



**Dynamic Coalition on  
Accessibility and Disability**

## **IGF DCAD Session on Workshop Proposals**

**26 February 2025**

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Hello and good morning, afternoon, and evening depending upon your time zones. I am Muhammad Shabbir, the Coordinator of the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability. I welcome you all in this session of, and the first meeting of DCAD in 2025.

In this session, we will be discussing the IGF proposals, modalities, dos, and don'ts. And to discuss all of these things and how to put in a good proposal, which should be accepted by the MAG and how MAG accepts the proposals, I have with me a very good panel who will be discussing different sights of the workshop proposals, the IGF model, the multistakeholder thing, and also the modalities that if you are interested in putting up a good proposal to advance digital accessibility for persons with disabilities, what are the things you should be taking care of?

So I have people from the Secretariat, thank you very much Anja and Celine. I also have people from the MAG. Thank you very much Gunela and Lito for joining us on this call today. Without any further ado, I would hand over the mic to the Secretariat first to talk about the IGF, modalities, and how proposals should be prepared. So, Anja, over to you. Will you be speaking or Celine will be talking about the presentation?

ANJA GENGO: Thank you very much, Muhammad. Yes, Celine coordinates this part of the work so I think it's best that Celine speaks.

CELINE: Thank you very much, Anja and Muhammad. Thank you for the program and initiative to hold such a thing, it's very important especially in preparing and guiding session submissions. Perhaps just to give you some key facts about the IGF session proposal process, but as leading up to the IGF, I'll give you a few key deadlines.

So starting with the Call for Session proposal, as well as the call for IGF booths and also for remote hubs, these are all first of all accessible via our website and then also open until the 12 of March. So from now on, we still have I'd say a little bit more than 2 week's time.

Afterwards, the multistakeholder advisory group, and again we have two members here who are part of the call today and they will provide also more information to that, will select and evaluate the proposals of workshops received so far, and Lito will go a little more into details of how they're processing these workshops, but as to let you know that around 80 sessions from day 1, so the 24 of June to the 27, day 4, we'll be able to allocate around session slots. These are workshop proposals and own forums and other kinds of session types so this is to give you a little bit more of a background and also a overview.

And once the MAG has selected and agreed on a list of workshop proposals, they will be officially selected at the second open consultation and MAG meeting which will take place from the 14 to the 16 of April in Geneva and online. I'll also share here in the chat, not only the link to the various session proposal submission platforms, but as the link to this registration platform for the second open consultation and MAG meeting because you can actually take part in the conversation on the open consultation day on the 14 of June of April, apologies, and then also be part of the selection process as observer on the 15 and 16 of April.

Long story cut short, we would welcome, of course, your active participation there, and then shortly after that open consultation and MAG meeting, I would say no later than a week, we will inform all the workshop proposers about either the acceptance or rejection of their proposal for the IGF 2025 program.

I'll hand it over now to the next speaker. I believe it is Lito who will provide you far more details about in general the process for session submissions. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much, Celine, for this very brief but useful information. Before I hand over the mic to Lito, I would request the participants that if you have any questions, you can put in the chat. (this is Muhammad) after Lito and Gunela speak, we will have a discussion section. Now I will hand over the mic to Lito. He will be talking about the main things of the proposal, giving us the insights from based on his experience from the MAG as well as also talk about the common pitfalls which should be provided while submitting a proposal. Lito, the floor is yours.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Muhammad. Hello, everyone. Good morning, good evening. So, yes, thank you for attending this session. We're trying as members and the Secretariat, we're trying to get better proposals, the best we can get, so we can structure an IGF worth of this year. What do I mean by this year? As many of you know, we have several characteristics for this year. In the first place, there is the 20th Anniversary of the World Summit Information Society which took place in 2003 and 2005 so celebrating in 2025 in Tunisia that we as the world, as humanity celebrate this summit. One of the outcomes of the summit was the IGF, the Internet Governance Forum, so this year there will be a discussion on United Nations about to continue or not or to modify this forum, the Internet Governance Forum.

Also, during this year I mean last year but coming to this year, we have we had this approval of the Global Digital Compact by many nations in the United Nations Fora, so that's another important issue for this year because we have this plan, we have this compact that we all are trying or looking forward to implement it.

