

Fourth Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

25-27 September 2017

Geneva, Switzerland

DAY 3

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Fourth Meeting - Day Three

Geneva, Switzerland

27 September 2017

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning, everyone. I would like to ask you to take your seat. We are starting in two minutes.

Good morning, again. I'd like to resume our session for today. Today, as you know, is our very last day of this fourth meeting. So I look forward to fruitful discussion that will allow us at the end of the day to make -- to take stock of what we have been doing and to plan for our next and final meeting and agree to a procedure that will allow us to come to an outcome by the end of that meeting.

So my intention is that in the afternoon session to dedicate some time to discussing follow-up to this meeting, how we want to address the work we have been doing, preparation for our next meeting.

For the moment, I'd like to propose to you that we should allow -- as it has been asked by some of you, we have in those two preceding days reviewed the new inputs that were submitted to this meeting. We had, I would say, a first reading not of all recommendations contained in those papers but at least of those recommendations that seem to be fit for discussion, and we had some extensive exchange on that.

I understand many of the proponents have revised versions they would like to submit to plenary and to seek your agreement whether that reflects the points that were made, and I will certainly look forward to that.

But in fairness to all those who have made proposals and who have not had an opportunity yet to have them discussed, even in the first reading, I understand -- and the U.S. made a point, there are many proposals on their part, or a few proposals on their part, they'd like to have the plenary feedback.

I am a bit uncertain. On the one hand, we want, of course, to go back to those recommendations that were submitted to this meeting. In my opinion, they reflect in a way an essence -- and they have in their entirety, they reflect maybe collectively the main aspects that we have been addressing throughout our meetings and for a reason, because they represent, let's say, these continuously improved amelioration of language on the basis of exchange we have had so far. So I think it is very appropriate that we could revisit those submissions, those recommendations as revised.

However, I also feel that in fairness to those who have not yet had an opportunity for their recommendations to be discussed in the first place to have a go. So I would like to propose some mixed approach in that regard. I think we could start with fresh new recommendations that have not yet been discussed, and I hope those will not be too numerous. And I assume that, because as I said before, the

recommendations are contained in the new submission the way they summarize or they contain the essence of many recommendations that were in previous rounds. So I would expect that there would be not a large number of things to be examined outside those issues we have already addressed when considering those new submissions. So I would like to propose this.

I do not have the exact order. We could go back to our list previous -- we drew in previous meetings in which we separated recommendations in three categories. We had opportunity to look into two categories. The second category we would not look at it. But I leave it for proponents themselves to assess whether it is the case. I don't think we should go one by one, as I said. But I'd like now, if you agree, to give the opportunity for those who made their recommendation in previous rounds to have comments on those.

I see some flags up. I have Nick Ashton-Hart and then United Kingdom.

Nick, you have the floor.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone. I certainly agree with you that I think it's really important that everyone -- every contribution doesn't get heard at some point. I'm certainly not addicted to spending more time on mine for the time being or even trying to readdress it necessarily again in the plenary of this meeting. I just would like to say that to me capturing in some way the essence that the network is one that everyone relies on for an increasing amount of daily life and ensuring that public policy is taken into account, the need for that network to be able to fulfill its everyday functions while addressing issues that arise related to content is -- to me it's fundamental as a climate agreement being able to say that limiting the average increase in temperature is an objective of climate policy. It seems like a really basic concept and one that, I suspect, wouldn't be actually controversial to highlight. And I'm very flexible about how that's done, and I'm happy to work with people with different views on that to achieve that. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone. Well, yes, we agree that we should allow a little bit of time this morning to hear some of these other proposals which have not been presented yet. We need to watch the time carefully. We don't want to spend too much time on that, but certainly we agree we need to do that.

We then need, of course, to come back to the issue of the structure of our report. And we have been listening to the conversation this week. We have looked at your proposal. We also looked at the Russian suggestion, and we would like to make a proposal on the structure of our report when we begin that conversation later today. I need to make a few small changes to it, but then I will send it to the secretariat. With your permission when we start that discussion, I would like a short opportunity just to present our proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Jimson, do you want to take the floor?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair. Good morning, colleagues. Well, I made consultations yesterday with distinguished colleagues, and I've sent revised recommendation to you and the secretariat.

I think to be fair, as we discussed yesterday, that those who never had the opportunity to make presentation to really do so, maybe quickly, so that we can also have opportunity to go back to the recommendation I made earlier that I believe had some gracious support from colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I certainly will do my best to issue time management that will allow us to come back to your proposal, to Nick's proposals, and everyone else's on the basis of the discussions we have for those two days, which I think have been very helpful in helping us in having a clear idea on how things could fit together in the final outcome of our meeting.

So without any further delay, I'd like to invite those who have made proposals at other moments of our work and who consider that their proposals or concepts or ideas they have proposed have not been addressed in the course of the discussion of those two days.

So I look at this moment for new ideas, not redrafting of issues we have been looking at because I think there is an understanding that on the basis of that no final language was -- has been considered as such, that we are looking at issues and on the basis of the discussions, we will try to improve text. But I'd like for at this moment to have some new inputs on the basis of contributions that were already presented.

I give the floor initially to the United States. You have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. It should be no surprise we would like the opportunity to present a few of our proposed recommendations from the third meeting.

I don't know if the secretariat can bring it up.

Shall I begin, Chair? Thanks.

For the first one, I think we're working with some others that have proposed similar ideas and trying to work and see if we can have a compromise on something I presented.

On the second one, I think we have already kind of discussed preambular text and things of that nature and what's kind of guiding our work.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>RICHARD HILL: Just a process point. How are we doing this? Are we going one by one or taking them as a block or what?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: That's what I would like be clear about the section you are focusing on.

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, I apologize. I am skipping the first two because for the first one, we are working with a similar proposal and trying to provide ours in an edit that's already happening. And the

second one I believe we have already discussed this issue. So I was skipping to the third one. I just wanted to explain why.

So for the third bullet point, the U.S. proposes institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policy should entertain proposals from all stakeholders relating to ensure the Internet remains an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable platform and strive to reflect areas of consensus.

I think this is fairly self-explanatory, but we -- you know, we certainly believe in a multistakeholder participation. We believe the input of all stakeholders is important to keeping the Internet the open platform that is effective and used by billions of people around the world. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. It's like several others we've seen. I don't have any problems at all with the substance. On the other hand, it strikes me as motherhood and apple pie and just restating what's already in the agreed U.N. resolutions, WSIS outcomes and so on. As you have said, Chairman, there's nothing necessarily wrong with doing that. So it's okay, but I don't see that it adds anything.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. And I thank our colleague from the U.S. for that presentation. As it was said by the chair, this language really does exist. We don't see how this will enable or how this will achieve our mandate looking at 69. We don't understand how institutions and processes should encourage and facilitate full participation of all stakeholders when our main objective here is to focus on the role of government. So our treatment -- or our priority is to first treat how we solve the issue in UNGA 70/125 which called us to implement 69, 70 and 71 as the role of government. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any further comments? Yes, thank you. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I think it's a lot of interesting views inside the proposal. So we thank U.S. delegation for making this. However, we didn't see the approach to the core of the mandate of our working group, their proposal for approach of mechanism how to further improve -- implementing enhanced cooperation.

And also we would like to give a comment regarding NETMundial principle. And, unfortunately, we should say that it's not consensus principles and not consensus document. So, if U.S. delegation would like consensus in the process, they should not put it in the list of documents. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. But now we're focusing only on the third bullet. I understand, as regards the first and second bullet as indicated by the U.S., this is still under examination.

May I revert to Canada. Yes, please.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning, colleagues.

Canada, I think will very much be in favor of this text being included as one of our recommendations. Contrary to what Mr. Hill proposes, I don't think that this is just motherhood and apple pie issue. We are seeing almost on a daily basis places where public policy decisions at a national level, sure, affect Internet through shutdowns. And that damages economy, damages human rights. For us as states to endorse this idea and this concept is very important. And that would send a very clear message. And then, if we go along yesterday that we encourage states to abide by these recommendations, I think that that has weight. It's not the creation of a new tool or new mechanism. But I think that it is a commitment that we agreed to take in our public policy making work. Thank you very much, Chair. We support this.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard. I'm sorry. I have nick Ashton-Hart and then Richard.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: I'm not sure. We may have raised our flags at about the same time. I'd like to make the same point and agree with Canada. You can agree -- there can be disputes about who is in the room when policy made and what process is used to make it. But, to me, the outcome is essential. You want an outcome that achieves ends that are generally agreeable. And I think it would be extremely remiss to talk about process and structures and have no -- nothing in our recommendations that relates to what the output should be and in whose interest it should serve. I think that would be, frankly, bizarre. And, certainly, I would be embarrassed to put my name to it. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. First I will address a point that Nick raised. So there have been proposals which would appear to be, like, constitutional principles. The network should be like this or the network should be like that. I actually tend to agree with the substance of those principles. But I don't actually think that was our mandate. Our mandate was to talk about how to implement enhanced cooperation. So it could be rephrased. For example, I don't have a problem with the way the U.S. has phrased it here. It says that institutions and processes should take something into account. So we're not raising that to a constitutional principle. We're just saying those institutions should take those principles into account. Anybody proposing that, I would prefer to see it framed in that way rather than the network shall do that or the network shall not do this. Because I don't think that's our mandate. No, for example, I said we need data protection. But I didn't say what the specific data protection principles are. I'm not suggesting this group would do that. I'm just saying this group should say that somebody should do that.

Now, to the point raised by Canada, I'm afraid we get here into extremely dangerous territory. And I would urge everybody to back off. Because I don't think anybody would understand this particular sentence or any other sentence as saying you cannot block child abuse material. I think it's generally understood that illegal content is going to get somehow removed or blocked or whatever.

The problem is we don't all agree on what is illegal content, except for child abuse material. Everybody agrees on that. And then there's a range of things we don't agree on. For example, the U.S. doesn't

allow gambling sites. Germany doesn't allow hate speech sites. China doesn't all kinds of sites. Generally, the U.S. is much more permissive with respect to political speech, but not everybody is. And, as you know, now we have a situation -- or maybe you don't know -- we have a situation in Spain where the authorities have blocked some of the Web sites that the Catalanian regional government wants to use.

So is that illegal? Is that a violation of human rights? I don't think we want to go there. There are mechanisms for doing that. And people who believe that national governments are not doing the right thing can bring it up to the human rights council or whatever.

So I agree with the statement as it is. But I don't think we should read something into it in terms of prescriptions on who can censure what content or not. I don't think we want to go there. If we want to go there, we can. I'm in favor of free speech. But I think that's a very dangerous can of worms to open, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, colleagues. I think we should focus on the principle, Mr. Chairman. Covering all the cross-cutting issues under the umbrella of the enhanced cooperation could not help us to realize and to capture the -- to satisfy outcome that we're going to and we are following.

So it seems that this is very general and cover many of the cross-cutting issues. It's better to focus on the mandate of the enhanced cooperation working group.

So we are not going to resolve all the problems under this group. Just refocus on the mandate of the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Before reverting to the U.S., I'd like to echo what we have been doing in regard to high-level principle. We started to discuss a number of elements as the nominated high-level principles because they were proposals coming from you.

But, in the course of the discussion we found out that some of those elements could, indeed, be considered high-level principles. Others would maybe fit in other parts of the text. So one thing I'd like to propose that we should not be too much tied to the language as framed as a recommendation. I think we are having some discussion that are shedding some more light on how we could address the topic. I think there is a general understanding the topic is relevant, although some reluctance to entertain it as a recommendation and maybe to have some modification language. I think this is -- I'm taking it as the -- maybe one of the main results of this discussion. So I would, again, encourage not to look at it as something we are approving now as a recommendation but rather as an exchange on how the concept can fit into a document. Maybe as part of the background of the ultimate goal, that kind of thing, we should see in a later stage how this should fit.

But I revert to the U.S. for comments in regard to points that were made. And then I would invite you to introduce the next recommendation.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. First off I agree with Canada. I don't think this is a trivial issue. I think it's incredibly important and relevant in discussions of international Internet-related public policy.

Also to Mr. Hill, we have another saying in English "Don't look a gift horse in the mouth," which, effectively, means, if there's low hanging fruit, if you're given an opportunity, take it. Don't fight it.

And I think within these U.N. discussions, it's often hard to find areas of consensus around a large group of stakeholders. And, if there's broad agreement for a concept, that shouldn't be a deterrent to accepting that. I think we should take these and really run with them and take those easy wins for this working group. I think this is one of those examples. I think it's agreed that this should be the goal of what we're doing. As far as I know, there's disagreements on the level of multistakeholder participation. But no one has ever advocated that there should be no stakeholder participation in these discussions. And this is a procedural point which goes with the process of enhanced cooperation to make the procedural argument that those recommendation from all stakeholders are relevant and pertinent in these discussions and should be considered. Thank you.

Should I go on? I go to number 2. So the second U.S. proposal this morning is that institutions and processes should encourage and facilitate the full participation of all stakeholders when considering international Internet-related public policy issues, including at the national and local levels.

Again, I think this goes to the previous one. It's a procedural point. It really highlights the need for the full participation of all stakeholders in these discussions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. I think this relates actually to the discussion we have had before in regard to inclusiveness, as regards the first part of your recommendation.

As regards the second part, I would just remind us that we have had discussion in regard to that kind of recommendation addressed to the national and local levels. There will be some sensitivities in that regard. And I think this has been extensively explained. I wouldn't -- I would, of course, give the floor for those who want to speak about it. But I think this reflects an area of disagreement that was very clear in previous rounds. But I will open the floor for comments, any comments you may have.

I have Richard Hill and Saudi Arabia.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, again, I don't have a problem with this. And to the U.S. I wasn't actually opposing your proposal. I was just commenting on it. No, you're correct. That's a nice saying "don't look a gift horse in the mouth." Of course, there's a famous horse where they would have done better to look more in the mouth -- a Trojan horse. So that saying has to be applied with some care.

I don't have a problem with this one. But I see that in the future there is going to be significant disagreement on what means full participation. To some people, including me, that means according to the Tunis Agenda. So I'm very happy with full participation. And I would come along and say, well, guess what? ICANN is not doing that, because governments have a purely advisory role in ICANN. Whereas, other people will say, oh no, that's not what full participation means. Full participation means that governments don't have a special role and everybody is at equal footing. So I'm okay with this text.

But just be aware of the fact that we're not actually solving the real problem. The real problem is still going to exist.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. And, again, here we see -- I mean, as some said, we have low hanging fruit. We already have fresh fruit in a great document. If you go and read Tunis Agenda 68, we also recognize the need for development of public policy by government in consultation with multistakeholders. We already agreed to this. I don't see how this will go as a recommendation from us. We already have an agreement at the summit level that any development of an international public policy will be in consultation with all stakeholders.

So why we reinvent the wheel here and redevelop a text that's already agreed at a higher level by head of states?

Therefore, as you said before, we should focus on our mandate which is how to enable government on equal footing. Otherwise, we'll go on cycle with a text that already exists in a document by UNGA or by the U.N. as a summit. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I see your point. Although I should say that we -- although the Tunis Agenda refers to full participation, respective roles and responsibilities which now here goes together in full participation, full participation in their respective roles and responsibilities, there is no reference, when we speak to multistakeholders, to equal footing. There's respective roles and responsibilities. We speak about equal footing when we talk about how governments should -- I see this raises a lot of -- I don't want to go into that, of course, please go ahead. But one thing I'd like to say is that we have been trying -- when we look into this issue of participation, I think we are trying to go a little beyond what is there in Tunis by engaging in some discussion on how inclusiveness can be further enhanced or how some guidance or some added language we can give some more precision. So I wouldn't say we are being -- by doing this tired and only replicating language from Tunis Agenda, which is, of course -- people see it from different angles. I was stating maybe that the reading we have that full participation implies to roles and responsibilities. But just so say we are maybe trying to go a little beyond what is there. I think that would be the objective of our exercise. If we just replicate what is in the Tunis Agenda, I agree with you, there is no sense in losing time in that regard.

But I have a number of requests for the floor.

I see Cuba, Parminder, and then Jimson, and Timea in the back. So Cuba, please, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you. One particular comment and one general one.

Well, the particular one you already mentioned. And, especially, in this paragraph it's a little bit strange -- well, maybe English is not my language. But how national -- you're talking about when considering international Internet-related public policy. And then it mentions the national and local at the end.

I see that I have told before that that has to be put in some other way, because it's not -- you know. I'm not going to repeat what I said before.

And also the more general comment that goes in the same line as was said before by the distinguished delegate of Saudi Arabia and also your comment. Here we have to take a decision. Are we going to rephrase and try to go in depth in things that already agreed in the Tunis Agenda and also in the WSIS+10 document? Because I'm not getting into the substance of this. Because this also happened with the statistics yesterday, the paragraph of statistics when in the -- in all those documents a very substantive paragraph in statistics.

So are we going here that is a lower group of lesser -- of less quantity of nations? Are we going to go again and try to refine concepts and recommendations that are already in Tunis Agenda and the WSIS+10?

I don't think so.

My preference would be our mandate is in paragraph 64 and 65 of the WSIS+10 document. And it sets the terms of reference of what we have to do here in a very precise way.

Paragraph 64 says -- because everybody knows the term "enhanced cooperation" has very wide interpretations. So, in order to do that to save that, the paragraph 64 says -- please, when we talk here of enhanced cooperation, we're talking about paragraphs 69-71 of Tunis Agenda. Don't put your head to fly. The only light, please, please.

In 65 it says, okay, taking into account what is in paragraph 69-71 of Tunis Agenda, please go and have a working group to give recommendation on how to implement that.

I'm not against -- many things here are very interesting, very good. But I think it's not in our purview here to do it. We could do it. I'm not against to revisit. And I was at NETmundial. That was very interesting to try to stretch the concept of roles and responsibilities. I think that we need an honest discussion further on, maybe here, maybe in CSTD, of the roles and responsibilities because that is not cast in stone. That's changed. But I don't think this is the place for doing it.

I know everybody here has opinions. I have opinions. Yesterday one delegation here said, We have this strong opinion. We have also -- some other delegations here have strong opinion. I'm not trying to do it. So, please, let's --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Do you have any comments in regard to the language we are considering now? Because what I say --

>>CUBA: Sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: What you are saying is exactly what I said before. We are not rephrasing --

>>CUBA: Rephrasing, yes.

[Multiple speakers]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no. We look at language, trying to see if this adds some value, if it puts some more perspective. That's what the kind of comment I would like from you, because I don't think today we can entertain any kind of assessment like that.

>>CUBA: So what I say, take all the paragraph out.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: You are against the paragraph. Thank you.

Can I have some more views? Parminder, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everybody.

See, I actually more than support this paragraph. And I will now elaborate on the "more" part of it. The problem is not if we are fine-tuning Tunis language, which (saying name) was talking about if we would agree fine-tuning it and making some progress on it.

And for encouraging full participation of stakeholders, our job is to implement the possibilities that are contained in Tunis Agenda and all that.

So what I request of you is -- other proponents of this language is to tell me or tell us what is that process, at least basic guidelines which you want that all places where international public policy making is done should be used for stakeholder participation.

Give me three principles which are growth over 2013, and I would sign on it right away without even arguing about it.

Should we use an OECD model? There are advisory groups of each constituency which meet and talk about it and write the documents and then it goes to it.

Now, I know what the answer to this issue is going to be. Well, there are so many places internationally where policy is made so we cannot give any guidelines because the places are different. This is a circular argument we have been going through all the time. We can't go precise because there are too many things. And we ask for too many things, we don't know which are ones.

Either we are talking about a set of processes and, otherwise, we are not talking about anything. I would, for example, like to know those new additions for stakeholder participation the U.S. wants to suggest and apply to when they say "international public policy is being made right now in too many places," and then, therefore, obviously they mean that stakeholder processes should improve in these too many places. One of those too many places is WTO, from which I'm just coming back.

I want to, therefore, use those processes which U.S. will suggest to improve digital economy policies in the WTO. That cannot be done.

Therefore, we are caught in being not fruitfully making any progress. And we should be using our time fruitfully because we are spending public money in doing all this.

I'm very much for it. Actually I'm more for it than the proponent. I want to hear the three basic processes or at least clear principles which should be used in this -- to kind of implement this wherever international Internet public policy is made. And please as present it. I am ready to sign it even without looking at it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I will refer to the U.S. after we hear the other comments.

I would just like to recall what we have been doing so far. I think there is a lot of discussion about what is in scope or is not in scope or what is relevant, not relevant, what we are doing. I don't think we should at this point revert to that discussion.

I think as the chair who proposed as a bottom line for all this is to see each text that has been proposed to us. And I think the basic test is whether -- what is contained there first will assist us in moving ahead in our objective. Will it contribute to further implementing enhanced cooperation without maybe touch on the -- would that be instrumental that the -- either in the general forum or a more specific forum, is that something that can be entertained?

And, second, is this something that is already there on paper or in Tunis or WSIS+10? If it is there exactly the same wording, maybe we don't need to lose time on that, although we recognize it's relevant.

But if we can add some -- or even to reaffirm its importance or to give some more clarity. I think it's within scope. I think we should not each and every time start discussing again whether it is relevant or not. It would be relevant to the extent we can show the link to our objective of further contributing to implementing enhanced cooperation.

And in my perspective, nothing of what has been proposed is out of scope in that regard because if you can demonstrate the link, not to leave it without any attachment.

So I would certainly encourage colleagues to look at the language before us. We are looking at pieces, not -- we are not looking at the whole package. The whole package will fit together at the end of our exercise. Let's not try to -- by examining one single issue try to address the whole picture. We are addressing different parts and see how this would fit.

And everything that will contribute to the ultimate goal to further implement is relevant. We should not be trying to put outside of the table one way or another. That's at least my view.

I have Jimson followed by Timea and Nick. Do you want to take the floor on this? Thank you.

So, Jimson, you have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair. I think both sides are quite good in the sense that encouraging all stakeholders to be on the table when important issues have been discussed.

The connection with the national, local level is really what I want to speak to. And that is that I have a similar proposal, which I think if we come together we could have a kind of intersection on that.

Because local and national part of it is very important from developing country point of view. And I think it's a good recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

India.

I'm sorry. Timea followed by India.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to come in quickly in support of the U.S. proposal as it has been in line with what we've said before. But in the interest of time, I don't want to prolong my comments. So let's go forward as you proposed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

India.

>> INDIA: Good morning, Chair. I just want to make a small comment on this particular proposal on the last part of "including at the national and local level." I think it would be much better if we confine ourselves to the international platforms on Internet policy making. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes. I think in light of the discussion we had before, we certainly -- I do not see unanimity in that regard. I don't see that notion could make it to a final report under, let's say, the consensus part of it at least.

May I then turn to the U.S. for your -- are there -- yes, Latvia. Latvia, yes. I have an observer at the end of the room. And then we move to the U.S.

Latvia, you have the floor.

>>LATVIA: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues.

I would like to support both of these recommendations and especially diverting back to the previous one, if I may.

I would like to say that this is a fairly fundamental principle. And in my view, it is a way and mechanism of implementation of enhanced cooperation process. And as very fundamental principle, it should be included in recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Netherlands, you have the floor, sir.

>>NETHERLANDS: Yes, good morning. Arnold van Rhijn, from the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs. Although as an observer, I would like to share some of my views with you, particular with respect to the proposal of the United States delegation as we have discussed.

I think the proposal the U.S. is putting on the table is somewhat different from the language of the Tunis Agenda. This one is directed to institutions and processes. We see it all around we here in

Geneva, institutions like the ITU, like WTO, like other institutions at an international level are opening up, listening to stakeholders from all different sectors. And this is a process which has started some time ago but should be strengthened and continue. I think that's the main message in this proposal.

And looking at the second part directed to the national and the local level, I can speak on behalf of the Netherlands that as a government, we are opening up our windows to the outside world, to our stakeholders on issues like public policy directed -- or linked to the Internet.

One example is last week -- very shortly, Chair. Last week we set up a digital trust center and in cooperation with our stakeholders, the private sector, the civil society. It has to do with the cyber attacks, especially this is a platform, a national platform, for SMEs, small companies, who are hit by these cyber attacks. It cost those SMEs in the Netherlands \$1 billion a year. Can you imagine? They would like to do their work but are hit by these attacks. So this platform has set up in collaboration with our ministry, with our private sector, with our civil society and the technical community to address these attacks.

So this is a very clear example that we on a national level are incorporating the views of the stakeholders in order to find a solution. That's what we call enhanced cooperation. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your intervention. I see no further requests for the floor on this. I will revert to the U.S. for your comments and then invite you to introduce your next recommendation.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, on the comment that this is similar to Tunis language, I think we had a conversation yesterday when discussing international organizations and there was the point made that, you know, if we're adding something to that conversation, that it might be appropriate. So I think we just need to have a fair approach with how we address implementation type of questions.

