

# **Fifth Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation**

**29 January 2018**

**Geneva, Switzerland**

**DAY 1**

DISCLAIMER: THIS TRANSCRIPT WAS ELABORATED IN REAL TIME DURING THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE WGEC AND THEREFORE IT MAY CONTAIN MINOR ERRORS. THE VIEWS PRESENTED HERE ARE THE CONTRIBUTORS' AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS AND POSITION OF THE UNITED NATIONS OR THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT.

WGEC - Day 1

29 January 2018

Geneva, Switzerland

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Distinguished delegates, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, as head of the secretariat of the CSTD, I'm pleased to welcome you to the fifth and final meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

Since it was established almost two years ago, this group has engaged in a very rich discussion and admittedly one that was not very easy at times about matters that will shape key dimensions of the future of the information society. That is if we get it right.

Most of you have been reflecting and negotiating on these issues for many, many years now. I think some of you have been involved since 2005. So when you accepted to serve in this group, you, of course, knew that your task was not going to be easy. And that makes your commitment to work for the good of the global community bold and admirable. So I would just like to thank you at the beginning, at the outset of this meeting.

From our side, sitting from the secretariat, we believe you have already achieved progress in identifying topics in which you share mutual understanding. That has helped our discussions to move forward. But we are all aware of the crucial effort that is still needed in order for us to be able to say that the mandate given by the General Assembly to this group has been implemented meaningfully.

So here let me begin by thanking Ambassador Fonseca for his leadership and the contributions from all of you to the second draft of the report of this group to the CSTD that Ambassador Fonseca has made available.

I mean, I do believe that it holds the potential to deliver a successful outcome to your many months of work. I also have great hope in your willingness to reach for common ground and your talent for devising a compromise that will respond to everyone's legitimate concerns and meet the expectations of the member states who mandated this working group and of the people whose resources enable its operation.

Let me here add more politically incorrectly, I hope you manage in these three days to address the elephant in the room of the institutional issues and we will have an outcome document at the end of Wednesday. As the head of the CSTD secretariat, I assure you that we will spare no efforts to support you in this endeavor.

Let me also take a moment to thank ICANN for captioning this meeting, and ICANN has agreed to do that for us. And it has been with us throughout these working groups. And thank you so much for that.

And let me stop here by wishing you a very productive meeting. Thank you so much.

Ambassador Fonseca, you have the floor now to take us forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Ms. Shamika.

Good morning, everyone. I'd like to welcome all of you to this fifth and final meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. Let me start by wishing all of you a very Happy New Year since I think it's the first time I've seen many of you and to express my satisfaction in seeing so many familiar faces in either room.

I'd like to also thank all those who have made contributions to my first draft which was circulated by mid December and which helped me to prepare the second proposed draft for the report.

I'd like to deeply express my appreciation for all the comments that were made, you know, in some cases conflicting among themselves. But I independently of the outcome of this exercise, I'd like to say it has been a very enriching experience having worked with you, having heard from you in a very elaborate way your concerns, your approaches. I think, again, independently of the outcome of this exercise which, of course, I hope will be positive, I think it was worth this effort.

As we are approaching the end of our work and there is -- as you are aware, there is no possibility to extend beyond Wednesday our work since the secretariat has to prepare the report -- to have the report finalized by next Monday in order to forward it to CSTD and then it should go to ECOSOC and to the General Assembly.

I would very kindly urge all of us to make sure that in our comments we will be as straightforward as we can.

I think we have had four meetings in which members and observers have had the ample opportunity to express their views, to discuss substance, and to elaborate on their views. And I think those are very -- have been very useful for all of us.

I think we have come to a point in which we can clearly understand what are the issues around which there will be consensus expressed by the group. And, of course, there -- I think it's also very clear for all of us that in some issues, there will be no consensus. So I would say that the challenge for this meeting is not to repeat the discussion on substantive topics. I think that part of our discussion is exhausted at some point to have an exchange on this substance but rather how would be the appropriate way to reflect on paper in the report our commonalities and our differences.

I think this is the main point I think should be discussed here, of course, as we go through the report. And I will immediately -- after we adopt the agenda for this meeting, as you can see in the provisional agenda, I'd like to walk through the report very briefly my proposal and then my suggestion would be immediately to open up for general comments.

I would kindly recommend colleagues, members, that at this point that you could maybe hold your comments, wait until I introduce the report. And then all general comments will be welcome before we move into our more working mood. And then we will discuss on how to organize our work and how we'll proceed through Wednesday afternoon.

I really hope that by the end of our journey we can prepare a report that can be embraced by the whole group. This is, indeed, what would fulfill the mandate we have been given as we have also extensively discussed the terms of our mandate.

The group, we are mandated -- the group was mandated to prepare a report. So my best hope is by the end of Wednesday we can have such a report. And, of course, in due time, we'll discuss the structure in how we want our report to be portrayed.

It is my best hope we can achieve that. And I am convinced this will be, indeed, a very important contribution. Maybe not an ambitious contribution, not a very -- I would say very cautiously meaningful to the extent that many of us would like and would expect it to be.

But I think, anyway, it will be some contribution to the discussion that is going on in so many fora and part of the -- and contribute to the implementation of the outcome of WSIS+10.

I said it at the beginning, I did not hide that -- knowing that there are some differences that maybe cannot be overcome, that certainly cannot be overcome at this point in time, that the outcome of this exercise would not be as ambitious as some that are outside of those discussions who tend to think that we could come up with some very complete and overarching and comprehensive recommendations. We know there's many aspects that are still difficult to address collectively.

But I think that we were able in those four meetings we had to develop common understandings around a set of issues that in my view, if we can convey it to our colleagues for CSTD, ECOSOC, this will, indeed, be a very important contribution for the tasks ahead in regard to enhanced cooperation.

So I would, again, thank colleagues for the very meaningful, very strong participation until today and kindly urge all of us to work in a very expeditious, very focus-oriented way. Of course, everyone will be free to make any comment that would be necessary. But I think at this point in time, we should rather discuss how we want things to be addressed in the report rather than repeat the substantive points that are behind us.

So with this, I'd like to propose the agenda for adoption. I see no objection. So the agenda as proposed is adopted.

And with that, I'd like to move directly to the introduction of the chair's second proposal of the draft report. I'd like to request the secretariat to post it on screen so we can walk through the documents.

Yes, thank you.

So as you are aware on 10 January -- or 11 January this document was circulated as per what was agreed in our September meeting. That should be the main document for discussion at this meeting. We agreed that I would circulate it for discussion at this fifth meeting. So I decided to circulate it together with a composite document which incorporated all the comments we had received so far.

I did this in order to facilitate your assessment of my own proposal in order that you could visualize the different inputs that were received and how I tried to address that.

I very humbly should say, of course, it's not a perfect work. It was my best attempt to reconcile views that were in some cases very opposed, very separated. So I would certainly look forward to receiving the comments and observations you may have.

Just for the sake of having a very brief overview of the documents, it starts with the executive summary, the page you'll see on screen, just very briefly explaining what is the intent of the report.

And then I have adopted, relying on contributions I received from many of you, on how we should -- to hone -- and how they should address, I decided to propose that these recommendations adopted by consensus of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation members are offered not only to government but to all stakeholders, including institutions and processes which may contribute to the development of Internet-related international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

So I thought it would be important to be explicit that those recommendations are -- that governments have a very particular role in that regard. So I decided to highlight governments but not lose sight that all stakeholders should also take those recommendations into account when developing -- when contributing to the development of Internet-related international public policy issues.

Then we move to the introduction. And here in the first paragraph, we recall the mandate that was given. I think for clarity we should transcribe the whole paragraph so we can make sure that all the relevant expressions are there. There is no lack of clarity on the mandate that was given.

The second paragraph just refers to the composition of the group, the process that was undertaken by the chair of CSTD, Mr. Peter Major, when setting up the group.

Paragraph 3 through 7 refer to the meetings we have had so far. So I -- initially I had proposed that we should describe -- have one paragraph describing each meeting, the important things that took place in each meeting. However, as you can see at the end of paragraph 8, my suggestion is that that set of paragraphs should be replaced by one single paragraph or maybe two -- it is up to maybe -- for further work to be there -- describing very broad terms the main tasks that were performed by the group. So we would not describe each and every meeting separately but rather the overall process and the important things that were done.

And I think it would be important, for example, to refer to the two guiding questions, to the number of contributions that were submitted and that kind of thing. I think by the end -- if we can agree to that approach, by the end of this meeting, we can have some very precise language for that.

Paragraph 5 refers to a number of important documents that were considered by the group. I tried here to incorporate some proposals that emanated from you in regard to important references that should be made in that regard, as you can see.

In paragraphs 6 through 10, I made some general comments regarding the processes and important topics that were examined within the group. And here I tried also to incorporate some notions and some ideas that were in your contributions, which I thought would also add gravity to what we have been doing so far.

Paragraph 11 and 12 refer to areas in which -- well, of course, we start saying that here we refer to areas that could not lead to consensus. My proposal is to refer those proposals in one annex to the report. And, again, I refer to the mandate that was given that requested the group to prepare a report. So I was thinking, in the light of the contributions we had, that one way to address it would be to refer in the body of the report to those areas but then to relate those to an annex.

And here, at the end of that section, you will see a suggestion that maybe the proposals involving institutional mechanisms could be clustered. And even we could have a box summarizing the main arguments in favor and against. This would be done in recognition that the particular topic of institutional framework was the most, I'd say, controversial and in the minds of many of us the most important issue to be addressed. So I tried to make sure that even if we refer these -- those are no consensus areas, again, I am convinced that we could not in this meeting bridge the differences around that topic. I think it would be self-defeating if we tried to develop language trying to bridge differences. The different positions are very well-made, very explicit. And, at least from the chair's perspective, there is no room to try to merge or try to come to some compromise language with regard to the substance. So, if we can agree that in regard to substance there is no consensus, the issue is how to reflect it on paper in an appropriate way

So my suggestion, since we have to come to a report, that should focus on recommendations that were developed by the group. My proposal would be to move that part together with the other areas in which there was no consensus to an annex.

Then we move to the main part of the report. And I think that is the part of the report, if I can draw your attention, that will be referred, when we think about it should be addressed by the ECOSOC, how it will be addressed by the General Assembly, how it will be read in the future, I think that is the part of the report that will represent the single contribution from this group. And I think, in the light of the extensive discussions we have had all over our meetings, our four previous meetings, we have come to a level of collaboration of these recommendations that I would trust that with some massaging or some further work could be accepted by everyone. So this will run from paragraph 1 through paragraph 13.

I think those are issues around which there is, I think, a very broad basis of agreement that those recommendations should be there. Although taking fully into account that for many in the room those refer to issues that are not the central issues of the discussion. I think this point was very explicitly made by many of you that by accepting those recommendations we are not, let's say, addressing the core of what should be done. But, indeed, that represents an agreement.

So, from the perspective of the chair, I think it would be a pity. It would be very regrettable if we could not, keeping that perspective, acknowledge that around those areas there is agreement.

In regard to 14, 15, and 16, I'd like to comment that those are ideas that were also extensively discussed in the group. I acknowledge there was no consensus around those ideas. 14, 15, and 16.

However, it is an attempt from the chair -- I'd like you to consider as that -- to look into these formulations as they appear trying to -- I tried to reflect on the comments that were made on the objectives that were raised, on the support that were raised. And I thought it might be useful for the group maybe to make a last attempt to come to consensus in regard to those ideas.

I think two main criteria were used by me when proposing this. It is very clear in my mind and to my understanding that any proposal leading to the creation of a new body or institution would not be accepted by the whole group at this point in time

So these three proposals, these three paragraphs do not address recommendations, do not lead to the creation of a new body or institution. I think this meets that criteria.

But, at the same time, by using existing fora and existing processes would provide an additional contribution, an additional opportunity for discussion of enhanced cooperation.

So I think those two criteria we are not creating new bodies or institution. At the same time we are making additional contribution to the discussion and to the examination of enhanced cooperation related matters. I thought those three paragraphs could be looked through that perspective. And, wishfully, if there is a wish on the part of the group, that could also make it to the report.

So, basically, and without any further comments, I'd like to open the floor for general comments in regard to the document that is presented to you, in regard to the overall exercise we have been doing.

I would really -- and, again, urge all of us to have in mind this is our very last opportunity to -- and I think it is within our grasp to make our contribution to respond to the mandate that was given by the WSIS+10 meeting. And I would very strongly recommend colleagues to consider those documents in our positive light. I have a few requests for the floor. I have Richard Hill followed by Iran.

>>RICHARD HILL: Good morning, and happy new year to you and to everyone.

I think you've done an amazing bit of work, Benedicto. And I think that what you have outlined is an excellent path forward. And I hope that all the colleagues would agree and we pursue this path. As you correctly point out, some of the recommendations in terms of the dedicated discussion, et cetera, are not really consensus. But you're putting that forward as a compromise proposal, which is entirely appropriate. Hopefully, people can agree on that. If not, then we stick to the box methodology that you've shown and people can put whatever they want in their boxes with arguments for and against. And that, I think, would be a very fair summary of the work. And then we can go forward also with areas where we have full consensus, though I think that really we should thank you very much and adopt your proposal as a way forward, Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ambassador. And I would like to say to everybody happy new year and good morning.

This is the last meeting that we have together here. And I would like to thank all members of this working group for their contributions to this exercise, Mr. Secretariat, and yourself, Mr. Chairman, who conducted the meeting in the best manner, I believe.

And also we thank you for drafting this draft report which is interesting to us. The work of the working group shows and as you have described we have had little progress in exchange of views and making more or having more understanding on this issue.

But we have to be optimistic. At the same time we have had some progress with regard to the set of high-level characteristics like transparency, inclusiveness, collaborative, sustainability and some other sets of characteristics. And I hope that, at least in this meeting, we will respect those characteristics in our discussions, which is very important.

Now we have a certain draft report, concrete draft report before us. My delegation thinks that we have to have a report. It is very important in this meeting because we have spent a lot of time on this issue and energy. And we have had a lot of exchange of views. We have had some contributions from some - - from the part of some members. All the stakeholders. And I think we have to reflect in one way or another these contributions and exchange of views for the future.

And this report should be factual. It is very important. One of the characteristics of this report is to be factual and reflect what was exchanged and what was contributed to this meeting. We think it's very important to have in this report or recommend in this report some kind of mechanism, whatever it would be the mandate of this mechanism. But we think that there's a need for a mechanism for -- to continue this dialogue and exchange of views and the new mechanism. It is very important. And I think the document with input that you have provided us is good for our future work.

We think in our discussions we have to bear in mind that this is a multistakeholder meeting. This exercise could be a lesson, very positive lesson for the future and the outcome of this meeting as a multistakeholder meeting should give us some lessons for the future. It's better to have a better lesson for the future and a very positive outcome.

We need cooperation in making an implementation in the area of governance, Internet governance and public policy. And we need flexibility.

Last point I would like to refer to with regard to procedures you referred to, I prefer to go through your draft report section by section and consider then. And, when there is consensus, we can go to the next section. Thank you very much again.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I recognize the Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone at our last meeting of the working group. And first we would like to thank our chair for the report. We understand that the task he had is very comprehensive. And, you know, you probably do the best you can. And we would like to thank you for that.

However, we have some kind of, like, comments on this report. And we would like to share our concern with other members of the working group.

We are actually trying to compare what is in the report we have right now with the mandate of the working group we have.

And we see some serious mismatches between those issues. And because we need to -- the group needs to develop the recommendation on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned on the Tunis Agenda. This should be done with reflection of diverse views and expertise of the members of the working group.

And it means a lot for us. Because we think that there are very much important points mentioned in the Tunis Agenda, which will lead to enhanced cooperation which really needs to be implemented and urgently needs to be implemented.

We think the first part goes to the role of the government. And, really, we think that this part of the role of the government in the implementation of enhanced cooperation in the public policy issues, international public policy issues related to the Internet is crucial part of the understanding of the implementation of enhanced cooperation. And we think that avoiding of this issue, this crucial issue will not be in the fruitful way of making the report. And we really -- we cannot avoid this issue, I would say. Because we have, you know, the mandate. And we need to follow it.

And, like Benedicto said in the morning right now, our comments should be as straightforward as we can. And we absolutely agree with this. However, we would like also to add those comments need to be reflected in the report as straightforward as we can accordingly. Because we have comments. We have contributions. We have a number of discussions. And these discussions should be reflected in the report.

And, of course, it's always better to have consensus view. But, well, it's a normal situation for any U.N. agency and any platform that there is not that -- we have some nonconsensus point of view to the implementation of something and it's a regular task to the group to take the opinion of some members of the working group and another part of the members could take their own point of view and we can discuss it.

And as Richard said, we need to go further in this area. And we will -- we should have to try to find some compromise proposal. If we cannot, we need to go to box format. We really call for our point of view to be reflected in the report.

The point of view of the number of members of the working group should be reflected in the report, in the main part of the report, not in the annexes.

And the part of the report would reflect the discussion, it should reflect real discussion of the issues. That's it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everyone. And like our reigning colleague, we would like to wish everyone a Happy New Year and good to see everyone back in Geneva. Per your, Chair, guidance, I will save specific feedback on the report until the appropriate time.

Just wanted to note that often when working methods are bad, we complain a lot. But when the working methods are positive, we often forget to mention that.

But I would just like to thank the chair and the secretariat for the draft that we have. Certainly we still have concerns, but I think that the plan of this working group outlined at the last meeting for some intersessional work to look at the zero draft, provide written feedback and produce a new draft has put us in an immensely better position starting this meeting than if we had just tried to pick up where the last meeting left off.

And so while I think there are certainly several issues we're going to have to work through, they're going to be challenging, I think that we do have a good basis, a good starting point this week that can construct our work and hopefully continue to make that progress on enhanced cooperation which was mentioned by WSIS+10 and giving us the mandate for this working group.

And at the end of these next three days, we can really walk away, I think, not solving all the problems of the world but building on a decade's worth of work and continuing to show progress on these issues.

And we look forward to working together with everyone in this room to hopefully accomplish that. So thank you.

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

Ah, Saudi Arabia, please go ahead.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, colleagues. Happy New Year to everyone. It's good to see everyone back here in Geneva with good health.

First, we'd like to thank the chair for the draft -- second draft that you prepared. Saudi did participate since the first meeting and on the first draft.

As said by some, we see that there are -- if we match the mandate with the version that you have, as you mentioned clearly, substance is missing. So either no consensus or we're treating issues that are outside of our mandate.