Those are important topics this year because they are the framework in which we are going to, the proponents will present and we the MAG will evaluate, and finally eventually, they will come up to the IGF in Norway.

So, that's another issue. The IGF this year is very soon in the year, well, relatively soon in the year in June in Norway, so that imposes certain speed, certain need to hurry to prepare these proposals in a timely fashion. We have to give to proponents and we the MAG have to work hard at different periods of the year in order to evaluate and to decide or select the proposals that will make up the IGF program.

So regarding evaluation, we have as MAG, we have a process, we have the stages that we go through once we receive the proposals. The first one is done by the Secretariat. They review the proposals, and they count, if you will, the ones that do not comply with the very, very least requirements, which are mainly diversity in the gender of the speakers, there are some rules there, and also the quantity of speakers that need to be on site in Norway. In that sense we have three, the requirement of three speakers that need to be on site including the moderator, but we also recommend to have an online moderator who can be on site or not, but those are part of the requirements.

Also, we want for diversity, we expect to have a list of two members in fact panel or speakers at least different gender from the rest of the speakers. Regarding the total amount of speakers, they can be around 5 or more, but not so many as to take up the whole time of the session because as you know, we encourage the participation of audience both on site and online. So we do take very seriously those proposals and aspects of the proposals.

Then when we go after this first screening by the Secretariat, the proposals, the remaining proposals which used to be, probably will be, many, many, will go to the MAG members and we will do our first individual evaluation. I don't know, Celine if we can show the criteria documents so we can share the with audience, but when we receive this these proposals, okay, Celine which are the link, we as individuals on the first stage, we go personally, individually through a set of proposals, the final number is still to be determined, according to the amount of proposals that we receive. But we use several criteria. For instance, we evaluate the proposed topic, and we assign 20% of the evaluation to that. That means that the topic of course should be aligned with one of the four subthemes that we have established for this year. The link is in the chat, and as I said, we evaluate the proposed topic. This, within the definition of the subtopics for this year, you can find some samples of some references to the kind of topics you can include in each

one of the subthemes or subtopics. That is one of the criteria, the proposed topic, how aligned is your topic to one of the subthemes. One or several, but in order to be focused I would recommend to aim to one of the subtopics that we have defined in the first open consultation.

Another criteria is the workshop content, so that means how you are structuring your workshop, what is the of course, who are the speakers, but what are you trying to do to get. In that sense, an aspect that is well evaluated by the MAG is that alternative opinions. What we mean is that we want to create some discussion among the panelists and among the audience later on so it would be very much appreciated if we have different points of view from the panelists, not necessarily opposite but different point of view on the subject. That is another criteria, the content.

The third criteria, we evaluate the policy questions. In the workshop proposal forum, there is an area section where you include the policy questions. What do you try to answer regarding policy with this proposal, with this workshop. That's another thing we evaluate.

The fourth is engagement and hybrid strategy, meaning how are you planning to engage your audience both online and on site. That's part of the dynamics. Finally, the fifth criteria is diversity. How are you fulfilling the diversity criteria in the most ample sense, that means you have people from different regions, different gender, different background, different stakeholders, and so on. So, of course, we provide a way for each one of these criteria and the workshop content is the largest with 30%, followed by proposed topic with 10, 20, and diversity 20. The other two are 15%ish so that is how we try to evaluate the proposals looking at those areas.

Also, if you include something about the GDC, as I said something related to that, you make up relationship with objectives of GDC or something to reinforce the WSIS + 20 anniversary, meaning that you become creative, you become innovative in what you say in the workshop, that would be very much appreciated by the MAG.

Let me see. I think those are the main things, the main tips, if you will, that you have to take care of when drafting and submitting a proposal. These are all included in the workshop proposal form, of course, and there will be some more data in the workshop proposal form. For instance, if you are related to intersessional work of IGF, for instance a dynamic coalition you may say you are part of the dynamic coalition, this one or otherwise. Or best practice forum, or whatever intersessional NRI or another intersessional work. That is not really taken into account in evaluating but it's a good thing to create synergies among the work. I think that's the main part for me. I will stop here and wait for questions. Thank you.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Lito, for this very insightful discussion and intervention. You highlighted the basic criteria for the workshop proposals and how MAG evaluates, what's the process, so I think the participants are now better appreciative of the whole process, and of course the MAG meeting between 14 and 16 of April is open and people can join as observers to see how the MAG is running all the process.

So, we have discussed what are the basic modalities of the proposals coming to the main crux of our discussion is that how do we present a strong accessibility focused proposal, and how do we incorporate strong voices of persons with disabilities in IGF sessions. To speak on the topic and to make a small intervention before we go to the question and answer session, we have Gunela Astbrink the MAG member, long time accessibility advocate. So Gunela, what are your thoughts? Over to you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you very much. Yes. Following on from Lito who has provided such an excellent overview of the whole process, I will just go into some particular details that might assist in workshop proposals that relate to digital accessibility.

There are four subthemes as Lito mentioned, and I'll just if you go to the web seat, if you haven't already, you will see that the subthemes include digital trust and resilience, sustainable, digital cooperation, and also universal access and digital rights.

Now, often it's in a disability sphere, you would say oh, right, universal access and digital rights, that's where I would put in a proposal about accessibility and barriers or solutions and so forth, but let's look at it a little bit more broadly and think, okay, there might be people on this call and later on who might listen to the recording or read the transcript, who have a particular passion or concern in an area like AI, cybersecurity, misinformation, disinformation, which is all mentioned under the subthemes as Lito mentioned. So I just wanted to highlight some, but there are a lot of other particular subtopics that proposer might have some particular expertise in or some concerns in, and rather than having a general accessibility session focus instead on a particular subtopic in some of the other areas, not to say that do not use the universal access and digital rights subtheme, but just to say look a little bit more broadly if there are particular areas that you want to cover.

And also it's a matter of coming from a lived experience of disability or disability advocacy, and making it clear in a proposal that you wish to cover some of these particular areas, if it's general accessibility or particular subtopics under some of the other subthemes, and then of course as Lito has already mentioned, you need to very clear with gender diversity, geographic region, and the number of speakers, so they are all a starting point. Obviously, writing a good, clear, and fairly concise explanation of the topic, of the workshop proposal, and also anything that relates to your topic under subthemes and subtopics, going from lived experience or as a disability advocate to policy. So you're connecting there. That's important, and there is a need to put in particular policy questions, so that helps your thinking, too, to frame the workshop proposal in a way. When it comes to policy, think about global policy instruments, rights based, for example the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, there is references to the Sustainable Development Goals, and as Lito mentioned, there is work being done now with the 20th Anniversary of WSIS and also about the Global Digital Compact, so they are all things to consider in a proposal as options. These are just options.

And I need to emphasize really strongly that read the FAQs, read about the evaluation criteria, and Celine has put in a link to the workshop submission manual where you can get more information because you don't want to spend time putting in a proposal, and then afterwards the selection process says, no, you didn't do this, you didn't do that. You have the possibility of making it a good proposal if you are well informed about the selection criteria that Lito mentioned and a lot of other information that's in the submission manual.

So, they are probably some of my main points, bearing in mind that this year there will probably be slightly less sessions, so the selection process will be quite tight. So the MAG members will be looking at really, really insightful workshop proposals, and as Lito mentioned, to have diversity of viewpoints on the topic. So, it doesn't necessarily mean that you are but in some cases it could create a very interesting discussion and again in engaging the people in the audience, on site, and online, and having particular strategies in mind to do that is really important.

So, I encourage you to look more broadly than Civil Society speakers. Look at if you can connect with somebody from the private sector, from a technical community, academia, and governments. So you make it very broad, and then you get, you get some interesting perspectives.

I would also encourage people putting in proposals to start organizing and thinking about what to write and inviting speakers as soon as possible because both speakers need to be registered on the IGF website and sometimes they need to set up a profile. All of that takes a little more time. So the earlier you start, the more time you have toward the deadline to round it all off.

I think that's probably covering most of my points. One more point, finally, is that there are there is a register of resource persons, and if you don't have particular people in mind as a diverse panel, maybe you don't know anyone in the private sector that could speak about this, then that could be a place to go to as well. So, there is two hands up. I think I'll stop there, and hopefully that's been useful. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks a lot, Gunela. It's Judith Hellerstein. My question to you and Celine and Lito, is could you talk about the concept this year of the of the extra points or additional points you can get towards your evaluation when you're partnering with one of the intersessional groups? How does that work? Maybe Celine could talk about that.

CELINE: Of course. Lito I will give the floor to you, I think you have a little more insight into that.



LITO IBARRA: Yes. Thank you, Celine. Thank you, Judith, for the question. As I mentioned, there is a section in the proposal form that we ask where we ask about the relationship of your proposal to any intersessional work. We have changed that a little bit this year in order to have only one intersessional if any, it's not an obligation, it's not something that has to be complied with, a proposal may come from different groups and not tie up any intersessional work. But if the proposal and the organizers of the workshop are related somehow, maybe they are part of or they work with some of the intersessional work of the IGF, that is good to know however, as I said and repeat here, it is not necessarily, there is not a section per se in the criteria that provides extra points for if you are related to intersessional work.

However, it is good to know. It is good to we'll try to get more close with this type of intersessional work and then the person in the dynamics coalitions and the best practices and the coalition policy networks and so on and national and regional IGF, they're trying to work together so we can have this type of work together. That is the reason we're trying to include or we are including that question this the form, but not necessarily MAG members. Some of them may take into their mind this account, but it's not necessarily an instruction for the whole for all of the MAG members. I have to say it's not explicitly included in the evaluation, but it's good to have information. We're trying to process that later on and reach and know about these relationships.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Lito. Before I hand over the mic to Celine, I would like to thank you Celine for sharing the links in the chat. I'm sure those will be very useful for the participants. Over to you, Celine.

CELINE: Thank you very much, Muhammad. Of course, we could always summarize all of these links and send them in an email so that we have it also saved in our inbox. Perhaps just to also reiterate a little bit what Lito said. When it comes to the link between the session submitter and also the IGF intersessional work, it is really just for our own statistics, our own information. It will not be better or graded worse depending on whether, you know, you have some sort of link to IGF intersessional work. And that leads actually to my second point that actually Lito mentioned. We are actually welcoming a lot of new speakers, new organizers, new participants, so this is also where for example, as a session

organizer, you can also get let's say a lot of points, if you do suggest speakers that have for example never participated in the IGF before. That is just something that I wanted to mention.

Also, thank Gunela, for mentioning the link to the IGF resource persons. So, visit link in the chat, it's the latest right now. But as you can reach out to us or the Secretariat. Because we may be aware of some participants or in general some potential speakers who express interest in participating in the IGF that could perhaps fit in a session proposal of yours. So explore the IGF resource persons link but as do not hesitate to reach out to the IGF Secretariat. Thank you so much.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Celine. Do we have any other questions from the participants before I open my list of questions? Anyone? Do we have any raised hands? You can raise hand or start speaking.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Mohammed.

MOHAMMED: Hello, everyone. Good morning, it's 7:30 a.m. in Washington DC in New York, I'm sorry. Can you restate that. I missed it, the deadline to submit the proposal? What's the deadline?

CELINE: Thank you so much, yes, of course, the deadline is the 12 of March.

All right. That's it. Thank you very much.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Any other questions? Okay. Meanwhile, people, think about the question. I will open my list. Lito mentioned in his remarks a point where initial screen something done by the Secretariat, so that would I think, fall into some of the common pitfalls which a proposal should avoid, I would say. Because I would if I spend a lot of time in submitting a proposal, at least I would want that proposal evaluated by the MAG, and as

it was said, it's not about the good or bad proposal, but of course if it's rejected in the initial stage by the Secretariat screening, that would I would consider to be a very bad proposal.

So Celine if you can based on your years of evaluating these proposals, what are the common mistakes that people do that we should avoid?

CELINE: Thank you very much, Muhammad, for that question. I think that question would also be very relevant for Lito and Gunela. What we're doing in the Secretariat is we're doing an initial screening, but just of proposals for example that have been submitted twice by mistake or spams, or for example also session submissions with only male panelists, so these kind of like hard criteria that should be respected before going to the for the evaluation to the MAG. Perhaps, Lito, you would like to add a few tips and tricks of proposals that did not make it through over the past years?

LITO IBARRA: Yes. Thank you. After the initial screening, which is, I was thinking when Muhammad asked the question, I was thinking that it's a pity that some proposals may get discards, if you will, at the first stage, the first screening made by the Secretariat. So I encourage you to read and re read the minimum requirements because if you don't comply with those, I mentioned some of them, but it's only three or two or three, we ask that are related to the diversity thing, two persons from different gender than the rest and so on. So there are a few top requirements that we don't go the whole team, Secretariat and MAG, we don't go any further. So that would be a pity that we don't get to read any of the anything of the proposal because of that hard stop criteria. Please read them, they are at the very top of the form so you can comply with those.

After that, when the proposal goes to the MAG, of course we try to evaluate from our personal and somehow subjective perspective how much the topic is aligned with the subthemes for this year. We always try to make them, if you will exclusive but of course topics are always related. You can select the subtheme or topic that aligns better or the best with your topic. As I said in the definition of the subthemes, we try to include some referential subtopics or titles not titles, but aspects that you may include or you may aim for in your proposal. The more the final this is, the more if the alignment with the

subthemes is very clear, there will be no problem because we will see, okay, these are the proposal is complying with the sub topic 3, for instance or whatever.

And we see that relationship very clearly. And also as I said before, the other criteria, it's important that you review them and look at the definitions of the criteria because that is what the MAG is looking at. Of course, the evaluation is personal first and then by groups because we get together online and then on site by groups to exchange our personal opinions, our notes, each member may make notes about the proposal, and say for instance this proposal is not very rich in diversity, regional diversity, for instance, but it's very rich in the approach, very innovative in the approach they're making to the topic. Those notes made personally by my MAG members are very good because when we get to the discussion, the part of the process where some MAG members may say I support this proposal, and another MAG member will say no, I don't see the value in this proposal. So we discuss and we argue, but if there are some tips, some notes that highlight the value of the proposal, then it's very clear in the proposal and the MAG member read about it and took a note, that would gain some points and may gain the discussions at the end.

Of course, it's reality that we have finite number of sessions that we can select after looking at the merits of each proposal, but of course at the end there will be some that sadly will have to be declined this year. But as I say, if you enforce and make it clear if the proposal the topics or aspects we have discussed in this session, the more, the more clear and easy the MAG member reading the proposal will look into that and make a note for the discussion, and also evaluate highly in their evaluation form.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thank you very much Lito and Celine. Before I give the mic to Gunela for her comments, I would also want to add a question for her. Gunela, you have a long history of advocating for accessibility, so while you add to what Celine and Lito has said, if you want to add, my question to you would be, can you share a few ideas of what proposals under which subtheme could be submitted, and of course what are the issues based on your experience of serving at MAG would be useful? And while Gunela speaks, I would urge the participants to think about the proposal, and even if you want to discuss a topic, we can discuss that given the brief time that we have left. Gunela, over to you.

LITO IBARRA: Gunela, you're muted.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Now I think we can hear. Yes.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Loud and clear.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Good. Thank you, Shabbir. Okay. So when it comes to particular subthemes to put into a proposal, I mentioned before the four subthemes, and about trying to mainstream disability into something like sustainable and responsible innovation. We know that the disability sector can be very innovative in regards to building new tools, new ways of interacting online, and some of those, I think, could be worth considering in the intersection of how innovative technology being responsible technology can be something that really fits within the disability area. That's just one idea, and really I'm not here to give ideas. That's for everyone else to come up with their own ideas. But it's the mainstreaming of technology, AI, cybersecurity, privacy issues, and many people with disabilities feel very vulnerable online and in real life, too. And how does privacy and the lack of it in many cases, how does that relate to disability and digital rights. So there is many different ways to approach a workshop proposal in the disability sphere that isn't just a panel of persons with disabilities and disability advocates talking about accessibility and the barriers and the potential solutions.

If we can look at it a little more broadly I think it would be good. So there are some of my tips, but I also wanted to follow on from Lito when it comes to the MAG assessing proposals. It's the particulate that is maybe easier after the Secretariat has done the first cut is the excellent proposals that really stand out, and they followed the evaluation criteria, they're raising something that's relevant and maybe a little bit different and have the diversity paths, and obviously gender and geography and so on. But those different stakeholders, who is going to speak, and what are their perspectives, and something where the evaluators fear this could be really an insightful debate and discussion, so those ones are probably the easier ones to evaluate, as would be the ones that are really not very good. It's the ones in the middle where you also think right if there could be a few good points there, there could be it covers off most of the evaluation criteria, but it's okay but is it going to make the final cut. That's where notes are really, really useful. To if they get

across the line, to debate with all of our MAG members when we get to that stage. That's some of my comments. Thank you.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Celine, Lito, and Gunela. Any questions or comments?

Yes, Mohammed.

MOHAMMED: Yes, have you received any proposals where organizations of persons with disabilities be have been involved in as either a partner or or panelist ses? And how would that count, in terms of what's the weight of this factor in evaluating the proposals?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Shall I answer that?

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, Gunela, you can, sure.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Okay. And Celine, I'll be very happy to hear your comments, too. Each year there are certainly a number of proposals related to disability and they are really evaluated in the general sense that Lito and I have already spoken about. When it comes to the percentages of each of the sections that we evaluate against, so certainly as a diversity criteria, it's obviously important as much as possible to have persons with disability, in general proposals, and persons with disabilities. But it's not necessarily evaluated any differently to those percentages that we talked about. Certainly with the diversity factor, that is one criteria of those others that we talked about, the gender, geographical region, the stakeholder groups, and so on, and age and disability and so forth, they come in, and there is another one too, so I hope that answers your question.

CELINE: Thank you.

MOHAMMED: May I follow up. I'm not asking of persons, I'm asking about organizations of persons with disabilities. We understand that disability is now a major or important factor or criteria in anything diversity wise, but I'm talking about organizations of persons with disabilities cht.

CELINE: Thank you, Mohammed. Perhaps DCAD can give a little more information on organizations participating at the IGF. We receive always over 500 session proposals, and very often the topics received are either specifically about the topic of disabilities or it is about a completely different topic but persons with disabilities are participating.

So I think it is a little hard for us to assess or to give exact names of organizations with disabilities, but Judith, perhaps you have some more insight.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Sure. Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein. Sometimes we do have new organizations. Last year, which was only a few months ago, one of our fellows, the organization that she was part of took out a booth. And so therefore, at those times you can see organizations for persons with disabilities are coming and taking out booths. But otherwise there is not there is isn't otherwise there is not really groups that take out, organization groups. I think it's more that we would like to do more outreach outside of the ICT community or the technology community, and we want to get involvement from people who are not part of the same sector, and that's always been an issue even with the IGF and even with attract being other groups to come, is how do we get the information about Internet governance, about the IGF to groups that do not already know about us? So that's where we rely on either our fellow, our DCAD fellows or other people to try to get as many people as possible to come and apply for sessions or join the IGF, but that's always a tricky thing to do, and it's not only the global IGF that has this issue but as the national and regional IGFs that have the same issue, so it's so that's one of the reasons why we decided to do the session is to try to get more involvement and get and spread the word about IGF to a larger community.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thank you, Judith for the insight, Celine and Gunela, too. Just a quick comment on that. To answer your question, Dr. L, yes, disability rights organizations would be considered but as an organization. Perhaps since we have the benefit of having

two MAG members who would be playing a crucial role in the new structure, whatever is formed of the coming IGF in the coming years, diversity is not just gender and region. Disability is a complete culture, and perhaps this ought to be considered when the subject marks are being developed within the diversity criteria. And the key component of that should be under diversity for people with disabilities; one, the lived experience; two, the organization who are of persons with disabilities, so this could be one of the future criterias and I think the new structures can consider that.

A quick question from the Secretariat or MAG if they can respond, and I would before I do that, I would want to ask the captioners if we go about 5 minutes above the time, would that be okay?

Sure.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, she says it's fine.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much. So the question is, so my question is about the accessibility of the workshop proposal. This is not just for us who are attending this call but who may be listening to this recording and reading the transcript. If someone finds the form difficult to fill in, would the Secretariat or MAG consider assisting particularly people with disabilities, for instance, people with cognitive disabilities, sharing the Word copy of the form or providing any other way of submitting a workshop proposal through instead of using the conventional way of submitting the form. I hope I made my question clear?

CELINE: Thank you very much, Muhammad.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Secretariat and MAG members as well.

CELINE: Thank you, Muhammad. I'm going to rely and I have to leave in a minute and start another one. But definitely. In case some members are facing difficulties in submitting the



proposal, they can definitely send to us the Word version via email. I will share here our email address. The only thing is it needs to, indeed, be submitted on time, so before the 12 of March. Okay. Perfect. Anja is staying a little bit longer in the meeting. And then we can fill out all the fields on your behalf, and we'll also assign the person who submitted it the editorial rights on our web page in case in the future there are some changes that need to be done, but as there of course the Secretariat can assist. Thank you so much.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Celine for this. Thank you very much for staying and giving the input. Thank you very much Lito as well. Thank you Anja for staying until the end of the call. Any last minute questions or comments from the participants before we start wrapping up?

MOHAMMED: Can I ask something very quick.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Sure.

MOHAMMED: Very quick. Can applicants expect that there can be some financial support from IGF organizers or for any workshop or proposal?

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: So I think I can answer this question. And meanwhile I can flag our activity as well. IGF financial support call was there, but the deadline unfortunately for that has gone. It was 17 of February, but if there is any change, I would invite Anja to comment on that. But there is certainly a call going to come up by the dynamic coalition on accessibility and disability, and certainly if someone has a proposal submitted, they would be considered they would be considered or rated high when the fellowship selection committee on the coalition of accessibility and disability is evaluating applications. So keep an eye out for the dynamic coalition call for the support. I know we cannot send a lot of persons for financial support, but certainly we do have small grants that we can provide.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Also, Mohammed, while travel support has closed, I believe the call for journalists from the Global South is still open, and perhaps Anja could say a few words about that in case you know of journalists.

ANJA GENGO: Thank you very much both Muhammad and Judith. I confirmed what Muhammad said, indeed we had to close the call earlier in the year very exceptionally because of the exceptional position of the annual meeting on the overall timeline, so 17 of February was indeed the call. The call is open. I consider you to visit the IGF website and consider applying. Let me just check. I think it's until March. Yeah, 7 of March. Exactly. 7 of March. If there will be any changes with respect to the IGF call for general travel support, we will let you know. For now we have a limited budget, limbed time, and there are no plans for now to reopen the call or extend the deadline.

MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Anja, for this comment. I would I would give the floor now to Judith to do both summary and wrap up comments. I bid you fairwell. Judith over to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you so much, Dr. Shabbir for this. Thanks to all people who have come and some of the new people, DCAD. We talked on the call, thanks to MAG members for giving us some great tips on how to improve our session proposals. As we said, we are having a lot fewer sessions this time, so it's going to be very different it's a lot more difficult to get proposals selected because there are fewer proposals out there, so I think we provided you hopefully we provided you with good ideas and great topics. And also to when you're selecting your proposals, not only look at, you know, gender or diversity where they live, where people live, but as try to get a good mixture and diverse opinions as well. I think then you'll stand a lot better chance in getting your proposal in the short time, but as if you want to also, they're also doing lightning talks which will be, you know, 10 or 15 minutes, and if you have a specific topic that you thought and you can't find a lot of speakers for it, the lightning talk might be something you're interested in. Thanks again for Celine and Anja for going the extra mile and may being sure everything is accessible as possible. I see we are at time with an extra 5 minutes. Thank you so much to everyone coming on the call. We will provide you with a copy of the call as well as my robot assistant has been taking notes, and he does he's been doing a very good summary, so we'll send that out as well.

Thanks so much. Oh, and lightning talks are only for on site speakers, but yes if you're going to be on site you could apply for a lightning talk.

Thanks to all for coming and I will close this call. Thanks again to our realtime transcriber. Look forward to seeing some of you online or in person in the coming weeks. Bye.