I also think that, as someone said, this is a broadly accepted concept. And so I worry that omission from a report can also be, you know, telling. It can be important for readers when there's a concept that is continually reinforced, reiterated, and then all of a sudden it's not there. And so I think that it makes sense to include it in the work we're doing here to make sure we're showing that we still have faith in this process.

I take the comments made from Cuba and from Indian colleagues that we had this conversation yesterday about national and local levels. I think there are conversations that should be happening on international Internet-related public policy at the national, local levels. I mean, that's where conversations start before they come there. But I take the point that enhanced cooperation is not about domestic policy. So we'll take Jimson up on his offer and work through his proposal on that cause.

And to Parminder's point, I think that clearly there are many processes that need improvement. I don't -- I think we have concerns about many. I know others have concerns. I don't think we should get into specifics on those organizations, not because they're not important. I just think that our task here is to

provide those recommendations that can be broadly adopted, signal an overarching kind of set of recommendations and then we'll have to work through those organizations.

I know that's an important -- or an imperfect model, but I think it's just within the scope of what we're doing. And with our time frame, we have to approach this with those broad concepts.

Moving on to the next proposal -- and I hope this one we've already presented in some ways and it had, I think, a lot of support, I would say consensus, but I'll present it again for comment.

"Institutions and processes should encourage the participation of developing countries, women, persons with disabilities, youth, and unaffiliated users in institutions and processes that are considering international Internet-related public policy issues." Again, this is just striking the importance of encouraging these institutions and processes to really make a concerted effort to increase the participation of stakeholders that have unfortunately been marginalized and underrepresented in some of these discussions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S.

Actually, this refers to a topic we have been discussing extensively in other parts of our discussion. Indeed, one of the high-level principles we had agreed is enhanced cooperation efforts should be inclusive. And you may recall that in my proposal trying to reflect on the whole -- the full amount of contributions coming from you, I propose that our documents should have a paragraph on the need to promote and support inclusiveness in the discussion of international Internet public policy issues. I think this is not to say there's nothing here in your recommendation. I see maybe here we -- maybe an added value of somewhat different approach would be to try to be more specific about what would be the target for inclusiveness. Some of previous recommendations refer to developing countries, some of them including least developed countries. But you also refer to developing countries, and you also refer to women, persons with disabilities, youth, and unaffiliated users in institutions and processes.

So I would suggest that the discussion should maybe focus whether we should be specific and mention what kind of groups should make sense to specify in such a document which I think there is already an agreement in principle to refer to this. So I think we do not need to discuss the need. I think at least from the chair's perspective, there is broad agreement in regard to the need to foster inclusiveness.

I think maybe at this point it should be discussing and focusing on whether we should be specific and maybe rely on some of the categories you are proposing. Maybe there are others to be proposed or whether the call should be made in a more broader format. So I open the floor for discussion.

I have Richard Hill. India, you also want to take the floor on this? Your flag is up. Yes? Okay.

Richard Hill followed by India and Switzerland.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yeah, my comments are similar to yours.

There's a famous U.S. jurist, Supreme Court judge, called, believe it or not, Learned Hand. That was his name. One of his famous citations is the difficulty in drafting legal phrases is not to draft a phrase that's consistent with what you mean, it's to draft a phrase that is inconsistent with any other meaning.

So this one taken out of context could be misunderstood that we're only encouraging the participation of those guys and not everybody else. That's easy to fix. So I would say, "Should encourage the participation of all stakeholders, including in particular." And then the question arises: Do we really want to list those out? Some of them are sensitive. I like developing countries but the current practice in the U.N. is to distinguish LDCs from developing countries. So then you also have to say "developing countries and LDCs." And in the ITU, you even have to put a footnote saying that also includes the small island states, et cetera. So we need to think a little bit about the actual drafting.

And then, for example, we're not mentioning older people of which I'm one. Do we want to or not? I agree it's perfectly appropriate to target people. But maybe we could fix that by saying, "Underrepresented groups such as," something like that. And then we're making it really clear what we intend.

So I think it's just a drafting issue. Otherwise, I do agree with you and the U.S. Chairman. This is a valuable text to go forward. Maybe not as a recommendation but in the chapeau or whatever.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. India followed by Switzerland.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just want a small clarification from my U.S. colleague on unaffiliated users, if you could kindly elaborate on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We'll revert to the U.S. for this after we hear -- are there any other -- yes, Switzerland. Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone.

I just wanted to put on the record our support to this recommendation and draw the attention to its connection to recommendations 4 and 5 presented yesterday by the U.K. And I think that some sort of merger could be made further down the road, hopefully, also with a text we circulated yesterday to the working group. So I think that this idea of full participation by everyone of a balanced representation of all stakeholder groups and also for the underlying purpose of serving the global public interest is very important. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We think the (indiscernible) is applied to here.

However, we would like to see what different status or participation for all persons with disabilities and unaffiliated users would be different from the other stakeholders. So what different area, what different playground they will be in. If the U.S. can specify how those will go in line with paragraph 35 of the different stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. So I will revert to the U.S. to comment and reflect on the points that were made. And, if there is no further will to -- or interest in discussing this, we'll move to the next recommendation. Please, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, certainly, we're open to changes to this recommendation that opens it up, makes it, you know -- that we're not trying to marginalize any other groups. We're just signaling that there needs to be support for specific groups which, again, have been underrepresented in these discussions, unfortunately. So ways to improve that we're certainly open. We just believe that the report should have something in there like this. Because it's discussed in many places. I mean, we discuss these issues at the ITU. We discuss these within the 2030 agenda conversation. And I think that they need to be relevant in discussions in international Internet-related public policy.

To my -- to the question from our Indian colleague, unaffiliated users, I don't know if this is the right word. But the concept we're trying to get to is that, when we talk about the Internet and we talk about multistakeholderism, certainly, we're all users in this room and have a voice in the conversation. But there are just users that aren't a member of a civil society group or a private sector or government that have a stake in the future of the Internet. They have a -- they should have a say in those conversations. And, frankly, they have very good recommendations and insight at times.

So I know that places like the IGF have had -- you know, have opened up conversations with -- I don't want to a "just users" but unaffiliated users, people that don't have any organization behind them. And I think that's an important concept. But, again, I don't know if that's the right word. But I think the concept should be there.

So I'm going to skip forward just because I don't want to repeat the conversation about participation. I think that, certainly, we'll have to address that. And we've had a few proposals. And, when we get there, we can kind of talk through how to do that.

But I'll skip to the -- I guess the third from last proposal. Institutions and processes should be open to strengthening and improving their existing structure and processes in order to continually improve international Internet-related public policy. Sorry. I forgot the international.

I think this goes back to a comment already made. I think there should be encouragement -- oh, I'm sorry.

It's the third from last. Yes. I don't know the word for that.

Again, this is a concept, I believe, we've discussed here. I won't say that organizations are not, but I think we should be clear that our recommendation is that this is a continuous process, that organizations and processes are continually evaluating their approach and making improvements. And it goes to the next paragraph about learning from other organizations.

But this should be a continual process. WSIS+10 talked about making further improvements. There has been some progress. But, you know, there can be continuous progress.

And so this really gets to the point and encourages these organizations to be willing to do that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. I should only remind that we have touched upon the same document discussing recommendation number 9 from the U.K. And I think we had very interesting discussion on whether this would be done from within the institution. I think this was the intent to -- or otherwise to come as kind of outside stimulation. But just to say that we have already in a way already touched upon this topic. I'll open the floor for colleagues to comment on this. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. Again, I'm okay with the thrust. I think it should be improved in two ways. First we should make it clear about which institutions and processes we're talking about, namely, those involved in Internet policy discussions. And I think we could strengthen it by not saying should be open but should do this. So I would suggest something like we recommend -- and should rephrase is a recommendation. We recommend that institutions and processes involved in Internet-related public policy discussions should strengthen and improve their existing structures and processes. Something like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think that reflects maybe adequately the kind of discussion we had before.

I see no further requests for the floor.

May I revert to -- yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Maybe, just for the record that -- I mean we would reiterate again the mandate. The mandate is not to go and check institution and processes that are now in place or would be in place. The mandate is the recommendation that would enable government. Again, we see here a discussion. I mean, discussion is not the focus of our mandate. It is to enable government to develop public policy. As we said, discussion is already having. We have the IGF. We have other foras that discuss issues related to public policy issues. The mandate here is to focus on development. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

As I said before -- and I think I should be fair to all points of view in the room, my perspective -- and, of course, it's my perspective. The plenary should, at the end of the day, say it's correct or not -- is that anything that can contribute to the ultimate objective of further implementing enhanced cooperation is valid, is in scope.

So, to the extent that what is being proposed that can be demonstrated that by doing that we are also contributing to further -- it's something we could entertain, certainly.

But I think, as in regard to other possible discussion, we must always make that link in a very clear way. Otherwise I agree with you to be completely outside of the picture.

So we must make sure that we frame everything we do within that ultimate objective we have. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

We support that all stakeholders should participate. And it's okay for us to have full participation or balanced participation. It's an absolutely normal thing, and we can agree on this easily.

However, we think that we always should stress that, according to their roles and responsibilities. Because this is the fairest statement which is that, according to the concept of a multistakeholder model, all stakeholders have their roles and responsibilities and the government has a particular role in the public policies. That's why -- well, if it's still in the concept, we need to figure it out. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I see no further requests for the floor. May I revert to the U.S. for comments and introducing your next recommendation.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, as you said, I think that enhanced cooperation is a process. You know, WSIS+10 was clear. There's been implementation. There can be more implementation of that or more progress in that. This proposal is mechanism organization agnostic. It would apply to any organization, however it's structured, related to international Internet-related public policies.

You can look at organizations like the ITU, which we just had council working groups that there were several proposals about how to improve the organization and make sure that it continues to support the needs of its members. I think that should be any organization. But I think that this working group should make sure that we're specifying the discussions on international Internet-related public policy. This is a very relevant point. The next proposal is related to that. These go together. But institutions and processes should be open to learning from other relevant institutions and adopt successful processes, including procedural and participation improvements, best practices, and lessons learned. I think many of the participants in this room go to a lot of different organizations and processes and meetings. And, certainly, some are better than the others. Some have better working methods. Some have better participation. Some -- you know, just, are put together better.

So I think that it's important as the community, you know, goes to these different meetings, that these lessons learned are, you know, recognized. And, hopefully, changes can be made to some of these organizations and to improve the whole process.

So, again, I think this goes with the previous recommendation. But I think that it would be important for us to highlight in our report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see the way you have articulated these somewhat different from the way you have already addressed this issue that is the need to ensure -- and I think this was good by all of us -- the benefits to have good information, share information. So I think the way you articulate provides some specific guidance in regard to that extent of information among institution and

processes, which I think is some -- I recognize it's really different from the angle we have been looking at it. I look for comments from colleagues.

Richard Hill followed by Cuba.

>>RICHARD HILL: Two comments. First the same kind of editorial thing in the beginning, make it clear which institutional processes we're talking about. The second, actually -- this is an area where there has been progress. Maybe we could note that somehow saying "further learn" or something like that. I'll give two examples. I notice that ICANN now is publishing a lot of stuff in 61 languages. And, conversely, we are using these captioning things and also in ITU. And I know they came from ICANN, because I'm kind of the one who suggested to ITU ICANN is doing something wonderful. Let's do it. So I think we want to capture somehow in a generic sentence that this is happening and we want to encourage more of it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Yes. After the good explanation of our friend Arnold about that this is specifically about institutions and processes, then maybe it's something that can be included. Because it's some sort -- goes beyond what is already in Tunis Agenda and WSIS+10 document. So, if that's the case, what then I would suggest is because all these paragraphs are institution and processes improvement in a way, to try to lump it. Because otherwise it into a level of detail that it's more detailed than other parts of the document.

So I would suggest this to be put, as it's been suggested, in the chapeau or in the characteristic of enhanced cooperation. Or maybe it can even be a recommendation, you know, of institution and processes improvement. That includes -- and then to list all the topics that are there. The inclusivity, the learning, the -- I don't know if you know what I mean. You know, not to have one paragraph for -- one aspect of institution and process improvement, to lump it all in one and maybe with some bullets after explaining the different institutions and processes. Improve it in the context -- I think this is very important in the chapeau -- in the context of public policy, international Internet-related public policy development. And, if we put it like that, then it makes sense, as you say, to relate with our mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your suggestion. I think it's very helpful.

Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

So this is just to say that I fully support this and that it would really be categorized in the area of improvement. Really need this improvement. So it's a very valid submission. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I then revert to the U.S. for your comments and then introducing your last recommendation.

>>UNITED STATES: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the comments. Sounds like there would be support for some recommendations related to these procedural. I'm open to a conversation about combining, consolidating, you know, structuring. And I think we'll get there. But I think it's good that the concept is accepted.

The last U.S. proposal relates to the IGF. I'll just read it. "As appropriate, the participation of all stakeholders should be welcome at the annual Internet Governance Forum, the national and regional IGF initiatives, and other bottom-up multistakeholder fora at the international, regional, and national and local levels."

Since we've had this conversation, I think at the end we can see if that's appropriate to include in this.

But I think the concept -- we talked about yesterday about these multistakeholder organizations have a role in the conversation on Internet-related public policy. And it would be important for this group to, you know, speak to the participation of those. And we welcome the participation of all stakeholders at those fora. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have Marilyn Cade followed by Richard Hill. And Switzerland.

>>MARILYN CADE: Good morning, colleagues.

I took the floor to speak particularly about this particular recommendation, which I hope we will be able to include in some way.

But I wanted to make an informational point because there are others in the room who also may be able to comment on this.

I serve as the chief catalyst to the IGF USA having worked with others to found it in 2009. It continues now as one of 97 national, subregional, and regional IGFs. And the -- many of the IGF, the national initiatives are supported by people who are in this room today and are very familiar with the agenda and the programs. The programs are all developed in a bottom-up consensus way. And many of them focus specifically on national public policy issues. But many of them also take up international public policy discussions and examine how those policy issues affect the stakeholders who are participating in that NRI. I know there's several others here who are very actively involved in their national IGF.

And my point in saying this is just to show an example that, at the national level, discussions that are about the implications of international Internet public policy are going on right now and are continuing to grow.

In 2015, there were 57 national and regional IGFs. And there are now 97. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry to disappoint lots of people. But I have to remind everybody that the IGF is a separate and distinct process from enhanced cooperation. And we're here to talk about enhanced cooperation. So I cannot accept any recommendations regarding IGF. I don't have a problem putting it

in as a factual statement somewhere. So, Chairman, if you can find a way to do that, I'm not going to complain. But we're not here to make recommendations about the IGF nor to make plugs for it. So, Chairman, perhaps we could move forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

I think we have the understanding and the General Assembly has been consistently stating this. Those are two distinct process, although they should work in a mutually supportive way. So I think to the extent we can demonstrate that we can make a reference to the IGF, that in line with that assertion of the General Assembly that by doing this we are seeking to ensure that they work cooperatively and mutually inclusive way, I think that might be relevant. So I think we need to work around, as we said, the language to find the appropriate way to refer to that.

I see Marilyn request for the floor. I have on my list -- I will give the floor again. I have Switzerland followed by Peru, Cuba, and then I revert to you.

Just for time management purpose to suggest that today I was intending to provide you a coffee break. We can skip it if you prefer, of course. So maybe it would be the right time now to do it or we can try to finalize these and then we can have a short ten-minute coffee break. That might -- let's make -- maybe try to finalize this in eight minutes and then we can have a quick coffee break after that. So I would encourage all of you to be as succinct as possible to the extent it's possible.

I have Switzerland, Peru. I have then Cuba, Marilyn Cade, Saudi Arabia. Let's see. If we get by 11:30 without finalizing, then I'll revert to that.

Switzerland, please.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And I would like to take this opportunity to support this recommendation. And in this spirit that both enhanced cooperation and the global IGF and, of course, national, regional IGFs and similar experiences, processes, fora are venues that reinforce each other that are mutually supportive, as is mentioned somewhere in the Tunis Agenda. So I think it's on spot to have this recommendation here.

I think that dialogue and exchange in a multistakeholder fashion as being done in those fora is really a precondition or is a very important element for enhanced cooperation in other organizations where there might be a more decision-making modus of working.

And I think would -- with the indulgence of all the members and participants and of the chair, of course, I would like to use this opportunity to, of course, invite you all very kindly to participate actively in this year's global IGF which is taking place here in Geneva this December and draw your attention to the flyer we've put at the table at the front of this room. So thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention and also for the invitation to attend this year's IGF in Geneva.

Peru is next on my list followed by Cuba, Marilyn Cade, and Saudi Arabia.

Peru.

>>PERU: I would like to support this recommendation and particularly the comments made by Marilyn. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I as member of MAG, of course, recognize the importance of the IGF and their own objective of policy dialogue. And it is complementary to the process of actual policy development. But I think that this paragraph in a way should reflect that because as it is, it's like the sky is blue because they are saying that all stakeholders should be welcomed at the annual Internet Governance Forum. That's already happening.

So I think if we want to mention here the global IGF and the regional IGF, we should put some substance, something like maybe in the introduction, "We recognize the complementary between" -- or "the synergy between the other process, IGF, and the public policy because it's a policy dialogue open to all stakeholders," to put it in something like that. Because like this, it's like saying, okay, the sky is blue because, I don't know, is there some -- in the Internet Governance Forum all stakeholders now are not welcome. Yeah, they are all welcome. Maybe in some national and regional are not welcome; but, well, that will be the internal affair of some state in that case is out of our purview.

So I don't know if you understand what I say. That if we're going to mention that other process, that the General Assembly has recognized is a different process from this one, to put it in context, to put this, this is a different process, has this complementary thing. Because like that, it really doesn't says anything. This doesn't give anything.

And on the other side, I insist. We tried to have this document as much concise and to the point as -- this could be a welcome thing. But, please, try to be concise and to the point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan.

And I think the points I made and others that we need -- if we accept -- we have to put in the proper context with the necessary links.

May I just make sure I have all those who have not intervened before I revert to Marilyn Cade. I have Saudi Arabia and Japan in that order.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Just to be short, we have a section on IGF in the 70/125. And we have a section on IGF in the Tunis Agenda. And we have a mandate which guides our work, which is on enhanced cooperation. So we need to stick to the mandate.

I mean, what new language this would bring to the work that we have now? I certainly agree in Tunis Agenda and the UNGA resolution of their view of that. And we have our working group on improvement. We should focus on the mandate, as we said before. Paragraph 69 is the core mandate of enhanced cooperation. Why we jump into IGF, and why we jump into institution and processes? Let's stick to 69. Otherwise, I'm not sure how the report will look like dealing with issues that is not relevant to the core mandate. We should (indiscernible) to UNGA. We do it with everything except the core mandate UNGA give us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Japan followed by Marilyn Cade.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan support this proposal because Japan think that multilateral -- multistakeholder approach is very important, and we agree with that approach. So Japan supports this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade. Thank you for the opportunity to make a perhaps more explanatory but very brief comment.

I think it is -- the Internet Governance Forum is established by the Tunis Agenda and is a project of the United Nations Secretary-General. The national and regional and subregional IGFs are autonomous activities that are developed within each country or subregion or region. And they develop their own agenda and many of them actually make policy recommendations that then they submit to government and to other entities.

And as I said, there are many people here in this room who are directly involved in a national or subregional or regional IGF. I think it's helpful for us to just make that clear for people who are not presently engaging in one of those initiatives.

They are complementary, but the topics that are discussed may include enhanced cooperation. And I am happy to talk individually with any of you if you are not particularly familiar with your own IGF. I know many of you are. And I will distribute a handout this afternoon just listing the 46 that have taken place this year. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. I have a number of interventions. May I just comment?

I think there might be some lack of knowledge, but I think basically it's not lack of understanding of what is being done by IGF and national IGFs. I think it's rather an understanding that -- and divergence of views whether this would fit or not in our work. So I think the important thing here is to try to develop some language that would demonstrate the link to making such recommendation to the ultimate objective we have here in this present exercise.

I think it's more -- and we have been hearing divergent views. We certainly need to refer to that in revised languages, trying to address the concerns that were expressed.

I have a number of delegations who have requested the floor, starting with Kenya, Mexico, and Russian Federation.

Kenya, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll be very brief just to support the discussion on this recommendation and just make an observation that, indeed, we really need to -- as much as we need to be broad enough, but we also need to focus on the core mandate that we have and also to the key paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda that we are -- that gives us that mandate that are in my view, 69 to 70 and part of 68.

And, also, just to note that from the recommendations that are on the screen, in my understanding, it would be very okay to make recommendations on what should be done and avoid what should not be done because it will be a repetition or a contradiction of (indiscernible).

I'm saying this with particular deference to one of the recommendations that we talked about in not erecting barriers. When -- just above it we are saying "encourage participation of all stakeholders." So those kind of formulations I think we need to take care of. That would bring some contradictions that may be unnecessary. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya, for your comments.

I'd just like to draw your attention that we have not addressed that particular recommendation and the recommendation that follows. One thing should not erect barriers and that will avoid promoting the role. I think it was -- the U.S. indicated we will not touch upon this. We are not discussing this. So it's not under our consideration here. Maybe even for the reasons you have mentioned, I don't know.

But let's then -- again I come back to my list and wishfully we can conclude and allow us some time for coffee break.

Mexico, you have the floor followed by Russian Federation. Then I revert to the U.S. for your final comments.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Just to express support of Mexico to this paragraph. We think it's important to have -- to include the importance of the multistakeholder approach. As you know, and everybody in this room knows, Mexico has supported the IGF.

And as far as we see this idea, the big challenge for this group will be to find a way to express how these different bodies and mechanisms are making contributions to this enhanced cooperation.

I don't think it's a good idea to put aside or to choose which bodies or which mechanisms we like or which ones we don't like. The challenge is to find a way to put all of them together and try to identify the way every mechanism can contribute to the goal we are trying to reach in this group.

So I will say it's not a good idea to start choosing which one we like and which one we don't like. I think there is a lot of work done so far, and we should be able to rescue the best from each mechanism or body and try to make a contribution to that end. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Mexico.

I fully concur with you. We should take an approach that is comprehensive. But just to indicate that we are not generally referring to particular institutions or organizations in any other paragraphs. We are referring to recommendations in a general form.

I think there might be a reason to refer specifically to IGF, as I have said before, to the extent we can demonstrate the link to the work we have been doing. But, generally, we are not making reference to the specific bodies and organizations elsewhere.

So IGF deserves maybe a special treatment because the General Assembly itself puts both IGF and enhanced cooperation in one single paragraph. So maybe we can -- as Juan has said, to look into the language that is there to make it consistent and then try to come up with some way to refer to it in a constructive way.

Russian Federation followed by U.S.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, I would like to say that Marilyn raised a very important point regarding national IGFs. It's a really important thing because actually the value of the national policy making is growing because of the development of the national segment of Internet and is becoming the basement for digital economy. And a lot of things are developed on the national level on the content and application of things like netizen and eGovernance, eCommerce, a lot of stuff.

However -- sorry. And we have eight Russian IGFs already, and it's a pity that Marilyn didn't come to us. We really hope that she will be able to come --

>>MARILYN CADE: Next year.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: -- in the future to Moscow because we've got an amazing event, really.

However, all these developments of the public policy on the national level actually without the harmonization and efficient coordination on the international level really create the risk of fragmentation. And we should understand this and the value of this particular group to address the point on the international public policy issues.

That's why, you know, we, of course, need to take respect to national and regional level. But we also should address international level of the public policy. This is first actually.

Then when it comes to the particular paragraph on here, we need to say that our chair is almost right. He said that it should be put in the proper content. And we need to remind our proposal which we made in May and also in January when we say that we can consider different levels and one level is intergovernmental and another level is multistakeholder level.

And IGF is clearly the part of this multistakeholder level. And we think if we put it in our report in the proper content, we can see the consensus regarding this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just quickly to comments by our Kenya colleague, we didn't get to the barriers-to-entry proposal not because we don't think it's important, it clearly is, just because we had a conversation about participation and then welcoming all stakeholders. I think that it could be important to include a welcoming of all stakeholders supporting the participation of all stakeholders and specifically highlighting the need to lower barrier to entries, if they exist, and not creating new barriers to entry. It's the same concept, but I think we can address it if we're getting to a conversation about participation. So didn't want to take too much of our time on that point.

But on this last recommendation, certainly we thank everybody for the support and the feedback. We were remiss when we introduced this paragraph not to thank Mexico who was the generous host of the IGF last year and we certainly appreciate that. And we look forward to the IGF this December in Switzerland.

We agree that we shouldn't be picking institutions and processes to specifically call out in this. I think that our proposal should be broad, they should be far-reaching. And for the most part, that's what we try to do.

The IGF is a specific case, because this has always been so connected to the enhanced cooperation process by the General Assembly and others. And I do believe it deserves some special attention within this report.

But, as Marilyn indicated, it is a difference from the NRIs and other multistakeholder processes that are from the ground up. They weren't agreed at WSIS, per se. They've come along since and from the ground up.

With that said, we think this group would be remiss, however, if we didn't acknowledge these processes. This global movement for a lot of regions around the world, a lot of countries have created a similar model so they can discuss both national public policies relating to the Internet. And, as Marilyn said, there's certainly a conversation about international Internet-related public policy. And I think that should be highlighted somewhere in this paper.

With that said, there's great feedback. I think there's better experts in the room that are very intimately involved in this. And so, if it's okay with the Chair, we'd like to work with Marilyn, experts from Peru and Mexico, Cuba, who have been involved in this process and try to perhaps come back with some updated language that really captures some of the feedback that we've received. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. As I indicated before, I was planning to go for a small coffee break. In the light of the time, I'm not too sure that we have time for that. Should we skip it again or do you really need 10 minutes for a break? I see a few people nodding. So let's make a very quick break. 10 minutes, not 15 minutes. And we'll get back to 10 to 12: 00.

[Coffee break.]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd like to resume our work. I'd like colleagues to take their seats.

I'd like to propose that we resume our work.

Just like the United States has done in regard to proposals that were submitted to our last meeting and that could not be duly examined at that time, I'd like to offer the opportunity for anyone who has made a contribution in a previous round that was not duly considered and the substance or content of which has not been addressed in the course of those two days of discussions.

And I would like to repeat my assessments that, upon discussing the last two days, the recommendations that were proposed for this meeting, we have, indeed, I think, touched upon maybe the main aspects that were addressed in previous recommendations in previous rounds of our work. So I wouldn't expect too many new points to be brought up.

But I'd like to offer then the opportunity for those who have made presentations in previous rounds to, if they wish, to come forward at this point in time. That would be the time appropriate for that. And immediately after that I would turn to those who have made proposals to this meeting and that, on the basis of discussions we have had, had some revised text they'd like to submit for consideration of plenary.

So, first of all, are there any -- from the part of anyone who has made recommendation in previous round an interest in resurfacing and engaging just particular discussion on any of those? I see none. Thank you for that.

So with this I think now we will revisit proposals that were brought forward to this meeting and that we discussed and that are now presented in a revised fora -- in a form that would lead to a degree of support.

I would, first of all, give the floor to Nick Ashton-Hart for your presentation.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you, Chair. The main focus of the proposal is probably obvious now from the shortened version. As I said earlier, it seems to me --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just a minute. Can we have the text uploaded so we can see it on the screen, the latest version, the one you will be referring to. Is that the right version? Yes, that's it. Thank you.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: The basic point being one I think that we all agree to -- I think it's certainly clear in WSIS that it's an objective of WSIS -- that having one interoperable, standards-based, ubiquitously available Internet is an overarching need in a modern world. And part of that is dealing with issues of content in a way that's sophisticated enough that the network's ability to perform other functions outside of the issues related to specific content is not compromised.

And on one level, I think this is probably to us an obvious point. But it's increasingly clear that in the wider world, there is lack of technical knowledge about how the Internet works. Famously, a lot of

people think Google is the Internet because what they do is search or email, or Facebook. Of course, those are applications that leverage the Internet as a communications medium. They are not the Internet itself.

And so the objective here is to find some way of formulating -- this is somewhat of a negative formulation to not do something, but it could be a positive formulation -- to make sure clear that the objective outcome of public policy making should be to ensure that the exceptions that states have a legitimate interest in altering, preventing, are not implemented in a way that prevents the Internet from serving its normal functions of facilitating interconnection between any two points.

And I deliberately worded this to make clear that the objective is not content related at all. It's simply in allowing two points on the network to technically connect to each other as the Internet protocol does natively if it's not interfered with. And so that is really the main point that I'm trying to get across.

And, from a technical standpoint, it seems to me a goal that every policy making effort related to dealing with questions of content should keep in mind so that the unanticipated consequences of public policy choices are limited and not made worse.

And I think that's enough, Chair. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Nick, for introducing the revised proposal.

I'd like to also to refer to the issue that you tried to address in your proposal. When I looked into all the inputs for this meeting and I was preparing -- trying to prepare something I could provide to you in a more consolidated way -- and that was through my proposal, the outline document you discussed in the first meeting -- I identified the -- what I thought would be a general willingness to recognize the need to maintain and grow a global Internet. I think that's the way I tried to phrase it. I know it doesn't address exactly the -- your proposal puts that same topic in much more detail.

My assessment is that, by making reference to the purpose of maintaining and growing a global Internet would be addressing the issue in a more general way that might be acceptable to colleagues. But then, on the basis of your revised proposal, I'd like to see comments from colleagues.

I have on my list -- Cuba. You had raised your flag first -- followed by Richard Hill and Saudi Arabia.

Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm sorry to say this. But I think this paragraph, really, is very problematic. Because, in essence, this paragraph -- okay. What we're doing here, let me in explanation - - have to do with the process -- regardless what you think about enhanced cooperation is the process of the creation or the development of international public policies pertaining to the Internet.

Here we are projecting or we're setting guidelines for the result of that process, for the policies themselves.

So it's like saying the policies that comes out that will come out should do this and should do that.

I don't know if that is part of our mandate. But I would not recommend to go that way because it's beyond what we're doing here right now.

Because this is about even something that we have not agreed yet. It's about the result of that process, the policies that will come out that should not do that. In general, I could agree on that. But then maybe we can say that policies that will come out how they have to take care of -- I don't know -- about the gender equality or whatever or I don't know, privacy. If we go that road, it opens a big universe.

I don't say that it's not important. Eventually, maybe the new mechanism, if it's something they created or whatever, or this new perfection improvement in institution and processes, will have to deal with that. But definitely not us. We should not prejudge the policies. We're discussing the process of how those policies will be created. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard Hill followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I made a similar comment previously. I don't think we're here to make actual policies but to recommend how policies should be made, which is a different thing.

That probably could be fixed by editing, as I also suggested at the previous proposal.

So the big problems I have with this one is that -- I'm sorry, Nick. I just do not understand what the possible implications are of this. So I couldn't support it, because I don't understand it. And also I think that it would be better to phrase it differently.

I don't know how many are following on the list. Constance proposed something. And then I proposed something else, which, basically, I copy/pasted from agreed ISOC text. So that has the advantage already that a large number of people have looked at it and think they understand it.

But then Justin proposed something which I thought was even much better. Because he turned it around positively. So, instead of saying something negative, we can say something positive. I think, if we want to go down this road at all, I suggest we take Justin's text. Maybe it's a U.S. text. I'm saying Justin, because it came from you the mailing list. But whether it's Justin or U.S. doesn't really matter. And we can work on that one, if we're going to go down this path at all

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Saudi Arabia and Marilyn Cade.

Just a comment that there are two ways we can see that kind of recommendation. We can see it, as one has said, maybe putting some conditions on the policy process, trying to guide the policy process. But we can see it as something that should be the basis or part of the agreed, let's say, background for us. We agreed that an agreed background is the Tunis Agenda or all the agreed text. And I do not have all the particular paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda or WSIS outcome documents in general, but Tunis Agenda in particular or WSIS+10. But maybe there's some language there that referred to that need to maintain global Internet. And, again, to the extent we can demonstrate or can argue that to do this is consistent with our aim to further implement enhanced cooperation, I think that might be a way to fit it into our report.

So I think it's more a way to see how this has been addressed before and how that could fit in the proper context we are working in.

Yes. Cuba, you have follow-up. Yes.

>>CUBA: No, Chairman. First I want to --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Is that a follow-up question or --

>>CUBA: Yeah, follow-up question. I want to ask you to clarify if we're going in this path of putting constraint or prejudging the result of the policy. Because, in that case, then our delegation will have to prepare more conditions. Because it's not only that the network to be negatively impacted. We can say there can be negative impact of access to information --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Juan, please.

>>CUBA: You know what I mean. First I want to know if we're going that way. Because, if we're going that way, then a big list of conditions will have to be prepared. Because there are many aspects of Internet that could be affected with the result of enhanced cooperation. And then not only this. Privacy. Many countries have put that -- privacy and --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please. I gave you the floor, but I -- out of respect.

>>CUBA: My complete question is are we going that way or not?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: This question does not deserve an answer right now. I said there are two ways of looking at the issue. I would say that the right way to look at the issue would that be some kind of background under general condition which we operate. We are collecting ideas to see if we can get to some text that would reflect this and put it in appropriate context. So I think it's not fair to -- at this point to prejudge what would be the outcome. To the extent we can demonstrate there is a reason to include it in a proper context, I think that would be done. Otherwise, I -- maybe to answer you more directly, I don't think it's upon us to establish any kind of precondition to policy making. I think we can indicate what are the parameters, what are the agreed, let's say, background or scenario in which that takes place. But in that, I certainly agree. I have a number of speakers, Saudi Arabia, followed by Marilyn Cade, European Union, Parminder. So Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. And we thank Nick for revising his recommendation. Reading this and going back to the references he made to paragraphs 47, 45, 42 and 30, I mean, we're trying to summarize agreed text in a way that I'm not sure how it is linked to our mandate, speaking about networks and platforms. I mean, we didn't understand how this can be a recommendation and how it's going to be used in this time. We're not trying to develop a policy now. And we have an agreed text which is more clear in the Tunis Agenda and in the UNGA resolution to the point accepted by everyone negotiated. So, if there is a need to capture other elements of network security and those issues, data protection and privacy, we have an agreed text. We can go and take it as it is. Not just combining ideas.

And we pick the ideas we like and leave the other we don't like. So we should seek for a balanced text in this matter. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

Marilyn Cade speaking.

I'm going to make a concrete proposal that the -- that Nick, Constance, Richard and the U.S. perhaps work at lunchtime to consolidate into just a couple of sentences. And I just want make a comment, as somebody who comes from a technical background at a fairly significant set of experience in the history of the Internet and high-speed communications and computing processing. I think, if we can establish just a short statement about the importance of the network as a platform for communications generally and its ability to operate efficiently at a technical level without prejudging who does it or putting restrictions on the future work that -- but just making a factual statement and using the joint brain power of the people who have been talking about this -- Constance, Richard, Justin, Nick -- and perhaps they could come back to us -- and the U.S. -- they could come back to us with a couple of sentences after lunch. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Chair. We would like also to support the basic spirit of this recommendation. I think it would be nice to have, as Marilyn just proposed, a merger or at least a redirection to the most positive aspect of this proposal, which would support probably at the level of a guiding principle, not as a recommendation process. So maybe I don't know if this can be put back on the guiding principles. We find it is important to support an open and accessible Internet. I think this recommendation is on the core of this direction. I believe, as I said again, that it would be part of our proposal. I don't know where exactly we could put it. But maybe a better formulation. And on the positive side, as I said, I can recognize (indiscernible) as a threat and a guidance to where the cooperation should go to should be included in our report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your comments. Let me turn now to Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

I would like the chair to take a decision at this point on -- and I know Chair is likely to stop me from talking on this subject. But what kind of issues and what are we discussing? There is, in my view, a set of mechanisms of public policy making which is a core set. Then there is a set of characteristics of those mechanisms which are transparency, et cetera, et cetera, which we had problem with in general terms. But We went long and discussed it and fine. Then there is a general outer set of the outcomes of that decision.

If we're not going to take any decision and everything is okay, there are hundreds of things. Richard states 40 pages contain very important issues. I want each of them to be put up there and discussed in

the same spirit. I don't know how this has been done that some proposals change one line and they are coming up. And the test of relevance is completely abandoned.

This is an issue about what kind of policies will get made. It's about -- I mean, of course, as Cuba said, my idea is that the central issue is that everybody should make policies and should ensure the economic ownership of data is not denied to the individual. I think that's the single-most important issue in data economy. Now, should we put that up there? Should we get into those lines? I want -- of course, Richard has been humble to withdraw discussion on his 10 or 15 proposals. All of them are very, very important policy outcome issues. So with what purpose has this issue been discussed so many times is not clear to me. And I'm completely against going on to this kind of a discussion.

Secondly, very quickly, nobody ever gives any unknown policy forum a negative instruction to say you could be stupid, don't make a policy that screws up Internet. I think it's very disrespectful to call up a policy body to say, Never make a policy to screw up the Internet. What do you think of them? Like, are they stupid to make policies to screw up the Internet? Nobody ever makes these kind of negative statements to a policy forum. It would have been different to say that -- encourage them to make policies which enhance the network as a platform, communication generally. Again, those statements really don't mean anything.

When it says it's ability to operate efficiently or as a platform for communication, does data regulation negatively impact the network as a platform of communication? I don't know. Data regulation is a very big issue. So there's nothing about this proposal which merits the time we are giving it. And that's my view about it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

I should say we are -- I think upon allowing some time for discussion on this, I think, first of all -- I think this is a point that as I see it from the perspective of many participants, particularly from the technical communities, one thing that in their view is very important for further implementation of enhanced cooperation to take place that this would be considered.

I think there is an issue that should be discussed whether that fits. I think you are right about the test of relevance in regard to whether this is a recommendation or not. I would tend to say -- I'm maybe jumping a little bit on the discussion, that it's not -- it should not be drafted as a recommendation as such. I refer to the language I proposed previously in my outline -- project of outline report in which I said "reflecting discussions we had before." That was not my thinking. I was reflecting on the views I had from you. I proposed to say the group consider the following elements should provide the background for efforts aiming at further implementing enhanced cooperation as envisaged by Tunis Agenda. And then there was a number of elements we considered when discussing high-level principles, such flexible and adaptable formats, results-driven efforts. Those are things we should not draft as recommendations. They would not be recommendations. That effort should be flexible, adaptable or recognize the sovereign rights of states. We don't need to frame it as recommendations.

And I put more or less on that same level the recognition of the important restraint on the rule of law and to aim at maintaining, growing a global Internet, which in a way I think addresses that concern. So I think we are now in a drafting mode. We are collecting views that will assist us in a later stage to put everything in a consolidated form.

I would agree this is important to have as part of the background and under which we are operating. But in the light of many objections and -- not objections but, let's say, reflections that were made here, I would caution against making recommendations in such a way that could be interpreted as putting conditions on the public policy outcomes.

But this is just to explain what -- I think it's not out of scope of the whole exercise, but we are trying to see how that would fit. And in my view at least, we could -- it's important to make a reference to it. I refer, for example, to what was said by Marilyn Cade. And I think the call that we should maybe put -- people could get together towards preparing some language that would address this issue in a factual way to reflect the importance of it but without putting it in a way that would be seen as providing, let's say, guidance or conditioning the actions to be taken in that regard. I hope that can help to move us forward in that.

Anyway, I think everything we are having -- we are discussing and say this will have -- again to converge to one unified text in regard to the report. As I said from day one, the approach I'm taking to the discussion we have is to collect views in regard to preparation of a final report to see how things would fit, in what part as background information, as recommendation, as areas that document discussions. I think this has been very useful in that regard. So we should not think that everything that has been discussed here will be drafted as a final recommendation. I think those elements should go into the report maybe in its proper context, in its own importance.

Should I revert to Nick? Yes. Ah, yes, I will give the floor to Mr. Ngnoulaye. You have the floor, sir.

>> JANVIER NNGOULAYE: Thank you, Chair. I will support this recommendation if the author rephrase it because the word "platform" can mean many things. And keeping the recommendation like this, I think it can have confusion. I think they are talking -- or write it to make it clear.

My understanding is that the strength of this recommendation has been carried into one of the U.S. recommendation. We work on it before. Unless the author clarify the word "platform." So this is my point.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any further views or comments or requests of clarification before I refer to Nick? I see none.

So, Nick, you have the floor.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much and to the colleagues who have commented rather than address each individually. I certainly think it is possible to incorporate this as you, Chair, have suggested and as the European Union has alluded to. There's nothing magical about the word "platform" or any

other particular word. It's the sense of this that is important. And I'm happy to incorporate it in any way that would be generally acceptable.

I would say to the suggestion by our colleague from Saudi Arabia that I think if we seek only to refer in block to agreed text of previous documents, we won't have much of a report. It certainly would not add any real value. So I think we have to expect that we will have to look at ideas, and some of them will be able to reflect exactly previous text. Some of them will have to reflect some new text or we will simply be involved in a very tiresome cutting-and-pasting exercise.

But that said, I'm perfectly happy to work on how this is presented and presenting it as a positive rather than a negative. And the suggestion to get together with a few interested parties is a good one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would certainly encourage you to partner with all the interested parties who have intervened and if a revised version could be sent to the secretariat as soon as possible. I think this also applies to all those who have made recommendations that were further revised here at this point. I think we should look -- we'll discuss it further when we come to the preparation of our last stages of work. But I'd like to take this opportunity to encourage you and all others to make sure you have from your perspective the state-of-the-art language you'd like to propose and send it to the secretariat to assist us in the following stages of our work along the lines I want to propose and discuss with you in the afternoon.

So with this, may I then invite Jimson to introduce his revised prior recommendations on the basis of discussions we have had on his original proposals? Jimson. And you maybe take one by one so we can have a focused discussion.

Excuse me, just before giving the floor, I have I think two points of order. I have Peru and Parminder. Peru.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Just a small thing, that should we just go to the points where substantive change has been made and just discuss them rather than going through the whole proposal?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Very good. I think that's a very good proposal.

Peru, did you want to intervene?

>>PERU: Yes. We made a proposal yesterday, and I would like to see that proposal this morning, if possible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, that's right. I recall in the course of discussion we asked Peru to prepare -- come forward with a text. This has not gone through even first reading. So you will have opportunity to do this certainly.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, I'm a little confused. How many times are we going to go through recommendations? Then do we get now another version of the U.K. recommendations? I thought that the algorithm was that we would go through them once, the authors would take this on board, and then they would work with you to see some future version of this, not that we keep recycling in this meeting.

And, yes, I agree with Peru. I would rather see new ones first and then come back to ones we've already discussed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I anticipate this yesterday, and I tried to convey my understanding at least that it might be useful for us all to the extent we had very recent discussions on some thoughts to have very focused -- and I fully agree with what Parminder said. Maybe we don't need new discussion, maybe just look at the changes that were made and to test very rapidly whether these would satisfy the comments. Otherwise, I think that will be helpful from the perspective of having -- coming to the endgame of our work.

Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, but then could we see a red-marked version? So maybe then we could take Peru. And in the meantime, we produce a red-marked version of this one and then we look at the red-marked version of this one. But you have to sort of cut off because then U.K. has every legitimate right to come back.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, red-marked version.

>>RICHARD HILL: And U.S. has every legitimate -- and you want me to come back with a red-marked version? It's ready. I have it. I have it. I can give another 50 pages, Chairman? Is that the intent?

Honestly, I think you should have a cut-off and say, okay, fine, people can produce a red-marked version but we're not going to discuss them here because, otherwise, we're never going to end.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, I'm trying to make the best use of our time. I offered the opportunity for all those who would have new proposals to come forward and present it. We have discussed a few proposals come from the U.S. But then no one else came forward with that kind of new proposal.

So I think in the light of the fact that we do not have a consolidated text, which I think I was expecting at this stage to be able -- but I think in the light of the discussion we had, we are not yet in that stage. I intend to discuss it in the afternoon how I intend to move about.

I think the way to make the best use of our time would be, in my assessment, to allow those who have their proposal discussed in the context of the meeting to come forward. We did that in regard to Nick just a few minutes ago.

And you are right, I intend to allow the same opportunity. So I intend to offer Jimson, the U.K., Timea, and the joint proposal by Russia, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia and Parminder, if they wish, just to test with the group whether their modifications were taken on board.

And, of course, we have this new proposal coming from Milagros. At the time I asked if there were any new proposals, I didn't yet get their reaction. If you can agree, we can either take Jimson's first and then I revert directly to Milagros or the other way around.

I suggest that we can hear Jimson's very focused indication of what modifications were made so we can have a very quick round of discussion just to check whether this addresses the concern that were made.

I think that might lead us to some early harvest, which is something I'm very cautious to say because in regard to Peter's discussion, sometimes it's very difficult. But let's make a try.

Jimson, can I -- you have the floor, please, to proceed.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair. Distinguished colleagues, I would like to really thank you very much for the opportunity. Let me say that maybe this should not be called Jimson's proposal anymore because we've had a lot of input with some colleagues.

And if I may start from 1, quite substantive changes in the language for all of them. So I will quickly go through the first one, that "governments are invited "-- in fact, the keyword here are "invited." This is a change -- "to increase their active and sustained participation on an equal footing in existing fora on the subject of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." Before I had "matters," "public policy matters pertaining to the Internet." It's now "issues" which is in line of the text of the mandate given to us.

So that is the change here. I "invited" and then recognize "international" and then "issues." I don't know if I stop here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any view in that regard? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Chair. I mean, do you want us to repeat our previous comment? Because we have the same comment.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, no, no. I just wanted to have that reaction from you, whether this new language -- if you do not change --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Nothing changed. We speak about participation here. We speak about development. So it's totally different recommendation from the mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you. I see no further -- I think that's the kind of very quick reaction I'd like to have in regard to those revised versions.

Can I invite you to move to Recommendation 2?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Sorry. Recommendation 2, that "on needs basis, e.g.," brackets around, e.g., "specific issue basis, government, business, civil society, technical and academic community should evolve and engage on processes of inclusive cooperation on diverse international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." The change here is regard to "international" and "issues." So I had

previously "matters." That's the change here. Thank you. And, of course, it's specific issue basis, focused on a specific issue basis.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I think -- I mean, anybody objected to "matters" and was in agreement with "issues," I would like to meet that person. I mean, was it an issue that "matters" and "issues" are different? If that's a main change, I don't see any change in it. And my objection stands that it was -- I have a strong objection to it. So I'm repeating it. This is a very -- I use the word nearly new model of policy making that spontaneously governance systems would form around an issue and dissolve after it's been solved. It doesn't happen. That's not how political organizations of societies have taken place, neither in our countries nor outside. That just means the most powerful guy is able to gather people around the person or the institution and do what he or she likes and give it a cover of legitimacy of being a governance mechanism.

This is absolutely -- absolutely new political conception floated around in this world now. The World Economic Forum does it now, for instance. And any kind of that language is not acceptable. And, of course, it also says in a sense that since it's on needs basis, no standing mechanism is needed. So in any case, it's completely non-negotiable and non-acceptable. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I recall that in previous rounds we discussed that might be room for that kind of, let's say, coordination in support for the policy development that would take place, not as a replacement. I think that's maybe a fair representation of some interventions that were made in that regard. So I would tend to think that the notion here of different stakeholders coming together in relation to some issues pertaining to international public management might, for the extent we can frame it in the context that that could be relevant or be of assistance in the context of a process of enhanced cooperation, not in replacement, that might do so. At this point we are not approving or objecting language. I'm collecting views on new language that is proposed. I think it's very useful to have those reactions.

If there are no further comments, may I request Jimson to introduce your third revised recommendation.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair.

And also to echo your comment that, actually, this is without disregard to any other recommendation I would make that still recognizes the need to have the enhanced cooperation within the existing framework or within some new framework.

Number 3: That all governments and all stakeholders are invited -- change again is "are invited" -- to increase awareness of diverse international public policy issues related to the Internet especially in developing or least developed nations through existing intergovernmental and international fora."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Could you maybe refer what were the issues or what is the revised language part of this in the concern that was raised before?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you. The change is in the use of "are invited."

And then "international" and also "issues." So those are three key changes there.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, Saudi Arabia.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Sorry, Chair. But I should observe that these changes are very small for us to keep on going through again and again. So many changes are invited, and then we spend some groups another half an hour to talk about it. It's not going to work in this manner, the huge number of proposals people have put in this.

The substantive changes have to be about the objections that were actually made. For example, there were objections made on the second, same as I did now.

If it addresses that objection, even in some kind of a plausible manner, whether the objective that agrees to it or not is called a substantive change. If there are just grammar changes are invited to national or international, that's not the main reason for the objections to those things. The main objections are tried to be attempted. We should put that on the screen and not these small changes. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia followed by Richard Hill.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I totally support the views was raised by Parminder. The issue is not "invite" or "matters."

You have a bigger issue with this recommendation. We've changed it so many times. So, if the next revisions are the same, we shouldn't waste time on considering them again. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I support those two comments, Chair. I would invite you to invite the proponent to show us either substantive changes or refrain. Otherwise, I'll be happy to send you the red marked version of my 40-page paper. And we can spend all the rest of the time at the meeting going through the editorial corrections that I've made. No, honestly, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor.

Can I then turn to Jimson for introduction of recommendation revised 4.

Bear in mind that I'm doing this in recognition, I think, of the work that was invested as requested by us. I think we should look at each paragraph and have an assessment whether this addresses or not the concerns that were expressed. I think it's good feedback for -- not only for Jimson and the group he worked with but for all of us or for me, for the secretariat, anyone that would have been involved in further stages or in the further steps of our work.

European Union, you want to intervene on that? Yes, please.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Just an observation. I think maybe to be fair also to Jimson's proposal --

(Speaker off microphone)

Wrong button, sorry.

Just to be fair also to Jimson. If I recall well -- and we can have a look at the transcript. Regarding this proposal, I thought we had some sort of consensus. And the points that were raised -- I think it was also by Saudi Arabia -- was to include the governments. And I see it was not only this which was changed. I see the proposal number 3 that was particularly addressing the governments to put on equal footing, if I recall well. So I believe that there were some substantial changes, if I can say so. But now I don't know if -- if the members of this group find them enough to build a consensus. But I recall, for this particular one, we had some consensus already in the room.

So I'll leave it up to the rest of the people here to say what they believe.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think that that's why I think it's useful to have a very quick look at the revised version, just to make sure whether the -- this would lead to, let's say, people's concerns or not.

May I then invite you, Jimson, to move to recommendation number 4 as revised.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much.

Thank you very much, Chair.

4: That all countries, including developing and least developed ones are encouraged to evolve multistakeholder mechanisms to address the implications of current and emerging regulatory and public policy issues pertaining to the Internet at the national and international levels which affects their country and citizens. This would contribute to their leverage in dealing with the issues in the international context.

So the change here is to provide a linkage to the international public policy process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. Just before handing the floor to those who want to intervene, I -- from the Chair I would say that the language provided certainly will, in the light of discussion we had before, will, I think -- would be objected by those who oppose that these be addressed to the national dimension.

So I applaud the effort that was made here. But, at least on that particular point, I -- I'm just saying this to avoid the kind of discussion I know that may ensue. So I think, at least from that particular perspective, I see no room as of now for consensus.

I would maybe invite you to move to your 5th recommendation.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

Actually, I apologize. I should have mentioned that this was what I was referring to when I said I would confer with the delegates -- distinguished delegate from the U.S. to see if we can harmonize this with their recommendation.

Number 5: Recognizing there are gaps, especially access and capacity and knowledge gaps, in addressing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, particularly in developing and least developed countries. Further support activities and mechanisms should be enabled to bridge those gaps.

So the change here is with regard to outlining the various dimensions of gaps. And that's what has been added here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see here an effort to -- as in the other cases, to reflect on the discussions we've had. May I just remind that that particular recommendation was one that I imported into my own proposal to the group.

I just indicated that we would -- I would suggest a paragraph would be inserted in our report flagging the importance of identifying capacity gaps with a view to develop appropriate solutions.

I think this proposal has the benefit to indicate the need to take into account gaps. And I see now an expanded version, including not only capacity but also access and knowledge gaps. I think this reflects the discussion we had before. And it also has a kind of action-oriented approach. Because it's not only to identify and monitor but to seek to work towards solutions in that regard.

So I would -- particularly from the Chair, I think that's the kind of recommendations that I have seen not only in your contribution, a number of contributions addressing the issue of capacity. I think it provides maybe a good diagnosis and an action-oriented approach. So I would seek other participants' views, but I'd like to make those initial remarks.

I have Parminder followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Jim.

As I've been insisting that we go to the level of implement -- and that's our mandate to talk about this. And, therefore, what should be existing. Something existing is what you can touch and feel and see.

So I very much support that if we can add to it. And, therefore, it should be explored to establish a system within the U.N. which is oriented to doing research analysis and producing reports on international Internet-related public policies. This is a stand-alone thing. It's not a governance mechanism. It is just a mechanism -- not a mechanism. The words have to be used carefully here. A focal point in the U.N. system, which is exclusively focused on knowledge needs of -- pertaining to international Internet-related public policies. I would like to add that here is the actual implementation of this particular sentiment or particular general point. And I hope that is agreed to. Because, if people are agreeing to this -- and if they don't agree to what I'm saying, then there is a major problem we need to start investigating. Because that's exactly what it is. We're just saying it shouldn't exist in some X

think tank in Norway or Latin America which we don't know about. We need someplace where centrally this kind of knowledge is produced, collected, and made available to all members on any good footing which they can use.

So my suggestion is it should be explored to set up a focal point in the U.N. system to produce, collate, knowledge reports, et cetera, and do research and analysis related to international Internet-related public policies. The language I would contribute.

And, in this context, I want to add that the proposal which was jointly made by some countries and myself, we've already stated that we want to add two elements to it. One is stakeholder participation mechanism and an element of having such a focal point in the U.N. system which is focused on knowledge needs related to international Internet-related public policies.

So, again, I'm not against this point. I'm agreeing to it perhaps more than what the proposal is agreeing to by actually wanting to implement it. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think you have a very clear point. You are referring to the fact that there are many clearinghouse mechanisms and observatories worldwide that would need something of a global nature focused on that collecting, monitoring, those gaps with a view to -- I think this is something that should -- I would invite if others would like to comment on that. I think that would be in line with the general idea of not only having the information but make it available in a way that can be useful at a global level. So I think that might be a very interesting idea to entertain.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia, as I have indicated, followed by Canada, Nick Ashton-Hart. So Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Twelve years ago Tunis Agenda stated in paragraph 60, "We recognize there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are particularly addressed by the current mechanisms."

And we come here after 12 years, we state the same thing that we recognize that there are gaps. We have more gaps than access or capacity-building or knowledge. We have gaps in security, gaps in privacy, gaps in data protection.

The issue that we're facing is that we're repeating language from 12 years ago that we agreed on. We have gaps, and we admit that we have gaps. That's why UNGA said go and implement enhanced cooperation to solve the issue of those gaps. We need mechanisms to enable government to develop international public policy issues to solve those gaps. We've identified this 12 years ago. Do we need to identify them again and don't solve them? The gaps will continue. Our man mandate is to develop a mechanism so we can solve the gaps that we are facing. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Again, Saudi Arabia, I think that what would be relevant, from the perspective of what we're doing, would be to demonstrate that we're not only referring to something important that was recognized but providing some additional elements.

And I think the discussion we're having indicates that there might be room for some consensus regarding the need to expand the scope of existing clearinghouses, mechanisms, observatories, at national, regional and, to a global extent, to assist in that regard.

So I think that would be indeed an addition and concrete input from this group if we could agree to something like that. And I would certainly think that that might be the kind of -- I'm also very cautious to use a non-controversial aspect of that discussion because we're not aiming at a new mechanism. We're just in recognition of a need to develop within existing mechanisms some way to address it.

I think there might be a discussion on where it should be placed or not. But I think the general call maybe could be included if all parties could agree.

I have then Canada followed by Nick Ashton-Hart.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. Simply to say that we were favorable to these recommendations when they were first presented to us on Monday.

And with these changes we believe that they should still be part of our consensus report that we will be producing. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nick followed by Marilyn Cade and Lea.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: I'd like to -- doing this a lot. I would agree with the comment of the chair about there being different subjects here. One is the need for information, and the other is the need for discussions, however, they're structured.

I should note, since it's been brought up a few times by Richard, and I proposed some short language of a similar nature because I wrote on the subject of international coordination of Internet policy for the Global Commission on Internet Governance.

This is not the first area of complex policy that the international community has had challenges following across the international system. And it has been solved very effectively in the past. I use the example from the humanitarian aid community, which has literally thousands of actors that operate often under very short timelines when an emergency happens in very challenging conditions and have to share information in realtime despite those conditions.

So I think that it would be possible on an administrative level to say to the system, to the U.N. system, could you please look at previous models for addressing the need for all stakeholders to understand what is happening, where it is happening, how to be involved in it, what the issues are at stake, what

contacts do you need to have in order to talk to the secretariat, talk to the key groups, talk to delegations? I think they would find a way to deal with that. You could house it in many places.

But, if at least we could agree on something like that, I think that would be a real value add from this group and not actually that controversial, especially in New York, where they rely on things like the ReliefWeb and Iron News systems (indiscernible) that I've mentioned and. There are others in other areas of policy also.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for these comments. Marilyn Cade followed by Lea Kaspar.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm really glad I followed Nick because I think those examples you gave were very useful. But I just wanted to say that when I read this, because the examples are in parentheses, I didn't read them as being exclusionary to other kinds of gaps. And I also - I read it as meaning lack of access to information or other kinds of resources, not specific to a particular issue that was being addressed.

I think it's a very helpful addition, and I look forward to finding a way to address the concern because when I heard our colleague from Saudi Arabia's concern, I thought perhaps he and I were reading it a little bit differently.

But I didn't -- I don't see this as excluding the idea that there are gaps in many other areas that would also need to be addressed in terms of access to information or even further addressed as issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Lea followed by United States.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Hi, everyone.

I'm going to try to be brief. But I think the spirit of this recommendation is something I would definitely support. My understanding of it I think aligns with what Nick was talking about. And I do think that there's -- I mean, you say it's uncontroversial. I don't know if it's uncontroversial. In fact, this has been around for many years and we haven't managed to find a way to address the issue of needing to increase information sharing and perhaps greater coordination.

This just goes to say that the spirit of -- if that's the spirit of this recommendation, I would definitely support having something in the final report that goes to address that and that need. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to speak broadly about the five edited proposals from Jimson. I think in general the concepts behind these are good, and we support moving them into the final report for more discussion. There's certainly some editing that could be done. But in general the concepts are there, and we appreciate Jimson for working to further refine them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Should I -- I see we are two minutes past lunch. Maybe we can -- I think that Recommendation 6 might be rather controversial in its discussion. But may I request you, Jimson, to introduce it at least so I can have a sense of how many would like to intervene on that before we break? Introduce Recommendation Number 6 and reflect maybe on the feedback you had in regard to Recommendation 5.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Chair. Well, let me say, if you permit me, that I actually did some extensive consultation in this respect and following my background, at least from developing country and from Africa in particular where we are making some progress in regard to government and the private sector working together for the benefits of the people. And now we really want that to be sustained in such a way that the government within the existing framework, incorporating other stakeholders, particularly business, can still do what it need to do, make recommendation, not decreeing anything but make a recommendation.

So in this light, as I will read this text number 6, that I also request maybe the Chair of the CSTD, if he's around, maybe to throw more light for the benefit of some of my colleagues. Former chair, okay. Thank you for that correction. Mr. Peter Major to add more light because I had the privilege of being in the CSTD in some of the sessions. It was a great honor to speak on a panel as an expert and also to speak remotely many times, number of times. And I have seen it as being open and inputs taking just like any other stakeholders.

So maybe he can illuminate more on the access in terms of participation the other stakeholders have concerning inputs to the recommendation the CSTD makes every year.

So with that in mind, that all stakeholders have the opportunity to speak, especially the government, I would like to say -- read the text again: That "the CSTD, in line with its mandate," that is existing mandate, "convenes a yearly dialogue within the existing CSTD events where all governments on equal footing can discuss and provide recommendations on international public policy matters pertaining to the Internet with the participation of the business community, the technical community, civil society, and the academic community." And I would also like to finalize this by saying that the mandate is just below the screen. It's available on the Web site. And the emphasis I noted is public policy.

As I mentioned three days ago, public policy, indeed, is a superset. And under that we have the Internet public policy issues. So I think it's already pretty covered. And the output, which is from a recommendation, is not -- is a recommendation.

If you still permit me to make this illustration, it's in line with, like, the 2030 agenda, like, firstly Millennium Development Goal. Not all governments achieve that, though was recommended. It was a recommendation. But some countries achieved it, and it was exciting.

So the same thing with the 2030 sustainable development goal. It's a recommendation, and no government has (indiscernible) to work towards it. We hope in developing countries that we can really achieve that.

But it's in the same line -- I'm saying it's a recommendation the CSTD will make through the assisting structure to the ECOSOC and then to the General Assembly. And recommendation countries can decide to go run with it or not run with it.

And, finally, I would like to really thank all that provided input. In fact, I benefited from a lot of things. I learned a lot of things in the process of fine-tuning this and understanding the spirit of this more. Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson.

I thank you for introducing this revised recommendation. I would like to recall that this idea of having a dedicated session at least as a minimum at every yearly annual session of CSTD was something that appealed to me. Personally, I think this is an idea that could be entertained by the group that would not imply the creation of a new body or even a new mechanism. It would be, rather, a way of addressing the agenda, agenda setting within CSTD allowing for the issue around enhanced cooperation to be discussed on a continuous base, not in the way we have been discussing it for a number of years and then we don't discuss it at all and we resume discussion a number of years later.

I see the effort you made to address some of the concerns that were expressed. I see a number of people requesting the floor. So I will give them the floor right away. I hope we could conclude discussion on this and then we break for lunch. That would be my proposal.

I have Parminder, Switzerland, and Russian Federation.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Jim. But as we had decided that elements of change would be highlighted, and I have not heard -- it becomes a little difficult for us to go back in our mind and try to find. I actually can see, I think, what has changed. But we need to know what actually was evolution, and then we can comment on that because we did discuss the fact that the mandate of the CSTD exists in this manner, which is fine to reiterate. But what is the change is not very clear. Please, I request, Jim, and all those who are making proposals -- repeat proposals to go directly to the element of change and we have a discussion on just that element.

While I have the mic, I know the change is that earlier --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please. So let me just follow up on what you are requesting. May I, Jim, request -- Jimson, as you have done in the other cases to indicate what were the changes that were made.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much for that. I think there are two significant changes. One, "within the existing CSTD events." Before it was general. Now it is being specific. It should be within the existing CSTD events. And I gathered, of course, the CSTD has five-day period and also intersessional. Perhaps maybe half a day or quarter day during that period. Maybe can entertain some of the issues pertaining to enhanced cooperation as a starter.

Then, also, we focus on the issues, not matters, issues. So that is the basic stuff. Within the existing CSTD events, that's the major change. And also replacing "matters" with "issues." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So let me revert to Parminder. Please for your comments.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Jim. And thank you, Chair. I would will like to go to what it actually means in material sense, the change means. I understand it now means that it would be made, can I say obligatory or necessary or mandated or requested to be obligatory that every session of CSTD has a section on Internet international public policy issues to be discussed as other issues are discussed already at present. Now, that I understand is what has happened with this paragraph 6.

Now, let me try to compare it with existing situation. I have been to most of the CSTDs, not all of them. But, perhaps, I followed the reports of all of them. And I don't remember any of them which did not have a session on Internet-related public policy issues or enhanced cooperation itself and so on. We are rely in a sense, on practical purposes, to people who have made it into big demand that things are moving fast and the public policy issues have to be addressed. It gives something which looks like something has changed but, in fact, nothing has changed, which makes it a little difficult for us to -- I mean, not even to say accept but to say, I mean -- you are being offered something in name but not in substance. Nothing changes for me.

And especially as now it has been watered down to within the existing events. Whereby, in the earlier language, there was some possibility at least to be kind of innovative and have some separate session and some separate thing which could have some knowledge processes around it and could have some different work, enhanced work, done around this thing and which has now been changed and watered down to present what is actually the current status in some formal manner. And that makes it even less acceptable than it was earlier. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And I would like to thank Jimson for this proposal.

I think that if we look at this proposal in general and we take into account how the discussion is going into -- in this working group, I think that there are elements of common ground there. And I hope that this could fructify into agreed text further on in our discussions.

We are here in our working group within the CSTD. I think that the CSTD as focal point for WSIS issues was reinforced by the WSIS+10 resolution of 2015.

And I share a lot of the reflections made by the chair of this working group before on the value of this proposal. So for the time being, I would say that there is more to this than only repeating what is the status quo. And I would like to see that the glass is half full and not half empty with this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I seek your indulgence to hear the last three speakers on this, and then I will revert to Jimson.

Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, U.S., Marilyn Cade. So four. I would beg you to be as brief as possible so that we move to Jimson and we can close this discussion before lunch.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We would like to thank Jimson for his proposal. And as he proposed it from the first time, this proposal actually have the support from the audience. And we think that -- well, even we still have some questions to this. We have questions to the mandate and the format because before it was a forum proposal. But, still, it's a working proposal and relevant proposal and could be considered as one scenario that should be discussed within the group and reflected in the report definitely.

And we also share this feeling with Switzerland that it's like a glass more than full than empty in this stage. Probably it's not the ideal but it's definitely the relevant proposal. So we need to discuss it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I think all of us follow the work of CSTD, and it's clear from the mandate that CSTD provide high-level advice to ECOSOC and UNGA. So we receive the mandate from UNGA or ECOSOC and we work on it. So I don't see how we in CSTD will study an issue and send it to UNGA and it's the other way around in the current mandate, that we receive our mandate or the issue to be studied and to provide advice on this current problem from UNGA and ECOSOC.

So I highlighted yesterday that our mandate on WSIS is general, that we will do a follow-up at the system one on the implementation. We cannot develop recommendation on WSIS. On WSIS, maybe. But on enhanced cooperation, on policy, I think this is out of the mandate of CSTD, of the current mandate. Otherwise, UNGA wouldn't have asked us to implement or to further implement enhanced cooperation if CSTD has a mandate on public -- international public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, United States followed by Marilyn Cade and then we turn to Jimson.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. As the United States said yesterday, we don't support this proposal. I think we are interested in the conversations that are creating the need for this kind of forum. I think we want to continue to engage with others and try to see if we can find what's behind some of this and maybe there's a way that we can work together to address it. But I think that there's challenges with asking the CSTD to do this. For one, CSTD has a full plate with the mandate related to science and technology which is increasingly a very relevant conversation and things like the 2030 agenda, not to mention the role of CSTD in the follow-up review of WSIS as the entity that collects all the reports from all the U.N. agencies and different stakeholders and produces reporting on WSIS, not

just related to Internet issues but all ICT4Development issues. So I think this is quite a bit to put on the CSTD.

But even more fundamentally, CSTD, while we very much appreciate the openness on a lot of conversation, there are examples where -- that members of CSTD have pushed for restricting the participation of stakeholder community. And there's been challenges there. And I cannot imagine a situation where we would have this conversation where there would not be an attempt to restrict the participation of non-government stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade.

It's clearly my job to say as someone from the stakeholders that I think this glass is at least more than half full, and let me explain why I see that.

I've been participating actively in CSTD since 2009 as a private sector participant, participating both in the intersessionals and attending them and also all of the CSTD meetings face-to-face. I have attended some of the CSTD meetings before that. And my focus has been not only on WSIS follow-up but also active engagement on the work on the second track on science and technology for development.

My observation of this proposal -- and Jimson should clarify this. But I see the way we have approached work on the two tracks within the CSTD has so far been different. We take a fact-based approach on science and technology and development with experts developing papers with panels for presentations and discussions. We do -- CSTD does SDI studies at the national level working with government agencies.

On the WSIS I will say we may have a panel here and there. But we're mostly so far on WSIS follow-up, other than gathering the reports, been a little opinion-based when coming together as opposed to being fact-based and expert-based.

So I'm hoping that this idea that Jimson is proposing is that we'll put a little more rigor and fact-based analysis into the part of the work that is about international Internet-related public policy.

I will also just say that I see WSIS follow-up actually as inclusive of enhanced cooperation since the topic was raised in the Tunis Agenda.

And WSIS follow-up is holistic. It includes the action items. It includes the other work that is going on in achieving the goals and outcomes expected in creating the information society for all. And that paragraph about enhanced cooperation is very much a part of the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS outcomes.

I hope we will give serious consideration to this, because we don't have agreement on a different approach. And yet we must make some progress. And I think it would be a shame if all of us went back to our capital or to our communities and said we're not even willing to take a small step forward by

trying this approach at CSTD. I'm confident -- I will address this directly to the U.S. government. I'm confident the resources can be found to support the secretariat, because they've been found before. And I'm sure the community will be able to address the need for the enhanced support. And, if we find after two years that the progress and efforts to address enhanced cooperation in this way isn't working, well, then we can reconsider.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn.

I turn to Jimson just to comment and reflect on what you said. I think we have been looking at these recommendations as creating or giving a new mandate or expanding in a way further refining the mandate of CSTD in general. Maybe we should take the approach of proposing that we should look into ways of improving the existing work. And also, referring to what Parminder has said, there has been ongoing discussion within CSTD on enhanced cooperation. Maybe on the basis of the discussion we have had here, the need to provide for more inclusiveness, fact-based, that kind of thing, maybe we can provide some guide. Because CSTD is our home. We can relate to CSTD and say we have discussed this in your work upon revising, discussing enhanced cooperation, we could do this or that to improve. We have been in another part of the conversation discussing the need for existing institution to improve their ways of dealing with issues.

So maybe more -- one way would be to focus to give a general guidance for the necessity to look into the issue every year. Another would be maybe to look in more detail how we can give concrete advice on how to improve that. So this would be maybe another angle to look at it.

But I turn to Jimson for your comments on that. And then we will break for lunch.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah.

Distinguished chair, distinguished colleagues, maybe I could just simply cut and paste what Marilyn and yourself said just now. And that should be sufficient.

But I also would like to really appreciate the language used by Switzerland and distinguished delegates from Russia with regard to at least maybe we can take a little step of faith moving forward.

And that is the inspiration I got at the first working group on enhanced cooperation with WGEC 1.0. And I got an inspiration that, look, this proposal will actually commit to take a step forward. But I didn't have the confidence then to push it -- to put it forward.

But, seeing that we've been given the responsibility to still tackle this issue and that's what gave me the confidence to say, well, maybe I should put it forward. And really want to thank all the (indiscernible.)

As the Chair said, it has kind of worked out. But, basically, the mandate is there. I've been part of the WSIS process, WSIS+10. And, in fact, we push a lot for our government back home to really focus on all the ramifications of WSIS.

And the issue of enhanced cooperation is a key part with government need to be strongly involved directly for recommendation.

I take back in IGFs. IGF is mostly dialogue, discussions. We talk about bringing out tangible outcomes but not recommendations. So here it's talking about recommendation or advice. So this I am very optimistic. Be able to provide some advice. (Indiscernible) be able to come together from different people that have been working, different institutions that have been doing an incredible job already. And we bring it to the table. And we still recommend much import whereby all these ideas can be coalesced and put in a proper perspective to present through the assistance channel of the United Nations.

So it's a small step, but I think will be able to help us make progress. Thank you very much

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. On that note, I'd like now to then to propose we break for lunch.

Just for your information, when we resume at 3:00 p.m., I would give the same opportunity that was given to Nick and Jimson to other proponents in case they wish to, on the basis of discussions we have here -- it's not an obligation to do that. I would not expect each and everyone to do that. In case they wish to test some revised language in a very straightforward way you have been doing, I think that would be the opportunity.

So that would encompass U.K., ICC-BASIS, the joint proposal, and Carlos Afonso is also one who made a proposal. So we could quickly go that.

But I'd like to indicate that I intend to stop anything in case we cannot finalize this at 4:00 p.m. I think we need to have -- dedicate some time to discuss the next steps. We are rapidly approaching the end of this. So I think we must get out of this meeting with a very clear idea of what will be the next steps and how we get there. I have heard from you. You are -- I know some of you have ideas on the outline of the document, on the -- we can discuss that. And I -- under that basis I will come forward with a proposal for the way forward.

So I would suggest we can resume and see whether there are any room or any interest in pursuing some in revised form recommendations that were presented in this context.

Also we have Peru's proposal, of course.

But at 4:00 p.m., I want to start to discuss -- to resume discussion on the final stage of our work, if you could agree.

I see United Kingdom and Russian Federation.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to present devised proposals after lunch. We think we had a good discussion about the U.K. proposals yesterday. We heard a lot of support around the room for them. We also heard some quite specific suggestions for changing the language,

which we will go away and look to accommodate. But they were very specific suggestions. So I think we will not bring them back to this group at this meeting. We'll make those changes and send it to you. But thank you for the opportunity.

We have spent a long time now discussing proposals again this morning.

We don't have much time left.

We would be concerned if we are just going to keep discussing essentially the same proposals. We think that we need to discuss the structure of our report after lunch. And, as I said at the beginning, we have a proposal that we would like to present for the structure of our report when we come back from lunch. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. You'll have the opportunity to do that for sure.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

We would like to say that we think we need to prioritize our work in a case to discuss the proposals that have not been discussed before. And we think we need to have a chance to do this.