So we hope within this meeting we can agree on really issues of our mandate, paragraph 69, how to enable government. If there are different views as mentioned by other, we can go with the option of boxes to reflect every views balanced and clear that are going to be submitted to the CSTD.

We have some comments. So maybe during the course of the day when we go section by section, we voice our concern. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard, do you want to...

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I did not hear any opposition to your proposed way forward. I just want to make sure we all agree on one sensitive point. Could you scroll to the bit that has the big box, the square bracket where you have the thing for the boxes? Could you show that on the screen? I just want to make sure that everybody is agreeing to that proposal that you have, not that we have a false agreement because we don't understand what's being agreed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard, I think you're maybe rushing a little bit. I'd like to -- from what I heard and having heard all of you, I think we should do what I was planning to do. Iran has also made that call and I think U.S. and others that we should walk through the document. We will get to that part you are referring to.

I have taken on board the comments that were made. And, of course, I cannot replace the assessment that is made by individual participants. But one thing I'd like to say that as chair I tried to come to some proposal that would not leave aside, would not disregard any of the proposals that were made to this meeting. I am proposing a format that would lead anyone who read the report to be able to refer to the proposals that were made.

The challenge we have, in my view, is how to reconcile that interest in not losing anything that was said with the -- at the same time maintaining the focus of our exercise, of our mandate and to be able to suggest and to propose recommendation that were developed by the group as a whole. And I think we have discussed a lot about -- if that should be by consensus or not.

I would only also kindly recall, colleagues, we are working within the context of the WSIS follow-up and the WSIS+10 follow-up. Everything that has been done in that context was done by consensus. The WSIS+10 resolution was adopted by consensus. Generally the work that has been done by the Second Committee with very minor exception is done by consensus. And we know in practice everything that requires cooperation and that requires joint action needs consensus. So that's I think the reason to have the main, let's say, message adopted by consensus.

At the same time, I tried to come to propose a formulation which would not lose the other ideas that were explored that did not lead to consensus. Of course, the formula I have proposed can be proved or there can be some alternative that can be accepted by delegates.

But I think at the end of the day, we need to very clearly have an understanding and, I'd say, some compromise in regard to be very clear about what we agree and we know what we agree, the areas in which we agree and the areas we do not agree.

Again, I think at this point we should not be discussing whether or not we agree. We know the areas we agree and the areas we don't agree. It's just how to reflect it on paper in a fair way to everyone and at the same time conveying a very strong message to the -- to our peers that will examine our work in subsequent processes.

So I would like then to proceed to walk the document through with you. Before that, I would give the floor to United Kingdom.

You have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to all colleagues and Happy New Year. Although I think the Iranian New Year is not until March, but we thank our Iranian colleague for wishing us a Happy New Year. It's very good to be back here again in the working group.

We'd like briefly to thank you, Chair, for all the work that you've done in bringing us this far and in particular for the great work that you have done in putting together this draft report. And we thank all those colleagues who have contributed their comments to it.

We know the task over the next few days will not be easy, and we know that there are many differences of view around the room. And we respect that.

Our mandate and our task is an important one. It's to make recommendations to further implement enhanced cooperation as it is set out in the Tunis Agenda.

That means making recommendations which have the support of everyone to make a real impact and a real difference. It's not an academic essay setting out all the different views and opinions that exist. It's about finding consensus that will take us forward because all parties have agreed to it.

And we know that some colleagues will continue to argue that our report, our recommendations, do not fully or do not completely implement enhanced cooperation. And we respect that view. But our task is to further implement, and we really believe that this is an opportunity for us to make steps forward and to further implement enhanced cooperation. And we need to make the most of that opportunity.

We think the draft report captures a lot of common ground. It captures much of the good work that many colleagues here have done over the last year or 18 months. There are still issues, there are some serious issues for us. And you mentioned, Chair, some of the areas which do not have consensus around the role of the IGF, CSTD, and so forth. There are serious issues there.

But for our part, we are willing to work collaboratively. We are looking forward to working creatively to try to find creative solutions around the problems that do exist with goodwill on all sides.

We think the draft is a very good basis for that discussion. And thank you, again, for it. And we agree with those who've suggested we should go through it as a kind of first reading. We may not agree everything as we go through but as a kind of first reading to understand where the issues are. We think that's a very good approach, and we look forward to working with all colleagues over the next few days. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If there are no further comments at this point in time -- and I want to just reassure you that in the course of the meeting, you will have plenty of opportunity to intervene and to make your views known on anything that is being done here.

But in order to allow us to proceed in an orderly way, I'd like to suggest we could turn to the second draft. I'd like the secretariat to put on screen the very first -- the executive summary part so we can -- and I thank the U.K. for recalling us, we'll make a first reading.

That means that anything that we agree -- nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. That's the current and very usual formulation we use just to make sure that by acknowledging or accepting any formulation at this point, that does not mean it will be certain in the report. We will have to look at the whole package at the end of the day.

But just for the sake of allowing us to proceed, I'd like then to submit to your consideration this executive summary paragraph. And maybe even that should be the last one because it summarizes what is contained there. But just for the sake of having your initial inputs and also recalling that maybe at this point in time you wish also to have a look at the composite document in which the alternative formulations were considered.

May I seek your comments in regard to that paragraph.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I guess somebody has to break the ice proposing some edits to the document.

In general, I think this paragraph is fine. I would just -- I believe it's the third sentence propose a change in just the formulation. I think the paragraph reads, "The recommendations adopted by the consensus of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation are offered" -- and I would change that -- "for the consideration of all stakeholders." And then "involved in international Internet-related public policy pertaining to the Internet."

I would also just while we're on this, since this is the first instance, I would encourage for the most part a standard formulation of "international Internet-related public policies" or "international public policies pertaining to the Internet," something that's just consistent throughout the document. Maybe we don't have to agree to that today. I just think it would just be good at some point to agree so we're consistent.

Are we doing track changes or...

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, one thing that I will ask the secretariat because I think otherwise we may lose ourselves in the midst of so many things that might be said here. And I will then invite the U.S. to repeat the proposals at stated speed so the secretariat can take on board.

Please do not delete the present text, just add brackets what is being proposed by the U.S. so we maintain the integrity of the second proposal but then we identify the U.S.' proposal.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And for the secretariat --

>> (off microphone).

>>RICHARD HILL: I think when it's this kind of basically editorial improvement, maybe we could show it as rev marks, which I think is what Justin suggested because it's rev marks. So rather than square brackets, you just use rev marks would be my proposal for this kind of thing, which I think is obviously not controversial.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. May I ask U.S. to introduce again the proposed changes.

>>UNITED STATES: The proposal would be to delete "not only to governments" and replace that "for the consideration of all."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just -- no, no. I think we should keep the text as it is. I don't want the original text to be changed. So after "stakeholders," you can -- but leave everything that comes before as it is and to just say "U.S." and then you insert the offered -- you said "for consideration of all stakeholders." We understand the original text says "for consideration not only to governments but to all stakeholders." And the U.S. wants to say only to stakeholders.

I want at the end of the discussion to be able to see what is the original proposal without having any changes in that.

Is it okay like this?

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, we would also propose, since I think included in that is "institutions and processes" so we would proposing deleting "including institutions and processes which may contribute to the development of" and just replace that with a simple "involved in international Internet-related public policies."

With our proposal, the paragraph doesn't lose its meaning, but we believe it's more to the point and streamlined. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think we need just in the second amendment that was supposed to say "institutions and processes involved in." Because we -- as I understand, you delete "including," right? You propose to delete "including." So it should read --

>>UNITED STATES: So --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Maybe we should just have one insertion and remove "consideration of all stakeholders." Move that part.

I think maybe we lost something in our proposal, or is it okay like that?

>>UNITED STATES: I think what's lost is deleting "not only to governments."

It would just be deleting that whole section all the way to "development."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think maybe, after we have the original text, we can have your alternative. Maybe you can read everything starting from "focused deliberation" and we take it on board.

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, absolutely. I think it's good if we work this out kind of early on our working methods on providing feedback.

So what it would read is -- or the -- it would, basically, be "are offered for the consideration of all stakeholders involved in international Internet-related public policies."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Could you then -- I think you were elaborating on this and say in your assessment it doesn't lead to any loss of content. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you. I thank you for your contribution.

I have on my list Parminder followed by Peru and Jimson and Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia.

Yes, Parminder, please. You have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone and a very happy new year.

First of all, I support Jimson's comment that the chair and secretariat did very efficient work between the sessions and did a very good process. And thank you so much for it. And for which reason we are on a very promising start. There are difficulties with the document, as others have stated. But thank you so much for that.

Now coming to the changes which U.S. has suggested, my problem is that we cannot change our mandate. And the mandate is to give recommendations to the UNGA. It is not to broadcast as if it were the recommendations. So, while the original text did justice both to the mandate and to the more expanded way of looking at what we can do, which was the governments and all stakeholders -- and I'm happy with that. But to remove governments and to say that this recommendation is actually to stakeholders and not where it's supposed to go, which is ECOSOC and UNGA, is a problem. And, therefore, I would request the original text to be retained. I'm happy with the second change which removes some text and instead of that says "involving." I think that serves a purpose well. But removing the governments from there would not be in accordance with our mandate. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have next on my list Peru followed by Jimson.

>>PERU: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to propose to change the last sentence that says, "as per the Tunis Agenda."

I believe it would probably be more suitable to say "enhanced cooperation according to the Tunis Agenda." Because "as per the Tunis Agenda" could be interpreted as if the Tunis Agenda is flawless. And it is not. That's the reason why we're here, in fact. So, if we say -- okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. I think it is already reflected on the screen. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished chair. Good morning, everyone. And also let me join happy new year. We like to begin by really thanking our distinguished chair and the excellent secretariat for the outstanding work they did in the reports provided for us to review and begin to consider at this point.

And also thank you so much for enabling me to be here, because you responded to my visa issue when it cropped up very promptly. So thank you very much for your promptness.

Just two brief comments. Actually, I would not mind if we retained the status of that executive summary as it were. But, if we're to adjust it as U.S. has proposed, perhaps it would be important to outline what we mean by all stakeholders. Maybe we have an asterisk on all stakeholders. And then you have at the bottom of the executive summary all the stakeholders outlined like governments, private sector, civil society, academic and technical community and international institutions and others. So that would be very clear, because it's executive summary. So we need to be clear about the stakeholders. So, if we don't retain the document as it is, if we're to adjust it all stakeholders we need to be clear about all stakeholders.

And secondly to the last comment made as part of the Tunis Agenda, I think, yes, it's also okay. But we could also look at in accordance with the Tunis Agenda, towards enhanced cooperation in accordance with the Tunis Agenda. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. The secretariat has also taken on board the latest contribution.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

First we were thinking regarding what U.K. said, it's usually not so easy to argue with English speaking delegates on the text in English. However, we read the mandate of the working group very carefully. And we couldn't find anything about consensus only recommendation, any words regarding this. Vice versa, we see the wording taking into account all the diverse views and expertise. And this is in the mandate of the working group. It's still about consensus. It's a usual practice of a U.N. agency to come up with consensus while expressing the views of some part of the members.

So we think that, coming to the executive summary of the report, it's extremely important to put it in here the wording for the questions that absent consensus, the report reflects the diverse views of different participants.

Can I repeat it? Yeah. Here, right here in the executive summary. At the end here, yes.

"For the questions that absent consensus -- for the question that absent consensus, the report -- that absent consensus."

"The report reflects the diverse views of different participants." And that's it on this.

And coming to the next -- we are arguing about stakeholders and their roles. And it's better to put inside here according to the rules and responsibilities as it's in the Tunis Agenda. So not to argue on what stakeholder is more important and what is less important. Just like we do always. Stakeholders, according to their roles and responsibilities. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation.

I feel we already are starting to address at a very early stage some issues I thought we could be addressing later on.

I think we could pursue and I'd be very happy to hear all comments from colleagues. But maybe one way out -- because we are discussing the executive summary, only the cover of the document, if we -- and this is something just for colleagues to have on the back of your minds. Maybe if we just refer explicitly to the mandate that was given and we say how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda for the information society taking into consideration the work that has been done on these matters so far, thus far. Full stop. We are just stating the fact. That's the report what the report is about.

I tried to suggest some additional language to give some more clarity on and to give some more detail on the work that has been done by us. However, again, I think we might, upon discussing it, if you have and anticipate some of the discussions I was expecting to have, of course, because they're important but, if not maybe not at this very early stage.

I could comment on all the proposals that were made so far, and there are a number of others to be made.

However, I'll give the floor to all those who have requested the floor. But maybe just keep on your minds that maybe the easiest way out is to be very short. Sometimes less is more. So that's something that just comes to my mind to avoid discussing at that very early stage some issues that we'll tackle as we go along.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia followed by Carlos Afonso. You have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I think you said it very clear that the first sentence is a resolution. However, when we get into the details, here comes the trouble. So the recommendation is intended to go back to UNGA, and UNGA will review it. But, judging that this recommendation and consensus are not only to government but to everyone in what context? So we prefer your first -- I mean, your recent proposal with the first sentence and to reflect the factual summary that we are answering UNGA mandate. And that's it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia, for that support. Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. Good morning, everyone. As a Brazilian and since the new year is already over, I prefer to wish you a happy Carnival, which is about 12 days from now.

The executive summary in the second paragraph, it already says it includes recommendations, et cetera, et cetera. Enhanced cooperation was envisioned in the Tunis Agenda.

And the last paragraph says again, "enhanced cooperation was per the Tunis Agenda.: Maybe we just strike out "as per Tunis Agenda" in the last paragraph because we already said it in the second one.

And, finally, probably, as we are revising the entire document, by the end we'll have to go back to the executive summary to take a look at it and see if it's still consistent with the document as it is. I think Spock would say that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Carlos Afonso. I think those are very wise words.

Let me move to the European Union representative followed by Canada.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes. Good morning, colleagues. And thank you, again, for this remarkable job that you did by putting this draft.

In our initial proposal, just a very quick comment to add. We had the relevant stakeholders. This is just to avoid having all this discussion again and again about to what extent and for which stakeholders. And I think it's a little bit more dangerous if we start now. If we want to keep something which is, I think, everybody can be happy with this to put the relevant stakeholders there in the expression and then go further down to our discussion.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I ask the secretariat, please, for us not to lose the both Carlos Afonso's proposal and then the European Union. Just say yes -- add relevant. And, at the end of the original last sentence just Carlos Afonso proposed to delete "as per the Tunis Agenda."

Thank you.

Canada, followed by Iran.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning to all colleagues. I'm happy to see you in such great numbers this morning. I think that's useful for the in-depth discussions that we're going to

need to have in the next couple days because then we can hear many views. And I really also want to add my voice to that of those who thanked the chair for the excellent draft that he has produced. It was not an easy task. There were many conflicting views. But I think that the document that we have here this morning is something we can certainly use as a solid basis going forward. So I'm wholly supportive of the process that we have outlined in front of us now.

On to the specifics of this paragraph, my initial comment is that Canada was happy with how the original version stood. I think we could have lived with a few editorial comments, but now it's starting to take a life of its own.

Looking at the relevant paragraphs in Resolution 70/125, you know, it talks about taking into account -- our report must take into account, our work must take into account. It doesn't say the report must reflect all views. The paragraphs in question do not actually say who our report is going to. It says we're supposed to prepare recommendations.

Of course, our process means we have an institution here that feeds the information through the CSTD, through ECOSOC, and through UNGA. But the paragraph itself in the Tunis Agenda doesn't say specifically who the recommendations are for. My understanding is they're for all stakeholders, including governments, institutions, civil society, academics, you name it. Therefore, you know, there was no pressing need in my view to specifically outline that this is for governments.

But all this being said, I think that the executive summary is likely to change quite significantly as we go through the report. So I would actually make a proposal right now that we end this particular conversation here. We've already had some views but that we park it and then we actually get on with the first paragraph of the report because, you know, as I said, the executive summary is supposed to reflect what will be in the body of the report and right now we're not quite clear on what that's going to be.

Therefore, in order to help us advance, let's start with the actual body of the report and then at the very end the executive summary will reflect everything that we've discussed. And it should be a very easy conversation then because everything in the body of the report will have been agreed to. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will hear all comments. But I anticipate I will certainly condone what was said by Carlos Afonso before and also support by Canada that we should maybe for the moment park that and come back to this as we have the full document so we can make sure that part adequately reflects our understanding.

I take on board also some comments that were made that here we are anticipating and interpreting things that are not too clear for all of us in regard to home the address or to -- how to adequately address the main targets for those resolutions. So maybe this is something that could maybe give rise to some controversy here and we should avoid.

Just for clarity, when I made my proposal to say the recommendations are offered not only to government but to all stakeholders which may contribute -- I was trying to reflect on the text of the Tunis Agenda. The text referred to "enhanced cooperation" clearly refers to enhanced cooperation to enable governments. So I thought it would be important to highlight governments but at the same time to recognize that all stakeholders can contribute to the process. So that's why I tried to avoid the word that all stakeholders would develop the public policy, that they would contribute to the development. So I was just trying to take on board that kind of important discussion.

I recall in previous rounds, for example, Parminder made very strong points about the fact that we should be very clear when we refer to the development of public policy. So, again, I think maybe we are here engaging some early discussion on things we should be addressing in the report itself and then come back to here.

I will hear all those who have requested the floor. Next on my list is Iran followed by the U.K. and Cuba.

Iran. Anriette.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, colleagues. And Happy New Year to all. And, Mr. Chair, I believe that the executive summary paragraph significantly address the mandate of the Tunis Agenda. And at the same time clearly reflected the role of the government and all the stakeholders. So we believe that it is not correct to water down the role of the governments. So Iran prefers to retain the original text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is the U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, we have a lot of text to get through so we should all, I think, try to avoid editing for its own sake to make sure we can get through the text at least for a first reading today.

We would point out to Russia that our mandate is in the introduction section. And I'm not sure that we need to repeat or misrepeat parts of it in the executive summary.

But we wanted to make one, I hope, helpful suggestion. There is a discussion about whether or not our recommendations are going to ECOSOC or to governments, et cetera. Perhaps one solution might be to change one word. So where it says "are offered not only to governments," perhaps if we said "are offered not only for governments" and "for all stakeholders." That might be a helpful solution because then it's not talking about where the report goes; it's talking about who the recommendations are for. We just make that suggestion if it is helpful. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, secretariat is also taking that on board.

Cuba followed by Anriette.

And I should apologize to Anriette. I could not see your flag. I think you have been there for some time. Just after Cuba, please.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. And join everybody to greet and best wishes for the new year. But I think here we have -- we don't have time to reinterpret neither Tunis Agenda, neither the mandate. I think that it's not in our mandate even to say -- even what this recommendations are for.

It's very clear in paragraph 65 of the Resolution 70/125 of General Assembly, it says -- I'm going to read that, "The group will submit a report to," not "for," "to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development at the 21st section for inclusion in the annual report of the Commission to the Council. The report will also serve as an input to the regular reporting of the Secretary-General on implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on Information Society."

So I think your original wording was a good synthesis of this. Even you try to be more flexible by including all the rest of the stakeholders. So if we're going to be precise and we're going to tweak with this, then I suggest to put what is actually the mandate. The mandate says that this group will send a report to the Commission and then the Commission will follow -- will send it to the ECOSOC and that is the actual thing.

We are not here to say this is going to be for that or for that or for there. It's very clear.

So, of course, everybody is free to have their own interpretation. But I think we don't have time to go into that. So I support your original text. But if we're going to change the original text, then go to the mandate, the original mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Anriette, please, go ahead.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just also to reiterate, thanks to our chair and those who supported him and the secretariat for a really excellent piece of work.

I'm happy with the original text. But I do agree with Carlos Afonso that we should remove the last phrase in the last sentence. So to delete the "as per the Tunis Agenda." We've already referenced the Tunis Agenda. And I feel that by ending the executive summary with "towards enhanced cooperation" is a stronger and a more future-oriented way of ending that summary because I would hope that as a working group, we both honor the Tunis Agenda but also start from the basis of reality.

And the world has changed a lot. In 2005, there weren't as many Internet governance or Internet-related public policy processes and institutions. And I feel that by closing that paragraph with "Tunis

Agenda" it's backward looking, conveys a backward-looking approach rather than a forward-looking approach, which I hope the rest of our report actually does. And I believe it actually does.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette, for this, I think, important contribution.

So I'd like to propose now -- we have heard a number of comments. I'd not like at this point to try to sort out and to come to some agreement around the very important notions that were introduced.

I would suggest taking on board comments and suggestions that were made before, that for the moment we can park the discussion and that we could move to the main body of the document where if you would read them, I would request the secretariat to put on the screen paragraph Number 1.

I hope there will be no controversy about that paragraph. But I would like to see your comments.

Basically that refers to the mandate that was given to the group according to the WSIS+10 document. It refers and explicitly includes paragraph 64 and 65 which I think we can agree is the main -- the guideline for our work.

Are there any comments in regard to paragraph 1? All right. I think this is factual. I don't anticipate any issues.

Can we move to paragraph 2? Again, that refers to the composition -- setup of the group and its composition. I see no requests for the floor.

Paragraph 3. And here paragraphs 3 through 8 I just recall what I said at the beginning, that maybe we should replace that set of paragraphs by one or two paragraphs describing the overall -- maybe you should retain 3 and then replace 4 and 8. Yes, I have Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: I prefer -- I prefer the original formulation with the details. I wouldn't like to see it compacted personally. I don't think the report is too long. And I don't think it hurts to have that detail. I believe everything is factual, so I don't think there's any controversy about this.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Any further reaction?

Yes, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Chair, I just wanted to jump in so I could say I agree with my colleague Richard Hill. I think if there's another formulation, would be happy to look at it. If there's concerns as we go through this that folks are raising and we get bogged down in this, then maybe. But as it stands, I think factual reference to every meeting is fine. And I agree, I don't think the report is so long that we're really looking to cut out those sections. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm one of the five business participants in the working group. So in addition to saying Happy New Year for 2018, I will also say Happy Carnival.

I actually really appreciate having the summary detail that is provided, Chair, and would support maintaining this.

One of the things I think we sometimes suffer from is that if we boil the ocean too much, we end up with so little factual information that those to whom -- those who will later refer to our report have great difficulty in understanding what occurred in our various meetings.

So I would propose and support that we keep this as it presently is constructed and join others in thanking you and the secretariat for your extraordinary and very productive work.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, I have -- Anriette, are you also seeking the floor? I have Anriette followed by Russian Federation.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I agree with the previous speakers. I think the detailed description is important. I think it also reflects the fact that we consulted more broadly outside of the working group itself.

And perhaps the only -- I mean, I don't have a specific editorial edition. But perhaps the comment Russia made with regard to the executive summary, which I felt wasn't necessarily appropriate there, but perhaps these paragraphs can include a reference to the diversity of views that were reflected. It is further in the document. But, yes, I would opt for retaining those paragraphs.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We would like also to raise our voice to retain this section. We think it's very important for those who will read the report to see what was going on, what was at the first meeting, and what was -- should be -- what also should be stressed that during this first meeting, we as a group managed to agree by consensus to questions. And those questions should retain in the report because it's just a small fraction of consensus issue that we reached.

And actually the second question -- first question that we addressed was about characteristics, and we also have this information in the text of the report.

And the second question taken into consideration of the work of the previous WGEC and the Tunis Agenda particular paragraph 69, 71, that kind of recommendation should be considered.

And actually there was the number of contribution for this particular question. It was a lot of discussion on this particular question. And it also reflects the core of the discussion of the working group. We should keep it in the text. And, furthermore, we need to reflect after in the report the discussion point on this particular question. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have next on my list Nigel Hickson followed by Jimson and Iran.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Nigel Hickson from ICANN, one of the technical community. Very similar comments to others. It's very good to be here, by the way. And I would like to welcome people to Geneva, my adopted home, so to speak.

The comment I was going to make -- and this is just purely editorial, if you did feel, Mr. Chairman, that the description of the various meetings that we've had which I agree with others needs to be there because I think it's important to show the evolution of our thinking on these issues, we could have them as bullet points on the paragraph 4. But I'd be quite happy to retain the suggested text as it is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Jimson followed by Iran.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Chair. Well, also to say I do support the retention of the text as it is. It's factual.

And in addition, there's so many you proposed. I think to be fit for purpose in the executive summary, maybe talking briefly about first meeting, second meeting, third meeting. That is a summary or text that could go into executive summary. So if we have something like that, it could fit into the executive summary. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just to comment that I relied basically on the Chairman's summary of each meeting trying to elicit the main points according to that document. So I think that's what was originally proposed.

Iran followed by Carlos Afonso, I think would be the last speaker on that. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, Iran support retain the paragraphs as it is because we believe that the detail descriptions of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation is very important as a background for the working in the future and we believe that in the future the different people will come and we will work.

So it is necessary to keep the details for the future that what happened in the past. But I'm flexible for your suggestion and the other some delegation can merge to some paragraphs. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I'm trying to do the summary as you suggested joining paragraphs 4-8, and I did it in a revised document which I sent to the list. But it never arrived to the list, so I'm not sure. It seems people were intending to preserve the original as it is. But I did try to summarize. It's there somewhere in the Internet. It didn't arrive in the list, but it's there.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

One thing I'd like to suggest then, because I see there is a very overwhelming majority that would prefer to retain a more detailed description of each meeting. May I just run through those paragraphs with you.

And then, Carlos Afonso, you can, as we go along, maybe propose any change or recommendation that you find necessary or appropriate.

So may I then turn your attention to, first of all, to paragraph 3. Basically, it's a very also factual paragraph that refers the date of the meeting and also that recalls that there was remote participation in live captioning that was made available for those meetings. I see no concerns about that. So I think that will be taken on board.

Paragraph 4 refers to the first organizational meeting, the one I think we had in September 2016 in which we decided on a method that works. And then we agreed on the two questions that will guide discussions. Those questions were referred to by the Russian Federation as important to be retained.

And invited contributions.

And then I just also added that, following the request, the secretariat posted the question. 37 contributions were received and made available.

Carlos Afonso? Okay.

I thought you were raising again.

In regard to paragraph 4, are there any issues? I see none. Paragraph 5 refers to the second meeting of the group. And here we, according to the record of that meeting, we refer to the initial discussion we had on the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation on the basis of the responses. I then proposed that the group would have a more focused discussion on the proposed recommendations during the third meeting and invited contributions to revise the compilation document.

Circulated in order to ensure that their proposals were properly reflected and to submit amended or additional proposals or recommendations.

So, basically, here we are saying that our first meeting focused on the first question that we agreed that the organizational meeting which was the high-level characteristics.

I see no request for the floor. Thank you for this.

Paragraph 6 refers then to the third meeting. And we recall, also according to the previous record of the meeting, that the group took note of a document I circulated before the meeting. I think this is of the discussion on high-level characteristics. We did not discuss that. You may recall but just took note of that.

And then there was a presentation of new and revised recommendations submitted by 12 contributions in the intersessional period. And we decided to focus on proposals around which consensus seemed

more likely to emerge as well as proposals concerning the development of an institutional framework for enhanced cooperation. Also we discussed briefly the outline of the outcome report, I think on the basis of a proposal by Richard Hill.

And then I suggested to continue the discussion at a later stage and invite WGEC members and observers to reflect on the discussion held during the meeting and carry out intersessional work to refine their proposals with an eye to combining or merging these whenever possible in preparation for the fourth meeting.

Yes, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. On paragraph 6 -- we still on 6? Sorry. Okay.

We had one edit that we can articulate at dictation speed. But on the -- after the new institutional framework for enhanced cooperation, we believe it's important in this context to note -- to add "that did not have consensus support" after "enhanced cooperation."

So "after development of a new institutional framework for enhanced cooperation," we would add after that, "that did not have consensus support."

We also thought there was a discussion, a factual -- factually, there was a conversation at that meeting about why that doesn't have consensus support which we have qualifying language on. But I think that goes into the pros and cons conversation that we'll have later. And we will hold that addition until the appropriate time.

But right now we do think it's important that we note that this -- since we're talking about the conversation we had, we think it's important to note that this did not have consensus support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. Well, I will hear -- I see there will be some reactions to that. Just that I tried in a way to take care of that in my formulation. Because I said, "We discussed proposals around which consensus seemed more likely to emerge."

That's why others proposals concerning the -- so in a way it is right there the institutional arrangement was not one around which consensus seemed likely to emerge and we should make more explicit.

But I have on my list Richard Hill followed by Saudi Arabia. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: No, I think the U.S. has a good point. I agree your formulation distinguishes the two categories. But a casual reader might miss that.

I think, instead of putting it in the end as U.S. did, I would put it after the "as well." So "seemed more likely to emerge, comma, as well as on proposals." And then you can insert bracket "for which consensus appeared difficult." And that's it. So I would do it that way.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We believe that your original text was quite balanced. Now, with clarifying the recommendation, have supported, did not have support explicitly, it will leave us to go on to check those recommendations that consensus -- is it within the mandate or outside the mandate? Because this was made clear during the third meeting that these consensus are very general. And we see it outside of the mandate.

So we encourage colleagues to stick to your original text. And we have difficulties with the U.S. proposal in this matter. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The secretariat is reflecting that on screen.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yes. This also struck me as needing some editing. My proposal is maybe not consistent. But I just thought, if we added between "proposals concerning" and then the "development of institutional framework," just the phrase "and whether or not there is a need for the development of a new institutional framework."

But I'm open to other editorial inputs. But I do think it's important to reflect that there wasn't consensus. I prefer not actually to use the term "consensus." I think these paragraphs describe our work. So I'd be happy just with the text indicating that there were differing views on whether there is a need at all for a new institutional framework or --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: To identify, what were those proposals? But as a compromise. Because at that very early stage some of the group members indicated that for them the most important would be institutional framework. So I decided -- we decided to look into the -- those that where consensus seemed likely to emerge. But then, on the second part of our meeting, to focus on the actual proposals, not to discuss whether they would be necessary or not but look at the proposals themselves. So, basically, I think that is what I tried to reflect here. But let's -- please, go ahead. And so the secretariat can take on board your formulation.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Richard's formulation. But, for the record, my formulation is inserting after the term "concerning" after the word "concerning" the phrase "whether or not there is a need for."

Yes, that's correct.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. First, we would like to clarify that we had -- as we remember -- discussion on both questions on characteristics and the second question also.

Still there was some bigger time for the first questions. But, regarding second questions, definitely there was a discussion. There was a number of contributions. And those contributions were presented and discussed. So we think it's important also to see it inside the report.

Then coming to the certain text which we see now, we believe that we need to make the extraction after "a new institutional framework."

Yeah. We need -- yeah, after. "A new institutional framework." To add "including intergovernmental formats."

Which is the point of discussions. And, you know, the -- well, diversity of views.

And probably it's better to change "enhanced cooperation" in here to "the development of international public policy issues related to Internet."

"Development of international public policy issues related to Internet."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see Germany.

>>GERMANY: Good afternoon, Chair and to everybody. Since I'm taking the floor for the first time, many thanks to you, Mr. Chair and to the secretariat, for providing an excellent basis for discussion here in this fifth session.

On the recent point regarding the third session paragraph 6, we tend to agree with Mr. Hill and the statement coming afterwards that this needs further clarification, that the opposition between consensus and non-consensus proposals is not clear enough. And we could propose the changes suggested by Mr. Hill. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We'd like to propose changing the word "framework" to "mechanism."

"Framework" suggests the entire framework, the many different organizations which are working in this area, including intergovernmental organizations. And I don't think in our discussion anyone was suggesting that the whole framework needed to be new. Our discussions were really about a new mechanism. And we think that's a better word. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

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

So maybe we could say "around which consensus seems more likely to emerge." Around. Around. Then substantive matters related to the mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, colleagues. I -- well, I see there -- I must confess I did not expect so much discussion around this. Because that refers to the actual things that were done in the group. I just -- as I said before, I just resorted to the language of the record of the meeting which, again, I think was very straightforward.

I think many of the additions that are being proposed are indeed true. For example, proposed by Richard Hill, I think those are -- they reflect -- but I -- maybe I would suggest for the moment we can move to another paragraph. And I would just leave for colleagues to think whether we need to have those additions. Because, again, what we actually did in the third meeting was very clearly we made a balanced decision. We discussed the proposals that seemed around which consensus seemed likely to emerge. That is a fact. And we also discussed the proposals related to institutional framework or mechanisms. Maybe the term should be changed. I don't know.

Many things were discussed. And many motions, when we were discussing the two sets of questions, the two sets of recommendations. I think many things can be added to that. But the core and the basic fact is that we discussed both sets, as I proposed in my original formulation.

So I suggest we can move to another paragraph. But just leave for colleagues for a second reading whether we need those additions. Because I think that maybe for each addition that is proposed, there will be some discussion -- and, again, we're discussing the past. We are just trying to put on paper what we did in a more straightforward way.

With that, if you can agree, I suggest we move to the seventh paragraph, paragraph number 7 that refers to what took place at the fourth meeting.

Here at the fourth meeting, as we recall in September, we discussed the structure and format of the report. We resumed discussion of proposed recommendations.

Initially we considered new and revised proposals submitted in intersessional period. And, also, again an opportunity was offered for all those who had made proposals in previous rounds that were not considered before also to have those proposals presented and discussed.

And at the end of the meeting, we decided on a time line for intersessional work in preparation for this fifth and last meeting. So this is for your consideration.

I see no requests for the floor. So for the moment, I think we could move on.

Paragraph 8, of course, refers to this very final meeting. And I hope it will read that we consider a draft report submitted by the chair and after extensive discussion adopted the report that will be submitted to CSTD and ECOSOC and UNGA. But let's leave it to the end so we can confirm that assessment.

I think -- yeah, I think we -- yes, because I had proposed to replace 4 through 8 with one paragraph, I then remembered the next paragraph that follows to 5. I think that's why it appears 5 here. So in this paragraph, my proposal was to provide some more detail on things that were considered by the WGEC in its work. So, of course, we say that in line with the request that was made by the General Assembly to take into account previous work that was done in regard to enhanced cooperation, we referred extensively to previous processes and documents, including the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, the report of the Working Group on Improvements to the IGF, documents prepared in the context of the previous 2013-2014 Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, and the process that led to the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the overall review -- blah, blah,

blah, WSIS+10, as well as various U.N. resolutions such as the Human Rights Council resolution entitled "The promotion, protection, and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet." It was also recalled that enhanced cooperation is often discussed at the General Assembly under agenda item information communication, technologies for development.

This last sentence, let me just comment on that. My original text said that enhanced cooperation was consistently discussed under this agenda item. And it was a point that was made by many of you, is that this does not correspond to the truth that in some years, the General Assembly has not discussed enhanced cooperation. But in many other years, there was some kind of a standard paragraph saying that enhanced cooperation in the IGF should be pursued as to distinct but complementary processes.

So since enhanced cooperation is part of the topic that is reviewed, I think it would be fair to say it's often discussed. But, again, I tried to adjust to those inputs I received.

So paragraph 4 is open for comments. I'd like to hear your views. Yes, paragraph -- yes, 5. The new 5, let's say. Yeah.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in paragraph 5, we need to reference the document and the resolutions that reflected inclusive and adopted by the General Assembly.

In this paragraph, we see that there is a reference to specific resolutions not adopted by the General Assembly. And at the same time, if we want to approach the specific resolutions, we have long list of the resolutions that we should reflect in the paragraph 5. So let us to focus on the inclusive documents and resolutions in the United Nations systems.

So I suggest in the line "Society WSIS+10 as well as various U.N. resolution" is enough and it should be stopped here, not the reference to the specific because if I want to -- if we want to reference to some resolutions, we have also long list of the resolutions. That it should be reflected in this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Yes, I've had -- and I'm sure many of us here in this room have also had extensive experience with trying to sort out lists and catalogs and so on and it's difficult. And either they get immensely long because you throw everything in or there's a lot of discussion.

I think we should simplify even more radically than what was just proposed. I would propose that line -- 1, 2, 3, 4 -- 5 where it says, "Enhanced cooperation and WSIS-related topics," full stop. Then you delete

everything that comes after that but you retain the final sentence. So you retain the sentence, "It was also recalled."

I'm just saying we don't actually refer to anything. We just say, "We referred extensively to previous processes and documents on enhanced cooperation and WSIS-related topics" and stop there.

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

I should just comment that the attempt I made here was to put some more detail and to make clear that those documents that were relevant to our discussions were actually considered -- actively considered during our discussions.

However, I take on board both Iran's concern to restrict reference to U.N. resolution adopted by the UNGA and Richard Hill's, that I think also seems to -- can also make sense.

I think we can say it in a more concise way or a more expanded way. It's up to the group to decide on how it wants to address that topic.

The important thing is to make clear and to convey the message that we complied with the call that was made to consider the relevant documents. I think this is the important message that should emanate from this paragraph.

Anriette followed by Cuba.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. I would really like to retain the text as it is. I think that citing those examples reflects that we did fulfill the mandate of the UNGA to take into consideration that work has been done.

And I think that particular resolution is one that reflects a WSIS goal as well, which is the centrality of human rights in the information society. I actually want to congratulate you. I think it's an excellent paragraph, and I would like us to retain it.

And I would not like -- I would be very disappointed if this working group produces a report that conveys that it is reluctant to make reference to human rights. That would be really disappointing, in fact.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. I just have a question regarding the last sentence. I'm asking, is that a fact that that is discussed explicitly under that term in the General Assembly? Because as a matter of fact, that is one of the recommendations that the Cuban delegation put forward, to include explicitly the development of public policy pertaining to the Internet in that agenda item of the General Assembly.

I'm not sure if it's already been discussed explicitly. So it's just a question. Maybe it's that I'm not very well informed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

Well, in response to that, I'd say that enhanced cooperation is discussed many years, not in every year. But only -- the discussion is usually restricted to the fact that we need to pursue enhanced cooperation together with the IGF, that they should be pursued through -- as distinct but complementary processes. There is not a substantive discussion. So I think it's different from what you are proposing, that within this item or somewhere else in the General Assembly, a dedicated discussion should be given to enhanced cooperation and engage into substantive discussion.

So, yes and no in a way.

[ Laughter ]

Yes, it is discussed that the concept should be developed. But there is no discussion on how to develop it, which I think is addressed by your proposal.

Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I totally agree with you.

So in this case, I think that that should be reflected more clearly in that sentence by saying something that what has been discussed is the enhanced cooperation conveyed or how to further implement enhanced cooperation because that was -- it was what has actually been discussed in the General Assembly, by the way, through the report of the third General Secretary that comes from CSTD each year.

It's not that enhanced cooperation because, you know, enhanced cooperation actually is the public policy development. But enhanced cooperation conveyed or how to further implement enhanced cooperation is the thing that has been discussed.

So I would suggest in this paragraph to put that clearly in that way. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan, for that. I think that provides opportunity to clarify what I intended to say here. I ask the secretariat to please insert, "It was also recalled that after that "-- you can say Chair's proposal since it's coming from myself -- "that the need to pursue enhanced cooperation." I think that refers exactly to the language that usually comes associated with the discussion on enhanced cooperation. The need to pursue enhanced cooperation is often discussed, not that enhanced cooperation is discussed.

I thank you for this clarification. That's in line of the spirit I had when proposing this. It is now submitted, of course, for your consideration.

I have on my list -- yes, U.S.

Saudi Arabia, do you also want to speak? Yes.

U.S. followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. On the latter point, I think -- and having participated in many of these ICT for discussions, usually it's framed as the process towards enhanced cooperation is discussed. So I think that's a way to reflect this issue of how it's discussed, is the process of enhanced cooperation is often discussed in UNGA.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We should focus on the resolution with directly enhanced cooperation such as UNGA resolution, ICT4Development, ECOSOC resolution which is in the follow-up of WSIS outcomes. If other resolution will be added in this matter, I mean, we should see it is really relevant to enhanced cooperation. Otherwise, I'm not sure listing different resolution, how much it will -- have we discussed it even here in the meeting? So I would say just to add after -- "as various U.N. resolutions such as UNGA annual resolution on ICT4Development, ECOSOC resolution." I'm not sure, if follow-up of the WSIS -- on the assessment and follow-up.

Again, when it comes to the human rights, do we need to put exact number and session? Or we reference very general -- because this is the issue, does it really deal with enhanced cooperation directly? This is the relevant issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, I think we risk opening a big debate because different people have different views on enhanced cooperation. I would agree with Anriette, that the human rights resolution is an essential part of that. But I could understand other people might have different views.

So there are two ways. Either, we simply accept whatever resolutions people want. If I say I want resolution X, we add it. Or we go back to my proposal and we don't have any.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think that we -- I think the reality is that in the course of our discussions, we took note in many resolutions about not only resolution but documents and the inputs were discussed during our meetings. And I think it is important to state that we complied with that part of the mandate that asked us to look into that wealth of documents and inputs previous to our meetings. And that was done.

How to reflect it on paper I think it's something we should decide. The shortest way would be to have a very broad and general reference such as proposed by Richard. Another way of addressing it would be to focus and to refer to those documents that relate explicitly to enhanced cooperation.

So I think in that regard, we have a number of documents that explicitly associate themselves to the discussion on enhanced cooperation, including the previous work that was done by the previous group, of course, and the WSIS+10 process and so on and so forth.

Or we can -- the third option is to expand even more and to refer to documents that are -- that do not explicitly refer to enhanced cooperation but that have a very important -- and should be fully considered when implementing such as the human rights resolution.

So it's -- I'm in your hands. I'm not sure at this point we should pursue discussion on that topic. Maybe again we should leave us some time to reconsider it and come back to this at some point in time.

Meanwhile, I'd like to hear -- I'd like to post the two last interventions on this unless anyone else wants to intervene.

I have the U.S. followed by Iran, Anriette. Those will be the three last speakers, and then we move to the next paragraph.

U.S., please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Not to be trivial but it's just a point of clarification, on the proposal to the last sentence, I think it had that it was the chair's proposal. But I believe it came from Cuba. And so I think --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Cuba made a point, I think, that is valid. And, as I said, the intent I had was to refer to the discussion that has taken place within the Second Committee. And having been there and having some familiarity of the discussion, every time enhanced cooperation is discussed there, it refers to the need to pursue the discussion. Enhanced cooperation is not discussed there per se but as the need to pursue.

So I think that's why I propose to insert it as the Chair's, let's say, clarification or detail on my own initial proposal but relying, of course, on the very important point made by Cuba.

I understand you also made the addition that usually it refers to the needs to -- the process towards enhanced cooperation. And I think that reflects actually what is there in the Second Committee resolution adopted under that item.

Yes, yes, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think I agree that there's often -- part of the discussion is this need to pursue. But I think it also excludes other references to enhanced cooperation which is about reflecting on processes that have already taken place or are continuing. How it relates to the IGF is always a way that enhanced cooperation has been referenced in ICT4D.

So that's why we were proposing, instead "a process towards," which I think encapsulates all of those -- the need for future progress towards enhanced cooperation, discussions that already happened towards enhanced cooperation, relationships with other processes. That's why we were using the term "a process towards," which is how I think UNGA often refers to that. We don't have to get bogged down on this. I just wanted to offer this as a replacement. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes. I think maybe we can refer to the full formulation that is adopted by the General Assembly. We can make sure we have the exact language. But I think you have a point that usually -- and I said that before -- when enhanced cooperation is discussed there, it's always with reference also with the need to develop IGF as well. So maybe we should -- it was recalled that the need

to pursue both the process towards enhanced cooperation and IGF is too distinct. And process is -- something like that. Maybe that could be a way out. And we could be referring to the language. We are not inventing anything. I leave that for your consideration. And maybe we can -- that's a way not to lose any of the elements that usually I included in the discussion under that particular agenda topic, agenda item.

I have Iran, Anriette, followed by Richard Hill. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I support any reference to any resolution in the General Assembly that adopted by the consensus. I have no problem with that.

Because that's a very inclusive resolution. And all the members of the United Nations has participated and made a decision on adoption of the resolutions. But the other one that is not inclusive and, furthermore, that any commission and any committee in the United Nations system has their own duty. So we cannot reflect some resolutions that few countries reflected their ideas under some commissions and some committees.

So I repeat again, it's better to just focus on the various U.N. resolutions. And, if we wanted to continue to reflect any resolutions in this paragraph, we have a long list of the resolutions that we could reflect. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

Anriette is next on my list followed by Richard Hill.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I don't want us to get lost in a debate. We clearly have different views on this.

Iran, my reaction to that would be my understanding of the mandate of the 2015 UNGA resolution is, in fact, precisely that UNGA would like us to look more broadly at work that has been done. So -- I feel this is a good example of when intergovernmental body has, in fact, come together and in the human rights council, which also includes governments with very diverse views, they were able to reach consensus. That's why I'm in favor of it.

It might be useful to also add an example of a multistakeholder decision.

But so I still feel this is a particularly useful example to cite. But, if we don't reach consensus on this, I'll understand, obviously.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I support what Anriette said. And I would add, as a matter of fact, we considered lots of documents that were not in the UNGA resolution. In fact, I think mostly we considered documents that were not UNGA resolutions, because that was our mandate. Our mandate was to look at everything. So I think it would be misleading to list only UNGA resolutions. So I still think probably the generic formulation would be best. But, as you say, we'll come back to that.

I wanted to comment on a different topic, the one we're here on at the last sentence. It was recalled that enhanced cooperation is often discussed. You proposed to go back to whatever language is actually agreed in the General Assembly as the agenda item. That would be the best solution. Otherwise, I would propose along the lines of what the U.S. suggested but slightly different words. "it was also recalled that topics related to enhanced cooperation are often discussed."

That would be my proposal. "topics related to." But, if you have actually agreed language from the agenda item, that's the best solution.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this. Actually, I think when the U.S. made a proposal, I missed that you're proposing that particular language, "topics related to."

No you are interpreting that. Good. Thank you. Otherwise, I had missed the point.

I have the U.K. followed by Canada.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Yes, we think from memory that the ICT4D resolution uses the phrase "the process towards enhanced cooperation."

It does not use the phrase "the need to pursue enhanced cooperation."

So for that reason we will prefer "the process." Having said that, there may be other creative ways around this. And we would be happy with Richard Hill's suggestion also. But we are not comfortable with the need to pursue, because it's not in that resolution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Richard made my point a little bit. When we talk about the documents that we consulted, we talk about the previous work of the working group on enhanced cooperation 2013-14. That was not even adopted by the General Assembly. It was not even adopted by the group.

If we can accept those documents as useful reference, surely we can accept the human rights council resolution. I understand this paragraph is meant to survey all the documents that one of us or some of us might have mentioned during the meeting. So I think these are all quite relevant. And, as such, Canada would prefer to keep the original paragraph with relevant additions of other resolutions, if others want to add them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

At this point may I just comment that I think, as I said before, we can take different approaches in regard to this. We may want to be very concise or -- but may I request the secretariat to put on screen the first paragraph that transcribes paragraph 65 of the WSIS+10 document.

And just to reiterate with you that we were mandated to -- well, the chair -- the third sentence says, "We request the chair of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development through the

economic and social council to establish a working group to develop a recommendation on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned by the Tunis Agenda, taking into consideration the work that has been done on these matters thus far."

If we restrict ourselves very precisely to the mandate, we should refer and to make it known that we examined all the documents, the work that had been done on this matter. On this matter I understand how to implement enhanced cooperation. So, if we take a very restrictive view of our mandate, we should be restricting ourselves to documents that explicitly relate to that work that what is there. Or I don't think it would be outside our -- out of scope if we refer -- and to expand it and say that beyond those documents that refer explicitly to, that we also looked into other documents as we thought they were related to our work.

So it's, again, a decision on how to approach that. The reality is that, in the course of our discussions, reference was made. So it is not, again, out of scope to say we did that. I think it adds. But, if we want to be restrictive, then the terms of paragraph 65 would lead us to maybe to refer to only documents that refer explicitly to the process.

Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, Chairman, it does not say taking into account only the work that has been done on this matter so far. And, if it had said that, it would be stupid because you could only look at past work and not progress. We took into account matters thus far plus other things, as Canada kindly pointed out. So this simply said that at a minimum we had to look at the work that had been done thus far, which we did. And as you say, either we agree on some long list of everything we looked at -- but I brought in a bunch of stuff that was not U.N. I'm not insisting that it be mentioned. I don't have any objections to listing resolutions. But maybe, again, the simple way out is to simply leave it open. And people can look at individual contributions to find out the various documents we cited. But I would support retaining the original also. That's also fine with me.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think it's very clear the kind of decision we need to make here. I'd like to leave colleagues to consider that for another second reading of the document. And also I think the same line, as Richard has said, that we are mandated to look at previous work that was done on this regard, but doesn't say "only." Just to recall that we are -- we have said that we had looked into documents including. So we are not saying that we did not look at other documents that are not explicitly mentioned here. So that's -- I think there might be a way to address it. But I'd like to leave it for a second reading and move ahead.

May I -- yes. Paragraph 6 is already on the screen.

The working group discussed the need in the light of resolution A/70/125, to consider in its entirety the Tunis Agenda for the information society, particularly the section on Internet governance. Here in that revised version I tried to reflect on comments that were received by you. And I think this formulation maybe improves on the first one that was focused on explicitly only paragraph 69-71. 69-71 is already

our mandate. So maybe there will be no added value if we just say that we looked -- that we agreed that we should comply with our mandate.

I think here we are sending the message that we looked at Tunis Agenda as a whole, particularly the section on Internet governance, in implementing our job. And I think this is actually what took place. Many of our interventions highlighted the need to make sure that everything we do here is consistent with the full Tunis Agenda, particularly the section on Internet governance which was also endorsed by the WSIS+10 outcome document.

So this is my proposal. And I'd like to have your reactions to that. I see no requests for the floor, so I thank you.

I suggest we move to paragraph 7. Paragraph 7 refers to a number of elements that you may recall when we discussed the high-level -- the first -- the inputs related to the first question what are the high-level characteristics. There are a number of notions of ideas, of elements that were proposed. In the discussion we had after that, my recollection is that there was a sentiment from the room that those elements were important, although they should not be characterized as high-level characteristics.

So this paragraph is an attempt not to lose those ideas that were proposed by you as important elements, important notions that should be there when the process of enhanced cooperation is being promoted. And I also here try to reflect on your comments and inputs to my first draft.

Are there any comments and reactions to paragraph 7? I have Nigel Hickson followed by Iran. Nigel?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. No fundamental problem with this paragraph. And I do reflect that those issues came up. But I think there were other issues as well. I recall that we discussed at one point how the notion of enhanced cooperation and the characteristics that we're going to look at later also enhanced the sort of policy making process and how we go about decision making.

So is it possible to say that, rather than just put those characteristics, we say, "amongst other benefits" or "amongst other issues" or something like that so they're not just exclusive? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So, if I understand, you propose to insert "amongst other" -- can you maybe just propose the amendment in the text so the secretariat can take it on board?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Chairman. Perhaps "amongst other characteristics."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just one point. I tried to avoid "characteristics" in this paragraph. Not to mix with the characteristics we're dealing with in paragraph 1 of the recommendation. So maybe we just say "amongst others." Okay.

Yes.

Just delete "characteristics."

I'm not sure it reads too well, but maybe we can improve on the language after later on.

Iran followed by Russian Federation, Carlos Afonso, and Jimson. Iran, you have the floor.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I remember in the previous meetings, the group has agreed at least on some element of this paragraph, such as assisting in the development, capacity building, and technology transfer.

And, if we look at in the same paragraph in the compilation text, it says that the group agreed, not discussed. So I suggest that the replacement of the "agreed" to suggest in the beginning of this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, I request the secretariat to reflect it. But I changed it because some of the inputs I received exactly challenged that. So there was no such agreement, that it was more of a discussion. But there was not, let's say, a firm agreement on that. But, again, I'm in the hands of the group. It will be reflected on paper, so we can come back to that.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

Actually, our comments are both for number 6 and number 7. Because we think there is kind of logic between them.

And, first of all, we think that there is an important point missed at the very beginning before we go to the other sessions, particularly in session of Internet governance, we think that, first of all, we need to say that group discussed the process towards enhanced cooperation detailed in paragraph 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda.

Then it will give us the logical step towards other questions. Because this question is the -- the final point of the discussion because of the mandate.

Process does enhance cooperation, detailed in paragraphs 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda.

And afterwards goes to the further light in the resolution. Because first is the paragraph 69-71 and then others related to the session of Internet governance which gives us sometimes better understanding of the point.

Another comment we would like to raise is actually close to what Iran said, that we are talking about discussion. But we do not point -- we agree with the point, what was the result of the discussion.

And if we -- if we point here only points of discussion, then why don't we talk that we discuss the role of the government? Why we didn't point that we discussed to the institutional mechanisms? If we're just listing some discussion without pointing that we decided anything and we have some result on this discussion, then we need to point different discussion which took place during our meetings. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. May I just seek your clarification because the first part of your intervention, I think it's reflected there on the screen.

But in regard to the second part, it's not clear what is the amendment you would seek to the text. Do you want to include other elements in paragraph 7 or what is the proposal?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Absolutely right. If we just listing the discussion points, then we need to add discussion on role of the government and institutional mechanism which took place. We can come up with the text in lunchtime. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. No, I see your point. I just want to be -- maybe to further clarify the intent of both paragraph 6 and 7.

6 was in addition to the mandate we have; that is, to consider enhanced cooperation -- the process towards enhanced cooperation detailed in 69 to 71 which is part of our mandate, that we just add information that we also thought it was important to consider in its entirety the Tunis Agenda. So it's something, let's say, in addition to what we were mandated to do. We also thought it well to be important.

I think that's something that has been the force of the discussions. For me it was very clear that kind of message.

And paragraph 7, again, I initially -- and my original proposal was to say that we had agreed when we're discussing high-level characteristics that those elements should be there. So in a way, I was related to part of our discussion that was to my initial understanding agreed by everyone that those things should be there.

However, I receive the reaction to my first draft some comments that we should avoid here, the word "agreed" that we should instead use "discussed." Just to recall why those things appear here in their present formulation. But your proposals are there.

I would just suggest to the secretariat if we could add at the end of paragraph 7 that maybe you can help me, Yulia, and say that Russia suggests that if that paragraph is to be retained -- if that paragraph is to be retained, other elements should be added. Is that a fair representation of your... just not to use the -- okay. We will keep it as is.

I will turn to Carlos Afonso and Jimson and Anriette.

Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. In paragraph 6 -- sorry, you refer to Resolution A/70/125. Actually it would be better to stay in light of paragraph 64 and 65 of Resolution A/70/125. We should precisely refer to enhanced cooperation. It would be more precise.

In paragraph 7, I agreed that "discussed" is not appropriate. I understand that Iran proposed the redaction should be "the group agreed that the process of enhanced cooperation should promote," et cetera, et cetera. If that's so, we agree as well.

Can I talk about paragraph 8 already? No? Okay.

[ Laughter ]

9?

[ Laughter ]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can we just exhaust the list of speakers for that topic before we break for lunch? Or would you prefer to break now and resume? I'm in your hands because we are losing translation here.

Can we go ahead? I have on my list Jimson, Anriette, U.K. and U.S. and Canada. Can we hear those people -- and Saudi Arabia, I'm sorry -- before breaking before lunch with no translation?

If that's agreed, I will give the floor to Jimson. Go ahead, please.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Well, there are two things. I'm just thinking that since we already accepted paragraph 4 to 8 will remain, then maybe better to just take note properly. So instead of the 5, there is 9. Instead of 6, we have paragraph 10 and 7 as paragraph 11.

Now, talking to 11 -- or now as you have 7 there that is accepted, well, I note a comment by one of the observers the other time with respect to the nomenclature of capacity-building and talking about capacity development in tandem with sustainable development goal.

And since we forward-looking, I don't know if instead of "capacity-building," we could have "capacity development." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. I recall that was also, yes, part of the discussion I think brought by Jovan, I think.

Yes, Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

Paragraph 6. I like the text as it is. But if we are adding a reference to paragraph 69 to 71, I don't think it should replace what is there about the entire section on Internet governance. So I'd rather just add to the end of that sentence, "including paragraph 69 to 71 which addresses enhanced cooperation."

And the reason I'm saying that is because we actually discussed other sections of the Tunis Agenda. We discussed paragraph 72 onwards. We discussed the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum. So I wouldn't want us to convey that we only discussed paragraph 69 to 71. But if there's emphasis on those paragraphs, that's fine. I'm happy with that.

Then on the paragraph -- following that, paragraph 7, I agree with those speakers that have pointed out it's not a comprehensive list. But my proposal would be similar to Nigel's. I would just suggest we delete the word "promote" and replace it to "contribute to, amongst others," and then have the list as it is.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Those are very helpful suggestions.

I have the U.K. followed by the U.S.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We are not very comfortable with the text in paragraph 7. But we have not objected because it says these things were discussed. And this is the introduction to our report, and it's a factually true statement. So we can live with it.

We think, Chair, you have achieved a reasonable balance here in this passage. And we are concerned by the suggestion from Russia that they might bring new text after lunch on the role of governments.

If that is the case, then we would be happy to propose new text on the role of civil society and the role of the private sector and others to make sure that we maintain that balance.

We hope that we don't need to go down that route. And proposing lots of new text at this stage is not helpful in getting us to a successful conclusion. But we're happy to propose new text alongside Russia if that's the way we go forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: So, thank you, Chair.

My comments are concerning paragraph 7. So the United States proposes deleting this paragraph completely. Paragraph 7, right? We're on 7, right? So we propose deleting this paragraph completely.

First off, we do not agree that all these concepts were agreed as being a component of enhanced cooperation. Some of the concepts were, and they were -- and, in fact, many of them are included in recommendations that we agree to later. I think if you look forward to the recommendations, the concept of peace is included in Recommendation 2 where it talks about role and things of that nature.

The concept of capacity-building is referenced in Recommendation 6 and Recommendation 12.

Sustainable development is included in Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 10.

And then security is included in Recommendation 7 which talks about the context for what enhanced cooperation should be doing which is to create a secure, interoperable Internet.

So I think those concepts were included in the recommendations themselves, and so I don't think there's a need for them to be included here without any qualifying language or just kind of a stand-alone.

The only concept that's not included in that list would be technology transfers. And, frankly, we do not see technology transfers within the mandate of enhanced cooperation. We think it's an important discussion that's happening within other development conversations, including tech facilitation mechanism, including the technology bank, including a lot of the 2030 Agenda follow-up and reviews.

But when it comes to enhanced cooperation, we think that this is outside the mandate and we wouldn't support it in this document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. To make this quick, I would very much concur with the U.S. proposal. I think the agreed section of our report is in the recommendation. It fits -- it wouldn't fit up here. And as my U.S. colleague noted, many of these things are, in fact, reflected in the recommendations. Therefore, it's redundant and, indeed, we should probably delete this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. We see this as an important paragraph and we share the views raised by Russia, that there were other elements that were discussed and agreed. So we would be happy to work with them to bring language on the role of governments in this matter. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I had said the list was closed. However, I received requests from Marilyn Cade and Richard Hill.

But just before turning to them for very brief comment, please, I just want to make sure everybody understands the origins of paragraph 7. When we discussed high-level characteristics, you may recall that many concepts, many notions were put on the table. Some of those we agreed those were high-level characteristics as such and those will appear. We'll see it later on in paragraph 1 of recommendations.

Other concepts were discussed by the group. My assessment as the chair, and maybe I was wrong, was that those notions were accepted somewhat. Maybe -- I think maybe I was wrong that technology transfer in the case of U.S.

But at least my personal assessment was that -- and there was an agreement, those were not high-level characteristics but they should fit in the text somewhere. I recall we said even introduction or in some text that wouldn't mention -- that's the origin of paragraph 7.

That's why I think it would not be appropriate in regard to the origin of this at this point to come up with notions that were not present in the discussion that paragraph relates to. So I would be reluctant --

of course, I'm in the hands of the group, anything that you want by consensus to put in that paragraph could fit in.

But I just want to recall that those particular elements that are there are elements that I thought were generally agreed when discussing high-level characteristics but should not go into that, it should go somewhere else. That's why I suggested to -- as such in that formulation. That's the origin.

So Marilyn Cade and Richard Hill, please, be very brief because we have already exceeded our time.

>>MARILYN CADE: First of all, I would like to support Jimson's paragraph that we could have all these paragraphs all renumbered since I think we agreed we were going to keep the 4 through 8. So if we could get the numbering updated, that would be very helpful.

But referring to the present numbering, it's my recollection that's very similar to the Chair's, that we did discuss these -- discussion did not -- in the way we were discussing it, we were not making consensus recommendations but we did discuss them.

Having said that, I understand the sensitivity that's been raised. I come from the technology business sector. And we do have significant sensitivities about how technology transfer as a phrase is referenced.

However, we did discuss it. So as long as we are all in agreement that this is the factual reporting part of the report -- and I believe it is -- I'd like to retain paragraph 7 as it is.

>>RICHARD HILL: I was going to make exactly the same point. As you had originally written it, it's factually correct. We did discuss all of those things, technology transfer including. We also discussed some other things. But that's okay; you highlight certain ones.

So I think the difficulty is that people are either adopting the suggestion from Iran or they're reading "discussed and agreed" but it's not there. So I think there's no implication here that we agreed to anything. I fully support Marilyn.

And your original language, it's factually correct. The group discussed the process of enhanced cooperation should or could maybe promote, blah, blah, because that was definitely discussed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think we heard the last speaker for the moment at least.

I'd like maybe to retain what the option you said, "should or could." Maybe that could do the trick and facilitate the acceptance of that paragraph. So we just put as an alternative "could."

And with that, I'd like then to propose that we break for lunch. I'd like to thank you for your participation in this morning's session and look forward to seeing you at 3:00 p.m. for our afternoon session. Thank you. Enjoy your lunch.

[ Lunch break ]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good afternoon, colleagues. We're going to resume our meeting in two minutes.

So we are going to resume from where we left at the end of the morning session.

You will see the paragraphs were renumbered according to the suggestion that was made by Jimson and Marilyn.

The substance did not change. But if you have a printed copy or if you're working on a previous version of the document, just take that into account.

We are moving now to the discussion of former paragraph 8, which now on screen is paragraph 12.

And I should just maybe clarify that that proposal was the suggestion received in one of the inputs that came to my first draft.

It occurred to me it would be a very helpful addition.

I think it reflects the discussion we had to the extent it would declare the group also discussed, not agreed, discussed the process of enhanced cooperation should be considered not only as a function of economic development and spread of information communication technologies but also as a function of progress with respect to the recognition of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We would try to convey the message the group also discussed that very important link between science, technology, and also what we want in terms of development and realization of human rights.

Any comments in regard to that?

Again, on the screen it's paragraph 12.

If you have a printed copy or if you are working on a previous version, it's paragraph 8.

I see no reactions.

I assume it is accepted under that understanding that nothing is agreed until everything will be agreed. I thank you for this.

Should we move on to on screen paragraph 13 that is previous paragraph 9.

"The WGEC took note of the fact that distinct processes for considering international Internet-related public policies have been initiated in the past years and continue to be initiated including through outreach to and between all stakeholders and relevant organizations within and outside the U.N. The working group, therefore, recommends further consideration of integration or increased synergy as appropriate between those processes."

The first part of this paragraph is something that relates to a conclusion reached by WSIS+10. And this is part of the language contained in the enhanced cooperation section in which it recognizes that enhanced cooperation refers to processes that have been initiated and at the same time calls for further implementation.

That's where we are.

Are there any -- yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Regarding, I guess, paragraph 13 -- we're on 13, right? I need to change mine in the document.

I think our only concern -- and I don't think disagree with it in principle, but that the last sentence recommends. And, since we have the whole section on recommendations, I'm just curious, I think it would be somewhat problematic to make a recommendation in the beginning part of the document. And I think that maybe that's something that should be looked at in the recommendations section, if there aren't already something similar to that, which there might be.

It just seems out of place making a recommendation before the recommendations section.

Thank you.

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

I have on my list Parminder followed by Anriette.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Actually, in principle, I agree with the United States.

This is a recommendation. And it should be considered along with other recommendations because it's actually the flip side of the whole institutional mechanism consideration.

This is one that what was always meant by enhanced cooperation was what's already initiated. And that should be strengthened on the other side because people think more new needs to be done.

And this is, of course, dependent on rather something new can also be agreed to.

That's as much as I know about the mention of similar paragraphs in WSIS+10 and other places. It was always a package because people agree to saying this because they were also getting the other side of whether the working group are being formed and such things.

This balances the other part and would be difficult to consider without that part.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you,

Parminder.

Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I thought one could probably just replace the word "recommends" with the word "explored" or "undertook."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So for the secretariat, the second to last line after "recommends" -- yeah, you can set into brackets, between brackets "explored" or "undertook."

"Explored," I think.

I think "explored" or "undertook."

Also explored.

The group explored/undertook.

Explored with a D or/undertook.

These are our alternatives, as I understand it.

Also we need, at the end of that sentence, U.S., I think it was supported by Parminder.

Move to recommendation section.

Thank you.

For the moment, if there are no further requests for the floor, we can leave it like this and we'll come back to this later on. Thank you for that.

Can we move to paragraph 14,

previous paragraph 10. "The contributions submitted by WGEC members covered a very wide range of issues and topics.

During the discussions held within the group, several areas of commonalities were identified."

Through the addition of these two sentences, I tried to relate to some calls to initiate that paragraph on a positive note. And it continues saying, "The commitment of WGEC members to improved understanding of different views and concerns was reaffirmed. Nonetheless, a considerable number of topics that were addressed in the various contributions submitted by WGEC members and observers in the course of the group's proceedings did not lead to consensus recommendations.

In some cases the WGEC did not even engage in substantive discussion of a number of individual proposals due to a lack of traction within the group to do so. In other instances, although substantive discussion actually took place in regard to proposals made by WGEC members and observers, there was no consensus as to referencing these in the group's report as recommendations that could be embraced by the group as a whole."

I again tried to relate to the different comments I received. And I think this reflects actually what we have done. But I look forward to comments or any other views from the floor.

Could that be accepted as a fair representation of our discussions?

Yes. Poland, please.

Yes, go ahead.

>>POLAND: Good afternoon, everyone. Happy new year.

I'm first time on this meeting, so I'm really very honored.

I would like to suggest that to cut this paragraph because -- and leave only the first sentence, because the rest is very not positive. It's very negative.

And I don't think it's very needed to explaining this lack of consensus recommendations.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So you suggest to start where?

After reaffirmed, I think.

Peru followed by Marilyn Cade.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you.

>>RICHARD HILL: We realize you don't have eyes everywhere.

So it's no problem.

No. I don't think we can delete this paragraph. The point of this entire section is to give a factual account of what happened. This is a factual account of what happened.

It's not negative that there's no consensus. It's just life.

We're all friends, and we're allowed to have different views. Sometimes we agree, and sometimes we disagree. And then we simply capture the fact that we didn't agree and, hopefully, also what the different views are.

So this is factually correct, and I would have a real problem to remove this material.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Peru.

>>PERU: I was going to suggest exactly the same thing.

I think that, at the end of this document, precisely the richness of the document resides not on an outcome that we have expressed given the possibility to those that agree and to those that disagree to express themselves.

I think that's very important.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson.

Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. And I will open my comments by making an observation I should have made earlier this morning.

And that is how wonderful it is to see both the returning attendees and participants but also some new faces.

And so let me say belatedly welcome to you for jumping into the deep end of the ocean with us.

I appreciate the comment that was just made by our colleague from Poland but also the comments made by Richard Hill and by Peru.

I had a slightly different idea.

And that was to keep the paragraph but to make a very small couple of word changes so that it slightly improved the tone but still remained very factual.

And I'm just going to very, very quickly also note that the second -- sorry -- the third sentence, which I believe was actually coming from comments that I made earlier.

The commitment of all working group members to advancing improved understanding of different views and concerns was reaffirmed.

And to me, I think that was one of the very positive achievements where we began to talk frankly to each other, but we remained in a positive exchange.

The small change, Chair, that I would propose is in the sentence that begins "In some cases."

And here I would propose to just reorganize the sentence so that it could read "In some cases, due to a lack of traction within the group, the working group did not engage in substantive discussion," et cetera.

So here what I did is strike -- I reorganized the sentence. And I struck the word "even." It's not necessary. It's a little too negative.

In the next sentence, I make a similar suggestion, reading at dictation speed, "In other instances, although substantive discussion" -- strike the word "actually" -- "took place in regard to proposals made by the working group members and observers, there was no consensus.

And then I would strike, "As to referencing these in the group's report" and keep -- "there was no consensus as to recommendations that could be embraced by the group as a whole."

So that it remains factual, but it's slightly less negative.

And I hope that may be something that we could consider.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I think the first part is okay.

Although I should say, Marilyn, maybe, even if you retained the original text, if you just left "even," it's even simpler.

So, actually, the same thing.

In regard to the second proposal, Claudia, Marilyn proposes to delete the words "referencing these in the group's report."

So she suggests to read it, "There is no consensus as to referencing recommendations that could be embraced by the group as a whole." Yeah. So we would propose to delete -- so yes.

Maybe just before recommendations you could add.

You can add, Marilyn, delete -- referencing these in the group's report.

I would like to hear others, but I would recommend those two suggestions two additions to be accepted. I think they are in the same spirit I have worked, and they simplify in a way and maybe avoid some negative sentiment that was there before.

So I thank Marilyn for that.

I have next on my list U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, we have a lot of sympathy for the point made by our colleague from Poland.

And, actually, it's very interesting to get his view as a newcomer to this process.

I think many of us have been dealing with this topic for some time.

But we need to consider the point of view of people who will read this report for the first time, perhaps.

And it is true that this whole paragraph, which is very long, has many, many words here does sound very negative and obviously gives a very negative impression to new readers.

We can have something like this here for sure, but we do need to think about maybe making it more positive and maybe shorter.

We would support the suggestions that Marilyn made.

They're very helpful ones.

But there are other sentences which could be reduced, we think.

For example in the fifth line.

"That were addressed in the various contributions submitted by WGEC members and observers in the course of the group's proceedings."

We don't need all that text.

It just makes the sentence longer.

So I'm not sure if this is a good exercise to do on the screen. But I think we could maybe just have a look at this paragraph again and see if there are ways to make it shorter and more positive.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, UK.

I have still a few requests for the floor on my list. And I'll give you the floor, of course.

I just wanted to at this point maybe to comment that I -- when I was preparing this text, I tried to follow some logic and some internal cohesion in the text.

So, if we, again, as I said before, the first three sentences were introduced in order to insert a positive note.

But the main message of this text is to document that there were areas in which there was no consensus for many reasons.

And, indeed, if you look at paragraph 15, if you remove that, we lose the large link, I think, to the next paragraph. So I think although I would prefer that we had worked always in a very positive and consensus mode, that that was not the case. And I think we had before documents appropriately in the text so it's unavoidable at some point to say there were differences, although this is not the main message we are conveying.

I have on my list the European Union followed by U.S., Nigel, and Egypt.

So, European Union, you have the floor, sir.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes, Thank you, Chair. I think initially also we had quite reservation with the initial formulation and we wanted to stress in this paragraph the positive note of how we reached this result rather than trying to single out what were the differences.

So I think the point that was made by Poland and the corrections later or the suggestions from Marilyn Cade or the U.K., I think we find them still valid on how to proceed.

However, on your last point, I think the problem with the next paragraph also is that maybe we could put this stress of the nonconsensus in the next paragraph so just keep the whole -- because unnecessarily in this paragraph, we describe more or less the procedure of building consensus.

And if we want to make a point, I think it would be better to address the nonconsensus issues in a separate paragraph which is the next one. So that would be my proposal.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If I understand correctly, you are proposing to merge the second part of the paragraph starting with the fourth paragraph nonetheless to the end, to merge it with the following paragraph. To have one single paragraph addressing it. Yeah, I think this is a good proposal. Thank you for that.

I have on my list U.S. followed by Nigel, Egypt, and Richard Hill.

U.S. Russia.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think we would agree with our Polish, European Union, and U.K. colleagues that perhaps the first half of this paragraph is overly negative and we should try to make it positive. We look forward to any proposals to do that.

We also think the paragraph is probably two sentences too long. You know, we have a sentence where we basically note that other proposals didn't lead to a consensus recommendation. And then in the next sentence we, you know, start a paragraph with, "In that context" and note that we've listed those nonconsensus recommendations in an annex. And my concern about this -- these two sentences at the end is they start to provide some kind of subjective opinion on those recommendations, that they only weren't discussed in this group because they didn't gain traction.

Some of them weren't discussed and didn't gain traction for a variety of reasons. They were either outside the mandate or they were never agreed to consensus or they were not even recommendations. And so there's some nuance that's lost there in just saying we didn't discuss them because we didn't -- they didn't gain traction which might mean we didn't consider them on their merits. We just didn't get to them.

And, also, on the second paragraph I think -- and this is what Marilyn's proposal, I think, helps to fix, is this notion that we didn't include nonconsensus recommendations. We couldn't reach consensus on including them in the report when in reality we didn't agree to them in principle on the basis of the recommendation.

So I would suggest deleting the last two sentences. I think nothing is lost. I don't think that it subtracts or adds anything to the overall report. But what I think that it helps us avoid is potentially making some kind of subjection of value judgment on those recommendations in an annex that weren't agreed to. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just for clarity, what are the sentences you propose for deletion?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. We would suggest deleting the sentence that begins "In some cases, the working group did not engage in substantive discussions" through the rest of that paragraph.

While I have the mic, I would also just like to note I do think there's a way potentially to merge this paragraph with the next one or move half of this paragraph to the next one which would make it more coherent in the final report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I have next on my list Nigel, Egypt, Richard Hill, Russian Federation. And at some point, we wish to look at also paragraph 15. So maybe after that -- those speakers, we can move to 15 and try maybe to think of a way to look at both paragraphs together.

Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and colleagues.

I was simply going to support what Marilyn Cade said. I think the word "even" in the third sentence is rather sort of subjective and not perhaps rather negative. So it would say, "In some cases, the working group did not engage in substantive discussion."

But then I was going to propose which -- I mean, whether it would help others, I'm not sure. But one of the reasons -- and I thought we had this notion in this text before. One of the reasons on some of the proposals that we did not engage in substantive discussion wasn't so much they were controversial or that they could have been controversial, was that the group considered them not to be germane to the substantive discussion. In other words, that they were out of scope, although that -- you know, I wouldn't necessarily say that. But they weren't -- you know, they weren't focused on enhanced cooperation itself.

So whether adding that might help in some notion of telling the story, because here I have some sympathy for what Richard Hill said in that, of course, we don't want it negative. We don't want it overlong. But at the same time, we are telling a narrative -- we are outlining a narrative to some people who aren't familiar with this issue. So telling the story about how we got to this final report is, I think, useful. And perhaps mentioning the reason that some proposals didn't lead to consensus recommendations is that they were considered not to be of substance in terms of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And maybe I should comment that from the Chair's perspective, when I proposed to say "due to a lack of traction," I was exactly trying to address the point that was raised by Nigel because for some in the group, those points were out of scope. But for some, they were in scope. So if I said, "Because they were out of scope," I would be referring only to part of the group. That's why I avoided that.

And I think "due to a lack of traction" is maybe a little more ambiguous but that, indeed, relates to what happened because the group as a whole could not engage because there was not enough support for that. That does not mean that the group unanimously agreed that they were out of scope. That obviously did not take place.

Next on my list is Egypt followed by Richard Hill and Russian Federation.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon to everyone. And since I have the mic for the first time today, I wish to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for preparing this very valuable report.

For myself I have not followed every meeting of this working group, but the report has really made it quite easy to catch up on the discussion and the essence of the consensus in some areas and the lack of it in others.

I think the colleague from Poland also opened up our eyes to the importance of our language being relevant to everyone, not just the people inside this very room.

And I tend to find this exact paragraph number 10 in the old numbering on my screen, 14 on yours, I think it's a little bit too long. And I think it's -- the problem of the use of the term like "substantive discussion," it's not really clear if someone didn't come to your meetings what do you exactly mean by "substantive discussion" because sometimes we can -- it can be about the scope as appears to be the case. In some other cases, it might be a fundamental difference in opinion where it's very obvious for the Chair and the working group that we will not get to a consensus on that proposal or the other.

So I think there's a little bit of a problem that we are trying to describe the way this working group handled the submissions or the proposals that were put forward. Maybe there are other ways to make that a little bit clearer.

The proposal from my friend Marilyn Cade is a little bit of an enhancement, but I still think we can do better to simplify what we are trying to convey and try to make it clear what do we mean by "substantive discussion" in some cases and why the group did not have the same level of discussion in other cases. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I think you are right. When I proposed the expression "substantive discussion" I was thinking about to indicate whether there was discussion on the merits of the proposal itself. I was not thinking, as you have said, "substantive" also covers whether it's in scope or not. So maybe "substantive" is not the best expression to be used here. We should revisit that. And I heard from you and from others that maybe the whole paragraph should be expressed in a more concise way. And some of you have proposed even to merge with the following paragraph. So I think those are some possibilities that are before us. I thank you for that.

Last on my list are Richard Hill followed by Russian Federation, and then I suggest to move to paragraph 15 because I think the discussion of both paragraphs goes together.

Is the European Union seeking for the floor again? Ah, okay, thank you.

So Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Three points. Yes, rewriting it, condensing it and making it more positive I think is not a problem so long as the information is still there. So we'll see.

Then in terms of whether things were in or out of scope, what you said is correct. There was no consensus as to whether certain items were in or out of scope. I'm not aware that the group actually reached consensus on any item being out of scope. So we just have to use that language.

And then just for the secretariat, where you have down at the bottom "RHill: Keep para," that's actually "RHill and Peru keep para."

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We believe that like U.K. said, we need to respect people who will read the report and they should understand how it was going on and the full, clear understanding. This para should be kept.

While if somebody can propose how it should be -- look more positive, it's okay for us. However, the whole meaning should not be changed.

What actually is our concern is that when we're talking about consensus or no consensus, we think it's really important to clarify consensus of what particular question, of what particular issues. Because as I remember, we reached the consensus regarding mother's apple pie which was wonderful, as I remember. It was the consensus.

However, for some questions we haven't reached a consensus. That's why we propose to put the clarity on this and name particular questions that consensus has not been reached.

And we agree that the para now looks pretty busy with the text. That's why we propose to split it for two paras and to start with one of the point of view. And if another participant have another point of view on no-consensus issues, they can add this accordingly.

So our text looks like, "Some participants emphasized" -- it's a new paragraph. It's for addition. "Some participants emphasized that Item 69 as well Item 35a of the Tunis Agenda on government sovereign rights for international Internet-related public policy issues still have not a practical implementation mechanism/institutional framework where governments could carry out their rights and responsibilities on equal footing and proposed to establish U.N. body/mechanisms," in brackets "U.N. organization, committee, or standing open working group." "Open," "standing open working group."

So this is the point of view of some members, and others can add their own opinion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation.

I'd say I think that was included -- I do not recall if that was included with your submission which I reviewed together with many other inputs. And I thought it would be at that particular part of the text difficult to entertain that language because I think that would change the nature of the report, of what we want to convey.

But I think one point I took from your previous intervention, and I think that was a relevant point -- not that this one is not relevant, but that we should maybe when we indicate the areas where no consensus are reached to be more explicit about what those areas are beyond institutional mechanisms.

I think this point was raised by many of you. I didn't include that in my report. I think it's a valid point you have raised.

I would look for, of course, reactions on the proposal. But I think that since you were last speaker on paragraph 14, maybe you can move directly to the new 15. No?

Yes, please. Please, go ahead.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Just one point. You asked the question, is it the text from our contribution, yes, we checked. It's absolutely from our contribution.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. No, no, that's what I was saying. I think it was in your contribution. When I was considering all the inputs, I was considering that. I was taking that into account.

But I thought that the previous language together with the paragraph we are going to revisit was in a way referring to that and provided some visibility to that. But I look for comments from the room in that regard.

So your proposal is there on screen. May I suggest then we park 14 and 14 bis as proposed for the moment and move to paragraph 15? Yes, Marilyn Cade.

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

I will honor your request, Chair, and move to 15. But I must just say that throughout the report, I am really going to ask that we treat each of the proposals equally. So for me, putting that much detail about one proposal into paragraph 14 even by adding a new paragraph, it creates a challenge for me.

Paragraph 15, on the other hand, notes that the full text of all proposals that were submitted to its meetings -- this is reading line 3 -- can be found in an annex to the present report.

And at this point, I will flag that, again, I think that in thinking about the structure of the report, keeping it high level at this point referencing that the full text of all proposals goes in to the Annex II, I'm more comfortable with that because I think we're just describing our past discussion.

I will have other comments to make later about the treatment of all of the recommendations. But those are my points for right now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn, for your comments because I was just reflecting on the proposal just made by the Russian Federation. As I said, I tried to structure the text in a way that for me made sense. Paragraph 14, the new 14, would just indicate there are areas in which there was no agreement.

Paragraph 15 would indicate that those areas of nonagreement are addressed in such and such way. And then paragraph 16 would focus, give some -- that was my proposal to give some highlight in regard to the issue of the institutional framework.

So my proposal to the Russian Federation is this new 14 bis should come as 16 bis because it relates to institutional framework not to the overall discussion of -- just for the sake of allowing us to have a more organized reading of the text. So, if you can agree, 14 bis, can the secretariat take note of that and move it just for the Russian Federation to have a look on how it would look in the text? So you take 14 bis. Yes. And you take it down.

And put it as 16, 16 bis for the moment. Because I think here we're going to have a very focused discussion on these -- and I think your proposal relates to exactly the point that is under 16. Otherwise, I think the point raised by Marilyn is -- say in 14, we make a very broad statement that there were areas of disagreement, if we give a very particular importance to -- at this point, I think the text will not flow as it should. If you can agree to that. So it's not out of the table. We are just arranging in the text. And we'll come back to this later on. Thank you.

So thank you. Marilyn, just clarify did you make any proposal for amendment of paragraph 15 as it is on screen, or are you accepting that?

>>MARILYN CADE: No, Chair. Thank you. Marilyn speaking.

I'm fine, if we -- I like your idea of moving Russia's suggestion of 14 bis to 16 bis and make my comments at that time to make sure all the recommendations are treated equally in terms of the level of information that is provided. And I think with that, then I'm satisfied with new 15.

>> Just a point for later, no textual changes. I'm comfortable with 15. You say that Annex II I presume that everybody would be invited then to provide the full text for the proposals in Annex II. Just to be clear. Individual members.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I was just checking with the secretariat, because I think we have been referring to annexes. And, actually, there is a limitation of words that will go into the report. So this annex, written part cannot be so large. So, instead of annex, we think maybe there will be some kind of hyperlink that will relate to the proposals. And, as you have asked, I think all proponents will be requested to make sure that their proposals are reflected adequately there. Anyone who reads the report will be able to identify the proposals, although not in a written annex because of limitation of space.

>> May I comment on that? I think that's exactly the right thing. I would suggest that there's a web page created where everybody who wants a proposal provides a document. And then the Annex II would have the link and perhaps a list and say okay, there are 23 proposals from 23 members or whatever. And you'll find them here. So that would be a one-page annex. And each of us would supply the thing that goes on the web page with the full content. I think that would be a good way forward from my point of view.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I have U.K., Russian Federation. Are you seeking the floor on that? U.K., please. Go ahead.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I apologize if I haven't followed carefully enough. I'm not sure what the proposal is for Annex II. My understanding from paragraph 15 is that Annex II will contain the contributions that were made to the group, not new ones that were made after the group finished.

So also I'm not sure exactly what those contributions mean. Do they mean the documents that members of the group and participants sent? Or does it mean the compilation documents that were prepared? So apologies if I misunderstood, but some more clarity would be helpful. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So my understanding, first of all, the first part of my previous statement was just saying that we are saying that all proposals that were submitted can be found in an annex to the present report. Actually they will not be in the annex. They'll be in a way in which the annex will refer to these because of limitation of space. But then we're talking about existing proposals, those that were made in the course of meetings.

The only thing that I think would be necessary to have the fine tuning of these proposals that in some cases there were one or two or many versions. So we want to make sure to reflect the latest, the most updated version. We're not talking about existing proposals. Those were the proposals that were made so far.

I see no -- yes, Parminder. Go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I was wondering whether you need to read this with the next paragraph. And then the notings made in red about clustering of institutional proposals. Because I don't know if they'll be able to understand if there would be an annex that it should have 23 links, which is very fine for me, though I do not see much collective value in having those proposals. But, as a record, that's fine. But I don't consider it as the output of a committee or a working group. They are proposals in which we can post and commit further.

The point is now what happens to the institutional proposals and other long discussions on using the WGIG format in which the boxes were inside the main report? And I heard in the morning Russia say that we need to use the WGIG model. And whenever we spoke of WGIG model during many meetings, it was only on one real point. That was to have institutional proposals in boxes within the recommendations as they were in the WGEC report.

Now, if we're putting links to individual reports, which is fine, though, as I said, not very useful in my viewpoint, what happens to the institutional proposals? Rather these paragraphs say that those boxes would be made and put in an annex or because these boxes don't have direct links. I'm not very clear. So I want to see that connection between 15, 16 and the red notings by the chair at the bottom of 16. I think I can see it on the screen, but it's there below.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think you have just started a discussion on paragraph 16 and what follows. Here, in response to what you have asked, my proposal to address that particular topic, as you can read in paragraph 16, would be to say that several proposals that do not lead to consensus-based recommendations refer to the particular topic related to institutional framework perceived as necessary

to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda. The issue was discussed by the WGEC and permeated discussions by other issues considered by the group. The proposals or recommendations to that effect were, therefore, clustered in a dedicated section of Annex II. So my proposal is that those would be part of Annex II, but in a section in which they will be clustered and clearly identified as such. So I'm not suggesting it to be included in the body of the report itself because I -- in relation to the responses I had from you, I felt that proposal would not lead to consensus. So this is an alternative formulation I propose for you for your consideration. And, as you have said, it may be -- Claudia, move the text a little bit up because now we have 16 bis. And also my suggestion was that, besides clustering the proposals involving the institutional mechanism in an Annex II box summarizing the main arguments in favor and against institutional mechanism key, features and rationale could also be drawn for more clarity. And then, of course, we have to think of a way in which this Annex II page that we'll relate, that we'll forward very clearly identifies that possibility.

So this is something that will relate to the technical aspects that we have to deal with. But that was my suggestion. 16. And the chair's suggestion to relate it to Annex II, together with the other proposals in a dedicated section.

Yes, Parminder. You want to follow up?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair, for the explanation. I'll come back to the question of following the WGIG model. But I understand your present text is not using that institutional model. And I will raise that demand separately. But, sticking to where we are right now, I understand that we were talking about putting links to separate proposals. But this is not any one contribution but to a synthetic thing. The boxes are very synthetic. You cannot link them. So this will be a clear text put out. Others may be links, but this is some kind of text which will be constructed around the institutional mechanisms. Even if it's in an annex right now for the purpose of this particular exchange. What I'm trying to say is that this is not a clear proposal to which it can be linked. It's somewhat of synthetic stuff which is created out of multiple contributions and some comparisons and something. This will be some accurate text which will be dealt with in Annex II as to this proposal, if I understand you correct. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just request -- can we put in a single page on screen, 16, 16 bis, and my suggestion? Is there a way to -- so we can have a look at the whole -- yes. Thank you. So I think that facilitates the discussion.

So I invite comments in regard to this package. Originally, there was 16. And my suggestion -- the Russian Federation has added 16 bis, which would -- even explained by Russia also require another paragraph stating the views espoused by other participants. So I would like to have your inputs on that. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

So, as we look at 16, you know, I think our position -- and it's been shared by many in the room -- is that this working group should really try to get the consensus on its output. That it really doesn't provide a

lot of benefit to the international community just to list areas of disagreement. If that was the case, then we really wouldn't have to come together as a working group because everybody could just list their areas of disagreement. So we should be looking for consensus in areas where we actually agree. So, as we look to 16, I think we've tried to be flexible throughout the document and be open to factual references in this report. If we did something in this working group, I don't think that there's anybody -- I mean, the transcripts are already going to be made public. So I don't think there's any reason to hide that or to not reference it.

But I think what you see here -- and particularly with the proposal made by our Russian colleagues for 16 bis is the problem when you go down the path of listing divergent views and non-consensus recommendations and proposals is it really opens this Pandora's box where everything that was discussed is now open for input into the document. There's no filter process at all for what could be put in here as long as someone raised it at some point through one of the meetings. And that's a very, I would say, low bar for inclusion in a final report.

So I think that it takes us down a very problematic path that we would prefer not to go down. And try instead to really focus on areas that where there was consensus, where we were really putting together a report that everybody agreed to.

And, finally, since I guess we're talking about all three of these, I think that's one of our real concerns with starting to list arguments in favor or against. I believe there's really no way for us to do it in this context because, practically speaking, we can't negotiate text that we don't agree with. I mean, that's not something a group can do. That we agree to this rationale that we fundamentally disagree with. We agree to the language of the rationale we fundamentally disagree with. And I don't think we're going to split into little groups and have a no objection basis proposals for this. So it takes us down an impractical path in a report I just don't see any way we could get to a consensus document. So, for those reasons, we would strongly suggest against the proposal for favor for and against. And we would really encourage everyone to try to focus the report on consensus outputs, not just listing areas of disagreement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

I think we have made a big mistake since I don't know which meeting trying -- that went into some confusion. Because this is a working group that we are not drafting a resolution or a decision that has to be negotiated in this way.

And so from day one, we should have considered the possibility, actually, the very likely possibility that there's going to be disagreement. So at this time to concentrate and to put as a condition to have a document that is 100% a consensus, then, Chairman, we should really stop here now and get to the conclusion that we are not going to have a document. And then maybe we got a chairman's report of that.

I have circulated to the group several weeks ago not only the terms of reference of United Nations groups that this is a working group of United Nations that it is not the first time that a body of United Nations-created groups to ask a question or a set of questions and to come back to them that's very a lot of instances. And I selected at random a recent one, and I sent it to the group. And it's normal that it's not unanimity in working groups. Because that's the case. The working groups are to discuss things that are very controversial and then to come back to with some sort of distillation of with a big issue to distill it. And to get one, two, three opinions and to go back to the body that asked that -- in this case it's CSTD and then ECOSOC and then the General Assembly to come back and digest that. It's really normal. I can really tell you or I can bring it tomorrow, hundreds of examples of reports of working groups that in some issues says in this issue, some member states or in this case that we have delegations that are not member states. Some participants of the working group sought and recommend this and this and that, and some other did not recommend this and this and that. In some cases it's just like that, and in some cases maybe the countries that want to make clear their position there's a footnote. And it says in this group are country A, B, C, and D. Everybody's protected. We, as a delegate from our capitals, know that the position of the country is there. And this is a factual way of returning this.

So if we're going to insist, I'm telling you, we get to the part of the recommendation maybe we don't have enough time. But if we are pretending -- because it's very clear since the second meeting, it's very clear that here in -- as you mentioned the elephant in the room, in terms of the mechanisms or framework or whatever, there's no agreement. There's no agreement. So we have to reflect there's no agreement and say this is opinion A and B.

And we are very lucky that we only have more or less only two opinions. There's some other cases where -- for instance, we have the WGIG report that you were quoting, we have four different opinions and all four were noted.

So I think that we have to get out of our heads that we're going to have 100% agreement here because that's not reality. And to pretend that -- and if as a consequence of that, we have no report, really the people will say, "Oh, these guys were, you know, wasting their time."

So we have to distill and say we have a number of recommendations that we all agree and those are all listed. And then when we get to the institutional framework or new mechanism, whatever, some delegates believe there's a need and they provide this and this and this variations. And some other groups of delegates think that there's no need for any new mechanism because of this reason, this reason, and that reason and that reason. And that's it.

And to end, again, and to reiterate, if we think and we expect to have 100% consensus report here, then it's maybe better to call it quits now and have a better use for our time here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

I heard you but I should very strongly disagree with your assessment of how we want to proceed because I think, first of all, we are not trying to hide anything. There are areas we can agree, and there

are areas we cannot agree. I think it's understood by everyone that some areas there will not be consensus, they will not be in agreement. I think we cannot officially say that we agree to something we don't agree. I think this is understood.

And the group is, of course -- it's a decision of the group how it wants to address any topic that comes to the group. There is, of course, the format as you have said and it's read in many U.N. reports, some said that, some said that. That's a possibility of addressing if the group agrees.

But we have had that discussion before, and I think this point was preceded because it is very clear on the part of the Chair at least the perception that the group will not entertain that kind of report. The group as a whole cannot entertain a report that say some agreed, some didn't. That's not the kind of report we are looking at.

At the same time -- at the same time -- let me finish -- we have agreed that we want to express the areas of agreement in a very clear way. And this will be, indeed, a contribution to the discussion. And we want to document the areas that were not in agreement in appropriate way.

So I think, again, we are not hiding anything. We are just, let's say, thinking about how to come to a report that can be adopted. The report can be adopted by consensus of the group. Does not mean that everything in the report is consensus. But the group agrees by consensus to portray the issues in the report in such and such a way.

And I think this was a point we had discussed before. I do not want to reopen discussion on that because this discussion where some said this was rejected by the group. I think it would be a waste of time if we reopen discussion on that. I would be very unhappy if that would take place in this meeting.

I think we should do our best to come to a report that everyone can agree by consensus the report, that we can all embrace the report, that will document the areas of agreement in a very clear way. That will be the main part of the report. And there will be a documentation because we do not want anything to be lost in regard to the areas of disagreement but not in the body of the report. I think that option was rejected, and I don't think it would be worthwhile to pursue the discussion.

Yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: I made this comment because some other delegation was insistent and to also have "substantive."

So now I am going to ask you a procedural question the other way around. How are we going to reflect those issues in which we don't have unanimity in the group? That's the question. How is it going to reflect this?

And depending on that, that would be acceptable to some delegation and should be unacceptable to others. That's why I'm telling you -- I'm asking this procedural question because that is the go-no go here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The answer is, I think, very straightforward. That's exactly what we have been doing since we have been examining paragraph 14. I proposed a number of paragraphs to document, first of all, to say that there were a number of recommendations that did not lead to consensus. And then we say we are -- these recommendations would be contained in Annex II. And now we are discussing a paragraph that will give particular relevance to the institutional framework. That is the way I am proposing as the chair in light of all the comments and inputs I received from you. That is the way I am proposing to reflect it in the report, that those areas would be documented and they would be referred to through these three paragraphs.

I would say maybe at this point we should not -- because I think if we start to discuss how the report would look like exactly is something that we might lose too much time and repeat discussions we had before.

If I could make an appeal to you that maybe we could go on and then we will revisit everything as necessary. But the proposal coming from the chair is the one we have been examining since para -- and it reflects in paragraph 14, 15, and 16. That's my proposal how to address those nonconsensus part.

I have on my list Russian Federation followed by Saudi Arabia, Canada, and Parminder.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

First, with the numbering of the items, actually 16 is previously 12. Yeah, because now it's changed.

Actually we prefer to leave it after 14 in this case because we think it's extremely important to put it before annexes because we think that annexes is an annex and text is a text. We think that -- these texts should be before annexes. And -- (audio difficulty) -- have the full contribution. And our contribution for some reason was not published. That's why sometimes in annex, it can be missed and disappeared somehow.

And in the main text, it should be -- it should be clear for a person who read this, what is the main purpose of nonconsensus, what is the main point of nonconsensus.

And we think -- why we insist on this? Because we believe that this particular wording, this particular sentence as for how the enhanced cooperation should be further implemented, it's answering the main point of the mandate. And avoiding this will not help us really.

And we understand your point of view, Chair, and understand if we try to put it in nonconsensus text, it will not lead us to the consensus of the whole. However, if we're avoiding this, it also will probably not lead us into consensus because, you know, this is the main point of the discussion. This is the main point from our point of view of our mandate.

And that was the main concerns of not only Russian Federation, it was actually the contribution of a number of countries. And actually this wording is from this contribution. And we think it's extremely important.

And according to the mandate, it should be inside the report taken into account all diverse views of the members of this particular working group.

And while it's usual regular work of U.N. agencies -- and we have last week ITU working group. And we have the same things, that some member states have one opinion and other member states have another opinion. It's inside the consensusly agreed report of the council of working group. What's the problem? Without this, it will not fulfill our mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia.

We could certainly reflect your proposal as you have asked, of course, for with a view to a second reading of that text.

However, I should be very clear and maybe even blunt about one thing. When I read all the contributions coming from you and made my proposal, I tried to be fair to everyone. I tried to reflect upon everything that was said and provide a text that was balanced, that was short, and that was straightforward, and that would at the end of the day allow us not to lose anything that was said. There would be a way to relate to all proposals in a fair way but would concentrate on the consensus part.

So I think your proposal, to be very frank, I think damages that kind of balance because certainly it will prompt a discussion on people who think differently and we have not adopted that kind of language, some said that, some said that.

I think this is a discussion we have had in previous rounds. That discussion, to my understanding as the Chair, I think that was preceded by the understanding we would focus on the recommendations we could develop and forward it as a group and that we would document the areas of disagreement in an appropriate way.

So I am proposing maybe there's a better way to document. But the approach of having inside of the text, some said that was rejected. It's not to say this approach is incorrect. It can be adopted. It's up to the group to decide if it wants to adopt that approach.

But I think the group -- the message I perceive from the group very clearly is this group, this particular, does not want to adopt that approach as a whole.

I think it would be self-defeating at this very late hour to refer to that kind of proposal. That's why we are retaining your proposal. Of course, it will be on screen for consideration and we will come back to that.

But I think we are bringing again to this discussion at a very late hour an approach that was already rejected. And I would very strongly plead with colleagues if we can maybe make a reality of that notion

that we, I think, collectively have developed to have -- to focus on the consensus part and to document that quickly.

I think as it was said in the beginning, there are maybe other creative ways of doing it in a way that will not damage that basic understanding. But I'm in your hands.

I would suggest then -- if you could maybe go back 16 bis, 14 bis, I still have a few other requests on the list. And then I would suggest that for the moment we will also park that paragraph because the same discussion will come up again when we discuss recommendations. So maybe we can try at least to move a little bit ahead in regard to recommendations and revert to that.

Before that, I have on my list Saudi Arabia followed by Canada, Parminder and U.K.

So Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

Well, I think we are at a turning point now. In every meeting, we keep pushing this discussion to the next meeting in which how to deal with the recommendation. Do we put every recommendation under one section? And consensus recommendations lead to consensus but some recommendations as happened in WGIG. We have this example in every meeting. We use the boxes, so we have approached that. We have a section of recommendation, and it will include consensus 1. But when we reach to the institutional mechanisms, we know there is two views so we reflect those views. We don't remember an agreement that only consensus recommendation would be captured because we didn't see this laid into a consensus report to be submitted to ECOSOC.

So -- and this is an approach we used to do in the U.N. In every meeting, in every the commission if there are two views around a recommendation, both views will be reflected equally. This is a caution. I'm not sure how we will deal with the recommendation if this will be outside the recommendation section because the recommendation as it stands now we see it, it doesn't deal directly to the mandate. And we prefer to have it in the recommendation section. Thank you.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. Thank you to all the colleagues for their input. I think that our esteemed colleague from Cuba is right on one thing, that in the U.N. many standing bodies that report on their work regularly, annually, that, indeed, it is a space where both views are reflected.

But our ad hoc group, which is created for one purpose and one purpose only, which was to provide recommendations, I'm afraid does not apply to that standing practice.

And there are other more similar discussions and meetings where consensus report is expected. And, again, our esteemed colleague from Cuba will know very well, you know. The group of governmental experts did not his view/her view. Again, it was a consensus report and it failed to find consensus. Hence, we didn't get a report. That is fine.

The purpose of that group was to provide recommendations. They couldn't agree. The purpose of our group is to provide recommendations. And a recommendation cannot be, "Well, I recommend this and the other person recommend that and everybody else when you read this go and figure it out." That is not the reason why we were brought together.

If that was the case, then we could have just emailed you all of our contributions with our respective contributions. You could have put them on the CSTD Web site and that's it, all views are reflected.

Instead, we chose to stay here, try to discuss, try to find ways to further implement enhanced cooperation. It's impossible to fully implement enhanced cooperation at the place where we're at now.

The current draft that you prepared which has a lot of good things in it has recommendations that, though, to some they may seem like little small steps. But to me, certainly, there are many of those recommendations that it would be very useful if for once and for all we could explicitly agree on these basic principles. Enhanced cooperation is transparent. Enhanced cooperation is inclusive. Enhanced cooperation is a process that leads to better international Internet-related public policy.

This has never been stated anywhere before. We would be making those recommendations to the General Assembly. And I think that would be a pretty significant step in a good direction.

Therefore, having a report that says his view, her view, there is very little value in that. We have a report here with potential good recommendations. And we'll have all the contributions and the transcripts at the end in the annex where everybody's views untainted will be reflected. People who really, really care about this issue, they will be able to do the research. But I think that we have to continue on the track that you had set us, Chair; that your paragraph 15 we've had a few suggestions for slight improvements. I think that's good. 15, 16. We can work with that. The addition proposed in 16 bis or now 14 bis, for Canada, unfortunately, that does not fit into the path that we had set ourselves on. I will stop there for now. But I wholly endorse your initial draft and the road that you had set our group on. And I would urge us to continue in this way. We still have two good days to work. Lots of other things to look at in this text. And I think that in the end, even if the top part, introduction, not all the views are reflected, hopefully, we can come to the conclusion that, in fact, there's enough here to say, well, probably this is better than nothing, which is where I'm at at the moment. Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. Parminder followed by U.K., and Richard Hill.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. So we're discussing the way we agreed to put different views or not. And how we would deal with so-called divergent views. I agree with Saudi Arabia that I don't remember agreeing that we would not take divergent views inside the report. I clearly agree that the WGIG model was repeatedly referenced to in a positive manner, including by the chair repeatedly. And at no point -- there were views about it, oppositional views about it. But it was thrown out.

Whenever I remember -- and you can go back to the transcripts, the WGIG model of recommendation making was present as very, very likely possibility of what we will do.

So to say that the group agreed to not go that way is not true.

Now, to just put views in an actual -- is for me, no concession or not a negotiated outcome because I do not know the processes of U.N. All of you know better. But my understanding, generally, is that if a member wants to annex that country's view to any report, it's very difficult to stop it. That's something that anybody who is a member of the committee can insist to put their views to it. So this is not something which a group together is giving a concession to some views. That's not how it is, and it should not be projected that way. An action is always a right to members to put their views to any report. That's a normal procedure. And I'm very sure U.N. would also be following that.

What was between concession and negotiated position was to put different boxes. I don't see that all of you agreed to that at any point. But that was always kept alive as a very likely possible thing. So that's not to say that we agreed to put that out and would only have all single arguments, single set of recommendations report.

Now, about U.S. and the Chair also said about focusing on consensus report, let's also understand that many members have made it very clear that there's no consensus on any of this. They're not talking about simple. But actually we don't agree with those paragraphs unless there is institutional paragraph or at the least there are institutional options inside the recommendation.

This particular line has been said many times over by many people even while they say it and preserve their right and go ahead and say other things. So there's no part of the report which actually is in consensus and others not in consensus. No. None of these paragraphs have any likelihood to be agreed by so-called consensus other than -- and I repeat -- there is a clear institutional mechanism as there is right now in the end or at least there are separate institutional alternatives within the report.

So to say that we could go by consensus in some part of the report is also not true at all. There is no consensus to make a report without those parts.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K. followed by Richard Hill.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Very briefly, our mandate is to make recommendations. We have taken into account many diverse views. We have looked at different sources of expertise. We have looked at the work already done as we were asked to do.

But our task now is to make recommendations. We would propose deleting paragraph 16 here and would be grateful if you could show that on the screen. We don't think we need to start listing the different views and different opinions that were expressed throughout all of our meetings. That's not what we're asked to do. There were actually many proposals that did not have consensus. U.N. body was one. There were proposals about ICANN. There were proposals about net neutrality. Some members of the group made proposals about trade, about democracy, proposals about cyber security. Many of them. We're not here to list every topic that was discussed in our meetings but did not have consensus.

So we will have in our report, I think now it's paragraph 14, a paragraph which explains that there was some other topics discussed. And we will have an explanation that some of these issues were not looked at fully and that some of the issues did not reach consensus.

And we will also have an annex where the different contributions are available for people to see. However, we are not here now to recreate and repeat the whole discussion and all the issues that did not reach consensus. We're here to give our opinion as a group, the opinion of the group as whole, not just the opinions of some of the group. And we should strive over the next couple of days to do our best to make a strong opinion from the group as a whole for that reason. As I say, we would prefer to delete paragraph 16. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have a few requests for the floor from Richard Hill, Iran, Nigel, and Sweden.

One comment I'd like to make at this point is the following: As I read -- Netherlands, yes. Netherlands as well.

I read carefully all of your inputs, and I have been listening to you throughout those meetings. And it's very clear there are two very opposing camps. There are some in the room that would prefer the report to have only reference to the consensus area, to have a very positive note, and not even to mention any controversy. I think that would be, if I can say, a maximalist position.

The other position is that those areas in which we have come to agreement are not the ones that are meaningful and that they would like to reflect in the report even in the main body of the report, even if in a non-consensus way would be the proposals they think would be important to further implement enhanced cooperation.

So what I tried to propose here was some kind of compromise. And I think that's the word that's needed at this point. There should be some compromise. No one will get out of this negotiation with a maximalist position. They will know they're not, I think. If there is an insistence not to make any reference to controversial issues, to some extent, they'll not be in agreement. And also, if you want to make it to the main report or areas of controversy, they'll not be in agreement as well. It is in my attempt -- and I propose to you -- it is a fair attempt in line with what was discussed before. It will focus on the consensus that we have achieved. And this is the core of the mandate to develop for the group, for the group to develop recommendations. It does not say for the group to inform or for individual members. If that's for the group, the recommendation will be developed by the group as a whole. At the same time, I think it's also fair to document the controversies. So my proposal -- of course, that could be changed, that could take another format -- is to focus on the recommendation, the consensus part, and to duly document the areas of controversies in a way that everyone can feel comfortable. So I think that's the only way we can actually achieve some compromise and come to a report that can be adopted by everyone.

We have again -- I think we are starting to repeat parts of the discussions we had before that we know will prompt other reactions in the opposing direction. So I would urge if we could all collectively try to

find some common ground. Some compromise that could be accepted without damaging anyone's position but duly documenting what we've done so far.

Richard Hill, followed by Iran.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I have several comments. Thank you, Chairman. Canada raised the point that perhaps this group doesn't follow the rules as other U.N. groups. You will recall, Chairman, in the very first meeting I made a comment that the rules will apply. You ruled in that effect. You can check the transcripts of the first meeting. We are, in fact, working according to U.N. rules. We don't have a strange set of rules that apply to us and nobody else.

Regarding the agreement that we should be transparent and inclusive, I'm beginning to doubt that we actually even agree on that. It seems to me that, if we want to be transparent, the report itself should be transparent. And the report, as you have said several times, Chairman, should capture the fact that in some areas there was disagreement. And I will make a positive suggestion to implement your proposal.

The other point is that we should all agree that Internet governance should be inclusive. I'd be happier hearing that statement if some of the countries making that statement didn't take exactly the opposite approach in the World Trade Organization where, after the World Trade Organization failed to agree to discuss Internet governance matters, a certain group of countries decided to create a like-minded group, which is, obviously, not inclusive or transparent, to go off and negotiate these things. So is there any real agreement? I'm beginning to doubt that we agree on anything, Chairman. We don't even agree on being transparent and inclusive, apparently. If our report should not be transparent, then negotiations on critical issues like free flow of data should not take place in inclusive bodies. They should take place in bodies where civil society is not allowed to participate in any way, shape, or form.

Now, in terms of how to move forward, I like your idea that there should be a section capturing a lack of consensus. Maybe it's just another section, non-consensus recommendations, but simply areas where there is lack of consensus. And then you can have the proponents put in whatever they want. And that gets around the U.S. problem where we can't negotiate text where there's no agreement. I think that's absolutely correct. And it's still not a report of the form some members say this and some members say that. It's just one particular section where there will be three or four paragraphs capturing things.

And I hate to do this, Chairman, but I have to for procedural reasons, since the U.K. wishes to be provocative by proposing to delete paragraph 16. Secretariat, could you please put in my proposal now in brackets, "Richard Hill proposes that there be no report at all."

No, I'm sorry. I have to do that because, you know, this is what we're talking about. If there's nothing along the lines of what the chairman is proposing, then we shouldn't have a report.

Obviously, I'll withdraw that suggestion as soon as we agree on a reasonable mechanism like you're proposing, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I think that's the nuclear option. But we're still in our first day. I think we still have a long -- some -- not too much time but some time to try to bridge any difference not with a sense to coming in agreement with everything, but in agreeing on how to reflect things in the report. I think we still have some time to do that.

Of course, if you want your suggestion to be reflected on screen, that's okay. And we'll come back to that.

I have on my list Iran followed by Nigel, Sweden, and the Netherlands and Cuba. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me thank you for your hard efforts.

Mr. Chairman, in the previous meetings, we have discussed under recommendations and how we should reflect on the report.

And also this afternoon, there are many good issues raised by the colleagues. Just I wanted to very brief and mention to two points.

First, the group is not the decision maker. And the group is due to discuss and gather all the recommendations including the consensus and non-consensus.

And we don't have bad or good recommendations.

Any members of the group has its views. And we should consider all the recommendations that are raised and discussed by the group in the previous meetings.

And second point is that it is due to the group to provide and preparation, not the resolution and not the statement, but the report.

And, if we considered the procedures of the U.N. in preparation of the report, says that all the views should be reflected in the report.

And we have discussed in the previous meetings that, of course, there is some disagreement that these views should be reflected in the main report or in the annex. There is a different view in the room. But we should consider these issues in the end of our discussions and negotiations.

If just we focus on the consensus issues and just we reflect the consensus issues in the report, we are going to send this report to the ECOSOC and through ECOSOC to the General Assembly. If we agreed this room on everything, so what is the duty and what is the business of the General Assembly on ECOSOC, when we're going to send this report to the General Assembly.

