategy and how/whether they fit within the strategy? Similarly, would DCs be considered as potential mechanisms to fill in gaps in coverage of a certain issue or of specific aspects of an issue? For example, if a review of the multi-year strategy identifies a specific issue that requires further attention within the IGF, could the Secretariat/MAG/etc. encourage the establishment of a DC to convene stakeholders around that issue?³⁶

While finding ways to further align DCs’ work with the broader IGF programme (e.g. themes of the annual meeting) is broadly welcome, it was also noted that this should not be done at the expense of DC’s independence. As one DC emphasised, ‘the MAG can tap into the DC work without needing to tell the DCs what to do’.

Key findings

1. DCs generally consider that they can contribute to the efforts towards a more inclusive, focused, relevant and outcome-oriented IGF, e.g. due to their ability to raise certain issues and to act as ‘entry points’ for newcomers, as well as their independence and flexibility.
2. There is general support for a more effective integration of IGF intersessional workstreams and the IGF programme.
3. While further aligning DC work with the broader IGF processes was welcome, this should not affect the independent nature of DCs.

Issues to explore

1. Continue discussions on how DCs could contribute to the future development of the IGF. (DCCG, DCs, MAG, IGF community)

Build on ideas already raised:

- ☐ Have DCs more involved in the planning of IGF meetings and in identifying focus topics and policy questions because they can flag current trends and emerging issues.
- ☐ Leverage DCs as resource and knowledge hubs for the MAG and the wider IGF community. DCs could also act as think tanks or research/policy incubators to explore new(er) digital issues and help inform related policy making processes.
- ☐ Leverage DCs to disseminate IGF outputs and work towards DCs having more actionable outputs themselves.
- ☐ If the IGF moves towards developing policy recommendations, DCs could contribute through collecting inputs from their networks and feeding them into the recommendations-development process.

2. Continue discussions on how DCs could contribute to a better integration of the IGF programme and intersessional work. (DCCG, DCs, MAG, IGF community)

Build on ideas already raised:

³⁶ [Dynamic Coalitions comments on the MAG WG-Strategy paper](#), June 2021

- ❑ Identify links between DCs' work and IGF tracks/themes/policy questions/focus areas and then facilitate the integration of DCs within these tracks/themes.
- ❑ Connect DCs' work with IGF main sessions, high-level sessions, workshops, etc.
- ❑ Continue discussions on how DCs could contribute actively to the development of the proposed multi-year plan/strategy for the IGF and what this strategy would mean for DCs themselves.
- ❑ Make better use of the annual IGF meeting to promote the outputs of DCs (and other IGF intersessional activities).

3. Make sure that in discussions on how to strengthen the integration of DCs into IGF processes and how to enable DCs to contribute to shaping the future of the IGF, a balance is achieved between what is asked from DCs, what DCs themselves ask from the IGF Secretariat and the MAG, and how all this is aligned with the voluntary, independent and autonomous nature of DCs. (DCs, DCCG, IGF Secretariat, MAG)

Annex 1: Dynamic Coalitions³⁷

1. **Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability (DCAD)**
2. **Dynamic Coalition on Blockchain Technologies (DC-Blockchain)**
3. **Dynamic Coalition on Children's Rights in the Digital Environment (DC-Children)**
4. **Dynamic Coalition on Community Connectivity (DC3)**
5. **Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values (DC-CIV)**
6. **Dynamic Coalition on Data and Trust (DC-DT)**
7. **Dynamic Coalition on Data Driven Health Technologies (DC-DDHT)**
8. **Dynamic Coalition on DNS Issues (DC-DNSI)**
9. **Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance (DC-Gender)**
10. **Dynamic Coalition on Innovative Approaches to Connecting the Unconnected (DC-Connecting the Unconnected)**
11. **Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Jobs (DC-Jobs)**
12. **Dynamic Coalition on the Internet of Things (DC-IoT)**
13. **Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles (IRPC)**
14. **Dynamic Coalition on Internet Standards, Security and Safety (DC-ISSS)**
15. **Dynamic Coalition on Internet Universality Indicators (DC-IUI)**
16. **Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality (DCNN)**
17. **Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility (DCPR)**
18. **Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries (DC-PAL)**
19. **Dynamic Coalition on Schools of Internet Governance (DC-SIG)**
20. **Dynamic Coalition on Small Island Developing States in the Internet Economy (DC-SIDS)**
21. **Dynamic Coalition on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media (DC-Sustainability)**
22. **Youth Coalition on Internet Governance (YCIG)**

³⁷ Listed as active as at October 2021.

Annex 2: Acronyms

APrIGF	Asia Pacific Regional IGF
BPF	Best Practice Forum
CoE	Council of Europe
DC	Dynamic Coalition
DCCG	Dynamic Coalitions Coordination Group
EuroDIG	European Dialogue on Internet Governance
ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
IGF	Internet Governance Forum
IoT	Internet of Things
IUIs	Internet Universality Indicators
MAG	Multistakeholder Advisory Group
MAG WG-Strategy	MAG Working Group on IGF strengthening and strategy
NRIs	National, Regional, Subregional and Youth IGF Initiatives
PN	Policy Network
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SIG	School of Internet Governance
WSIS	World Summit on the Information Society
Youth LACIGF	Youth Latin America and the Caribbean IGF
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization