

Transcript

Second Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

26-27 January 2017

Geneva, Switzerland

DISCLAIMER: THIS TRANSCRIPT WAS ELABORATED IN REAL TIME DURING THE SECOND MEETING OF THE WGEC AND THEREFORE IT MAY CONTAIN MINOR ERRORS.

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Second Meeting
Geneva, Switzerland
Day 1, 26 January 2017

>> SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Excellencies, distinguished delegates, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, good morning to all of you. As head of the secretariat of the CSTD, I wish to extend to you a very warm welcome to the second meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, especially for those of you who were not with us earlier this week at the CSTD intersessional panel meeting. So welcome to all of you.

As you know, the working group was established by the Chair of the CSTD last May in response to a request made by the General Assembly in the outcome document of its overall review of the implementation of WSIS outcome. And this is the GA resolution 70/125.

According to this resolution, the purpose of the working group is to develop recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda taking into consideration the work that has been done on this matter thus far.

The group has been requested to report to the Commission at its 21st session in 2018 for inclusion in the annual report of the commission to the ECOSOC.

This report then will also serve as an input to the regular reporting of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on implementation of the outcomes of the WSIS.

So at its first meeting last September when many of you were here, the group agreed on inviting inputs from all stakeholders on two questions that would guide the discussion of this second meeting that we begin today.

Now, the secretariat, as promised, posted all the questions on the working group's Web site and collected all the output/inputs, and then they were all compiled and put -- then put on the Web site.

I sincerely hope that you did find this material useful in your preparations and also, you know, starting today in your deliberations.

So let me not take too much of your time. You have two very busy days ahead. So I wish you a very productive discussion and assure you that we are here for you. And all my team sitting in the middle and everywhere around the room we are here.

And let me also thank -- we are also going to have the captioning services because there will be some remote connections. And I really would like to thank ICANN. I think Nigel is in the room. Thank you so much for availing these services for us. This is a real -- this is very useful in this kind of a multistakeholder discussion.

So now turning to our Chair, I know there is a murmur in the room -- I should not tell the Chair that there is a murmur in the room that we cannot have a better Chair than our Ambassador Fonseca to take this forward.

So, Ambassador Fonseca, we are -- the secretariat is solely behind you, very much behind you. So, please, you have the floor to take forward the agenda.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Ms. Sirimanne. I would like also to welcome colleagues and to wish each and every one Happy New Year. I think for many of us this is the first time we have been seeing each other.

As Ms. Sirimanne has indicated, we are looking forward to a meeting, that we would have very much a working -- you know, working mood more. And, therefore, I would certainly look forward for your full contribution in those two days.

I'd like to draw your attention to the inputs for this meeting as per the decision that was made at the 30 September inaugural meeting, organizational meeting, we had last year. You will recall that the group agreed that at this meeting that will be the first substantive meeting of this working group, that the work should be based and be guided by the answers that we received to the two questions that were elaborated by the group at that time. So what are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? That was the first question. And take into account the work of the previous WGEC and the Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraphs 69 to 71, what kind of recommendations should we consider?

So as you are aware on that basis, a consultation process was launched. And all together, 27 WGEC members contributed with submissions and ten observers. As we have discussed at the last meeting due to the very severe constraints, financial constraints, personal constraints faced by the secretariat, there was no possibility to, as usual, in the context prepare some documents that would in a way be a synthesis of or provide for an analysis of those contributions on the basis of which we should be working.

So, basically, the authoritative documents we have before us are the contributions themselves, the full text of the contributions. Those are the main inputs for this meeting. And as I said in total, there were 37 contributions amounting to approximately 160 pages.

As anticipated in September, I indicated that I would make a personal effort to work together with you and the secretariat trying to provide for this meeting one piece of document that would provide for some more focus on the discussions. Otherwise, we would have to address those 160 pages simultaneously.

So I would like to reaffirm -- and this was already contained in my synthesis report -- that this, indeed, was possible to achieve. I'd like to acknowledge and thank the assistance I received from the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee in that regard, particularly through Mr. Bruno Bioni who was the expert who was assigned to help in that regard.

This is very much what was done -- and I think it's important to highlight this -- in regard to the NETmundial meeting we organized back in 2014.

At the same time we took the same approach. The community was invited to comment. Many, many contributions were received, and that effort of organization of the ideas was also put in motion and -- which led to one single document upon which the executive committee at the time worked, and we are -- I think that was a successful experience in doing this that led to the now successful outcome that in the end, on the basis of the work of the executive committee of the wider participants themselves of NETmundial, we achieved an outcome document.

I think that was a key for the success of the meeting, to be able to rely on one single document, although not perfect, of course, because it's almost impossible to try to synthesize or to -- even to enumerate the important ideas and proposals, contain those in one document of 17, 20 pages.

So therefore, besides the submissions that are, again, the authoritative documents, you have before you also a synthesis document that is being offered on my own responsibility under this -- in that spirit.

Of course it will be up to the working group to consider whether this is appropriate. Also, I would look forward -- as I have indicated in the paper, in my notice for you, that I look forward your reactions, especially those who contributed in the sense to clarify whether the way their positions are portrayed represents their -- on are correct, accurate, or not. And this document, if the group wishes to work on that basis, is something to be revised on that basis.

We have already received a few comments from, for example, Mr. Richard Hill, also from Australia and others I don't recall, but we have already a number of comments.

While, let's say, they make a positive appraisal of the document, they indicated that they had particular issues and those are -- those are being taken on board by the secretariat, which will of course revise the document accordingly.

But again, the way we will deal with these submissions themselves, the synthesis document, is something that is up for the group to decide, and I look forward to receiving your reaction on this and to see if you think it is an appropriate way to move forward.

The idea of the document, again, was to try to organize discussions so the synthesis document is organizing sections, trying to highlight and indicate what are the main issues that we're addressing with regard to the high-level characteristics of enhanced coordination.

I think this is -- as you have decided back in September, I think this would be the initial step that this group should take.

I wish also to anticipate something else we are doing.

We are -- I am also asking the secretariat to distribute two documents, additional documents, on my own responsibility.

One is a spreadsheet indicating who said what in regard to the high-level principles, so we'll have before you the full -- it's a tool also to try to have a comprehensive view of the contributions and the notions contained there, so this will be also made available for you as soon as possible. Possibly in the course of the day.

And the second document is also on my own responsibility. It would be a compilation of the actual recommendations contained in those documents.

I think that it is important for us to have before us in a single document also the transcription of the actual recommendations that were made by those who contributed, because even in the way we drafted the -- you drafted the questions, one referring to the high-level characteristics and the second question referring to your recommendations, I noticed that many contributors tried to correlate what they thought were the high-level characteristics with what should be the recommendations.

So I think it also might be useful for you -- of course everything I'm saying is up to you to judge -- to have one single document capturing all the recommendations.

In doing so, I am anticipating something that will be posted by the secretariat as soon as we finalize work in that second document.

I thought it would be useful to establish different categories of recommendations, and so the document will contain seven categories of recommendations, broad categories that I identified in the inputs, but the -- with -- again, as with the synthesis paper with no elaboration, no judgment on the contributions, no (indiscernible) of proposal. Just, let's say, the full transcription of the text.

So those categories are: Some proposals of recommendations refer and address specific institutions, processes, and fora. For example, there are recommendations addressed to ICANN, to IGF, to ITU, so -- either things that should take place within these organizations or initiatives that should be taken by governments and other stakeholders in regard to those institutions, so I think this is one broad category that emerged from the compilations.

And of course there will be no proposal coming from the Chair. Just the enumeration of those ideas that are contained there.

A second set of recommendations referred to follow-up to the previous WGEC work. Also, I noticed that some contributions, or many contributions -- I don't recall exactly -- also referred to aspects of the previous WGEC group that should be revisited and expanded by this group, so this will appear under a particular section.

The third would be recommendations of priority or focus areas of future work.

A fourth category would be recommendations addressing organizational or coordination aspects of, for example, how to provide for better coordination among the different processes or how governments themselves should coordinate among themselves to do this or that. So these are the kind of recommendation here.

There are recommendations addressed to national governments, what national governments should do to enhance cooperation on a national basis, to establish, for example, national IGFs to include in their delegations members from other stakeholder groups, and that kind of thing addressed to national governments with a view to enhancing cooperation.

A sixth set of recommendations deal with the creation of institutional mechanisms or instruments. Here referring to the creation of new bodies or frameworks or agreements. So this will come under this section.

A seventh and final set of recommendations addressed the characteristics of recommendations.

So some recommendations deal with -- not with specific recommendations, but rather they say they should be, for example, generic, should not try to deal with particular issues, should be thought in a way that would address all processes simultaneously, so -- and there are differing visions on how this should proceed.

So these all will come under this.

So this document, I will not dwell on it too much because it is still not available, not yet finalized, but that will be in the course of the day, I hope.

So if -- again, if the group wishes, that could also be -- help to guide the discussions. I would suggest not at this initial exchange we'll have. I think as you have the -- and I repeat, as you have decided in the previous meeting, the first and I would say the -- maybe the priority issue for us to discuss this morning, certainly, or even in these two days, would be the issues around the high-level characteristics and the synthesis document was intended to provide you with tools -- an additional tool for that, if you wish.

And -- but then we -- these documents or recommendations I think should be taken up in a later stage and then we would try -- as you have decided, try to correlate with principles and recommendations and come up with something that would be an output of the group, either on a consensus basis or as per the mandate to receive those sort of documents, differences of positions, where they may exist.

So I think this would be my initial comments for you on how we have proceeded in the preparation of this meeting.

I look forward for your feedback on how you would consider that we should be moving forward, so I will open now the floor for general comments in regard to the process or the way we should proceed.

So -- and, if you wish, also to focus on this proposed working agenda for us in which I suggest we should focus the discussion on the issues raised by the synthesis paper. Again, fully acknowledging this is a very imperfect attempt to -- just to bring to your consideration what are the issues that maybe should be further discussed among us in the group, with a view to trying to find some common ground or identifying those areas of lack of convergence.

So I look forward for your reactions. I recognize Mr. Richard Hill from APIG.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize. I'm violating the procedural rules I drew attention to. I took the wrong flag. It should be the Richard Hill flag, not the APIG flag. I will fix that during the break. I apologize for that.

Thank you very much for the document, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, this is the way to move forward in principle. But I think we need a little bit more work before we go that way.

I don't think your document as it stands is suitable as the primary or sole working document because as some people pointed out there was some misunderstandings as to what positions were. And, also, I believe there are some things missing that need to be added. But certainly a future version of that document could be the basis for future work.

I think the document you produced, the structure was a bit limiting. I would propose some changes to the structure, and I think that would then allow bringing in the things I thought were missing.

I think the way forward, Chairman, would be for you to send us a Word version and then each of us can do revisions and then send it obviously to everybody so you have full transparency. And then from that basis, you could produce a new document.

So for the present meeting, I do think we need to look at the individual contributions. I would propose that they all be introduced before any are discussed, very shortly one or two minutes from each contributor to introduce their contributions so that everybody knows them. I realize that everybody has read them very carefully, but it's still always useful to have a one-minute summary.

I think that you're correct, there are two things. One is enhanced cooperation, the other is recommendations, some of which are related to enhanced cooperation directly and some of which are only indirectly flowing from direct -- from enhanced cooperation. So we probably need two documents, and that's what you're suggesting.

And I think that these should be developed in parallel and simultaneously. One is not a priority over the other one. And, in fact, perhaps we need three output documents. One is considerations on enhanced cooperation. The other one would be, I was thinking, a revision of the gaps paper with recommendations inside it. But perhaps we could have a revised gaps paper and then separately a paper on recommendations because it's true that many of the recommendations are not directly related to gaps. Although -- thank you. Although, you can always invent the gap to correspond to recommendations. So either two or three papers. I'm flexible on that.

And, in fact, I was going to bring this up understand the agenda item 3 for day 2, way forward. But since you bring it up now, we may as well bring it up. So my suggestion is that we already agree, and at the end of this meeting start mandating you -- and I have no problems with suggestions coming from the Chair, by the way. I encourage them -- to come up with these either two or three papers which initially will just be compilations of what's come in from the members and then we'll get refined, condensed. Hopefully we find consensus on many areas and so the papers become much shorter and there are only

very few areas where we say, Well, there wasn't full consensus and there was view 1 and then there's view 2 and then there's view 3.

So, again, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for kicking off the work. We much appreciate that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think the points you made are very well explained. I would like just to indicate that my intention was not at this point -- I'm not considering at this point to be working on output documents. I think this will be part of the work we do in a later stage.

So this synthesis document is not intended -- should not be seen as any draft output of this group. It is just a way to organize -- a proposal to organize discussion around some issues. And at this point, I would not be too much concerned about who said what. I think the important thing would be to discuss the ideas that are there, if those -- if the group considered that those ideas are their ideas or the notion should be further elaborated rather than looking into the actual quotations coming from, I think the purpose was just to highlight what are the issues identified and bring it to the group as a proposal to organize our -- but I would be comfortable if -- I'm in your hands. If you wish to -- before even considering doing that to allow for each one to present its contribution, I think that might be also a way forward. I look for some more reactions on this.

But, again -- and I take on board your proposal in regard to the output. But, again, I think we -- I think we are in the very initial stage of our work. At this point I'm not considering and thinking about the output. Of course, this is something you have been suggesting. Then it's taken note of.

I recognize the European Union. Yes, please, go ahead.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, I thought your approach made a lot of sense because you suggested quite clearly that the synthesis document is not either an output or a working document that we're supposed to develop or prepare. And, quite frankly, going back and trying to turn it into a working document or an output is what I understand Richard Hill would like to do. And I'm not suggesting that no adjustments or changes can't be made. It seems to me it's the kind of working document that could be amended, slightly adjusted, et cetera. I mean, I noticed a couple of minor things that we would have said slightly differently and added. But as an overview of where the main issues are, we thought it was a very useful document to start from. And I think it helps us to focus on some of the big issues.

So I would rather not start rewriting this document and changing it. I think we should go forward as you suggest. You've talked about another document that you're going to send around which gives an even bigger picture of the numbers of issues raised and where the concentration of those issues is. It seems to me that's a very good way to start.

And although I would be very interested to hear everyone's contribution, in theory, everyone has had those documents. They have had a chance to look at them. I'm not sure whether it's useful to go through them all each individually. But I'm happy, of course, to hear the highlights, if people want to add highlights or identify a particular aspect that they think doesn't fit entirely within the -- within the

synthesis document itself. So we're in the hands of the entire group, of course. But we think what you propose is a very good start. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I'll turn to Peru.

>>PERU: I would like to support Ambassador Fonseca proposal as well as European Union. I think the way forward is quite clear. With respect to Mr. Hill, I believe that perhaps we will not make the best use of the only two days we have to discuss these issues if we go back to detail aspects that really have already been taken care of.

I believe that the best way is to start with the working paper with the suggestion Ambassador Fonseca has proposed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I will give the floor to Nigel Hickson from ICANN and then Russian Federation.

You have the floor.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good morning to you and to fellow delegates. It's really good to be here.

Thank you so much for your synthesis document. We fully understand the basis of the document, and it's very good of you to spend time putting it together. And we would join with the European Union in this respect as well.

We think we can work on the basis of this document. Essentially what we're doing, as I understand, would be to work on the headings, on the subheadings, or whatever. And whether we agree that a particular word should be changed or a dot should be changed to a semicolon is something we can address at another time perhaps.

But I think we need to move forward and to work on the basis of this document for our agenda in terms of the headings, I think is an excellent way forward. And we very much look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation and then Iran and Saudi Arabia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. First of all, I would like to thank for the document with the compilation of the contributions, is, of course, a useful document and important to simplify the process to understand the overall view of the whole list of the contributions.

However, how we see it is some details actually disappeared, for example, our points of view. But it's a good step for, like, first step to go. So we support the idea to come with another document that we can make also the online contribution for this.

And what is important for us is that we need to focus on the mandate of the working group. And that's why we think that it's important to structure the new document in a way to better solve the mandate of the working group.

So we propose actually to divide all the contributions to answering questions. Like, first question is: Between whom -- between what actors enhanced cooperation should be? Second is: What is the scope of enhanced cooperation? And the third question is how to fully implement enhanced cooperation. So we proposed the structure to go from one by one to better understand because if we start with how to implement enhanced cooperation without understanding between whom enhanced cooperation should be implemented and what scope it should be solved, then it will be not possible to solve the mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. And I would like to comment in that regard that I think you have touched on some of the main elements that bring the discussion on enhanced cooperation. And if you go through the synthesis document, I think the synthesis document allows and indicates that those issues are issues that were identified and tries to identify those who were speaking on those issues. So I think if we go through the synthesis document, if we take this as a basis of the discussion, then I would invite comments on one section and another, we will deal with those issues that have been addressed. I think your concern was fully taken on board when we were preparing this synthesis. Again, not as any draft output. I would not be too much concerned about the language that is there, as it was said before. I think we are not in a stage that we will be working on the document itself looking at the language and addressing the language. This is not the intent. It's just to discuss, to bring to the fore of the group the issues, the issues that are there and to provide for space for the issues to be discussed in preparation for a later stage in which we will try to agree on the way this will be reflected in the report.

So, again, I think the points you have raised, those are central aspects; but if we agree to go to take, as imperfect as it is, as a basis. There can be in the course of discussion any amendments or any -- even in terms of issues that were left behind can be brought to the discussion, I think that would -- that would address your concern.

So I have on my list Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Japan and others. So I offer the floor for Iran. Please you have -- sorry. Yes, yes, Iran. Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Ambassador. Good morning to colleagues. Happy to see you again here.

First of all, we are very pleased that we have you guiding this group. Under your capable hand and expertise and long experience that you have, we will achieve fruitful results.

Second, I think we need to be aware that we must have something as an output at the end of our work to be precise and concise and on the point which helps the people. If you have a long, long document, it will be difficult for some people to understand and so on. So we should avoid that and try to make best effort.

There was some order from one prime minister in 1942 in the second world war, about eight or nine lines, talking about brief description of the thing. And he ordered that if you wanted to read your document, be brief. Otherwise, I can't read it and I don't have time to read that. That is an important element.

I think our distinguished colleagues from Russia put the points in the proper order. And I think that is a good start, a start of this meeting. No problem with the basic documents, but we would like also to some extent join the European Commission or European Union. I know distinguished European Commission in GAC, but European Union, no matter.

I think we should have the possibility to provide to the people contributed and to highlight the points. For instance, Richard Hill put considerable amount of efforts. And he has prepared very rich documents on the points with experience that he had 25, 30 years here or there. And I think he touched the important point, and we should not ignore that. Perhaps we may not go to the detail, but we should allow him to present his document and put the highlights of those documents. It's very, very important.

For instance, he put his finger on the jurisdictions. Jurisdiction is one of the most important elements and critical to the activities. It is related to the enhanced cooperation and many other things.

So I don't think that we should ignore those documents, and we should allow him to present the document, highlight the points and we try to put it in the basic document and thorough discuss.

The other contribution was very, very valuable, and we have to also make the same treatment. I suggest that if you agree, Distinguished Chairman, you allow the people to present their documents and put the highlights but not go into detail of the documents. No doubt, we don't have such time in these two days. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

And what I'm -- just before handing to others who have requested, I am thinking it would be appropriate to have a hybrid approach in regard to what I have suggested. So I think it is fair as you have said, and Mr. Hill as well, to allow those who wish to highlight the aspects that contain their contributions. I think this is something that would be totally in line with what we have decided last time. But that would not be, let's say, mandatory for everyone. So those who wish may do so. And after I hear the present round of interventions, I offer the opportunity for those who have contributions to make their presentations if they wish. And I will maybe on that basis, on the basis of the reactions I have received, then suggest we could focus on the issues that are in the synthesis document trying to provide some discussion among us. And then I'd like to have very focused discussion on aspects. I would really invite colleagues not to come up with some rhetorical -- I think it's important, of course, to have some principled interventions. Those are important but to focus on the issues at hand. I think that would be a very good use of our time, if we can focus on the main issues that are raised in the documents and at least to have further exchange and better collaboration among us.

So I'm just anticipating something that I would certainly propose at the end of this round of interventions trying to respond to those different ways to deliver this meeting.

I will now give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia. Just as I think this was requested at the last meeting to identify those members and observers, Saudi Arabia is an observer to this working group.

You have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, colleagues.

Well, we first thank you for your synthesis effort, and we find it a good guidance. However, as colleagues have said, it needs more modification indeed to capture the contributions submitted by everyone.

On the matter before us here, I think we should focus on the mandate that was given from UNGA, which is to develop recommendations on how to implement enhanced cooperation. This is -- should be the focus of our work in here. How can we, at the end, develop some recommendations in order to enable governments an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities?

With the guidance of the documents you are going to prepare for us to help the discussion, I think we might use them in preparation for the output document. And I think an exchange of views, interested people who would like to exchange their views, will help us in the discussion before, I mean, getting in the deep discussion of the matter.

This is in short. And I just would like to highlight, as you mentioned, that I am an observer. However, UNGA requested the full involvement of all stakeholders. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia, and indeed, as you have highlighted and I'd like to personally welcome your participation and this is totally in line with what was decided last year. I just indicated this for the sake of -- because I was requested to do it last time -- when I give the floor, to indicate whether it's a member or observer.

All the previous speakers are members, so I was not pointing to you -- I will do it as of now for each and every person I offer the floor.

So now I give the floor to Japan, who is a member of the working group.

Japan, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everybody.

First, I'd like to thank the secretariat and the Chairman for their hard working for preparing this working group.

And as for the synthesis document, we can support to proceed with discussion based on this synthesis document because I think it is a very good start to understand in what points we can agree on concerning the characteristics of enhanced cooperation, and in what points we have divergent views.

I think the first thing we should focus on is what kind of points we can agree on concerning the characteristics of enhanced cooperation, and after we have some common understanding, common basis, on what are the characteristics we can agree on concerning the objective of the working group, then we can go to the next step. We can consider what kind of recommendations we should consider to achieve this goal.

So we support your proposal to proceed with the discussion based on this synthesis document and also support your second proposal. That is, to do some hybrid way. For those who want to make some highlights in their contributions, I think this should be allowed. I want to hear many -- the various views concerning these characteristics on enhanced cooperation, so we also work on the presentation from the members concerning the highlights in their contributions. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan, for your comments. I'll now give the floor to Mr. Nick Ashton-Hart from the technical community, a member of the working group.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Ah. Thank you and good morning to everyone. I would support your hybrid approach, Ambassador, with perhaps one slight amendment.

Given the number of people who would be speaking to their contributions, we could spend probably all of today, if we're not careful, on that.

Perhaps people could make their comments within one or two minutes and you could then start waving at them or something.

We're attracted by the points made by Japan, but we would like to further -- further say -- I would like to further say that most of us have argued about the characteristics of enhanced cooperation and what the meaning of Tunis is until late into the night in many parts of the world over the last 10 years, and I'm sure that we would be very capable of doing that again here, and in many other places in the world for the next 10 years, and we would probably not get much further than we have.

So I personally would implore us all, as Japan has suggested, to start with what we do agree on, what -- where do we need additional enhanced cooperation, rather than candidly arguing about who needs to be in the room at the time because we're just not going to always agree on this.

So my hope is that we can focus on what we are going to agree on, have some points of difference that we try and hash out, but not try and come to complete agreement on things where we absolutely know we won't come to a complete agreement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick. And, well, I don't see a direct contradiction between those views because even the synthesis agreement and the spreadsheet that will be distributed to you shows there is a lot of convergence on -- in regard to some of those -- what would be some high-level characteristics.

So I think it's possible to provide for that identification. In some other areas, of course this will not be the case. This is also indicated in the synthesis document. So I think in -- certainly we'll be able to come up with things that are -- there's a lot of convergence or maybe wishfully consensus, but as you have also indicated, the mandate of the group does not oblige us to do everything by consensus. We were also tasked to document differing positions and to include these as input for work on this issue on the part of the UNGA, who invited us to do it. So I would certainly not refrain from going to discuss some issues, even if we are controversial, to the extent that these will, by the end of the day, need to be documented.

I will turn now to Mr. Parminder Singh from I.T. for Change, a member of the working group.

And then for your reference, I -- oh, yes, and then Mr. -- the representative from the U.K., after Mr. Singh, and then Cuba, Canada, and United States. Those are the ones I have on my list for the moment. So you have the floor, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And I first would like to thank the secretariat for putting together an excellent document, and even more the Chair who, on his personal initiative, has put together a synthesis document which gives us a very good picture of what people have been trying to talk here.

I think one key issue right now we are facing is whether we proceed with discussions around the concept of enhanced cooperation or move on to the second question, which is recommendations or, as I understand it, possible institutional mechanisms coming out of people's different interpretations of enhanced cooperation and whatever it is.

So much as I would like to agree with the Chair's -- Chair's desire to spend the two days talking about the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation, I agree with Nick that we have talked about it a lot. And it's not only that there are disagreements. One of the key issues is that we really do not know what does that particular interpretation of a high-level characteristic translate into in terms of what should there be.

And even if I look at the synthesis document which the Chair has so kindly put forward, almost everything I can agree on in this, but I do know that actually there is not such agreement between members on the institutional mechanisms.

For example, the Point A talks about to enable governments. That's the purpose. And second says intergovernmental format. And third says multistakeholder inputs.

Now, I can agree completely with the multistakeholder's input part of it, along with the other two things ahead of it.

So unless one knows what is meant by saying A2, "Multistakeholder Format," what is it that is a desire of the people who put forward this conception of enhanced cooperation? What kind of institutional mechanism they are talking about it?

I'm not able to agree or disagree with that contention.

So I completely agree that the decision-making process of enhanced cooperation should necessarily engage all stakeholders -- very well -- involved in Internet governance in the broader sense, all those who are included in the ecosystem and so on. Furthermore, in the sense of a joint systemic interpretation of Paragraphs 69 and 71 is good. I'm agreeing with this till I know what is it that the people who want this to be the key characteristic means in terms of institutional mechanisms, and if I know the institutional mechanisms, I can either agree with them or point out shortcomings, in my view, or talk about accommodations.

Similarly, if we go to other issues like binding and nonbinding, for example, some people say there should be binding outcomes of any process of enhanced cooperation. Others say there should not be binding outcomes.

Now, again, I do not understand what exactly is meant. For example, let's say UNESCO. I don't know whether UNESCO makes binding outputs or nonbinding outputs. I understand they make nonbinding outputs and the binding ones are actually treaty processes which they merely facilitate and which is a different kind of intergovernmental agreement which intergovernmental agreements are possible at any time when governments get together.

So if we are setting up hypothetically a new institution like UNESCO, it normally gives nonbinding outputs, so the difference between binding and nonbinding is not clear till we know what kind of institutional mechanism is being suggested. Then alone we can kind of discuss, "No, that's too much," "That's less," or reach a middle ground. And I can talk practically of all the other issues on which I can agree but I know there are differences vis-a-vis the institutional mechanisms which they may correspond to.

So my brief contention here is that if we start talking about what kind of institutional mechanisms people have in their mind to fulfill that particular concept of enhanced cooperation which they forward, which is really the recommendations we are going to make, then we really go on to the work of actually making recommendations and have a possibility in next January to make an output document with recommendations. And as Chair has wisely pointed out, it is possible that there will be some agreements on some part of institutional mechanisms, differences may remain, but if there are clarities of two or three kinds of institutional mechanisms which fulfill a certain conception of enhanced cooperation of some members, they can be listed as options, and that is the kind of thing in which we, having spent four years now working on this group, can actually contribute to the global process of norms and policymaking. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, and I thank you, but again, I think you're right but you are, in a way, thinking about the final outcome of the group, the final output.

I'd just like to recall that it was decided by the group at the first meeting, organizational meeting, so the first the question, the first set of issues deal with high-level characteristics. I take the point made by you and Nick that has been discussed a lot along -- but it was decided by the group that one starting point

would be to discuss the high-level characteristics. I don't think we should -- we would be in a position to deviate from this discussion now on its own merit, what are the high-level characteristics.

Of course if in the course of the discussion anyone wants to correlate this with the institutional mechanisms or institutional framework, he or she would be, of course, free to do it, but I -- I think that the recommendations that are the issues addressed by the second question that was decided by the group that would in a way refer to those high-level characteristics is something that I -- as I explained at the beginning, I was thinking to address in the context of these documents, compiling the recommendations coming from you, and I would certainly not encourage us to go back into that part of the discussion right now because I think, one, we would be, in a way, changing the decision we made before, which is of course something we can do, but maybe would be already starting to discuss some issues that -- some issues, not all issues, that have a lot of controversy without giving us the opportunity to further dwell on some maybe even concept what will aspects. Exactly in the sense you have been saying. What exactly is understood by binding or nonbinding. I think we can maybe have some discussion around this without exactly thinking about the final output.

So I think that maybe I was trying to interpret that it was the intention of the group to -- to have that kind of conceptual or structural discussion and then move to some more precise recommendations.

But I agree with you. Maybe the endgame would be this. But I was just thinking on how to get there and that's how I'd like to suggest to the group we should proceed.

I'll turn to U.K. and then Cuba. U.K., you have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to you and to all colleagues.

And thank you also for the document that's been circulated. We would agree with those who say it's very useful to see the full range of views set out.

And we would agree also that colleagues should have an opportunity, if they wish, to set out their views in the meeting today.

But we do think we need to be careful not to polarize our work too quickly.

We've argued in the past that there needs to be a step-by-step approach to our work because we know that there are some very difficult issues that we will have to deal with, and we think we need to be cautious about jumping straight to detailed recommendations because our work could very quickly get into difficulty if we do that.

We would agree with Japan and with others who have said that we should start looking at where we can agree, and that will give us a good basis for moving forward.

And when we read the responses to the two questions, we read them with a very positive spirit because although it's clear there are differences, there are also many areas in those responses where it seems to us we can come together and find consensus. And particularly regarding the characteristics of enhanced

cooperation, many of the responses mentioned very similar characteristics, and we think that's a very positive development.

We should try to capture some of that consensus now, and then use it as a guide for our discussion later on recommendations.

We think that our aim should not be to document our differences, as I think you said, Mr. Chairman, but instead to find practical recommendations to further implement enhanced cooperation. And if we start from the common ground that exists, and if we take a step-by-step approach, we believe that will give us the best chance of success. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. I -- yeah. I was just looking at the mandate we received from the UNGA and it says that the group should take into account all the diverse views and expertise. Yeah, the way it is drafted, it may lead to different conclusions, so it may be read as addressing the constitution of the group, but I -- having been there in New York at the time of the -- I think the spirit was not to lose the diversity of views, and so that's why I said we should also document the differences. But again, this is something I would not like at this point to focus too much on the final output. Rather, on the issues to be discussed.

I fully agree with you we should take a step-by-step approach in that regard -- maybe even baby steps -- to make sure that we -- even if we make some limited progress, we are on a common ground to the extent possible. But in the end of the day, if we found that in some areas the differences are so huge, I think that might be the case to also document. But at this stage I'd like to give a try to move on a consensus basis as much as possible.

And drawing a little bit on what Mr. Singh said, I think it's important for us -- and I think this is why I'd like to have a discussion among us on those main aspects regarding --

For example, binding and nonbinding. I notice in the contributions that even those that in general favor nonbinding outcomes, in some circumstances they may favor binding. For example, in regard to combating cybercrime.

So the issue about binding/nonbinding would be, let's say, not an absolute on either side, but rather a question of examining particular issues in which that -- and I think maybe in the discussion that could -- we could have more clarity on this before we move to the discussion on the institutional framework we have.

I think that that's the kind of discussion I was looking for when I was reviewing the synthesis paper and thinking about the kind of interaction we'd have at this meeting.

I just put this for your consideration, of course. I'm in your hands in regard to how we proceed.

Just for information, I have on my list Cuba, Canada, United States, Jimson, Lea, and after that, I suggest -- Mexico, and I suggest after this, we close the list and we offer the opportunity for those who have contributed, if they wish, to -- Pakistan -- to highlight with the express request to be as short as possible,

if possible, in two minutes or three minutes in order to make sure we don't spend too much time on this, taking into account that all the submissions were made available to participants before the meeting.

So I will give the floor to Cuba. You have the floor, madam.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Thank you, Ambassador. Welcome all of the colleagues. I realize that it is 11:30, 11:30. We have been speaking a long time, and we have not even approved the agenda of this meeting. So I am really worried on the method of work. I realize that in the previous meeting we have a huge problem with the management of the time. We had a huge problem with the management of the methods of working agenda.

So the first thing I want to really be clear, we have only two days and it's 11:30. We have not approved the agenda, and I want to propose some amendments to the provisional agenda.

So my delegation realized we already had the remarks by the director. We also have the opening remarks by the Chair. And we still are on Item 3. So I suppose we should not enter in exchanges of views because we have not approved the agenda.

So, my proposal is that item 4 to be amended and to be replaced by the title of the first question that we approved in the last preparatory meeting.

So item 4 of day 1 should be replaced to read, "Exchange of views on the contributions regarding," and then you can insert the question -- the question I do not recall, the one related to the characteristics -- and then to delete item 5 for today. We think that this proposal of item 5 that is stock-taking, this should be moved to day 2 because I propose that this item 5 of the first day is related to item 3 of the second day. That is the way forward. So I think that today we could concentrate and exchange of views on the question 1 as it was decided in the preparatory meeting or the previous meeting.

And then tomorrow, for tomorrow -- I repeat. For the provisional agenda, the day 1 I agree with item 1, 2 and 3. And I propose item 4 to be amended to say a change of views on the contributions related to question 1. And then item 5 I propose to be deleted.

Then day 2, I propose to item 1. We really already have different remarks by the Chair. So I don't think tomorrow we need that. And we will focus to have item 1, will be exchange of views on the contributions on the second guiding question. We even can put the title or the exact question. And then we can have a second item that is way forward because tomorrow probably the afternoon of Friday will be more concentrated on possible way forward on what documents are we going to use in the future, what documents we are going to produce, any -- any way forward that we agree on.

So the items for tomorrow will be only three. So will be exchange of views on question 2, the way forward, and then we can have closing remarks.

I repeat, we need to use our time because we have been discussing and there is no order. For example, some of the members are talking on possible recommendations or are talking on what documents are

we going to use as a basis. Others are talking on characteristics. There is no order in the room. We need to understand at the time we make interventions on what topic are we -- we need to give our inputs.

If you want to listen to our comments regarding the synthesis paper, we want to say that we thank the secretariat for making the compilation on the contributions of members and observers. We are still reading these two documents.

Regarding the synthesis paper, we also are going to read it. We are going to send it to our cabinet. And that's it.

I think if you want to listen to our exchange of views even without approving the agenda, we are in the same line of Russia, in the same line of Iran, in the same line of Saudi Arabia that we should focus our work in the mandate of this working group and also in the mandate of the Tunis Agenda.

We feel like all the experts that we should not concentrate too much on discussing characteristics because it's been discussed in previous meeting, although it's our mandate to discuss our exchange of views. As U.K. mentioned, we decided to have two questions. We need to have a little exchange of views on the first question.

But the main task really, if we had a previous WSIS and so on, the main text of this working group is to have an outcome, more concentrated recommendations related to the second question.

And for us, the key issue is to have an institutional mechanism. So that's for the outcome in the next sessions. I do not want to talk too much because there are different colleagues that want to speak and it's 11:30. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. I think you have raised a very important point, one which I would like to address before turning to the other speakers. I take your intervention, first of all, as a point of order because you have rightly pointed out that we have not approved our agenda.

I must say I was so enthusiastic trying to move into the substance that I forgot to take that formal step you have rightly pointed out.

So I would like to submit -- and this is in regard to the point of order that was raised -- the approval of the agenda, take into account the proposal made by Cuba. And I would like to make a few comments on this.

In regard to your proposal regarding point 4, exchange of views on the contributions, although I have in my initial presentation and also in the discussion that has ensued maybe highlighted in line with what was decided by the group at this 30 September meeting, the intention to focus in that maybe on the initial discussion we have on the high-level characteristics because that was the decision of the group. We know this does not relate directly to the mandate, but I think the group when they made that decision in September took into account the Tunis Agenda, took into account the terms of the resolution that was approved by WSIS+10 and decided the best way to fulfill the mandate was to work step by

step, first of all, discussing the characteristics and then moving into the recommendations. That's the way the questions were drafted.

And I think my proposal would be to more or less follow that approach. So we are not deviating from the mandate. We are not deviating from Tunis. In regard to Question 4, it was not decided -- and I think it would not be in line to separate the discussion because as in the course of many interventions -- and, for example, I take the points raised by Parminder. It's maybe even unavoidable on the path of some to correlate both aspects, high-level characteristics, recommendations.

So I would not endorse the idea that today we should discuss high-level and tomorrow recommendations. I think maybe for the purpose of that organize, we should focus first on the characteristics but not impede anyone that wishes to talk and anticipate their position. This would be just fair and in line with how we decided.

So my proposal was to keep the language contained in item 4 as it is. I don't think there's a need to differentiate between today and tomorrow, today we address 1, tomorrow 2.

In regard to item 5, I take the point raised by you. But here the initial -- I should have explained it at the beginning. That was a mistake on the part of the Chair.

The idea was to allow us at the end of today, maybe we can spare 20 minutes, 30 minutes, I don't know. It would be up to the group -- by the end of the day to make an assessment of what we have done and make a decision on how to proceed tomorrow.

So, in general, those items, 4 and 5, were drafted in a very broad way to leave to the working group the total flexibility to decide. So the stock-taking could take place, of course, either by the end of today or tomorrow morning. I think that would be up to the group to decide. So I would suggest that at least 4 for the moment that could be retained in day one, in the understanding that the group may decide otherwise. The group has full liberty to decide on anything.

So with those two -- or those comments -- and I apologize for the extension of the comments -- I would then formally -- maybe -- I have taken all these -- and I repeat after we address this issue, I have Canada, United States, Jimson, Lea, and Pakistan on my list. But at this point, I would like just to -- and I would like maybe to ask those to bring down their plates because I want to just submit to the approval and request and ask you if the agenda can be approved as suggested by me on the basis of the points raised by Cuba or not.

But I give the floor to Richard Hill for his comments on that particular point. Yes. Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>RICHARD HILL: -- in item 2, which was the comments on your opening remarks, we would then come to the approval of the agenda. But now you are jumping ahead. That's fine.

I have no problem, Chairman, with the understanding that under day 2, item 3, way forward, I would like to have a discussion, if possible, of structure of outcome documents. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. Could you repeat? I was not clear about your proposal.

>>RICHARD HILL: No objections to the agenda. It's just on day 2, item 3, way forward, I would like to start a discussion of the structure of the output documents for this group. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

So I -- so I -- with those comments, I would submit for your consideration the draft agenda and would seek your guidance on this.

Yes, Jimson? Jimson from --

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Jimson, Chair, AfICTA.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, from the Africa Information & Communication Technologies Alliance. You have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, secretariat, and distinguished delegates, I would like to, first and foremost, agree with the agenda. And I propose it should be adopted.

And why I also say that, I also agree with Richard that we were actually responding to opening remarks and that we hope you will get to the agenda adoption. But all things work well.

So I also would like to note that with (indiscernible) or project management methodology, once you have given an assignment to a group, it's just appropriate for you to listen to the group to get feedback as we suggested and many delegates have suggested. So I'll agree with the suggestions that as many would like to do a quick recap of their submission, they should do it formally. Two minutes, no more than two minutes. And then we'll move forward as we have already recommended. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Could we then approve the agenda as proposed by Cuba, amended by me and Richard? I see no objection. So I will formally hammer it is approved. Thank you.

[Applause]

So let's move on then. And then formally now we are under agenda 4. I think we are trying to strike a discussion around how we proceed but on the basis of the contributions that we have received. So I think it is appropriate that we are now on agenda Number 4. Again, I will give the floor to those who have requested before -- those are listed Canada, United States, Jimson, Lea Kaspar and Pakistan -- for general comments. And after that I would offer the opportunity for those who have contributed if they wish to highlight the main aspects of their contributions before we decide on how to move ahead.

So, Canada, you have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And good morning to you, secretariat, colleagues, and all participants here in the room today. My intervention -- I will reserve perhaps time for another

intervention later on to talk more about our contribution. I am still reacting to your comments from earlier. I want to thank you for the work that was put into the synthesis paper. Like others have mentioned, it is useful to see sort of as much of the views captured there.

I think personally it would have been -- for it to become eventually a working paper for the group, we would have liked to see it focus more on the items that were already in agreement in the submissions because this is one thing we noticed when we read the submissions, was that, in fact, certainly on the characteristics, there was a lot of overlapping ideas. And I think that a starting point for our work, as has already been mentioned by Japan and U.K., would be to start on those things that we agree on. They may be little things now, but the idea would be to grow and build on those elements of current agreement.

And certainly by the end of the meeting this week, this is one thing that I think it's within our reach to say that we have a few things that we agree on, not to prejudge anything in the final outcome document. But that would be sort of, you know, opening the route for the next -- for the next steps.

In terms of taking account of all views and in the final report, again, this has to do with not prejudging the outcome. I think that it is important that in our work we certainly consider all views and all -- you know, all possible understandings of the question of enhanced cooperation. But if we as a group in the end decide that our final report should, in fact, highlight those things that we agree on, I would hope that we would not refrain ourselves from doing that and insist on reflecting the views that were not agreed on if there is some space for us to have a positive report, rather than one that is just a neutral "we agree on this, we don't agree on that." I think that would perhaps be a missed opportunity.

And more on a practical front, I have questions for you and, I guess, for the secretariat. First of all, I would really like to thank ICANN for their contribution in allowing us to see the transcript. This is so, so very useful certainly for me and I hope for all colleagues here in the room. And I would ask if it is possible that we be sent the transcript at the end of today and then again at the end of tomorrow instead of waiting for a whole -- for the end of our meeting before sending the full transcript.

And the other thing that I would like to ask is in regards with -- I understand that there are remote participants that are possibly there with us. And I was wondering if the secretariat could give us the instructions on how we can also join to see if there's a chatroom there so we can ensure that their views are heard and seen by all of us who are here in the room. Because I remember that last time when we had our first meetings, there were certainly people who were listening to us remotely and I think felt perhaps a little bit excluded. So I certainly would like to have the connection and the information on how to be able to log in to be able to see what's going on in that space as well. Thank you very much.

And I will, again, make a further comment later on. Thank you.

>> ANGEL GONZALEZ-SANZ: Yes, yes. With regard to the transcripts, we should be able to provide something, perhaps not absolutely perfect because I understand that the team that is doing the transcript at the end of the day needs to do some checking that the names are correct and all that. But certainly by the end of tomorrow, everything should be okay.

With regard to the details for the connection for the remote participation, I think we can provide those, but I would advise you to contact my colleagues because personally I don't have that information.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We will come back to this as we have that information. I will now give the floor to the United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Good morning, Chair, colleagues. Good to see everyone in Geneva. Happy New Year to everyone.

First, as this is our first intervention, we would just like to thank our colleagues who provided contributions to these two questions and extend our appreciation to the Chair, to the secretariat for organizing, making those available online. I think this is a very useful practice to follow and something that hopefully we can continue in future iterations of this working group.

I also would like to echo my Canadian colleague, that things like capturing transcripts and remote participation are extremely valuable and important and should be recognized by the group for the efforts that went into those.

More to the issue at hand, we as the U.S. delegation enter this meeting, I think, hopeful and optimistic concerning what we can accomplish. Reviewing the documents, we saw many similarities and areas of potential agreement. In some cases I think we even prefer other's ways of framing and other contributions to what we sent in on our own. This is a good thing. That's collaboration. That's cooperation.

So we think this week could be a good opportunity, as I believe U.K. colleagues, Japanese colleagues, the Chair has indicated, in finding those areas of commonality where we agree, to focus on those areas first, and then we can build on that as we move forward.

We certainly understand some of the pessimism with that approach, based on past iterations of this working group, but as we said at the last meeting, I think we're in a different place.

I think we've progressed in this discussion. We're in a better place. We've reached agreements in a lot of places, so I think we deserve -- or we have a responsibility to give that discussion another chance to happen.

Like we said, there was a lot of commonalities. There was a lot of areas that could be agreement in this document. So hopefully this week we can focus on those areas and then move on to other issues.

Just one other thing. I think there was a little bit of confusion, and I guess the onus is on us as a working group because we created the question, with the second question, and some of the contributions, including the United States contribution, focused on recommendations to the scope of the working group. Some of the other recommendations indicated were more recommendations to further implement the process of enhanced cooperation.

So as we look to deal with high-level characteristics and recommendations together this week, I think it's important to recognize that not all the recommendations were geared towards that approach. Many were geared towards what we should be looking to accomplish in the meetings, not what we should be looking to produce as an outcome in a final report. And so with that, I offer a reservation, because we did not provide an input that captured those kind of recommendations, so it might be difficult, at times, to go through some of that kind of discussion. Thank you. And we'll reserve our comments on our contributions till later. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S., and I take your point about different characteristics of recommendations as contained in the submissions. Some address the process, some address -- are very specific to particular processes and fora, some address what national governments should do, et cetera, as I have spelled out in the beginning, and I think different contributors took different approaches.

And I think maybe this is the beauty of working on multilateral and multistakeholder cooperation, so we can reach our views on the basis of exchange and inputs coming from others, and we can discuss and see if what others have proposed have any sense or not and try to come for some common ground. I think this is very much in the spirit of having constituted the working group and we truly value the contributions coming from all parts and the like. Maybe we could proceed in that light, as we move on.

So I'll give the floor to the four -- five -- four who have requested to speak in general, and then, as I have indicated, I will first invite those who made contributions to highlight aspects, and then I will make a proposal in regard to work and to discuss some central elements that were highlighted by the synthesis paper.

So I offer the floor first to Jimson Olufuye. Following, Lea Kaspar, Pakistan, and Mexico. So Jimson, you have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair.

Well, I will just quickly do a brief overview of the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation that we -- I proposed.

Let me first really congratulate us for the success of the first meeting. It was quite a successful outcome that we had these two questions that we had to respond to, and it showed clearly that we are quite focused, and I think if we follow this process, we'll get a reasonable outcome.

Well, we believe that while we're talking about enhanced cooperation at a high level, it must bring peace and harmony in the community, in the Internet community.

We also believe that there should be openness, just as we have transcription, where we have remote participation, so everyone that is willing -- underlined -- should be given the opportunity to be part of it, part of the discussion, and the engagement process.

We also believe that it should be inclusive, it should be multistakeholder in nature. That has helped a great deal my colleagues from developing countries. From Nigeria, we have seen the benefits of the

multistakeholder approach and it's going even down to the subnational level. And it should also be results-oriented. So that is why I support other speakers --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. May I just interrupt you, respectfully, because I think this is what I intend to do just after we hear those who have asked for general comments and then we move to that particular --

Okay. Just for clarity. So with your indulgence, I will then move to Lea Kaspar, but we'll hear your comments and I'd like you to start from the beginning, when I will indicate, and you are already the first -- in line as the first for the next session.

Yes, please.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. And since this is my first intervention as a member of this working group, I'd just like to quickly say that having participated in the last iteration of the group as an observer, I'd like to thank everyone for their contributions, all observers for their contributions, and look forward to their participation in our work going forward.

Just -- that was just a general intro.

I would like to support the approach that was suggested by a number of members here. That is, sequenced, and going first into the first question and looking at the characteristics that were -- that members were asked to -- and others were asked to comment on in our consultation period.

Perhaps just two points that colleagues have mentioned, and in particular, Parminder and Nick Ashton-Hart worried that we might not get far if we go down that route and might end up in the same place where we were in the last working group where we couldn't agree on a definition of enhanced cooperation. However, looking at the contributions and comments on characteristics, there does seem to be a lot of consensus and common ground. And I do think -- and Parminder will be -- I forward to this discussion but there seem to be a number of characteristics that could be mechanism-agnostic. So regardless of the recommendations, specific recommendations that people may have, and the solutions, we might be able to find agreement on a certain number of characteristics that are applicable regardless of the solutions.

So that would -- and maybe just a last point, a question to you, Chair. On the compilation that you mentioned on the characteristics, it would be useful, perhaps, to see that as we start that conversation, maybe a question of when we could expect to see that document? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I think you're addressing the compilation on different recommendations that - or not? Can you clarify?

>>LEA KASPAR: I think you mentioned two things in the beginning of the meeting. One was the -- an Excel spreadsheet. Was that for different characteristics? And if that's it, that's what I meant.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. This is -- I have submitted it to the secretariat. I think it will be made available in the course of the day, and indeed, it relates very much to the discussion we want to have. But Claudia, can --

Well, I beg your indulgence. I just consult with the secretariat.

Yes. I'm sorry, I consulted with the secretariat and -- because we have been doing things in a quick pace and a lot of goodwill, but limited resources, so I have forwarded to the secretariat the document yesterday evening, and in the course of preparation it was not yet made available, but it will be made available on line and we can also have it on screen, because I think the spreadsheet and the accompanying text will help us go through, especially in the areas of where there was major convergence of views in regard to what will be the high-level characteristics.

I think if we can maybe address that part of the discussion -- and I think this will be in line with what was proposed by Japan, U.K., and others -- to focus first maybe on what is more -- has more chance for us to come up with consensus, because I have not seen anyone challenging the notion, for instance, of transparency on human rights. I think maybe we just need to have some discussion to make sure we frame it in the right way as something that should be there in regard to enhanced cooperation before we move to other parts.

So this will be made available both on line and also on screen.

And the document on recommendations which I also mentioned, this will be maybe by the end of the day made available, but I would not see it as something we should be discussing right now.

So thank you. Thank you for your understanding.

I turn to Pakistan and Mexico and then we'll hear those who have made submissions.

Pakistan, you have the floor, sir.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. Thank you, Ambassador, and good morning to everyone. Actually, I was reluctant to take the floor because in the meanwhile, we have spent almost 20% of our time of this meeting.

So I will go only on one procedural point.

As you have suggested that we can, after this, go into one by one delegations who wish to take the floor and explain themselves, I think what we can do is to straight go into the discussion part, exchange of views as has been mentioned in Agenda Item 4, because what we have found is that your synthesis paper is a very good document. We thank you and we thank the secretariat for this valuable work. It's important because of course there are a number of contributions from a number of members and others, and it's really difficult to synthesize them, but you have done a really good job.

It's your document. We, of course, do not own it in a formal way, but I think it's -- it's an important contribution from your side.

I can suggest one thing, that taking this synthesis paper, we can start from one point -- let's say Point A - and then start from there, Point B and C and other areas, and have an exchange of views on those issues which are listed therein, rather than going into explanations.

Because if we do this, we will be essentially doing the same thing. That is, explaining ourselves and reacting to what has been said or given by other members.

We have the contributions, which is the main document, from all the members. We have read them. I think this is a time when we can react to what's -- what has been proposed by others, and of course let others react on what has been proposed by us.

So I think we should now straight go into that exchange of views.

After listening to all the possible views, then you can come up with a suggestion that now we can go into a format in which we can list them in such a way where future work can be established.

But I think now we need to be more structured in order for us to be more productive. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

Personally, I couldn't agree more with you. As I have indicated, I think those submissions were made available and the synthesis document tries to organize a little bit the discussion.

However, I have received requests from a few parties that want to have the opportunity to make a short presentation in highlighting some aspects, and since we agree that the submissions themselves are the authoritative documents that are being -- I'm in a position I could not refrain from giving the opportunity for those who wish to highlight their positions.

Although I agree with you, I think we should make an effort not to lose too much time on this and move to the discussion on the important topics and thank you for your kind words in regard to the work we have done so far.

So the last speaker, let's say on the general framework of discussion before we move to the contributions will be Mexico. Mexico, please, you have the floor.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Good morning to all.

I have taken the floor to join others to highlight the fact that we have to avoid the polarization of the discussion. In Mexico's view, we should try to take from the contributions the common elements and put them together under the umbrella of the two guiding questions we have been working on.

We have seen that there are many common elements to be rescued from the contributions and we should take advantage of this.

Mr. Chair, we appreciate your efforts in preparing the document, the synthesis you have prepared, which as you said has no status. As you have mentioned, the contributions should be the basis and the main document for discussion, but this hybrid approach that has been proposed could work as well, in case people feel that this is the way to go forward.

In any case, we believe that we have to be able to warranty that everyone feels comfortable on the way we are going to work, and we have to give the contributions the value, the unique value, they deserve.

In that sense, a step-by-step approach, as I think the U.K. mentioned, could be the way forward. Maybe being so ambition is not a good way to continue. We should be more -- more cautious.

Let me emphasize that we must focus, at least for this moment -- we think this is the best way to do it -- we must focus on the two guiding questions.

As we said before, there is a lot of food for discussion on the contributions, and we believe that if we do so, we can maybe identify common elements to continue the work on in this group.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Mexico, for your comments. So I suggest now that we move and we have discussion on these topics that were identified in the synthesis document. On the basis I have been hearing that there might be -- maybe we can have an early harvest in regard to those issues that have more convergence in the contributions, that are in this synthesis document also relying and being referenced by the spreadsheet that is on screen. I would suggest maybe our discussions at this point should be focused on the element that refer directly to what was addressed by the first question what are the high-level characteristics, Section D, part 2 of the synthesis enumerates what are those elements, characteristics that emerge more -- in a more constant way in the contributions.

So I would kindly request the secretariat to post that part of the synthesis document. And, of course, we'll also in the course of the discussion refer to the spreadsheet because they are in close relation.

So maybe we can have on the screen Section D of Track 2 that is on page 16. Page 16 and 17, I think those are maybe the elements I would suggest we could further discuss now. For your reference, it's index of topics, principles, and possible characteristics for enhanced cooperation. So I think this is in direct correlation with question 1.

As I had indicated, the first speaker on this will be Mr. Jimson Olufuye. Thank you for your kind patience to wait for that part of the meeting. I give you the floor. I also have on my list Richard Hill and Mexico for the moment.

Jimson, you have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair. I would actually just say -- let me quote the part I spoke about earlier and paste it in this section. Since you give me the opportunity, I will quickly summarize. When it comes to addressing the question number 1, the high-level characteristics,

what are they? We have various examples of where enhanced cooperation has been going on and which we are convinced about. And on that basis, I would like to really allude to some of the points raised in the stated documents concerning what we also submitted, peace, openness, inclusivity, multistakeholderism, and should be results driven. Results driven says there's no point doing anything without accountable output. So we should have that behind our mind when we are looking at what constitutes enhanced cooperation.

I also see in there in terms of high-level characteristics, in terms of human rights, yes, it's very, very important and it's connected to the notion of peace which we identified. And also net neutrality, when it comes to the nature of the Internet itself. So that's underscored the characteristics -- (No audio) --

>>RICHARD HILL: -- contributions and now you seem to have gone away from that. Are you going to do that or not? You will. I have no problems with the order. I just -- there are a few things that I believe are not reflected so I want to come back to them but I'm happy to follow your order. So I will now comment on index, with the understanding that I can then come back and make more general comments.

On the index, it's true that we all agree on these key words: "Human rights, at least "net neutrality" some of us agree, maybe not all; "transparency", for sure, we all agree, et cetera, but you probably all know the English saying that the devil is in the details.

So for example, if we talk about transparency, which I fully support, I would conclude that the WTO, which is notoriously nontransparent, has no business discussing anything about Internet governance, but anybody who has seen the TPP and the leaked version of TIPP knows that there's plenty about Internet governance in there, not to mention TISA, which is full of Internet governance topics, and they are apparently -- because everything is secret -- working on an eCommerce agenda or intend to work on an eCommerce agenda.

So, you know, depending on how you define "transparency," some of the people who proposed that may or may not agree with that particular definition of "transparency."

The same for evidence-based policy making policy. Of course we should all be doing that. But then I would point out that in the area of Internet governance, in particular the cost of Internet exchange, which is a key issue for developing countries, there is no evidence because it's all private sector and so there is no data so nobody knows what's going on. In fact, most Internet peering at high level is done on barter agreements and so they don't even know themselves how much it costs because they don't bother to track it because it's all done on a barter basis.

And on consensus-based, yes. But I think we all agree that consensus does not mean unanimity. If consensus is taken to mean unanimity, then I cannot agree because that means that we never decide anything.

All those countries who have an active net neutrality legislation know perfectly well that you did not get unanimity, you got broad support and then you went ahead and did it. So we have to understand what

is consensus based, which brings us back to a point that is in my contribution that doesn't appear here, which is does everybody have equal rights in decision-making. Or for certain kinds of decisions do governments have a privileged role? And as everybody knows, my position is that for public policy matters governments has a privileged role.

You are completely missing, Chairman, some of the things that I brought up. In fact, in your compilation, the very first paper from me is a paper on what enhanced cooperation is, and it gives three characteristics. Two of which are more or less incorporated. The third one, which is key in my opinion, is totally missing, which is recognition of sovereign equality, political independence, and self-determination of peoples. Now those actually come from the U.N. charter. These are recognized principles of international law. In fact, imperative international law, jus cogens. So surely we can all agree that these are fundamental characteristics of enhanced cooperation. And they should appear there. And, in fact, I even have a formulation, which I will not read, lower down in the paper about that.

So those are my comments on your compilation at this stage, Chairman. And, again, I would like to come back and highlight some specific aspects of some of my contributions. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think this is the second mistake I made this morning. I think I want so much to move to the substantive discussion that I contradicted myself. I said I would give an opportunity for those who made contributions to highlight but then I moved directly to that part. I think this is kind of mindsetting that happened to me, and I apologize.

We have taken on board those who are asking from the floor to speak on that topic. But with your indulgence -- and, again, I take this, Richard, as kind of a point of order you have raised. And I thank you for doing this. I would kindly ask you sometimes to help the Chair in some things that are not totally in line with what has been decided or said.

So I would -- we take on board all those who requested for the floor to speak on this particular topic, what would be the high-level characteristics. And we heard Jimson, Richard Hill. I have Mexico, Parminder. I have Timeo Suto from ICC. Not Mexico. I have Iran, Saudi Arabia, Cuba, Anriette, Russian Federation, and United States, ICANN. But then I would ask those I have mentioned just to put their plates down because with your indulgence, we will follow that list as soon as we move back to the discussion on the high-level characteristics.

But I would in line with what I said offer now the opportunity for those who have made contributions. And maybe some will be the same. I will now be permitted to highlight elements contained in their contributions. And I would beg you to be as brief as possible. Of course, I do not want to refrain you from stating any -- I do not want to refrain anyone from speaking. But please be as brief as possible because I think it might be in our best interest to allow as much time as possible to discuss and to have an exchange on the important elements that are there.

So I give the floor first again to Richard Hill because since the beginning, when he first took the floor, he even stated it would be his intent to do it. So I will offer the floor to Richard Hill. And I will ask for you

to keep your plates raised, only those who have contributed that want to highlight aspects that are -- be from WGEC members or observers. We will take all those on board at this point in time.

Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I will go through these very quickly in the order in which they appear in the big document, the compilation of all of the contributions from the members. So the first one was enhanced cooperation. I mentioned the key point, recognition of sovereign equality, political independence, and self-determination.

The other two points made there, that enhanced cooperation was not meant to give private companies equal rights with respect to states for what regards public policy decisions. And the second point -- [off microphone] -- disagree. The IANA transition process is not a good example of enhanced cooperation. I won't detail any of this. It's all there on pages and pages of text. So as my colleague Aresteh says, perhaps that's counterproductive. Nobody reads it. That's life.

The second point is equal footing is a key element of enhanced cooperation. We all know that. And so with respect to ccTLDs, now that IANA is no longer under the purview of the U.S. government, perhaps there's some steps to be taken. In particular IANA has reached an agreement with the U.S. government that it would not make changes to .US, .GOV, or .MIL without the agreement of U.S. government. So other governments may wish to ask for something similar that is exchange of letters with ICANN regarding their ccTLD.

And, further, the U.S., in effect, has several TLDs because they have .US, .GOV, .MIL, and .EDU. And perhaps other governments could also ask to have additional ones like .CH01 or .CHGOV or whatever.

The third one is about good faith. And I think that good faith is also an essential characteristic of enhanced cooperation as of any negotiations.

And, again, I did not see this in your list, Chairman. I forgot to mention that earlier.

And based on an academic paper, do we actually propose a definition there? Parties negotiate in good faith if they use reasonable negotiating strategies, implemented sincerely with the mutual intent to negotiate an agreement, if that agreement is possible. I won't go through and parse all of that and explain why it makes sense.

And for those who are -- have been involved in these negotiations, you may be very amused by the list of seven recent examples that I give where there was blatant violation of the principle of good faith. I have anonymized these so that I don't name the countries. If anybody wants to know, I do have the written proof. And some of them will recognize some of them. And they come from all walks. It's not targeting developed or developing countries, and it's not targeting large or small countries. Everybody is guilty of this at one time or another.

Then the key paper, Chairman, which perhaps we won't look at now but sometime later is the gaps requiring study. And that was responding to the question of what kinds of recommendations should we

consider. And as you recall, Chairman, there was some discussion in the previous meeting as to what status to give to the previous gaps paper. So I wish to be very clear. The previous gaps paper must be an input to this meeting, not decided by the meeting but I am hereby inputting that old gaps paper into this meeting in my name. So the previous gaps paper is an input to this group, not to this meeting obviously but to this group.

Now, more broadly -- and I hope everybody at least as human beings, if not as representatives of an organization, can follow me here. Some of us have been surprised and some have been shocked by some recent events, political events, such as the Brexit and the election of President Trump.

Now, there's general agreement if you read the press that these results were driven by dissatisfaction with the results of globalization. Whether people are right or not to be satisfied is something else. But people perceive an unequal distribution of the benefits of globalization.

Now, in my view, we've striven too much to increase efficiency and neglected to maintain equity. There are two solutions here. Now we know what both Prime Minister May and President Trump say, let's stop globalizing or at least globalize less and do some more national protection.

The other way to approach it would be to come up with globalized norms that ensure equality. In fact, that was the origin of WTO in the GAC. When it was originally created, it was to try to come up with trade rules that would benefit everybody.

Now, the issue arises in Internet governance because Internet, as we know, is global, or at least it's supposed to be global or we wish it were global. And here we have an opportunity to face square on these issues of what concerns Internet governance. We're not going to solve the globalization problem in general. But we can at least give a path to address the globalization issues for the Internet.

So we have a choice here. Do we do nothing as some people have advocated more or less subtly and watch as the Internet becomes less global, which is what's going to happen? Or should we work towards international norms that will allow the Internet to remain global? Then should the norms be binding, not binding, et cetera, that's a separate issue. I hope we can agree that there are areas -- and that's what's in the gaps paper -- which definitely need additional work.

And make no mistake about it. It is an Internet issue. According to Oxfam, eight men, not people, men, there are no women, own as much wealth as the poorest 50% of the world's population. Now, of those eight, four are in the ICT industry. Bill Gates. You all know about him. Carlos Slim, Mexican mobile phone. Bezos, which is Amazon. Zuckerberg, which is also fiber and ICT, Zuckerberg, which is, I think you all know, Facebook. And Ellison and Oracle and now also Java because they bought Java. So it is an ICT issue, and it is an Internet issue.

And the purpose of the gaps paper is to outline very specific steps for how to address very real issues. And I'll only mention one here because I don't want to take up so much time, which is the well-known issue of IoT security where we all agree something has to be done. We may not agree what has to be done. And if you read my paper, you will see that I'm not proposing a solution. I'm proposing a meta

mechanism. I'm saying not necessarily "we" but somebody should tell the responsibility entities, which in that case obviously includes IETF, ITU, as well as others, to start thinking about it and propose something.

And I think that really we do a disservice to the entire world if we do not step up to our responsibilities and address square on these issues. We may not agree on all the gaps. We may not agree on all the recommendations. But surely we must agree that something must be done.

And now I will move on to the next paper. Sorry. That one is quite long. It will take me a while to scroll through it because I give extensive references.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just interrupt you, Richard? I will not stop you from making your presentation, of course. I just would like to recall that all the recommendations you have made, you and others, will be in a compilation document with no analysis, no -- just for the consideration of the working group. This is intended to be taken up in a later stage. So maybe you just can take that in perspective, that there will be a moment in which we will look into those actual recommendations coming from you and others in a different moment of the meeting. But please go ahead.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you very much for that reassurance, Chairman, because I was not sure that that would be the case, so I take that as a given and I very much appreciate that.

So the next paper was jurisdiction and equal footing with respect to Internet domain names and addresses and that comes out of an issue that was raised by the fact that ICANN, now that it's completely disenfranchised or independent of the U.S. government, is subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts, and so there are various ways to get around that.

And the specific recommendation made here is that the United States could consider making an agreement with other states to the effect that it would not exercise its jurisdiction over ICANN in ways that would violate the principles of equal footing and the roles and responsibilities of governments.

So I will not go into that in any detail. As you say, Chairman, we may or may not come back to that.

Then we have the next paper is protection of country names. This is an issue that's been brought up in various forums, including in ICANN, over many years, and actually I went back to the record and it turns out that in 2003 WIPO produced a recommendation which was agreed by all of the member states of WIPO, with the exception of Australia, Canada, and the United States -- and Japan also expressed certain reservations, and they recommended certain things about the protection of country names -- that was not implemented, understandably, when ICANN was under the tutelage of the United States.

Now that ICANN is independent, they could reconsider the matter, or what I'm suggesting is that perhaps the U.S. could reconsider the matter. After all, there's a new administration now. Maybe they have a different view of the world.

We know they have a different view of the world.

And so maybe they would agree to implement in U.S. law the WIPO recommendations on the protection of country names.

And Paper Number 7 is on revisiting roles and responsibilities, and I'm suggesting -- many people have pointed out that the Tunis Agenda is old and the roles and responsibilities have progressed and we should understand them in a more flexible manner, as pointed out in Brazil, and so I'm suggesting some specific changes to the roles and responsibilities.

We could, of course, not do that but we could propose a recommendation to CSTD who would propose a recommendation to the U.N. General Assembly and whatever. I'm not proposing to go into this in detail. Just the principle.

And then just one final word on the ICANN jurisdiction issue. It's come to my attention recently that the unilateral U.S. sanctions on certain countries sometimes create issues. I'm talking about the need for OFAC licenses. And so ICANN may wish to consider some steps to ameliorate that situation. Again, it's under U.S. law, it has to follow U.S. law, but within U.S. law they could do some things. I haven't published that yet, but as we come to that, I will have specific possible other recommendations when we get to the ICANN issue.

Then, Chairman, something else. There are three papers from observers, and I'm not sure whether we're giving them equal weight or not. If we're not, then I would like to make sure that we do give equal weight to the truly excellent paper from Bill Graham, which I fully endorse and which, in fact, in my view is making a similar point to the key points that I made before, and I will just, if you'll allow me, Chairman, take the liberty to read that because -- just one sentence because I think it's extremely important.

Which is that we, the working group -- this is -- I'm quoting what Bill says. "The working group can achieve the greatest benefit by turning its attention to finding concrete mechanisms to bring all stakeholders together in productive work to anticipate what public policy challenges are likely to arise in the field of Internet governance."

And then he details them and some of them are similar to the ones I've outlined. Others are different.

Then there's a contribution from the Center for Internet and Society which highlights the need for regulation of what are de facto or monopolies or natural monopolies. They're proposing industry self-regulation. I disagree. Nevertheless, I think their paper is excellent. So I would like that to have the same status in my name as -- as the papers from the members.

And then there's a paper from DENIC, the German ccTLD registry. Part 1 I like very much and I'd like it to have equal weight with other papers. Not the rest, but that's okay, we can bring the whole paper in and discuss it as equal weight, if the others -- if the intent was not to give equal weight to the observers. If the intent is everybody's equal weight, then there's no problem at all.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard, for your almost short presentation. I would comment that from the perspective of the synthesis document, all the contributions I assessed on an equal basis because I was looking to the ideas that are contained there, so either if they come from members or observers, I thought it would be appropriate to reflect them on a par level.

So in regard to the compilations, I think because of some issues that were raised in the discussion list that we should separate, it was done so, but it's not an intent to attribute second-class status to those observers.

And again, many of the issues, or wishfully all the issues, you have raised in regard to recommendations will be contained in the compilation and there will be an opportunity to look into it. It will be up to the group to decide whether any recommendation, according to the group, belongs to the discussion, is within the scope of the -- I think this is a discussion that will take place at some point in time.

I'll just recall that we are planning to have at least two more meetings this year.

So I understand there to be some concern that we cannot get to some discussion, but we intend to plan the meetings to allow for all those ideas that were submitted to be discussed and, if possible, agreed by the group.

Otherwise, we'll document those to the extent they belong to the discussion.

So thank you.

I will turn now to other contributors who also wished to highlight aspects that are contained therein, and on my list I have first Timea Suto from ICC/BASIS, then Saudi Arabia, and Russian Federation and a few others I will spell out as we go along.

So I give the floor to Timea.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Good morning, everyone. Before I go forward, I just want to let you know that my flag went up hoping that we are entering the phase where we share our highlights of our contributions, so I would -- respectfully would like to ask you to remove me from the list of those wanting to comment on Part 2, Item D.

So moving on, I'd like to first say that I'm here, as one of the five business members of the group representing the International Chamber of Commerce and its Business Action to Support Information Society initiative, or shortly "BASIS." And as many of you fellow members, we submitted our contribution in advance of this meeting, and I was very happy to see that many observers have done so as well.

The level of engagement from both members and observers shows that our approach to do homework between meetings and to open up our discussion to the community was the right approach, and I hope we will be able to continue in this spirit going forward.

I do not wish to go into very many details regarding our contribution as it is available for all of you to read. I would just like to highlight a few main points.

Regarding the attributes, we identified those we think best describe the methods -- this method of collaboration we call enhanced cooperation. We noted a list of seven characteristics. Namely, and without any particular order, that enhanced cooperation is: Participatory and inclusive; responsive; flexible; respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms; effective and sustainable; evidence-based; and last, but not least, transparent.

Regarding what kind of recommendations we should consider, we focused on the nature of the recommendations we are to make here, building our response on the clues given in the Tunis Agenda and the premises expressed in the description of the attributes.

So provided that enhanced cooperation is a process with the characteristics I just mentioned, we are of the view that any recommendations we make are to be general in nature and mindful of how different stakeholders in different parts of the world facing different issues have implemented and will need to continue to implement enhanced cooperation based on commitments to openness, inclusivity, and outreach so that they encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in discussions that are critical to the responsible development of the Internet.

And a third kind of these recommendations would be that they should be responsive to innovation in order to be future-proof, developed with a mind-set cognizant of the pace at which technology evolves and changes by the minute.

And the third thing I'd like to highlight from our contribution is that we consider the context of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development and the 17 goals as an important consideration for the work of the working group on enhanced cooperation. We should strive with every recommendation we make to consider the benefit of our work as it contributes to a collective effort to advance the global goals. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will now turn to Saudi Arabia and then Russian Federation.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, our response to the first question was the rights from the mandate of UNGA, which is implementing enhanced cooperation as emphasized by the Tunis Agenda.

So looking to Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 69, it is very clear that enhanced cooperation is to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues, and we see this is missing on the document on the screen, and (indiscernible) possible characteristic of enhanced cooperation. This is one of the main and essential characteristics of enhanced cooperation based on Tunis Agenda.

Another characteristic is to enable governments to develop policies that will ensure the stability, security, continuity of the Internet within a framework that will ensure the equal participation between governments. This is -- also was highlighted in our Question 2 about the recommendation what we -- what could be, I mean, discussed and seen by the working group that there is no, until now, framework or mechanisms that will enable our government.

We should seek the establishment of this framework under the suitable agencies or U.N. agency and U.N umbrella.

This is, in short, to highlight our response regarding Question 1 and 2. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I'll turn to the Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. First of all, I will say a few words about the sequence of the -- of our discussion.

We think that, you know, if we have synthesis document and -- we think that it's much more logical to start from the very beginning of this, and we do not understand why we skipped the definition part and come to the very specifics, because we think that -- and we spent a lot of time on this -- that we need to follow the mandate of our group, working group, and it means that we need to structure our discussion in a way that we start from the main point related to the mandate of -- and the main question of the mandate of the working group, and then only come to the secondary issues and questions.

And -- because otherwise, we come to the -- how to say -- broad discussion.

Like Richard said, that one of the characteristics of the enhanced cooperation is equal footing and we completely agree with that, but between whom? If we start from the creation "between whom," then it will be much easier to answer on equal footing. So we insist that we start from the definition part of the document, from the very beginning of the document, and will go from main topics to the secondary topics.

Otherwise, we have a risk to throw out the child with the water.

And when it comes to Russian contribution, we will not speak a lot about the details of the contribution because it's available and everyone can read it. However, we need to focus some things.

First of all, as I said, between whom?

As we see it, in the Tunis Agenda it clearly says between governments, and so it should be considered, from our point of view, as just a logical step from the Tunis Agenda.

On the other hand, we reaffirm that other stakeholders should have the participation in the process, and in this case, we need to discuss how it should be -- they should be involved in this process, how the consultation with other stakeholders should be organized, and probably we need to speak about two levels of the enhanced cooperation.

First between governments; and another between other stakeholders.

And now the important point we would like to stress is the scope of the enhanced cooperation, because as Richard also said, that IANA function is out of the scope. We agree with that. Because how it's written in the Tunis Agenda, the scope of enhanced cooperation is international public policy issues related to Internet. It's not about day-to-day activities. And IANA function is a brilliant example of day-to-day operational activities and do not have direct impact to the international public policy issue. It's just the organization who makes the maintenance of the database according to the policies that were worked out outside the IANA function.

So coming to the scope, we think to -- it's important to consider that this is an international public policy issue and we need to consider that this issue is very broad. So it's not limited by the technical function at all. Of course it's important things like access of Internet, technology for access for Internet, DNS system, and, you know, all this standardizations stuff and public policy related to the technical aspect of the Internet, but it's much more broader.

We would like with the group to discuss this scope, because we have also some documents like mapping exercises. They propose their own levels of -- and of course human rights is a part of this and cybersecurity is a part of this.

What we proposed in our contribution, as was proposed by one of ICANN's reports, three levels: Technical, content level, and social economic development level.

So we need to consider the broad levels of the international policy issue. Without this, we -- without this very important discussion, we cannot move forward on the question how to implement enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia. I think you have raised an important -- and this is not the first time you are raising it so I would like to address it.

My proposal to start with Section D of Track 2 was not to deviate from discussing those elements that, as per Paragraph 69 through 71, define what is enhanced cooperation, and I think indeed the synthesis document, its first part in a way elaborates on those elements that define enhanced cooperation and they refer to -- they relate exactly to the language: Enable governments, equal footing, the multistakeholder dimension, nonbinding.

So all those issues will -- are there and they are going to be considered by us as we discuss the issues raised by the synthesis document. So in a way, it's kind of a way -- I don't know how to say -- exegesis of the document, and one which I think is very important from the perspective it provides some more clarity on the definitions of what -- from their perspective, those are the high-level characteristics because those are the defining aspects of enhanced cooperation as per Paragraphs 69 to 71.

What I propose we start was, as I said, by Section D because those are more than those -- more than a definition. I think those are, let's say, principles that should guide enhanced cooperation. And I proposed this because -- not as a way to avoid discussion on the other part because we'll have to discuss

it, but trying to maybe have some early harvest on notions that can be agreed more easily. For example, that enhanced cooperation should be inclusive, transparent, open. I think this is maybe -- that's why I propose to reverse the order in which we approach the document because I thought that might be an easier part, one that would, on the basis of that common understanding, lead us to a better basis for discussion of those elements that may give rise to some more controversy.

And I think this is very much what we discussed last time as -- and I recall that exactly the intention to establish two questions, the first, high-level characteristics, and then was try to come to some more general agreement or consensus on what would be the principles and let's say overarching things that should guide us and then move to something more specific.

But again, I am in your hands, of course, to decide on the order we take the issues.

In a way, again, I think I tried surreptitiously to move into some direction that I think may give us some, let's say, more early harvest and some more -- but I think it is clear it is up to the group to decide. I'd like maybe when others comment on these or -- we are, of course, now focusing on the contributions and asking those who have to highlight, but if anyone also wishes to comment on the order we should proceed, I think that might help us when we move to the other second part of our meeting in that part.

So with this, I turn to Anriette. You have the floor.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think I'll start by commenting on that last question. I actually think it's useful to start with characteristics. I think I agree with those speakers who said a phased approach can be a helpful approach. I don't think that -- that could also lead us into areas of disagreement, but I think it could lead us towards outputs and that would be helpful.

As much as I would like to comment on Richard Hill's improvement of the Tunis Agenda, which I think is fantastic but 11 years too late, I'll go straight to D6, Section D on the characteristics and topics. First to comment --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry. This we'll do after we hear the highlights.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: General comments then. Just with regard to -- actually no, I won't. I would not submit our submission because I think that could actually just take too long. I'll wait until we get back to that section, Benedicto.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Anriette. You certainly have the opportunity to do it as you wish after that.

So next on my list is Cuba and then Pakistan and United Kingdom.

Cuba, you have the floor. I'm sorry, do you prefer to have someone else? Yes, so I turn to Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador. I just want to touch on one very important issue because in our first meeting, we had agreed that we will be -- in question 2, that we will have to give recommendations

as per Tunis Agenda, paragraph 69 to 71. I think we should focus on that because we have been tasked by the General Assembly to give recommendations.

We can come up with different kinds of recommendations, but at the end of the day, what we need to have is a set of policy ideas and recommendations that could be practical, pragmatic for us to realize what has already been mentioned in Tunis Agenda.

Now, if we look at para 69 of Tunis Agenda, I think we need not go into the details of what constitutes enhanced cooperation and what defines it, what are the elements and things like this.

It's very much clear that, first of all, we need to have governments on equal footing. Institutional mechanism need to be strengthened and improved. This is one of the main points that has already been mentioned in Tunis Agenda. I think if we redefine it and try to come up with something else, it will only worsen the situation.

Now, after this, I can react to some of the elements that have been mentioned in your synthesis paper, which I really think is very good effort on your part. And I believe that we can work on the basis of it -- its orders so we can have a structure, as I said earlier on.

As you mentioned, there have been some inputs by -- some contributions which said that --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Pakistan, I am sorry. I'm very sorry to interrupt. But very respectfully, now we just want to hear from those who made submissions, highlights coming from their submissions. And you are free to do this in regard to your submission, what are the points you want to highlight. And, also, I have invited any comments, if you wish, on the order we should after that take in regard to the synthesis paper, as we should start with the list of principles, let's say, like this or we should start from the beginning of the document, if you may wish.

But, first and foremost, if you maybe would like to highlight things coming from your contribution. In regard to the points you are making that are very valid, we will come up to this in a latter stage of the meeting.

>>PAKISTAN: Okay. We'll go back to reacting to other's proposal later on as we suggested. I will now only point out one thing that has been mentioned in your synthesis paper but with reference to our input. I think our input is very clear, and the main gist of our contribution is on what I have already mentioned. That is on strengthening institutional mechanism and bringing governments on equal footing as far as Internet governance is concerned.

So the point is with reference to A, as mentioned in page 7, to enable governments, that is in deference to Tunis Agenda 69. It has been said that only two contributions, Pakistan and RIPE were not accounted for this inclusion.

So I just want to clarify one thing because our contribution was in bulleted form. We didn't try to have a very long paragraph. We only mentioned in few different bullets so that it can be very concise.

So I think our idea in referencing that point that is to enable governments as far as in the direction of what has been mentioned by many other colleagues that is mentioned by Parminder, I think Saudi Arabia and others, it has been mentioned in only bulleted form, not long paragraph. So I just want to clarify that our idea was very similar to what has been said by others, similar contributions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this is well taken note of. Thank you for this.

Next on my list is the United Kingdom. Please, you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I will just make some very brief remarks about our submission regarding the characteristics of enhanced cooperation. And in our contribution, we say that if we can find agreement on these characteristics at a high level, it could allow us to make progress in identifying shared objectives and then finding agreement on recommendations.

And we would agree with the comments by Pakistan, yes. The outcome that we are moving towards is a set of recommendations in line with the Tunis Agenda. But we think if we can agree on characteristics, it would allow us to build greater common understanding, increase confidence in our work, and be a guide to us when we start to look at those recommendations in detail. It would be a good step, and I think as you said, Chair, an early harvest for us.

So in our contribution, we proposed seven characteristics. I will not read them all now. We were pleased to see that many of the characteristics we suggested were also suggested in other responses. We think this could be a good basis of consensus to move forward. Some kind of exercise to agree on a set of shared characteristics could be very useful in taking us forward to make agreed recommendations.

We have some concerns about the document on the screen, particularly because that document highlights characteristics that were only mentioned by one or two responses. Whereas, we think the spreadsheet that you have emailed around -- or the secretariat has emailed around -- seems to try to include all responses. And perhaps it might be helpful if we all have some time over lunch to have a look at that spreadsheet and have a look at that document as it's a new document. We would just like to look in a bit more detail to that.

If it's perhaps more inclusive, that could be something we could come back to in the afternoon and use as a way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this is, indeed, a valid point.

I will give the floor now to Mr. Wolfgang Kleinwachter from the University of Aarhus.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Chairman. In my paper, I propose a layered approach. I would differentiate between enhanced cooperation within the stakeholder groups and enhanced cooperation among the stakeholder groups.

Starting with the first layer, you know, we cannot erase away history. I was involved on the Working Group on Internet Governance which prepared the Tunis discussion. And the paragraph 69 was an agreement on a disagreement because governments could not agree on oversight of ICANN. It was very simple that the U.S. government had a special role and governments did not accept this, so they introduced the language of equal footing. And with the completed IANA transition, I think this has changed now. So we are now in a different environment.

And now in the GAC, all governments are on equal footing. In the United Nations, all governments are on equal footing. So it means in the cooperation among governments, I think this equal footing issue is more or less solved. There are some issues which are still on the table. Richard has mentioned it. Jurisdiction is an issue..

CcTLDs I think is not such a big issue because we have paragraph 63 of the Tunis Agenda which more or less has made clear that the sovereignty over the national domain space is in the hands of the national governments. So it is in my eyes not such a big issue that all issues can be settled around ccTLDs.

So what we -- what I see in the way forward is that we should look into the enhancement of cooperation not only among governments but also enhancement of cooperation within the other non-governmental stakeholder groups. A lot has to be done to enhance cooperation among civil society organizations, also to strengthen the legitimacy of the civil society groups so that they can have their voice in the multistakeholder discussions. So there is a space for enhancement of cooperation among the private sector members, and certainly a space for an enhancement of cooperation among the technical community.

And moving to the second layer, I think the multistakeholder model is accepted now worldwide. Even the G20 has agreed in Hangzhou that the multistakeholder model is the best way forward to enhance cooperation in Internet governance.

But we do not have procedures, how to cooperate among governmental and non-governmental stakeholders in the multistakeholder model. So I think this could be a way forward to think about, you know, how to enhance or how to define procedures for cooperation among governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

And here I think the best way is to use the Internet Governance Forum as the platform to discuss this, to introduce new mechanism. Would probably create problems which cannot be settled in the next five or ten years. But we have the IGF. This is an existing body. And if this discussion could be transferred to the IGF, this would save probably time and money. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think your points are noted, and they are very much in line with your contribution. I'd like to -- just to recall that we are working in the context of -- we are mandated to the work in the context of paragraph 69. That is very clear to correlate enhanced cooperation, to say that its intent is to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policies, blah, blah, blah, which is -- so I think the point you raise about the need to

think about enhanced cooperation among stakeholders is a valid one to the point that they will help in achieving that objective spelled out in paragraph 69.

Otherwise, I would say it does not belong to the scope of this group to maybe invest -- I think we can propose recommendations to enhanced cooperation among private sector, civil society to the extent this will impact positively on the major objectives we have at hand. Because there are many enhanced cooperation initiatives within those stakeholders do not belong, and I think that would be out of scope.

I think your points are very well-made, but I would -- I have heard from others that, one, ICANN does not belong to this discussion or that IGF would be a separate thing that might assist in enhancing but does not mix -- is not the same.

I think 59 also is what the General Assembly has been repeatedly assessing every year, that IGF and enhanced cooperation should be pursued through two distinct processes, although mutually reinforcing. So I think those points are well-taken, but maybe they should also be seen from the perspective of the mandate we have and the comments coming from other parts.

We are quickly moving to the time for this morning's session, but I think we might have time to hear all the other proponents. I would suggest we take on board and we listen to these before we break for lunch to make sure that we can start in the afternoon on a more, let's say, interactive mood.

So I would turn to -- I have on my list Parminder Singh. I understand Richard Hill wants to take the floor again. Japan, Iran, United States, India, Cuba. I would just like to -- Cuba, when you are ready, just flag to me so I give you the floor.

So maybe the others will not have time to finish in the morning, but let's make a try. So I will give the floor first to Parminder. Please, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: In my description of what other high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation, I stuck to the Tunis Agenda language. I separated elements of 69 which clearly says that it is to enable governments on equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in terms of it should be international public policy issues. Public policy is important. International is important. It's not about national issues. And also -- but those which do not pertain to the day-to-day technical operational matters. So ICANN is separate but such matters as do not impact on Internet public policy issues.

I think it was a very well-drafted paragraph. And it has all the elements which should describe what enhanced cooperation is.

Now, either we can agree that we need this kind of thing or we can agree, because views do evolve, that we do not and things have changed. I don't think we should go out of what has been defined as enhanced cooperation.

And I would actually also want to draw your attention to the paragraph, which is 61 which is the one -- para which actually prefaces as is typical in international documents. You first create the context of something and then in a later part of the document respond to that context.

And the context in 61 is very clear. We are convinced -- so all governments agree they are convinced that there is a need to initiate and reinforce, not "or," and reinforce as appropriate a transparent, democratic, and multilateral -- "multilateral" is clear -- process with the participation of governments but also private sector, civil society, and international organizations in their respective roles. We know of many multilateral processes which are among the governments which have stakeholder participation. There's CSTD process, and there are many other processes.

So it does not leave much room for interpretation of what is being asked for. It also says this process could (indiscernible). And here it is a good creation of a suitable framework or mechanism where justified, thus para in the ongoing and active evolution of current arrangements. So this talks about a suitable framework or mechanism.

I think this is what it is. People may have a view that it's not required or they may have a view it's required.

Going outside the boundaries of what has been described, to characterize any situation where people get together as enhanced cooperation is really unfortunate because it takes away from the task of what we need to do.

I do distinctly remember that in the early years post-WSIS, the clarity of enhanced cooperation being intergovernmental platform was very clear. And the people who do not like it were against it.

In 2008 -- and I should have to quote this part of the history -- it was my organization which wanted to get enhanced cooperation discussed in the Internet Governance Forum.

The MAG said it's on record that enhanced cooperation is about governments, is a different thing. It should not even be discussed in Internet Governance Forum. We were disallowed from having a workshop on that subject. Fortunately Brazil made a position that was there that, no, it should be discussed and we got a main session on enhanced cooperation. The point was it was very clear the people and all members of MAG are the ones whose organizations are represented here and countries are represented here were of the view that enhanced cooperation is about governments. And, therefore, it should be kept out.

So there was no confusion. But people were for and against, and that could still be. But let's not confuse the meaning of enhanced cooperation which 61 and 69 clearly give.

Now going to the second question which I again will just touch upon -- just a minute, please. Thanks.

So we are trying to figure out -- there are three parts to be looked at here.

First question is that are there public policy issues of the international kind which -- which we need to sort out? And it's very clear, even if we see a newspaper today we pick up, that there are so many public policy issues around the Internet which are of great importance and which need resolution and I think I won't go into it because I have listed a lot of issues starting from social media to artificial intelligence and so on.

And the second issue, of course, is if there are international public policy issues, whether governments are being able to play their role on an equal footing on this matter of international public issues.

And here we know that there is no forum where all governments on an equal footing are able to address Internet-related policy issues, and, however, absence of a democratic global public policy forum does not mean that these issues are not being sorted out.

In this relation, I always mention OECD's Committee on Digital Economy -- Committee on Digital Economy Policies, which precisely is a committed mechanism dealing with Internet-related public policy issues.

Just a few years back, it changed its name from Computer, Communication, and Information Policies to Digital Economy Policies. Therefore, it is very clear that OECD countries think that there are a huge number of digital economy issues or digital issues and they have a committed mechanism to deal with that.

So it's very difficult to figure out why when you are at -- we are at the U.N. those public policy issues do not look pertinent, because this committee has a very loaded calendar which deals with a host of public policy issues. I have a list of them here but I wouldn't read them out. But every year, they have about 10 or 15 new issues which are being dealt with. So that should prove that there are a huge number of public policy issues.

And now since all governments on equal footing are not able to deal with these issues, the suggestion and my recommendation -- my input has been to create a new institutional mechanism of which I give the model of the OECD Committee on Digital Economy Policy as a good model because it has an intergovernmental -- it is an intergovernmental committee but has a very good method of stakeholder advisory committees attached to it and that could -- kind of model should also be used at the U.N., because they are the same set of public policy issues which have to be dealt with. It can be dealt with with the same structure as OECD does. And very surprisingly, however, OECD considers its Committee on Digital Economy Policies as a multistakeholder mechanism. ISOC also considers this committee as a multistakeholder mechanism. Now, this committee --

I do not know, therefore, what's the meaning of a multistakeholder mechanism because this committee is an intergovernmental committee. It has advisory committees which are stakeholder committees. Now, if this is considered by people as a multistakeholder process, that's very, very fine, and that's why I keep on insisting that we need to actually put on our finger to what does the particular concept mean in terms of institutional mechanisms.

India had, a few years back, proposed a committee in the U.N. with exactly the same structure and mandate as the OECD committee, but that committee was called as intergovernmental in an attempt to have governments take over the Internet, so the same structure I do not understand how one committee in OECD can be called as multistakeholder and in the U.N. it gets called as intergovernmental.

So I think we need, therefore, to get outside these concepts and talk about what does that concept mean in terms of precise institutional mechanisms.

To end my input, I therefore suggest that a similar kind of committee or other body inside the U.N. dealing with the same kind of issues as the OECD's CDEP deals with, would be the proper way for this working group to give its recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I -- well, I -- you -- you made some -- gave us some additional information, but I saw that you were relating to your submission. I didn't interrupt you and I thank you for this.

Just want to recall that when we discuss at any given moment the working group will decide the recommendations or the basis of the compilation, that your suggestions will be there alongside others. There will be an opportunity for this in another moment of this meeting.

Well, I have on my list a few other speakers. Richard Hill, Japan, Iran, Anriette I understand wish to speak again, Nigel Hickson.

Parminder is asking for the floor again --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. It's a follow-up? Yes, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: The points which I made during my input, this particular institutional mechanism is also detailed in the input. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no. Absolutely. Absolutely. That's what I meant. It will be also in the compilation.

So I -- I -- just one minute, please.

Yes. I am told by the secretariat that we -- it would be preferable to break now for lunch and come back at 3:00 sharp so we make sure we don't lose any of the technical support for this meeting.

So when we resume -- and I repeat -- we'll still hear from those who made contributions.

I have Richard Hill. I think he'll amend some comments he has made. But we'll also have Japan, Iran, ICANN, India, Anriette --

Do you want to speak? Yes, please. You have the floor. Maybe just for a clarification. And the U.S.

>>RICHARD HILL: Chairman, it was actually a procedural intervention.

I very much support the comment made by the U.K. that we'd do better to focus on the two new documents that you've sent, rather than the previous ones, so instead of discussing in what order should we take things, et cetera, I would even go past the Excel and I would propose that we focus on the Word version of the summary, and I think that indeed we can all reach very quickly agreement on a lot of things there.

So it was a process intervention. I apologize for insisting.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Oh, thank you. Thank you for this. So with this, I'd like to thank you and wish you a good lunch and we'll be back at 3:00 p.m.

Are there any announcements on the part of the secretariat? No? No.

So thank you. See you at 3:00. Thank you.

[Lunch break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good afternoon, colleagues. I'll ask you -- invite you to take your seats. We'll be starting in two minutes.

I invite you to resume our discussions. As you may recall, at the end of this morning's session we still had to hear from some contributors who made submissions or made contributions to this meeting, so I will offer them the opportunity to speak.

I would just like to -- before doing that, to -- for the record to call your attention to two documents that you have received. I think those have been emailed to all those listed in the WGEC discussion. Both members and observers.

The first document is a revised version of the spreadsheet, and here I should apologize to Canada because the contributions from Canada were omitted from the first version but it is now duly taken to -- taken on board.

So you have, please, to disregard the first document you have received on the spreadsheets. Of course the language that is accompanying the document remains, but the original version is replaced by this one.

The second document is, as I told you at the beginning of the meeting, a compilation of the recommendations contained in the actual submissions to this meeting.

As we have agreed, those are the authoritative documents for meeting, the submissions, the 37 submissions that were received, so this compilation document is just an attempt and a contribution on -- I take personal responsibility for it and for any omissions or misrepresentations, just also for your consideration regarding those recommendations.

You will see that I tried to separate the recommendations into different categories addressing -- for example, recommendations addressed to existing international organizations, foreign processes, so some of those recommendations are addressed to ICANN or IGF, ITU, so they would be all of recommendations under -- for that category under one -- in one section.

I will not elaborate again but for -- another set of recommendations address national governments, another set of recommendations concerning the creation of new institutional frameworks, be it bodies or agreements, and so on and so forth.

So this is a document for your consideration. I -- this document will not be discussed today, since it has been distributed a few minutes ago, but I'd like to ensure all those who made recommendations that in the course of the organization of our work, at some point this will, of course, be considered.

We -- I think this would be in line with what was decided by the group at its September meeting, and I think that follows in a logical way the order of the questions we have addressed to the community.

So what are the high-level characteristics?

I would argue that the synthesis document tries to address this in a more precise way.

In the course of this morning's discussion, it was clear that for some participants, high-level characteristics refer directly to the terms and expressions that are contained in Paragraph 69 to 71, so the high-level characteristics we should be aiming at are those that are already spelled out. I think that point was made by Russia and others. So we should be looking here at what we mean by -- by the participation of government, (indiscernible) enable governments, equal footing, and so on. So this is addressed in the synthesis document, in the first part of the synthesis document, while others would have looked for others -- at this part of the question -- at that question as meaning some high-level characteristic of a more principled nature. So maybe instead of characteristics we should even mention principles that should guide enhanced cooperation, and this is addressed in Part 2 of the synthesis document.

So at some point after we finish the discussion -- the presentations on submissions, I look for your guidance whether we should initiate our work immediately after that on the basis of the further examination of expressions contained in Paragraphs 69 to 71 or in the principle part.

My proposal, as you recall, was to maybe initiate by the principles part because that would possibly enable us to have some early harvest and come to agreement in a more easy way.

We should also be guided and be -- an additional tool for that would be the spreadsheet that has been distributed because in the spreadsheet you can see all the contributions from all parties in regard to all characteristics that were identified, so that might be of assistance for us.

So with this, again, I will now turn to those who had asked for the opportunity to further elaborate on their submissions and highlighting elements that are there.

I have on my list USA, Japan, Iran, Mexico, ICANN -- Nigel Hickson from ICANN -- and Canada.

So in that order, I --

Is that a point of order or -- yes, yes. Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. Just a point of clarification.

Did you say that you sent a new document? I have received the new version of the spreadsheet and the Word version. Did you also say you'd sent another third document with recommendations, or that's something -- that's coming later?

Okay. Very clear. Fine. It was sent. Okay.

So I did -- I did not get the third document with the recommendations. Maybe it will come, maybe not. We've had some problems with the mailing list.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Maybe this can be checked with the secretariat because I understand -- and I stand to be corrected -- that members have received, but we can check in your case.

We'll work around that.

So I'll give then the floor to the USA. You have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and just to note, I and a few of my colleagues here also did not get the -- that last contribution, so -- but I know others did, so there must be something on the mailing list.

Concerning the U.S. contribution, first I just wanted to highlight our conceptual framework which we listed in the document. It was kind of before -- in the preambular part, and it's the only sentence I'll quote from our -- from our contribution, but we noted we believe that the goal of enhanced cooperation is to continually strengthen and improve existing institutions and processes that are discussing Internet public policy issues so the Internet remains an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable platform where everyone can create access, utilize and share information and knowledge, to achieve their full potential, exercise human rights and fundamental freedoms, promote sustainable development, and improve quality of life.

As such, our contribution provided a list of high-level characteristics that we believe supports these goals, we believe are relevant, broadly accepted, and reflective of a growing consensus inside and outside the United Nations system on matters of independent public policy.

As noted earlier, we also provided our views on the appropriate scope of this working group, but we did not provide recommendations for how to make further progress on the process of enhanced cooperation because we felt -- we believed that was the next step.

So we welcome the opportunity to discuss this or any other contributions this week.

On the other question about, you know, how we proceed, I believe you -- this morning you offered a very good approach, Chair, to early harvest some of the high-level characteristics that have broad support, and I agree, I believe it was with the U.K. colleague and perhaps Mr. Hill earlier, that the spreadsheet that was circulated I think offers many advantages, that it shows where there is likely already broad consensus on achieving some of those.

So perhaps as a next step, that could be a good place to start -- and it sounds like that might be the direction we're going -- to really focus on those characteristics and elaborate on them and perhaps later that helps us organize ourselves when it comes to a recommendation in other matters. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments and suggestions. I will now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. In my contribution, we suggested to start the consideration on the enhanced cooperation it is quite important to note the open, distributed, and interconnected nature of the Internet, and we need to promote such nature of the Internet with the engagement of multistakeholders.

Enhanced cooperation is, after all, how to improve the way to address international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, and to do that, instead of setting up an entirely new institutional arrangement, we support the approach to continually strengthen and improve existing institutions and processes that are discussing Internet public policy issues.

As a goal of enhanced cooperation, transparency, fair process, and accountability should be ensured, and promoting the engagement of developing countries are quite important issues that everyone can agree on.

But we also think enhanced cooperation is not just about developing countries but also about promotion of the engagement from all stakeholders.

And as for the way forward, as you suggested, we also support this to first -- to see in what characteristic we can agree on and then start thinking about how to make -- how some of the recommendations can be under this topic, under the characteristics that we -- what we already agree on, that we can make agreement on.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. I'll give the floor to Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. Mr. Chairman, as you pointed out, the contributions of the working group members are available on the document. Just remark -- just highlight some points referred to question 1.

First point, it is highly expected that the working group would contribute pursuing the implementation of the mandate and the common understanding about enhanced cooperation which could be acquired through relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda. In this regard, paragraph 68 and 69 of Tunis Agenda provides a division of functions among different stakeholders. It clearly articulates that policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of the states. They have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues. Para 68 of the Tunis Agenda further clarifies this right, role, and responsibility. Based on that paragraph, our governments should have an equal role and responsibility for international Internet governance and for ensuring the stability, security, and continuity of the Internet.

Point two, Internet governance is an important component of the information society and should be accomplished in an appropriate way.

As referred to in the agenda principles, our government should have an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in the international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

Point three, there are serious concerns regarding the digital divide between developed and developing countries. Why? There are closer and closer relations between the two in all walks of life. Why? Progress has been made in terms of closing the gaps, and differences in some areas and considerable technological divide still exists between (indiscernible) and within countries. Such divides often act as impediments in harnessing the potential of science, technology, and innovation for the ongoing processes such as the implementation of the sustainable development goals. To overcome this lasting gap, technology development and transfer and capacity-building have crucial role.

Point three, there are some internationally accurate documents that are guiding us in its deliberations. In this regard, paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda stipulates that enhanced cooperation shall enable governments on equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

Last point, any policy admitted under the enhanced cooperation must contribute to the achievement of the internationally accurate 2030 agenda for sustainable development. The 17 goals are supposed to cover as an umbrella other activities and direct deliberations, decisions, and measures of international community until 2030. Although cooperation and information technology and knowledge are among cross-cutting issues and do not fall in a single or two goals. It seems that the goals 9 and 17 are the most relevant ones. Goal 9 addresses the promotion of the inclusive and sustainable industrialization and fostering innovation.

In general, information and communication technology, in particular 9, the goal 17 refers to science, technology development, and transfer and capacity-building as means of implementation which play crucial role in achievement of the 2030 agenda.

Mr. Chairman, if you allow us, my colleague has further comments on two portions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, please. I will offer the opportunity as far as this correlates to the submission you have made. If it refers to the issues that are not contained in submission, I would ask you to delay for the next stage of discussions. But I offer the floor. Please, go ahead, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I will wait till the next stage. Thank you, thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I will now turn to the representative. You have the floor, Madam.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Let me begin by first complimenting you on the excellent synthesis report that you had circulated earlier. It has given us a very comprehensive view of these submissions from different countries and different organizations. And this has been very, very helpful in deciding on the framework in which we would like to discuss this particular issue.

Very briefly, I would like to highlight some of the points which we have made in our submission. The first is that the whole purpose of enhanced cooperation is still evolved from the perspective and strategies on public Internet policies and to ensure that open, secure, accessible, and transparent Internet is maintained.

We have highlighted the role of multistakeholder community in enhanced cooperation, the role of different multi- -- the different stakeholders and providing equal opportunities to support all these stakeholders in making contributions.

Another point we have highlighted is that there are different forums in which -- different forums in which different kind of cooperation is taking place, different issues related to Internet governance are being made. But there appears to be some kind of lack of coordination among these different regional groups. That point was earlier made by one of my colleagues here, and I think the approach that he had suggested was quite interesting. The layered approach where there needs to be some kind of coordination mechanism among these stakeholders and within these stakeholder communities, I think that idea needs to be discussed further.

Having said that, we have also synthesized the role of the government, diplomacy of the government, in shaping the Internet policies and also recommended that the new institutional mechanisms may be discussed to carry out their roles and responsibilities in Internet public policy issues.

We've also made a recommendation that there is need to empower the Government Advisory Committee of ICANN to play a more meaningful role and more substantial role in International public policy issues particularly with regard to management of critical Internet resources.

We have also stated that there is a need for a forum, some kind of forum, other mechanism, other body, which is led by the U.N. under which the international cooperation on enhanced cooperation can be discussed. We have not gone into the details of this, but I think it will be a good idea for this group to discuss the details further and to develop a consensus on what kind of forum can be evolved in that regard. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for highlighting those elements that are in your submission. And I just want, again, to assure you that we have made an effort to take them on board of this compilation of recommendation documents.

By the way, I would like to invite all those who have contributed to have a look at the document to make sure that their comments are adequately reflected there. Also, if they agree with the categorization that was indicated because at some later stage when we deal with this document, if the group wishes to do so, I think this will be -- we need to have clarity on that, that it duly reflects all proposals that were made. And, again, we made an effort to take everything on board.

I will now turn to the representative of ICANN, to Mr. Nigel Hickson from ICANN. You have the floor, sir.

>>ICANN: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon. As I said earlier, it was a pleasure for ICANN to be asked to contribute to this exercise.

I'll just mention three brief points in relation to our contribution. I think the first is in relation to what the U.K. said this morning and to what the U.S. alluded to earlier and other people are mentioning, including yourself, Mr. Chairman, that we should certainly take the characteristics that a number of us have submitted and try and reach some sort of common understanding on what are the most important ones or the ones that are shared between us.

I think this is exactly the sort of work that can be taken forward on, which we can make excellent progress on.

In terms of those characteristics, I think that a number are shown on the spreadsheet, of course, and one can -- one can pick from a number, but I think clearly accountability is important. Accountability for all the different organizations, stakeholder groups, governments, et cetera, that are putting forward these recommendations.

I think transparency, as has been alluded to earlier, is also one of the benchmarks in which we work. If we don't have transparent processes, then how can we move forward in this regard? If we don't have the information, if we don't have the ideas of what is happening, we don't have the feedback, then we make very little progress on issues. And we've seen in the Internet governance space what happens when we have a lack of transparency on issues. The sort of lack of progress we make.

So I think that's -- that's fundamental.

And ICANN also put forward an interesting -- well, I don't think it's particularly interesting, but an interesting, if you like, characteristic, which is factual backing. I don't know where we came up with that phrase but I think it's quite pertinent in the current environment, that if we are -- if we're discussing things, then we do so from a basis of fact. And a number of contributions, of course, are made -- on this issue are made from basis of fact of the Tunis Agenda. On issues of Internet governance I think it's important that we work from an independent basis of fact.

So thirdly, Mr. Chairman, where does that get us? Well, as I say, I think it gets us that we can reach some sort of understanding and I think it's entirely consistent with the notion of enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda.

Yes, of course, Internet public policy issues are the responsibility of government. Many of us were in government, and of course governments have a responsibility to their citizens for public policy issues. There's no argument about that at all.

But other stakeholders contribute to that process, and if they didn't contribute to that process, then they wouldn't be here in this particular environment. They wouldn't be in the OECD. They wouldn't be in the CSTD. They wouldn't be in the WIPO committees on intellectual property. And they wouldn't be at the IGF.

So, yes, stakeholders have a place in the framework in which governments talk about Internet public policy issues, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the benefit of this committee which you ably chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I -- last on my list is Canada. You have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Just to briefly go over what was motivating us in terms of our contribution and providing input into this discussion, our goal here was to ensure that the -- that our conclusion leads to an outcome where the Internet continues to provide the economic, social, and cultural gains that we have benefited so far from, since the time of Internet's inception, and its phenomenal growth.

So our proposal here is really to sustain an open, free, and secure Internet where individuals' rights and freedoms are protected, where information and ideas flow freely, where innovation flourishes and continues to generate prosperity, and where both the information the Internet holds and the digital infrastructure is protected.

And to reiterate what our colleague, Nigel, from ICANN has said, it is correct, governments have a huge role to play in that, but that role is really strengthened by the multistakeholder community.

So our contribution highlighted specific characteristics, which was that enhanced cooperation is a process that should be open to stakeholders, it should be transparent, it should seek to protect and promote human rights, it should be fact-based, it should stand the test of time, and ultimately in the context that we're at today, it should serve to advance SDGs, which is the agenda that we governments and whole society needs to push forward in a very urgent manner.

The one thing that I've heard so far this morning in many of the contributions -- I'll just head back one second.

And even though our contribution might not have highlighted some of the characteristics that other contributions have had, I think that your -- your -- the compilation that you have prepared in terms of the characteristics that seem to be -- that seem to have agreement on, there certainly would be other

characteristics in there that Canada could wholeheartedly agree to, even if they're not reflected in our current contribution.

So going back to some of the things that I've heard this morning, one of the things that a bit confused me, I guess, is this returning always to Paragraph 69 as it holding characteristics.

When I read this paragraph, I see that this paragraph holds aims of what enhanced cooperation should do in terms of enabling government to carry out its role in Internet public policy, but that's not a characteristic.

That is the goal of what enhanced cooperation should help to achieve.

So I think we need to be cautious to not necessarily confuse this.

So as I've mentioned, I think that our -- much more so than the synthesis document of all the contributions, the one that summarizes just the high-level characteristic document and the associated spreadsheet, I think this is the way that we need to -- this is where we need to now start working with these two documents, to see where we can already find common ground and then use that to build on the rest of the discussion in terms of recommendations.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada, and I thank all those who made interventions. And at this point in time we would need as a group to make a decision on the way forward.

We have -- in the previous meeting it was decided -- the only decision that was made in that regard was to submit to public consultation the two questions and to agree that in this meeting we would -- this would guide us in our discussions.

So I would just recall, because we haven't agreed on the structure of the discussion, but I think the -- and in this comes, the synthesis paper, as an attempt to organize the discussion that should take place on the basis of the submissions that were received, which we agreed would be our guiding -- what would guide us in that meeting.

So I would suggest a couple of things.

First of all, you have before you a number of documents, so we should decide on which document we should work.

First of all, the compilation of recommendations that is submitted to you, it is mere factual information drawing from the language that was proposed by you, so it's just an attempt not to lose any of those recommendations, but I would suggest that these should not be touched on by us at this stage. I think recommendations clearly is the goal of this working group, to provide for recommendations, but as we -- many parties have stated, and I agree with this, that we should take a step-by-step approach and not losing sight of the ultimate goal but not move it too directly, because there are many some steps that may help us in that regard.

And I think this is consistent with the approach we have taken in the 30 September meeting, and this is reflected in the questions.

So first we would focus on what are the high-level characteristics on the basis of the responses we have, and then we would think of the recommendations in correlation with these or not.

As someone has said, I -- at this point I'm not -- I couldn't recall, but some of the recommend -- some of those high-level principles would be recommendations agnostic. I think that was the expression that was used. And I -- so maybe by -- and in line with what we decide in September, if we would focus now.

And if you agree, my proposal would be to work on the basis of the synthesis paper, and unless there is a very strong objection -- of course I will be in your hands -- I would suggest by starting with the easiest part of that synthesis paper that relates to what was interpreted by some as the high-level characteristic that would be the principle that should guide us, and then I am referring to Part D of Track 2 of the -- the second part of the document, Part D, which enumerates -- was an attempt to enumerate those, and if we take -- if you accept my proposal, and by doing this we should decide whether we work on the basis of the synthesis or on the spreadsheet and the --

>> Hello?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- accompanying text which has been highlighted by some, provides for a more compressive view of what was stated and also have some analysis and some contemplative analysis of the principles of expression that appear that could guide us in making wishfully some very early decision on that topic, and that might assist us in the following steps.

So I -- I am in your hands. I -- as I said, unless I hear very strong objections, I would suggest that we proceed that way.

I see Jimson and I recognize Jimson and then Parminder. You have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: I would like to really thank you for this document that has been provided. Thank you to the secretariat as well.

Well, the -- what I think we could do is that we could look at the spreadsheet, and alluding to what the distinguished delegate from Canada said earlier, that there are a number of high-level suggestions of characteristics that she could also buy into that she did not necessarily submit earlier.

So I'm thinking perhaps we could take a look at the spreadsheet, and likewise myself, there are a number of characteristics I will endorse, really.

So the spreadsheet is beautiful. Good job. And it's very easy for -- I assume that one can look at those characteristics and put a dot on all these, and if possible, we can then collate.

With that, we could easily get a summary of where we have a lot of interest.

Because where we have a lot of interest shows clearly or mathematically that, yes, we will have some level of agreement in these ones, and the ranking will give us a basis of seeing where the majority are and we can take it from that top level where we have the majority and we'll begin to take it, and with that, I think we can make -- move faster.

So -- but the document provided is very sound basis. The -- that is, the spreadsheet provided is very sound basis. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comment and for your support. I turn to Parminder and then to Iran.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I understand that we don't intend to work on the recommendations categories document. Not now, so we are talking about other documents other than this.

Among those documents I'm happy to work on the synthesis document, but starting from the Track 1, definitions and characteristics, where it's enable governments, second is intergovernmental, multistakeholder, multistakeholder format, on equal footing, then B1, B2, B3, and C1, C2, C3. Because these are issues which directly refer to the subject matter which is under consideration. And if we compare that with the part which is the last part and which some prefer to have us begin with, I don't understand this part, first of all, because some of the issues, D1, D2, D3, D4, are actually policy areas. Open data, human rights, network neutrality and cybersecurity, they are policy areas. So I'm not very sure what kind of discussion we can enter into. I mean, what would we discuss about cybersecurity here? We can't get into a discussion on that. Or network neutrality. I mean, are we intending to talk here about network neutrality?

So it's not clear that -- what kind of discussion can take place on this floor.

And D5, D6, D7, D8 are characteristics which also come in the other document as high-level characteristics. Transparency, inclusiveness, responsiveness to innovation, evidence-based policymaking, sustainable and consensus-based.

The problem with these principles, if we call them principles -- I don't even think they're principles; they are good things -- that they refer to almost everything. If I.T. for Change should be transparent, inclusive, responsive to innovation, evidence-based policymaking, if government of India is trying to open a new policy consultation it should be that, almost -- business perhaps also should be that.

So we are talking about some factors which are good and in general we'll be discussing what is good in this world. I mean, it's not even clear whether it's just about policy process in general, what to talk about, Internet-related policy process. So these are good words and if we all agree on that, yes, things should be transparent, inclusive, responsive, evidence-based, sustainable, and consensus-based, we'll all agree immediately on that and that's really not the meat of the issue here, and therefore I would prefer that we start from A, A1, A2, to B, B1, B2, and do C1, C2, and these are concepts which came from the responses and are directly relating to the subject matter of our work and we focus on that.

Otherwise, we are just too much on the peripheries and won't, in my humble view, reach anywhere. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, and let me just, in defense of my own proposal and taking into account your points that are very valid, just to say that what I'm proposing to deal first with that part of the text is not to avoid discussion of the other parts, which -- I agree with you, Russia, and others -- touch on the heart of what would be enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda text.

So we should walk through all those notions and further discuss how we could, as a working group, make some further elaboration on this that could help in fulfilling enhanced cooperation.

So this is completely taken on board.

I just recall that the idea behind my suggestion -- and I am also drawing on interventions that were made by a number of colleagues -- is that in addition to what is there, those elements, those are maybe some principles or some high-level elements that could -- that should also be endorsed by the group.

So I agree with you this is not the heart of the discussion. I think the heart of the discussion and the main output that is expected from the group are the recommendations. This is what is the mandate of the group.

So to come to the recommendations, I -- I'm proposing as a step-by-step to elaborate on the expressions coming from Tunis Agenda elements, important elements contained in 69 to 71. We'll do that. But before that, just to agree on a set of principles that should guide us.

Just -- if I may maybe abuse my position as the chair, but just to call your attention that the spreadsheet is accompanied by an analysis document, some text, that, for example, indicates that five -- the five most strongly supported characteristics, for example, transparency, inclusiveness, multistakeholder participation, collaborative, flexible and adopted by -- I think those are principles, different from the case you mentioned that some of the items that were proposed by some do not exactly have that characteristic of principle, it's more policy saying that it should not come under this category of principle.

So my proposal, if the group accepts, if there's no -- would be to try to look at this section of the document, trying to -- maybe to set a bar. We are not obliged to bring on board anything. We can, for example, just meet some of the things that were said that do not belong here, but for example, these first five -- transparent, inclusive, multistakeholder participation, flexible and adaptable, those could maybe easily be accepted, even if we expanded to 10 -- the 10 most voted that I think would include result-driven, to respect the sovereign right of states -- I think that refers to a point that was raised by Richard Hill previously -- to be evidence-based, sustainable, and to promote sustainable development.

So I'm proposing these as a very, let's say, kind of early effort if we could just agree that those are -- and of course in the spreadsheet and these -- even in the accompanying text, you have reference to all those elements that were also mentioned, but some could maybe belong here, some not.

So it's not a way to avoid the discussion, recommendation. We will get to the discussion on the language contained in 69, 71. It would just may be a way to focus on these kind of early harvest things, outcome we could get at an early stage, if the group wishes to do so. But I would like to hear others on this. I have on my list, Iran, Japan, Anriette, and Nick Ashton-Hart.

So, Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think I tend to agree with Parminder that perhaps we should start with part one or task one or group one. But no problem if you want to start with two. However, for the time being, we should not give them any label, the title of that. It is not principles and characteristics and so on and so forth. We will discuss the topic and to see whether they are policy or whether they are what. And based on that, then we will give them a label.

Something we need to bear in mind, that we don't need to define what is enhanced cooperation. "Enhanced cooperation" came from the European in 2005 in the last part of the WSIS, is composed of two words, "enhanced" and "cooperation." Enhanced is quite clear. What does it mean? Is to intensify, to increase, to further improve the quality, the value and the extent of the issue in question.

And the "cooperation" is the actions of process of working together to achieve the same objectives.

Now, we have to see what are the objectives of enhanced cooperation, whether in the task one or the task two. Once we have that, then we have to find out the modality, how we achieve those objectives.

In line of those are two elements that we have to discuss, several areas we talk about equal footing. But equal footing between whom? Between the governments themselves? Between the other stakeholders themselves? Or between government and stakeholders? That is an important element.

In respect of the public policy issue, it is quite important that is almost exclusively the policy -- the duty of the government to do that but no doubt with the consultation with the multistakeholders. So I think that we have to be very careful to establish equal footing in that respect. But you can discuss that.

So that is the contribution I wish to make at this stage. So any part you want to take, but for the time being, don't give them a title or a label and give the idea. But some of them are very, very difficult to go. Network neutrality takes a lot of time and so on and so forth. Cybersecurity, years and years we discuss in ITU, in ICANN, and so on and so forth.

So perhaps title them, give them a brief description, but not go into detailed discussion because it is outside the patient of the meeting. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. And thank you for your flexibility.

I think that the proposal I made from the chair, that we start with that part regarding -- I understand you don't want to label but just for the sake of maybe have the different categories of principles was to avoid some difficult discussions. But I take your point that by doing so maybe we will start having a discussion on issues like cybersecurity, human rights, which is something we should certainly avoid.

So my take was that we could maybe easily agree that some elements like cybersecurity is not a high-level characteristic. But if the discussion would take us to having that discussion, I would certainly not support it. But, again, I'm in your hands.

I would like to hear more comments in that regard. I'd like -- I have on my list Japan, Anriette, Saudi Arabia.

Japan, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I can agree with the suggested approach to start a discussion of possible characteristics for the enhanced cooperation in that consensus report. It's going to be a D. That item in D, D1 through D10, it seems -- it's not an accurate reflection of the parties expressed in their contributions. I see this spreadsheet. And, also, I find this Word document, this is analysis expressed. And this kindly shows the five most strongly supported characteristics of enhanced cooperation or ten more strongly supported characteristics.

I think this can be more better start point to discuss because what we are going to do is to find some area, some characteristics that we can all agree on.

In that case, I think rather than starting discussion from D1 through D10, I propose to start a discussion concerning what kind of characteristics we agree on based on this spreadsheet and this Word document. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan, for your comment. And I have also heard the same coming from other parties.

Just for sake of clarity, the mandate we have is to develop recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. So that mandate can be divided and be realized in many ways. We can suggest institutional change. We can indicate gaps, for example. We can ask for coordination, and we can state -- this is my intent in making the proposal to start by this, to say that one way to further implement enhanced cooperation is to ensure that some characteristics will be in the process, that will be transparent, inclusive -- I'm drawing on the five most voted, multistakeholder, collaboration.

So I think it is not the main thing that is requested but it is something that if we recommend it, I think it will be an added value to what we have. So this is the intent, not to avoid discussion on anything else but maybe to -- at the first stage to concentrate on this.

There would be this complexity that was read by Iran and others that by doing so, maybe we'll -- and this is something we want to avoid -- to go into discussion on things that maybe do not have that kind of -- let's say, do not provide for that kind of general approach so we can -- that's the kind of discussion I was looking forward in that regard just for clarity.

So I will give the floor to Anriette.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Chairperson. I completely support that proposal and that way of moving forward. I think we need to be very clear. I agree with Japan. We should for the purpose of this discussion of characteristics use the spreadsheet and the Word compilation and not the synthesis document. As you've pointed out, it doesn't include everything.

And with justice to the synthesis document, the heading of Section D is actually "topics, principles, and possible characteristics." So I think it's worth discussing the characteristics. I agree with the Chair, it will help us frame the recommendations.

And I think the secretariat document that's just been circulated that shows us which of those characteristics have most common support is a very good place to start.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon, colleagues.

We tend to agree with Parminder. Dealing with your version of the report, it's better to do it from the beginning, from page 1. This will give us really a general overview of the matter before us. And then when we arrive to the Section D, we'll have at least a picture of relevant items there and what is the missing point that we need to add. But starting from the middle of the document will cause more, I would say, discussion in a way that will not end by a target or by an outcome. Therefore, it's better to start from the beginning of the document and then to reach the end with a clear understanding of the mandate or understanding of the objective that you are seeking of. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, yes.

>> ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Saudi Arabia, that's true, but the document does not, in fact, follow the sequence of the questions that the responses followed. So, in fact, it might be confusing in terms of the document itself. But I think starting with characteristics is consistent with the questions that the WGEC put out to the community. Characteristics was question number 1.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette, for this.

Just also for the sake of the clarity of my thinking in that regard, that I think there are two different interpretations of what would be high-level characteristics. For some high-level characteristics are those that are spelled out in paragraph 69 to 71. So the one high-level characteristic would be to enable government on equal footing. So some people tended to see from that angle. Others saw high-level characteristics more from the perspective of principles.

So, you know, it's more a decision on how to address one first in regard to the other. But I think both would belong to that discussion from my perspective, trying to reflect what we heard as responses coming from you, what that would mean.

I will now turn to Mr. Makoto Yokozawa from JISA, Japan Information Service Industries. And then I have on my list, Richard Hill, Kenya, and Constance Bommelaer from ISOC. So, first, Mr. Yokozawa, you have the floor.

>> MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I echo the discussion proposed by my colleague that we should start with the characteristics especially highlighted on the spreadsheet.

And, again, we -- I think we should focus on the discussion, what do we have to do here in this two days' discussion, not too much complicated discussion and after checking what is agreeable and what is not agreeable on this spreadsheet and especially the heading of this spreadsheet.

And we can bring it back to home for the second response for this spreadsheet for the next meeting of WGEC maybe end of May or some other timing. And we need to just to clarify who is thinking how about -- for the beginning in this case of the high-level characteristics of the enhanced cooperation.

So, again, my thinking is -- here is we should focus on what we can do here in this two days' meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I give the floor to Mr. Hill. Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to support the last statement that was made and the two previous statements from Anriette and Japan and many other previous speakers. I think we should focus, however, not on the spreadsheet but on the Word version, which I think is easier to work with. It's mechanical. I don't have a problem with the spreadsheet.

And then I would propose a specific methodology. We start running through those in the order you have shown them, and we see here if anybody is objecting to any of those or if people support other ones that only have one or two. Maybe when we go through the room, they get more than one or two. And then we just draw the line somewhere. To me, I think the line where we had about four support in your Word version is fine and we can just accept those.

And then as the colleague from Japan just said, it would be useful not to consider that a final output. But that's an input to the next meeting and then we can all come back to the next meeting with further thoughts about that particular list. I think if we do that, we will go very fast.

Your document, as I said before, I think is incomplete. I'm not comfortable with the structure. And there were some misunderstandings. I did not intent for network neutrality to be a characteristic of enhanced cooperation. So if we go to that one, we will spend a lot of time just getting it right before we go anywhere.

Whereas, I think the spreadsheet and the Word derived from the spreadsheet are excellent starting points. I would recommend we strongly focus on those from now on. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Kenya.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: I take this chance to congratulate you for the manner in which you are creating the meeting. I have been a little bit quiet from all the morning because I'm trying to understand. But I (indiscernible) we have a number of points of convergence in the discussion that has gone on from morning.

Just to be very precise, maybe I'll in a way take over from what Hill has said. In my view, when we got to the spreadsheet that has been developed and the synthesis document, I think the difference is very minimal. So I thought the spreadsheet that has been developed was just a way of helping us move a bit faster, to see things from at close range in a concise way.

However, as the Chair, you said earlier if anything is missing, members here have a chance to add. Or if something has been put that is not what some members have said, they can also raise it and it be corrected appropriately.

But my other point is that I would also want to believe that if some members in their submissions did not mention some of the characteristics that other members did not mention, it might not necessarily mean that they're opposed to those characteristics. It is only that they submitted some, they did not submit others. But if there are those which are not highly stipulated but they still make sense, I believe we have the capacity to be as objective as possible to make the best outcome of this meeting as much as possible. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya. Thank you for your kind words and for your flexibility. I will turn now to Ms. Constance Bommelaer from ISOC and at least for the moment the final intervention made by the Russian Federation. And then I will come up with some suggestion on how to move forward.

Constance, you have the floor.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Mr. Chair, I would like to start by thanking you for analyzing the various contributions and also, of course, putting together the synthesis that has been proposed for consideration of the members of this group.

I'd also like to echo some of the suggestions that we heard to perhaps try to extract some of those high-level characteristics. It seems that many of the members of this group would have an entry point something to say.

I can say that for The Internet Society, we've developed a list of high-level characteristics that could be a submission, a contribution, a direct contribution to that discussion. We talk about inclusiveness and transparency, collective responsibility, effective decision-making and implementation, and, finally, collaboration through distributed and interoperable governance. This does not mean that other colleagues will not have a different prescient terminology or view on what those characteristics are. But if we're able to find and identify those high-level principles, we can offer a broad enough basis for an inclusive discussion. And I believe we will have greater chances to agree on some sort of output for this working group. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I have then Russian Federation and after that the USA.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we agree with those who said that there is some, you know, difficulties to work with the spreadsheet and the Word version is better. This is first. Second is that just the reminding that we work in the sense of consensus here, and, you know, if some members would like to work from the beginning of the document because it's actually more -- well, in relation to the main task and to the heart of the -- our discussion, and we would like to say that a number of delegations say that they would like to start the work from the beginning, starting from definitions, and to discuss it in this way, because characteristics is something which is not answering the -- the main question, what is the enhanced cooperation, how it should look like.

And I think the chairman will follow, somehow, this approach also. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and I'll try to be quick since I think much has already been said on this subject. I'd just like to associate with those that have suggested we work on the basis of the characteristics that have been highlighted in the spreadsheet or in the Word document that accompanied the spreadsheet and just note that as you said at the beginning of this conversation, our task here that came from WSIS+10 was to develop recommendations and so the question on how we structure our work for the next two days but, you know, throughout this whole process is what helps us get to those recommendations and helps structure them in a proactive way.

And I just -- I worry a little bit that we're talking about definitions and characteristics and mapping and principles, and I think the conversation from last time was this characteristics conversation was part of a step-by-step approach that helps frame our conversation and helps lead into a way that we can structure it.

So I think that there sounds like a lot of support for that in the room, and I think it could be -- and even I believe somebody said it should be very -- fairly easy to get to consensus on those characteristics from the spreadsheet.

So maybe -- perhaps that's a good place for us to start to begin this process which we're already, you know, half -- almost through the first day, on some agreement and then that will help us structure the work going forward. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have -- well, the list keeps going on -- Lea and Pakistan, and then if I can beg your indulgence, I will close the list on -- and I will come up with a proposal for your consideration.

So Lea Kaspar and then Pakistan.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. I would like to align myself with the previous speakers and your suggested way forward, Chair.

I think it is important for us to find areas of agreement, and it sounds like there is already common ground on -- in the discussion of characteristics. And I was actually heartened by Parminder's intervention because he himself said that, you know, it would be easy to agree on a lot of these, and perhaps that's the direction and something to think about. If it's easy to agree on those, maybe we can get through those quickly and proceed as soon as possible on to the other items on the agenda.

And just to add one more thing, in just thinking how we would get to -- get to the recommendations, if we were to start with those, I think it would be more difficult to agree on recommendations that -- without finding common ground on the characteristics. However, the other way around is easier to do, so I think that it's easier to agree on characteristics that do -- that are -- I think I mentioned it earlier -- that are agnostic to the recommendations that we're making but the other way around is more difficult. Which I think that is my logic, to approach it in that way and to go with your suggested approach. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lea. Pakistan?

>>PAKISTAN: Yeah. Thank you, Ambassador. Actually, my suggestion -- I tend to agree with the previous speaker because my suggestion would be that we should now go into the recommendation part because there are a number of recommendations that have been made by some members which, if we come up with a language, suitable language around them, we can build high-level characteristics around them afterwards.

So I think my recommendation would be that we focus on the recommendation part and we leave the high-level characteristic part for later on, because if we have a recommendation, then I think it's easier for us to develop high-level characteristics which have already been mentioned by a number of -- in a number of contributions.

And the second point is that we have a number of high-level characteristics which are very general. For example, if we look at the spreadsheet, there is -- the very first characteristic is a mention of peace, so I don't think that anyone would have any issue with this -- with this characteristic or with this thing.

Of course it has been mentioned by one -- in one contribution, and as has been said by our colleague from Kenya, it doesn't mean that if it has been mentioned by one, that other people disagree. Rather, this is something that everyone would be agreeing with it.

Similarly, we have this in O, good faith.

So I mean, these are very general and generic kind of things which we should take for granted in any multilateral setting or in -- in our working group.

There are, nevertheless, other high-level characteristics which are very important, but to get back to my suggestion, I think those are very relevant to what kind of recommendations we will come up with.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: To the previous point, just to say that as much as I would like the delegation from Pakistan to agree with me, I think I was suggesting the opposite. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. I -- yes, I'll give the floor, Canada, yes, for --

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to take the floor again but very briefly, in terms of addressing recommendations right now, for Canada it would be a problem because how we structured our answers and our contribution, we answered the question, which was, "What kind of recommendations" and not "What are the recommendations that you would want this committee to -- this working group to make."

So at this point, Canada would have -- has no recommendations, clearly, in our contribution because we talked about the nature of the recommendations, not the recommendations themselves.

Whereas, again, as I have mentioned in my previous intervention, we seem to have a lot of overlapping characteristics that we already agree on. Let's work on that, see what we can secure. Because as even Mr. Singh had said, that we have already a lot of agreement. I think we can do this fairly quickly. And then from Canada's perspective, now that once we have the principles of enhanced cooperation, now let's see what recommendations we derive from those.

I think trying to work on the recommendations right away is setting us up for talking in circles for a long, long time because we will not have a basis, a solid ground, on which to stand on.

So I would strongly urge us to consider the Japan proposal, which was to work with the Word document that you sent, along with the spreadsheet, which highlights the four or five characteristics that we already have an agreement on.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. Well, after hearing you -- and I see Jimson has asked for the floor. I'll give you the floor in a minute.

I wouldn't like to prolong this discussion because I think we are wasting time, precious time, discussing procedural aspects. It is clear from the interventions I've heard there is no consensus in regard to full consensus, meaning each and every one in agreement with either approach, which forces me as the chair to make a decision, to propose a decision to you. One -- and here we are addressing a procedural aspect, how we should proceed.

So on the basis of everything I've heard from you, from member states, from members from other stakeholders, there is an overwhelming majority of participants who would prefer and would accept my proposal to work -- to initiate work on the portion related to principles in the spreadsheet, and this is my proposal for you, unless there is resistance.

And with this, I fully -- would like to fully guarantee that no topic that was addressed before, in the previous section, in the beginning of the document, will be taken out of the discussion. It's just a matter to organize.

And the second comment I'd like to make in that regard is that even if we agree -- and I say "agree" in brackets -- that those principles should be there as a recommendation, we may at any stage revisit this. Any -- this is the basic -- I think one of the principles we work on, in the context of the U.N. Nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

So maybe we can agree that multistakeholder format is one principle, but then when we refer to the discussion on this and we elaborate, we say there are many complexities and we may want to -- to revisit or to add some language to that regard.

So I -- really, it's just a proposal to initiate work.

So I would really beg you to take that proposal from the chair on the basis of everything that was heard, and I think that there is an overwhelming, also, majority of opinions in regard to by doing so, working on the basis of the spreadsheet and its accompanying text.

And I would also, unless there is some -- some objection, take the approach, adopt the approach that was proposed by Richard Hill. So when we look at the language that was provided -- and I will maybe ask the secretariat to put on the screen the document that accompanies the spreadsheets, high-level characteristics -- is it there? Not the spreadsheet itself, but the accompanying document that provide some very short analysis and at the end of this document, you have the list of the proposals that were made. You have that enumeration with the number of support.

And again, this is not something that is written in stone. Doesn't mean that, for example, with transparent that was mentioned by 16 contributions will remain until the end of this process with the 16 contributions. It can have the support of everyone or -- and even those list -- that list may not be exhaustive, as some have pointed out; that maybe something else should be added and should be reviewed.

So I suggest that we take -- could you identify the document? It is there? Yes. So let's move to the end of the document, where you have the list. On one column, the high-level characteristic. On the other column, the number of stakeholders that suggested it.

Yes. Okay.

Okay. So what I propose that we could go, wishfully quickly, one by one, just to make sure that as we frame, let's say, some draft recommendations regarding that those characteristics should be part of any process that we consider should be considered enhanced cooperation discussed should be there. I would suggest that we could walk through that list to make sure that we keep on board, at least provisionally, those elements that seem to have wide acceptance and to make sure that maybe we'll get rid of some of those and bring on board something that was missing here.

So I -- yes, Carlos Afonso, please.

Carlos Afonso from NUPEF, civil society.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Some of the characteristics are part of other characteristics. So we say, well, only four people -- four members voted for democratic, but actually, a lot of the characteristics of democratic participation are already there in the upper lines.

So we should take a look at -- with this approach, as well, in order to -- one characteristic may supersede the other and so on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Excellent. Thank you. Thank you for this comment. I think this is something we should take into account as we move on.

Anriette, are you seeking the floor?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: A comment. I think this list, we probably can also merge some of these characteristics.

We have transparent at the top of the list. Further down we have openness. Now, openness might have been suggested as a principle as well, but I think when we're talking about a characteristic of enhanced cooperation processes, openness is probably covered by inclusive and by transparent.

So just to point out that I don't object to any of those at all. I think it is worth looking at how they can be merged and what the different type of character- -- we might want to cluster these characteristics, but at this point I'm actually very happy with this list.

The other two that I thought could be merged would be good faith and trust. You know, I think they also convey -- maybe even collaborative can be merged with good faith and trust in the process.

So that's really all at this point.

I find it a very useful place to start, and I have no further comments at this point.

Just to highlight maybe that -- that what could appear as contentious at the moment would be multistakeholder and then also respecting the sovereign rights of states to establish and implement public policy, but in fact, seeing them here as characteristics, I think they actually work quite well alongside one another. They don't necessarily have to be seen as the one excluding or contradicting the other.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. I have Iran and -- I'm sorry -- Richard Hill on my list, but on the basis of the comments that were made by Carlos Afonso and yourself, I -- I think at some point I'd like to focus on the individual characteristics that were proposed.

I think I'll suggest we could go one by one, just to make sure if that notion is acceptable we retain it and in a second reading we try to have that merging or arrange on the side. So we are not, maybe at this

point, be too much concerned about how it would look in the final, just to retain the notion, if you agree. But then I will turn, as I said, to Iran and Richard Hill.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I think the idea of merging some of them is a good idea. We cannot merge all of them. Footing you cannot merge. But many things like multistakeholder, inclusiveness, and so on, you can merge. So if you merge the number to much limited, while maintaining some of them which is not consistent to be -- to be included in others.

So maybe a few people -- I don't know at what time this afternoon -- this evening or what time -- can get together or try to reduce this to some more general higher category and so on and so forth.

That would be good. But I don't think that at this stage, we should eliminate any one of them that may be good, even if one proponent. That may be inclusive in others, may be merged in others. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: I agree with the comments from Carlos and Anriette, and I just -- I don't think we need to change any text here but I just wanted to make a clarification so we don't avoid [sic] confusion in the future.

The one that says "participation by governments on an equal footing" that's meant participation by governments on an equal footing amongst themselves. It does not imply that governments would suddenly be on an equal footing with the other stakeholders.

I don't think you need to say that but I just wanted to have that in the record so we don't get confused about what we intended there.

In terms of the way forward, maybe we could just go through the list and see if anybody objects to anything.

I do object to one or two of them, but way down on the list, nothing at the top.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this.

So my suggestion now would be that we would -- I invite you to look at the list. I will read out for you one by one, and maybe, as proposed by Richard -- well, you are free to make any comments you may wish, but we maybe work on the basis of no objection. Meaning that if there is support for -- to retain it, I think it's not necessary to further elaborate. For example, it's not necessary to say that you support transparency but if there is any kind of objection or let's say qualification that is needed, I think that should be voiced. That's the approach I suggest. I look forward to the comments by the Russian Federation. You have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Hello? Thank you. Actually, it's a good characteristic. However, are we really sure that this is a characteristic of enhanced cooperation? Because several of them are considered as a

characteristic of management of Internet. For example, if you read the Resolution 7125 for 10 years review of WSIS, you can see that, well, we recognize the management of the Internet as a global facility, includes multilateral, transparent, democratic, and multistakeholder process, so it's already considered as the -- the characteristic of Internet governance, but how can we differentiate them from Internet governance and enhanced cooperation?

Because enhanced cooperation, of course, is a part of Internet governance but a very particular part. And from our point of view, this particularity is about the equal footing between governments. So it's a multilateral intergovernmental mechanism. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think you raise a valid point. But I would again draw our attention to the fact that we are dealing in a very specific context. We are trying to provide some further guidance or to come forward with recommendations, suggestions, on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. So we are here dealing clearly with enhanced cooperation as a subset of Internet governance as a whole.

So maybe -- I think in principle all those characteristics for enhanced Internet governance also apply to enhanced cooperation. But maybe if something is more specific to other processes or not -- that's why I would suggest that we could go one by one just to make sure that if something here maybe thought not to belong, maybe we can just make some mark and decide to revert to this. But maybe we can have some quick decision on some element that could be acceptable to everyone.

I have on my list U.K. and then Saudi Arabia.

U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. While we think there is a lot of agreement in the room, we recognize, of course, there are some different views and some caution but there is some agreement here and we should try to capture that. It's an opportunity for us to take another step forward. But we should be careful maybe not to spend too much time on this exercise. We are a bit worried if we start re-editing everything or if we start thinking about voting on every individual one, it could get very complicated. And we do have to move on to the next step.

What I think we're trying to do is to identify the characteristics which have got the most wide support amongst the group. And so our suggestion would be that we simply take the top ten in this list. We think the top ten is a reasonable balance. As others have said, perhaps having the multistakeholder participation alongside respecting the rights of states, that provides that kind of balance which I hope would be reassuring to many people in the room.

I think if we agreed on the top ten, we would need to be clear this is not an exhaustive list. There may be other characteristics that people could suggest. But we would be saying that these are the ten characteristics that we can agree here now today as a kind of working basis.

And if we could do that, it would take us another step forward and provide us with a solid basis for thinking about the next step and talking about recommendations.

So rather than spending a long time with a very complicated exercise, our proposal would be that for now we can agree on a working basis the top ten characteristics on this list because those are the ones with the widest support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. I think the proposal is well-noted. However, I have listened to some contributors that in some cases some proposals that were made even by an individual contributor could be easily supported by others. So I am not sure if we should at this point in time lose even some idea that they are lowest rank. Maybe they will make it, let's say, to this final set of principles. So my intention is, of course, not to lose too much time on this -- I think we have already lost too much time -- but to work on a non-objection basis.

I would suggest I could read out in the order they appear. I want to be very cautious about that, not meaning that any party that wants to react or object but rather to elaborate a little bit. So it's not exactly on a non-objection but on a "no need to comment" in case it is found by the wider membership as something that can be easily accepted.

I think your intervention is very important to highlight again that some of those characteristics have received very consistent support, very strong support, which is a very clear indication they could make it easily into the list. But, again, I think we should on the, basis of things I have heard, not lose something that could make it to the list. For example, some intervention have made specific reference to trust and good faith which are lower ranked below -- but I think my personal opinion is that this will certainly make it to the final list because I don't expect anyone to object to trust and good faith. I think it's one of the characteristics of our own exercise. I would be very surprised if that would take place.

So let's hear other colleagues. But I would very strongly call on colleagues not to delve too much on this. Maybe if we could allow ourselves to give a try towards what I'm proposing, just to see. Maybe even in the first element there will be some discussion that we show it is not useful. But maybe we can give a try and see if it works.

But I give the floor to all those who have request for it. So, first, Saudi Arabia, European Union, Japan, Kenya, and Anriette.

So, Saudi Arabia, you have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah, thank you, Chairman.

While discussing the high-level characteristic for the first might be a good exercise. But we need to at least go in order of the contributions submitted under these topics. Otherwise, having the discussion on the transparency -- no one has difficulties with transparency. But what exactly do we have under this title? This is the work we should do in here. And as our colleague from Russia mentioned that we have some characteristics which is not relevant to the enhanced cooperation itself. I think we should do some filtering and to focus on those that are really relevant on paragraph 69. Then this will make our work easier in the future.

But making decision now without knowing the text underneath every title, I think it's a hard exercise. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I just recall what I'm proposing, I think, is in line with what was decided by the group. The first question refers to what are the high-level characteristics. So I'm just trying to find a way to deal with it first through the angle of what would be the principle that should guide the process but without avoiding discussion on the elements. Certainly we'll come to that later on.

I will -- so, again, I will turn to the European Union and then Japan, Kenya, and Anriette.

European Union, you have the floor.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well, I apologize for coming in to do the exact opposite of what you asked, which is to support you. You said not to support suggestions.

But I can't resist because as Anriette and Carlos have both said, as you go through this list, it will become self-evident that there are areas that can be combined. I think the U.K. has proposed multistakeholder and respecting sovereign rights of states. It's obvious that flexible, adaptable, and sustainable could be brought together. So I think by going through this, you will see that there are many that can be combined. Many of you have mentioned this already.

And I'm sorry to repeat this, but that will allow you to put more into your package. So I'm sorry to come in, but I encourage you to insist on your approach.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you. I will certainly do that.

Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. We can support here the way we are proceeding. So maybe we are going to discuss these maybe from the top ten first. And I agree with the previous speaker from the U.K. saying that maybe we are not -- we should keep the number of the characteristics to a manageable level. Maybe ten is enough. We shouldn't have 20 or 30 characteristics. I support to keep the number of characteristics to maybe under ten.

And we also agree with -- when we see this list, as U.K. pointed out, I see multistakeholder participation and also I see respecting the sovereign rights of states to establish and implement public policy. That reminds me of our discussion we had in the last WSIS+10 outcome document negotiations.

At that time, we had a very lengthy discussion, multistakeholder versus multilateral approach. And we really had spent a lot of time there. And we don't -- I don't want to repeat that discussion again here.

So at that time, I propose that we are not spending too much time for which one is better or which one should survive. We just suggest to have just a brief discussion, just a brief exchange of views that this is one important, this one is important, without coming to some conclusion (indiscernible) while we are creating these top ten in a package. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan. Thank you all for not having extensive discussion. I would prefer to have no discussion. That's why I'm proposing to read out. And if there is agreement that this is one notion that should guide enhanced cooperation, that should be taken on board summarily.

And I would not be concerned at this point with how this would look in the final output of this group. I think we are now collecting ideas, notions. How this will be worded and formulated is something to do in our next stage, also in relation to the discussion on the language coming from 69 to 71. And that is so -- again, it would not be a final decision in regard to the wording or even to how this would be drafted. It's more, like, say, some kind of early identification of elements of ideas that should make it to some recommendation we could put forward.

On my list, I have Kenya, Anriette, Marilyn Cade, and Richard Hill.

Kenya, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Just to support other members who are saying the approach you have taken is good enough for now. And, also, observe that the list of the characteristics we see, there are not very many. And in this respect, I would suggest that we don't go into cutting off either at ten or eight or 11 because whatever we are cutting off will be one of those proposals by one of us. It doesn't mean that it's a lesser proposal. But, of course, as I said earlier, there are not very many.

I also want to support the idea that some of those characteristics, they can be either matched or refreshed actually to look more -- more inclusive or better -- for better readability.

I have two examples, maybe I can just point out, when we talk about participation by governments on an equal footing, that is exactly what we are looking for. But in my understanding, equality could easily represent that characteristic in a better way and much broader than exactly how it has been put.

And then the last one on the list, responsive to innovation, I think that limiting responsiveness to innovation alone would be actually limiting that characteristic. But responsiveness is, in itself, an important characteristic which can be applied to very many areas, either innovation or policy change or certain changes in an environment. So we should not limit it to only innovation.

But, Mr. Chair, I think my main point is I don't see the point of us limiting or cutting off some of the suggestions by members. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya.

Anriette. No, you're not asking anymore, okay. So I turn to Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. As this is the first time I've taken the microphone, which I know must have been a shock to everyone --

[Laughter]

Rounds of applause for my patience.

[Applause]

Thank you. And my apologies, but I thought it was time for a little humor.

I want to say that in the early days of the discussion about this group, one of my first submissions was a call for us to do homework. And I'm very pleased that all colleagues agreed, and we did a lot of homework.

So now I would like us to reap the benefits of that homework. And I would like to endorse that we move forward with the Chair's approach and to ask even for colleagues who might not be totally comfortable with that, perhaps we take the agreement that we're going to try it.

I would also just say to our colleagues from Kenya, thank you so much for your comments. In the days when I was doing organizational development work with -- in a multistakeholder environment many years ago, we practiced the category of putting those things we weren't yet ready to agree on, on the parking lot and scheduled a time to be sure that we came back to those.

So perhaps we could practice that approach so that colleagues don't feel like something that they care a great deal about discussing totally falls off the list. But it is postponed until we get through our first set.

And, so, Chair, I endorse your approach and I join our colleague from the European Union in suggesting that we insist on it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn, for your comments. And don't be -- don't refrain yourself from speaking to the points you may wish. We look forward to your comments.

Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to support Kenya and say I really have a problem with the comments from the U.K. and Kenya, that we should only take the top ten. If we only take the top ten, then we don't have respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms. We don't have openness, and we don't have democratic.

If people start insisting that we restrict this to ten or something, then I'm sorry to say, Chairman, we will rapidly have no consensus whatsoever. So I think that we should adopt your approach and simply go through and see where there's significant support.

I could live with the top 15, but I think it would be much better not to put a number on and to go through what you said. And as people said anyway, these will be collapsed. So even if we take the top

15 at the end, they won't be 15. So I don't see any justification whatsoever from stopping it then and I would strongly object to that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. But I may be wrong, but I think what Kenya said is we should not lose any proposal. Even those that were support by even one, that should be retained. That's what I understood from Kenya.

So with your indulgence, before that we listen to Russian Federation and then I will proceed as suggested.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Mr. Chairman, I have some confusion concerning this. We have characteristics, but they have subject. How can we say in the same table result driven, evidence-based, and respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms is two different items? I'm not against them, but this should be not on the same line. One is the subject. Other is characteristics.

Flexible and adaptable, it does not -- not, not, not, not the same as human rights. I'm sorry. Help me with that. Maybe two tables, one subject for discussion and then characteristics, what we want to receive from that. Help me with that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think one of my concerns -- and I stated we should not be too concern about the way this would be worded in the final, let's say, outlook -- the output we will make. I would say exactly in that direction that there are different -- some of the elements that are here different in nature may be -- but one thing I think we should do and I think that would be a useful recommendation coming from this group, to indicate that in our view any process towards enhanced cooperation and implementation of enhanced cooperation should take on board those elements. B, it's referring to the process itself or to some characteristic that should -- outside that should be embedded in it.

So I take your point. I think that will require some further work in regard to the wording so at this point we'll just look at the notion. What belongs to enhanced cooperation, what does not belong. And this is the exercise I propose we proceed as of now, but we'll hear Iran first.

You have the floor, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair.

You took the words from my mouth, that first we go to all items, then we will see whether they fit within the enhanced cooperation or not, and the third is that whether some of them could be merged into the others to make the list shorter.

So you start this process going all together as an element that stands to be valid for their own, but whether it relates to the enhanced cooperation or not, whether it relates to the topic, as Russia correctly mentioned, there is another issue, and whether they could be merged with the others. So

these are the things we could do. We should not rush, and I think that is a good exercise to start. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, colleagues. I think we're actually getting somewhere in this very positive.

Just one thing. It's not just merging, which I think, you know, there's a lot of the characteristics listed that are prime for merge and finding a way to kind of state them in a more holistic way, but I also think that some of the characteristics, particularly later in the document, might be more appropriate as a recommendation to help achieve those characteristics.

So as we look at how we're -- I think as we go through this, we need to remind ourselves many -- some of these concepts might not be lost by not including them in this list. This list is just a way to structure what we're doing so when we get to the recommendations, which I think is where many people in this room have a lot of strong feelings and strong inputs, this is just a way to structure that conversation into that.

So perhaps some of these proposals wouldn't be lost. They just might be more appropriate being elaborated on in the next iteration of this process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, USA, and I take on board what was mentioned before by Marilyn Cade, that we should assign ourselves some homework. So I think part of our homework after this meeting would be on the basis of some decisions we make how to arrange this in a way that will be more appropriate, and I think that refers here.

So without -- if you'll indulge me, without any further ado, I'd like to draw your attention to those specific high-level characteristics. I would mention them as they appear, but without being tied to that title "high-level characteristics" but let's say notions that should be part of what we mean by enhanced cooperation.

At this point, I would not also be concerned about -- because I think each and every of these terms could lead us to very complex discussions on how these should be translating to existing processes or how these -- for example, when you talk about transparent, and I think Richard Hill made a point in regard what means -- what is the meaning of transparency in the context of the IGF, of ITU. It may not be the same. But let's say that would be some kind of general high-level characteristic that we think should be embedded in those processes, and I don't think it would be up to us here to try to elaborate or anticipate what -- how this discussion will take shape in those existing organizations' fora, but rather to indicate that we think this is something that should be there per -- for its face value.

Maybe in some other case, like multistakeholder participation, there might be a concern also about how this will take place and how this relates to the role of governments, but I think here again, there will be the notion coming from the WSIS that Internet governance at large should involve all stakeholders in

their respective roles and responsibilities, so maybe we should add those -- some wording here, but I would not expect us to elaborate too much on how this would take shape in the different processes.

So with these comments, I would invite you to look at the first, the -- the first ranked characteristic. That is transparent. And taking on board also that there might be some merger -- for example, transparency and openness, transparency and accountability -- we'll deal with this later. Let's just look at the -- that expression, transparent, and see if we can have some consensus that this should go into any recommendation addressing how enhanced cooperation can be further implemented that any process should be transparent.

Well, I see no objection or no requests for the floor, so I take this is something that indeed can be taken on board, so I would suggest we move to the second highly ranked. That is, inclusive.

Again, I see no requests for the floor.

Multistakeholder participation?

Oh, thank you. No requests -- Parminder. Make my day, Parminder.

[Laughter]

>>PARMINDER SINGH: One part of me says that let this list be gone through quickly because at this rate, we'll in any case be going to the next document which I would probably be favoring to discuss.

But still, let me say it at this moment because you also said that let's not go too much into how things will happen in actual places, and it's very difficult to really know -- I mean, at the end of the day, we would probably reach a conclusion that some things should be transparent, inclusive, multistakeholder, collaborative, and so on, not knowing what should be transparent, inclusive, multistakeholder, and so on.

As you said, that some of these issues -- all of these issues are applicable to Internet governance but enhanced cooperation is one clear instance of Internet governance.

Now, some of this would be different in that particular instance or that particular facet of Internet governance, which is one of the biggest things around enhanced cooperation. That's what particularly is enhanced cooperation.

So multistakeholder participation in holding a conference is very different from multistakeholder participation in public policymaking. It's the democratic principle, the constitutional principles of how policies get made. Public policy is a very clear concept of political establishments.

So, yeah, I mean, I'm very happy to go through the list and agree on everything, but I wanted to raise this issue that people should be able to say that when they agree with it or disagree with it, what are they agreeing or disagreeing with.

So even for transparent, yes, it should be transparent, but what do we really mean in terms of a possible process or mechanism of public policymaking? I mean, transparent is -- of course we can leave it because it is easier to understand.

But not multistakeholder participation. This can -- we can pass along but if you come to flexible and adaptable, again, I would have some comment.

But my issue here is that you're probably losing context of the application of these issues and that's why we may be very happy that we're going along very quickly, but probably we need to be able to say at each of the more important points what that conception is. Even not people who support it should be able to say that this is their conception of what they see as a process to be for public policymaking, which enhanced cooperation is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments, Parminder, and I think it is just fair to take notice that in regard to some of those characteristics that are being widely accepted by the group, there are some complexities attached to it that should be further looked into.

For example, when you mention multistakeholder participation in regard to public policymaking, that may deserve some qualification. That will be in dialogue with the discussion on equal footing and multistakeholder that we'll have on a later stage.

So I just repeat what I said before, that anything we decide here should be seen in context with the discussions that are yet to take place.

So what we are maybe deciding here at this stage does not mean that the way things are framed here will appear in a final document without any further qualification. Just that these are general things as notions that should be embedded in the enhanced cooperation process.

So I take on board your comment. I think this is fair for us to be aware from the beginning. In order, of course, not that anything that might be seen in conflict will come as a surprise later on.

So I think your point is very well taken.

Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just a comment on multistakeholder participation but -- and it also, I think, applies to inclusive.

I think it has two meanings. On the one hand, there is the principles and the importance given to the participation of stakeholders, as is reflected in the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS+10 high-level meeting chair resolution, but I think there's also a characteristic around participation of stakeholders that would be -- I'm not sure how to define it -- that would be more specific according to the issue at hand.

So if a public policy around environmental concerns and impact of Internet infrastructure development on the environment, for example, is being discussed, it would be very important that specific

stakeholders who are working or impacted on -- by those types of public policy outcomes should be there.

So I'm not suggesting we -- I think we keep that. I'm just flagging that when we elaborate these, it would be worthwhile, you know, pointing out that -- that there are these two layers. There's multistakeholder as we've come to understand it through the WSIS process, but there's also inclusivity of stakeholders in a more specific sense, referring to those that are directly impacted by decisions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Fully agree on -- speaking in a national capacity, it would be very important for us at this point to mention the different roles and responsibilities and the different contexts, so I think this is the kind of high-level characteristic we can agree should be embedded in any - - but that has to -- as Parminder has said, used the expression, that some context should be provided to provide for a better understanding of what are the related notions associated to that characteristic as seen by the group as a whole.

So could we move to --

So in regard to multistakeholder, I'll just maybe at this point make a small mark that it's one of the notions that is accepted but should deserve some more elaboration, some more text for that.

Collaborative?

Flexible and adaptable?

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thanks, Chair. Again, trying to provide a context to some of these terms, because these are terms which have been taken from the Internet discourse which has been building up in the last many years, and as I have seen this -- these two terms used together in some conceptions of Internet governance in many reports which have emanated from some of the northern think-tanks, for instance, and commissions, it has meant often to mean that somehow institutions should take shape around a policy issue when it emerges, and the structure of that shape should also be dependent on the policy issue which emerges and then it somehow disappears, a very postmodern conception of politics, which really does not, you know, relate to how democracies function, because these kind of very flexible forms are normally formed by stakeholders who are most powerful to call -- pull together an issue-based network and take some decisions.

So again, I just wanted to put a context that a lot of Internet governance models which have been floated use this terminology as stakeholders getting together around the policy issues spontaneously and developing norms and is not a form which in many public policy areas is very good for the people who are marginalized and not very strong, and they normally require institutional stability and depth to be able to take democratic decisions.

So that's one context I wanted to put forward on the flexible and adaptable. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comment. I must say that when I read it out, I associated these to many contributions that referred to the need to ensure that any process should be, I think, future-proof. I think that was the expression.

I was thinking more from the perspective of being adapted to future circumstances, also in regard to technology, but I was not thinking from the point of view you mentioned.

I -- again, here maybe we need some further clarification on the meaning. Yes, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: (off microphone) -- I think better fulfills that particular criteria, which the chair seems to be in mind. It's at the end of the table. And I agree that it should be responsive to innovation, the system should be responsive to innovation, which is not the same thing as I understand flexible and adaptable in the context it has been used. Sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. We'll come back to this. I'll give the floor first to Iran and then to the European Union.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps we need to better understand what it means by being flexible in enhanced cooperation. Either we cooperate or not cooperate. Flexible? That means some sort of latitude that at this stage I don't collaborate, I don't cooperate, and this, that, and the other. So we really need to understand what is behind this. Those people who made this contribution, perhaps they clarify. Maybe we have not got the point that they make. But flexibility and enhanced cooperation, what does it mean? Adaptability, yes, adapt to the environment, situation. But flexibility is also -- perhaps we need some sort -- so what I suggest is not to delete that from this list but highlight that and to come back to that to see whether we understand that. So I request the distinguished secretariat to firstly have the possibility of highlighting some of the issues that we need to come back to that. So that is one of the -- one of the issues.

And the other, not to come -- again ask for the floor, but results driven. What is results driven? So we are taking from the budget without base budget? It's all driven. So these are the things -- terms just taken from the scratch, so we have to really know that one, so these are the two things that I want to mention. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think your intervention is very much in line with what was raised by Parminder, and I think it is in the interest of the group to be very clear about the meaning of anything we suggest. I would certainly endorse the idea that we need some clarity on what is meant by flexible and adaptable.

I -- as I said, my reading of this was that it was responsive to innovation or future-proof but I may be wrong and I stand to be corrected and to have clarity on what is the exact meaning, but I look forward to the European Union maybe to shed some light on this, and then to Anriette and Wolfgang.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Well, now you put me in a difficult position because you asked me to shed light on it. I thought you did. And I was going to say exactly the same thing. And I can understand Parminder's concerns.

And I -- I thought -- and I was going to propose exactly the same, but you did it before.

To suggest that -- I don't know if you're using square brackets or how you're managing this but to add -- where did I see it now? Responsiveness to innovation in flexible and adaptable. I don't mind about how the wording is put but I think that's exactly what was being discussed by many people or proposed by many people.

The other is that you could put -- and again, it's a question of wording but I think it is responding to technological change, responsive to innovation, sustainable, flexible, adaptable. All those words are part of the same package for me.

So I leave it in your hands how you manage it, but I -- I think many people around the room would have similar ideas.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much. Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Chair, I also support Parminder's point. I don't think it should necessarily -- I don't think flexible and adaptable contradicts that. Maybe we can put the characteristic accessible, you know, somewhere in this text.

And then just in response to Mr. Kavouss, I also had a similar question initially about results driven, but then I thought, you know, it's a good discipline. It's -- you know, maybe before President Trump shuts down the U.N., it's not a bad thing for us to -- to -- you know, to be results-oriented but it is a bit strange, but I think at this point let's keep it in there because I think it's quite a helpful discipline. I think we can -- perhaps at a later stage when we finish our document, we can refine how we want to -- to express that we are result-oriented, but I think at this point it's a good approach and good to keep it in there.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, for the moment, we are getting there. But it's still flexible and adaptable. No, no, that's okay. Yes, yes. No, no, that's okay. The next one, so you can comment on both. Professor Wolfgang and then Saudi Arabia.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Quick response to Parminder. I think it's absolutely clear that there is no one multistakeholder model. I always argue to use the language "multistakeholder approach" because this gives us the flexibility to develop also innovative procedures, you know, how to deal with an issue. So that means the way how the stakeholders are involved in policy development or decision-making is dependent from the issue.

It looks different if you discuss cybersecurity issues, if you discuss Internet governance-related trade issues, or if you discuss names and numbers. So I think paragraph 71 says very clear, we'll involve all stakeholders in their respective roles. That means one issue, the role of the government or civil society or technical community, will be organized in a way which fits the special needs of the issue and another issue that's different. That's why I would not recommend to use the multistakeholder model but the multistakeholder approach. And this gives us the flexibility to react to also new emerging issues.

We have a lot of new issues which come in the future -- this is the point you have raised. Artificial intelligence, Internet of Things -- where we probably need a flexible framework to deal with this issue. And if we just exclude, you know, this multistakeholder approach and say, okay, we should give preferences to the multilateral things, then we exclude also opportunities to add more knowledge and Wisdom to the processes. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Saudi Arabia on my list.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Well, I think Parminder raised a very good point. We're discussing these high-level characteristics in no context. So it is hard to know the meaning of these and relevance. It would be very difficult for us to discuss this. It's like an English class now. It's very good wording, it's fine. But how to put this in real life and a recommendation. There we will find, I mean, problems and issues to put these into recommendations in line with Tunis Agenda. I think we should highlight for more deliberation and discussion but having very light discussion, title looks fine but what are behind those titles.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think the challenge for us here is to come to some agreement around some principles or characteristics that would be acceptable for even very different positions, different contexts. For example, in regard to multistakeholder participation or multistakeholder approach, I agree with Professor Wolfgang, maybe I -- unless this would be violation to the spirit that was contained in the submission. But I don't think it's the case we should replace "multistakeholder participation" by "multistakeholder approach." It's something that should be embedded in the process.

But I think the real issue here would be to see if that expression addresses concerns expressed by you, by others, by those who favor the creation of intergovernmental body.

But I see that even those who favor accept some sort of participation among stakeholders. So I think the things we are trying to come to expression would be accepted by the group as a whole.

I think we must make sure that the way we approach the multistakeholder element, we do it in a way that all parties would be comfortable in accepting the principle.

I concur with Professor Wolfgang, if we refer to multistakeholder approach, we are referring to an ocean that is qualified by many, a portion including the one I mentioned that is important, my delegation, their roles and responsibilities which in our case allows to see in different context how the multistakeholder approach would be applied. So I at least personally try to accommodate some concerns we have.

I think, again, the challenge here is to come up with formulations that even if we are not addressing the specific context, they could be accepted as something that could guide the process even for participants coming from very different perspectives and very different directions.

So I would suggest for the moment we could keep the approach we have been taking, highlighting those elements that need some further work but to retain that those are important notions that even if they deserve much more elaboration on our part, much more homework on how to better -- those are important things we should not drop at this point.

I will -- I have on my list Nigel. Do you request the floor? No, not anymore. Okay, thank you.

Should we move then to the next characteristic, which would be result driven? We have already heard some comments from Iran and also Anriette.

I think in that light, I would also suggest that result driven should be highlighted as one that needs some further clarification in order to make sure if it will be -- if it will make it to our final list. We have -- all of us have clarity of what is meant by this.

I have on my list Mr. Yokozawa from the Japanese industry and then Jimson Olufuye.

You have the floor, Mr. Yokozawa.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Yes, yes. Nothing to add if you say the result driven is marked as yellow, with yellows.

But if you look at the sheet -- at the spreadsheet, it is indicated to the "result driven or the effective." So maybe we can treat this word as what is shown in the spreadsheet.

And, for example, the ICC-BASIS has marked as the agree to raise this as characteristics. But we were just highlighting this keyword "effective."

Maybe just referring to this, I agree result driven is remaining as one of the candidates of the characteristics. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Well, I just want to throw a little more light into the characteristic result driven. In Nigeria, I know, for example, more than 20,000 projects became failed project. And looking closely, it was more like the attitude to that project. And so in Nigeria, the (inaudible) process now, result is very key in terms of spending, in terms of what you do. So that is all we're looking at, that whatever we're going to come up with must have in mind that we're going to provide a result. It's going to add value. It's going to be effective at the end. So it's not just an exercise, just to have a program or just to have a mechanism or just to have a process.

So within enhanced cooperation it must have some result we expect down the line. So that is the whole idea why we feel that any enhanced cooperation should have that kind of high-level characteristic. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I give the floor to Iran. And I apologize. I think you have raised your flag and was not recognized before. But please go ahead.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The Japanese colleague raised a good point. I think perhaps after result driven, introduce a slash or a diagonal stroke in English and put "effectiveness." That is more understandable by the people rather than "result driven," "effectiveness." That means whether these things we are developing are effective or not. That would be good, and we come back to that. So introduce after "result driven" in the table, diagonal stroke "effectiveness."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention. May I just maybe request the secretariat, I think my suggestion -- and this is being submitted for your consideration. In regard to the third item, multistakeholder participation, replace it with "participation by approach." Can it be done on the screen? Instead of "multistakeholder participation" to state "multistakeholder approach." No, delete "participation" and replace it with "approach." So that maybe we don't lose this.

And in regard -- and then three lines below in "result driven," we include what are the proposal by Iran, slash "effectiveness." So there's something, an attempt to reflect on things that were said and submitted to your consideration.

With this, I turn to European Union. You have the floor.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to come back in again. On "result driven," I was just wondering if goal oriented or something like that would be a better word. For me -- and, again, I'm in your hands and the hands of the room. For me "effectiveness" is something that is rather an ex post assessment element. So goal driven or goal oriented or result driven or something like that I can understand because this is what you're aiming at. But effectiveness is for me ex post. You can't determine that something is effective unless you have looked at it.

I understand what is being proposed, but I just wonder if it's something that is not necessarily a characteristic of enhanced cooperation but the result of it. But I leave that in your hands.

But I'm just wondering if using the word "goal" would be better than "result." Again, it's completely open for your very good management to decide how to do it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. My opinion would be not to lose any of the elements that are being proposed and with the provision that we should revert to -- certainly to this in some next occasion.

So my suggestion -- and I request to secretariat under this item to put even slash "goal oriented" so when we come back to this, we decide what is the best way. We want to reconcile the different views. I understand from the perspective of the business sector, it's very clear what is meant. I think there was a concern that on other parts, especially because we are dealing with public policies that span many areas, like cybersecurity. So we want to make sure that here we include something that makes sense also in other contexts, not exactly that have that kind of business input.

But I think as I understand from the Chair, the notion that any process should be -- should have that kind of forward-looking, very pragmatic approach should be there. I think it should be retained. It is good by the group to retain it.

So if you agree, I suggest we could move to the next topic that refers to respecting the sovereign right of states to establish and implement public policy. I think that relates to paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually we do not feel comfortable with this phrase because, first of all, respecting sovereign rights of states to establish and implement public policy looks like it's in the context of a national public policy. So when it comes to enhanced cooperation, it's clearly stated in Tunis Agenda that the topic is international public policy.

And we think that this is important things now to be detailed because it's clearly different relations between governments and other stakeholders when they make their national public policy and if we go into the next level on international public policy. Then it will be another part of relation between governments and other stakeholders. So we see that we change it because when we go to the characteristic of enhanced cooperation, we need to speak about international, not national public policy.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia.

Let me just read out what is stated in paragraph 35(a): "Policy, authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states. They have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues." And then we're developing 69. So I don't see -- I think Tunis Agenda addresses the authority of states both from a national perspective but also from -- I don't see a contradiction here.

I think those who propose these were trying to correlate high-level characteristics with the provision that is already in Tunis Agenda which we are -- we are not touching on. In a way, we are just recalling something that should be guiding our work.

I think that's to put in perspective that I think it's nothing new that's being stated here but rather whether we should or not say that it is a high-level characteristic.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: The Section 35 talks about all areas of Internet governance. But enhanced cooperation is about international public policies. And, therefore, 35 has two sentences. One is about the sovereign right, and sovereignty applies within a country. And internationally they have said right. So if we just remove so, then you probably -- and add "international" before "public policies," that would be -- perhaps satisfy Russia because I think also would be the proper thing what 35 means in

respect to 69, which is enhanced cooperation, respecting the right of states to establish and implement international Internet-related public policies, or just public policy.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, we'll come back to this. I would like to listen first to Japan, then Saudi Arabia.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair.

As for respecting sovereign rights of the states, this is kind of the traditional, basic principle that is already subscribed in ITU constitution also. Since it's a basic idea, I really don't think we need to debate this here because, you know, the enhanced cooperation -- we are not -- enhanced cooperation, "enhanced" means to improve something, to improve the way to address international public policy issues for the Internet. We are talking about improvement, improving.

So I think it's kind of misleading to repeat this traditional idea of respecting the sovereign rights of the states. I'm a bit reluctant to accept this. For the time being, could you maybe highlight it in yellow maybe. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, I will comment on this, but I'd like first to hear then Saudi Arabia and Richard Hill.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Well, in short, I support the views expressed by our colleague from Russia and Parminder. We really need to add the word "international" before "public policy" to reflect the characteristic of enhanced cooperation. It's also international public policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard Hill and then Mexico.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Every item on the list is something that's obvious, and that's why we're able to agree on them, so we don't need to say transparent, inclusive, collaborative, et cetera, et cetera, either.

So if we start picking and choosing, we're going to get nowhere. So if Japan insists on putting respecting the sovereign rights, however it's reformulated -- I'm not sensitive to that -- in yellow, then I want to go back and put everything else in yellow also on the principle that nothing is agreed till everything is agreed.

I thought we were in good faith going through stuff where there's obvious overwhelming support and we were not going to question that. If we start that game, I'll go back and question transparent, Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Just a question. I think it will be important to know what's the rationale behind this element we have on the list. For me, at least, it's not clear if the idea is to highlight the right of the states or maybe the idea is that -- to give the enhanced cooperation this characteristic of being respectful of the mandate and responsibilities of each actor, which I -- I think this is the difference.

One is to highlight the state responsibility and the other one is maybe to make a difference and be sure that it's going to be respectful of the mandates and responsibility of each actor in this multistakeholder approach.

So I will be happy to hear from the proponents what is the rationale behind it because I think it's important to know exactly what's the meaning behind. Maybe that can help to understand better this phrase. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

As you rightly mentioned, this text is more or less from Paragraph 35(a), so we don't want to mix it up with the Paragraph 69.

If we want to introduce international public policy issue, take Paragraph 69 and put it somewhere, but this is saying that this public policy issue, exclusive rights of governments and so on and so forth, because government establishing this based on the needs of the public -- of the people living in that country. So we don't want to mess it up with international. If you want to put international, put it in another paragraph but not this one. This one is verbatim from the Paragraph 35(a), so we keep it as it is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just allow me to make some comments.

I think we have initially referred to Paragraph 35(a), and then Parminder also commented, and Iran.

As we look at language coming from 35(a), again, it says it's sovereign rights for public policy issues, but as rightly pointed out by Parminder, when the specific subset of international Internet-related public policy, which is the one that is of interest for us, it does not say for sovereign rights. It says states have rights and responsibilities.

And maybe the notion of sovereignty in international public policies is something contradictory in itself, because each state will exert its sovereignty but in cooperation with others. One will not impose its sovereignty on -- or should not.

So I think that maybe here I would tend to agree with what was voiced by Iran that here we are trying to import something that is very clearly stated elsewhere and say it is a characteristic of enhanced cooperation.

Maybe we should retain that notion but not as a characteristic of enhanced cooperation but, rather, as something that is spelled out in the Tunis Agenda that is important that should guide, let's say, the

efforts of enhanced cooperation but not as a characteristic because it's something that -- a decision that was made 10 years ago. We are not changing it. Maybe we can recall it and say it's something that should be certainly followed, but maybe it's different things as the other elements we have identified as characteristics.

So I'm in your hands, of course, but I think maybe here we have a kind of different nature of things.

I have on my list Pakistan and Professor Wolfgang and -- Mexico again? No.

So Pakistan, you have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador. Actually, the Paragraph 35(a), Tunis was formulated in a very different context.

It was the context in which the role of governments and the role of stakeholders was differentiated and given in terms of public policy issues with the government, technical and economic-related issues with stakeholders.

Since we are referring to 35(a) now with respect to this characteristic, I think it's quite fair that now we need to contextualize it, because if we don't do it, then the original paragraph is saying in a different context, but we need to bring something -- some context out of it so that it is -- it makes sense to us.

So I think I would support those who are suggesting that we should put "international" because policy authority for governments is in both areas. Of course at national level, but at international level they have also authority, but of course the need to cooperate with each other. Other than that, it's not possible.

Since our objective and mandate is only with respect to international, I think it would make sense if we include either the word "international" or we can reformulate in a way that can provide this meaning. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

Professor Wolfgang.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I support the proposed approach by the chairman that some things are self-evident, and I want to remember also, all participants here, that the group of governmental experts have agreed already two years ago that the (indiscernible) principles of international law are relevant both on line and off line. So that means the seven (indiscernible) principles laid down in the United Nations charter, which include the sovereign equality of states, the right of self-determination of people, and also the principle of international cooperation are already laid down, and -- as they exist, and are relevant both on line and off line.

So we just can refer to the fact that this is the reality, but I do not see this as a very specific for enhanced cooperation and so far, you know, let's refer to the existing document and let's move forward what we can add as the way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Iran and then Parminder.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps I was misunderstood. I said that put 35 verbatim, because 35 has two parts. The reason is for drafted is two different things and two different areas, so if you want to put 35(a), put it verbatim the entire paragraph. That is, two paragraphs. The first one talking of the public policy issue, the sovereign rights, and then saying that that -- they have the right and responsibility for international Internet public policy issues.

So as I mentioned, verbatim, mention that, but not separate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. This is noted.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I have no problem with the proposal of Iran to put both elements of 35(a) there due to, again, connected to the enhanced cooperation.

It is directly connected, the second part, which says that states have roles and responsibilities in terms of international public policy issues because 69 says "We further recognize the need for enhanced cooperation in the future to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues." This is a cut/paste from the role which was defined by the second part of 35(a), so that clearly says, again, government's roles and responsibilities in international public issues is a part of 69 as well, which is the heart of the matter for enhanced cooperation.

So that part is more important of 35(a), but even if both are put there, I wouldn't have a problem.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. At this point in time I think it's important in some portion of the document, of the report, to reflect on this particular topic on how the right of states -- the sovereign right of states to public policy and roles and responsibilities in view of international Internet-related public policy issues apply. However, again, I'm not too convinced that that should come under this section of characteristics, and I -- my suggestion would be to agree that this issue is an important issue, it should be addressed on the basis of the transcription, and to mention Paragraph 35(a) maybe even as an introduction, as something that should guide what is -- or should lead us or should help us in interpreting what is said below, but I don't think we should attempt to rephrase 35(a) because 35(a) has two parts, as has been said.

One that refers to the roles and responsibilities for international Internet-related, but I think this is seen in the overall context of the first part of 35(a) that says that states have the sovereign rights toward the Internet.

So I think when you read everything in -- together, that conveys some context that if you just take the second part, I think we lose something.

But again, I don't think my personal opinion, that this would belong here in characteristics. I suggest we agree that 35(a) should be reflected also in the report as something that should be guiding ourselves and therefore I would maybe at this point suggest either to delete it or to highlight it, indicating that that part deserves some more work on our part towards seeing how to best reflect it in the final output of this group.

Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: The fundamental part of enhanced cooperation is exactly this paragraph. It's the -- the fundamental characteristic. Now, I agree that it's already agreed, so perhaps we don't need to reproduce it, but then let's make that clear.

So put the entire paragraph here, if you want, or put in a sentence saying, "The high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation include Paragraph XYZ of the Tunis Agenda, and, in addition, the following characteristics," I can go along with that. But I cannot go along with your listing characteristics without making reference to the basic ones that are already agreed. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Wolfgang?

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Certainly this is an important paragraph, 35(a), but you cannot discuss 35(a) in isolation. You cannot isolate 35(a) from the Paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e), and you cannot isolate 35 from the Paragraph 34, which defines Internet governance, and I think if we refer to 35(a), we have to have also a reference to the working definition, which is the overall umbrella for all this. So that means the 35(a) is embedded in the general approach which can be drawn from the working definition and which says "includes also the concept of sharing." Sharing principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs that shape the evolution and use of the Internet.

So that means an exclusive treatment of 35(a) would destroy the context, and you have to have this whole architecture reflected in the report on the recommendations of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have quite a long list now of --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Let me -- okay. Who should be next?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I thank you. So I'll give floor now to the Russian Federation, followed by Saudi Arabia and Canada.

You have the floor, sir.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we would like to support what Iran said, that both issues are important. 35 para is important, but we also need to speak clearly here about international public policy as a intergovernmental format. And we need to add it here and to work with the wording.

When it comes to 35, it's also just detailing public policy is only for (a) and (d). Others are about technical characteristic, not just public policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I think this is a turning point in our discussion. We are not mandated to discuss Internet governance in general. However, the mandate is to discuss enhanced cooperation and the role of government and international public policy issues. That's why we have asked to amend this high-level characteristic to include international, at least to be inside the context of the mandate which is enhanced cooperation. This should be clear in our discussion. We accept that Internet governance in general include a multilateral process and a multistakeholder process. But when it comes to enhanced cooperation, the majority is for the states to develop public policy issues in consultation. So this high-level characteristic should focus on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I would like to chime in to say that I support your approach in terms of that this is not a characteristic. This is bigger than that, and I agree that this perhaps does not fit in this list, but it is something that is agreed, it is well-framed in the Tunis Agenda, and it is quite factual. It is much more than a characteristic. So I would agree with you to move this particular discussion or this aspect of the sovereign right and the role of governments in establishing public policy, international or national. It's not a characteristic; it's a fact. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I think Wolfgang's point is good. It's always difficult to take bits and pieces out of context, so I have no objection to adding more text or more references to the Tunis Agenda.

And to Canada's point, as I said before, I don't have a problem making this a preamble or a chapeau, or whatever, so you can say, "Enhanced cooperation is this, that, and the other thing" -- or just references to Paragraphs X, Y, and Z -- "and in addition has the following characteristics," and then we can discuss the characteristics. On the other hand, if the intent is to say "The characteristics are" without explicit references in the same document, in the same place to some version of these what are accepted text, then I cannot agree.

So that's my compromise proposal, Chairman. We come up with a chapeau, which is either reproducing text or citing paragraphs, and then under the chapeau we have additional characteristics or whatever -- we can find the exact language -- and we can have a list of points.

But I have to say I think that we're going on dangerous ground now because people say these are accepted as facts when, in fact, they're not. In fact, the whole discussion up to now has always been about, "Oh, do we really accept the sovereign rights of states, except for one particular one," which we know about and will not name.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'll give the floor to Anriette and ICANN, but I would like to comment at this point in time.

I fully agree with Canada that when we are referring to portions of Tunis Agenda that have already been agreed upon and we should -- do not have a mandate to rephrase or reformulate, so I would be very reluctant to try to change the language coming from Tunis Agenda from other portions, or even from the three paragraphs we are focusing.

I think that maybe we can have -- that was my proposal. To have, even at the -- up front in the document, in the introduction, saying that everything that we understand enhanced cooperation is framed by the -- the paragraphs on Internet governance as spelled out by Tunis Agenda.

My experience, having worked at the WSIS+10 meeting in New York, if we try to select one or two paragraphs, as relevant as they are, we end up in that kind of exercise because immediately someone else will come and say, "No, not only this, but" --

So we can agree that the general framework, we are working this one, and due to the fact that enhanced cooperation has particular characteristics, we may wish to highlight some of those paragraphs. Maybe 35(a) or 34. But let's not, let's say, talk too much and discuss too much on the substance of other paragraphs that do not belong to the enhanced cooperation section. I think it would be -- and I think that would be a good approach at saying "In that framework, we agree or we recommend that enhanced cooperation should have these and these characteristics."

So again, I think that particular item should be moved, maybe with that kind of framing, one -- again, I don't think it's up to us at this moment to think how -- just maybe to retain the idea it's an important thing but that should come up front and in a way that will be seen as guiding and framed -- given the context or everything that we follow.

But I would like, of course, to hear Anriette and ICANN on this topic. You have the floor. Yes.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: My input is really just to agree with you and with the input from the -- the comment from Canada and Richard's proposal.

I think it can be definitely in preambular text. And I also think that we might want to, at some point in our output document, look at what the scope is of these international public policies.

And -- and just to flag, there's also quite good text in the WSIS+10 resolution, the 2015 resolution, which refers to cross-cutting. I think the term in that resolution is "cross-cutting international public policy issues."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Uh-huh. Okay. Thank you. Nigel?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Mr. Chairman, I mean, really just to agree with what Canada proposed and I think what you summarized quite correctly. I mean, I think this is an incredibly important group of words but how one describes it as a characteristic alongside some of the other characteristics I think is -- is somewhat more difficult, and I -- I can see that, you know, by amending it and adding words, one might get there, but I think it will be better in a preamble.

I don't think, for example, just adding "international" actually works because I don't think then it becomes a sort of factual -- a factual statement.

So I think your approach, which I understand we've taken in a couple of other situations where we've referenced the Tunis Agenda and perhaps given an example of a paragraph rather than specifically saying "according to this paragraph" or whatever is the best way forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel, for your intervention.

I give the floor to Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I suspected that at one stage we would lose track of the meaning of the term "characteristics." And we seem to have reached there because it seems that the process of respecting the sovereign rights of states to establish public policy is not a characteristic but multistakeholder approach is a characteristic, which to me look like things at a similar conceptual level, whether one agrees or not, but we can agree on the level of a particular term.

Both are similar statements of rules of actors in an institutional framework, which is supposed to have to do with public policy making.

So now to say that if something is of the nature of respecting the sovereign rights of states is not a characteristic but if something is a nature of a multistakeholder is a characteristic is really getting beyond just framing concepts, which are applicable to a divisive kind of discussion.

So I must also insist that the term "multistakeholder approach" is there in 37. It's not in 69. Some other words are used. But international public policy making, the right of states, right and responsibilities of a state for international public policy is part of 69, which clearly categorizes what enhanced cooperation was supposed to be by those who framed Tunis Agenda.

I think if we need -- we are to go along with this process, we quickly make some bracket with "international" and something like that and carry on saying -- remembering this discussion took place here. But any question of removing this is something not acceptable.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I must say respectfully, I do not concur exactly with your assessment because it's not that we are not saying that the sovereign rights of states is something not important or a characteristic. Actually, we are proposing even to give it a high status in the document because it would be in the context of rules that have been decided should govern the process.

What I'm arguing here is that when we try to formulate -- I'm already -- at the same time I'm trying to avoid it but thinking how the output of the document will look like.

When we say that a way to further implement enhanced cooperation needs to take on board some notions, for example, that processes be transparent, inclusive, should have -- I think different to say it should respect the sovereign rights of states. I think this is something that's up front.

It can be argued that everything is up front because when you look at the different paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda on Internet governance, everything, you know, is there: Transparent, inclusive, multistakeholder approach. So at some point, we need to see how these ideas will feed into the final output. I agree with you.

My suggestion now would be for the moment would be to highlight this. We take on board all the discussions, all the points that were made. I think it should not be removed from -- I agree because of not everyone thinks this is the case. Let's just highlight the full text and we will come back to this in another round of discussion on this.

But the intention here is just to see in which section of the document each of those notions -- both are important. The right of states or in the primacy of states in the establishment of public policy of the multistakeholder approach is how -- or in which section that would fit better, not that we are saying one thing is important, the other is not important. I think that's the way at least as I see it.

So if that could be acceptable, I would suggest doing this. But then I'd like to listen to others.

I have on my list Richard Hill, Iran, and Mr. Yokozawa from Japan.

Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I support Parminder's proposal. I can partly support you, Chairman, but only partly. Multistakeholder, as Parminder pointed out, is also there in the Tunis Agenda. So why are we singling that one out and not -- so we have to be consistent.

If the idea is that we do not repeat things that are in the Tunis Agenda, I can live with that. But then we have to review this whole document starting from the beginning because that's not how we started.

So since you've put "respecting the sovereign rights" in yellow, Chairman, I request formally that you put everything in yellow that we have gone up to. So please put transparent, inclusive, and collaborative also in yellow because my understanding was that we were not getting to the games of taking out things that were already agreed. I think transparent and inclusive are already there in the Tunis Agenda, so we don't need to repeat them. So I can live with an approach that refers to the Tunis

Agenda and says then in addition to things that are mentioned explicitly in the Tunis Agenda, here are other things that are not mentioned explicitly which we like. That's a different exercise, and I don't think any of us are prepared -- well, maybe some people were. I was not prepared for that. So I was not looking at this list in that light, and I'm not prepared to say which ones are or are not already covered in the Tunis Agenda.

Again, Chairman, please put transparent, inclusive, and collaborate in yellow.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran is next and Mr. Yokozawa. After that I close the list as we are approaching the deadline for our meeting this afternoon and I come back to the issues that were raised by you, Richard.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We don't agree you take it from this list. And the entire paragraph (a), little a, should be there. The other paragraph 35 is not related, technical issues and so on and so forth. So we don't want to put it.

And you said that you put it in the preamble. It depends what language is used in the preamble. But our preference is to keep it here. But the whole paragraph (a), little a, because first part relates to the sovereignty of the government for the public policy issues is more or less internal.

The second says they also have Internet public policy. So both part of the paragraph (a) should be there in this without any highlighting. If you take -- highlight like this, that means we are (indiscernible) to respond to our responsibility. The whole thing is here. The sovereign rights of the government for the public policy issues and the same thing for the international. So what else are we discussing?

So we don't agree that you take it from this list, please. Keep the list the whole paragraph but without highlights. Otherwise, we take the approach of Mr. Hill. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Mr. Yokozawa will be the last speaker for this session. Please, you have the floor.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you, Chairman. I just want to give some technical proposal about this discussion, very long discussion.

So I would like to highlight in a different color, other than yellow, because this specific item is a little bit different from the other items. So we should have some intense discussion about this, whether we should put it in the preamble or a chapeau and putting with the Tunis Agenda reference or not. And maybe that could be something we have to work afterwards.

So at this moment, I should -- I would propose a different color marking should be better to move forward the discussion. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I give the floor to three speakers that have requested. I think it's important maybe to have some more views before I make a final statement on these. And we resume tomorrow.

I recognize Russian Federation, United States, and Saudi Arabia.

Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the situation which we have now, it's due to start from the beginning of the document. If we start from -- start in the middle -- if we start from beginning with chapeau, enhanced cooperation is something based on and then we mention 35(a), 35(d), 69, and so on where we have voting concerning public policy-related issues.

In this case not to have side discussion now but to have it. That's why we received that. That's one point.

Another point is concerning we should look what is the format. Format could be Internet Governance Forum format. That's one format. The format concerning multistakeholder format is another format. Maybe we could also consider one formats or two formats. In this case, we should have some different text for that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. USA. United States of America thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My intervention will be very short. I am just going to say I think at least personally as we started today, I was a little uncertain about the approach we were taking and kind of where the day would lead.

I think that we've started on a path which is being constructive, is leading us to start to identify concepts and ideas, and to start actually getting towards -- or making progress towards our goal. I also notice it's kind of the end of the day and it's been a little bit frustrating trying to work through that process.

So my recommendation is instead of making kind of decisions on this right now at the end of the day, I think having this list, having understanding the approach we're taking, and having a night to consider that, perhaps think about some of these points because some of them -- I may -- we may agree with, we may not. This is the first time we are really considering because they weren't in our proposal.

I think having an opportunity to reflect on some of these and maybe beginning that tomorrow morning without having made decisions on anything today would be very beneficial and our recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Well, in short, I think the intervention of Richard and Parminder are quite to the point. We have characteristics are included in the Tunis Agenda and they are not highlighted in yellow. When it comes to the main characteristic discussion, some said it's not relevant, it is a fact. So either we highlight all what we have discussed for future discussion or we should not highlight any text in here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, thank you. In regard to this, I would like to say the following. I think we may have some difficulties to say now how all this will fit in the document. But I think there was -- well, first of all, I think it was agreed at least as I understood to proceed this way, to give a try in revisiting those items, trying to identify which of those would, let's say, be non-controversial, if I can use that, or not lead to some further discussion and which could maybe easily be framed in a way we could recommend. So I think in a way, we have been doing it in quite a successful way because I think that even those items that are highlighted in yellow now, they have not been dropped. I think the issue about how they are how to reflect in the document, how to find the appropriate language, and how to reflect them in the document.

And all of us, I think, share the same sentiment that we don't want to -- first of all, we are not rephrasing the Tunis Agenda. We should fully take on board everything that is there. And maybe take the same approach in regard to things that have been said elsewhere. So I take the point that, for example, if 35(a) is there and there is a paragraph that includes stakeholder that is also there, maybe everything that relate to that issue should come up front and indicate that this should frame the discussion. So I don't see a major issue about this.

So, Richard, I beg your indulgence because the approach we decided from the outset was to if we don't see any objection, let's leave it as. Let's just highlight those elements that are controversial. I would be reluctant to highlight the full document because I think that would not reflect the discussion we had here. I think tomorrow we should -- I suggest we keep the document as it is, has been developed until now, that we resume tomorrow. We sleep on this, and we come back tomorrow. Wishfully we can have maybe some quick discussion because I think some of the points that have been raised -- some of the main points that should be discussed, I'm not sure if we took a different approach and start discussing the language that would take us farther in a quicker pace. Probably we would be much more stuck around some discussions.

So I -- we could have done the other way around, but I don't think now it's -- at least I'd like to -- with your indulgence to give a try to -- try to finish if we can probably quicker than we have done for this one, two, three, four, five, six, seven points. I think we have done something today, not maybe too much but something. And I think we can come back tomorrow and try to have a go at this and then move immediately to the section of the synthesis paper, if you wish to work on the synthesis paper.

And then we will walk through the language and try to have some -- and discuss all the points that were raised here. But this would be my suggestion to you in regard to what we have done today.

I see we are already behind schedule but I see Richard Hill would like to take the floor for a quick comment on this, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. Thank you. Yes, I can live with your proposal, Chairman, except I think we more or less agreed we would not necessarily go back to the synthesis document. I didn't understand that it was planned to do that. And I think it might help if you or somebody else have the energy tonight -- I will not do it -- to come up with the candidate chapeau. Not something that we would negotiate or approve, but just so people have some idea of what we're talking about in the chapeau which would say,

"Referring to Paragraphs XYZ of the Tunis Agenda," blah, blah, blah, because then it will be easier for us to look at these things in context if we have even just a first initial straw man draft of the chapeau.

If it's not possible, it's not possible, but if it were possible, I think that might help. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We will, yes, first of all, exhaust the discussion on -- as we have been doing in regard to -- on how we will deal with the paragraphs addressing the language. At least to me, it is not clear we'd decided to leave the synthesis paper, to put it aside. I think that decision was taken in regard to that part of the work we are doing.

We'll need to have some more reflection on whether we work on the basis of synthesis or maybe we work on a more synthetic paper just illuminating what are the issues and we can discuss the issues. But I think something will get there. We discuss it when we get there, I think. I hope we can finalize the review of this list in the first one hour and half hour and that will leave us some time to go through the other part of the work.

So with this, I'd like to thank you for coming today for these discussions. I would like to turn to the secretariat to ask if there is any announcements to be made in regard for tomorrow's meeting. Otherwise, we'll be meeting here at 10:00 a.m. to resume our work.

There are no announcements, so I'd like again to thank you and wish you a good night's sleep and see you back tomorrow. Thank you.

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Second Meeting
Geneva, Switzerland
Day 2, 27 January 2017

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning, everyone. I would like you to invite you to take your seats. We are going to start in two minutes.

So good morning. I welcome all of you to this morning's session of the second day of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation meeting.

I will -- just before we resume the work we are doing yesterday, I'd like to make a few comments on how I propose to organize our work for today.

I think as we have agreed yesterday, we will start immediately by trying to finalize the list of items of characteristics that have emerged from the contributions. We -- I hope this will not take too much of our time for this morning's session. And immediately after that, we will move to the issues, other issues, that were also in connection with characteristics that were raised in the contributions, those dealing more precisely to the wording of Paragraph 69 and 71.

So my best hope is that we could have at least a first reading, first discussion, on those topics today, so by the end of this meeting, we could, anyway, address, at least in a first go, the issues that were mentioned by you in your contributions in relation to the characteristics but also to the scope, to the format, so the issues associated to the main characteristics of enhanced cooperation.

At this point in the day -- and I'd like to flag this as from the beginning -- we will need to agree on the dates, on the exact dates for the next meetings, the meeting in May, and the meeting in September-October. I'm flagging this because I've received requests from various parties -- and I think this is very fair that those requests were made -- that we should be able, by the end of this meeting, to have a precise understanding of what would be the dates for the meetings for this year, at least, for planning purposes and organizational purposes.

So I think the experience of working those two days have demonstrated, especially next time, we will go through, if the group wishes to go through, the compilation of recommendations, because I think this would be the other leg of our work associated to the questions we addressed to the community back in September.

We certainly might need more than the two days we allowed ourselves for this meeting.

So my proposal, and I leave it for your consideration -- not to discussion now; I'd like maybe that you could digest a little bit on this -- that we could meet for three days in May, before CSTD; and regarding the September meeting, I would suggest that we need at least three more days, if not more, and I think

there will be a challenge to find the exact timing for the meeting because I understand there are so many international meetings and events in September-October.

I heard from colleagues that maybe the end of September or first week of October would be the best suitable dates, so I would like to, in formal consultations with you and the secretariat, try to think a little bit what would be the best dates, so by the end of this session today -- not now -- we could discuss this.

So this is as I see it for the moment.

I'd like to invite you to resume the work we had done yesterday. I would certainly expect that it will not take us too much time to revisit, and I have some optimistic expectation that in regard to the remaining items that we listed as characteristics, there might not be the kind of discussion --

I think in relation to some of those preceding items, those raised were attached to some of the most important controversial aspects, so I would not -- I would tend to think that the remaining items could be revisited in a more quick way.

I will -- for today, we will use a resource available for this room, with the assistance of the secretariat. I would kindly invite all those who take the floor to not spend more than three minutes, and this will be displayed on the screen so you -- it will be there for your information and discipline, and I hope this will enable us -- also be an additional instrument to help our discussions to be even more efficient than the ones we had yesterday.

So just before, then --

And I'd ask the secretariat, please, to post on screen the list of items. We will take it from where we ended yesterday, but before doing that, I have two speakers who have requested for the floor, Nick Ashton-Hart and Jovan Kurbalija.

So Nick, you have the floor.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thanks very much and good morning. Just as a point of clarification, I had thought the agenda we agreed to yesterday was that yesterday we would talk about Question 1 of the two questions and today we would talk about Question 2.

Is that not the case? Because if I -- unless I'm misunderstanding, you're proposing actually to spend rather more time on Question 1 without necessarily any limit as to -- and I didn't think that's what we actually said we would do. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Uh-huh. I think you are -- what you just said referred to the proposal that was made by Cuba, and I recall that in reference to that, what I suggested is that the discussion would not address exactly Questions 1 and 2 because, anyway, they are interrelated; that we would -- and I think it was agreed in the course of discussion to work on the basis of the items that are as they are spelled out in the synthesis paper initially, on the -- building on the characteristics, but -- not on the basis of the

synthesis but rather on the spreadsheet and the accompanying text. That's what we are doing right now. And then that where he would revert to the other issues that were raised.

So anyway, those issues refer to both 1 and 2, so I -- my suggestion was not to have that kind of separation of the topics.

But since I have also circulated -- the secretariat has circulated the document on compilation of recommendations, anyway -- and I think this was also agreed, that this would not be touched upon until we finalize the discussion on the issues that were raised in -- as spelled out in the synthesis paper.

Anyway, those issues relate more to characteristics and principles than to the recommendation itself, so I think that was my proposal and I think it was accepted at the time that we should go on in that way and that we would only look very specifically at the recommendations on the basis of the compilation document in another stage.

So I -- I thought that was how -- maybe the way I articulated it was not clear, but when we approved the agenda, it was agreed that we would -- the language in 4 would be kept as it is, so that would give us flexibility to address the issues as we decide.

So first maybe we have -- even though the questions are interrelated, we focus a little bit more on the characteristics, the format, scope, and then we move to recommendations in another stage. Is that understood or -- is that okay?

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you for that clarification. I had understood that we wouldn't discuss the documents, per se, but that we would actually not spend all of our time at this meeting on characteristics alone, and if I'm wrong, I'm happy to be corrected by other colleagues who remember differently.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think that if we do not go directly to the document and we prolong the discussion on procedural aspects, we'll not get there.

My intention was to revisit very quickly the items, and I said I think we could do it quickly, but I'm in your hands. If you want to discuss these procedural aspects, that could take the full morning and it's up to you. Jovan?

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: Okay. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Benedicto. It's great to be today here. It's my first intervention as a member of the working group, and my apology for being quiet, and there is one reason, one excuse why I haven't been active, at least yesterday.

We had a briefing for permanent missions addressed on the other side of the corridor in Room 23, attended by 45 missions and 9 international organizations, and it was one of the activities which we have been doing since the beginning of the year aimed at understanding what are the digital priorities of international organizations, permanent missions, and other actors in Geneva, including start-up community and other places.

There is a feeling that there is participation in history making. Don't worry. I won't go over three minutes. And that there is a need to have -- to use this year, at least in Geneva, and I would say worldwide, to make some sort of constructive and proactive steps in order to strengthen the Internet we know.

In this consultation, there were two points that have been highlighted so far. One is the centrality of data, centrality of data in many respects from human rights, to economy, security, technology. This has been an underlying issue of concern, and this is what people understand. They understand data as email, as a tweet, as sort of big data which is in the focus.

The second issue which is more complex is -- I can frame it as a sort of confusion or perception of avoids or gaps or whatever, whatever you call it. Very often people ask where we can address this issue. And my understanding -- and I'm giving this informed guess -- is that 70% of these perceived gaps are question of perception. ECommerce is addressed in WTO. And I know that Nick is doing a lot of work of connecting WTO work with the other communities. Ambassador of Panama is today with us here.

Cybercrime is addressed in the U.N., OECD, and other places. There is a lot of needs to do awareness building and capacity-building on the question of the perceived gaps. There are 30% of real gaps. And we notice them -- that they are filed by, for example, courts. Citizens go to courts in order to request justice online. We had the case of the Right to be Forgotten, Facebook. Now the case of the Uber.

They are also filed by the politicians who provide some sort of shortcuts for the quite complex problems of our digital space.

Therefore, the more we use our time to provide the informed discussion and to reduce this confusion, the more effective and important we will be in this decisive year for the development in digital policy.

And if I can use lingo of these days, let us keep Internet great always. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your discipline. And I -- I thank you for your general statement. Since you were not here yesterday, I think it is important that you could report on this. However, I would, as I indicated in the beginning, not deviate to the task we assigned to ourselves yesterday and try to finalize it as soon as possible.

I would very kindly urge you to, if we could, move to the discussion of the items as they are there. Of course, I will give the floor, if anyone requests. I see Richard Hill and Jimson.

But I think if we think of using the best of our time, we should go directly to that task because this will allow us to revisit -- have a first reading of those characteristics, those principles.

My intention is then to walk through the other issues that were raised in your contributions and that are addressed in the synthesis paper regarding the form of the scope. I heard many calls even for the work to initiate on that. So I'd like not to lose any time before moving to this.

But I'm in your hands.

And then I think that would provide us maybe a more consistent basis to go through the recommendations as they came from you. I think that would be for a second meeting. But we will only get there if all of us will contribute in a way that will not prolong discussions on procedural aspects. So with this, please, Richard Hill.

Three minutes.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I fully agree and support your way forward with just a slight nuance. I think we should move to the question 2 in the recommendations at our next meeting and not necessarily wait until we finish the discussion. So I just wanted to clarify that. I took much less than three minutes. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for this.

Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Chair, good morning, everyone. Just to re-emphasize what you mentioned yesterday, that we will just continue the discussion on characteristics this morning. And as you said, I think that's what we concluded with yesterday. So just want us to proceed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you for your support.

So I would then kindly ask the secretariat -- is it on screen, the list of items? We'd like to resume from the point we were -- we ended yesterday. Yes, I can see now on the screen.

So just to maybe to recap some of the things we said yesterday, we are going through that list one by one. And I have invited colleagues to work on the basis of if there is no need for comments in regard to the relevance of inclusion of that particular -- any particular item, that I have invited colleagues maybe not to comment because it is understood that it should be there in a way. But if there is any kind of qualification or objection, it should be made clear.

I recall both in regard to multistakeholder approach and to respecting the sovereign rights of states, it was argued that these are addressed extensively in other parts of the Tunis Agenda. So maybe it should not be the case to appear here. Maybe it should, let's say, appear as a chapeau in the introductory text to the report indicating that the Tunis Agenda, the Internet governance sections apply to enhanced cooperation. And in the context of enhanced cooperation, maybe we can highlight some aspects. And I think those aspects were highlighted as important.

So at this point in time, I would not be too much concerned -- I urge you to be not too much as to how this will be worded and formulated, articulated in the final document. Just retain the idea of things that are pertinent or not pertinent. And, of course, we are highlighting in yellow those issues that deserve, let's say, special treatment.

So with this and with your support and understanding, I'd like to then to turn to the item related to evidence-based. Evidence-based. Any comments? Yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone.

Just a question about process this morning. So the plan is to go through this list on a no-objection basis to see what will remain and what might be excluded because perhaps it's better as a recommendation or just is -- doesn't need to be in this list of characteristics.

And then the next step would be to try to consolidate some of these like ideas? Or are we doing that at the same time?

I just -- just as an example, I believe sustainable and promoting sustainable development have a similar kind of thought. As we go through the list this first time, should we highlight those? But certainly we have no objection to sustainable or promoting sustainable development. So during this time, are we just on no objection or are we also trying to consolidate? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd say that we are not trying at this point to consolidate or to merge. We are just identifying the ideas, the notions that would fit under -- I'm trying to avoid to think in terms of the output but think in terms of recommendation that will be submitted by us with the purpose of further contributing to -- implementing the concept of enhanced cooperation. So we would say that those principles or characteristics are important to guide or to be embedded in any enhanced cooperation process.

So I think in regards, for example, transparency, inclusive, it was agreed that we can easily say that any process regarding enhanced cooperation should be transparent and inclusive.

In regard to multistakeholder, there is no objection that multistakeholder should be there. But we have just highlighted in yellow to indicate that maybe it should not be worded in that fashion but rather to be reflected in another way. So this is the kind of exercise we are doing at this moment.

Once we finish this, my intention was not to try to work on this but to consider it a first reading and then revert to the other issues that were raised in association to characteristics. Those issues as reflected in the synthesis paper are linked to the wording of paragraph 69 and 71. So this is what this in the synthesis paper is considered as Track 1.

And you'll recall that some parties could have even initiated by that part. So I'm just trying to have a quick look at this and then we revert to the issues that were identified.

Thank you. So I understand there is no objection to retain the notion of evidence-based as one. And again, this is not a final, final decision. Everything that we -- will be revisited in a later stage, in the light of discussions we'll have on other sections, so just be sure that anything we decide now will be -- will have a final go.

I have on my list Iran and Japan.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you to all distinguished colleagues.

May I, Chairman, request you kindly -- any item you take, just one or two minutes or one minute of explanation what we mean by that.

What do you mean by this one that this is no objections? What we are looking. And what is isolation with enhanced cooperation? What evidence we are looking for. Yesterday, we proposed something and some colleagues said that is the exposed one. After the things we see what is evident. What evidence are we looking for? Looking for facts? Factual necessity? So quickly have some small explanation before asking any view on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I give the floor to Japan. Maybe he will help us out.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Actually, I wanted to raise the same point as my previous speaker. So I really don't understand why to promote the enhanced cooperation, to promote collaboration, why we -- do we have to do that based on some evidence? I'm not so clear. So I really appreciate some proponents for this to explain something. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan. I notice that 8 -- that that notion was contained in 8 submissions so I would maybe at this point invite anyone who has contributed to shed some light on the intent behind it. I'll give the floor to Nigel Hickson from ICANN.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you and good morning to colleagues.

I think we were one of these that -- one of the submitters, so to speak, that cited this particular characteristic.

I think what we had in mind was quite simple, in that whatever process we're talking about, whether we are discussing a new treaty on cybersecurity, whether we're discussing the creation of standards, whether we're discussing some process in ICANN, whether we're discussing privacy, whatever process we're talking about where stakeholders get together with governments to discuss public policy issues, then the -- the basis for those discussions and the basis for the agreements reached should be evidence-based, in that there should be a factual basis to those discussions. That the delegates should be presented with factual information on the issues that they're -- that they're discussing.

I don't think there's anything particularly sort of original about this or particularly controversial. It's just that one shouldn't go into discussions and try and agree something that's going to have a significant effect on other actors unless one has one's facts clear and one has evidence for the policy decisions that one is making or recommending. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel, and at least to me it seems to be in some form of relation with what Jovan informed us at the beginning of the meeting that the issue around data is very important in the context of the digital economy, and I would say Internet governance.

So to have -- to -- decisions and -- would be based on solid information and data, I think that's maybe the intent here behind it.

Is Iran satisfied with this or do you think we need some further explanations?

The -- one of the options then would be to leave it in yellow to indicate this is an issue that deserves also some more thinking on how to better reflect the notion behind it in the paper and to see the characteristics. I turn to Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman, and thanks to ICANN and my colleague, Nigel.

Chairman, this is the way that we proceed. Anything we discuss, we have to look at or think of the implementation. If we take the explanation given by Nigel, cybersecurity, what evidence Nigel seeking for? To have a document on the cybersecurity and so on and so forth? Thousands of pages of documents? Thousands of different views and no agreement even sometimes on the cybersecurity what does it mean?

So on and so forth.

So -- on top of implementation, do we need that at all? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would then suggest that we don't lose much time here. Just let the secretariat, please, just put it in yellow because it indicates there is no -- because I think in regard to the principles, certainly we need to have full consensus to insert anything there. So I take the point raised by Iran that there are still some issues to be further examined, so I suggest that could be maybe part of the homework we should assign to ourselves in that intersessional period to go through to have some more clarity on those terms that are being indicated in the room that people have issues with, so I would suggest that we take this approach for the moment, in order not to spend too much time here in plenary for this.

So if we can proceed that way, I would suggest now we turn to the item regarding sustainable and -- yeah, sustainable and the next one is promoting sustainable development. So maybe if anyone wishes to comment on both aspects.

I have on my list Lea, Anriette, and Jovan.

Lea, you have the floor.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. I actually believe Anriette was before me, but I'll take the floor.

I was actually going to comment on the promoting sustainable development one, and it's -- I don't have any objection to that substantively. I would just like to flag that the nature of that characteristic is different to the ones that we've been discussing so far, and it is similar to the one that we're going to come to very soon, which is respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, and it seems to me that there's a -- that these are talking about the aims or what enhanced cooperation is achieving, rather than the actual nature of the process. And I was actually recalling -- you mentioned this yesterday -- it reminds me of a conversation we were having during the NETmundial process where we separated out

characteristics and the principles related to process and those that were related to the aims and the underlying underpinning principles like human rights, and perhaps that's something in the later stage we can come back to, and if we can flag it that they're of a different nature to the other ones that we've discussed so far so we might want to see if they can be in a different bucket. So, yeah, thank you so much. But no objections to either that one or the previous one. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. I agree with Lea. I think the suggestion of at a later stage clustering these in -- in a category that's characteristics of the outcomes of the process and characteristics of the process itself.

Sustainable, I'm not sure. I don't think we put that in, but I think sustainable is important.

My interpretation of that is that whatever -- that the process is one that is not too expensive, not too time-consuming, you know, not too heavy, not setting up mechanisms or structures that then require a lot of resources to sustain which means they fall apart.

So that would be my understanding.

Sustainable would -- I'm obviously speaking as an NGO here. We have to put these in our funding proposals and in our implementation. It would also involve utilizing existing processes, existing mechanisms, and building enhanced cooperation on top of those or integrating them into those. So I just think it's quite a useful overall characteristic because if these enhanced cooperation processes are not sustainable, then they're not going to last and they won't work.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jovan?

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: Well, along the same lines -- and I think it was indicated that there is ambiguity between sustainable and promoting sustainable development, but I think it's -- it has been cleared. But just to add a few points, sustainable could relate also to sustainable Internet, which is then on the line of robustness of the Internet, and I guess I completely agree with Anriette. It's more related in our case to sustainable policy processes, which means that policy processes that can -- can deliver the results over a certain time, linked, to a large extent, to capacity development, therefore building institutional, individual, national capacity to sustain interventions in the policy processes.

One -- therefore, we may find some clarifier around sustainable, either sustainable Internet, which is the line of robustness, or sustainable policy processes, and the second one, we may consider to add sustainable development goals, which is the name of the game, at least in Geneva. Therefore, the whole concept of sustainable development is now more centered around discussion around 17 sustainable development goals. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list the Russian Federation, Parminder, and Saudi Arabia.

I'd like just to comment, before handing over to them, that I think the interventions by Lea, Anriette, and Jovan indicate -- and I think the points they raise are very valid -- that we should -- and again, I think that's a part of the homework we should do in regard to those items, to see exactly how we want them to be worded, because we want to retain here any characteristics those attributes of what a process should be, should have.

And differentiate -- and I fully agree -- with the purpose of doing -- of the process. So I would certainly support that promoting sustainable development is the goal, not an intrinsic characteristic. It's the -- the objective.

So I think part of the work we have to do in between now and the next meeting would be to, again, not lose the idea but to see how we can be articulating the document in the best way.

And in regard to the point raised by Jovan, certainly I think here we are not focusing on the robustness of the Internet, so we are focused on the -- we are working around only enhanced cooperation as a process. So I think that notion of sustainability as related to Internet itself is not the one we would be looking at at this moment.

Maybe sustainable could be retained to the point that the working group members could consider this is an important attribute of the process, to be sustainable, to have -- and again, maybe we need some more elaboration on what aspects of sustainability would be necessary for the process. But I -- I'll turn now to Russian Federation, then Parminder and Saudi Arabia.

You have the floor, Lulia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we agree that sustainable and promoting sustainable development looks like too redundant, and this is because we're -- as we said yesterday, we mixed in one list subject of enhanced cooperation, goal of enhanced cooperation, and characteristic of enhanced cooperation. And of course it should be considered in a later stage and we need to group it accordingly.

When it comes to sustainable, of course it's a good thing, but it can have relation to any process, and it's kind of an obvious thing.

And I would say that it makes me feel deja vu because, you know, it's like in a story about three blind men who try to feel the elephant and -- you know, but they touch the -- only the part of the elephant and say that, you know, the elephant is like this and elephant is like that, and everybody knows the story and knows what is the end of the story, and the end is that they came to the disagreement, basically.

And that's why, actually, we support those who ask the chair to start to discuss the very point, to come to the next item of our discussion, because what we have here in the characteristics, it's right, it's a characteristic, but it can be -- characterize any -- not only enhanced cooperation. It can characterize Internet governance. It can characterize hundreds of processes and mechanisms. And we do not see elephant. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone.

Iulia is right, I think the elephant in the room, which we need to see. But more to the point about the sustainable thing, which I would have passed as a good thing and with a desire that we move forward quickly and let's -- until my friend, Anriette, gave her interpretation of sustainable, which then makes me put this on record that I don't think sustainable necessarily means investing less into a process. I think sometimes sustainable means investing more into a process. And also, she said that it means that we work on existing processes, improve them, and don't create new processes. So I think this is going too much to the core of discussions which belong elsewhere and which points to the problems with having these words which, as Iulia pointed out, could mean very opposed things to different people, and I now stress the fact that for me, sustainable is where more investments, institutional investments, are made, capacity is built, as Jovan was saying, and such things, rather than doing less of these things.

Which I can understand in terms of a project for an NGO could mean different things.

So the least I would like to say is that they be put on record and perhaps this is also a candidate for highlighted -- being highlighted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning, colleagues.

Well, I -- listening to the intervention discussion from the morning, it's like we're solving a puzzle. We have some words, but we don't know the relevance to enhanced cooperation. Everyone is guessing this might be relevant to this angle or the other angle. And I share the views raised by our colleague from Russia. We're going in cycles about what do we mean by sustainable, evidence-based. Is it really relevant to the enhanced cooperation? Is it relevant to the mandate that we have to implement 69?

I think we're moving a bit away from the mandate that we have and we're focusing on issues that are really not relevant to the mandate of us.

So I would add that we focus, as Iulia said, to the core issue and put this wording in the right context. Then we will know the meaning of sustainable or promoting sustainable development. I'm not sure how this will happen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade. I guess -- thank you. I guess I would just take note that since eight respondents referenced this, it is important to consider with an open mind and open heart in order to try to understand it.

So I really found Anriette's suggestion helpful to me in thinking about how we might later sort of begin to develop perhaps another category. But for now, I'd just like to make reference to the fact that really a very large number of respondents referenced these topics, and so I think they, for my part, really need to stay with us, even if we decide to put them into a different category later. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, I have Belarus and then Anriette. Belarus, you have the floor.

>>BELARUS: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, colleagues.

Well, personally I don't see any harm in having such categories or such characteristics as sustainable, but, well, promoting sustainable development probably is more the goal than a characteristic. However, as I read it, it is like our goal is to enhance cooperation, and this cooperation should be sustainable throughout the years. So if we put it like sustainability of the cooperation, I think it could be considered as a very good characteristic. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair. In fact, my colleague Carlos Afonso just reminded me that the French word for this is durable, durable, which I think is what I had in mind. I think the previous speaker expressed it very well. It is the sustainability of the cooperation.

So, Parminder, just to clarify, I was not referring to the cost here because sometimes it can actually be quite intensive to create these.

So I think that sustainability of the cooperation, that that might be a better way of characterizing it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Well, I would like to recall the purpose of what we are doing. That is to identify those items that can be easily -- can be easily made to our document in terms of characteristics that should embed any enhanced cooperation process in a way that would be seen by all of us as relevant and pertinent and raising no particular concerns. Maybe if they are self-evident and they belong also to other process, I don't see a problem in doing so. I think sometimes to repeat the obvious has a value in itself.

I recall that the first resolution adopted by the Human Council on the Right to Privacy which was seen as a major breakthrough that said human rights offline also apply online. When I read it for the first time, it seemed to be the most obvious thing. But it was something that in its context quite important to state it and to develop afterwards. So sometimes it's not useless to repeat and to consolidate some notions. I think that's the kind of thing we have been doing here.

So in regard to the discussion we had, I think sustainable -- I would ask the secretariat to state sustainable/sustainability of cooperation. But in the light of comments that were made, particularly by Parminder, I think that raises some concerns that part of what is intended here does not apply to each and every case on the part of some parties who would also be addressed on the enhanced cooperation. I think that raises an issue, whether it is -- I take the expression that Lea used -- agnostic from the perspective of these areas, frameworks.

I would suggest that it should be highlighted as something that still deserves some more thinking on our part.

And, yes -- yes, I was addressing the first part. But I also would like to highlight the second one, promoting sustainable development, for a different reason, not because maybe it doesn't belong here but because maybe it should be worded in a way to indicate it is the goal, the purpose, not some intrinsic characteristic.

And I think, again, this is, I think part of the intersessional work we will be doing, trying to see how those expressions would fit in a final contribution from these group to the efforts towards enhanced cooperation.

So if you would agree, I think we could move on on that basis. I see Iran, Kavouss, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I was about to support you, if you do not put it in yellow. I think with the proposal you make, sustainability of the process of sustainability of the cooperation or enhanced cooperation, no one has objected to that. We are waiting for this cooperation for years, and now we have started the process. We want to be sustainable. So your proposal is good, and I don't think that it should go into the highlighted. Maybe you ask if there is any objection to the proposal that you have made.

If we start to have yellow on yellow at the end, we end up with many yellows. It is like ITU with square brackets. Sometimes we have to resolve these square brackets and this yellow. We don't want to come back and repeat the same thing as we have told, turning around ourselves.

So let us try, if possible, to take your proposal and to see whether it could be without color. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: As someone who proposed to putting highlight on it, I agree with Iran that with the new description, I would be happy to -- for it to go without highlights. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So to the secretariat, so in that item, we delete "sustainable." We keep "sustainability of cooperation." And we delete the highlighting. We just leave it without any highlighting. It's okay? Okay. I think that reflects what we have discussed.

Just recall, this was not my proposal. I think it came from Belarus, supported by Anriette. I would like to thank your contribution to that discussion.

So with this, can you move to the next item, participation by governments on an equal footing.

Yes, Kavouss, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Yes, it is in the Tunis Agenda. The only thing we have to clarify, equal footing with respect to whom? Among governments? Yes, certainly. But equal footing of governments with others, it is questionable because that would be some sort of the capturing. So if the clarification that you could make that equal footing among governments, no problems. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this. I think this is one of the main issues that I would certainly not -- I'd come up with one solution for this. This is one of the issues I was thinking of walking through, walk through the issues that were raised in association with the language contained in paragraph 69. This is one of the issues we should be certainly examining. And I would expect, of course, some discussion on this.

For that purpose here, I thought we could retain -- because that relates directly to the language that is in paragraph 69. So maybe there is some ambiguity for the moment, and this will be discussed further.

But since it relates to the language, I was thinking that for that purpose, that could be retained. And then we can have some further clarification as we go along.

I see Iran nodding.

Yes, Belarus? Are you taking the floor?

>>BELARUS: Thank you, Chair. Probably. Just a proposal to avoid some ambiguity. If we replace by -- by "all," participation of all governments on an equal footing, I think then it will get more clear what we mean under this proposal or this line. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think that it might. So could I ask the secretariat to insert that word, by "all" governments? Participation by all governments. That helps. But I think for me it is consistent and maybe even more -- provides some more clarity than in the text itself. Yes, I look for your comments.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I take your point that this is obviously an issue that's going to need to be discussed. I also think since it's rooted in Tunis language, it's one that I don't know if we want to start editing language at this point. Certainly we wouldn't agree to editing language in just a context on a board like this.

I think capturing ideas that might help us to kind of move forward but starting to edit and agreeing to that I'm a little uncomfortable with.

And I also think this might be one that as was previously stated this morning might be more appropriate in kind of an introduction or kind of related to what our work is here.

So I guess my point at this time is just to -- since we know this is an issue that's going to have further conversation, perhaps we just don't spend too much time editing or trying to agree to language here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Iran and Parminder.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. To be very brief, this issue came out in the second phase of the WSIS when all governments, they have problems that one single government have authority to do everything. And that is why that is put there.

And now that issue is to many extent or to great extent has been dissolved after the transition except the jurisdiction, which is still under one single government. But I don't think that we need to change the language. Retain the language as it is in the WSIS. This language has been resolved of the two years of extensive discussions with three PrepComs and so on and so forth, and it is better not to do it here. It is not right and appropriate to edit it or to paraphrase it. We have to take it as it is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Perhaps we can sort this matter out in this manner. I think this characteristic six has been contributed by contributions which have been written contributions made by people. And I'm quite sure that these all six were meaning it in a specific sense. And the people who have used these terms can tell it.

But it is obvious the way it is written, participation of all governments on an equal footing actually means participation of all governments on equal footing with each other. And that was what was being meant by the six people who have contributed it. The language strongly suggests that.

And I think we can move on having accepted in the text, the transcript, that this does not refer to equal footing with other stakeholders. Now, whether it should be there or not, there is still something which can be talked about.

But this particular thing refers to -- because it says participation of all governments, it does not refer to equal footing with other stakeholders. That is a separate issue. People may want to include footing with other stakeholders. Neither does this preclude it, but this is not talking about it.

And if that -- the text can go in the transcript, probably we can keep it as it is.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I see Richard Hill and Russian Federation. After that, I will try to come up with some way forward here.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, I support what Parminder said. And if you think further discussion is needed, Chairman, I think this is also one of the items that could go into the famous chapeau because this is really, as many people said, taken directly from the Tunis Agenda and we're not proposing to change or to renegotiate or even to reword. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Since we were out of the six perhaps who made this contribution about governments on equal footing, of course, it should be absolutely clear among whom this equal footing is taken, you know, in a context. So we actually agree with how it says here, proposed by Belarus, and also can be -- it says among governments, but it should be absolutely clear without any other understanding but between whom, between governments. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I see Kenya, and after that, then I will make my comments.

Kenya, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone.

I made a slight comment on this proposal yesterday. When you talk about participation of all governments on equal footing, in my reading of paragraph 69, actually that is what we want to happen.

So I'm trying to think, how can we make what we are looking for become a characteristic of itself? Because paragraph 69 reads, to enable governments on equal footing. So what can we do -- what I am saying is: What can we do to make governments do what they have to do on equal footing? So it cannot also be a characteristic of what we want.

In my understanding, we could capture the spirit of equality in whatever will happen. Equality will be a characteristic of the engagement of governments. And in most cases within the multilateral or international frameworks, equality, like, for example, if it comes to voting, one country has one vote or something that does not give one country an upper hand over others.

And this is, I think, from what some colleagues have said here this is what you want to change, not one government to be in charge of or to control others.

So in my suggestion, instead of talking of participation of all governments on equal footing, we could put just one word, equality, which can be defined in terms of decision-making, voting power, or something like that.

Maybe Chair as says, some members have also mentioned earlier, it is like the challenge we have is we are mentioning characteristics but we have not seen the main elephant. But the reality is if we read specific parts of paragraph 69, 70 and 72, it would be very clear on what we really are looking for.

In my understanding, paragraph 69 keeps clear the need for enhanced cooperation in future to enable governments. But in enabling governments, I think all other stakeholders are supposed to play a role. Maybe that is a discussion which, as you say, we shall get into later on. But I think it would be very good for us to be very clear from the beginning whether we are thinking on the same line or not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya. Thank you for the proposal to replace "by equality." But I'm afraid that might give rise to some discussion that I really would like to avoid, try to avoid at this point in time.

I think it would defeat the purpose of this exercise we are doing at this moment because we are trying just to see which items could make it to the list without, let's say, the need -- or if there is a need, that would be done in a later stage. So I take the points raised by many that refers to language that is already in the Tunis Agenda. We should not maybe try to rephrase it there, that we should think of the right placing of that notion. And especially because this is something we intend to discuss. And I would like, as I have said, to move as quickly as possible to another part of the meeting, which we'll go through and examine in more depth the language associated in those paragraphs.

So for these reasons, I would suggest we should not prolong discussion on this particular item right now. I would suggest it would be retained in its original form.

I think, Belarus, I think it was a good attempt. It makes sense to include all governments. But I would suggest for the moment for secretariat to delete it, to revert to the original wording. And we are highlighting this as indicating that we still need some further work in relation, first of all, to see if it fits here or if it goes elsewhere, in which form. And we will be benefited, of course, by the discussion we will have as soon as we finish this list. And I would beg you to -- that we could move as quick as possible.

Again, the specific purpose now would be to identify those items which would be characteristics that would apply to each and every process in a way that all of us would be comfortable. Even if we come up with five or six, I think it's not a bad ranking because we might end up with at least one paragraph that we can say we recommend that. This is not to say this is the only thing we are doing, but at least I think we are starting citing maybe a common base which we wish to do in a more in-depth way later on.

So I suggest we move to the next item, respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms.

So here I think what is intended is to say to that any enhanced cooperation process should respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, and that would apply to any kind of format and to any scope of cooperation.

I think here again there might be some reflection on whether it is a characteristic or it is a goal, so I look for your comments in that regard, but I think the notion that human rights should be respected is something that is -- has been very firmly consolidated in discussions in the last few years. I wouldn't expect objection to the notion, but maybe if anyone would like to comment on how this should be reflected in our work.

I see Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Governments at the level of the ICANN, GAC, Governmental Advisory Committee, together with other stakeholders discussing this issue for years, so I think it is good you put it as a goal because it is so complex and complicated and difficult and so on and so forth to go to the details of that in the process. But as a goal, yes.

So agree with that. Keep it because everybody must respect the human rights and so on and so forth. That is the goal. Otherwise, for the implementation, then you go to the -- which convention you take.

Now we're discussing there's tons of the conventions, covenants, and so on and so forth. So let us take it as a goal, as you mentioned. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would then suggest and would ask the secretariat also to highlight this so it is not a rejection of the item, but, rather, an indication that homework -- I'm taking the word from Marilyn Cade -- is needed in that regard.

Can we move to the next item, responsive to innovation?

I think, again, this is directly related to language contained in one of the paragraphs in the Tunis Agenda, so I would not expect any objection to the notion, but if you -- anyone would like to comment on the relevance of having it under this particular section or if it should go elsewhere or maybe we'd like to seek your guidance in that regard.

Otherwise we keep it as a characteristic.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman. Another issue that we are discussing among ourselves for years is what are the criteria to say whether it meets innovative or not, innovation or not. Enhanced cooperation, what innovations we expect?

It would be good we put it as a goal, but it is difficult to implement it in the process because someone may say that this is old, this is not new, so what is -- what cooperation, enhanced-type cooperation, is new one and which one is not new one? And what innovation do we have to do in the process?

Put it as a goal, there would be no problem. This is -- always we are looking for innovations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Switzerland and Anriette.

Switzerland, Jorge, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much and good morning to everyone.

We included, as I mentioned, innovation in our contribution, and the idea is not only that any process of enhanced cooperation is responsive to anything that may evolve in the technical, social, economic environment where we are putting ourselves in the digital realm, but also that the process itself or the processes of enhanced cooperation themselves have to be really innovative and responsive to those changes.

And so it is, in a way, a characteristic to the process itself.

We might have setups, frameworks of enhanced cooperation which are existing now. We may have others which are emerging. And in 10 years' time, we surely will have other kinds of issues where we need enhanced cooperation. And we are talking about things that are changing at a very fast velocity as big data, Internet of Things, which also require this kind of cooperation. So I think it's also a characteristic to the enhanced cooperation we need. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Switzerland, for your intervention.

I have on my list Anriette and then Jimson and Parminder. Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: -- (off microphone) -- with Switzerland. I think that captured what my view is perfectly.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. From the developing nations, we really need these characteristics. With regard to what we evolve down the line, we really need it.

We talk a lot about digital divide. It's because of slowness and responsiveness to innovation.

So I think what Switzerland said and Anriette mentioned is tied in with what I feel should be characteristics. We didn't mention this in our paper, in our contribution, but we duly support this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Chair, just to add that responsive to innovation is mentioned precisely in this manner in Tunis Agenda. That in 71 it says the process of enhanced cooperation would be responsive to innovation. So I think it's mentioned as a characteristic of enhanced cooperation in Tunis Agenda itself.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Could we just then retain it as a characteristic?

I don't see any objection. I think the explanations provided maybe address concerns that were raised before, so I think that could go without the need to highlight, for the moment.

Can we move then to the next item, openness?

I see no requests for the floor.

Sorry?

Ah, yes. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Good morning to everyone.

Just a question. Of course I accept both openness and transparency. I just wondered if there was supposed to be a difference between transparency and openness and if we need to distinguish them.

So my preference would be to have one or the other or the two combined, but of course I don't object to either one. I'm just wondering if we're not being extraneous in having both of them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We had agreed not to engage in a merging exercise, or consolidating, but at least from my perspective, I think these refer to different things. Transparency refers to the notion that everything that is being done should be disclosed in some way, and openness refers to the

scope of participation, to be open to those who wish to take -- that's at least how I read the different terms. I didn't see them as meaning the same thing. But I remain to be -- stand to be corrected, maybe, on the basis of those who have made their contributions.

I have on my list Russian Federation and Iran.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, I agree that transparency and openness is quite close meaning, and we would like to prefer transparency than openness because, you know, just coming to enhanced cooperation scope, if we have cybersecurity stuff in there, trade, eCommerce stuff, some of them have the natural limitation of openness and, you know, transparency, I think, is more prioritized, from our point of view.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. As you mentioned, clearly there is some similarity but it is not identical. Therefore, we keep both, with the exercise that we see whether or not we could merge some of them. The objective was to reduce the number of these items to some manageable, but maybe in future. For the time being, keep it as it is and then we look at that one. This and others that there may be a possibility to merge them. Maybe. Thank you. But not at this meeting.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I also support the view expressed by the distinguished delegate from Iran that we should keep it. There are some slight differences but let's just keep it as it is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Mexico, followed by Constance Bommelaer from ISOC.

Mexico, you have the floor.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Just to join others in saying that we see a close relation between openness and transparency, but listening to what you said about the scope of participation, there is a link also with the part we mentioned before of inclusive -- the characteristic of inclusiveness.

So I think it's a good idea to see how we can limit or -- the meaning of these words because I see some overlaps. Either transparency with openness or with inclusiveness that you mentioned.

So I think we -- we should try to avoid this, and if there is room for deciding for one term or the other, I would say that we can take advantage of that. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Constance?

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Good morning, everyone. I would support, I think, Iran's request to keep the two notions of transparency and openness. I can say that for the Internet Society, we see openness in a broader perspective. We see it as having ramifications, you know, in the business field. We see it as having ramifications, of course, in the technical field with the notion of open interoperable standards. And we could say the -- the same thing in the societal field with this idea of openness, open free flow of communication. So we would strongly support keeping both notions, and in any case, preserving openness as one of the main characteristics.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Switzerland, followed by Lea Kaspar.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much.

I guess that Mexico and ISOC have just made the points I wanted to make. On one side, openness has this technical and also economic meaning that ISOC underlined; and on the other side, openness is also different to transparency as it is linked to inclusive processes in the meaning of being open to all. And this is an idea which is also highlighted many times in many of our documents, including in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Lea?

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. I would support those speakers before me who have -- who wish to keep this -- to keep openness on the list. I do think that they're actually very different, transparency and openness, and I also think that they are -- it is different from inclusiveness.

So we can have a meeting that is Webcast, right? There will be -- and all the documents are open to the public so you can have a look at them. However, the participation in those -- in the meeting is not open.

So as you, Chair, mentioned, you can have something that's transparent but not open, and I think those will need to -- would need to comply with different criteria of how we measure it.

And then on top of that, because people mentioned inclusiveness, we -- you could have an event or a process transparent, you can have it open for participation, but it still not might be inclusive because those with disabilities, those who are disadvantaged have not been given the chance to participate and therefore not complying with the criteria of inclusiveness, so I think those three terms are actually quite different.

And in this case, since we're talking about openness, I would strongly support keeping it in separately. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think we ended up at the -- at the end of the -- or at the stage of the discussion maybe in a more complicated place than we started.

I would very frankly say that for me, openness was something very simple and straightforward, but if we think openness as linked to the -- the possibility to participate, the ability to participate in the

process, and if that, anyway, relates to the issue of equal footing, I think that term might still need some further work on our part to make sure that its inclusion will be consistent with the different positions held by various participants in regard to other topics to be examined.

So if openness -- I think different interpretations of openness were voiced. If openness is seen as the open to participants from each and every participant that may wish to -- so I think this will not be consistent with the view we are not dealing with now, since we are aware of the submissions of those who defend that some processes should be intergovernmental and there are nuances whether they should be open or not. The --

So I think that maybe at some point in time, the notion of openness should be retained and should be highlighted because I think that might -- that will be in conjunction, in connection with some other parts of the discussion we have not had yet.

I would certainly support it to be retained, but I think just to be fair with those who have held different views in regard to the format of -- I think we should not jump to something that we might later on be -- have to retrieve. So I would suggest it's to be kept into highlight, because I think this will relate to discussions we are still -- that are still pending.

Yes. I see -- is anyone asking for the floor?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. It's an observer. I'll give you the floor, please. Could you identify yourself, say your name and affiliation, please.

>> Thank you, Chair. I represent the Centre for Communication Governance at the National Law University Delhi, and since this is the first time taking the floor, I want to thank the chair for allowing the participation of observers and for allowing us to make interventions in this meeting.

Just carrying on from what was said by other speakers before me, I just wanted to point out that openness, along with transparency, accountability, are important good governance principles and that -- and we believe that these are principles that the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation should bear in mind and is possibly a -- and are important characteristics of enhanced cooperation going forward. However, we accept that this might be -- it might be -- make more sense to discuss it along with other characteristics, but going forward, it would just be useful to perhaps discuss openness along with accountability, transparency, and other good governance principles that are widely recognized by U.N. institutions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention.

Can we move to the next item? Democratic?

So Internet -- enhanced cooperation processes should be, by design, democratic?

I see no objection to this. So I think that could be retained.

Yes. United Kingdom?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everybody. We just wondered if the colleagues who proposed this word could say a little bit more about what they mean. There are different possible interpretations of the word "democratic." For some people it means referendums. For some people, it means governments which are democratically elected. For some people, it might mean countries voting on issues. For some people it might mean that countries with larger populations should have more of a say. There are many, many different interpretations of what this word might mean, and it would be helpful just to have some clarification on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to speakers that might shed some light on this.

Richard Hill and Parminder.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: We have noticed elsewhere there is two of everything. There are different interpretations of openness. There are different interpretations of responsive innovation. There are different interpretations of sustainability. There are different interpretations of transparency, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

I think -- actually I did a little bit of homework, Chair, prompted by Wolfgang. And I did look at the Tunis Agenda. And I looked at the section on Internet governance. And actually every single term that we have here appears already. So this is a bit of an exercise in repetition because everything here is found with the exception of, we'll come to, good faith and the exception of flexibility. I think those are the only two things that don't appear in there.

Democratic appears. And if you look in context -- and I'm happy to do this offline -- you will see that it clearly refers to the general meaning of the word which is actually human rights that people can affect public policy decisions either through direct votes in a few countries such as Switzerland and the U.K, at least for one particular issue, and otherwise through their elected representatives. So that's the common meaning of the word, and that is all certainly that I understand in the context of the Tunis Agenda.

But, again, it's already there in the Tunis Agenda. And I don't think we should get into an exercise of trying to redefine it, et cetera. And perhaps this is again something that you would handle in the chapeau because it is one of the elements of the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder? You are not requesting for the floor anymore.

So could I -- yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman. No problem at all. It's democratic. That's all.

But for many of these items that we have dealt with and we will deal with that, how we implement it? You want to have this process of enhanced cooperation and take these items and have to implement

that, how do we do that? Sometimes it may be difficult. So we have to look into the implementations. No problem with this topic at all. We don't propose to put it in yellow or any other color.

But the implementation? Because different people have different interpretation of that. We have seen in some of the contributions the way that they have mentioned democratic. Even for the equal footing, they put democratic means that government and other stakeholders should have this equal footing. This is democratic in their views. Do you want to do that? Do we want to do that? No problem with the text, with the title, but implementations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, as I see it from here, I think there is no objection to the notion that process should be democratic. I think there is -- this particular aspect raised by Iran, that we should try to look not only from the perspective of the democratic processes that should be supportive of the enhanced cooperation but also at the process itself, how to implement it in the -- I think this is a matter -- and that is in dialogue with the notion of inclusiveness or what you should do to guarantee developing countries would be there, people with disabilities.

So I think that might raise some issues that still need to be further -- I would say clearly this is something also for some more refinement work on our part. I would suggest it should go into -- should be highlighted for the moment.

So in that case, there is no objection to the notion, just we just need to reflect on how this could be better addressed in the document. If you can agree to that? I see no objection.

So this is -- we can then at least -- again, we are just going through a first reading of this, and then we'll come back in the light of the discussion we'll have also in other sections of the document.

Parminder? Yes, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I wanted to just point out that it is also mentioned in enhanced cooperation clearly that an enhanced cooperation process would be democratic. That is mentioned clearly.

So it really does not, therefore, need to be contested because it's in the same meaning as it is mentioned in Tunis Agenda. But I just wanted to make that observation. And it is in the hands of the Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I mean, in your hands of the group, of course. I saw a few reservations in regard to including it. If there is no -- maybe just to -- maybe we can have some indication if those reservations remain. Otherwise, we can remove the highlight, take into account, as you said, it is already very clearly spelled out as a characteristic. We will not be saying anything new.

Maybe the interpretation, the implementation, is something that might be deserved of some more work but not the notion itself since it is already there.

Can we take it in that way and then remove the highlighting? Canada?

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues.

I think I would prefer to keep your initial approach. I fully recognize that it is in Tunis Agenda and it is a concept that we fully endorse.

But I would like us to be able to flesh it out a little bit, particularly when it comes to the time of, as Iran was suggesting, how is that going to be embodied in actual implementation. So I think I would like to keep it highlighted for now just so we can flesh -- it's on our list of things to flesh out. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So I think consistently what we have been doing when we see some issue associated, we keep it highlighted. That indicates we need to do some further work. So I suggest this would be the case here.

Then we move to the next item, effective communication. Maybe could I, maybe in anticipation of what Iran was going to ask, ask some of the proponents maybe to elaborate a little bit on what is meant by effective communication.

Yes, Iran. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We can extend this table to include many, many, many items. Do we really need this effective communication? We know that if you want to cooperate, you have to talk together. You have actions which involve working together and that is communication. So unless we have some explanations of the real need of that, perhaps we should consider whether we need that or not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So we have a call for deletion of this item for your consideration.

United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And I tend to agree with the deletion, not because I don't certainly believe effective communication is an important issue. But I think as we start to get further down in this list, I think it's a good place to remind ourselves what we're doing. We're trying to create a framework and high-level characteristics. And I think looking down some of this list, a lot of these next proposals, or a handful of them or many of them, seem to be more recommendations. It might take a better form in recommendations from this group for how effective communication -- or that the process of enhanced cooperation supports effective communication or something like that.

So I don't think we're losing it by deleting it. I think it's just more appropriate in a conversation about recommendations for how to achieve some of these higher-level principles. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I see Lea and Anriette.

Lea, you have the floor.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Just quickly to support deletion of this item. Also just to point out that above when we are talking about result driven, we mentioned effectiveness already as one of the options that we're going to discuss. So if people are worried about effectiveness, we can talk about that under that other item. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, I think in our submission we used the heading "enablers." So I don't think it's a characteristic. But I think that, for example, we put secretariat support in our submission because we think -- these are not characteristics but in order for enhanced cooperation to be effective, you need certain support processes in place, you know, such as effective secretariat, well-resourced secretariat support, and effective communication procedures and tools.

So I'm happy for it to be dealt with in a different way. I'm not sure it's a recommendation, but it's not a characteristic necessarily.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S., are you seeking for the floor again? Okay.

So I would suggest here in light of what we have heard to differentiate from the approach we have taken thus far, to highlight it in red. I think this is to indicate that these certainly should be deleted from this list. But at the same time, we don't want it to disappear completely because we want to make sure it will be -- the idea is not lost. So effective communication, can you highlight in red?

And then we are moving to the next agenda -- next, not agenda, but next item, consultation by governments. A.

And, yes, I see Iran and I see Richard Hill.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Just we need a little bit of explanation. What do you mean by consultation by governments? The whole thing is enhanced cooperation. The first alphabet is working together, a little bit more than consultations. Consultation has different meaning. You consult but you don't take into account. But working together is different. Equal footing and so -- just explanation why we need that. Thank you. I'm not proposing to delete that but just explanation why we need that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If anyone wishes to speak to that point raised by Kavouss, I would just like to anticipate that I would suggest that maybe you take the same approach as before, that that could be highlighted in red because I'm not convinced that would be a characteristic intrinsic but rather may be a means or a tool to achieve it. So I think it's kind of different of what we are trying to achieve here.

I would like to hear others. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think we've push that one up. But my suggestion would be to make the characteristic consultative rather than consultation by government. And by that I mean that I think it's important for this process to be seen more broadly by those that are -- that have a stake in Internet public policy but that are not part of or inside the enhanced cooperation process to feel that they are able to be heard and to share their views with that process in a way that this working group has put out a call for public input.

So I would see the characteristic as consultative, and I think it should apply to all stakeholders who are part of that process.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I just would like to hear others and then I will come back to your proposal. I think that's maybe a good way out.

I have Parminder and I have the Russian Federation.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. The problem with "consultative" is it comes a core attribute of the process as the process is advisory in nature. The process is not perhaps decision-making, but it is advisory. And we have not gone into those layers of what enhanced cooperation would actually be, whether it's advising somebody or it's making decisions.

So I think this is supposed to not be the core of enhanced cooperation but an input into enhanced cooperation. So probably public consultations is something that was -- I mean, by governments, the consultation is public.

So if consultations by government is not good enough, maybe public consultations is what is meant here. But consultative looks trying to determine the core of what the process should be about, and that may not be appropriate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we agree to put it in red color because, you know, we think it should not be in the list because it's not the characteristic of enhanced cooperation. And what Anriette said is that the consultation could be done in multistakeholder participation. It's just the obvious part of it.

And we do not agree with this consultative role of governments in the enhanced cooperation at all. It looks like, you know, GAC role in ICANN, which is not effective and not participation in decision-making activities.

So let's delete this from the list. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I -- well, I would like to suggest -- take into account the issue that was raised by Anriette. But as Russia has said could be addressed also by another part of principles that we have either agreed -- or agreed to keep on board but with some refinement, related to multistakeholder, to openness.

Maybe the way it is phrased here, we should agree it does not fit as a characteristic of enhanced cooperation.

I would suggest we keep it in red so we do not lose the concept but we leave it for further work in a different category of those that are highlighted in yellow. But I like for your guidance on this.

I see on my list Richard Hill, Iran, and Nigel Hickson from ICANN.

So, Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I agree with your way forward. And I would also agree with Parminder, Anriette, and others. As I understand it, this is intended to say that governments should consult outside of just the executive and legislative branch before making decisions, which is a common practice in all democratic governments.

I don't think it had the sense that was criticized by the Russian Federation. So I think it's just a question of wording. So I support your approach, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman. Perhaps we should be conscious and mindful that some of these items are overlapping each other. When you say democratic, yes, we already mentioned there should be consultation. This is part of that.

When you say multistakeholder participation or approach, this is part of that. There are many things that. But if we want to say public consultation, you have to say in what sense. Public consultation nationally? That Richard wants the order that the governments before making any decision please consult the public? Could we do that as an outsider, to get into the business of any particular country as a policy saying that you must do that? Otherwise, we don't take it as an advice. I don't think that we need to take that approach.

Or are we talking of overall consultation? That means public comments. This is what ICANN is doing for everything, going to public comments. I'm not criticizing nor supporting that nor objection. So which one we mean? So I don't think we should say "public consultation." It is vague. We agree with you. Put it in red to see what we can do. But at the end, we have to see which one of them are covered by the others. We don't have a long list because it would be difficult to implement that. And we would have difficult to follow that. But supporting the Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I wasn't going to intervene. But having listened to the last few interventions, I mean, I think this is -- this is quite important. I, of course, fully appreciate it's not necessarily a characteristic. And obviously I take your excellent suggestion that we put it in red and perhaps discuss at another time.

But I think it raises a fairly fundamental point here because we have been talking about -- and our friends from Saudi Arabia reminded us yesterday on this point, that these characteristics, of course, are in relation to enhanced cooperation. They're not in relation to a garden party. They're not in relation to a visit to a pub or anything like that. They are in relation to enhanced cooperation.

Enhanced cooperation to us and to many encompasses a variety of processes, some of which governments are in the lead in terms of national security or defense or whatever. Others in which businesses could be in the lead or technical community could be in the lead or civil society could be in the lead, depending on what the process is.

If you take a process in terms of technical standards, then clearly other actors are in the lead than if you take a process of cybersecurity. And so in these processes, different actors have different roles, but the one -- one of the real characteristics of the effectiveness of a process is consultation.

So if governments are in the lead on a process, then they consult with others.

If standard-makers are in the lead of a process, then they consult with others as well.

So I think we should at least hold that notion, perhaps, if it's -- if it is a notion, and come back to it at another time, because it does seem to have a pertinence in terms of this consultation element. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you. On the basis of what we've heard, I would then suggest we keep it as it appears on screen, and of course we will certainly refer to it in a later stage.

Thank you for this.

The next item is accountability. Any comments in that regard? Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. It is a valid topic but we have to see who is accountable to whom and what are the accountability and what are the idea -- the criteria and so on and so forth. It's a very difficult subject.

In some other areas, we are dealing with that since 2014, November 2014. Still we have not finished that. Thousands of good people working many, many hours and so on and so forth. Hundreds of emails has been exchanged. Still it's some of the issue.

So first we have to say who is accountable to whom? Are we talking that enhanced cooperation should be accountable to somebody? The process? Are we saying that one government should be accountable to the other government, one sector to other sector? So what do we mean? In French, (speaking in a

non-English language), the application will of that. So could we have some clarification? Thank you. Not opposing. Just clarification.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Could I ask anyone who has made such a proposal to weigh in and provide some clarity?

I have India, you have the floor.

>>INDIA: Good afternoon. The point that I would like to make is that I think it's a really valid which has been raised by Iran as to accountability by whom and to whom. Now, we in our written submission have made a proposal for having an institutional mechanism or some kind of framework for the WGEC. Now, if we are talking -- if we are taking the proposal forward, if we are talking about it, then perhaps we can fit in the criteria of accountability. Otherwise, without a mechanism or a forum where we can raise the issue of accountability or take back the accountability of the institution itself, it would not become very relevant to the subject here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Switzerland?

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair.

We included the principle of accountability in our submission, and we linked it to the idea of good governance and checks and balances, with the understanding that any process of enhanced cooperation or any framework or arrangement of enhanced cooperation or where enhanced cooperation would take place has to be accountable, and depending in each case on the stakeholders involved.

But this is a thought, I think, that could be shared by most, that depending on where the enhanced cooperation takes place, we make sure that it is accountable as a process or an arrangement to all the stakeholders who have an interest, a stake, into that specific environment. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yesterday you were guiding us when we started to discuss the characteristics, and I recall you saying that it could then be helpful when we start looking at recommendations. So I would suggest that we -- we keep it there at the moment, and I think India's points are obviously valid. It is complex. But I think if we keep it there at the moment, it's there for us to reflect back on when we start looking at concrete recommendations, if we ever get there.

But I -- I think as -- I think any governance, any policy-related process, should always strive to be accountable, so I would prefer that we retain it at this point.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think we can either retain it or highlight it in yellow.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Maybe to highlight it in yellow because there are some issues associated.

And I have the feeling that when we discuss trust and integrity of the process, some of the concerns might be addressed by mentioning trust and the integrity of the process. And even good faith as was raised by Richard Hill some time ago. So accountability, yes, in yellow. Thank you.

Consensus-based is the next item. Is that an intrinsic characteristic of any enhanced cooperation process? Should it be seen as?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: It's a question of consensus among whom. At the international public policymaking level, the tradition is that it is done by consensus among all governments. Normally that's the process. But I cannot accept public policymaking processes requiring consensus, for example, of the same corporations which may need to be regulated under some aspects of that public policy framework.

So there cannot be a policy public making process which requires consensus of all stakeholders. Especially those involved or bringing private interests on the table. So my issue here is -- and this is one of the things which goes to the heart of the matter, like participation, equal footing participation among whom. Consensus-based among whom. I know it is there in the NETmundial document, for instance, but this particular issue of consensus among whom for public policymaking.

Because I can understand many other things which may require consensus, but public policymaking is a particular kind of intergovernment -- Internet governance process and public policymaking has to be consultative, participative but depends only then finally on those who represent people's will and not a consensus among everyone. I just wanted to put that note.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I have Saudi Arabia and Iran.

You have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Well, we share the views addressed by Parminder. Consensus between whom? If it's between government, we think any fair mark or mechanisms as the U.N. system work by consensus -- if this is what is meant, it's consensus between government, it's fine, but if other players or stakeholders will be involved in that consensus-based approach, I think we're going beyond 69.

So we need clarification or at least explanation from the people who propose this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Kavouss? Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman.

This is a difficult issue again, consensus. Whether we go to the U.N. practice of consensus. It means that no formal disagreement. That has a risk of a blockage. All countries agree on something and one country said, "No, I don't like it. Block it."

Some other people are talking of soft consensus which has no criteria. Some criteria would be like some few people that make some arrangement among themselves and come into the meeting, have discussion, and say this is consensus. The others did not reply.

Or they say majority -- it must be minority, some small minority. We don't know what is small and what is minority.

So it is very, very difficult. And I can say that with respect to between the governments, we could agree that because of the risk that I have mentioned. One government could block that.

So my question is do really we need this or we take it as a practice and we try, usually? What you're doing now, we're taking consensus at the meeting without any written agreement, so it is -- among the people to say that if they want to be effective, we have to agree on something, and we come to some sort of agreement, but without putting it in a way that we need to have that consensus because of the definition of consensus and risk of the consensus and application of consensus.

So perhaps the question is do we need this here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think, again, this is one expression that in the first approach is very straightforward and maybe could be easily accepted by all, but I'd like to raise maybe an additional layer of complexity I think in the same line as Iran has raised, but thinking that Internet public policy -- public policies pertaining to Internet may be addressed in a variety of contexts and formats, and even thinking of the existing institutions and arrangements, some are multistakeholder, intergovernmental, and various mixes.

So I'm not sure -- and certainly from the perspective of governments, if you have a context in which -- which is more of intergovernmental nature, it's certainly not appropriate to say to be consensus-based in each and every case, because governments have ways to decide on things. Consensus is of course the preferred option, but there are as legitimate ways of making decisions among governments that are not consensus-based.

At the U.N., it would be totally paralyzed if everything would be decided by consensus. Thinking about from the Security Council to each and every commission and group, consensus is not the fourth rule. So I -- for that reason, I think we should not delete it, maybe, but certainly that should be highlighted in yellow, I think, because it's an expression that deserves to be seen in the context or even of other parts of the discussion we are still to have.

So I would look at the secretariat to highlight it in yellow and we indicate in that some homework in that regard and we move to capacity building. Is capacity building one characteristic of enhanced cooperation?

Here again, my first -- allow me to abuse my position as chair. I think capacity building is one of the main focus areas for work. Maybe not a characteristic, not an intrinsic, but rather something we want to achieve through enhanced cooperation.

So maybe here again not to delete the notion but to see how it would make it to the document, how it would be articulated. Maybe not a characteristic. But I'd like to listen to proponents and others that would like to comment.

I have on my list Richard Hill and then Jimson.

Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I agree completely with your comments. In fact, I think we -- everybody agrees we need more capacity building and enhanced cooperation, and it has two aspects.

One is to build capacity so that there can be more enhanced cooperation, and the other is the one that you mentioned. Through enhanced cooperation we will increase capacity building.

So it goes both ways. So I fully support your way forward, Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Well, I didn't propose this, but just ruminating that through this process started, I have learned a lot. In this working group, I have learned a lot.

So there is always opportunity, you know, to learn. So whatever we do, we should give newcomers opportunity to know what has been happening. So a lot of background information, a lot of references and -- and the papers and the high-level materials that boosts the ability of newcomers, it gives room for newcomers to get to know what is going on. So I think this is quite -- very important. So I didn't put it there but you should have that capability to get (indiscernible) to have like all the Web site information the secretariat put up, those are materials. So we should be able to have such a credential, to have a history of all the things that have been discussed, so that whoever comes in can be equipped to fit into this situation.

So I think this is very valid for developing countries.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I think most of our colleagues would agree with that.

Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Well, we know capacity building is one of the important elements in any subject, but dealing with enhanced cooperation and according to Tunis Agenda, you will see capacity building relevant to the Internet governance in general. So focusing on the subject of enhanced cooperation, the expected level of capacity building I think is among -- or educating governments of their rights and responsibilities. If this is what is meant by -- by what's represented here, I think it's fine, but we really to know in what terms we will seek capacity building and enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Japan, Carlos Afonso, and then Iran.

Japan, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Japan also thinks that capacity building is important issue, but I think it's rather -- it's not a characteristic of enhanced cooperation. Rather, it's kind of a -- it should be categorized as a recommendation. As for the characteristics of enhanced cooperation, I think it -- we

only -- I think we don't -- we only have a consensus on the collaborative, inclusive, and promoting the participation from developing countries, and after this -- on the basis of such a consensus, maybe we can think about the proposal and to -- as a proposal where capacity building is something we can agree on.

We should engage in capacity building activities so that everybody -- developing countries can take part in that process. So I -- in that sense, I think it's kind of categorized as a red because it's not a characteristic, it's a proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan.

Yes, we take on board your suggestion.

Can I turn to Carlos Afonso?

>>CARLOS AFONSO: I wonder if Jovan is still in the room, because the -- the -- his organization, DiploFoundation, is -- works on the concept of capacity development as superseding capacity building. It is quite interesting. If Jovan were here, he could give a contribution, but if he is not -- okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Yes, we agree with the capacity building as an important element in every process, but we associate with Japan whether it is really a characteristic. I don't think so, personally. It's not characteristics. It may be required in the process where we put them in the recommendation -- still we have to discuss -- or elsewhere.

So perhaps we should highlight it in that sense and to see what we do in future. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Lea?

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair.

I do think capacity building is important, but perhaps that falls under the same category of properties that we've discussed earlier that are extrinsic. So rather than the intrinsic values, maybe we can categorize them together with what relates to the outcomes or what relates to the objectives of what enhanced cooperation is trying to achieve and have that discussion when we go back to it. So my suggestion would be to put it in yellow and discuss it in that -- later on when we come back to those properties. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this, Lea, but from what I heard, I think it needs a clarity there. Capacity building is not an intrinsic characteristic, something to be as a goal or -- so I -- for the moment, I would suggest that we keep it in -- highlighted in red so we are not losing it. Certainly capacity building, as many have said, is something we should be -- should discuss at some point more extensively, but not as a characteristic. We cannot say that an enhanced process should be designed having capacity building as one characteristic. It's not a characteristic. It's a goal or a -- I understand your point that in some other previous cases we have taken this approach. We might have -- and I think when we revisit

this, maybe we'll have different colors, more into the -- as we -- but for the moment I would maybe highlight it in red to indicate it clearly will not go into that list. I think that would be the -- and maybe we should -- we should do -- part of our homework would be to revisit those that are in yellow up, because they should be either in red or in some other different form.

So I would beg you, maybe, just to keep it for the moment and then we will certainly revisit that.

Can we turn to the next item, international? Well, it's quite obvious, I think, it should be international. I'm not sure we should say it is a characteristic, but are there any -- my suggestion would be to delete it. I think the very definition of enhanced cooperation cannot be done by one single party. Well, I tend maybe to be corrected about that but I think it requires international cooperation by definition.

Parminder, would you like to comment on this?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I'm not sure on what basis, Chair, it is two or for some other reason it should not be here. I think international is very definition to enhanced cooperation. And there is a confusion among some actors -- and I see it in many discussions -- in which they go to the national levels which are very, very important. We are still a world which is basically politically organized around nations.

But it is very clear in the Tunis Agenda that it is only about international public policy-making. It is intrinsic to very meaning of enhanced cooperation and, therefore, it is in my view a core characteristic -- characteristic of enhanced cooperation and should be retained on this list. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We also agree that it should be retained into the text as the important characteristic of enhanced cooperation since it's dealing with -- supposed to be dealing with international public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So thank you. Well, I would be more than glad to come back on this because the reason I call for deletion was for me to -- felt it was self-evident that it was not necessary to say.

But I think I take your point, Russia, that maybe exactly we should reaffirm because even to dispel some interpretations in another direction. So I would suggest it should be retained without any highlighting.

If that could be agreed, I suggest we turn to the next item, strengthening cybersecurity.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: That's clearly an extremely important topic, and I support doing that. But I don't see it as a characteristic of enhanced cooperation. Rather, it's an outcome of enhanced cooperation. So maybe some of these need to go into yet another category, which is desired outcomes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think I see a sense in the room of an agreement to that. So maybe to that point, could I ask the secretariat then to highlight that in another color? Green, strengthening cybersecurity. Maybe in green. And taking that opportunity, I think we should do something that was suggested by -- or implied by what Lea commented before, that those items that relate to outcomes should be highlighted in the same way. So I would ask the secretariat also to change capacity-building to green. So two lines up, to also put that in green.

The same thing in regard to respecting human rights. I'm not too sure. So this would be -- no, no, I think that's not an outcome. So think about the outcome.

So promoting sustainable development for sure, that should be in green. No, no, not participation by --

[Laughter]

That remains in yellow. Yeah, promoting sustainable development. Certainly because it's a rather goal than characteristic.

And I think that's it. Maybe some -- just for the sake of having some more clarity of what we are doing. Then this, of course, would be revisited as we go along. I think for the moment at least those -- so can we revert back, come back to the list where we were before?

So the next item on the list would be -- yes, Richard. Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. I think perhaps one more. I think responsive to innovation is perhaps an outcome because the idea, to me anyway, is not so much to have innovation to these processes but rather that these processes encourage innovation. I'm not sure on that but perhaps.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think in the course of previous discussion, it was said that responsiveness is already indicated by Tunis Agenda itself as a characteristic of the process. But I stand to be corrected.

Lea, can you comment on this.

>>LEA KASPAR: Perhaps. I think what these have in common -- and I would add respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, although they could fall in -- I will explain why. It sounds to me that the process, the ones we have discussed earlier transparency, openness, inclusiveness, refer to the process itself. So thinking about the discussions that we're having and the nature of those discussions.

So are we then saying that those discussions would be in and of themselves respecting human rights? I would assume so. But I think what is meant here is that the outcomes of those processes would be respecting of human rights in a similar way that we're talking about the outcomes of the process promoting sustainable development.

So I think the nature of the process versus the nature of the outcome is what the two categories of describing.

Another way of explaining it is intrinsic values of properties versus extrinsic values of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lea. I take on board your comment. However, I would maybe request for the moment to keep it as it is because I think human rights is not the only outcome but also something that should be part of the process itself from the start. So it's both. It's both. It should be there from the start.

So I think -- you know, those categories are somewhat artificial. We can revisit them and make sure that we (inaudible) them in the appropriate way. So for the moment, those that have -- I would suggest we could certainly when we come back revisit this. But I would, with your indulgence, kindly suggest we could move forward.

I see -- can I request, Carlos Afonso, can you put your plate down because it's a bit confusing.

I think I have Iran on my list.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. For the sake of time, you have a lot of things to do before lunch break. I suggest that we don't go back to recolor them at this stage. Let's go through the list and to see which ones remain in which color and then we could come back to see whether we could do anything further.

So because you have a lot of things to do -- and I understood that you wanted to finish that before the lunch break. So perhaps we should not continue this recoloring at this stage and take the part of the -- the remaining part of the list to see what we can do before lunch break. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I certainly don't intend to prolong this. I just want to make sure that all the outcome purpose, items, have the green color. I think this is done for the moment at least.

Let's take your advice and move on quickly. Actually I was expecting we could have done this by the end -- by 11:30, some time even from the morning session could be dedicated to other things. But I see this is not the case.

So let's move it as far as we can, as fast as we can, and try to have a first reading of those items by the end of this session.

The next one is linked to other dialogue platforms. Would that be a characteristic of enhanced cooperation? There are -- this was contained in two submissions.

I just want to recall that many recommendations -- I couldn't say exactly how many -- indicate the need for better coordination among the different institution processes that deal with potentially enhanced cooperation. So I think that's in a way linked to something to be discussed further.

But here we are trying to just make sure this is something that could go into the list of characteristics that should be up front and guide each and every enhanced cooperation process.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Perhaps because of the nature of the concept as mentioned, it should not be seen as a characteristic. It may go elsewhere. Which color you want to give to that, I don't know. But it is not characteristic.

When you say "other," what do you mean by "other"? So it is not characteristic. It is undefined characteristic. This is one point.

Second point, Chairman, I want to make -- to make your job easier, if you agree and other colleagues agree. From this we go to the items proposed by one single author. We fully respect the views of everybody, but I suggest a procedure for that. You ask among those whether anyone wants to raise any of them to be discussed or we don't want to do that. Go totally democratically, totally. But just leave it to the authors whether they want to take it or not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I thank you for this proposal. And I think this is supported by many in the room. I would certainly do that after we discuss -- if it is okay to discuss this item, we will proceed like this and request of the individual proponents if they would like to defend it. Otherwise, those would be taken out of the list.

But before that, I have on my list, India. Yes, India, you have the floor, madam.

>>INDIA: Some of the points that we had raised in our written submission, we have stated that there have been parallel and simultaneous efforts going on at various regional, international, and multilateral forums on enhanced cooperation.

But the reason why we are not really able to reach anywhere is because there are many recommendations and there is not much call for coordination between these various forums where such discussions are taking place.

That is also -- the same kind of discussion is also taking place at various -- in the private sector among the various multistakeholder communities. And there is a need to coordinate and bring together all these forums where such discussions are taking place. And that would be one of the characteristics of enhanced cooperation. So I would request that this item be retained as one of the characteristics. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Any other comments? Yes, Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I also have Japan on my list. You have the floor, sir. And then Parminder.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Since the Internet has open and distributed and interconnected nature, certainly we need this collaboration among different fora. Collaboration -- under characteristics, maybe we can say enhanced cooperation should be collaborative or promote coordination.

But this linked to other platforms, it's kind of the recommendation to be there. As a characteristic, enhanced cooperation should be collaborative. And then to do that maybe we should -- we should promote linking with other platforms.

So in the sense, I think it should not be listed as a characteristic. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I support India's position and -- support India's position but also the arguments given by Japan which I was supporting and then Japan said it is not a characteristic. Because I take all the arguments and they actually say that Internet is interconnected -- is a public space which is interconnected with all public spaces. Whether you have finally a loose coordination mechanism or a tight new institutional body, whichever kind it might be, whatever way we operationalize Internet enhanced cooperation, it would involve linkages with other kind of institutional spaces. And that I think is key to any enhanced cooperation processes around Internet.

And, also, a reading of Section 70 and 71 of Tunis Agenda talks about taking relevant organizations together and that togetherness -- taking it together looks a continuous process and that continuous process, as I understand, can only be maintained if there is some kind of linkages across. And it was always recognized that this is a complex public policy space.

So it is kind of agnostic to what kind of final recommendations of an institution mechanism is given, whether it's a tight new body or a loose coordination space or whatever. I think this is almost essential to the idea of enhanced cooperation, that it should be linked in some way to other platforms. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just had, I think, just some of the wording might be a challenge because what is "linked" to other dialogue platforms? I think that -- and I believe Parminder had just said, a link, better linkage. And I think our Japanese colleague used the word "collaboration," which I think is what this is trying to get at, is better collaboration amongst dialogue platforms.

And I note that collaboration is earlier in the document. And if that's the intention, then I think that it's covered. Certainly there is no problem with better collaboration linkages as an aspect, but I think the way it's framed here is that this process is linked. And that might be a little bit different than the linkage and the collaboration.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. At this point, I do not see consensus either to retain or to delete. And there might certainly be room to merge or consolidate with the notion of collaborative aspect that should prevail. So I would suggest for the moment to -- in order not to prolong discussion at this point, to keep it highlighted in yellow. So it is only to indicate some further work should be done, either to

consolidate or to think about the way that should be formulated in the document. So the idea is retained but it is not yet decided how it would appear here.

With this and on the basis of the proposal that was made by Iran and supported by others, tacitly, I would like to invite those who had made recommendations that appear only in one of the submissions -- that does not mean that others could not support. This has already been said. So it is not a qualitative assessment of the proposal, just a fact that it was proposed by just one contributor.

I'd like to invite those who have made their proposals to -- or anyone else who would like on their behalf to support because maybe we not have in the room all those contributors, be they members or observers. So other parties may wish to refer to -- even if it was not the original contributor to some of those items. But then we'll take them as a block, try to retain only those that could be defended, let's say, by either the contributor or someone on his or her behalf.

So I invite you -- I have on my list Richard Hill and then Jimson.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to see if anybody else would support including good faith, good faith in discussions, meaning that when there are discussions taking place, they should be conducted in accordance with the principle of good faith. That's not found in the Tunis Agenda. I think it was assumed to apply, but I think it's probably worth putting forward.

If there's objection to that, then I will come back with a counterproposal, if you permit, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So let's, maybe before turning to Jimson, just try to address that topic raised by Richard. Could we retain then good faith as a characteristic that should be embedded in each and every enhanced cooperation process?

Jimson, could you maybe just provisionally turn your plate unless you want to comment on this, so I can take on board those who want to comment on this proposal.

So I have on my list Jovan, Parminder, and Iran.

Jovan, you have the floor.

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: Sorry. I was just for a few minutes out of the room and I just heard that there was some reference for qualification on capacity-building. But I guess we want -- this is closed. Do we expect any reference on the question of capacity-building? Or we move on with the agenda?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yeah, I think that we -- when we discuss capacity-building, there was a proposal from Carlos Afonso, that he could hear you, for clarity on how this would fit in the discussion.

But we decided that capacity-building is rather a desired outcome than an intrinsic characteristic of the process.

So for the moment, I think we extend this, we certainly refer to discussion on capacity building later on, and then we'll certainly look forward to your comments. I think for the purposes of this action, I think that the issue has been exhausted. Thank you.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: The term could fit, but my issue is with the level at which we are now kind of descending or ascending to, and the kind of terms -- if we start using "good faith," then there are many other things which people would ask for, and it's too generic to be useful in this particular context. One is that good faith is required for any kind of discussion required at the U.N. Security Council discussions and any other place. So -- and it seems to be prefaced by a suspicion of bad faith, first of all, so I don't think this really needs the criteria of -- be taken as a characteristic of a particular thing which we are trying to discuss. It's too granular, too general, and for that reason I would not support its retention.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Good faith, whether it is announced or spelled out or not is an essential element of any process. If we don't have good faith, what we can do?

We could establish trust among ourselves. If the trust is established based on the good faith, even those who do not disagree are ready to discuss and try to some sort of agreement.

And just as an example, in accountability in ICANN we are doing during these days, this is one of the major elements, and a lot of contribution has been made and there has been full support by the community who are not here.

So I don't think that we could delete it. Whether it's characteristics or not, but I -- I don't want to push that it is a characteristic, but it is a necessary and fundamental element, good faith, and we have to retain it in one way or the other. I have no problem if we retain it as a characteristic. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So here again, I do not see consensus either to delete or to retain. I -- but I recall Richard said that maybe we should take the floor again. Otherwise, we highlight it in yellow, indicating that some -- okay. So let's do like this. So we highlight good faith in yellow.

So thank you. I'll turn now to Jimson for your comments. Please.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair. I did propose peace. Of paramount concern to us is the issue of peace. Whatever we do, we must have -- we must be led by the desire for peace in the Internet community, the international community, and we believe developing countries, we need this a lot to guide us, to be a major (indiscernible) of any form of coming together, not a conspiracy to bring down the Internet or for disorder in the community. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I don't see anyone else --

Yes. Yes, Iran. Iran, please, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Just I'm going to refer to the transfer of technology.

Chairman --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no. Please, Iran. May I just wait for you just to conclude on the item related to peace and then we'll come back to you, if I can ask you kindly just -- I'll come back to you as soon as we finish this discussion on peace.

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: We are going in areas which are all good things, but nothing to do with what job we have at hand. We need peace. We need job growth. We need good health. But we cannot keep on putting these issues onto the characteristics of enhanced cooperation. And I don't know whether what is being referred is peace in the room or peace as an output of the system. These kind of words we may keep on adding in the list are not really adding anything to the job or the purpose of this particular group, and I think they're good words but don't have a place, in my view, here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Maybe to further clarify why it specifically apply, to foster peace and harmony in the global Internet community. That is the -- the focus. Any form of enhanced cooperation mechanism must first have peace and harmony in the global Internet community, just to clarify that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Jimson, for the clarification.

I would therefore suggest that we could highlight it in green. I think that the -- as we have done before, we are -- here we will identify peace as one of the desired outcomes or something that would benefit from the process, rather than should be embedded in the process.

Even though I certainly support the notion that peace should prevail in the negotiating room. I would certainly be a very enthusiastic supporter of that. But I think for the purposes of the design of the enhanced peace process, I think that would belong more to the outcome than to the intrinsic characteristic, if you could agree to that, and with this, I would then thank you. Thank you for this. I will invite Iran, please, sir, to comment on your proposal.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Just my comment is regarding on transfer of technology.

Chairman, if we approach it through the Tunis Agenda, we find in a different way in many articles that refer to the transfer of technology in different languages.

For example, in Article 69, it references for the enhanced cooperation to enable governments, so how we could enable governments without transfer of technology. At the same time, we have referred to

transfer of technology in other contributions. That's right that just maybe one member's reference in its contribution to the transfer of technology, but if we approach to the many conventions, this is one of the characteristics that just could enable the governments, especially the developing countries, to follow and to realize their goals in -- in the frame of the transfer of technology.

As you know that there -- sustainable development goals was adopted last year and it should seem to be a roadmap for the next 15 years for all of the countries. Especially for the developing countries.

So this item is very important of the -- of the sustainable development. Especially in the means of implementation section.

So we believe that any policy and measures under the enhanced cooperation must contribute to the achievement of the internationally agreed 2030 agenda for sustainable development. So we believe that we should keep these items maybe as a goal of the enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran.

Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, all colleagues.

Are we in the item in the exchange of views on the two questions? Can you clarify to me?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: You ask about -- what we are finalizing now is the review of the items that were contained in the individual submissions in relation to the characteristics that should be embedded in enhanced cooperation process. We are working on the basis of the spreadsheet that was distributed yesterday and especially on the basis of the accompanying text which leads, at the end of that -- it is on the screen, the list of possible characteristics.

So we are just going through it to make sure that those who can make it to the list or otherwise how we should address them in a later stage.

We are just about to finish it. We are now just revisiting those that were supported by one single delegation and requesting -- we are taking it as a block, just requesting delegations to -- who wish to defend to bring it to the group. Otherwise, those will not be taken on board.

So this is what we are doing right now and we'll turn, after that, to also the discussion on characteristics, but those who are directly linked to the wording of Paragraph 69 to 71.

I had expected to do it in the morning in response to requests that were made since the beginning of the meeting by the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, I think even yourself, but we haven't been able to get there as yet.

I'm counting on everyone's good will that we could move it as far as possible, possibly by even in the beginning of the afternoon session.

>>CUBA: Thank you for your expansion.

I understand that we are on Item 2 of the agenda. That is, continuation of exchange of views on the contributions on the two guiding questions previously agreed upon. We understand that there has been a procedure trying to discuss some terms and -- that relate to characteristics, but we are concerned that in the way we are proceeding that is maybe to inject some terms or to try to interpret some understandings that were already agreed by the summit.

So we believe that this kind of exercise could be counterproductive because sometimes the delegations that block or oppose some terms that could be part already of existing international commitments or understanding. So we are worried that this exercise of discussing characteristics to have as an outcome like a reinterpretation of what has been already agreed at the national level.

For us, the exercise of discussing the different positions of the members regarding the characteristics is very -- is very useful because it's in our mandate. We agree to discuss two questions, the first question and the second question, but we oppose to have as an outcome of this discussion agreeable terms or not agreeable terms. For us, this is just an interchange of views. We will not have any outcome produced by you or by -- by the group. This is just an exchange of views, as is the title of the item of the agenda.

So we -- as this item on the agenda relates to both questions, I just wanted to highlight because we didn't do it yesterday, and it was agreed that the agenda item on the exchange of views could be in any of the two questions, so right now we want to highlight our contribution that was sent.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Excuse me, Cuba. I'm very sorry to interrupt --

>>CUBA: Yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- but since you have not followed the meeting from the start, we are just about to conclude a part as per what we had agreed. I would maybe just kindly request you that allow us to finalize this and then I will give the floor back to you for your general comments before we move to the next section.

But it would be helpful for the -- I know you are very respectful of the other -- of the meeting, so let me just finalize what we are doing. Then I will allow you the opportunity to speak on any topic you wish.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Well, but this -- this discussion is under the item of continuation of exchange of views on the contributions on the two guiding questions previously agreed upon? This discussion is under that item?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, it is in the item, under this item. However, it was agreed by the full group to work according to some methodology. I want to be respectful of the full group, if you'll allow me just then to conclude what we have been doing, and then I'll turn to you and I'll give you ample opportunity to speak on any topic you wish, if you allow me this.

But I'm very sorry but I -- I -- we have been doing work since the beginning of the morning. We are about to conclude it. We just heard from Iran defending a proposal. I'd like to propose a way forward to this. I think if we go to some general statement, we will deviate from what we have been doing.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Thank you. But in any case, we would like to intervene on the characteristics. I think any member is -- have the civil right to speak. We want to refer to the characteristics --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. So then as I told you, let's just conclude with what we are doing with Iran and I'll come back to you, if I can ask you kindly to -- I will refer to you immediately after we finish the business with Iran.

>>CUBA: I thought that Iran already finished.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, no, no. No, we are still addressing the issue that was raised by Iran because we have not made a decision on how to address the item to which he was referring. That is, technology transfer.

I understand on the basis of what -- the exchange we had and what Iran has just explained to us the purpose behind it that it is -- I think Iran sees technology transfer both as an enabler for enhanced cooperation to take place but also as an output. So certainly not as a characteristic, an intrinsic characteristic.

So my proposal here would be to highlight it. If Iran -- and I look forward to Iran -- I look to Iran either if you want to highlight it in green so we indicate that it is -- it has an outcome nature or if you want to highlight in yellow because that would indicate that we want to see it both through a (indiscernible) of enabler and outcome. So I just look -- otherwise, I would just suggest it to be highlighted in green but I would just want to check with you what is your preference, how you want it to be portrayed in these documents. Please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you for your comment. No difference what kind of the color. Just we are going to open this item for discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So I'll just suggest, just for the sake of a first reading, to highlight it in green, so secretariat, please, technology transfer would be highlighted in green.

I haven't seen before any further requests for the floor, so I assume that in regard to the other items here -- yeah.

So Cuba, I will -- I revert to you. I will revert to you, certainly, unless it's a point of order, but I'd like to conclude the business in regard to that section before I turn to you, in respect for the full membership.

I would -- I would certainly like to be very respectful of your position, the point you want to make, but just also before moving to other delegations, I want to assure you that we in no way are trying to rephrase the Tunis Agenda or any other instrument. I think this is something that I've been doing from

the start. Even some suggestions that implied changes were not accepted. We decided to stick to the Tunis Agenda, to have Tunis Agenda and all other framework documents as very up front.

So maybe it's a concern you have, but there's no reason for that.

Another point for you is that we are not preparing output document. We are just collecting ideas. We are certainly going to do some intersessional work on this. But we are not working in a drafting mood or preparing any kind of output, so just to make sure that your concerns are well taken on board.

Would you like to intervene?

But, please, I would not be in a position to allow you now to make a general statement. This will take place immediately after we conclude these negotiations.

But if you want to raise any other point of order, please go ahead.

Microphone for Cuba.

>>CUBA: Yes. Well, I am clear that this is not a negotiation, an effective negotiation at the end of your statement right now. This is not a negotiation.

We think this exercise was an exchange of views among the members of the group. We do not expect you to produce any document, not the secretariat, on the basis of colors or what has been discussed.

This is a useful exercise to know each other's positions and views.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Cuba, excuse me, I will have to interrupt you. And I will -- no, no, please. Let me -- no, no, no, please. We have been doing some work. I cannot allow this.

>>CUBA: Can I finish?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no. I will give you the floor right after we finish this.

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please.

>>CUBA: I think it's not -- it's not diplomatic to interrupt a delegate, a member of the U.N., a member of this group to be interrupted. We are having an intervention.

In our understanding, we feel that this is -- in the item of the agenda, this is an exchange of views. And we are expressing our position, that it is our understanding that with this exchange of views in connection with this paper, specifically to this paper, we do not believe that there should be a document prepared on the basis of this paper. This paper is helping us to exchange our views on what our belief or our ideas on what could be the characteristics. But with this specific listing, we are not in a position to have a priority of some terms in some colors and other terms in some colors. We are just listening to each other.

We do not feel it is adequate to have a paper where we are having those green colors and not the yellow colors terms because the paper, as it was prepared, I think, by the secretariat, or by the Chair, is a compilation from the different contributions that were published. So it's a very useful exercise to listen to each other to more or less have an idea what are the different positions on the terms, on the characteristics.

But we do not expect to have a paper on this listing to prioritize some terms or others because for some members, some terms are -- the terms they believe should be the characteristic of the topic we were discussing. But there are other terms. So what I think is a useful exercise to discuss exchange of views, but we do not expect to have an output or paper prepared on this.

And let me add to this that this is the opinion of Cuba. That is very regrettable that my delegation is interrupted at the moment, especially by the Chairman. I am really, really, really sorry. This should not be the way to proceed. I really believe it's a very regrettable situation. Very regrettable for my delegation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

Well, I just want to make clear -- as I told you before, I will give you the floor. I will not interrupt you. I just want to make sure that we proceed as smoothly as we can because since you are not here following the meeting from the beginning and you are not aware of what took place until now, I think that out of respect for the group it would be just fair to allow the meeting to proceed and to look for the appropriate moment in which your intervention to be made.

I just mention this because from the beginning you draw my attention to a point of order regarding -- and I think it's just fair, and I thank you for this. So I notice that you have a lot of care and you are respectful of the rules of procedure and the way to proceed. So I was just drawing your attention that it was not the appropriate moment for this.

But in no way I want to interrupt you or to cut off your right to speak. Anyone here will be allowed to speak on any topic to the extent they wish.

The only thing that at the moment you wish to make your intervention, that was not the right moment. Forgive me to say. It was not the proper moment. It was out of order. I just call your attention that the moment for your intervention that is legitimate, that you will be able to -- that was not the appropriate moment.

I was just trying to conclude some discussion in which we have been involved since the beginning and trying to move forward.

So I will offer you -- I will just for the moment kindly -- if you want to prolong this, as you said, we are working in a diplomatic environment. I will certainly, as a Brazilian diplomat, not impede your word or any other who wish to speak. But I want to make sure to the extent I can and using the authority I have to make sure that the meeting proceeds in order in respect for all of us that are here.

In that context, I would like to suggest is to finalize the discussion we are having. We are just about to finalize. I don't think we will take more than 10 or 15 minutes either now or after lunch. And then we, as we decide for the next step, I will offer you -- but I would also like to have the opportunity maybe just before that to explain to you what we have been doing, to explain what has been the criterion. And I think many of your concerns may be -- might have been addressed by that time.

Do you want to take the floor again? Yes, please. You can go ahead.

>>CUBA: Thank you. We are going to intervene in the afternoon on the items related to the exchange of views on the contributions on the two guiding questions previously agreed upon to refer to our contribution as it was decided at the beginning of the meeting yesterday, that any delegation can highlight their contribution at any moment on this agenda item.

Regarding this discussion, we are going -- we were going -- we were addressing the point of this discussion, like, five minutes ago. We are in order on with respect to rules of the procedures. Even from yesterday we were asking (indiscernible) on the agenda and so on.

So we were saying a few minutes ago that for us, it's a very useful discussion, the one we have been having, through the day of today. And we have been following the discussion.

But the opinion of my delegation is that we should not have different categories of colors or not to have an outcome, summary, or a report on this specific discussion because for us, it's a little controversial to have a kind of priority of terms that could imply a rank interpretation of the Tunis Agenda. This is my opinion on this discussion. That is why I'm talking right now before you end the discussion on this topic.

Then in the afternoon, I will talk on the highlights on the Cuba contribution. So we are in order, and we request to be respected our right to speak any time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. I don't want to prolong it. We can discuss bilaterally. Maybe just -- I think now understand better your position. And I should apologize if I was rude in interrupting you.

But as we reviewed Item 4, exchange of views on the contributions, we have agreed to follow some procedure, some method of work. First of all, we allowed delegations each to highlight elements that in were their contributions. Those who wish to do so have already done that.

However -- so it is not any more what we are doing now, but I will allow in the afternoon to do it, if you wish. No problem about that.

And then we decided to go in a methodical way following some order of work. So it is not everyone is speaking on anything at any point in time. I think that was the contradiction between your approach and mine to this exercise.

So I certainly would reaffirm to you that you be offered the floor to speak on any topic you wish. But I would very strongly beg U.N. colleagues that to the extent possible that we should stick to the

methodology we have been following. Otherwise, we'll start discussing things in a random way. And I don't think that would lead us anywhere.

But, again, I want to be very respectful of the positions you have had of the contributions you are taking to this debate.

I think we are now behind schedule with regard to the time we should stop for lunch.

My intention originally was to have concluded this discussion. Maybe I would kindly ask colleagues if there is still interest on the part of some delegations to go about some of those items that have been supported by the individual delegations? Otherwise, we can in the beginning of the meeting already move to another section. But I just want to make sure that if anyone else in regard to individual items that were proposed by individual delegations, if there is still some interest in going about any of these? I think I would like to be apprised in order to make sure we have the right time management between now and the beginning of the afternoon session.

Parminder, do you want to take the floor on this? Yes, please, go ahead.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: The second-to-last item, considering underrepresented groups to be retained, I think it should be an essential part of any public policy process that it gives disproportionate attention and consideration to underrepresented groups. And these underrepresented groups could be LDCs. It could be isolated countries. It could be the disabled community or whatever. But I think any simple text on public policy would say special consideration to underrepresented groups should be given, and that part in my opinion should be retained.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would suggest to maybe try to go a little bit further, five or ten minutes, try to finalize discussion on those topics.

I would like to listen to Saudi Arabia. If it's on the same topic -- on the same topic? Yes, please, go ahead.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: From our views, we could like to keep producing outputs. It's really an important goal for us to produce outputs when conducting enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I think at least we have two expressions of support on the part of Parminder to the issue regarding underrepresented groups, on the part of Saudi Arabia producing outputs.

So I would like first maybe to spread the discussion and to take each item on its own merit. In regard to considering underrepresented groups, is there a consensus in the room either to retain or to delete? Can it be retained? Canada.

>>CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Yes, definitely considering underrepresented groups is something that is fundamental to enhanced cooperation. And I think that -- but maybe it's just in the phrasing that we need to work it because it also touches on diversity. It also touches on inclusion. So

definitely would want to keep it but let's refine it even further because it is definitely a very important one.

And since I have the floor, I'll just say at the same time for Saudi's suggestions, I think we had one previously which talked about outcomes or results oriented. So, again, I would group that one in that category for proper wording in terms of how we want to retain the characteristic. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, United States and Iran.

United States, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And to be very quick, we would certainly support retaining considering underrepresented groups. I think that was from the U.S. proposal, so obviously we support it.

But I do agree with my Canadian colleague, that perhaps it is good to look at consolidating with some of the other concepts which I think it fits nicely with.

And the same comment on producing outputs. I think it is similar to something we discussed earlier. So these are consolidation kind of questions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran, you are not seeking for the floor anymore? Okay, thank you.

So I have on my list India, Nigel Hickson from ICANN, and Richard Hill. So, India, you have the floor, Madam.

>>INDIA: Just to express my support for this particular item in the characteristics because it also addresses the question of gender divide and -- the gender divide and the national divide, the linguistic divide and equal representation of all these stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for your input. I will turn to Nigel Hickson from ICANN.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Fully supportive of considering underrepresented groups.

We are also quite keen on diversity, but whether the two have a commonality I leave that to others. But I think the diversity within processes in terms of the representation is quite important. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I think diversity is slightly different than underrepresented groups. They're related, so I think that in a future version we consider combining them.

But I have a process problem now, Chairman. It's no longer clear which one of the ones that in white we are retaining and which of the ones in white we are retaining because we didn't follow the order. So

perhaps during the lunch, you could sort that out with the secretariat and they could show a strike-through the ones we are not retaining.

I take it that we are retaining both diversity and considering underrepresented groups.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I was going to address this. I think in light of the exchange we have -- and according to the criteria we have been following, I request the secretariat to -- in regard to producing outputs and considering underrepresented groups to highlight both in yellow. So meaning that the notion is somewhat retained but should be further refined.

In regard to diversity, I'm not sure if we should do the same because I think there was some support to retain it. But maybe just for the sake of not losing time here, just also to highlight diversity.

And in regard to the others that were proposed by one single delegation case, there is no further request for support. I think those that are -- that follow "peace" should be indicated -- maybe with the secretariat to decide one color, not to delete them but to put it in a color to indicate that these had -- were not discussed or had no support in the room to be retained, just for the sake of having a more clear visual information of what we had been doing.

Yes, Iran, are you seeking the floor again? Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. What is the color of underserved or unrepresented countries? No color or with yellow? Why yellow? Because I think this is elsewhere discussed, and we are facing this problem in discussions in particular governments that are not represented because of problems, resources, difficulties, and so on and so forth. So we have to take it as an essential element and you put in the characteristics. But without color. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I understood there is wide support to retain it as a characteristic. But some parties want to indicate that some further work is needed in regard to how to phrase it, to articulate it and how to place it in the document. So I think consistent with the approach we have taken in similar previous cases, that is why I am proposing to put in yellow, to take on board all the contributions.

Again, there was an overwhelming support to retain it straightforward as a characteristic.

So again, this is something we have done. It's not something that is directly linked to any kind of outcome. I think it's just one exercise among us in the spirit we have, exchanging views on the contributions, trying to come up with some sort of more structured idea of what might be the main messages emerging from those contributions.

So I .

-- yes, Cuba, do you have a comment, please, before I conclude?

>>CUBA: Thank you. For us, the transcripts, the paper that is going to be circulated by the secretariat, is enough for -- as a member of this group, is enough for us to have an idea on what are the positions of the countries and the civil society and observers regarding the characteristics of enhanced cooperation,

so for us, their paper of the transcript of this discussion is the -- the one that will help us to have an idea on the positions of the different stakeholders.

Second, regarding this document, we do not agree on deleting any of the terms that are listed in this paper because as Iran, we believe that this should continue to be maybe analyzed or we should continue to think about this compilation to be analyzed by our expert that is not present because there is no funds for him to come, and also because we would like to have an analysis.

We -- as I said, maybe we see that the colors are an indication of what is the commonalities, maybe, or support that some terms receive from some members of the group, but we do not favor to have a kind of elimination or deletion of other terms that maybe didn't deserve or that were not discussed at all. So we do not feel comfortable on this kind of deletions.

Maybe this paper could be like that, circulated by the secretariat, maybe with the colors for all of us that were here, and then could see and participate in the discussion.

But apart from these two -- the two that we have on the screen, the transcript and this without relation, this is like a basic document for us to continue thinking and having an analysis, but we really are opposed to delete, because for example, I see "fair and equitable," I see other terms that maybe need from our side to continue thinking about it.

So we see it as not an ending task or a final paper, this one to be produced later. So those are our comments on this exercise.

I think that the paper helps to move the discussion and to have opinions and to -- among all of us, but we would not like to delete any of the terms that are compiled in the paper. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. Maybe you'll be pleased to see that many of the things you said, I said myself in the course of the discussions, and you may notice that I asked the secretariat not to delete anything. So nothing that was in the original has disappeared from the document. Everything is there. What we tried to do in -- on the basis of the comments that were made, we tried to organize a little bit and tried to feel -- have a sense of the room what -- which of those items could maybe be clearly seen as characteristics or not.

But again, as you review the transcripts of the meeting, you will notice that I said many times that what we have been doing here has -- we are not working on a drafting mode, we're not in the preparation of an output of any way. We are trying to better organize our ideas to better reflect on the contributions, on what come -- the contributions themselves -- I have said it at the beginning, and I repeat it: The contributions are the authoritative document. So what we are just trying to work on the basis of the contributions, trying to elicit some things that might be useful for us in a later stage, but at this moment in time we are not going in any type of decision-making or negotiations. We are just trying -- exchanging ideas and trying to move forward, and there will be an opportunity later on for us to go into that mode but not now.

And if you'll allow me just to repeat, nothing is lost in the document. All the ideas are still there for everyone to see. We have also decided that we need some intersessional work, some homework between now and next meeting, trying to better articulate this, so I will welcome the contribution from your expert, Mr. Juan Fernandez, which is a very good friend and colleague from many other discussions we have on Internet governance. So I look forward for your contribution as well as for other contributions. Nothing that we have said here is decided until -- and what we have said, that many of those things are -- will be -- need to be better contextualized as we go into other parts of the discussion.

So just to make sure that your concern is also my concern and the concern of the room, so I think we are very much on similar pages in that regard.

I have U.K. and then I come back to Cuba again.

U.K., please, you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, we also have comments on the work that we've done this morning, the good progress that we've made, and we have some proposals for next steps in this process.

But we note it's nearly 1:30. We think we've done a lot of work this morning and maybe we have earned our lunchtime. Perhaps we can all reflect over lunch and come back to this conversation after we've had something to eat. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. I would certainly suggest that we start the afternoon session by agreeing among us on what we'll be doing. My proposal is to discuss the issues that were elicited by the contributions. The issues are, anyway, indicated in the synthesis paper but I don't think we should take the synthesis paper, the first part, as our guide and maybe you should just draw into it to identify the issues and have an open discussion on the issues dealing with the format, the scope, the issue of equal footing.

I mean, some of those issues we have been already addressing, so I think we are trying to building -- we are working kind of building block way trying to come up with something that might be useful for all of us by the end of the day. So I would certainly support your suggestion that we break for lunch now, but before that, I'll turn to Cuba for her statement. Please.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Well, we request the secretariat to take out the strikeout from the listing because there are different terms that are deleted from the list, so we -- we want those terms to be alive, not to be striked out.

The second thing is that we believe that we have not made so much good progress. I differ from the colleague from the U.K. We have been the whole day of yesterday and the whole morning of today, so three sessions, only in Question 1. That is the characteristics. That is why yesterday I proposed the agenda to be amended to have the first day for characteristics or the Question 1 and Friday, today, the whole day, on the second question.

So we are not making good progress, really.

We hope that to -- this afternoon, the only one session from the four sessions, the only one session that we are going to dedicate to the Question 2, we hope that we could move forward, really, because I remember that at the beginning of the meeting yesterday, a lot of members request to be more focused on Question 2 because we need to go to our concrete outcomes and unfortunately it's only the afternoon of Friday. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. I have some requests for the floor but I beg you to make your interventions at the beginning of the afternoon session.

By concluding, two points.

One thing is that I ask the secretariat -- and I will look to the secretariat -- just to find some color -- not to strike it, but to indicate that -- some color to indicate that those issues are not addressed here but they are -- maybe we can put it in pink --

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- I don't know, so we make sure these are not lost. And the second point I think --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think the good news is that I think we had some good discussion. We can make assessment whether it was good or bad progress. I leave it to anyone -- each and every one to assess.

The bad news is that we haven't yet finalized the discussion on the characteristics, so I think the decision we took at the beginning was to first -- to go about the portion of characteristics but then we'll go back to the issues raised in the synthesis document. There are some parties who interpreted it as that those characteristics should be those ones, those ones that are already stated in Paragraphs 69 to 71 and that deal with enable governments, equal footing, and the scope.

So, you know, we are not -- certainly not moving this afternoon to the discussion on recommendations.

By the end of the day, we'll discuss the way forward. My -- I can anticipate my suggestion would be for the next meeting to -- maybe to have more focused discussion on the recommendations on the basis of the compilation that was distributed to you yesterday, and as some parties have expressed, they feel that they would not be in a position in this meeting to comment on many actual recommendations that are contained there coming from other parties because they -- they were -- they did not come to the meeting in that mood.

So I think part of the homework for all of us would be on the basis of this compilation of recommendations to prepare with our experts, with our capitals, to next meeting. Wishfully we can dedicate to this.

So this afternoon we will revert to the issues that some parties have been asking that we should have addressed from the beginning. I will -- wishfully, I hope we can make as much progress as we can, so for next meeting we can wishfully also have a full meeting dedicated to the recommendations. Otherwise we'll have to revert to some of those characteristics before we move to recommendations. But again, I want to wish everyone good lunch. See you back here at 3:00 p.m. sharp, please. Thank you.

[Lunch break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I would like to call the meeting to order. We are going to start in two minutes.

Good afternoon. I will invite all WGEC members and observers to resume the meeting.

I would just recall that in the morning session we were able to finalize very initial discussion on the items that could be described as possible principles of characteristics that should guide and be embedded in enhanced cooperation processes.

I want to make a few comments in that regard. As you recall, we are working on the basis of the submissions that were presented in response to the two questions. The first question being: What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? And the second question taking into account of the previous WGEC and the Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraph 69 to 71, what kind of recommendations should we consider.

So the approach we took was to focus first on the first part of the question: What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? And in doing so, we are drawing on the inputs that were submitted to the commission by different contributors.

Those inputs were organized, that was an effort on my part, in a synthesis document which has two parts. The first part that is entitled definition and characteristics of enhanced cooperation, that first part tries to address the issue of characteristics of enhanced cooperation through an angle that was the preferred one by a number of contributors that looked at the issue of what are the characteristics of enhanced cooperation through the analysis of the terms, expressions that are contained in paragraph 69 and 71. For a number of contributors, those are the characteristics of enhanced cooperation that should be considered in regard to question number 1.

Another group focused characteristics from the angle of what would be the principle that would apply to each and every enhanced cooperation process that should be devised independently and from those terms -- in a way from those terms and expressions that are contained in paragraph 69, 71. I think with some caution because in some cases there was some overlap. As we have seen, as we have gone through those items, some of those items that were proposed either refer to language contained in the Tunis Agenda or to language included even in paragraph 69 to 71. So it was kind of like an artificial way of dealing with it, but it was the group's preference to address the issue of characteristics first by this angle of what ought to be the high-level principles independently in the way of the language contained in paragraph 69 to 71. This is something we achieved this morning, again, I would like to repeat, in our very first approach and non-committal way. So nothing that has been done so far has any kind of

output-oriented approach. It's just a way of us trying to organize ourselves in the discussion around the issues that emerged from the act of submissions, which are the authoritative documents for this meeting.

So having finalized this, my suggestion for this afternoon's session would be that we would address the first part -- the issues that are addressed in the first part of the synthesis document, whose title, I repeat, definition and characteristics of enhanced cooperation. In that first part, as I have said, and I repeat, reflects the issues that were brought to the attention of the working group by those who have seen -- have interpreted that characteristics refer directly to language that is contained in paragraph 69, 71. By doing so, this will allow us this afternoon wishfully to walk through some of the main topics that are usually discussed in relation to enhanced cooperation, the format, the scope, the conditions for participation of stakeholders, so on and so forth.

I recall that from the beginning of our meeting yesterday, there was a call for that part to be the initial part of our work, although again there was a preference on the part of the majority of the room to go through to do otherwise. And this was then accepted by you my proposal. So now I think it would be time for us to focus on the issues.

I would not -- encourage you not to look exactly at the exact wording of how those issues appear in the synthesis paper. I think the synthesis paper had the advantage of bringing to our attention what are the issues, for example, when we look into Track 1, A. So those contributors that focused on the expression to enable governments, they elicited that this should elicit our discussion in regard to when we think about enable governments, what kind of formats, which kind of format are we talking about so it addresses the issue intergovernmental format versus multistakeholder format. I take on board it is more of a continuum of positions. So there are nuances, very important nuances, between the various contributions addressing intergovernmental that does not necessarily imply that the multistakeholder dimension should not be there. So there are some nuances regarding different contributions.

I think -- so the issue that I would like to propose to discuss would be, for example, in regard to that section -- the issue regarding intergovernmental, multistakeholder, and how they should relate and what are the complexities involved rather than focus on the actual language coming from the synthesis document that, again, is just a tool that was devised to try to assist the discussions, not to be the focus of the discussions. It is not a draft output. It is not any kind of document that has input. It is just the purpose to try to structure discussion on some issues.

So if you accept my proposal, we would go through the synthesis, trying to discuss the issues that are there. I recall there was very strong call for us to do it even at the start of the meeting. But I'm proposing now that we have gone through to do it now.

As regards the recommendations that, of course, that is the question that was addressed in question 2, you'll recall that yesterday the secretariat circulated a compilation of the recommendations that are -- that were made by contributors. So, again, the focus of our meeting as decided in September would be to look in contributions. So that compilation of recommendations word by word what was proposed by different contributors was submitted to you. I think it would be fair to allow us some more time to go

into it. I suggest this should not be taken up by this meeting due to the restraint of time but also due to the needs for some delegations. I was approached by some delegations who requested some more time to go through and to be better prepared for the discussion in regard to those -- to that paper. So I suggest that would be taken up by another meeting, probably the meeting that would be maybe May. I put forward that proposal. I suggest that we could, if you agree, move directly to the issues that are addressed in the synthesis in response to the first question, seeing through that angle what are the characteristics as per the interpretation of the language contained paragraph 69 through 71. So I look for your guidance on this. United Kingdom. You have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon, everybody.

Well, yes, we have spent a long time now discussing characteristics and we've done a lot of work there and we would certainly agree with you that we now need to spend some time this afternoon discussing Question 2 and listening to what colleagues have to say about recommendations and giving a proper airing to some of those issues.

We heard a range of different views on the characteristics. As you said, we're not finalizing or agreeing the characteristics now, but we would ask if you, Chair, could reflect on the different comments that were made in our discussions, and if you could prepare a consolidated text at a high level and perhaps send it to us in advance of the next meeting, so that we capture some of that discussion.

But we think that now we should, as you say, allow colleagues an opportunity to present their views on Question 2. We think our focus should be on the contributions that have been made and we have a concern that if we focus too much on the synthesis document, our conversation will end up being a discussion about whether or not the synthesis document is balanced or accurate or fair and so forth.

We don't want to get into that kind of negotiation on the synthesis document, so we hope that we can spend some time this afternoon just inviting all colleagues to present the views that they contributed and giving a proper airing to some of those different points of view on the recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., but just for the sake of clarity, I think you said you agree with me but you said something different from what I said. I said we should not focus on recommendations this afternoon. These, I think, should be deferred to another meeting, among other things, because the document on compilation was distributed at this meeting yesterday and some delegations have requested more time to go through it before we engage into discussions. Even if -- if it is only for presentation, it would take us a lot of time from this meeting.

What I propose is that I don't think the discussion on characteristics of enhanced cooperation has been exhausted. As I tried to speak in my poor English, there were two different approaches in regard to what are the high-level characteristics. Some parties said we should view it from the point of view of principles that should guide enhanced cooperation independently of anything else, so they -- this is what we have done so far.

But other parties have argued that the high-level characteristics are those that emerge from the language itself of Paragraphs 69 to 71.

So when I propose to look at these, what the characteristics, through that angle, what are the characteristics that emerge from the language, I was proposing to look at the synthesis document not to follow and to discuss the issues that are there, but to look at the -- what are the issues that prompt us to discuss.

I gave the example, for example, when in Item 8, to enable governments, those who responded trying to identify what the characteristics by looking at that expression, they raised the issue around the format, intergovernmental or multistakeholder format.

Similarly, those who focused on equal footing raised some issues. I think here I would propose that the most relevant discussion would be equal footing among government or equal footing among all stakeholders.

So that's the kind of discussion I'd like to have -- to propose to you this afternoon, rather than going to the actual recommendations, which, one, I don't think there is -- all delegations, all parties would be prepared to do it now, to engage, and because part of what we assigned ourselves to do has not yet been done. That's just for clarity.

I have on my list other speakers. I have Saudi Arabia, I have Cuba, I have Nick Ashton-Hart, Richard Hill, Iran.

Please, so I start with Saudi Arabia. You have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon, colleagues.

Well, I'm just taking the floor to react to our colleague from the U.K. who proposed to prepare a document on the discussions that have been done on the characteristics.

I think we should avoid such development of such document. Cuba was very clear that the transcript will surface and we will go back home and we review the positions and the intervention that was made. We'd like to develop more documents to be thrown to us from time to time. So let's stick to the transcripts and to the contribution that was submitted by -- by the members and observers. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba?

>>CUBA: Thank you. We also support the comments by Saudi Arabia. We only have this session in the afternoon to try to follow the agenda that we approved. That is, the continuation of exchange of views on the contributions on the two guiding questions previously agreed upon. So we agree with U.K. that what we should do in the afternoon is to interchange views on the contributions of the members related to Question 2.

We are not ready to discuss the synthesis paper. We think the presentation of the synthesis paper, we will study the synthesis papers in our capitals, and again, I repeat that discussions on Question 1, the

transcript document on the list that was discussed on the different terms are enough for us to analyze for the third session and even the intersessional work that you are proposing to have.

So maybe we can proceed as U.K. mentioned. We can listen to different highlights, brief highlights -- because we only have one session, brief highlights of the contributions of the members regarding Question 2, and maybe we could have a kind of also list, brief, like by proposals or highlights of ideas on Question 2 as we had the paper with terms for Question 1. That will help to guide us on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nick, you have the floor.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you and welcome back from lunch to all colleagues.

Just briefly, I would like to agree with both of the proposals of the U.K., and the explanation that Cuba gave about the discussion of Question 2 I could not put better myself. It sounds perfect to sort of take everyone's temperature and review the highlights without agreeing or disagreeing, necessarily, about anything. I think that would be wonderful. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. Once again, I will agree with and support the U.K. proposal on both counts. One is that we ask you, Chairman, to provide a synthesis document containing the gist of our discussions. I agree that it's all in the transcript but the transcript is very long and rambling and it would be very useful if you could assemble the relevant portions and put it together into something that you believe is coherent. And that's just an input to us. And then, you know, if we don't like it, we don't like it. And I do agree that it would be useful if that were sent intersessionally so that we could even comment on it on the mailing list and perhaps refine it.

And I do agree that it would be nice to spend a short time now on the highlights of the recommendations, with the understanding, of course, that this does not exhaust the topic of the recommendations, and then we come back to the recommendations next time as a priority issue, and then move back to the characteristics, which would be based on your new document. And your new document could pick up from the synthesis. Nothing prevents you from saying, "Oh, I had a lot of good things in the synthesis, I'm going to put them back in." I'm not saying throw out the synthesis. I just think -- as I said at the beginning, I don't think the synthesis document was mature, but now I think you have all the information you need to make it mature.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Iran, then Canada, Russian Federation, and the U.S.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon to everybody. Something that I wanted to say and perhaps I said it in an implicit manner. In no way we have to either paraphrase or

modify the outcome of the Tunis Agenda. We have to quote that in an italic form without any changes at all. Put, quote, and then put the sentence or sentences, and then italic and end of quote.

This is my first point.

The second point, Chairman, with respect to the recommendation, I agree with you that we have no time to discuss it. In fact, we have not digested it yet. So what I would suggest is that at least at the beginning of that document, on a cover sheet, you kindly introduce or the secretariat introduces the following:

This document is compilation of proposals made to the second meeting and merely reflect the views of the others. If you want to add something between the two, you could add that one after present a second meeting. It was not discussed and debated and, thus, reflected the views of the others. And that would be good with that understanding. It would not be considered an output of this meeting but guiding us for the future meeting.

Now coming to the discussion that we have yesterday and this morning, which was in our view useful, constructive, helpful I also think that should have some sort of formality actions. We can't just refer to the transcript. Perhaps we can put transcript in a document, having question and then the transcript related to that question or issue and second issue and so on and so forth and add something at the beginning of cover page that this is a compilation of the proposal made to the second sessions discussed together with the comments made thereto or thereon. That is the label of that. But it is good to giving a name or label to that document but not on the -- I don't know -- either Web site or something. We have a formal way for that.

With respect to the synthesis document, I don't know whether you want to go item-by-item of the synthesis document. But I fully agree with you and others that we can go to the second question to see what we can do this afternoon. So this is my contribution to this subject. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I turn to Canada followed by Russian Federation, USA, and Pakistan.

Canada, you have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Welcome back, colleagues.

Unfortunately, and with respect, I will have to disagree with the proposals that we heard from Cuba and Saudi Arabia that just a summary of our discussion would be sufficient. When we launched into the discussion for the characteristics certainly from Canada's perspective, it was very clear that we were at a minimum going to look at that table and then we were going to retract and requalify some of the things as these are characteristics, these are outcomes, these are part of the chapeau because they are in a different category altogether. They are not are we going to repeat paragraph 69 as has been suggested, that's fine. But I do think that table needs to be reorganized to reflect the discussions that we've had this morning.

And you as Chair obviously have a very difficult role. And I would expect that this would be a document that you would present to us to shepherd us along this path that we're going towards, towards an agreement, a document, recommendations. Certainly that was Canada's understanding when we launched into this discussion on characteristics, and I would expect that to be brought to us during the intersessional process. Perhaps with some homework that you might set out for us saying did I capture this correctly. Are there things that can be regrouped? That's fine by me. But I do think that there needs to be some sort of cleaned-up version of what we spoke about this morning and yesterday afternoon.

As for going forward, myself, like I said before, we did not prepare recommendations specifically. We talked more about the nature of the recommendations in our contribution. I would be more than happy to hear specifically what my colleagues have in detail explain what recommendations matter for them.

So I'm fine working with the synthesis paper. But I think frankly, I think we need to dive in a little bit more into what people want to talk about, which is their own recommendations and what matters to them. But thank you very much for your consideration.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

I give now the floor to Russian Federation followed by USA and Pakistan.

You have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

Actually, we would like to support those who say that we need transcript because we think the short version of transcript is not enough. We need a transcript, you know, in order to avoid any interpretation of what happened, and it should be the document about the meeting as a whole.

Because when we see in the synthesis document, according to the explanation, it should be a compilation of contribution. However, we see that there is an interpretation of our position. For example, when it comes to intergovernmental format, multistakeholder inputs, and multistakeholder formats, Russia is actually I can see in multistakeholder format.

What we have in our contribution is clear about equal role and responsibility of governments for international public policy issue. And, of course, we are not against the participation and involvement of other stakeholders. But we are always clear that enhanced cooperation should be among governments. So I think we need to change this.

Probably there are some more interpretational mistakes there. So transcript is important. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

USA.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. First, I agree with you that certainly we haven't gone through an exhaustive list in discussion of characteristics. In some way I think it has been exhausting at least. And I'm concerned about how much more progress we can make on that issue today. I think there's been a lot to digest. Healthy conversation for this point but perhaps it's better to kind of break from that.

So I support the U.K. proposal for a Chair's version that distills this conversation we had this week and then helps frame it in a productive way for future deliberations.

I also wanted to note that I appreciate your comment about discussing recommendations because I think the U.S. had been one that objected to talking about recommendations because part of our input into this process was our recommendations were focused on what the group should discuss as opposed to providing specific recommendations.

But at this point, I think it could be helpful to hear the presentations if other members and observers want to provide an oral presentation of their contribution. That could add some -- it could help us understand the written contribution and certainly in the intervening period help us to consider and ponder on those recommendations and be better prepared to discuss those at the May meeting. So that might be a productive use of our time that we could support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Pakistan followed by Japan. And, Cuba, are you taking the floor again? Pakistan followed by Japan and Cuba.

You have the floor, sir.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Ambassador. In my last intervention yesterday because I didn't speak afterwards. The reason why was we thought -- and I'm still sticking to the position that we held yesterday, that we should go directly into recommendations part because what we believe is that these characteristics are abstract concepts. And unless you -- we all discuss and react to the contributions made on the recommendation part, I think we're going to go in clueless way.

We do not have certain directions. These are very good concepts. These are very good principles. But how to implement them, how to contextualize them depends on what kind of recommendations we have in place.

It's really sad to see that almost we are at the end of our meeting and we haven't gone through the recommendations part. We have not been given opportunity to react to the contributions made by others which is very important because all the things that have to be said are already on the table in the form of compilation of contributions.

So all -- the only thing that we had to do was to react to exchange of views, what you already reflected in the agenda that we approved, that we need to have exchange of views on both questions. Okay. We did for characteristics, but I think we already spend almost the entire time on it.

So, again, I would urge everyone and, Ambassador, you, that we now really have to spend our time on recommendations in this meeting and the upcoming meetings because after we come of something tangible, we will be able to see how much these concepts are applicable in practical ways.

There will be things which are really good and can be applied, but there will be things which couldn't be applied in the manner that we'll finally have in front of us.

So, Ambassador, thank you so much. Last point actually on the discussion that's going on, whether we should have new documents, whatever, I think my delegation would always be flexible in this regard. And we always appreciate whatever documents you can come up with because it will be helpful.

But the only caveat would be that if you are coming up with something, it is under your responsibility, and it should ease our work rather than complicate. Because if we have so many documents then it will not only complicate our work but I think it will be burdensome on you. So we can have many documents, but it should be really to where it's making our job easier. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. I will listen to the other speakers and then I will comment on -- in general on all the statements that are made.

I just draw your attention to the resource we have regarding time control and kindly reiterate the call for your interventions, to the extent possible, be limited to three minutes as indicated above.

Now I give the floor to Japan followed by Cuba.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Actually I agree with the previous speaker from Canada. We also think actually so far in this one day and a half days we made great progress, I think.

We propose that first we should look at this characteristics issue. My intention was to find some area that we can agree on. And actually from the discussion so far, there can be many areas where we can agree on, we can potentially agree on.

Well, what we need from now after this one and a half days is to -- as Canada pointed out, to reorganize this table. By this work, we need this work. But by doing it, we can see maybe less than ten high-level characteristics that we can agree on. And on that basis, maybe we can find -- consider recommendations.

So, Mr. Chairman, my suggestion is how to do that. Can we do that in this afternoon? Or maybe can we just ask the Chairman to do that work for us and just to do that intersessionally? What I want to stress is that we need this work to make use of this one day very fruitful discussion.

And as far as the use of this afternoon, I'm flexible. We can do it together with chairman to the organization of the characteristics. And by doing that, we can make the consolidation of the high-level characteristics. That is the necessary one. We need that.

And if that work can be tasked to the Chairman or secretariat, we can use this afternoon as you suggested, to hear from the others what kind of recommendations they think they should be considered in the working group. We can go along with this. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba, do you want to take the floor? Please go ahead.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I realize that there is no consensus among the members of the group to have a document to produce, like, a summary or common elements on what are the characteristics. I mean, there is no consensus because there are different positions between the members of the group in requesting a paper from the Chair.

Cuba would not like to have a paper proposed by the Chair on some common characteristics because we are not at this stage yet. We understand that there will be a process of future negotiations or recommendations. But to go to that stage, we need to discuss both questions. And when we finish the exchange of views between the two, the positions of all of the members on question 1 and question 2, then it's when we think there could be a comprehensive document where we can find the real common elements.

We do not think the best way is to produce a paper with common elements on question 1 because question 1 and question 2 is the whole task. We cannot cut in pieces our work.

It's not that we are opposed to the role of the Chair. At the moment, we think when that kind of whatever proposal should come, we are flexible. But we believe right now we need to give the same treatment to question 2, the treatment that we gave to question 1 to be equal and to listen and to understand everybody. And after that, when we are finished dealing with question 2 -- (child screaming in background).

The right of the child on the convention, almost universal convention on the right of the child.

So that's it. That's what I wanted to say. I do not think this is the moment to produce a paper. We think with the transcript it's enough. And the listing that we have with the terms we are questioning more or less, I mean, just to be an informative document, not to be agreeable or to agree or whatever.

Then for the recommendation, we can do the same. Maybe we can have a listing of -- like the other document, a listing of all of the proposals, like that more or less. It could be produced by the secretariat or something for us to understand.

And then we go to the intersessional, whatever process you are proposing, I don't know, by electronic way or by meetings in Geneva or by Internet interchange for preparation of the third session. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. I think those are very helpful comments.

I have on my list Richard Hill, Anriette and Kenya. I will give you the floor in that order.

Before that, allow me to make some comments. I would like to propose some way forward. So maybe those who will speak after me can react to what I say as well.

So, first of all, many points were raised, I think many concerns. I'd like, first of all, to say that I receive from you a very strong message that this stage of the meeting should move and allow people who have made submissions to refer to the recommendations that are contained in those submissions. So my proposal is that immediately after we close this discussion, we allow those -- and we follow the same procedure we did in relation to the characteristics. We allow those who wish or those who wish to present on behalf of others to take the floor and highlight the recommendations that are contained in their submissions. So this is my proposal for you.

In regard to the point that was initially raised by U.K -- and I apologize because in my further intervention, I did not address it. And I think it was supported by some but also others have reservations. I would like to say that the Chair is available to assist you in whatever I can. I will, of course, in case you give me any assignment, I will be more than happy to do it. In case there is no consensus on the part of the group, I can try to be of assistance anyway and come up with something that in my opinion reflects the discussion we have had.

So I think -- as I think Pakistan mentioned, or I don't know who -- I can submit something on my own responsibility. I just want to make clear that it will be not a proposition kind of document. It will be kind of trying to reflect -- building on the transcript, building on the discussions we had here, just trying to organize a little bit what we've said. I think that might be useful for the group. So this document will have no official status. It will be up to the group to consider where to take it or not. So I just want to make an effort to be of assistance to you.

I understand there is no consensus to request me to do it, but as one of the WGEC members and as the chair, I can do it anyway on my own responsibility, and I will certainly not refrain from doing that. In that understanding, I want to be very clear.

The second issue I think was addressed by Russia, and there was some expression of concern that part of what Russia said in its submission was not adequately reflected in the synthesis.

I think this is just, fair. I think not only you, other parties approached me and said the same, that "This is not exactly what I said."

So when the synthesis was put out, the intention was exactly to have that kind of reaction. But again, the synthesis is not an authoritative paper. I understand that there is maybe a majority of opinions that we should not rely on the synthesis paper. So I think the authoritative papers are your submissions word by word and it is there in the compilation provided by the secretariat. So just be sure that everything you said will be word by word reflected and is available to any delegate. The synthesis was an attempt to organize the ideas but it has no official standing.

And second, I -- and last comment is that I heard some comments in regard to the way we have been proceeding that we should go first to recommendations, that it was kind of a waste of time to have --

There are different views in that regard, but I just want to make clear from the chair that I'm trying to reflect exactly what was agreed by this group last time.

So the two questions, if you look at the questions, the first question is what are the high-level characteristics, the second question addresses recommendations, so what I hope to do is in line, to my thinking, exactly with the approach we took.

First we discuss characters and then we move to recommendations.

Of course in my opinion, the discussion on characteristics was not exhausted because there was two ways of looking at what would be the characteristics. I think we looked at one of them, a set of contributions that took that approach, not -- but I will be more than comfortable at this point of the meeting to move to the recommendations part to allow those who have made submissions to reflect and to highlight their -- the points they may wish.

So I -- I think there's still some kind of unfinished business in regard to characteristics, but I fully take on board the wish of the group to move now to recommendations.

So the paper, I will -- or any submission or any contribution I can submit to you will just reflect on the first part, the one that we discussed here in the room. I'll not try to engage into that part addressing the language because this was not discussed in the room. I don't want to come up with ideas of my own; I just want to reflect what was said.

So in that understanding, and my proposal, I suggest that we move to the -- and we allow any WGEC member or observer who wishes to make a presentation and highlight the elements contained in their contributions.

But before that, before that, I'd like just to -- I have three speakers -- Richard Hill, Anriette, and Kenya -- to address those -- all those elements that have been part of the discussion we have had from the beginning before we move to that.

So Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Actually, you've said what I had raised my flag to say, primarily. Namely, that of course you have the authority to input documents even absent consensus of the group.

I suppose if there were consensus to forbid you, then you should not, but that's clearly not the case.

So I would invite you to input your paper, and if some delegations don't think it's useful, they will say so, and then we will act accordingly. But I think some of us definitely would appreciate that, so I would encourage you to proceed in that manner and I fully support your way forward. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair.

I support the idea of moving on to recommendations, and then just in response to the document, you know -- and I understand, Cuba, your concerns but I think I see this as a document that I would like actually the secretariat to produce, obviously working with the chair, but to me, this is a document that would actually capture the work that we've done.

So I don't see that as a particularly contentious document. It won't have any formal status at all. It will just be a form of capturing the combination of the work that was done on the Word document and then extracting from the transcript as relevant.

I think that would be useful for us as a group and I think it's also a way of making our work transparent to those who are not here and are trying to follow what we are doing.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. I personally think this is a very useful suggestion but I think we may get things even more controversial because if I'm not getting our mandate as chair, I think we cannot ask the secretariat to do it if there is no consensus in the group.

Kenya?

>>KENYA: I just requested the floor to, one, support the proposal by Cuba that it will be good to have some brief brainstorming on the recommendations, and thereby I also support your suggestion that we move ahead and (indiscernible) on the recommendations.

We had an agenda at the beginning of this meeting and the agenda had those two items and I think it would be very unfair if we concluded the meeting without even having any idea on the -- one of the questions that we were to address.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So with this, I would then kindly invite contributors, either WGEC members or observers who have submitted contributions, to highlight their -- the portion that are related to recommendations contained in such contributions.

I have on my list Richard Hill, followed by Nick Ashton-Hart, and Parminder.

Those are the two -- three speakers on this topic.

You have the floor, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Since I had seven documents, I'll need 7 times 3, 21 minutes, so everybody, please go out, have coffee and come back. No. I'm joking. I'm trying to liven things up.

I introduced everything yesterday so I don't need any more time.

I'll just say I looked carefully at the compilation. I think we should use the compilation as the reference document, the compilation of recommendations as a reference document. Three of mine are missing. I sent the details to the secretariat and he will produce a revised version in due course.

And then the only other thing I wanted to say again, but I'll say it more shortly, we have to stop pretending that everything is fine. Everything is not fine. People are voting. We see the results of the votes. This is not just related to global trade. It's also related to the Internet. The 2016 report of the Internet Society, which I cite in my contribution, makes it clear some people are now afraid to use the Internet because of lack of trust, and this may be exacerbating the digital divide.

We know where the lack of trust is coming from. Consumers are unable to evaluate the security of the devices and there are no standards on security, minimum security, so manufacturers ship stuff that is inadequate. For example, with default passwords and things like that.

So let's stop kidding and accept that some things need further attention and let's go look at them. And by the way, if you go back and look at the Tunis Agenda, you'll find that they're exactly the same as in 2005. Lack of security, spam, excessively high cost of connectivity in developing countries.

So I do not accept the statement everything is fine and the current arrangements have been working. It's just factually not true. So let's stop pretending and, please, let's look at some recommendations and we can be very flexible. And if you look at mine, none of them are saying this group makes a decision. All I'm saying is that this group should ask that other competent bodies look at the issues, and to me that's the enhanced cooperation. We should say, "Look, guys, you need to do more work in these particular areas."

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. And let me just take the opportunity raised by you in regard to the fact that three of your recommendations were missing, just to encourage everyone to look at the compilation document and make sure that what you intended to recommend is adequately reflected there.

We made an effort together with the secretariat to identify some of those that -- formulations that are identified as recommendations do not appear as such in the document, but we thought that the way it was drafted indicated a kind of recommendation, so we'd just like to make sure either you want to include something or take out something if you think that maybe it was not a recommendation, it was more like a kind of statement on your part.

So I would -- I think this is part of what we should be doing in between now and the next meeting.

And I thank you for raising this point and for being very brief, Richard, on the presentation of your proposals.

I'll turn to Nick Ashton-Hart.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you much, Chairman.

I shall -- I shall try and probably fail to be as brief as Richard but I didn't speak very much yesterday.

I also agree with Richard. I think that it's -- it only makes sense to be willing to admit that there are areas where cooperation has not produced sufficient forward movement since 2010 or where new realities that we are confronted with mean that greater cooperation is required.

I use as an example cybercrime and law enforcement cooperation, where it's widely understood that current mutual legal assistance systems are too slow to deal with various kinds of cybercrime and point out some of the venues where that takes place.

I don't think anyone is harmed by admitting something that we all need to do more of. On the contrary, I think that it would be value-added to do that, and we should be -- we should be willing to say what basically everybody knows to be true.

I think we should also focus on what is being communicated versus the medium of communication.

And by this, I mean that the issues that are brought up in relation to enhanced cooperation in general refer to the content that is being communicated rather than the network that is a platform all communications use. And the reason why I say that this is an important point is because it is very easy to disrupt communications very broadly when you are trying to deal with specific issues of content. And we have seen many examples where this has been -- this has happened, where it was not -- the objective was not to harm the network everyone uses, it was to get rid of a particular piece of content that in one country may be objectionable, but that it had the disruptive effect on the network for everyone.

And one of the reasons -- there are many reasons why you would want to recognize this concept, that the platform is a shared resource we all depend on, but one of them is the question of affordability which Richard has just raised.

It's unquestionably true that we are not going to close the digital divide unless the marginal cost of connecting people is kept as low as possible. And anything that introduces uncertainty in the -- the ecosystem of people that -- and companies and regulators and the like that is required in order to disperse broadband, especially in rural areas, is something that we should avoid because it's going to be as difficult to connect everyone to the Internet as it has proven to be to connect everyone to the telephone system.

And so I think this -- this group could provide a very useful function by recognizing this fact, that we should ensure that the measures we take in relation to content do not disrupt the network that we need for all communications.

And I think we should -- when we're looking at the many suggestions that have been made for cooperation, we should prioritize those which we can see have a general socioeconomic benefit, where solving a problem would be of benefit to all countries and everyone generally. That's not to say that all

areas of cooperation which are needed aren't important, but you can't do everything. We can at least maybe not prioritize them but focus our energy and what we have to say on those where we can see the largest benefit to the largest number of people.

And in particular, it should go without saying but I think it should be explicitly stated that the objective of all of these -- of all of this cooperation should have a development dimension to it.

Most of the people who are not yet connected on line are in developing countries. Getting people on line has to be a priority. It's the -- it's what comes before anyone can do anything on line.

And so I think it's useful that we -- we should try and prioritize what we highlight, keeping that strongly in mind.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick, for your intervention.

Next on my list are Parminder, followed by Jimson, and Iran. Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: My present input is not about my contribution but I wanted to make some comments on what I suggest we do as we input in this particular section on recommendations.

I propose that we talk specifically about what we think this group can recommend and we be as clear as possible --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Excuse me. I -- Parminder, very respectfully, because we decided now just to hear highlights from the contributions and then from -- on the recommendations, then we move to see how we are going to address it in a later stage.

I'd like now just to listen to highlights on the recommendations that -- you made many contributions. Maybe you want to, through that angle, if you wish, and maybe you can make some comments but correlating to your proposal, if you wish, but we will have another part of the meeting in which we'll think about the way forward and how to structure those recommendations in the future work, if I may ask you, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yes. I understand that. I was just saying that we -- we focused on what it would like in a recommendation and it was just a general matter comment.

I would like to highlight the recommendations which I have made but I'll come back in the queue after other speakers.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'll give the floor now to Jimson Olufuye.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, colleagues. Good afternoon. Well, I'm really privileged to be part of the first phase of this working group, and looking back throughout, it has been -- I would say we're making some progress, though steady, because we -- it is quite structured and I like it that way.

So on this issue of the recommendations, yes, I'm following the -- the document that we prepared. I want to thank the secretariat and the chair for putting this together, the secretariat -- the document involving the compilation of recommendations.

Well, if we go to Page 16, if you go to Page 16, I have two recommendations there on Page 16, and I will just quickly focus on this.

I have recommended as Recommendation 45 that on a needs basis -- we have a lot of need, definitely, as has been well highlighted. Joint action on law enforcement, the issue of tackling the abuse, spam, or whatever you -- so that on a needs basis, governments, business, civil society, technical and academic community should evolve and engage on processes of inclusive cooperation on diverse global public policy matters pertinent to the Internet. That's the first one.

And the second one on this is that efforts be made to increase awareness of diverse public -- or diverse global public policy matters pertaining to the Internet, especially in the developing and least developed nations, so I think it is quite relevant.

And then if you go to Page 19, I also have something there, and that is a recommendation that has to do with national governments, Recommendation 57. That all countries, including developing and least developed countries are encouraged to involve national multistakeholder mechanisms to address current and (indiscernible) and policy issues pertinent to the Internet. I believe charity should begin at home, really. You cannot come internationally and be talking and raising your head when at home you're not bringing all the people together, you are not cooperating and collaborating with all stakeholders.

So I think this recommendation will help governments to go back home, as well, as frequent as they are out there internationally participating. Thank you. I will stop here for now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. Your intervention also prompts me to recall that in the compilation document we made an effort to establish -- to try to extract from the documents different categories. Some addressed to governments. Maybe some are addressed to existing processes. So I would invite you certainly also to look at the document from that angle.

I saw that you referred to the compilation document in your presentation. But I -- just for clarity, it is not necessary. If you wish, of course, you can do it. But now you are directed to refer to your own text. The compilation was an effort to take on board the recommendations. But you do not have an obligation to refer to the compilation document. It is also a non-status document for the moment. Please, if you wish to do so, most welcome. But feel totally free to refer to the wording contained -- and the spirit contained in your actual submission.

With this, I will now give the floor to Iran followed by Cuba by Professor Wolfgang and Pakistan and U.S. Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I saw Pakistan was looking for floor and raising his hand and shaking his card repeatedly. Perhaps give him the floor because he tried to attract your attention. He couldn't. After then after him, I will take the floor. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Pakistan would be the fourth on my list. But if you have a point of order, I will give you the floor right now.

>>PAKISTAN: Yes, Ambassador, it was point of order. But with deference to you, I withdrew because the only explanation I was seeking that the exercise we are currently now undertaking, we have already done it yesterday. That is presenting our own contribution. But I think what was required was to have an exchange of views on where we stand in terms of recommendations.

I think opportunity should be given to react to all the recommendations that are already there. Contributions have been made. We just need to react and to exchange views where we stand.

I think we have very limited time and we should utilize this productively.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. And thank you for seeking clarification on this.

My understanding is that the group decided to revert to the discussion on recommendations; and we are taking the same approach we had when started the meeting, that we allowing those who wish to highlight -- I heard a few calls in that regard. At this point, I'm not too sure whether this represents the sentiment of the room. I tried to interpret in this way that we should first allow those who wish to highlight and then to provide for some discussion.

But, please, bear in mind that, also, it is -- the Chair's approach, we have been informed that many participants are not prepared to discuss the recommendations because -- not that they have seen them for the first time but they were aiming at having a discussion structured along in sequence, first the characteristics and then recommendations. But I'm in your hands anyway.

So I would invite -- I would suggest that we continue -- I see there is some repetition with regard to what we did yesterday. Yesterday we requested presentations on the submissions at-large including both aspects, characteristics and recommendations. Now we are focusing more on the recommendations part. You are right. There is some overlap. I'm not too sure whether we should -- yes, Jimson, please, you have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Chair. Sorry maybe I got this wrong. Yesterday when it was said certain individuals would make a presentation, it was with regard to characteristics. It was with regard to characteristics. And so I limited my talk yesterday. I didn't go into recommendations. I said I would deal with the recommendations later. So you are very much in line because now we are hearing everybody on recommendations. It is very much in line with what we discussed yesterday, Distinguished Chair and colleagues.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I must confess, I should have to consult the transcript at that point in time. But if I take it that at least some participants interpreted that what we did yesterday was limited to characteristics, I think that would be, indeed, a reason to make sure that all those who have not addressed -- I saw, for example, that Richard Hill said I thought -- I talked yesterday so I'm not going to repeat. I think probably all of us should be invited to take the same approach, not to repeat things that were said yesterday in this general presentation but make sure that the actual part related to recommendations, if they were not addressed yesterday, that there will be an opportunity to do it now in preparation for the discussion on recommendations. So this is the approach I would like to suggest.

I see people nodding. So next on my list is Iran. You have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I don't think that we are here to solve the problem of the world. There are many, many things to be solved. But we are not responsible for that. I think people are asking action to do many other things that it is not directly related to the enhanced cooperation. So we have to be careful and look within the mandate that we have.

Number 2 as mentioned by Jimson, I don't think Richard Hill present his recommendations yesterday. Some of his recommendations are not implementable at all. And we have to listen to that, and we have to comment. If he don't want to comment, then okay, no problem. I think we have something to do. We should remain within our mandate. We should not talk about something which is not our mandate, mandate of others.

So I would suggest that people present the recommendations one by one. Doesn't matter. Three minutes is three minutes. We have spent a lot of time on many things. So let us do that, please. Otherwise, it would not be properly guided how to deal with some of these recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I would maybe beg to defer because I think the mandate we were given is broad enough and it is -- I think there have been different interpretations to what would be the scope.

So when we were mandated to develop recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation seen as enabling governments to fulfill their roles with regard to Internet public policy issues, the interpretation on how the actual recommendation should take shape may be very different.

And I take a point, you take a different approach than Mr. Hill. But I would not say that one is more appropriate than the other. I think it's up to the group to discuss the proposals and decide which should make it to our report, if there is one, and which do not belong to enhanced cooperation. For the moment, this is the approach we took when preparing the synthesis. We are not judging -- passing judgment on anything that was said. We are taking to the group to decide because we have a mandate, but we have to interpret and to come forward. We think that in addition we'll not just repeat what we

try to interpret and to say how we think our mandates should be translated into concrete interventions. I think this is what we are mandated to do.

So very respectfully, I beg to defer. But I think that is part of the discussion we must have.

Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. Regarding the item where we are now, that is exchange of views on the contributions of the two guiding questions as we approved in the agenda and following the methodology that we decided to follow up on your proposal yesterday.

Now we understand we are in the moment to exchange views on question 2, although we dedicate three sessions to question 1.

We want to highlight regarding the compilation of recommendations and in connection to the main contribution of Cuba, the only one where we make some recommendations on question 2 for Cuba, the enhanced cooperation for us is a desired state of the enhanced cooperation. So we are concerned that - there are a group of recommendations presented by different members of the group that are not directly -- that are not directly -- to have a concrete outcome of the working group. But instead there are some recommendations on what could be the characteristic of the recommendations.

So I think that the group should be concentrated on the mandate of the working group; that is, to have a concrete outcome.

And in the case of Cuba, the objective or rather proposal is to establish a mechanism that allows all governments on an equal footing a responsibility to have an analysis on what is international Internet governance.

Also, this mechanism should be focused on the development of public policy by the governments in consultation with all stakeholders in line with what is being mandated by the Tunis Agenda. This is the main interest of Cuba.

Also, for us, this mechanism should not replace an existing organization but rather to be a coordination mechanism that calls upon the organizations responsible for the essential task associated with the Internet to contribute and create an environment that facilitates the development of public policy principles.

The mechanism for us should be an intergovernmental mechanism based on United Nations and with formal links with other stakeholder organizations or forums.

This proposal of Cuba is a very general one. We are still analyzing the proposal of others with the recommendations by all the members of the room. And we are ready to work in a concrete proposal or concrete detail mechanism to be presented for the intersessional process or the third session.

We invite developing countries to join and to propose a concrete mechanism. This mechanism is crucial to be connected with all stakeholders. We repeat, we are confident that all stakeholders should be part of this mechanism.

But as has been said by Russia and by Iran and other colleagues, we feel this mechanism is in the first layer to connect governments in the public policies related to Internet and at the same time to take into account advices or opinions or the connection with civil society and the rest of the actors crucial for having an Internet governance that help to have a peaceful use and economic benefit from the platforms that already exist. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba, for your intervention.

I will now give the floor to Professor Wolfgang.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a new observer. And, first of all, I want to thank you as Chair that this meeting is really on equal footing for members and for observers. So that means there is no difference -- different treatment. And I think this is a good example that the multistakeholder approach works in reality in this group. People who want to make a contribution are able to do it. This is a step forward. And this is I would say not yet the general rule in the United Nations system. So you are a pacemaker. You create some innovation for procedures within the United Nations by just doing what you did.

And this brings me to my main point. As an observer, I want to say some of my observations from yesterday's and today's discussion. And what I really miss is a higher level of creativity and innovation in the debate.

Sometimes, in particular yesterday, I had the feeling that some members of the group are fighting the (indiscernible) of yesterday. They are walking in circles just reiterating what we have achieved in Tunis. The Tunis document is good, but it's 12 years old.

And while Richard is right that a number of issues from the Tunis Agenda are not yet settled -- spam is only one of them -- 12 years later we have different work. Richard will remember this on the ISOC report.

It referred to the big challenges which come with the sustainable development goals. In it the cybersecurity agenda is totally different from what it was in the year 2005. The human rights agenda is much bigger than it was 12 years ago.

So it means I really invite the members of this group to be more courageous to face the challenges which are really on the table in the years ahead.

So it will be more complicated and more complex. And insofar I'm very happy about the statement made by the delegate from Cuba which more or less recognized that even if we agree it's the sovereign right of governments to make decisions on Internet-related public policies, this will not settle the problem alone. So it means governments need the involvement of the other stakeholders if they want

to settle problems. So we have to have innovative mechanisms how to organize, how to enhance this cooperation.

And we should also not have to envision if we create a new centralized body that such a body will settle the issues. We had the proposal on the table in Tunis to create an Intergovernmental Internet Council as a centralized place. This was rejected for good reasons.

The Internet is a decentralized system, and also the negotiation system for Internet issues will have to be decentralized. There will be no centralized body. And we have already a number of good negotiation channels in the United Nations where all countries are participating on equal footing. The First Committee is discussing security issues. The Second Committee is discussing --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can I ask you to come to a close.

>>WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I was just at the end of my statement. I invite the members to be more courageous in looking forward. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. I thank you for your kind words to the Chair. I like to recall that the configuration of this group was agreed upon by the General Assembly. I think this is, indeed, a very good sign of the willingness, even in the context of the U.N., to develop new ways of thinking. And it was, of course, later on proposed by the acting CSTD chair and approved by both the CSTD and ECOSOC. So that configuration represents, let's say, a consensus and wasn't fully endorsed by the membership.

And I am, of course, more than happy to be able to follow up on this. Of course, if you come to a point in which -- concerning particularly the report and recommendation and decision which should be adopted, then we will revert to the members of the group. This is understood. But in regard to the discussion and to inputs and to the full participation, observers are more than welcome as always.

Another point I would like just to comment in regard to what you have said, Wolfgang, and I think we should reflect -- I'm afraid I'm doing exactly what I'm trying to avoid which is to deviate from what we are doing now, which is listening to the highlights.

But I cannot avoid to comment that the framework that was published back in Tunis 11 years ago in a way stands the test of time because maybe the context has changed, many things have changed. But the needs for on the one hand having an institution like the IGF and the needs to develop mechanisms -- models open ended for governments to engage in public -- public policy-related, Internet-related issues remain. So in a way, the landscape has changed but the framework, the basic ideas, are still relevant. And the process that we are in a different context trying to -- but I take the call you make that we should be creative and not maybe revert to the situations and the context we had before. This is fully taken on board. Thank you for this.

So with your indulgence -- and forgive me for having abused my position here today, but then I turn to the U.K. followed by the USA and Russian Federation.

United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, in our response to Question 2, the United Kingdom made some remarks about the kind of recommendations that we should look at because we think we will do our job most effectively if we develop recommendations which, as far as possible, can be useful to different stakeholders in different circumstances facing different issues at different times.

We say that because the Internet is having an impact on almost every aspect of modern life and almost every aspect of public policy, and the range of issues and the range of stakeholders effective -- affected is now extremely broad.

So this means that we need to develop recommendations that can be applied to different kinds of issues and stakeholders in different circumstances. And we also emphasized how quickly innovation and technology is accelerating, so we need to develop recommendations which don't just last for the next 12 months but last for the future.

And we have also started to look at many of the responses to Question 2 from other colleagues, and it's clear that there will be some difficult issues for us to look at.

Colleagues will not find it surprising if I say that there are some recommendations proposed which the U.K. does not support. There are also some recommendations proposed where we think we need more discussion, more conversations with colleagues, and we need to understand them better, we need to understand the spirit behind them. And actually, the conversation we had yesterday and this morning about characteristics was very helpful in establishing a common understanding on the spirit behind some of these recommendations where more conversation is needed.

But also, there are many recommendations that colleagues have proposed which the U.K. can wholeheartedly support because we think that this group has an opportunity to develop recommendations which will improve enhanced cooperation processes. There are a number of areas we can look at. We've suggested areas such as consultation and engagement, making evidence and information available, opening up policymaking processes, enabling the participation of stakeholders from developing countries, sustainable development, promoting and enabling environment for investment, promoting and enabling environment for innovation, and building understanding of multistakeholder enhanced cooperation processes in the full range of existing international organizations. There's a very full agenda for us there, and we believe that these kinds of issues present a very valuable opportunity for us to make significant progress in developing enhanced cooperation and there are many areas there where we can, we believe, come to a successful outcome and a successful conclusion to our work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Paul, for your intervention. I'll turn now to the U.S.

You have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

First, just to note, I guess again, our responses to Question 2 were more conceptual than specific to a potential outcome type recommendation, so I would just offer that any future discussions of this issue should consider more than just the recommendations on the table this week. I think we would need to take into consideration inputs to this meeting, also conversations here today, and then any contributions before the next meeting before we continue discussing this issue. But with that, just a few of the suggestions for this working group that we raised.

We believe that, you know, through the course of our work we should consider recommendations that enhance and support the full involvement of all stakeholders in developing Internet public policy, including at the national and local levels.

We also think this group should consider recommendations focused on tangible nonbinding recommendations that improve processes and institutions focusing on development of Internet public policy, and while we don't think this group should spend time deliberating on recommendations that have been repeatedly rejected in several different fora, we do think that we can focus on some discussions about -- we also don't think this group needs to focus just on new recommendations. I think there's a lot of examples of enhanced cooperation over the years that perhaps were specific to one organization but could be more applicable to several or, you know, as a best practice or something.

And finally as we discussed today, one of our contributions -- and we were encouraged by the positive reception it received -- was we believe this group should focus on ways -- on recommendations to enhance the participation of developing countries, women, persons with disability, youth, and unaffiliated users in institutions and processes that are developing Internet public policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention.

I will now turn to Russian Federation, followed by Japan Parminder.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Well, just in short, we would like to answer the question that was raised by Wolfgang regarding that Tunis Agenda was 11 years ago, just reminding you that the UNGA, by the resolution of 10 years review, reaffirmed the Tunis Agenda, so it's -- all of the powers that's in the Tunis Agenda can be considered as the modern one. This is the first.

Next is about the recommendation. Of course we need to come to the recommendations on how to -- for implementing enhanced cooperation as our mandate, and we still need to believe that we need to start from the definitions of the enhanced cooperation to discuss what platform or mechanism or framework should be realized in order to enable governments on equal footing and so on.

Next, and actually it's according to the compilation document. It's a very important topic, is the scope of enhanced cooperation, because we believe that if we do not discuss properly the scope of enhanced cooperation, we cannot move, really, into the recommendation on how it -- to implement.

And actually, what we put in our contribution and what we haven't seen in the compilation document is that we see different layers of international public policy issues.

It's infrastructural level, which actually can be applied for capacity building, for access technologies, to DNS and all this stuff. Cybersecurity also is a part of this.

Content level, which is very important because when talking about the content, it's another level of security. It's informational security, and also a lot of things related to the content, which is not really covered and adequately addressed.

And it's also the big volume of social and economic development layer, and it's ethnic and cultural aspects of international public policy. And when we look to the entire scope of this, we understand that it's a hard decision how to coordinate this, and it's -- because it's -- it's the question how we will do it by one organization or several organizations.

As Richard said, that's probably -- we need to use several organizations according to their competence area, also, to be part of this.

And what we put in our contribution, "Relevant international organization responsible for essential task associated with Internet should create an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles, international public policy principles."

So we see it as the -- how to say -- ecosystem.

And just for the protocol, coming to the document, we see that Russia is mentioned as the -- one of the authors of the statement that IGF is an essential element of enhanced cooperation, and this is not true. It's a misinterpretation of our contribution, just for the protocol. Please just know this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iulia. I think in your intervention you touched on the fact that we have not dealt adequately extensively with the issue with regard to definition and this is exactly what I tried to do at the beginning of this meeting, to in a way exhaust a discussion around characteristics through the angle of the definitions, but this was defeated by the room. I think clearly the majority preferred to move directly to recommendations by hearing highlights.

So I agree with you. I have the impression that we have still kind of unfinished business in regard to the discussion of the characteristics. We have moved to recommendations. But I'm in the hands of the group and of course we -- in those procedural matters, we have to move in the direction the majority prefers and -- but I agree with you.

And one thing that you have mentioned in regard to the categories, we -- working with the secretariat, we try to identify the categories that were received according to the kind of actual recommendations we identified, so that -- those categories were identified.

Maybe there is another -- as you propose, another way to organize, and we would look forward to any suggestions to that regard, so maybe a revised version can be put up, but we would look for assistance if that is the case.

I will, with this, revert to my list.

I have now Japan. You have the floor, sir.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. As a goal of enhanced cooperation, Japan believes that enhancing participation of developing countries is, among many, a quite important issue. In this working group, a recommendation should be made on this theme.

In addition, we also think enhanced cooperation is not just about developing countries, but also about promotion of the engagement from all stakeholders.

In that sense, we think enhanced cooperation has been implemented to a certain extent since the first Internet IGF was held in 2006.

Various stakeholders from many countries have participated and shared information on Internet-related issues. As a result, this annual event has been a useful fora for promoting cooperation among various stakeholders and solving the global challenges.

In addition, when it comes to Internet resource management issues, as more and more variety of stakeholders have joined this process, the reform of ICANN has also made great progress. IANA transition has been successfully accomplished at the end of last September, and we support this progress as in line with the Tunis Agenda, since it aims to enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities on an equal footing basis in GAC.

Japan suggests that the recommendation to be considered in this working group should be about fostering more involvement of developing countries, as well as other stakeholders.

In that sense, enforcement of a GAC (indiscernible) function might be discussed at this working group.

Japan is reticent to support any proposal to set up an entirely new institutional arrangement. Instead, we support the approach to continually strengthen and improve existing institutions and processes that are discussing Internet public policy issues. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan, for your intervention. I will give the floor now to Parminder, followed by Saudi Arabia and Timea Suto from ICC/BASIS.

So Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: (off microphone) -- directly go to the recommendations-related inputs provided by me and my organization, and I would refer to the compilation document which the secretariat has kindly provided to keep it short.

So the core of what we would like to be recommended by the WGEC is that it should suggest a mechanism that can enable all governments on an equal footing to develop the much-needed international public policies pertaining to the Internet and its associated larger digital phenomenon, which is almost a literal statement of Section 69 of Tunis Agenda.

And such an institutional mechanism can only be in the form of a U.N. body dedicated to the subject. This would be similar to how the WHO works on health, UNESCO on education, FAO on food and agriculture, UNICEF for child issues, UNDP for development, U.N. Women for gender and so on.

An important function of this new mechanism or body will have to be undertaking extensive research and providing support, especially to developing countries on Internet-related public policy issues.

These issues are enormous, fast-moving, and developing countries do not have anyplace to go to to get good information and expertise on these issues. It is therefore most important for WGEC to recommend a clear mechanism for governments to be able to develop Internet-related international policies in consultation with all stakeholders. The proposed new body would establish appropriate relationships with all existing bodies who do technical work or related public policy work and also direct relevant public policy issues to them, receive their inputs and comments, and contribute specific Internet-related perspectives to issues under purview of these other bodies.

And when this body starts functioning, it would most likely be very much enabled for develop- -- by development of a framework convention on the Internet. Framework conventions, as you know, is a whole kind of enabling global legal system which can allow development of principles, protocols, and processes, and, as the time requires, treaties and agreements in different aspects of the Internet, and this framework convention can also formalize the multistakeholder structures of ICANN, the various regional Internet registries, and other technical standards bodies to do this work. We do not want to touch the way this work is distributed but some kind of legal recognition of the way they work and accepting their structures would actually be good for cooperation among these bodies, so this framework convention can produce an enabling environment for all these.

So this is on the side of public policy issues, and enhanced cooperation also refers to the technical Internet resources, but it says that day-to-day operations of critical Internet resource management is not in the purview of enhanced cooperation, but development of public policy principles regarding this area is within the -- within the purview of enhanced cooperation, and what we would like to see happen is that -- I'm not going to click this -- okay, that ICANN should get incorporated under international law. It should move away from U.S. jurisdiction. It is not appropriate for an international governance body to be under the executive, judicial, and legislative jurisdiction of a single country, so it is required that ICANN, without changing its multistakeholder structures as it functions now -- nothing else changes. Only the jurisdiction layer changes to international law. And that's required to be done immediately.

And some process has to be developed to -- to develop the public policy principles regarding Internet core resources, which is mentioned in the Tunis Agenda. What that process should be, whether the proposed new U.N. body should do it or there should be a little -- another body which is nongovernmental doing it is something which should be considered. Thank you so much, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, for your intervention.

Next on my list is Saudi Arabia, followed by ICC/BASIS and Pakistan.

You have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Ambassador.

I mean, in drafting our response to the second question, what kind of recommendations should be considered, I mean given the fact that we lack mechanisms or a framework that enables governments on an equal footing at an international level, we need such, I mean, consideration by the working group to draft a recommendation in this area and to enable the existence of such framework or mechanisms for government in order to develop international public policy issues.

I just would like to answer to the -- some of the interventions that we have the history of 11 years. There is an UNGA resolution which was adopted maybe weeks ago that reaffirmed that Internet governance, including the process towards enhanced cooperation in Internet governance should continue to follow the provisions set forth in the WSIS outcomes.

So governments and leaders in New York are still believing in the outcomes of Tunis, and it is still valid in this time of year with the challenges that we have facing us right now.

So I think we should be held accountable to the mission that was given to CSTD and to ourselves, represented here in the working group, and to try to come up with a recommendation that really will solve the problem that we are facing currently.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your input.

I will now give the floor to Timea Suto from ICC/BASIS, followed by Pakistan and Anriette.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. I shared general highlights of our contribution yesterday, but I thank you for this opportunity to share more specifically on our views on recommendations.

Our response focused on the consideration on the nature of the recommendations we are to make. We built our responses on the clues in the Tunis Agenda and the premises expressed in a description of the attributes.

So in view of the characteristics we already covered as important to enhanced coordination, we are of the view that any recommendations we make are based on three pillars.

First, they should be general in nature and mindful of how different stakeholders in different parts of the world facing different issues have implemented and will need to implement enhanced cooperation.

Secondly, based on commitment to openness, inclusivity, and outreach, so that they encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in discussions that are critical to the responsible development of the Internet.

And thirdly, they should be responsive to innovation and, in other words, future-proof and developed with a mind-set cognizant of the pace at which technology evolves by the minute.

We highlighted in our answer that enhanced cooperation is a method of cooperation which is already in use in many fora. We provided a few examples. Certainly not an exhaustive list. These fora, among others, have well-established processes for consultation and collaboration with all stakeholders.

Our recommendations should look at what can be done to improve this method of confirmation in a manner that could be appropriated by the different stakeholders in different situations and different levels. Thus, ICC-BASIS emphasized that recommendations should be general and flexible in nature and not prescriptive to apply to any specific policy issue.

We also proposed to look at options and methods to enhance participation and activities where enhanced cooperation is implemented, not only in terms of materially supporting stakeholders to be present at meetings but by opening up existing processes to involve relevant stakeholders by awareness raising, information sharing, connecting local actors, capacity-building, remote participation, et cetera.

And as noted yesterday, we should strive with the recommendations we make to consider the benefit of our work as it contributes to a collective effort to advance the 2030 agenda and the global goals. Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. I will now give the floor to Pakistan followed by Anriette and Carlos Afonso.

Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador.

In our contribution, we mentioned that the foremost element of enhanced cooperation is to look at the ways and means to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out the roles and responsibilities. This is something that has been mentioned in 69 of Tunis Agenda, and we think it's the basis of our mandate and our work here.

What we need to do is to look at how to -- how to do it. There has been some references by previous speakers saying that it was more than a decade ago when we adopted Tunis Agenda. So we strongly disagree it is as relevant as anything because all the governments reaffirmed Tunis Agenda just a little over a year ago.

We should deliberate on the framework of institutional mechanism. We think it's very important -- what kind of institutional mechanism would look like is something that I think we should be focusing on and deliberating upon.

It could be -- it could be in the form of an international organization. It could be in the form of a working group or whatever. But the foremost thing is -- and that has been recognized in all the major documents pertaining to our work is that developing countries have not equal say in international public policy issues when it comes to Internet governance or resources.

It is as true as it was in the past. We all know that even when it comes to IANA transition, it still is under the U.S. jurisdiction. And although there are some changes that have been made, but overall it's structure when it comes to the political oversight is not changed.

When it comes to institutional mechanism, I think a very good example before us is OECD's digital economy policy. I think Parminder mentioned it yesterday.

Whatever structure it has we can -- we can get it. I think if it has been done at OECD level, there is no -- it shouldn't be problematic for us to have a dissimilar structure at the U.N. level or at international level.

We could do it as lean as possible. We could do it as efficiently as possible. I don't think that it's a problem. The structure could be the one that is adopted by OECD digital economy policy.

Ambassador, this is something that we generally mentioned in our contribution, of course not in that much detail because we thought that when it will come to the meeting, we will elaborate upon it.

But one last thing that I would mention is that there is talk about many issues, be it human rights, be it cybercrime. I think what's more important is that, of course, these are very important issues. But most important is that where to discuss it, where to take this agenda forward because what's lacking at this moment is that many things happening at the same time but their output, their productivity is not as much.

I think we need to consolidate, of course considering the distribute nature of Internet and Internet resources. But there is no denying the fact that it could be done, as has been done in many other related subjects at international level. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan, for your statement.

Anriette followed by Carlos Afonso.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair.

So just to give a bit of context to the recommendations, thanks for the compilation. So my network is Association for Progressive Communications. Our view is that we agree with Richard. There are challenges. We think it's important for the working group to recognize that. We do not see the Internet as a single entity and, therefore, the Internet-related public policies that touch on the Internet can also not be dealt with in our view by just one entity. It can be talked about but not dealt with.

We think this diversity of issues is already being reflected in the extent to which bodies are dealing with and making Internet-related public policy. This is the big difference since 2005.

We have U.N. agencies taking the lead in that. So we have the Human Rights Council. We have UNESCO and so on. This is also happening at the regional level. You have, for example, the African Union Convention on personal data protection and cybersecurity. So there's not a complete vacuum here at all.

This does make it challenging, but I don't think we should add to that challenge by creating even more institutions.

I do think that the gap is that there isn't a space where governments can have this broad-based discussion.

I agree with Richard when he suggested that Bill Graham's submission captured that well. This way governments can anticipate issues that -- future-oriented issues that would need discussion.

We also do not think that governments are the only actors that have rights and responsibilities with regard to public policy. But I'm not saying that in a way that doesn't recognize that governments do have a specific responsibility. We think the role and responsibility varies according to the issues, and we think our recommendations should address that.

So, we think that in terms of recommendations -- and this is in the recommendations in the compilation -- to look at some that can improve existing mechanisms, making them more inclusive, transparent, accessible.

We agree with previous speakers who say the developing countries do not have sufficient access but also not sufficient influence. And those apply to the intergovernmental spaces but also to other spaces.

And we think better sharing of information and collaboration. So we'd like to see recommendations that address that to existing institutions but also to emerging ones.

And we like the idea of recommendations that address the link between global and national. I think Jimson captured it very well. And, in fact, developing country participation in international policy spaces can be reinforced by them working more inclusively with non-governmental stakeholders at a national level.

And then we also think that there is a need for an annual forum. And our proposal would be that this forum for governments can be held back-to-back with the IGF. It doesn't necessarily need to be institutionally attached to the IGF. It could be attached to another U.N. body such as CSTD, for example. We see it as a discussion space rather than a policy-making space.

We think it also needs to be open to other stakeholders, but it should have character as a space for governments because I think there's a need for that.

And we think that will also strengthen the IGF in itself which for all its success has not really -- sorry, I'm going over time -- has not sufficiently -- government participation in the IGF can be strengthened. And I think that is a general recognition. There is a general recognition of that.

So I won't go through the recommendations. That's really just the type of recommendations we see as necessary.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette, for this.

Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: I tried to post a sort of contribution to the list. I think it's there already. And I apologize for not being able to contribute before because I was under a surgeon who opened my heart, and it took a few months to recover. But I'm okay now.

So I would like to -- I tried to do a summary of what I heard yesterday and part of today and posted it. And I will try to refer to it very briefly because the time is short.

The first thing I want to emphasize is that the Tunis Agenda, many paragraphs refer in one way or another to enhanced cooperation, not only 69 and 71. And, you know, we read and reread and we find new statements which relate to issues of enhanced cooperation.

The agenda is not a sort of (inaudible) which is eternal. As the Information Society and Internet evolve, these 11 years of development have been beyond almost imagination. They were re-affirmed by the UNGA, as the Russian delegate reminds us, in 2010. Some concepts, prepositions, and guidelines need reformulation, adaptation, or improvement. Multistakeholder participation as a process of Internet governance were both concept babies, just born at the time, 2005. So did that forum with 12 clear objectives listed in the agenda, the Internet Governance Forum.

So I propose we refer to the advances in collaboration and consensus regarding principles achieved through the various national and international forums happening before and during the first and second round of the WGEC.

So both within some countries like Brazil, who have an example of the Marco Civil, and internationally like the NETmundial declaration, the recent U.N. HRC declaration that Internet access is a human right, among many other institutional or collective initiatives, reacting, diagnosing, forecasting, proposing guidelines, processes, principles and organizing methods, which in one way or another represent practices of enhanced cooperation either in the multilateral or the multistakeholder contexts.

In other words, why we discuss it in two rounds of the WGEC? Many groups of individuals, organizations, and governments are trying to practice it. The IGF itself evolved, and we can say it evolved beyond itself with a diverse network of national, regional, and other IGF-related initiatives to debate, diagnose, and even propose recommendations at those levels, regional and national.

All of these converge to an annual IGF and interact which in itself is a major reason to ensure the continuation of the IGF process.

And I would like to mention that Marilyn Cade has a map of this big network of IGF-related initiatives. It's fantastic. It covers most of the world in national and regional initiatives. It is a network already, no?

Some participants of the WGEC are in a way or another thinking about the full creation of a new entity or mechanism which would review enhanced cooperation. If there is one conclusion, we would have to two working group rounds.

And I advanced conclusions before we finish.

[Laughter]

But it is that the list of challenges is too broad to be given to any specific intergovernmental or multistakeholder (inaudible), whatever the imperfections in any case.

Also, at the point we are in the discussions as Wolfgang and others, APC, Internet Society have suggested, why not take advantage of the broad network which several IGF-related processes have established and insert or join back-to-back, as Anriette said, them in a carefully organized way the issues of improving intergovernmental and multistakeholder cooperation. After all, the majority of the WGEC members agree with whatever recommendations we manage to make will be non-binding and so is whatever IGF-related fora generate as well, at the same time trying to stimulate even more extension of the IGF-like processes to as many countries as possible.

This would not preclude the invocation of other forms of collective dialogues, Parminder's suggestions, be them in a multilateral, multistakeholder fashion. One thing doesn't not preclude the other but would take advantage of this evolving already big network which I was mentioning.

Regarding, finally, the issue of the participation of existing institutions in the process in practice of enhanced cooperation, we should at the outset adopt the principle that no one will be excluded. ICANN and its governance roles are the main reason the so-called critical Internet resources theme was included in the IGF theme in Rio in 2007. And it's imperfect. No one is perfect here. Its imperfect multistakeholder nature, as most recently in the IANA transition process, motivators bringing constituents and the organization to this dialogue.

Obviously, the ITU cannot be excluded either as it impacts all national policies regarding the primary regulation and use of telecommunications infrastructure in binding arrangements. It's enhanced cooperation of Internet and Information Society issues. This is not relevant. We better stop here.

And so is the IGF the broader civil society or multistakeholder collectors, big networks as we also talked about, APC and the various internet society and so on.

So this is what I wanted to state as a sort of attempt to cover for my lack of contribution in the past. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Carlos Afonso, for, I think, very helpful comments. Thank you.

The remaining speakers on my list are Nigel Hickson from ICANN and then I have Iran, India, and Constance Bommelaer from ISOC.

So, first, Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: I will cede to Iran. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to highlight three points of Iran's contribution on question 2. The first is related to considering the establishment of a mechanism which will be conducive to the implementation of enhanced cooperation.

In this relation, every effort should be made to treat countries, both developed and developing ones, on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities with respect to the international policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

The second point refers to SDGs. The 2030 agenda for sustainable development is very ambitious. And working group will play an important role in achieving the SDGs and other parts of the development agenda. The 2030 agenda as well as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda have made repeatedly several direct and indirect references to science, technology, and innovation, bearing in mind paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda, Islamic Republic of Iran is of the view that the working group should pave the way to materialize the access to technology by developing countries in order to play the role on equal basis.

Point 3 refers to the cultural diversity, local languages, (indiscernible) concerns and useful traditions based on which many societies continue to lead and enrich the civilizations across the globe.

To this end, the national efforts of the developing countries for creating, improving, and expanding capacities to allow the involvement in all aspects of the global information society should be facilitated by other governments and institutions.

This could be done through inter alia, sharing knowledge, and experiences enhancing capacity-building, creating and enabling global environment, and transfer of technology. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your intervention.

India is next on my list followed by Constance Bommelaer.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I have already given some of the main highlights of my recommendations yesterday in the first session, and I would like not like to repeat them.

Secondly, the other recommendations I have (indiscernible) during the course of the day during my interventions earlier in the aforementioned session.

There's just one point I would like to highlight which is part of India's submission.

We have made reference to ICANN. And when we look at the synthesis report and the points that are under discussion here, we feel very much that ICANN is within the scope of enhanced cooperation, particularly because it relates to various important issues related to Internet governance and jurisdiction of laws.

We have suggested that there is a need to empower Government Advisory Committee of ICANN to play a meaningful role and substantial role in international public policy issues, that there should be an institutional mechanism which needs to be created for the GAC to report to ECOSOC through CSTD working group on an annual basis on public policy issues.

This is also now in connection with what we mentioned about the accountability, so if we talk about accountability as an issue, as a characteristic of enhanced cooperation, then this is one of the recommendations that we have made. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for emphasizing that aspect.

Last on my list is Constance Bommelaer. I'd like just to seek clarification from Nigel. Do you want to take the floor yet after Constance or -- yes. Okay. So we'll hear Constance and then Nigel.

Constance, go ahead.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

As my Indian colleague, I'm not going to repeat what we have detailed in our written submission that was sent to the secretariat, so perhaps I'll just highlight a few of the salient points that seem important for the consideration of the group.

It was our perspective, diving into the discussions of this working group, first of all, that it was important to recognize that enhanced cooperation had made progress over the past -- the past years. I should say the past decade.

There are a number of proof points, and we saw this with the first compilation that was done by the previous working group. I will give a few -- a few examples but we've seen, for instance, how UNESCO or ITU, traditional intergovernmental organizations, have progressively opened their working environments to stakeholders. And the other way around, we've seen a number of policymakers attending IETF, i.e., technical community meetings that belong to the broader Internet governance ecosystem.

I would also add, one point that we had made in our written submission was that we feel it's important to set aside the definition of enhanced cooperation.

From our perspective, at WSIS+10 in December 2015, the General Assembly confirmed the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance, and from where we stand, if we want to make progress in these discussions about enhanced cooperation, we have to acknowledge what has been agreed at the highest level, the U.N. General Assembly.

Now, in terms of characteristics, I won't develop them. I will just list them very quickly because we've expanded in our -- in our written submission.

But characteristics for the consideration of the group for good governance, enhanced cooperation would be multistakeholder, open, participative, transparent, accountable, inclusive, and equitable. These, again, for the consideration of the group.

And now in terms of priorities for enhanced cooperation, topics to focus on where enhanced cooperation can be useful -- and I said this the last day of the formal CSTD session so I won't develop access.

Access remains a priority and we know that bringing the final billion on line will remain complicated for economic reasons.

And finally the need to have comprehensive policy approaches, given now the tie between Internet governance and sustainable development.

So I would say a call for enhanced cooperation between the Internet and the development communities.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention.

So last speaker on this topic will be Nigel, and then I will propose a way forward.

Nigel, please.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly don't mind going last. And it's -- it's nice to hear ICANN mentioned. There's always a dilemma, I think, in these -- in these respects when people talk about whether ICANN is within something or without something. On the one hand, you know, you want to feel important and be involved in something, and if you're excluded, you don't feel so important, but on the other hand, if you're included in something and then told to do things, you don't always want to do them.

So I'm not sure where we should be.

But on the -- in terms of the -- in terms of the topic under discussion, I mean, we were pleased, as well, to be able to put in a contribution on this in terms of the recommendations, and I think we've got a good base to move forward.

I think we had a very constructive discussion this morning and yesterday on characteristics. We might not have agreed them all. We'll obviously come back to it.

But clearly there was a very positive dialogue on a number of key characteristics.

And one of our recommendations should be based on that, in that we should indeed look at enhanced cooperation processes and say quite clearly that they should have certain types of characteristics and we can -- we can build on that and I think that's very important.

And there's a couple of additional points that I think that come out of that, in that these enhanced cooperation processes we talk about clearly should respect human rights, that they should take into consideration that not all stakeholders are equal, and they should take into consideration the developmental aspects that Pakistan and others, including Parminder, related to.

They should take into consideration that dialogue has to be open and shouldn't be membership-based.

And of course they should take into consideration that there are different roles and responsibilities, as we alluded to this morning.

There are many different processes we're talking about here and the roles and responsibilities of the different actors vary depending on that process.

So I think that's very important indeed.

I would also completely adhere to what Constance just said in terms of the evolutionary aspect of enhanced cooperation. It's happening. It's taking place. Perhaps it's not taking place in exactly the right way in all the fora, but we have seen this tremendous progress in various institutions.

So I think that's very important as we -- as we move forward.

And indeed, that leads us to conclude, I think, that we don't need a U.N. process to enact enhanced cooperation. Whether we have a coordination process, that's different and we can talk about that and there are some interesting ideas, but clearly enhanced cooperation is something that is moving forward.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel, for your intervention, and I -- I would suggest now that we could move to the last -- second-to-last agenda item. That would be the way forward. We'll have roughly 40 minutes for that.

I would like to -- just in regard to the discussion we have had, it shows I think it might have been useful in some way to better inform participants on the positions of each other, although this was already

contained in the submissions, so -- but it was your decision to do it, but I think we need to move to some more interactive kind of discussion.

Because if we -- I would like to see in our next meetings that we could -- instead of having statements like we have at the U.N. that do not relate to each other, that we can have -- provide some more interactive discussion.

The purpose of preparing the compilation document was to provide you with a tool for this, because there you will find the -- word by word all the contribution -- all the recommendations you have proposed and we agreed to work on that basis, but trying to establish some categories.

And I repeat: There are many approaches that can be taken in regard to what enhanced cooperation should look like or should be further strengthened. We -- on the basis of the recommendation, which was not invented by me or the secretariat, we identified seven broad categories. Recommendations addressed to existing specific institutional processes or fora. That would deal with the issues associated to ICANN, ITU and others. Recommendations of -- on follow-up of the previous WGEC work.

Recommendations of priority of focus areas.

Recommendation addressing organizational or coordination aspects.

Recommendation addressed to national governments.

Recommendation on the creation of new institutional mechanism instruments.

So I could notice from the conversation that some parties tend to think that that is the -- the heart of the discussion, but again, in the recommendations, there are other types of recommendations that should also be examined.

And finally, recommendations regarding characteristics of recommendations themselves.

So this is offered for you again. I'd like to invite for you to look into the document to make sure that we improve the document to reflect adequately your views, but I think that next time we discuss recommendations, we should do it in a more structured way and provide for a more interactive debate.

Otherwise, we'll keep repeating things that have been said that we know, in a way, but we can -- will not maybe be able to elaborate a little more among ourselves how -- if and how this could be articulated in the eventual report, in fulfillment of our mandate.

Now, in a way, the same applies to characteristics because we have had some interactive discussion -- I think it was useful -- regarding the principles, if I can use that expression, but not on definitions. I hear that's something that we don't need to touch on the definitions, but many participants think that the definitions should lead us to -- to some further discussion and some further reflection, either in conjunction with recommendations or on its own merits, so I think this is also a part of the discussion we need to plan for next meeting. And again, in a structured way.

Maybe the approach proposed by the synthesis document is not the right one, but we certainly -- I think part of the homework I'll take upon myself to do is to try to elicit from this synthesis the issues. So we will not discuss any document, maybe just one single sheet of paper indicating what are the issues that should be discussed associated to definitions.

So I think we lack -- and of course we have to revert to the discussion regarding the principles themselves, trying to better refine the first exchange we had on those items that were proposed.

So I think in regard to the way forward, there are a number of things we should do. At the close of the meeting, with the assistance of the transcript, I -- unless there are any further guidance, I think I should work with the secretariat to try to organize a little bit more the discussion for next time.

Now, in that regard, I just would like to recall one thing.

At the first meeting, September meeting, the group just decided on the questions and nothing else, so for this meeting we started the meeting, we've -- 160 pages and no guidance on how to go about it, so I think part of the discussion we had here was very instrumental in -- even for ourselves to better understand how we can go about.

I made an attempt to try to guide the discussion through the synthesis paper to provide you with tools for that, but again, just to recall that we started from zero in regard on how the discussion should -- and I think now it is, in a way, taking shape, at least from the perspective of the chair.

I think now maybe the issues we should further discuss are clear. Of course we had a lot of time to get clear and maybe a lot of repetition of -- that could have been avoided, but I think we are probably now in a better position to plan for the future work ahead of us.

I'd like, just in connection with this, to indicate that from my perspective I'd like to suggest that the meeting, in line with what we had discussed before, should take place before CSTD.

I would say in the light of the experience we had, we would need at least three days of meeting. I'm looking at the secretariat because I know that imposes on the secretariat a burden because they will be simultaneously preparing for CSTD.

But I think especially if we are going to have some more interactive, some more focused discussion on recommendations, we will certainly need more time for this. I would clearly make a call for this to be made possible.

That would leave us with a decision to make in regard to September and October meeting. As per the informal discussions I had with some of you, I had a feeling that probably end of September or early October would be the best dates in regard to some other planned meetings, especially for October, so I think this is yet another issue I should also consult with the secretariat and come up with some proposal.

Probably not by the end of this meeting, but we hope to be able to make a decision as soon as possible in order to allow for planning for all of us.

So those would be my maybe comments.

I'd like to have reactions from you on how to proceed, if you find this is an appropriate game plan or if we should think of something else. As always, I rely on the collective wisdom of this working group.

Yes. I have United States. I understand it's a point of order. Please go ahead.

>>UNITED STATES: Did you -- am I on?

Did you say there was no May meeting? That there was no anticipation of the May meeting? Or we would have a May meeting and we're just looking for potential dates of the September-October meeting? I just missed that. I'm sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Next meeting will be May, back to back to CSTD. I think that was already agreed. I think initially we were thinking of having today meeting -- I'm proposing that it will be extended to a three-day meeting before CSTD, that we can meet immediately before to see the proposal. And independently of the May meeting, we have already planned for a third meeting, September-October, so at this point, I don't think we -- we would have a precise proposal for this but it would be roughly end of September, early October.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. That's helpful. And I would just encourage on that, perhaps as part of the conversation, we can agree to hold the meeting in general or in principle. I would just not want to -- and then wait for the secretariat to provide dates. I just wouldn't want to wait until May to then get -- to decide on dates for September, which might be -- create a travel burden for some, with Geneva hotel rooms. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, this is the idea.

Actually, it -- our best guess was to have a final decision on this by the end of this meeting, but that was not possible.

Yes. Do you want to make a statement, Claudia, or no?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can you speak on the mic?

Sorry. I was just checking with the secretariat. We'll put on the screen the dates for the May meeting. Also an indication of the CSTD meeting just for clarity.

I have on my list, I think, to speak on those topics, Iran and Richard.

Iran, please go ahead.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

First, for the September-October meeting, if you wish, you can put "provisional," but I agree with those people that said that we should decide on September-October in our May meeting but not now.

But putting something provisionally as an indication may help for the people to arrange their travels and so on, because there are so many meetings, Chairman. So it would be good if you do that one.

And now I'm waiting for the May meeting because we have a lot of things to do in May in other areas, very, very heavy loaded. However, with respect to the recommendation, we are grateful and appreciate the authors of those recommendations, but I think that we should have a way forward to comment on those recommendations.

I suggest, if possible, in order not to type everything, if possible you could provide or secretariat provide those recommendations in the Word format but not PDF. In that case, we could do it in a Word format and then try to have. Otherwise, we have to start to type something and so on and so forth. Because we have several comments on the recommendations, while we appreciate the essence of that, but we have to do that one. Otherwise, it would be very difficult. And that is something that really helps because we need to comment. Some of those recommendations I mentioned, they are not implementable.

And we have to also, as a principle, avoid to criticize any other work that has been done with any other organizations.

The -- the activities on the transition was commented and criticized. I think that was a good job, a fantastic job was done by the people, and now after many, many years, we are waiting, now the community, they have this power.

And then GAC, unfortunately some people mentioned that they are not treated equally. It is not true. GAC is treated equally. But it depends on the GAC itself, whether they participate in the decision-making or not participate, but they get treated equally like others. There might be some inequality in the GAC, I agree, but I think that we should not criticize other organizations. We should concentrate on our own work and ask for help from the other organizations and instead of criticizing, be more constructive and more objective. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

I think in regard to your proposal to circulate the compilation of recommendations in a Word format for comments, we could do that but I'm not sure that we are now already in a drafting mode. I think we should allow ourselves first an opportunity to exchange views, and on that basis maybe to decide on how we deal with that.

I think we -- I'm -- I would certainly not encourage at this point that we would go in an exercise of changing the wording that was proposed by someone, trying to amend or -- I don't think we have yet come to that stage that would allow us to do this. Unless that was not your intention.

Well, in regard to recommendations addressed to other existing organization processes, again, I think this is a category of recommendations that some parties thought would be appropriate in fulfillment of the mandate that was given to the group.

I don't think that in principle that would imply any criticism because we can -- I think it would be in our purview. If we think that something should be done by someone else that would improve the ecosystem at large by improving it, I think we should not refrain from doing it.

And in regard to the ICANN itself, I would beg to defer and then speak in a national capacity. We don't think that the role of governments within GAC is on par with other sectors. We are not in a decision-making power equivalent to others, so I think anything that can be done in that -- and particularly ICANN is submitted to U.S. jurisdiction. So there are a number of issues for governments to consider. We don't think it is --

So I beg to defer. I think it's not a case to engage in discussion here and now, but just to say that things are maybe much more complex and should be seen in the light of what was said and I -- it's up to the group to judge in each and every case whether it's appropriate or not, whether it should be related to as a group, and then in regard to the report, if there are dissenting views, we will see how to deal with this.

Next on my list is Richard Hill and Marilyn Cade.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. First I wanted to agree with you fully that actually we've progressed amazingly. And as you said, we started from zero and are continuing up. And that made me realize that all of us, including me, seemed to have forgotten one very fundamental characteristic of enhanced cooperation and Internet governance: Bottom-up. And this group has been a great example of bottom-up because we developed the questions entirely bottom-up, and we had a whole bunch of inputs. And you are trying to structure them and that's not easy and it's an interactive process. To me this is a very model of a bottom-up process.

So if nobody objects, I would suggest that we add bottom-up to the list of characteristics because it was so obvious that it didn't occur to any of us to put them in there. And I commend you, Chairman, for your managing this process in a very bottom-up manner.

Then in terms of the way forward, I think I mentioned it earlier, I think that we're moving towards direction where -- not now but we could envisage having two output documents would be annexed to your report. One is a document on the characteristics, and I think we see it will have a chapeau and then some other detailed things. And the other is a compilation of recommendations. Hopefully we agree on all the recommendations. If we don't, it's not a big deal. We can do like we did in the previous gaps document and say some are here, some are there. And I think probably we should revisit the gaps document and reproduce some of it.

And so we could either have gaps and recommendations together or have gaps as one document and recommendations as another document. It's too early to say. I support your idea of now going through

the recommendations; and we'll have the discussion which ones are in scope, which ones are out of scope, which ones can be implemented, which ones cannot be implemented.

And I agree the criticism can always be phrased positively saying, You should consider doing more of this rather than you fail to do that. So that's all the glass half empty, half full.

So thank you very much, Chairman. I fully support your way forward with those comments.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your statement. I turn to Marilyn Cade followed by the U.K., Parminder, and Russian Federation.

So, Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I'm really struck by how much work we have accomplished, but I'm almost struck by how much we have ahead of us.

I think it's worth taking note that, you know, we have made quite a bit of progress.

I have a question for consideration. I don't know the answer, but you know my favorite word is called "homework." And I'm just wondering -- not to think about any markup about any of the recommendations but how we are going to be able to have further exchanges of views.

Is it possible to think about using a template approach for some online submissions that would address the recommendations? Or do you believe that we need to wait until we come back together for our next meeting to have that exchange of views? And when I say "exchange of views," I'm talking about having a dialogue with each other, not just making statements to each other.

And right now I think we're still in the stage -- pardon me, my dear colleagues, but I think we're still in the stage of making statements to each other. A dialogue to me looks a little different, right? It takes Carlos' comments and Anriette's comments about a possible -- some ideas and it has a brief presentation recapping and then a Q&A and interaction.

And I think that's going to be important for us to do on some of these, if I could say, major recommendations where we can be in broad agreement.

I can envision a set of recommendations where there's, you know, very broad support, a set of recommendations where there's much more clarification needed, and some recommendations where we can't get to any kind of agreement and we may have to put them in a category of these remain -- these suggestions were made that did not -- I don't know what our measure is.

But I think we've got to have -- we've got to figure out how to talk, not just state. And I don't know the answer to that. But I do -- I think that's an important next step for us.

And then I'll just take this opportunity to mention, Chair, that Carlos made reference to this map. And I have about 35 copies, I'll put them in the back of the room if anybody wants a paper copy. And then I

will post the updated version to the list for anyone who wants a soft copy. It's merely intended for informational purposes since not everyone perhaps knows about the network of about 70-some national and regional IGFs. So just intended for information.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. And thank you for your suggestions. Since you were very disciplined in regard to the time management, but I have one question for you. What do you mean exactly by the template approach? Do you think we should develop one template that people respond to each and every recommendation? What is your idea?

>>MARILYN CADE: Some people in this room, I might be looking at one of them --

[Laughter]

-- or maybe a few others are very familiar with the approach that we've taken in some of the work we've done at the ITU where there's the topic and then a space to write the response.

And rather than having, I would just say, random writing, right, it's a -- so here would be the recommendation. And it's in a form that when the secretariat receives it, it's much easier for them to cut and paste it into a single document.

I'm not the expert on it, but I am the expert on having benefited from the use of that approach in many of the consultations, the consultation on the ITRs, the consultation on the WTPF, some others. So that was what I meant by a template.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this clarification. We'll revert to your proposal later. I'll comment on this.

I will give now the floor to the U.K. followed by Parminder and the Russian Federation.

U.K., you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. As we are coming towards the end of the meeting, we would like to just take this opportunity to thank you for the work you have done and all the patience you have shown and also to thank colleagues in the room for the constructive spirit that we've achieved so far.

In terms of the next steps, we're very conscience that a number of colleagues said that in their responses to question 2 they did not propose actual recommendations. They haven't done that yet. And we think it's important there is a space for them to be able to do that.

It's also possible that some colleagues, having listened to our discussion over the last two days may want to amend some of their proposals and also it's important we have a space for that. So we think perhaps coming up with templates now is maybe jumping ahead a little too quickly and may get us into trouble.

We agree with the comment that Iran makes, which is that perhaps the next stage is for us to have an opportunity to comment on one another's proposals. Perhaps not detailed drafting but as a more

general level. What we perhaps need to do now is to have an exchange of views on one another's ideas. We haven't done that yet. We have really only put in our own proposals. And maybe an exercise of exchange of views like that might help us to identify where there are areas of potential agreement.

So perhaps a way forward would be now to invite further responses to question 2 in light of our discussions over the last two days and that we could then come to our next meeting with those responses, those recommendations, those different views for consideration. But that might be a possible next step for us at this stage. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. And I, indeed, agree that we should allow people who want to submit new proposals with recommendations or to amend their own recommendations to be able to do so. I will work together with the secretariat to make sure that we stipulate some -- and post a notice in that regard that will allow us to have enough time to prepare, to adjust the compilation document by the time of the -- of our meeting in May. Thank you for your suggestions.

Parminder, please.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: First of all, I do actually miss, as you earlier said, a non-discussion on those -- first part of the synthesis document. There are some important conceptuals needed. And I think as Russia said, the scope of enhanced cooperation probably needed a little more clarity. And in this respect, I'll mention just one point, that public policy is at the center of enhanced cooperation and public policy has a very clear definition in political science. It is something which made by governments and representatives of people.

It is definitionally that if you pick up -- if you just search Google and look at the definition, you will get a lot of definitions just saying that is what is done by governments. So we cannot make all kind of work in the Internet governance ecosystem as public policy. Public policy is democratically placed in a clear meaning which is that representors of people in governments make public policies. The rest is many other things. There is subordinate work to public policy, but it is not public policy. And enhanced cooperation is very clearly about public policy.

And if you go too deep into the delegated parts of policy and rulemaking which are at many levels which is not public policy, then we get into kind of discussions which are not pertinent to enhanced cooperation.

The scope of enhanced cooperation is something important to keep in mind as we go ahead. I know people will interpret it the manner they interpret it, but I thought it was important to say that.

After that, I come to how we can go forward. And I think today we did make considerable progress on listening to people and seeing what people's ideas are. And it would be useful now if people get on to really recommending what do they mean and if they mean this could possibly be done, then actually state how it could be done. For example, I heard Anriette and Carlos saying that something of this kind could be arranged. So at this point, it looks encouraging. But to hear in some kind of a concrete measure that this is how that meeting can be done and this is a kind of function that meeting will do,

then that helps other people to say, well, yes, I more or less would agree to that because this seems to cover what I am saying probably with the additional of one function or other.

Even Nigel said perhaps we can talk about a coordination process. I wonder then, well, maybe that's what I could agree with. What kind of coordination process is this? If somebody can come out and say coordination process whereby there is this mechanism and it happens twice a year in this manner, then we start to know what exactly is being talked about and agree.

This very much goes to what Marilyn said about a question and answer session on these two proposals. That also takes me further, that it is also difficult to do it to do it 30 proposals.

So I can see there are four or five kinds of proposals around. And if some people bunch together and develop mechanisms or -- I don't want to, you know, second guess and use any words which they may not want to use. But it's either a process or a framework or a mechanism, whatever that is, in some precise details, if some groups get together and their kind of process is elaborated in some detail, listening and commenting, accommodations would become much more possible. And we may agree. For example, I may just agree that this kind of process with this additional element looks like I think would satisfy much of what I'm trying to do or what Nigel was trying to say could be the possible coordination mechanism.

So I agree with this kind of question and answer session, some presentation. But we can lump kind of proposals into three or four forms. One is the kind of thing which Anriette has been speaking, which is around IGF. Other could be a coordination mechanism. Other could be using a template to just find what other organizations are doing and whether they are doing well enough. And one is, of course, a new kind of institutional mechanism which is situated in the ecosystem.

If we have three or four kinds of presentations -- I know I'm repeating myself -- then the process of cross-questioning and accommodations would become much easier and probably would do a lot of progress in the next meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I agree with you. It might be easier for us from a methodological point of view to focus on less categories. But the experience we've had, even during the course of this meeting, is that if you don't allow people to speak to their own proposal, the process in a way might be seen as not inclusive enough or not open enough. So I think it might be unavoidable to allow at least some time to go through each and every proposal unless the proponent itself would defer and consider that his or her concern has been addressed elsewhere.

I take your point that we should concentrate on a few key aspects emanating from the language in regard to form and scope. And taking upon a point you have raised before, maybe try to differentiate between what takes place at the level of policy development, what takes place at the level of decision-making, because maybe one approach might be slightly different when we think about development or decision-making.

But, yes, please, go ahead, again.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: -- entirely on a voluntary basis. People would be able to present a proposal much better if some -- many people get together and kind of, you know, flesh it out. And others are also able to better understand and respond to it. So entirely voluntary. We don't want to force a template on the proposers.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, absolutely. I think this meeting would benefit very much if we had some opportunity to have a mix of plenary meetings and smaller meetings. I think we have some -- we have not that kind of flexibility due to the services we have to rely on. But maybe at some point of the discussion, if we could move to a smaller format with all those people who are all interested but maybe those that are particularly interested maybe could help us.

Maybe we can try to address this in a more informal way on the margins of the meetings either before -
- I would certainly support any initiative in that regard. As I said, on a voluntary basis but trying to best consolidate the issues for our consideration. I think this is very much taken on board.

I have on my list Russian Federation. The U.S., are you seeking again for the floor? Yes. And then Japan.

So Russian Federation, please, go ahead.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we agree with those who said that this will be important to add something into the contribution or to amend it with the recommendation. Of course, it will be useful for the further discussion next meeting. And that's why we have just a few processional questions.

Do we have the deadline for the homework to be contributed? Because it's better to discuss it now. And then we prefer -- if you will prepare the compilation document, we prefer to get it in advance, at least two weeks before in order to be prepared for the meeting in a proper way.

And the third question is when the transcript will be available on the Web. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think, Julia, we should work with regard to establishing a deadline or a tentative deadline now and work backwards. So if by the meeting that starts on the 3rd of May, we want to make sure we have the document 15 days before. We must take into account the time that the secretariat needs to provide for the final compilations. I would think maybe one week or less. So we just have to make the consultation that the deadline would be three weeks before the meeting. We can circulate it, but I think that might be -- that's a good suggestion, to think about the deadline.

So that would allow -- I think that would take us by the second part of the month of April. So it will be -- quite some time, more than two months, to contribute if we want to take that approach.

I thank you for that. I think we will -- yes, Marilyn Cade, you want to comment on that.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Just a point of clarification.

Given that we understand that we are really overloading the secretariat for the -- this work as well as the -- as well as the CSTD itself, I guess I might ask if -- even though it might push us to respond more quickly, I might ask if it wouldn't be advisable to move up our responding deadline to take some pressure off the secretariat.

Just an idea.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Fully agree. Marilyn, thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I'll say let's try to have a mix. We need to allow enough time for people to comment, at least two months, but also to allow some time for the secretariat to prepare, also considering that the secretariat will also simultaneously be preparing for CSTD. But I -- I think that the point was well taken and it will be reflected in --

I would -- my intention would be, after this meeting, to try to summarize these things we are discussing and put it on paper and circulate to you as early as next week, so we will be -- there will be plenty of time for you to digest and further refine any inputs that will be submitted to the meeting.

I have then on my list USA and Japan, and after that, I -- with your indulgence, I will close the list of speakers for this afternoon's session, unless anyone wishes to make a final statement because after that, I will move -- yes. I'll also give the floor to Peter Major and then I will make some concluding remarks. So -- and Richard Hill. So USA, please, you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. My -- we certainly appreciate the opportunity to provide inputs until the May meeting or some deadline before it. We want to be sure that, you know, our contribution or additional contributions that are taken to that question aren't prejudged by what we've done here. We're providing new recommendations. And so as we look at those, if there is a consolidation that's going to happen before the May meeting, I would suggest that we don't just update a document, we provide a new document based on all the information that's been provided to this meeting, been provided to that point, been discussed here, and so that it's a -- a fair process in that way.

I also -- I -- I appreciated the U.K.'s intervention, but I -- but I just want to make sure that just inputs to the process is not the only thing that we're doing our homework on before the May meeting.

As we get into the recommendations, I believe that many are technical, they require a lot of expertise that we can't necessarily just bring to Geneva on all these issues, and so it's really beneficial for our preparation to be able to see feedback from others on recommendations and to have that dialogue.

And so while I know it's a little bit strange to have an open opportunity to provide input and feedback, I think that in this case that's what's necessary, to be able to comment on other recommendations and then also to leave the window open to provide new recommendations.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think the concern is well taken note of.

Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Since the meeting is going to end, coming to a close, I'd like to join my previous speaker from the U.K. in appreciating your effort for this work. I think you did a very excellent job in handling these very difficult issues and as (indiscernible) pointed out, what we did in these two days, kind of the bottom-up approach among these various issues, we certainly pointed out some issues that we find important as high-level characteristics, and I am really satisfied with what we have done and what we have made as a document with the various colors.

So Mr. Chairman, to make you more productive for the next meeting, what I understand is maybe you're going to distribute some paper based on these two days discussion concerning the high-level characteristics or what we have discussed, so maybe in the May meeting what we want to do is two things. To continue a discussion on these high-level characteristics based on your new revised version of the paper, and second thing is to exchange our opinions concerning the proposal that is now in the compilation document of these proposals.

And if we are going to do the second thing, the exchange of discussion concerning the recommendation, I'd like to ask the chairman to do the same thing as we are going -- as you try to do in this working group. That is, to make this kind of a synthesis document concerning the -- this compilation of the recommendations. I think that way it will really help us understand what is the essence of the others' recommendations because the compilation document is a bit difficult to read, so I need some help from the chairman.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan, and thank you for your kind words, as well as the U.K. and others. I just repeat: I want to be at the service of the group, to the extent I can.

In regard to your request to prepare a synthesis, I really do not think that might help us because I think I have gone through the recommendations. The recommendations are very different in nature, in scope, in -- for example, the recommendations coming from Richard Hill were very specific, so I don't think they should be merged or consolidated in any way with any other thing, so I really don't think it's an effort that would -- and I repeat. I think it is unavoidable at some point that we'll allow ourselves enough time to go through each one.

I hope we can do it in an effective way, in a way maybe with the same approach of looking at the characteristics to make sure some of those proposals could be easily incorporated and be owned by the group as a whole. Otherwise, there would be issues associated that could be further examined. But I -- I don't think that the work of consolidations would maybe be appropriate in that context.

I could do this, but I don't think that might be useful for us by the end of the day.

But again, thank you for the confidence, but I think your trust in me is exceeding my capacity to deliver in that particular case. Thank you.

Peter, would you like to make a statement? And then I'll turn to Richard Hill.

You have the floor.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just reflecting on the deadline for submissions to the secretariat, I would suggest the end of March or beginning of April, to allow the secretariat to concentrate on the bulk of the work they are about to pursue until the CSTD meeting. So they have really a very, very heavy charge of work, and probably it would help them to have it as early as possible, so I suggest to have it by the 1st of April, all the submissions.

Since I have the floor, let me congratulate all participants of this meeting. I have been listening to the debates and the discussions, and I was very happy to see the constructive way you have been doing your work.

A small remark concerning the -- the format we have. Probably it would be beneficial for the future to have some kind of informal discussions, allowing people to have some coffee break together. I know the constraints of this room, which are very strict, but probably with better enhanced cooperation, we can overcome these constraints.

And finally, let me congratulate you, Chair, for your patience, for your very ably handling this meeting, and I wish you good luck for the next meetings as well. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much. Thank you for your confidence, and you can count on me to pursue, to the extent I can -- I can make a contribution to the group. Thank you for this. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I'd actually raised my flag to thank you, but before coming to that, I want to say a couple words about Japan's intervention and I support you, Chairman, and actually here I will align with the United States. It actually happens. I agree with them it's premature to try to produce a compilation. We do need to do it. Japan is correct. But I think not now. We need first, as the U.S. said, to get people's reactions to the stuff on the table, which could be written or it could be verbal at the next meeting, and then based on that, you'll be able to produce the synthesis document.

So I just wanted to thank you -- and I'm sure everybody agrees with this -- for the excellent work that you've been doing and your fairness and the way you've been handling the procedure and all the preparatory work, as well as the secretariat, obviously, who has done a lot of work and is also working, struggling, trying to find out how to handle this new group which doesn't follow accepted procedures, and they've been very, very responsive and very helpful in helping us to organize our work.

And also thank all the colleagues for their very constructive approach.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard, and I'd like --

Nigel, are you taking the floor? Please.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just to, I mean, obviously echo the thanks and particularly to you, of course, and the secretariat. Very grateful for all the work that has been done. It makes these meetings go much smoother.

And really just a comment on the interactive element that's been discussed because I think -- I think this is a really good suggestion.

I mean, clearly we probably can't have a debate on every single recommendation, but I think Parminder and others have put their finger on a number of issues where perhaps some interactive dialogue and the exchange of facts, even, could be -- could be very useful.

So really welcome that at our next meeting.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S., are you seeking for the floor?

Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Just -- and I would like to extend my compliments to both you and the secretariat on the work done here. And I say that for the secretariat because I'm going to make a request that I fully agree and I think we can accommodate early submissions, but I would also ask -- and I won't ask for a time line but that any documents that we do plan to discuss at the meeting are provided, you know, at least a few days before the meeting so we've had time to read them and hopefully collaborate and plan for -- and prepare for them.

And also, I just want to clarify that the homework questions made the request that not only would it be inputs but also feedback. Is that -- and I just wanted a clarification if that's your intention. To allow feedback and new inputs. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Well, I haven't thought about the feedback. I think -- as many have said, I think we would expect at the meeting itself, the exchange to take place. I think if any party, any participant, would like to share his thoughts on any recommendation in anticipation of the meeting, that might be useful and save us time, so I would certainly not impede you, stop from doing this, if you wish, but I wouldn't say it would be kind of homework for all of us.

I think that on a voluntarily basis, if anyone wants to comment on any recommendation or the full set of -- I think it must be encouraged to do that. That might be useful for us. But I wouldn't think we should set us collectively as a task for each and every one. Yes, please, follow up.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you for the clarification. I think that's fine. I just wanted to make sure before we leave Geneva exactly what the plan was. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Excellent.

So with this, I think we are coming to the end of the meeting. I would not like to speak too much. I think especially after some very, I think, intensive days and I think productive days, I'd like to thank you - all of you for coming.

We have had some remote participants. I'd like to thank them as well. They were not in interaction with us, but I'm informed that a number of people have also followed our discussion, so I'd also like to thank those.

And I'd like especially to thank the secretariat for all the assistance that has been provided, Ms. Sirmanne, Don, Claudia, Bob, I miss a few names. I'm sorry, I don't know all the names but all of you, thank you. I think we have limited staff. You have been doing wonders.

And especially for this meeting because this meeting was -- the timing of the meeting was particularly challenging because the responses were received sometime before Christmas, New Year, and many people were on vacation, so it was very -- so it was not a surprise that some documents that I sent to the secretariat for distribution were done even during the context of the meeting itself but this is something to be avoided certainly for next meeting and I will continue to count on you for -- and also I'd like to thank the technicians for the support provided.

So thank you all. I see you on May 3rd here again in Geneva. I hope in this same room. I think we have this. I think we have been benefiting from the -- I heard this is the very second meeting that is taking place in the room. It was inaugurated by CSTD. So we are just in a very renovated ambiance and very fresh. I think that has also maybe helped us to have a good working ambiance.

So thank you. I wish you that are going to travel safe travels back and look forward to seeing all of you on May the 3rd. Thank you.