And, of course, we have the time constraint. But we can limit the discussion. However, it is not right and not fair to discuss for the second round for one proposal and to skip the first round for others. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Fully agree with you. That's why, before looking to revise the proposal, I made an offer for anyone who had any new ideas to come forward. The U.S. did that, but no one else did. So I just wanted to be -- reserve time to do it. But I understand from your intervention that you're not bringing to the attention of the group revised recommendations for its consideration, the same approach as taken by the U.K. I thank both of you.

So, if this is understanding, we can start -- there is ICC-BASIS that I'll just seek -- not maybe now. When we resume. If you wish -- no? And Carlos Afonso I think will not. So I think we have exhausted. I think we're there -- in my understanding there is one single recommendation that has not been discussed. That is Peru's. We will wait for -- maybe we can start looking at the Peruvian proposal. And then we discuss the outline of the report. I have United States and then Cuba. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to echo the need to really be clear on structure and process leading this afternoon. We have one more session. And, as this is the penultimate meeting, there needs to be a clear path.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Absolutely. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. There are some other proposals. Because here we started looking at proposals in the compilation of the proposals that were sent for this first meeting. At the beginning you

presented your proposal of a draft document that you took into consideration not only those proposals but proposals made earlier. And that's why it was okay. But now if that -- if your proposal is out of the table, then previous proposal, like the proposal from Cuba, I think it has to be brought back on the table. I think that the one that the U.S. presented is also in that case. It was a previous proposal.

So in that case, I want also to propose to present again the proposal of Cuba. That is a very short one on the organizational arrangement that it was a question that it was sent in the previous meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. And maybe you were not in the room when I made the offer to anyone who wanted to revisit proposals put forward in previous meetings. I did that in the beginning of that -- after the coffee break.

But I understand that. I don't want to be too rigid about that. I think, when I was looking to the paper, I presented to you, you'll see that your proposal was one incorporated. So I would be very much interested in receiving inputs and feedback on this. I would say that we have covered, I think, in my perspective the main concepts and ideas in those two and a half days. So I think we could spare some time to listen to Peru.

And then, if the plenary agrees, we could look into your proposal. I would hope to cover the two issues by 4:00 p.m. so we can discuss the outline of the report. Yes? Yes, please.

>>CUBA: I'm happy to discuss it the way of your initial document of this session.

So let me ask you: That document is still going to be discussed? Because I'm happy to discuss it the way that you summarize it there. If that document is not going to be discussed, then I will show the full proposal of Cuba. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I have a number of ideas coming up in regard to the report. You have my proposal, the way I see this should be reflected in our report.

We have a proposal coming from your -- the joint contribution from Russia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Parminder. They propose a framework. I understand the U.K. is going to propose an outline.

So when we -- at 4:00 p.m. I think everything will be there for discussion. I think the important thing is that all of us we can agree for the following steps and have a clear indication of what's expected from us and how it will get there in relation to the outcome we all want. So thank you. With this, I apologize. We have -- yeah, Canada. Canada, please.

>>CANADA: Sorry. I'll try to be short. I'm just worried that 4:00 might be a little late to start discussing our report. So, if there's a chance to do it earlier after we heard Cuba's recommendation, I think that would be ideal. And I would like it to be understood that we haven't decided on a structure for a report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no.

>>CANADA: What you put in your draft is all valid information that we may choose to import or not in whatever format that we decide in the end. As well, I believe that all the contributions that we've heard since we've started meeting in September, as far as I'm concerned, can still be on the table and still be discussed. So, with regard to Cuba's point, yes, they did have contributions previously.

At the moment, I don't think they were necessarily consensus. But, if, when we have a draft structure, we still want to discuss them to see if we can put them in there, it should still be a possibility. Not just limit it to what you had put in your initial draft, which as far as I know --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Absolutely. This is understood. This is understood. Yes.

ICC-BASIS you want also to intervene on that?

>>TIMEA SUTO: Yes, Chair. I will very brief. I just want to thank you for the opportunity offered to us to comment on any revised recommendations we might have had. We're still working on this with colleagues. And we'll send that to you and enter the group in as shortly as possible. But maybe perhaps after this meeting. But I would just like to offer that time that we would have taken to discussing our revised recommendations to discuss the report and the report structure. And we'll be very keen on hearing proposals for that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So, again, just for clarity, we start again at 3:00 p.m. We'll look into the Peruvian proposal, which is altogether new. We will look into the proposal from Cuba, which was incorporated in my proposal. And I think I -- we want -- I want to give the flexibility to allow Cuba as a proponent of a previous recommendation to come up and seek further views on that. And then we'll move directly into the report. Maximum at 4:00 p.m., so we make sure we have enough time to discuss it. Thank you, have a good lunch.

[Lunch break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good afternoon, colleagues. I hope you all have had lunch and time to get some rest. I would -- as we have agreed before, we should start by looking to proposal coming from Peru that is a totally new proposal that wasn't subject to even a first reading. I see Peru is not in the room, so I will then suggest we consider proposal coming from Cuba as was highlighted in our previous session.

This was not discussed in the context of this meeting. You may recall that refers to making a suggestion, recommendation, to debate every year at the General Assembly as part of the general debate on one of the agenda items, this topic. I also incorporated the draft document I send to you initially as a basis of discussion. Of course, we are not discussing it now, just to remind you that something was part of the documentation for this meeting. So I think it would be appropriate to seek input in that regard. I'd like to offer the floor to Juan, if you wish to make introduction in regard to your proposal. And then I seek further comments from the room.

Please, Juan. Cuba.

>>CUBA: I'm not going step by step through the proposal. It's on the Web site. You can see it. I'm only going to tell you the rationale behind it.

The rationale, as many has pointed here, that these Internet governance things are so transversal that are being held, being discussed in many places. But still it's needed some place precisely because it's being discussed in so many places. You need some focal point for political discussion for this by governments, in which governments could go. So that's why we propose that we need something, governmental mechanisms, and in complete accordance with Tunis, with the full participation of the other stakeholders.

And in the recommendations, we recommend different places of the U.N. system where this can be, okay? And that has been taken also in some other proposals like the joint proposal by Russia, Pakistan, Parminder, and also endorsed by us.

But one point that it was the one that was mentioned by our Chairman Benedicto is that another place where this can happen, even simultaneously with some other proposal or on its own is to be done in the U.N. General Assembly itself. General Assembly itself in its committees, as my friend Wolfgang Kleinwachter reminds me, are already seeing some of these issues on a yearly by basis. For instance, cybersecurity has been seen in First Committee, and the human rights is in its Third Committee. And there's a day in which the number of the agenda items is called information and communication technology for development and it has a heading that is called "promotion" -- it is there. You can move the screen a little up, I can read it. "Promotion of sustainable economic growth, of sustainable development in accordance to the Internet." In that day, could be -- in that agenda item, that could be put a point of Internet governance. That's a way of doing it without creating a new body now that the budget of the U.N. is strained or something like that. And it's an alternative that I want you to take into consideration, of course, with all the other proposals that are there as an alternative.

The rest you can see there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan, for introducing -- for in a way recalling the main elements of your proposal and its main intent. I must say that when I was -- after having reviewed all the contributions that were proposed by you and trying to import those ideas or concepts that in my view could lead to recommendations on our part, I took on board that one for many reasons. I want to explain in line with what Juan has said.

I think here we are not talking about creating a new body or mechanism which I know is being discussed in another part of our discussion because we are addressing -- we are referring to something that is already in place. The UNGA has already been debating it every year. There is an agenda item dedicated for ICT4Development under which there is the yearly review of implementation of the WSIS outcomes, including enhanced cooperation.

So, again, it would not provide for a new mechanism, neither for a new approach. I think this would boil down, in my opinion, to making recommendation that -- upon considering the issue on a yearly basis, some time would be dedicated in some format to discuss enhanced cooperation.

As having been a delegate to the Second Committee and by irony of history, I participated in all discussions with except ICT4D. It's a kind of irony.

Yes, do you want to comment on my previous experience? Maybe you can complement. Yes, please.

>>CUBA: It's not for discussing enhanced cooperation, please. It's for discussing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, please. Because enhanced cooperation is the discussion of how to do that. It's for discussing international public policy pertaining to the Internet.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, absolutely.

>>CUBA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, sometimes the technology, we will adjust and this would be reflected in the report. We have agreed upon.

But the point I was making is that in my opinion, that would boil down to making some kind of recommendation that upon considering that on a yearly basis is something that is taking place. And since we are looking to ways to improve the way the existing organization bodies are dealing with this, that would boil down to some kind of recommendation that would impact on time management, on organizational -- maybe offsite events which is the kind of thing we do at Second Committee, that kind of thing.

That's the reason I imported into my own paper I submitted to you as, let's say, an initial point to start discussion on this. And I'd like to -- just to say that for the record.

Having said that, I would like to open the floor for any further comments in regard to this, recalling that we have had a conversation on that before. The proposal received some support, some objection, reservation. So I think it might be useful at this point to know what is the feeling of the room in relation to that particular recommendation after all that has been said and done in the context of this meeting.

I have on my list Iran. You have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I agree with your remarks, that we are not going to create the new mechanism here. But we should consider this reality that we are going to recommend what we're going to do in the future.

But a new mechanism is a proposal of the Iran delegation in the last meeting, and we also have a four member in the one package that we have discussed yesterday. And also today Cuba delegation proposed these recommendations.

So, logically, we should consider this kind of recommendation and the final report should be captured in this recommendation even there is no consensus on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. Just to remind that we decided to discuss the outline of the report and what we want to contain therein and which format after we close discussion on that particular recommendation.

I recognize the United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Are we talking about 1 and 2 or just 1? The proposals. Number 2, okay.

>> (off microphone).

>>UNITED STATES: So I'll say unfortunately I have been involved in a lot of Second Committee negotiations. They do happen every year. We have a resolution. It's right there on ICTs for development that's negotiated. A lot of input is fed into that including a lot of the work that is done by ECOSOC through CSTD as part of the WSIS follow-up and review.

I guess my question right now is: What would be new or different particularly noting that as our Cuban colleague said there are other UNGA committees doing work related to this. Certainly in First Committee for several years now the Russian delegation has drafted resolution on international security issues. Third Committee has the privacy in the digital age which the Brazilian and German governments have sponsored. I think rightfully Third Committee has decided that conversations about cybercrime should happen in the Vienna context.

So I think there is a conversation. There is discussion of this. I just right now don't necessarily understand what would be new and why a group like this would need to make a proposal to UNGA related to that when there's no barriers at UNGA for a member state to make a recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will revert to Cuba after we hear other inputs, in case there are any. I don't see none.

So, Cuba, please, you have the floor to comment on.

>>CUBA: I thank my colleague from the U.S. to bring all those details because that will make easier to understand and explain this proposal.

Yes, precisely. In First Committee, there's discussion on Internet cybersecurity thanks to Russia that introduced that many years ago. But as you know, many countries here don't want to mix Internet governance with cybersecurity so it's okay, leave it there.

And we have all those things also in Third Committee on privacy. So, okay, what we're saying here is we need this for everything else in Internet governance, all the things that has a relation with development, like this new development like artificial intelligence, Internet of Things. And what we're saying -- and you know, because you know the procedure of the General Assembly better than I, that what is needed -- because you know if you don't have it -- is to have that as an agenda subitem there placed so

countries can prepare throughout the year with the schedule that is for those who present the papers and present papers, proposals for resolution, even contributions to rediscuss at that political level.

If it's something that has to do with intellectual property then maybe it will be funneled to WIPO or whatever. Of course, if something from cybersecurity would come here, it would go to First Committee. At least to have that there, to have a slot identified for this issue that is an issue of interest of the global community, I think it doesn't hurt anybody. If nobody present paper, if nobody, good -- it will be a good time to go out of the U.N. building to have a hot dog or coffee or in the cafeteria within the U.N. You know, those times are cherished in the U.N. building.

And if somebody presents a paper and presents some problem to discuss, then there's a place where any country can go in the yearly General Assembly. I don't see how that could bring harm or put anybody's positions in jeopardy.

So I'm happy to take the floor again, Chairman, if there's further need for clarification. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. As I said before, there was in previous round some discussion on this. I think we have had some additional reactions and Cuba has taken note of that.

I think if there is no further request for the floor, I would like to thank Cuba and suggest that we could then resume that discussion in the context of the discussion on how everything would fit into the outcome of our work.

Having said that, I think since Peru is not in the room yet, I will suggest that we could then move directly to the item we had discussed -- agreed to discuss, which is the follow-up to our meeting and the preparations for our next meeting.

I want to hear from -- I look forward to hearing from you some ideas that may help us to make sure that at the end of our last meeting we can fulfill our mandate, just recalling that our mandate refers to the development of recommendations. There is a very clear call in that regard.

Maybe I should even read out -- I think it's -- we have been doing this but just to make sure we have all the same understanding of what we are aiming at. "The General Assembly request the chair of the CSTD through the ECOSOC to establish a working group to develop recommendations" -- so this is clearly the mandate of the group, "to develop recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda."

So this is the mandate we have taken into account -- taken into consideration the work that has been done on these matters so far. "The General Assembly requests the group to ensure the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders, take into account their diverse views and expertise, and request the group to submit a report to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development at its 21st session for inclusion in the annual report of the Commission to the Council."

So I would only highlight again -- and indulge me for repeating that has been repeated many times over our discussions, we are mandated as a working group to develop recommendations. We are mandated

as a group to ensure full involvement of all relevant stakeholders, take into account their diverse views and expertise. And we were also very clearly mandated to submit a report. I think those are the elements contained in the mandate we are given. This should not be subject to further discussion because we are not able to change that. We are called to develop recommendations, to submit a report.

So I would like at this point to hear colleagues' views on how we should be doing that. As I said at the beginning of this meeting, I think we are now at a very late stage of our work. We have been, until now, having methodology of work, working on the basis of contributions that have been submitted to the group. I think this has led to very important, bottom-up discussion reflecting the various diverse views. We have had -- to the extent possible allowed for the opportunity for recommendations to be discussed, for recommendations to be revised, for recommendations to be revised as per the discussions we have had. We are in our fourth meeting. So we started that in our first meeting. So we have -- at our second meeting actually. In the first meeting, we drafted the questions. Second meeting started receiving input. So we did that at the second, third, and this fourth meeting.

I think that has been a very useful method of work, very much aligned with the mandate we have to ensure full participation, to allow diversity of views.

But at this point, as a chair, I think I have responsibility to propose that we should engage in a more action-oriented method of work aimed at having a report. So this is what I'm proposing to do.

My initial proposal at the beginning of this meeting, you may have noticed, was to -- I made a proposal as I could see until the beginning of this meeting how some of the concepts and ideas we have had should feed into the report in the various parts. That was my own proposal. But I recognize we have had so much discussion and we have moved, I think, very, I would say, positively in many issues, at least from the perspective of allowing us to have a better understanding of different points of view.

So I would for the moment park my own proposal. I do not want maybe -- I'd like to hear your views on how you think the report should look like, how it should be structured, and how -- and I thank the U.K. for having send us also a proposal regarding the time line. I think it's important for all of us to think about the time line in between now and our next meeting.

I thank the U.K. I think very useful proposal, proposing for me to submit a draft report by the end of October, then to allow some time for revised inputs so that will assist us in coming to our next meeting with a draft report in better shape for consolidated approach. So I would maybe -- I also recall that even in some of the contribution, particularly the joint contribution from Russian Federation, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Parminder, they also provided for an idea on how the report should look like. So the discussion is open for all ideas. I think it would be very important for me as the chair individually and in case there is also decision to start some kind of drafting group to receive all the inputs in that regard. I think that would be the appropriate moment for us to do so.

So I have on my list -- and I'll open -- and I'll give the floor to those who have requested the floor, united Kingdom, Richard Hill, United States, Peru.

Peru, I think we are parking now the discussion of your proposal because we have moved to the part of the discussion on the report.

Do you want to speak to this. Richard, please?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. I was going to make the point that, out of politeness and fairness, as soon as Peru came in the room we should suspend the discussion on the procedures and take proposals from Peru. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd be most happy to do that, if the group would indulge us and give us the flexibility. I see people nod in the room. So I will ask U.K., Richard, and U.S. maybe to just -- I'd like to thank you for this flexibility. So we allow Peru to make the proposal. And, just recalling this is a proposal that is coming to us for the first time. It has not been revisited yet. So I think it's to the benefit of all of us, I offer them the floor for my friend and colleague Milagros for introduction of your recommendation. Please, you have the floor, Peru.

>>PERU: This is not working, no? Thank you very much. And thank you, Richard.

Our proposal is intended to fill the gaps we have identified every time we have agreed to include our reference to the wording "internet international-related policies." To this respect we believe the purpose of this proposal coincides in principle with a great number of recommendations we have revised these days.

And our intention is to raise the importance of the development of international law of the Internet, which should be the starting point or a fundamental reference for Internet international-related policies. We have circulated the paragraph that you have on the screen. And, in that paragraph, we proposed the creation of a workshop to identify the body of applicable international law.

This is one way of viewing this. The other way of treating this mooter would be recommending the Secretary General to mandate these tasks to the United Nations International Law Commission, which, by the way, is stationed here in Geneva. And it would be very most easier for them to deal with all of these issues. This is all. I would love to hear what anyone has to comment

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. The floor is open. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. And thank you to Peru for this opportunity to discuss this proposal. I am interested in further examining this idea. And I'll make two comments. One is I think it probably should be thought about as international legal frameworks. Because some of the issues mentioned may already have some existing work that has been done and perhaps others don't.

And the characteristics of an international law may vary from topic to topic. I would also think that, perhaps, it would be possible to start with asking for identification of where there may be already existing applicable international law.

Like others, I'm always leery of asking for the creation of new legal frameworks.

I spent a good deal of my history dealing with modifying WIPO treaties to be reflective of the needs of those they were affecting in the area of trademark and copyrights and also in commenting and pushing very hard for adjustments in the original draft of the then called Council of Europe cybercrime treaty because there had not been proper consultation with technical experts.

In the end, I think that the resulting international legal vehicles were much strengthened after that consultation.

So I'm not objecting to the idea. But I would just ask for us to think about this a little differently in terms of it being -- it could end up being and probably should end up being different legal frameworks based on the issue and that it would need to start with documenting where some legal frameworks may already exist. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>PERU: If I may --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'll come back to you when we hear inputs.

The Russian Federation followed by Richard Hill and Parminder.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

We think that international legal framework is important point and is a valid point in the 70/125 Tunis Agenda.

>> Sorry, microphone.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: It didn't work? Now? Okay.

Yeah.

We think that it's a valid point. International legal framework is an important part of international public policies, because we have a lot of national public policies. And, without harmonization, without coordinations in the area like security and personal data and a lot of things, it should be somehow coordinated and, also on the legal level, international legal level. That's why we think it's important and also part of our mandate because it's in the 70/125. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. I recognize Richard Hill followed by Parminder.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I very much like this proposal and would support it. And maybe we even might get consensus. It probably needs a little massaging with languages, as Marilyn suggested. That's normal for an initial proposal. In fact, this is kind of a chapeau for some of my proposals what I'm proposing development of international law in very specific areas. So this is kind of capturing the overall need. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Peru, for this proposal, which is coming late. But I think is an excellent proposal. And I, first of all, would like to place my complete agreement with it, with some changes, as Marilyn and Richard spoke about.

The law is one end of policies. This policy space is a large space of which law occupies one end. And I think legal frameworks are important to an aspect of the policy space. But times of the Internet as (indiscernible) are over. It's become very, very important space, artifact, reality, institution, which surrounds everything today. And we need to start looking at what are the legal frameworks which inform them and kind of organize that process. So just generally to support this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list -- and I apologize for not taking the right order. Canada, India, and Saudi Arabia. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. And thank you to Peru for putting forward a recommendation.

For Canada it is clear that we have a very good international legal framework, which is called the U.N. charter. We also have international humanitarian law. We have human rights law. We have excellent resolutions from the Human Rights Council affirming that human rights offline apply online as well.

Therefore, we're a bit -- we -- we're a bit surprised by this need for further development of international legal framework in the sense that there are excellent legal frameworks that are existing that just need to be applied and enforced. Therefore, clearly, this would not fit as a recommendation for Canada. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

And I would like to thank Peru for bringing this very interesting proposal on board, even though it has come in a bit late. We would certainly like to go back and examine this proposal in detail. But for now, I would just like to say that it brings a very interesting area of work in the field of public policy and applicability of international law to Internet-related public policies. We would definitely like to come back to this proposal. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues.

We thank Peru for this interesting and good recommendation, I mean, to solve the vacuum we have in the international framework that goes around security issues, privacy issues. And I think it deserves more thinking in the coming period in how to form this in a good way as a recommendation coming out from the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list U.K. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you Chair. And thank you for the presentation of this proposal. As others have said, it's coming quite late in our discussions. And we are now just coming up to our final meeting.

So I would worry that this opens up a really huge range of issues for us to be taking on at this point.

Particularly, where it says, "All aspects of the Internet." All aspects of the Internet is a very, very large subject. And, of course, many aspects will be subject to domestic law. So there's a whole conversation about the domestic law as opposed to the international law. And, as others have said, there is already a body of international law. So, again, there's another very complex conversation there.

We also note that much of that international law is informed by expert bodies. And we've talked about some of the many other U.N. agencies that are already involved in forming these kinds of issues. So we're not sure that giving it to a commission which would not have that expertise is the best approach. So I think this is very wide ranging. It raises a whole load of very interesting questions. But I don't think at this stage we'll be able to support it as one of our recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see some flags up. May I just -- if you have already spoken, just put your flag down.

So I have next on my list Iran. I have Parminder. I have ISOC. Zambia. ISOC and Zambia and United States. Netherlands. I think that's it. Yes.

So, Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me thank the Peruvian delegation for this recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have already many U.N. agencies that they do their jobs and they affect the cross-cutting issues that have mentioned in this recommendation.

In line of the previous speakers, I believe that, if we are going to create international legal framework, this body should focus on the principle issue of the Internet, not the cross-cuttings -- the other cross-cuttings that already we have many U.N. agencies and U.N. commissions that follow the issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Let me turn to Parminder followed by Zambia.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Sorry for coming late. I'll be very, very short. I just want to connect to the fact that there was already a proposal for framework mentioned in my proposal in the last set of proposals, which is why we shared, discussed, and so on. And that has a great amount of connection with this particular proposal. I don't think they're the same. But it's, basically, a new legal framework and connecting different legal frameworks in relation to the Internet. So this space has already been among the recommendations, and I would see Peru's proposal connect to that. These are the set of issues already on the table, and they should not be put aside just because they come in late.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Zambia, ISOC, U.S., Netherlands. And after that I will close the list.

Unless there is -- and revert to Peru, of course, for comments with regard to input that were made since we have agreed to close and to start discussing the outline of the report and follow-up to our work by 4:00 p.m. So I think that will enable us to do so. So, Zambia, you have the floor, sir.

>>REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. And we just would like to thank Peru for this proposal. We are not sure whether we do have sufficient instruments to -- legal instruments to govern the Internet at the international level. And, if we do, we also are not sure whether these instruments are coherent.

So our proposal would be that we support the recommendation and perhaps see how we can then further analyze it and strengthen the existing instruments. I thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. ISOC.

>>ISOC: Thank you very much. The Internet Society would also like to thank Peru for this interesting proposal.

From our perspective, there really is a question of timing. I think this proposal would have been really interesting maybe a few years ago before we started, you know, the 10-year review process of the entire WSIS, the World Summit on Information Society. And, during that process, we realized, going through the action lines, whatever the topics were -- whether it was cybersecurity, whether it was the ethical dimension of the information society or multilingual content and so on and so forth, that for each and every one of those areas we realized that what needed to be done in the coming years was to enhance existing mechanisms we had and that existing legal framework simply needed to be applied to the new emerging digital situations. That really was a very strong consensus and outcome from my perspective coming out of WSIS+10 at the U.N. general assembly level. So, really, the highest level in the U.N. system. And it would be my perspective that we perhaps, you know, put aside this issue because it really seems that we would be reopening a conversation, a discussion that happened already a few years ago. And that we move forward on areas of consensus. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. It will be brief. Because I really think we need to get to the structure of the report.

The U.S. associates with the comments made by Canada and the U.K. But I also think that ISOC's comments just now were very relevant to our discussion here.

Our mandate comes from WSIS+10. And the proposals for new legal instruments were certainly proposed in that meeting, were certainly discussed at that meeting. And I would say that the outcome document is fairly clear that it does not see those as necessary right now. I think there's a paragraph even under the Internet governance sections that existing frameworks have been effective in making

the Internet what it is. And so, for that reason, I don't know if this group is going to add to that conversation. And just, frankly, the U.S. has been a longstanding position that we don't currently support an international legal framework for the Internet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Netherlands. After that I had closed my list. But I see Nick has put up his plate. If you wish to be very brief, I don't want to be too rigid about -- thank you. Thank you for your flexibility. Netherlands and then we revert to Peru.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair. Just to express myself against the proposal made by Peru, we think that there are already sufficient legal international structures present but should be enforced in the near future. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Would you like to -- yes, Richard Hill and then I will come back to Peru.

>>RICHARD HILL: To those who have sufficient instruments, I'd like to ask you what you consider to be the international instrument on data protection. And, again, I'd like to remind everybody that as we speak, proposals are already made to WTO to call for a certain type of data protection regime, which is no protection at all, called the free flow of data.

So I would like to know whether everybody here thinks that, yes, WTO should go off and do that. And if not, do we need something? Do we need a global equivalent of the European global data protection regulation?

Another issue, what about international competition law? Do we need any instruments that would allow somebody to look at international dominance of companies as opposed to just national or regional dominance. If these instruments exist, I think it would be helpful for the group if people could point them to us, not now, but at future discussions.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And thank you especially for the last part of your intervention which you said you are not expecting an answer at this moment.

I think, in the course of discussions, those points have been made. And we, I think, fairly understand positions and where each one of us comes from. I don't think it would be a good use of our time to prolong discussion on this. I appreciate it if you could take that off line.

Nick, do you want to make a point on this? And then I revert to Peru. I'm doing this because I want to make sure when we come back to Peru that we have -- Peru has all the elements to make a final comment in regard to everything that was said.

Nick, please.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much, Chairman.

I just wanted to briefly note in case anyone actually is worried that the WTO is going to make rules on the free flow of data, that's absolutely not in the prospect at any time in anyone's mind. I spend half my time on trade policy. There's just zero appetite amongst the members for any kind of normative result on any Internet subject at the present time. They are discussing what to discuss, not what to agree. So lest everybody worry that the trade community is not going to come in and take your data away, give it away to anyone else, or to tell you what you can do with it. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Please, let's not --

[Laughter]

I encourage you to -- I see you have been discussing these over in the list. Maybe you should continue doing so to the benefit of the group.

Peru, can I revert to you for your comments.

>>PERU: Yes. First of all, I would like to thank everybody's comment. I think agreed or disagreed, everyone deserves to be heard. And I personally appreciate everyone's opinion.

I would like to read briefly what the mandate for this international law commission is. The mandate is to initiate status and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its qualification.

To say that we have enough laws that we have a charter and so on, could also we interpret it as if we have a charter, why do we have a convention on the (indiscernible)? If we have a charter, why have we worked on a convention for many other issues?

I believe the proposal we have made deserves another opportunity. I think we should discuss this more thoroughly and by no means put it aside. I don't think it would be fair because the same way we have respected everyone's opinions, we expect our opinion and those who favor this proposal to be respected. So I would not encourage this to be put aside.

And also with all the respect, all of you deserve, I would like to say that these issues regarding Internet are obviously being dealt with by a number of different organizations because the Internet has developed too quickly and, thus, has given rise to a polarized treatment of the issue in different foras, in different international foras. And that is not precisely an efficient expression or a coherent expression.

International law is a body that is constantly in evolution. And this is what I think we should -- we should acknowledge. In fact, like Parminder mentioned, I found that this proposal went -- was very coherent with other proposals I have heard in this past days. So I think we can go back to it and later on discuss it.

There's a little fear -- I can feel there's a little fear from many of you to the possibility of normative issues. I wouldn't fear that very much. I mean, normative issues is putting things in order. We're not talking about normative issues. We're talking a body of law. And I have been -- excuse me?

>> (off microphone).

>>PERU: Perhaps my English is not proper? Okay.

Because I deserve the respect I give you. Okay.

I believe you might all be ignoring certain trends and precisely some presentations given by some presidents in the General Assembly that you probably didn't hear. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would certainly think we had good exchange, and I think many points of view were voiced. I wouldn't see a point in prolonging discussion as of now on this particular issue as proposed by Peru.

This is nothing of -- no proposal, no idea is off the table as of now. I think we will have to see in due time how these will fit into broader context of the overall message we want to convey. So I'd like just to make -- say that for the record.

Also, recognizing that this proposal, though, new in its drafting format, refers to ideas and concepts that have already been discussed and have entailed substantial, I'd say, controversies. So I think at this point maybe we could -- not taking out of the table but as we had agreed before, let's now have some discussion on how we want to agree on the follow-up to our work, especially towards the completion of our mandate.

We are, by the way, beyond 4:00 p.m. which was the time we had agreed to start discussion on that.

So with your indulgence, I would come back to the list I was initially entertaining. Let me find the list. Just a minute, please.

I apologize. I think we misplaced our documents. I recall we were starting with the U.K. But then I'll ask colleagues again to put up their plates so I can identify and take note again of your wish to speak on that particular topic. We are moving now that is to the follow-up of our work in preparation of our report.

U.K., you have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, as you say, we are near the end of our work here as well as near the end of our meeting at the moment. And we do really need to focus now on our report. We were established to make recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. And so we'd like to make two proposals for how we achieve that, first around the time line and, second, a proposed structure for the report. And it would be helpful perhaps if the structure for the report could be shown on the screens.

I think it was emailed around to people before lunch. So I hope people had an opportunity to look at it, but perhaps it could be on the screen as well.

I will start with the time line, though. And we're suggesting three stages for the time line, first that our chair could circulate a first draft or a zero draft of the report by the end of October. Then all of us stakeholders can submit --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Excuse me, Paul. Can we just wait for it to be uploaded so we can see on screen?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Now the time line. Yes, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: The first one, by the end of October our chair circulates a first draft. Then by the end of November, we have a chance to submit track-change amendments to that report and we send them to our chair.

And then, again, we rely on our chair to look at the different views and different comments which have come in and produce a second draft but a clean draft. So we do not end up starting our meeting in January with a draft which is covered in red suggestions, but the second draft should be a clean draft which forms the beginning of our discussion at the next meeting.

So we may have got the dates not quite right. Maybe we need a bit less time in October, a bit more time in November, I don't know. But that's the kind of broad three-stage approach that we would propose for the group to consider.

Then coming on to the structure of the report itself -- and, again, as I said this morning, we listened to different comments and conversations over the course of our meeting this week.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Paul, may I suggest we discuss then the time line and then we revert to the report. I think maybe it was -- there was a point of order so we keep the discussion focused on one part and then on the other part of your recommendation.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: If we could do that.

So if we could then look into that proposal, I would like, first of all, to thank the U.K. as I had indicated before. I think it provides us an initial food for thought on how we can organize ourselves in regard to the time we have in between now and our next meeting, which, by the way, something we also want to discuss. We also have Ms. Shamika, the head of the CSTD secretariat. She will be coming to our meeting with a purpose also to discuss the time for -- the availability of dates for our next meeting.

But in regard to this, I'd like to really think that might be at least a basis for discussion on something that would be realistic and could lead us to that.

My only comment at this point, I think by the end of October, I would be more than happy to circulate. But I would certainly like to rely on those proponents that have made a proposal, that have revised their proposals. So I'd encourage all of you who have made a contribution to send to the secretariat the

latest version of your proposals so we could have the entirety of documents before us before the circulated first draft.

I think it might be okay to allow for one month to make track changes. I think what is maybe ambitious is by the first to have a clean text. I think probably we will have a text that will still have some bracket language. And maybe we can think of some intermediary step between November and the first week of January. But those are, let's say, my initial comments. Overall, I think that proposal is very helpful in allowing us to visualize what would be, let's say, a feasible way forward for us.

I have on my list Marilyn Cade. I'm not sure of the right order. Marilyn Cade, Richard Hill, Saudi Arabia.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade.

I have just a couple of clarifying questions. And let me thank the U.K. for their very coherent example of a draft time line. I think it may be a little too aggressive in some areas, as the chair had mentioned. And I appreciate the fact that the U.K. had acknowledged that.

My question is specifically about the next meeting and to point out an area of implication and concern I'd like us to keep in mind.

There will be a CSTD intersessional sometime in January or February. And for many of us who have extremely limited travel time, et cetera --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just -- with all respect, but just factual information, the intersessional will be from 6 to 8 November here in Geneva.

>>MARILYN CADE: That was my question. You short-cutted it. 6 to 8 November this year. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I think this is -- we're just talking about the time line -- an excellent proposal. If the U.K. could agree then, Chairman, picking up your idea at the beginning, we add a new bullet right at the beginning called by 15 October, or whatever, proponents to circulate revised versions of their recommendations. And then, of course, whether you can do this by the first week of January depends on you and the secretariat. I think we would all be willing to (indiscernible) in that.

But if I understand the U.K.'s proposal correctly, the idea is that you would try to consolidate the different suggestions made. And, you know, everything is going to be in square brackets at that stage. So you might have specific areas where there are alternatives and you put them in square brackets, but the whole thing is in square brackets. If I understood the U.K.'s proposal correctly, it was, in fact, you would make an effort to consolidate the different comments and come up with something that could be

used as negotiating, recognizing that you didn't necessarily incorporate all of the comments from all of the people.

So, for example, if somebody said "delete a paragraph" but other people didn't say that, maybe you leave the paragraph in maybe with square brackets or not. So I don't know if I understood U.K. correctly. But certainly I would definitely support that approach going forward. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'll come back to the U.K. after we hear a few other comments.

Are there any other further comments? Yes, Saudi Arabia, I think you had raised your flag before.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

My comment was captured by Richard, I mean, on the issue of how a clean version will be developed. Will you consolidate similar recommendations? I mean, how -- how the chair -- I mean, it's a big task that we throw to the chair that he will develop a clean draft. But what is the U.K.'s views on this?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I revert to the U.K.

What I could say, I think, that's the usual procedure we follow. As chair, I try my best to put out a text that would be a clean text from my perspective. But this would be submitted to your consideration. You can accept, reject, amend, delete, expand.

So second version of my proposal would still be, let's say, trying to bridge the differences that are, in my opinion, may be bridgeable. But in case there are any fundamental points, I don't think -- I can even make a proposal. But in the end, it will be up to the plenary to decide whether it's acceptable or not.

So by the end of the day, the decision will always be a plenary decision. So that's why we need the -- anyway, the final meeting because we must make sure anything that is proposed is owned and accepted by the group. So I think it will be a kind of incremental process, I hope, and progressive but always depending on the group's assessment whether it corresponds or not to -- it meets everyone's concerns and needs.

I have on my list Russian Federation followed by Cuba and Iran.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, we'll welcome the possibility to discuss how we will work on the report. It's a very important point. And we think that proposal -- proposed approach is absolutely -- can be accepted. However, it's better to take the time for face-to-face discussion on the text somewhere in November. If it's possible to make it close to intersessional CSTD, just after, at least one or two days, it will be perfect from us.

If not, then we propose three days in January after council working group session. So just after it will be three days, 29, 30, 31 of January. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia, for your intervention. I think that is already a practical suggestion with regard to how we address it at the very end of our process.

Cuba followed by Iran.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm an optimist by nature, but, even though I'm also a realistic person. And I think that here the problem with the report is that definitely there are going to be issues in which it's not a unanimous support. You proposed to use a method that has been used in previous reports within the U.N. system. That is, in those cases very -- not in all, but in very specific and key cases, where there's different opinions, those opinions -- and opinions that were expressed and supported by a number of countries, those opinions were reflected in the report.

And that does not disparage the report, neither takes out the category of being a consensus report. That will happen in the WGIG report. Carlos can confirm. And this has been, as some delegate said, in some other report. We're not having a decision. We're not having a resolution here. And you said that. You started in that way. But some other delegates here are taking the way of the strict definition of consensus. I sent the day before yesterday the link to a book about that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We are addressing now the timeline.

>>CUBA: So my question is: if that thing is not resolved and alternative views are not going to be accepted in the report, then I think we can save time and energy in not having another meeting at all. Because then there will be no report. Because, if, for somebody, it's unacceptable to have some idea to some other part, it will be unacceptable not to have it. So I just saying that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. But, with all respect, this is out of line with what we're discussing now. The point you're raising is important, but this is not what we're discussing right now. We're discussing the timeline. We are discussing the idea that I should make -- provide a draft report and so on.

But I just want to close this, and then we move to another part that will address maybe your point of concern.

I have Iran and then Peter Major and U.K. Iran, U.K., and Peter Major.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. In light of there's no face-to-face discussion up to next meeting, so it's very difficult to say that we will have a clean text by the first week of January. And I propose to minor amendment, not to mention the clean. When we see the -- when we say that "clean text," it means that there's no objection on that. So it's due to, after receiving the second draft, we discussed again.

So it's better to say that the second draft, not the clean second draft. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran, for that proposal.

Maybe I'll turn to you after we hear Peter Major. And then we take all the comments, and I revert to you. I have Peter Major and then (indiscernible.)

Peter, you have the floor.

>>PETER MAJOR: Very briefly, Chair. I concur with the proposed timeline. And I already anticipated the Russian proposal yesterday. I put down the dates for the next meeting, physical meeting after the meeting.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. We'll also address this issue of the date of the next meeting in a few minutes.

Switzerland. Oh, no. I'm sorry. I mixed the two of you.

>> Thank you, Chair. I wonder if we can maybe have an order, not face-to-face, but remotely since we have now a platform we can continue our discussion. Maybe we can organize by the December or January another session where we can meet and continue to discuss on make a decision on the draft. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think this is a very helpful suggestion. Because I fear there might not be an opportunity to meet in November or December, because we have such an intense agenda of meetings between now and the end of the year. At least for me, I would say it would be impossible. Probably I'll be back here in December for the IGF and in between we have the ICANN meeting. So I think that may render impossible to come again. But, I think it's very important that, to the extent that it's possible to arrange for some either video conference, conference call, or some exchange that will allow us to have direct, immediate interaction. That might be something to be entertained. I'd like to check with the secretariat also the possibility to do it. I think that there might be not difficulty to do that. And maybe this is a step that could come in between the end of November and the first week of January. So that would be a suggestion. Keep that in mind for our moment as a possibility.

I certainly support the amendment proposed by Iran. Because I think the clean draft is the ultimate goal. I think this is a shared goal as something we would like to see by the first week of January. Clean. But maybe not to say it so explicitly. Because probably, in the light of how those things usually unfold, it might not be realistic to think we might have that kind of clean second draft by the first week of January.

Do you want to -- yes. I need to go to Richard here, and then I revert to the United Kingdom.

>>RICHARD HILL: Maybe we can call it the consolidated second draft or something like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Very good. So yes, U.K., please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

And thank you for all those comments. Yes, we agree. Having a deadline of 15th of October is very useful. So thank you, Richard, for that suggestion.

Yes, the idea of a second draft -- I apologize if "clean" is the wrong word. Maybe I caused confusion. The idea of having this second draft is really to make sure we get off to the best possible start in our discussions in January.

But that second draft will all be in square brackets, as you said, Chair. Everything in that second draft will be opened for discussion and conversation.

So it's simply to try to get us to a good start. But maybe "clean" was the wrong word. Maybe "consolidated" is a better word. So thank you for that.

I'm not sure about the idea of additional meetings. I think many colleagues here will have very, very busy diaries already. And it's quite late now to fix up additional meetings, although I'm sure conversations will continue over the weeks to come. And, finally, I just wanted to support with Russia's suggestion, I think it was, our next meeting should be immediately after the ITU council working groups when many of us will already be in Geneva. So thank you, Iran, for those suggestions. I'm ready to move on to the other part of our proposal. Thank you.

So we, as I said, looked at the proposal that you sent around, Chair, for the structure of our report. We looked at the proposal that Russia made as well on the structure.

And we also listened to the different contributions this week.

And so we'd like to propose the structure that you can see on the screen. And I will just run through it very quickly. It starts with an executive summary, as your proposal did, Chair.

Then there is an introduction which talks about the backgrounds to a group. It talks about the meetings that we held and what happened at each of those meetings.

Then we took a subtitle from the Russian contribution, I think, the scope and focus of enhanced cooperation. And we've suggested there in that section we should recognize the text in the Tunis Agenda about enhanced cooperation and the outcome document of the WSIS review, plus recognizing one or two other things such as the role of the IGF, or recognizing it's distinct but complementary, et cetera.

Then the next section is on the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation. And we've taken text from your proposal on that, Chair.

And, finally, a section on recommendations. And, as this was our mandate to produce recommendations, we suggest that you list them as recommendations set out very clearly so that we are clearly responding to our mandate.

And, finally, we suggested what our annexes should be. Again, we also looked at the report of the working group into IGF improvements. We took that as a guide, as a good precedent. So an annex on listing members of the working group is one suggestion we got from there. We also think it will be useful to include the contributions that were made to the working group to make sure that all of the different points of view that were contributed to this group are referenced in an annex and can be found there.

So that's our suggestion for the overall structure of our report. Of course, there's plenty of things to discuss in terms of the contents still. But we think that that structure would be a useful guide for us as we go forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., for your proposal. Thank you for making reference to many elements and ideas I had made in my own initial proposal.

I notice you have made an effort to reflect discussions we have had so

far. But I'd like to open the floor for discussions. I note I think the intervention made before by Cuba may be had a bearing on the structure of the report as well. I take note of the -- as I indicated at the beginning that the joint proposal from Russian Federation, Pakistan, Parminder, and Saudi Arabia also had ideas on the structure of the document. So we have here a number of ideas on how to deal, to address the report outline. I'd like to have maybe -- maybe we can have, in the course of the discussion, reference to those alternative ways of dealing with the different items in the report. I -- even upon focusing on your proposal, I'd invite colleagues to comment in general. I think it's not -- this would be the -- I think it's very -- reminds me of the discussion we had on the joint proposal, the outline that's proposed. Juan has just made a few comments in that regard. So, on that basis I'd like to open the floor for discussions. Who goes first? No one, so it's accepted. Oh! I was going to -- Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: I don't have a tape recorder, but I just want to repeat what was just said. So that's understood. That's a question -- what?

(Speaker off microphone.)

No, the question is -- it's a question for everybody here. If this report does not have the flexibility of including different opinions, then the work is not -- I was just reading, at the beginning of the WGIG something that was written by Bill Drake that we didn't intend from the beginning to get to a unanimous decision because we knew it was impossible. Here to try to get unanimous, it's impossible as well.

So, if we don't accept to have different opinions in one topic or two topics, the topic that we decide, to have different opinions that reflects the real state of mind of we, the experts, that are represented either our countries or our NGO organizations and all that, if we don't get that, then this whole exercise is fruitless. Because, as I said before, with the same emphasis than some government says that they cannot accept the mentioning of some ideas -- because it's the mentioning, because it's only to consider and all that -- in the same way I can say that many delegations here, at least one, mine, could not accept a document in which those ideas are not reflected. Because that will convey the idea, the -- to ECOSOC and the UNGA that those things are not on the table, that nobody thinks about that.

And that is not true.

That has been a suggestion by many people. So I think -- your initial draft, I think it was a very good compromise in only one paragraph to put those alternatives in a very succinct and very polite form. But

it was very unfortunate that that effort that you made that I really congratulate you for that was not accepted by many delegations.

And, if that is not going to happen, in the future, I think that we can save all the time and all the discussion and all this drafting. Because we will have a deadlock like the previous working group that somebody here remembered. And here is the chairman. Because the issues are the same.

And the positions are the same.

And, if the reactions are the same, with lack of flexibility, we are not the deciding body here. We are making recommendations to the deciding body. Somebody said okay, that's putting the ball back to the game. Okay. That's what we can do now, if we're honest with what happened and what we discussed in this room.

The other thing is try to, you know, sweep the dirt under the carpet and leave it there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan.

I have on my list a number of speakers. Richard Hill, Parminder, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia.

But, just before turning to them, I would like to comment the following. I think, at this moment, I am not entertaining the idea we'll not get to an outcome. And I think all of us should be aiming at fulfilling our report. If, by the end of the last day of our last meeting we cannot do it, we should acknowledge that and look for a plan B. But I'm not entertaining plan B. As of now, I do not want us to engage in that. I think you should look at what we have been doing. We have seen a lot of convergence around many ideas. And I see many areas in which we can make very -- I would say very productive and positive recommendations that will add value to what we have now. So I don't think this is something we want to throw away.

At the same time, my personal ideas, as reflected in my first document, I think we should make -- agree on a way, an appropriate way in which everyone will feel comfortable to document those areas in which we cannot come to that point,

in which the group as a whole can support a decision, make proposals for what I think we can agree.

And, in the context of our work, of the U.N. work, and elsewhere, many delicate issues are being addressed. And there are ways of addressing -- of dealing with these. There are the difference of opinion to record and to move things forward.

I think many of us have maybe fresh on their minds the outcome of the last UNGA group which also led to some deadlock. But we should not forget that there are previous three editions in which there was a report and made very incremental -- and made progress, but it was there, documented around issues that are very delicate.

So it's not to say that failing one single area should lead us immediately to think on a plan B.

So let's for the moment focus on this. I don't see a fundamental -- maybe it's a positive, not to be a fundamental difference in approach but I think there is an understanding that even in case there are opinions that are not linked, they should be in a way reflected. The proposal coming from the U.K. is to put it as an annex.

My proposal was different. I think your proposal is different. That's why we are discussing here. Let's see -- I'd like to have your inputs coming to me in that regard beyond the ones that are already on the table. That will assist me to comply with what we have just decided. You are asking me to provide you by the end of October a draft report you can look into. So I just want to have inputs from you that will allow me to do in the best way I can. This will be submitted to your consideration. If you think it's okay, let it be. Otherwise, we will continue discussion.

But for the moment, I would like to collect views, alternative views, on how we are addressing it. I think you made very eloquently your position.

I have on my list Richard Hill followed by Parminder, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the U.S., Canada, Marilyn Cade, Australia.

So, Richard, please, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thanks, Chairman. I would like to start with a procedural point. Can you please scroll back up to the time line that we agreed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>RICHARD HILL: So this is agreed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Netherlands.

>>RICHARD HILL: So actually we've agreed that you are going to create the first draft of the report.

Now, if we agree here on the structure, then you'll follow the structure that we agree here. If we don't agree here on the structure, then you're going to do whatever you think is appropriate based on the discussions. So that's the first point.

So we have definitely agreed a path forward for the report. The only risk is that the draft you produce encounters so much opposition nothing can be agreed. I don't think that's going to happen, Chairman. I'm feeling very confident now that we will be able to move forward very productively.

Now, my second point is substantive. If we could scroll back down. Thank you. So actually there have been several proposals for the report. I made it verbally at the last meeting. And then I didn't put it in writing because I didn't think it was necessary. But that was an initial report. That's rather more similar to the proposal coming from Russia and others than to either yours or the ones from the U.K.

I like some elements of the Russian proposal. Again, this is all for you to take into consideration unless we happen here to agree already on the structure.

Regarding the U.K.'s proposal, I think this would be okay if it's understood that the recommendations are not necessarily recommendations on which there's unanimity. So it would be okay if, for example, one of the recommendations read something like: Recommendations regarding new mechanisms, some people thought X and some people thought Y and some people thought Z or whatever. So we could accommodate diversity of views within this structure.

Personally, I'd prefer either the Russian proposal or your proposal, Chairman. So I would rather urge you to go in that direction. But it's clear to me that it's necessary to capture all of the views. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder, followed by Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I'm not able to read -- I can't comment on it because I haven't seen the text. And I know the text was sent around, but can you just send it around again because my laptop doesn't take WiFi. And on the phone it becomes very difficult to -- I have been trying to search for the text. I didn't get it. I can't see it on the phone and comment. I can't comment on a lot of the stuff.

I have a feeling it's not very different on the top from the proposal we submitted earlier. And there could be -- background can be worked around.

I think there's less difficulty on it. In day or two we can work on all those areas, I mean, without having read them really.

So the real issues, of course, are recommendations. And I was about not to comment on it because I agree that there will be recommendations and then in the annex there would be all the responses or whatever, the text used here, whatever was -- contributions, other contributions.

Now since you've already raised the point, and Richard as well, I think the core issue here is that one recommendation would be of a different nature. That recommendation is of a different nature in the chair's draft as well. It is there in WGIG. And, again, I'm repeating in WGIG, the alternatives were within recommendations. So there is a different kind of diverse views than the various responses which will come in the annex. And the difference is made out by relevance.

Now, we cannot say that, okay, we have a view that all stakeholders should be on the same footing and that should also be put on a box. So not all those issues can be put into boxes of recommendation. Only one set which goes to the core.

I think we can agree the core is the issue whether new mechanisms are needed or not. That's very fine some people say they are not needed. That is a valid view. But that question is at the core, is something -- I don't know. We can contest. Actually -- okay, I will come do that later.

So what recommendations would be of the kind which is in WGEC which says that we did do this, this, and there were opinions which are provided in these two boxes? But this is central to the architecture

of the report. We have been saying it from the start, but we have been told to postpone that point of whatever it is.

But now I think at one point we need to know that that decision has to be made because for us, even when we in the intersessional period make a track change, I wouldn't know how to do track change things because for me every track change would be "unless so and so is agreed, this practice of is struck off." I will have to strike off all paragraphs unless this particular thing is agreed.

So I just want to put it to the group that this element -- I think it is -- this is developing countries who have been -- and there's no doubt about it -- who are asking for a new mechanism. They have been asking for WGEC, the present WGEC, for a long time. This is their demand that we need a new mechanism. They were consistent during WSIS+10, at the WSIS. Now, they wanted a new mechanism. People say no, there's no need of new mechanism. Those that have been saying no, figure out what is a mechanism which is needed. This was a statement during the WSIS+10.

Right now after four years of WGEC activity, it's a compromise to agree that, okay, we would say that there are two views. But that is the least we have to go because if there is no recommendation which actually tells that this is the view of some people and this is a mechanism that's needed and other people saying existing mechanisms are working for so and so reasons and these are the five improvements we should be taking, these are the only institutional proposals.

Other is dependent on this. And if this doesn't happen, it clearly is a null report from our viewpoint. It simply gets sent that we could not agree on the report.

The reason for that is I heard from Canada and USA today a very surprising statement. They said it has already been decided in the U.N. documents that there would be no mechanism. That was very surprising. Everybody knows that a lot of people disagrees with such a statement. This is not a fact. It was not decided, and that's why the group has been made.

Now, if we sent the WGEC report with a lot of stuff but not these two boxes, it will definitely be established in some people's mind that this is a most definitive evidence that it has been decided by the global committee that there should not be -- that there is no need for a new mechanism. That's something obviously we are not ready to do. So it's not a threat that there will be no report. That's the only logical possibility available to us that unless these two boxes are made, there would be no report because if there are no two boxes, then what would be interpreted from any report is that it was decided that there would be no mechanisms. And we are not going to be ready to say that. That's very clear.

So if we agree there would be two boxes, then we are talking about a report. And if there are two boxes, then we are talking about other recommendations. Then we are talking about a background and an annex of contributions made to the working group. This is a simple thing.

I don't think there's much (indiscernible) ability on this particular point for many of the people present here as I have talked to them and I understand their position. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Again, I think it is very premature to make a judgment on the final outcome, whether it could be acceptable or not. It's something I think we need -- we just decided on the process to get there. The initial step would be presentation of a draft on the basis of your recommendations that will be sent in revised form. So I think, again, I'll do my best to reflect on paper in a way that could be acceptable to everyone the points that were made, the agreements.

This is to be seen by you. I don't think it would be maybe productive to discuss as of now what would be the final, final outcome because this is something in progress. We have agreed that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So let's just -- and, by the way, it's curious because at some point in the discussion, I think Saudi Arabia or others -- forgive me for mentioning your -- when referring to WSIS+10, said it was mandated to develop new mechanism. Other people have different interpretation. So you see the need maybe to have some kind of -- not arbitration but some type of reconciliation of different views.

I think this is what the group was called for. That's the mandate we have. The diversity of views is there. For some the core mandate is this. For some the core mandate is that. So it's the diversity of views. That's the nature of our work. And as a chair, I have -- I would gladly take upon myself the responsibility to present to you text that in my opinion might lead us to consensus.

And this would be judged by you. Once the text is out, you can destroy it, put some more lipstick on it if you want or anything else to avoid the Frankenstein discussion. If you want Jack the Ripper, you can rip it in different slices to your liking. It would be up to the plenary to decide on the final. I think it's premature as of now to pass the judgment on what will be the final outcome.

I think the purpose of this session is to collect views. I think there are divergent views how the report should look like. I'm taking this on board and this will be very, very helpful for me when putting together the first draft for your consideration.

Do you want to follow up on this? Parminder, please. If you could be very brief because there are many speakers.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I will be very brief. My comment, therefore, actually was on the structure and not on the substance. The structural point is that among the recommendations, there is a possibility to call something as a recommendation but being a different view. This is just the possibility that this kind of layering is possible as a structure.

And I was connecting the structure to an important substantive issue. But I don't want the structure to go at any point the recommendations are identified as perfect consensus and the rest is all in the annex as a contribution. I'm just putting in the structure this possibility. I just wanted to put it on the record that is a possibility in the structure.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Again, the group can do anything. The group can decide and set a number of different ideas and say those are recommendations or not. I took the point at some point in our

discussion it was stated that the WGEC, when presented four scenarios, had those recommendations. This is something that was important to do. If the group wants to entertain this idea and to say these are recommendations, so that would be.

But when I look at our mandate and the group is to develop recommendations, everything that can be owned by the group as a whole as recommendations, as those would fit into that category of recommendations. Otherwise, I think we'd be talking about diversity of views and split recommendations which I don't think is exactly what we were -- but this is -- this would be further discussed.

Again, let's wait for the first draft, and I will get your comments as we go along.

Russian Federation followed by Saudi Arabia and the U.S.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Actually, we think we need to say thank you for U.K. to acknowledge the need for background in the report because we think it's a really important thing because all our recommendations is based on something. So the background report should be in place. And we are ready also to add what we think is useful in the background.

Regarding the other side, well, we heard our mandate. Chair read it through. And when it comes to the putting just all contribution into annexes, we will never agree on this because we think that it is not how the mandate should be fulfilled.

According to mandate, we should present all diverse views. And this is not the presentation of diverse views. Diverse views should be in the report. Otherwise, the mandate is not fulfilled.

And when it comes to the recommendation, we think that the good thing is to group them or categorize them because there are certain issues we need to address. And, for example, what I put in least improvement in multistakeholder participation, it's one issue. Another issue, lack of coordination between different public policy bodies and processes. Another is role of governments in enhanced cooperation process, for example, or possible evolution of institutional frameworks.

So we have number of issues, and we need to address them. And it's not right just to put the least of the recommendation. We need to group them and discuss in the group under certain categories.

First, we believe it is much easier to find the consensus on such slider issues.

And another point is if we have diverse views, we should fix diverse views. If you look at the resolution, at the same point our mandate is stated, there is the understanding of UNGA that there is diverse views on this point. So it's not a surprise. Actually, what is expected from us is the professional view on the issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is Saudi Arabia followed by the U.S. and Canada. You have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. And we thank our colleague from the U.K. for their version of draft.

Firstly, I mean, by looking at the chair proposal and the U.K. proposal, we see -- I mean, we've noticed even changing the body of the text. So I would like to ask you, Chair, to put only the headings now on the screen. Let's not see the bodies, so just the headings in one space so we see "introduction," "recommendation," "background" on one page. Let's now forget about the content of the report. We just copy the headings because the content is another story for us to discuss and decide on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry. I think the U.S. has a point of order on this.

>>UNITED STATES: Yeah, Chair. I just -- I think normal process is to finish the conversation about the U.K.'s proposal which we were doing before we start looking at alternative proposals. So I don't have a problem going through this exercise. I just -- comments on the proposal by the U.K., may be good to finish that process before we discuss something else. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, U.S.

Just before turning -- I just recall that when -- after U.K. introduced, I just made a statement that the same matter has been addressed by other proposals, including my own that I'm not putting on the table now, but the one from the joint contribution. Then I invited maybe for joint discussion because the issues are basically the same in substance. I think there are some issues to be addressed that we don't need to replicate discussions.

So I think -- and I am allowing Saudi Arabia -- because I think maybe he has a point in making comparison between -- and I think that's the moment now. We don't have much time to discuss.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I'm not trying to change anything. We will agree on this structure, not on the content in the document that we have. So any agreement will be on these headings. Body of the report is a totally different story.

Another question for our colleague from the U.K., they deleted the chair options. Is this a way that we will include -- we will not include options in the recommendation from their point of view? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to the U.K. after we hear -- next is U.S. followed by Canada and Marilyn Cade.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I didn't mean to intervene on the Saudi comments. I just wanted to make sure there was a proper working order here. So we didn't comment on the timeline, but I think that's a very good approach for the U.S. delegation. Having a text in an orderly fashion that we can review is critically important so we can come to the final meeting really prepared to discuss it. Timeline looks good, and we're happy about that. That structure -- that process was very effective for WSIS+10. And it's something that we should try to emulate here, because it was a good practice.

I agree I like the structure that the U.K. has proposed. I think it makes a lot of sense. It seems to be pretty standard issue for a report like this from a working group like this. But I also think that it's reflective of the conversation we've had. I mean, we've discussed the scope and focus. These high-level characteristics, we spent a meeting here. And we spent the last two sessions talking about recommendations. So I agree with all that. It sounds like there's positive support for the U.K. structure. It seems similar to other structures that have been proposed by a coalition of countries and the chair. So I think we're in pretty good shape there.

But I want to address the issues that have been raised by some others about the process, consensus proposals versus others. You know, we must express some concern here about this potential breakdown of a consensus-based process, which is really the hallmark of U.N. discussions, particularly, discussions on topics like this.

I'm not sure I've ever been a part of a U.N. negotiation that so quickly broke down on we're just going to agree to disagree without going through the process.

Many of us were engaged in WSIS+10, which mandated this working group. There was areas of disagreement there. There were these same areas of disagreement there. But that group at that level within the U.N. General Assembly identified areas of consensus and then asked this working group to continue a dialogue, continue the conversation, and come back with recommendations. They didn't ask us to go highlight the differences, because they were known. We were tasked to go find areas of compromised, of consensus, and provide recommendations to the international community. I really don't know what we benefit to just highlight those differences of opinion. I mean, we've used the working group on Internet governance a few times. That's was really a landmark report at the time. It was a different kind of report. It was to provide options into the Tunis Agenda. And there was a need for information at that point, and so the working group was asked to do that.

This is different. I think the model that we should be looking in this room is the CSTD working group on improvements to the IGF, which I know many in this room were involved in that had similar issues or similar questions. And the group produced consensus recommendations, which not only were they useful to the international community but were recognized by UNGA in WSIS+10 as an important document and one that could be acted on in the further implementation of the WSIS outcomes. I think that's the model we should be using. And within that we should be looking for areas of consensus, not just highlighting our agreements. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. Well, I think you should take the blame for at an early stage trying to sort out the difference between consensus and non-consensus.

However, I would, again, repeat what I said at the beginning of this that our mandate provides us to develop recommendations and also to prepare a report.

And I see a substantial difference between one and the other.

The WSIS+10 outcome document, basically, is a resolution. So a resolution -- I'm sorry to say it -- but, traditionally, has those parts, a preambular part. But it's all substance. It's substantially different from the report of the meeting. We do not have a report from the WSIS+10. Usually, at the U.N. you have a service that is outsourced that provides for a report of the meetings. Usually it has a description of the meeting. One said so, one said so. Some people said that, that said. That's a report. But that's not usually what stands for history. We were tasked to do both, to prepare -- to develop recommendations, very straightforward, very direct. And I would say recommendations grounded on consensus, because we are aiming at language that would say the working group agrees, recommends, advises. So we can do it in relation, even if there is divisive issues. But I don't see a willingness in the room to entertain that kind of language in regard to issues that are divisive. So I think that that -- maybe I'm jumping to -- but I'm acting on the basis of what I'm hearing from you. And that's different from a report. Because the report has an obligation to include an executive summary which was not done by the WSIS+10 document because it's not a report. It's a resolution.

It calls for introduction. Calls -- so it's something -- it's different in nature. So I think it's up to the group to decide how it wants the report to be outlined, how the different pieces will go together. But it will be substantially different from the recommendations that will be contained in the report but do not coincide entirely with the report.

So I -- again, I'm collecting your views. I take the points that they are different views in regard how those different elements should fit into the report. I'm taking all those in account. And I'll make my best effort to come up with something that might be acceptable for you.

But that will be submitted for your consideration and approval, rejection, amendment, so on and so forth.

May I turn to Canada followed by Marilyn Cade and Australia.

>> CANADA: If I may, I'll switch with Australia because my colleague needs to go pick up children, so we'll inverse roles. Yeah.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please, Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you very much, Chair. And thank you, Canada. Thanks, Chair.

Look, in all my work here in Geneva, I'm asked to be useful to my capital. And I think it's really important that we also keep in mind our need to make sure that these U.N. conversations stay useful and stay really constructive and productive.

Our mandate is to produce recommendations. I agree with the very sensible comments just given by the U.S. describing diverse views is not particularly useful. And, as Russia previously commented, everybody knows what these diverse views are. UNGA already knows this. So rehashing views is not what we've asked to do. So we've been mandated to produce recommendations on how we can take forward enhanced cooperation. Consensus recommendations, Chair, are useful. They have authority. If

we're simply going to record our differences, then there's no reason for anyone to compromise here, to be creative, to look forward and find positive solutions.

I, too, like my Cuban colleague, am an optimist. And I believe we have the potential to reach some creative and positive ways forward.

And I think, when we get to the text, that's a great opportunity to do so.

So I'd like to encourage you, Chair, to lead us, yes, to draw on the diversity of views expressed, but, in order to produce a consensus report, a useful report. So let's keep discussing, let's be focused and collaborative and move forward to find solutions.

So, on this basis, the Australian delegation would like to endorse the U.K proposal as a really useful starting point for a productive discussion. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your comments and your support.

Next on my list is Marilyn Cade followed by Canada.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. I will -- I'm going to make two comments. And that is right now, having looked at all of the approaches that have been submitted. I'm going to reflect back on a comment I made seems like much earlier in this week.

I really appreciate the comments that are made that -- and this most recent one made by Australia, that she needs to be -- that, as a representative of her government, she needs to be useful to capital. I suspect that is a charter that everybody who is sent here has to address. I say that, because that's true of all of us here as different stakeholders as well since we are representing different parts, for instance, of the business community, the technical community, the civil society community.

I don't think that, including in the document in some way the diversity of views is a rehashing non-useful information.

I think the question is how is it included in the document? And I think the Chair had an elegant approach and one that I certainly found useful to consider and remain in that place myself.

I will just make a quick comment about -- and I'm not suggesting we debate this, but I want to make an observation. Right now -- and I don't think this is a recommendation.

But I notice that we are only going to reference the members of the working group in the annex. Perhaps we could have an annex with a couple of paragraphs that describes how the process has been open to observers, whether they are countries or other stakeholders. And also the fact that we have used open mechanisms such as Webcasting and transcripts and remote participation in order to enable more transparency and inclusiveness. And I -- then it can go in a -- it certainly can go in an annex. But I

think we're kind of missing something if we don't reflect the fact that we have done as much as we could, really, to try to make the process open and accessible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. And thank you very much for these very concrete suggestions. I think it's important to include it, I would say, even in the body of the report in the introductory part in which we describe the proceedings of the group. Because, in my original suggestion to you, I thought, of course, including an annex communicate which members of the group and also to indicate there was remote participation, live captioning. But you have mentioned a number of other tools we use to ensure diversity of views was part of our work. And I think it's important to report that back because that's also part of the mandate we had that the group should issue full involvement of all relevant stakeholders taking into account their diverse views.

So I thank you for this. This is certainly -- I would endorse that should be reflected. I don't think there will be no controversy to indicate that in our work we made the best use we could of all resources available to make sure there would be inclusivity and participation. By the way, we have the remote participation I don't see many remote. Maybe on the list there have been some inputs. And but I would look forward for even more participation in that regard.

You can even draw my attention to things that I miss, because sometimes I don't have time to check as we go about the meeting if this is relevant to the work we are being doing in plenary. So thank you very much for that, Marilyn, suggestion. Very helpful suggestion.

Next on my list is Canada followed by the Netherlands and Mr. Yokozawa. Canada, please.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. From Canada's perspective, we came here with the hope of having consensus with a fairly reasonable degree of confidence that we would be able to produce recommendations that would have consensus.

Our paragraph 65 of the WSIS document talks, indeed, about taking into account all their diverse views and expertise, Speaking of stakeholders. But it doesn't say to report on all views and expertise. We have to take into account in our discussions, in our back and forth. We have to hear all views. But our mandate is not to report on all views.

If that had been the case, we could have just mailed you all of our contributions and then published them as these are all the views. And I don't think that -- I don't think that would have been useful. It certainly would not have enriched any kind of discussion.

A rich and good outcome for this group are the recommendations. And they're going to be good recommendations because they're going to be based on a consensus. We're not here to propose options. Maybe that was the mandate of the WGIG, but that's not our mandate.

And, as my U.S. colleague has indicated, the working group on IGF improvement is perhaps a better model for a template to follow rather than to present option A, option B, option C.

So, in the end, I find myself a little bit coming to the same place as where Cuba is starting from, which is, if the whole point of this was just to reflect all our views, indeed, we don't need a report. We just need to refer to all the contributions. And then we've done our job. We've reflected all the views.

I think that would be unfortunate. And I still think like a number of you that we have potential for drafting a report that will build consensus. And, in that regard, I think that these U.S. contributions -- sorry -- the U.K. contribution sort of brings out an element of both your proposed draft and the joint contribution Saudi, Russia, and others had put forward.

So I think that there's, perhaps, a creative middle here that has been found and that could be sort of the document that we need to populate going forward.

So thank you for giving me the floor, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. Thank you for your comments.

Next on my list Netherlands followed by Mr. Yokozawa and European Union. Netherlands, you have the floor.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair.

Just like what others have said, our main goal is to come up with recommendations. So this implies a consensus on the recommendation which we can send forward to the higher platform. If there are difference of views -- of course we had this in the past during the WSIS+10 exercise where there were a lot of difference of views. But, again, we came up with a report, a consensus report.

And the differences of views -- well, of course, one could read the difference of view in the lots of contributions which were an annex to the reports. So I -- I think what also has been mentioned by the U.K. is that these reports could reflect that by having all the contributions made as an annex to the report. But the report, which, of course, must have normally the recommendations being reflected where there is consensus.

So, in that respect, we can fully support the proposal by the U.K. And I would also add that the remarks made by Marilyn Cade are worthwhile to reflect on. That is to say, that when there's a report, it should also be reflected that there was a large multistakeholder input. Of course, we highly respect the members in this group. But we have to take into account the remarks made by observers and remote participants and in order to have much support. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Netherlands, for your contribution.

Next on my list is Mr. Yokozawa followed by European Union and ICC-BASIS.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I won't go into details but focus in on the U.K. structure, U.K proposal. So I think this is very good and close to my thoughts in my mind that the business stakeholders can easily capture the importance and the how the -- how the outcome of this working group is. So we highly -- I highly support this proposal from the U.K.

But just two suggestions on that is, one, is the other paragraph 19, where the structure is a recommendation. So, as a broad headline recommendation, I would like just to confirm that in this section, there could be -- there should be no conflict between any pair of these recommendations or no duplication.

And the well-organized -- I want to make sure that the -- this part should be in, like, this way. So this is one thing.

And the second one is also in this headline recommendation section.

Maybe we could assume some substructure here, maybe sorted by some equal (indiscernible) or sorted by the high characteristics of the EC, enhanced cooperation, or anything. I don't touch it. But maybe it depends on the number of the recommendations we can get. But I think some substructure here should be very much useful to easily understand what was the outcome of this document. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

Next on my list is the European Union followed by ICC-BASIS and India. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We thank also the U.K. Particularly we didn't comment but we thank also for putting on the table the time line and thanks to all the group for constructively accepting this because we believe putting the time line puts us in perspective that we are going to have this report. I think the share the optimism by Cuba, Australia. So we are seeing the end of this journey, I think, in this sense.

Now to the content. I think it's a bit dangerous this discussion with the options. And particularly when I see that we are putting options, the black and the white, the one or two options. If I followed well the discussion so far, there are several states of gray between all of these options. There are conditions. And I'm a bit afraid that these conditions will not be reflected well when we go to this type of content as presented here.

On the other hand, I see a very powerful message when we convey recommendations which have consensus because at the end of the day, working group has to produce something that is useful to the General Assembly. So I believe the request for reflecting what was discussed here is legitimate. So we should take into account in our report how this will be presented. But I believe that recommendations, which is the tool that we need to provide the General Assembly to further work on and focus, is what we were asked to do.

So thanks also for the overall structure. And I believe we will conclude soon with this and we'll go to the details of those recommendations.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

ICC-BASIS next, followed by India and Richard Hill.

ICC-BASIS.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. And Thank you, Chair, for your earlier remarks urging us to stay on a path for an outcome.

We agree with you that we are here to make consensus recommendations. We have seen a lot of convergence around many ideas. And like you, we see many areas in which we can make very productive and positive recommendations that will add value to what we have now.

We support the U.K. proposed time line and welcome the helpful structure.

Along with the many who have stated this before, we support the premise of modeling our report on that sent to the UNGA from the Working Group on IGF Improvements. That report had significant traction and has proven implementable because of the consensus support gathered and the credibility that comes from it. There continue to be ongoing efforts to take that report forward.

And echoing what my Australian colleague said earlier, we feel the time we have invested together to achieve consensus should be taken forward in a report that can have this kind of impact.

This is the call of the UNGA, to provide consensus recommendations that can be implemented to further enhanced cooperation.

Our mandate, as per paragraph 65 of the UNGA WSIS+10 resolution, says the group should take into account the diversity of views. And I fully support the value of including observers and remote participation and giving access to the meeting and transcription as well as including all this in the report.

So the method says that the group should take into account the diversity of views, but as was also noted by Canada, I think it does not say the report should. Spanning divergent points of views from the group in the report would fail to offer value back to the UNGA and to our stakeholders. Such a report is not implementable or actionable and perhaps something we may have well been able to do without even meeting.

So we have value to offer to the UNGA and can bring recommendations back that allow further implementation to enhanced cooperation as conceived by the Tunis Agenda. Let's not be derailed in that mission by fragmenting the views we have aligned on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, I still have a long list. I will read out the list I have: India followed by Richard Hill, Iran, Parminder, Russian Federation, Japan, Kenya, Cuba, and United Kingdom -- Latvia and we revert to United Kingdom, of course. Is it ICANN? Yeah, ICANN.

U.K., I revert to you, Paul, for general comments in regard to your proposal as the basis for the discussion.

And after that, I would suggest maybe close the list because we'd like to have some time to discuss the timing or the dates for our next meeting. I think it's important also that we get out of this room with some ideas on the timing for planning purposes.

So I would encourage you to the extent possible to be as brief as you can. We still have 40 minutes to go, but I would try to dedicate at least five or ten minutes in the end to discuss next steps also in regard to the dates.

So with this, I give the floor -- I recognize India followed by Richard Hill and Iran.

India, you have the floor, Madam.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Considering there's a very long list of speakers, I will be brief.

I would like to thank U.K. for two very concrete and practical suggestions, first, on the time line and, second, on the structure of the report.

I think the time line suggestion is very useful, and it will help us to get into the draft -- in the drafting mode and give text additions on the various proposals.

On the structure of the report, I agree with some of the other -- with some of the other participants here that we do not discuss the content as of now but only talk about the general headings. I think that should have consensus as of now.

Thirdly, I largely support the recommendation of the proposal made by Mr. Richard Hill on keeping the structure of the report and reflecting the diversity of the debate here. I know that I've said this before. Also I will reiterate here. This takes me back to para 65 of the Tunis Agenda which noted diversity of the views and requested to group to continue the dialogue and work on the implementation on enhanced cooperation.

Now, when there is -- only if there is a diversity, there is a debate. If there is no diversity, then obviously there is no need for further debate or a dialogue. In that spirit, I think we need to reflect the different views that are there in this working group. They may form part of the recommendations. They may go into the annex, or they may go into the -- into the introduction part of it. That can be debated perhaps later.

But I would like to, once again, reiterate it would be honest on our part, on the part of the group, to reflect the diversity of views. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India.

Next on my list is Richard Hill followed by Iran and Parminder.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, what I'm going to say is different from what has been said up to now. So I was hoping I wouldn't have to start invoking procedure, but I see that might be necessary. But don't worry, Chairman, at this stage I'm not going to quote the actual articles and resolutions. I'm just going to keep my comments generic.

People seem to be conflating the report and the recommendations. These are two separate things as you yourself said, Chairman, some time ago.

We have been mandated to do two things. One is to send a report. The second is to send recommendations. Now, that's entirely normal for the U.N. because mostly they're preparing resolutions. So as you correctly said, they have prepared a summary record of the discussions and then the resolutions. If the resolution is agreed, that's fine. If the resolution is not agreed, that's fine, too. But in any case, there's a summary record.

Now, in the normal U.N. practice, these are separate documents so we could envisage having two documents. One is a report, and one is a set of recommendations. Or we could do it in line as proposed by U.N. by the U.K. or we could have the recommendations in an annex. All of that is possible.

But I think that some people are not understanding that if there are no agreed recommendations, there's still going to be a report. So if we fail to agree on recommendations, there's still going to be a report. And by normal U.N. practice, that report is going to contain a summary of views.

So I don't see how anybody can argue that we're going to produce a report that doesn't contain a summary of views because the report anyway is going to contain the summary of views if we don't agree to the recommendations.

Now, some people have said there's no value of reflecting divergent views. I disagree. I think the main value of this exercise is to reflect the divergent views. For the reasons that Parminder said, I'm going to explain it differently.

If we don't show that there are divergent views, then we are in effective saying the status quo is fine. And we don't need to discuss this anymore. Now, there are a number of us in the room who believe quite strongly, in my case, that the status quo is not fine and, therefore, we must give the message that at least some of us do not agree that the status quo is fine.

Otherwise, there's absolutely no value to this whole exercise. But, you know, we don't want to go there, Chairman. But in the end if we say nothing, that's saying that the status quo is not fine.

So I would urge really the colleagues to come back to normal U.N. practice and to accept that we have some recommendations which are agreed or perhaps not entirely agreed and there's some options in them and then we have a report that reflects the diversity of views. And that's exactly what you have done in your initial draft zero, Chairman.

And, hopefully, then we don't have to get to the next level where I actually have to quote the actual articles of procedure that would apply if we start getting nasty. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

Next on my list is Iran followed by Parminder and the Russian Federation.

Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm very brief because whatever I wanted to raise, the previous speakers raise it already.

Mr. Chairman, I fully respect views of the members that emphasize just reflection of the consensus. But I have a question. What is the title of the working group outcome? Is it a working group statement? Is it a working group decision? Is it a working group resolution?

Mr. Chairman, all of the people in the room, they are familiar with working with the U.N. system. And we have a Sixth Committee on the General Assembly that produce yearly hundred documents, more than hundred documents, on title of the resolution, report, decision, statement. And each of them has its definition.

If we are talking about the resolution, that means if there is no consensus, it's called to a vote. And when talking about the decision, it should become to the consensus.

But if we reference to the report in the U.N. system, it means that including the diverse views. Of course, in the beginning and in the main -- in the main structure of the report, the focus on the majority of the group has the consensus on that.

But in the annex and in the continuation, it should be also reflecting diverse views that open the door for the negotiation in the future that not again start from the zero draft. So I believe that if the group not included diverse views, it's not completed its mandate.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

I think, again, we are not at this point in time ready to give some very precise indication on how everything will look. But in regard to the first part of your statement in which you ask what kind of output is expected from the working group, I think the mandate is very clear. Recommendations and a report. I think what is under discussion, how those two things relate, we have to develop recommendations. We have to prepare a report. That's -- anything we prepare should have that delineation. Maybe the recommendation be contained in the report would be separate or the report would be the same. I think that's the kind of discussion we have. But no question about that we are mandated to develop recommendations and to prepare a report.

Yes, I include you on the list. Yes, Pakistan, please.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. Sorry to interrupt in the middle of discussion. But I wanted to propose that we have listened so much from members. We are here for past three days. Would you please propose your line of action? And I think we can then consider it rather than, you know, going in circles. I think that will be helpful if we only have 20 or few minutes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. Maybe you were not in the room when we decided previously we start with the time line. There is a decision on the part of the group that by October 15th revised recommendations be sent to the secretariat. On that basis, I will prepare by the end of October a first draft. And then there will be a process towards that. This is already taken care of.

We are just collecting views on how that will assist me in the preparation of this document. Thank you. Your concern is already taken care of.

May I turn to, again, Parminder, Russian Federation, Japan, Kenya, Cuba, Latvia, ICANN, and concluding with the U.K. And after that we have a brief exchange, I hope, on the next date for our meeting.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Earlier when I was trying to present my view of why there have to be options within the recommendation itself, at least in one recommendation, separate from the diverse views which could be in the report or compilation, the chair said that this is premature so let's not do it. But I have seen so many arguments which have said that there shouldn't be options within the recommendations. I find it unfair that the opposite arguments are being made now, but I have to postpone my argument as a hypothetical situation.

Therefore, I need to make it now because a lot of people opposed the making of options within recommendations. And, of course, even U.K. has said that in the end, there would be compilation of all inputs and that I think most people have agreed to. And my idea is whether there would be options within at least one recommendation.

I heard the chair also say some things to the effect that recommendations are things which are full consensus and then there's something else. I think there is a theory building of definition of what recommendations are which probably then are not including options, even on the core issue of whether enhanced cooperation means new mechanisms of this kind or enhanced cooperation are existing mechanisms with some changed characteristics.

Now, the point here is why it should be in the recommendations is that, first of all, it is the core subject, and we need to figure -- tell that at least over all the discussions we came to two or three views. We have been saying this from the last meeting and actually the meeting before. And, therefore, this much progress has been made and, like, WGIG did, this much we did and now whoever is going to consider may take it on from there so what has actually happened over the four years is not lost.

Now, as I said, there cannot be recommendations without this options box. And this is not a threat. This is a fact of how people's minds are arranged. These options that are actually being proposed so we can have recommendations because if we have two options boxes, one says this is enhanced cooperation which is a set of mechanism, and others saying there are existing bodies, still we can have other recommendations which talk about enhanced cooperation and people can associate it with different things.

Now, people may not agree with this view but please try to understand this point of view. If that option is not there, I can't think of a single sentence about enhanced cooperation which -- I mean, most of the people who associate with the proposal we have made can agree with. People can suggest a line and I can answer back because every line has to be something to do with enhanced cooperation in the report, in the recommendations. And we cannot accept that line because that line absent at least the options box, if not as we have asked actual recommendation of a new mechanism, means that we are referring only to existing structures as enhanced cooperation. This is a statement made then. And not one of us will agree with any recommendation absent that option.

I don't know whether it's too complicated. I can say it again. I can put it in a paper. But for me, it's very clear that the problem is that recommendations cannot be made absent the options boxes. And in this case, it is not like the IGF working group. I was a part of the IGF working group. The problem there was different. There were improvements. It was possible to agree on three improvements and not agree on two improvements and go ahead.

The problem is more like WGIG where the job was given to give institutional options. And in that respect, in this case, the only thing we are considering is what is the nature of institutions of public policy making. One group says new is needed; the other says there is existing.

I don't see any agreement possible on any sentence about enhanced cooperation about these options. I'm repeating it. I want to make it clear because that's how things are.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I think the points you have made are very clear. May I say they were very clear in your first intervention. I didn't see any added value in the second intervention because you are repeating what you said. For me, it was very clear.

The guidance I need from you in regard to this was given in your first intervention. I thank you for that. And in your second you reaffirmed, which is -- I think it's more than clear.

Russian Federation followed by Japan, Kenya, Cuba, Latvia and ICANN and U.K. Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, thank you. We'd like to interact in the matter of your diverse U.N. consensus. This is the very important point, and this is actually the main point of our discussion right now. And, actually, I remembered the discussion during the resolution. It was in New York. And it was -- I don't know how to say it in the late hour or in the very early hours. Because it was 3:00 something in nighttime.

And we -- we were discussing this. And it's -- it was the point with the clear understanding of the problem. Because the issue of enhanced cooperation have the quite big history and also the history of the first working group.

And, actually, the point that there is a diverse view was taken. And I don't know probably it's because English is not my native language. But I'm reading the resolution. And I'm reading para 65. And I see here, "We note, however, that divergent views held by member states with respect to the process towards implementation of enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda. We call for continued dialogue and so far."

So this is the resolution of 10 years of WSIS. The resolution is a consensus document.

So we see in UNGA the consensus on the issue that there is diverse views. So what we are talking about, we think it's a medical fact. And that is why the report should see diverse views.

It was the discussion. It has the history on it.

That's why we think we understand the mandate very clearly. And that's why it's not no doubt that report should contain the diverse view on the -- if there are. Of course, if there are.

Otherwise, we are talking in around and around. We're talking about Tunis Agenda. And what are the meaning? We are trying to rebuild Tunis Agenda. We are trying to rewrite the text of Tunis Agenda. It was agreed that the whole Tunis Agenda reaffirmed in the WSIS resolution. So there is no need to come back and change the text. It's already there.

But the mandate is to come to the discuss these diverse views, especially when it comes to enhanced cooperation paragraph 69, 70, and 71. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. I think we are coming to a point in which we are starting to repeat the arguments. And it may get tiresome for some of us. I will certainly urge all those who still ask the floor to intervene to make their comment as brief as possible to the point so we can conclude discussion on this and ensure we have adequate follow-up.

Next on my list are Japan, Kenya, and Cuba.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. I think that the report of the group gives clear difference between consensus recommendations and non-consensus proposals. And, in that sense, I think U.K. has proposed good structure of the report. And Japan supports the U.K. proposal. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Kenya, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. I think our time is going fast, and I see we are closing up. So far I think we have made some good progress. And the issue is I think we have difference on some alternative on the timeline. There's some consensus on the content.

I think what we have taken too long time, in my view, is trying to direct you on how you -- what you include in the report and commendations and what you should not.

It's fair. But, actually, the discussion in the last three days and even the other meetings there have been leading you on how we should end up with a final report. And, in my intervention two days ago, I think it requires the chair's wisdom to really come up with a final report that captures the views and the expectations of all of the members of this honorable working group. And I think you have the capacity to do so.

When we refer to the Tunis Agenda and the other resolutions, I also to understand that we can read and interpret paragraphs selectively. That's what we should try to avoid. Because, when we go in the full length of round one, 22 paragraphs or something paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda, you can interpret it and take what you want and say this is what is guiding us now and this is what is not guiding us. But I really want to believe that is not the case.

I had a suggestion which might be a bit wild, but I will still put it across.

Taking into account the views of some of the members here and, of course, with a strong view that every view that has been presented here is important for it to get a place in the final report and, if possible, in the recommendations, I do not believe at one time it will be possible to make concrete recommendations which the General Assembly can pick up and follow-up with full implementation. And we could ask the General Assembly to decide on some issue which is outstanding. And, in this case, the General Assembly can create a mechanism to address that specific issue separately.

What would happen because, actually, this group will have accomplished its work by saying we have done our work and we have agreed on this by consensus. But there's an issue, which is important, but would like the General Assembly to make some decision on how to carry forward with it.

I think it's a way out. But I'll leave it for the membership to look at it.

We are in a situation only talking of consensus. It reminds me two things. One, there is a system of making decisions which they say the majority have their way; the minority are right. So let's not ignore that kind of thing. Most of us we can talk too long, too much. But those who don't speak, they might also be right. I remember, Mr. Chair, around 10 years ago in a meeting with you and a colleague of ours was crying at the end of the meeting. A colleague from Indonesia, if I can remember.

And the problem was he saw the meeting collapsing. And he said he can explain the outcome of this meeting to the capital. But, when he goes to his house, he cannot explain to his young children when they ask him what has he been doing for these two weeks, he cried because he says, "I'll tell them I have nothing to tell you."

So we should not fall into that trap of getting out of here and telling people, actually, we have been away for three days or I've been going to Geneva for several times, but there's nothing that I can tell you I did.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya. Thank you for these very appropriate remarks.

Thank you for reaffirming your confidence in my capacity. I hope you may be sure I do my best to try to live up to that challenge.

Thank you for reminding us that there is a purpose for us being here. And I think I'm really touched by what you said about having to report back home, because I had to travel here on the day of my 22nd wedding anniversary.

So I would have to compensate when I come back, of course. But it will be very hard for me to explain - maybe not for this meeting, because it's not the final meeting -- but I was part of something I really wish to see a good result at the end. Thank you for that.

Cuba is next on my list. Juan, you have intervened twice on this. I think you have made your points very clear.

>>CUBA: What?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: You have already intervened twice.

>>CUBA: I just said -- gentlemen, I'm going now to take the book like Mr. Richard Hill. I just sent you a link to the U.N. library that has the -- it's the authority on the type of documents of United Nations. As you can see, the main documents of the United Nations are resolutions and decisions. It's a pity that the representative from the Netherlands is not here. Because the WSIS+10, Tunis Agenda, all those are resolutions, resolutions that of course has to be voted. It has its procedure and all that. Decisions is another type of high-level document that is usually for procedural issues. You can see it there in the reference.

And there are reports. I'm going to read you now. Reports of U.N. bodies. It says, "Most U.N. bodies such as committees, commissions, boards, councils, and conferences report on their work."

And now I'm going to make a parentheses of myself. All these committees are created to discuss one issue or another issue and discuss many things that -- expert groups and all that.

It will be very strange that they get unanimous decision. Normally, it's a discussion to advance the knowledge in one field because it's been asked by the parent body there. So I am the parent.

So then this document says, "This report includes a summary of the work of the body for a given time period or session. In general, U.N. bodies report to the parent organ on the work of the session and include dates of session and meetings, membership during the sessions covered, summaries of discussions held."

So that has to be in the report. "full text of resolution or decisions adopted by the body." That is not the case here because we're not adopting resolution or decision.

This is very important, because it links -- you will see -- "And recommended actions to be taken by the parent organ, including draft resolution for consideration by the parent organ."

Why this is important? Now I go to something that my colleague Richard Hill has mentioned, the apple pie recommendations here. There are many recommendations here like all stakeholders should participate. That should not have -- those are not a recommendation that we should have. We have to give recommendations to our parent organ.

Now, having read that, and then finally this, "are usually supplemented to the official record to the parent organ." Once we have this knowledge that I am giving to you now and you can get from the Internet, we can get back to the our mandate. And you can see how this mandate links with this. Because it asks -- we should request the chair of the Commission of Science and Technology for Development through the (indiscernible) to establish a working group to develop recommendations on

how to fully enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda. These are the recommendations for the parent body for the General Assembly is the recommendations should be in the form that General Assembly should do this. The General Assembly should do that. We should not give, you know, here recommendation that everybody should participate. The disability should be included. No, no. Those are apple pie or sky are blue recommendations. That is not what is asked in this.

And it keeps on going. The group shall be considered, blah, blah, blah fully informed that all stakeholders taking into regard the diverse views. "the group will submit a report to the Commission of Science and Technology for Development in the 21st session for inclusion" -- that's how it says there, because it has to go to the parent body -- "for inclusion in the annual report of the commission of the council. The report will also serve as an input to all the regular reporting of the Secretary General implementation of the outcome of the World Summit Information Society. Of course, this regular report of the Secretary General is to the General Assembly."

Having all this, I recommend, please, to follow the book.

We have to make a report that have dates of sessions and meetings, memberships, summaries of discussion held in which all these opinions have to be there and recommended actions to be taken for the parent organ.

All the recommendations have to be for the parent organ. We should not -- doesn't make any sense here to recommend something for the IGF because it's not our parent organ. It doesn't make sense to recommend something for the ITU, because that's not our parent organ. Doesn't make sense to recommend -- we have to make recommendations. The General Assembly should do this to implement, further implement enhanced cooperation because what is our mandate. That's it.

Thank you.

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

Again, we -- thank you for repeating the -- our mandate, which we have, I think, at this point revisited this many times. The group shall develop a recommendation how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda. So I think, in the course of discussion there, your views on how recommendations we can develop can further implement enhanced cooperation. And I hope I'll be able to reflect those recommendations that can be owned by the group and submitted by the group as such to -- in fulfillment of our mandate.

Next on my list are Latvia, ICANN, and then I will -- I see no further requests for the floor.

And I will turn then for the United Kingdom. Since we started discussion on the basis of the proposal of the United Kingdom also taking into account there were other proposals on the table, I revert to him for concluding remarks, in case there are no further requests for the floor. and then I'd like to spare some minutes to discuss our next meeting. Latvia, you will have the floor.

>>LATVIA: Thank you, Chair.

And thank you for your skillful guidance of this discussion.

I would also like to thank the U.K. for proposed timeline and structure.

As this working group is all about reflecting divergent views and opinions which may be summarized in separate report, while the purpose of this working group should be to produce consensus recommendations, based on those views and opinions that have been expressed. And Latvia definitely supports that spirit of consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

ICANN.

>>ICANN: Thank you, Chair. I will be brief.

ICANN supports U.K. proposition within the format of the report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I will now revert to United Kingdom for your comments in regard to the discussion we have had.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, everyone, for their comments. I think we've had a really good and useful discussion over the last hour.

Sometimes our discussions only involve a small number of participants. But what strikes me from the discussion we have had is just how many different people have intervened. We have heard voices from all over the room. And that, I think, shows very clearly the level of ambition there is for us to reach consensus in our work. And it's been good to hear those different voices speaking out in favor of consensus and a successful outcome.

We're very pleased that there's support for the timeline, and we're pleased that that was useful.

I, obviously, cannot respond to all of the points. I won't try. But there are maybe just three points I would like to respond to briefly.

First of all, I think Russia and some others talked about our mandate. We are clear that this group is not here to produce options. We are asked to make recommendations.

And, yes, it is true paragraph 65 says that the group should take into account the diversity of views. And we are doing that now. And we will have done that.

But nowhere in our mandate and nowhere in paragraph 65 does it say our report should describe different views.

The U.N. General Assembly just did not ask us to do that.

The question for us, really, is about the practical effect. And here I would just thank Kenya again for the really eloquent intervention, which I think was very, very timely and very well made. Thank you for that intervention.

Because for us, we are here that we want to make a practical difference. We have an opportunity to further implement enhanced cooperation. We are not here just to see our own opinions printed on a piece of paper. And for us, consensus recommendations have authority and people should be expected to act on those recommendations. If we just have differences of view in the report, it's really no help to anybody at all. So our ambition is that we should make a difference and we should have a report which reflects consensus.

And then, finally, I respond to, I think it was, Cuba at the beginning who said if we don't have different views in the report, we should go home now. I think with all respect to my friend and colleague from Cuba, the opposite is true.

If we are going to just have different views in our report, then there is no need for us to work for consensus anymore. There's no need to make any compromises. There's no need to try to think of creative ideas or solutions. We can just put in our own opinions and just see them reflected on the piece of paper. And then there's no need for us to be here.

But for us, we are optimists and we are here to try to find consensus. We have seen in the last three days some really good work, and we've seen some areas of consensus starting to emerge. We certainly don't want to start our work in January with a list of disagreements. We think that when we see that first draft of our report, we might actually surprise ourselves about how much progress we can make. So with that, Chair, we would just perhaps offer you the best of luck when you start to draft a zero draft. But we very much look forward to seeing a draft which shows just how much possibility there is for us to reach consensus and make a real difference to enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K.

Short intervention. Richard Hill, please. And then I make some concluding remarks.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you. I just want to come back on one specific point that the U.K. made. By asking us to make a report, which the General Assembly did, they, in fact, asked us to report back on divergent views because U.N. reports contain divergence of views. Now, I'm not going to dwell on that. That's normal practice, and that is well-documented.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, I'd like to thank all of you. I think we had a very rich and enlightening exchange. I will certainly take all the points of view into account when I will be preparing my draft report. Also, I count on your revised contributions. I just would like to recall that idea to send to the secretariat by 15th of October.

Yes, I will turn to you in a minute.

But I just want to say one thing. There may be some areas of divergence that are emerging in these discussions. And I will do my best to try to put that on paper in a way that arranges everyone.

But I think the good part of these -- even in spite of the divergence is I think everything we should do is grounded on reality. I think all of us here in this room, we have seen in written form the contributions we have heard. So I think it is maybe a challenge for all of us to -- when fulfilling our mandate to develop recommendations to prepare, submit a report, to put it in the adequate way and that will convey to the outside world and to CSTD, ECOSOC the views.

But I think we are -- we should be grounded on reality. And I think we should -- and I will try to do my best to reflect on paper the reality of what we have been doing, the reality regarding development of recommendations to the extent we can develop recommendations and to submit the report.

I think I will -- I think those who have expressed their -- trust I will be able to do it. I will do my best. And then it will be up to the plenary, to all of you, to consider and to make the appropriate amendments. I think we have not too much time to do that. The time is short.

But I think we have had so much discussion on this, I think maybe it's clear on everyone's mind what are the limits, what are the red lines for some, and others what are the areas of consensus. I think it's just a matter of having the ability and the willingness and the goodwill also to accept that in the appropriate format. So I'd like to thank you.

I see United States and Russian Federation requesting the floor. I would give the floor, but I will beg you to be as brief as possible because we just want to allow the secretariat to speak on the dates for our next meeting, the possibilities, so that we can come out of this meeting with the time line, with the idea for the work before us in preparation for next meeting, but also the time horizon for our final meeting.

So United States followed by Russian Federation.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, I can be very brief because that was my question, if we were going to get to the date for the next meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you for the possibility to take the floor. We need to address, you know, very quickly the point of the main concern. It is not the reality that we cannot agree upon everything. We can agree upon many aspects we're discussing.

However, there is certain points with implementation of Tunis Agenda and in particular, now, its implementation of para 69 and 68.

So it's not about that somebody understand it in their own way. We believe that somebody doesn't want to implement what is agreed in the Tunis Agenda. Somebody doesn't want to enable governments on equal footing to pertain their role in international public policy issues related to the Internet.

And if we agree upon -- that we want to implement how it is envisaged in the Tunis Agenda, we will clearly get to consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, all, again for your interventions and for that brief exchange for those three days of discussions here.

May I turn to the secretariat to enlighten us on the possibilities on dates for our future meeting.

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ SANZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure I can give you a lot of enlightenment because we have been trying to obtain precise dates when the meeting rooms are available from our colleagues in conference services.

But they do not have a complete calendar for 2018 yet. Apparently, there are a number of bodies that have to decide on the calendar of meetings of the round sessions. So we don't have precise information to give you on the availability of meeting rooms.

However, we can tell you that for us to be able to submit the report of the working group in time for it to be processed for the CSTD, we cannot have the meeting later than the last week of January. So we have been asking the conference services division for information about the availability of meeting facilities any time after beginning of January. And as soon as we have precise information, we will make it available to you. But at this time, we don't -- we cannot tell you anything more than we should meet before the end of January.

We can hear your preferences in terms of when the members of the group would be more easily available and then we'll try to impress on our colleagues in the conference division the need for clearing space around those dates. But I'm afraid that there are other institutions that have preference over us in terms of the attribution of meeting rooms, and we are subject to that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. In that regard, I recall there was already a request on the part of some delegations, including Russian Federation and others to avoid overlap with an ITU meeting, council meeting, that will be taking place in January. I think this was confirmed. Maybe you want to -- maybe just for the record to state. I think we already have some tentative dates. We'll hear from Peter and then Canada and U.K.

>>PETER MAJOR: Basically the proposed date from Russia, I think, is the ideal date because it's back-to-back of the ITU Council working group meetings. But probably the final date can be consolidated during the intersessional meeting of the CSTD. I believe it will be the last opportunity for us to do that.

As I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I really want to thank you on behalf of all the participants for your patience, for your wise chairmanship, and for guiding us through these three difficult days and just maintaining the optimism in all of us.

I think we are going out from this meeting with the feeling that we have already achieved something and with the hope that we are going to come up with something which would be useful, not only for us but for all (indiscernible) as well.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Thank you. I have Canada and U.K. I think on the dates for the next meeting.

>>CANADA: Yes, Thank you, Chair. Yes, the specific dates for council working group clusters is 15 to 26 of January. So, obviously, we would have a strong preference then for the meeting to be 29, 30, 31st. Yes, 29, 30, 31st for our meeting. Personally I'm based in Geneva. If it was from the 8th to the 12th, it would work, too. But I can understand that many people might not enjoy having to cut short their Christmas holidays.

And before I give up the floor, I, too, would like to most sincerely thank you for your work and your support as well as the secretariat and the transcription service. Without your common and sustained efforts, I think our deliberations would be made much more difficult. So thank you. Thank you to everybody.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Very similar points. The council working groups begin on the 15th of January and end on the 26th. Like Russia and Canada, we would prefer to have the meeting straight afterwards. If that's not possible, then perhaps immediately before but certainly not during those two weeks where there are ITU meetings.

And we also associate ourselves with the remarks of Peter Major and Canada. Thank you very much, Chair, for the fantastic job that you're doing. It's been a pleasure over the last three days and we're looking forward to the next meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you. On that note, I'd like again to thank you, congratulate you also for a very fruitful discussion and for providing a way forward in a way that will allow us to fulfill our mandate. Thank you very much. I wish you -- for those who are staying here, very happy day. For those who are traveling, as myself, safe travels. And look forward to see you in January. Look forward to your input and to follow up on what we have decided. And I feel really confident and optimistic about the prospect of achieving something that will be useful, that will add value and will, indeed, fulfill the mandate we are given. Thank you very much.

Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

[Applause]