So let us respect to others views and reflect all the recommendations in the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. Next on my list is Nigel followed by Sweden.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Earlier I was going to say I agreed with some of what Richard was saying. But I think perhaps I won't, in light of what he said in the end.

Because I think, Mr. Chairman, as you said, we're in a situation here where we're trying to find a way forward to produce something that's of use to other people, not of use to ourselves.

If we were writing something for the benefit of the people in this room, then, yes, I think the report would be somewhat longer.

We would probably even want our own names in it. And we would want some of our quotes. And we would want our preferences. And we would want our prejudices.

But we're not doing that.

We're doing this because we believe in Internet governance. We believe in the importance that the governance of the Internet makes for sustainable development, for general development, and for economic growth, societal benefits, for personal benefits, et cetera. We believe that the processes where governments and other stakeholders come together can lead to better results.

We don't all agree in the ratio of the different stakeholders getting together to produce those results. But we do agree in some sort of form where governments, with the participation -- sorry, my English is not up to it -- participation of other stakeholders can achieve results.

Therefore, this task that you've set us, Mr. Chairman, or this task that the UNGA, the WSIS+10 review process set us is, we believe, very important.

And people are looking at what we're doing.

And, if we do not have a report, then questions will be asked. And, yes, of course, those questions can be answered. No doubt those questions will be answered perhaps in May at the CSTD plenary when we sit in this room again to draft the WSIS resolution. They'll be no doubt answered at the plenipotentiary and in other forums. And we'll all have different opinions why we didn't produce a report.

But will other people listen? Will they listen at all? Will they think these people obviously were earnest. They were serious, they got together, but they couldn't produce a report? No, they won't think that. They'll think of the inability of people to come together, of governments -- of 25 governments in the room to be able to reach anything of any importance.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think we are moving towards something that we can agree on.

We would agree with what you have said, that we are trying to produce a report that is honest, that does, indeed, try and reach a consensus on some recommendations but at the same time admits, yes, there were difficult parts and we couldn't agree on all the different recommendations as my U.K. colleague has said.

Where I would differ from him is that perhaps we can in this paragraph 12 or 16 actually say, as the Chairman has said, that one particular issue we had difficulty on was this particular issue of institutional frameworks. Perhaps we can expand that and say there were a number of other issues and just put

their titles. And then perhaps in the annex, we can cluster the proposals. So rather than just links everywhere, there is a sort of guide to where the different proposals lie.

But, Mr. Chairman, honestly, we also think that having to, if you like, put pros and cons, having to put the views of why we believe in one proposal is better to do with the IGF or to do with the CSTD or to do with cybersecurity or to do with ICANN's names and numbers is something that we just can't do in this report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Sweden followed by the Netherlands and Anriette. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you very much, Chair, for giving me the floor. And good afternoon, colleagues. I'd just like to agree wholeheartedly with your assessment, Chair, about the adoption of a zebra-type report with different proposals after one another has been rejected by this group and that it would be a waste of time to repeat that discussion.

Instead I think like Nigel Hickson just said, we are moving under your able leadership toward something that should be able to reach consensus.

I also agree wholeheartedly with everything Canada and the U.K. said, including to delete para 16 and to the delegations that insist on having a zebra-type report I would say we would like to have a report that is useful. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Netherlands.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chairman. As this is the first time I take the floor, I would like to thank you for your hard work which led to this report which is the basis of our discussion today, tomorrow, and the day after.

On the question what should be in and out of this report, I think we clearly have to look what is related to work of this group and we have to look at the mandate of our working group. Like the U.K. and Canada said, the goal is clearly to come up with a consensus report with respect to recommendations how to further implement enhanced cooperation.

Of course, it's also necessary to state that there were differences of few in the room. That's no secret. So that should be mentioned explicitly and, of course, if one would like to see what's really at stake where there was no consensus, one could see in the Annex II where all the contributions are stated what has been on the table.

So in short, Chairman, I fully agree with what Canada and the U.K. have said. And we also want to delete paragraph 16 where there are options mentioned which clearly there is no consensus on this yet.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is Anriette followed by Cuba and Russian Federation.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I think we really should be careful that we don't -- we don't track back on the good progress that we did made this morning. We really did make process -- progress.

I also do recall that we discussed the option of using the WGIG format. I think that at the last meeting that I attended. Juan proposed that we do that. I was very familiar with that format, having my organization being part of the WGIG.

I also recall we decided not to follow that format. So, Chair, I certainly support your approach.

Just a reflection on that as well, I think the WGIG was making recommendations to the Tunis Summit. It's very different making proposals for action. That's the language in the mandate for a summit to making recommendations through ECOSOC to the General Assembly. We discussed the format of our report in the Working Group on Internet Governance Improvements. That was the previous CSTD working group. And I recall that we actually -- I think we even had -- maybe Marilyn will remember or Parminder. We had input from the secretariat that reporting into ECOSOC we needed to submit a consensus report. And as a result, we actually excluded quite a lot of content that we developed in our final report because we understood that what was required of us was a consensus report.

Saying that, I agree with the Chair and with others who have said that it's important to reflect that there were these differences.

So I think I would quite like -- if the Chair has prepared or maybe overnight or in the course of the next few days to provide a little bit more detail about how that -- what that annex will look like or how these differences of view on the issue of a mechanism would be reflected. I would find that helpful.

Nigel, I must say the way in which you framed it just now made a lot of sense to me. I quite like that.

So I do feel that there's middle road here between reflecting and recording that there were these differences in such a way that it's on the record in the annex but not in the report itself.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. After I hear colleagues, I will make a few reflections and try to respond to provide some thought in regard to what you have said regarding providing more detail. I think it's an important thing.

I have a number of requests for paragraph but that refers to the very important aspect of the structure of the report. I suggest that after we hear those speakers, I read out the list and even though I know we have not come to any conclusion but I'd like to allow ourselves the opportunity to try to revisit as much as we can and have the first reading of the full document to go as far as we can today. So I would suggest that after those speakers, I read out that the list would be closed and we move to the other section of the document.

On my list I have Russian Federation, Latvia, Switzerland, Australia, Mexico -- sorry, Cuba was first on the list. Cuba Russian Federation, Latvia, Switzerland, Australia, Mexico, Richard Hill. Then we move to the next section of the document.

Of course, it's understood, nothing has been decided. But we are just trying to have a full sense of the overall document. I think that might assist us when we come back to revisit those issues.

Cuba, please, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: I'm going to be very short. I only have a supplica. In English, I am seeing the translation, it's a plea, a petition, or a request for you if the colleagues agree that now that we're going into recommendation to do it in the reverse order, to begin with the last one and go to the first one. That's a plea, petition, or request that I have for you and for our colleagues to do it in that order. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

When we come to that section, I will propose that to the group. Let's see the temperature of the group. So you may just consider that proposal.

I think it might be useful -- might give some continuation to the discussion we are having now.

Russian Federation followed by Latvia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We actually would like to answer the point raised by U.K. and ICANN regarding that there are a lot of other issues we can touch upon and -- like net neutrality and others. We should totally disagree with this. It's not because it's not the right point or not the important point. It's, of course, very important point.

However, we need to stick to the mandate of the group. And the mandate of our group is not only to make the recommendation. We need to make the recommendation on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. And what is enhanced cooperation is a process is reflected in Tunis Agenda 69, 70, 71. And there is not any wording about net neutrality in such a paragraph.

And why we insist our point of view to be reflected in the report is because we believe that this recommendation reflects -- answer the main point of the mandate. It's addressed the main paras of Tunis Agenda which reflect the implementation of enhanced cooperation. And that's why we believe it should be reflected in the -- in the report. And we cannot see how we can accept it without the reflection. In some cases how it is reflected but it should be reflected.

And if there is some delegation who remember how we did not agree on reflecting the box, box format of the different argumentation, but when and where we have as a group agreed to put everything as diverse views into annexes, I do not remember such a point. We did not agree on that. We never agreed to put any diverse view into annexes. It should be reflected in the main text because it's the main issue of our mandate. This is really what our group should do.

And, of course, it should -- the report should capture the fact. And there is different opinions and some disagreement of the issues.

And it's actually in the resolution of WSIS+10 that there's diverse views on member states regarding how to implement enhanced cooperation. It's a medical fact that there's some diverse views, and our report should reflect this. It's, of course, the main point of the mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. Thank you for further clarify your views. But, again, I'd just like to state that from the Chair's perspective, I've looked into the inputs coming from all of you. I received many expressions supporting the view you have but others that were opposite. So I tried to come up with something that I could -- I thought could lead to a balance without losing, without losing being able to refer to the proposal.

Again, we are coming back to that. Let's hear the last speakers on that point and then we move to the recommendation section.

I have on my list Latvia followed by Switzerland.

>>LATVIA: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

And since this is the first time that I'm speaking today, I would like to thank you very much for the work invested in preparing both the draft reports and especially for your efforts to formulate recommendations that could come out as collective deliverables of this group.

This is very important since mandate in para 65 asks a group to submit a report. And we don't interpret -- we don't see it as a possibility for an individual participant to compile their differences.

So I would, indeed, wholeheartedly support your approach. With regard to current discussion, I have to say that unfortunately para 16 is not acceptable to us. We join in this regard previous speakers on 14 bis.

And with regard to Annex II and also I regard it important to emphasize that all contributions should be reflected equally. So actually it would be difficult to see a place for a specific box or pros and cons. They should be reflected as they have been submitted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Latvia.

Maybe I can request the secretariat just to add Latvia together with the U.K. to propose the addition of -- I think I may have lost. I think others may also have made some proposals.

Just to keep in mind that is a proposal that was made by U.K. and supported by others, we'll come back to that.

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Switzerland followed by Australia.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And I try to be very brief as it is already a late hour. I would first make a reflection on the kind of recommendations we are working on and then a more procedural suggestion.

On the reflection, I think that looking at the mandate given to us by the UNGA in the 2015 outcome document, we have to distinguish between what is the process and what is the result of this working group.

I think that the process includes things like looking at the record of the prior working group on enhanced cooperation. Of course, to look into what was decided in New York in 2015 and also to -- during our discussions in this process coming up with our report, to take into account all the diverse viewpoints and opinions.

But a different thing is the result. And I see that we are being asked not for options. We are being asked for recommendations. And as far as I understand, the method we have been using all this time has been to distill as much consensus as possible. So that would be my reflection on the substance of the discussion.

And my suggestion on procedures that we are kind of stuck with this paragraph 16 since a long time already. And I feel that very much about this paragraph 16 will depend in the end on the content of the recommendations that come afterwards, especially the last recommendations you very skillfully drafted and tried to achieve a common ground proposal.

So why don't we square bracket paragraph 16, go to the recommendations, and later on we will come back and perhaps with a more open mind after achieving good consensus on the recommendations, we'll be able to arrive at the common text on paragraph 16. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Switzerland, for your comments. I subscribe to your description of the difference between process and results. And I was also -- as I said, I was exactly trying to move us to discuss the actual recommendations after we listen to the last speakers. So thank you for your very wise intervention.

I have on my list Australia followed by Mexico, then Richard Hill.

Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Firstly, I'd like to say Australia is pleased to be here today and to participate in this group as an active observer. And we are here again today to contribute in a constructive manner. So in that vein, I'd like to add my support to your proposal to document the differing views of the group in another way other than the final report.

But a document that notes all our areas of difference will be interesting for those who want to know why recommendation X and Y wasn't in the final report. But moving forward, everything requires cooperation and joint action needs consensus. So those areas where there was not agreement should be available for U.N. consumption but are not useful as the final report of the group. Thank you.

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

Mexico is next on my list.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. First, let me thank you for the document. For Mexico it's a very good starting point. And we have some comments about this discussion.

From our point of view, the main goal for us is to make recommendations on enhanced cooperation. And we are here because we believe that that is possible, so we should work with this in mind. We like to describe a discussion. In our view paragraph 14 refers to that. And then we see that there is a complement by paragraph 15 when it refers to the annexing, which is going to be included on the proposals.

And the transcripts as well, I think, are the transcripts reflecting the discussion and in a way all the proposals made during different meetings of this group.

So I think this is a fair picture about -- of what's happened here in the working group.

I can see there is a risk to start making specifications about particular proposals. Because, as everybody knows, there is no agreement on them.

So I will say it should be better and safer for everybody to have a very general description about the discussions of the working group. We should try to keep the language of these paragraphs as descriptive as possible. Very general and very simple. And I think one thing which is very important is to concentrate on the recommendations -- on the agreed recommendations. Because I think this is the main goal of the group to present agreed recommendations.

And I know there were discussions. There are some differences of opinion, which is important to reflect. But I will say let's avoid these kind of issues which are giving out negative, let's say, narrative picture about the work of the group. And let's continue with that. And let's work on the report with the idea to make a contribution. Because I think everybody in this room is -- it means that we want to have a report. I don't think there is an option to do something different. Thank you very much

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I had last on my list Richard Hill, but I recognize also after that Mr. Yokozawa at the back of the room. And then I suggest we move to the recommendations section. Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. On the last point made by Mexico, there will be a report. The only question is whether we in the group will make the report or the secretariat makes the report. Because, as I understand the procedures, it's actually usually the secretariat that makes the report. If we agree a report, that's fine. If we don't agree a report, then the secretariat will do something. And I trust fully that the secretariat will know what to do on the basis of existing procedures. And I believe in the process, you're also involved, Chairman, if my understanding of the procedures is correct. There will be a report. The only question is whether we do it or the secretariat does it.

Now, on the point whether we agree to use boxes or the WGIG approach or not, Chairman, can you go back and show the red text, please.

I do not recall any agreement on the structure of the report. I recall I made suggestions. Japan made some suggestions. Then you had a draft. And after that different people made some suggestions. Nick made some suggestions. I made some suggestions. And the agreement was that you would come with a proposal, having looked at all the suggestions, which you did. And then you asked us to comment on that, which we did. And we have the second draft. I don't think it was correct to say it was agreed we would not do this or that. That's still an open point.

I think that, in terms of the red text, maybe we should not try to summarize the main arguments in favor and against. We should simply say that there's a space where people can put in whatever they want about non-consensus proposals. And that's it.

And the final point is procedural. If I'm not mistaken, what we're talking about is a report of this group, which is composed of a certain number of member states and a certain number of named individuals such as myself.

So I'm very happy to hear what the observers have to say. On the other hand, I don't think the observers in the end get to sign off on the report. It's only a report of the member states and the named people like me. It doesn't matter, because the positions have been expressed also by members. But I think we should keep that in mind. The observers are observers. They're not actually signing off on the report. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. Well, I want to move as quickly as we can to the next section. But, in regard to your first point, I think to have a report prepared by the secretariat is the worst case scenario. There would be a report. But certainly the group will have failed in fulfilling its mandate, which is to prepare a report. So I think it's not even a plan B for me. It's plan Z. If at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday we cannot agree, maybe. But let's not entertain it for the moment, I would say.

And, in regard to participation of observers, since the beginning we have tried to be as inclusive as we can. And we think it's a strength of this exercise. And if we think that what we are doing here will have to go through CSTD, ECOSOC, and UNGA, I think it's very important to take on board all views expressed unless we can't fulfill our mandate and it can be undone later on. But I take your point.

Then we move, after we hear Mr. Yokozawa and Lea Kaspar, and after that we move to the recommendations. And we'll have plenty of opportunity to come back to those issues later on.

Mr. Yokozawa.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief.

My name is Makoto Yokozawa. I'm one of the five business participants. And thank you for all, thank you for everything. And, carefully, I have heard about the interventions today about this paragraph,

specifically paragraph 16. And I know this is not voting, not a majority or not minority. It's not a discussion of that.

But at least someone with a business participant would like to support the U.K. proposal that we don't need paragraph 16.

Because we are business. We don't like the ambiguity in any messages. So I think my association and the other business have appreciated the clarification of the parties in this early report. So that's the reason why we strongly support the elimination of paragraph 16. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see the secretariat is inserting your reference. Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. I'm Lea Kaspar, one of the civil society members of the group. And, since I'm taking the floor for the first time, I'd like to thank you, Chair, for all your work and leadership.

I'd like to throw my hat into the ring as well on this particular paragraph. Coming into this meeting and when I saw the second draft, I was hopeful about the potential of reaching and coming up with not only something that will fulfill our mandate as the working group but also something that will be useful for those who have asked us to produce it.

Now, in my comments on the first draft back in December, I was one of the people who actually suggested -- and, by the way, by mistake I sent my comments only to the secretariat, even though it was meant to be sent to the entire group. Apologies for that.

But, in my comments there, I did suggest to focus on areas of consensus. I suggested a number of deletions of sections that were not consensus-based.

Now, after hearing today's discussions, I've come to not reverse my position, but I do realize that that might not be possible and do accept that we will -- that not reflecting areas of disagreement will not be something the direction that we are likely to go in.

Now, having said that, I do believe that your approach, Chair, is a sensible one. And, if we go down the route of reflecting those areas of disagreement in the annex, I'd like to make just two points on how that should be done.

And two points there are that, on the one hand, then proposals that have been put forward on -- that have not reached consensus should be treated equally. I don't know whether that was what Marilyn earlier was saying. But we need to be fair to all the recommendations there that were made. That would be one point.

And the second point would be that in that section, we should avoid interpretation and creative writing to -- and keep to facts.

I don't know whether that means grouping them, like Nigel suggested, in some way whether that would be helpful. But I think, if we go down the route of creatively interpreting what these recommendations

were, that will get us down a rabbit hole that I don't think we'll be able to get out of by the end of this meeting.

The last point I'd like to make on this occasion is that I'd be in support of the proposal made by the U.K. to delete paragraph 16. And I don't think it's necessary, given the other paragraphs that we have. So I would support that suggestion. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lea. And I thank you for your comments in regard to how Annex II proposals should be addressed in case we can agree finally to have Annex II.

Previously also, we have also sought further clarification in that regard. I think that we should maybe, first of all, agree on the whole structure of the report. I think one of the points that were raised by you and others is that all proposals should be treated equally. And maybe that we should be very careful about inserting at this point new language, interpreting or even if -- as it was my intent to provide some more clarity, maybe if we at this point try to do it, so it might add another layer of complexity. So we should -- we'll come back to those issues at some point, hopefully. But I thank you for raising those points.

May I suggest we move to the recommendations section? I recall there was a proposal from one to address the recommendations in an inverted order. I must say I have mixed feelings about that. Because I was thinking initially to address in the order we have discussed things, high-level characteristics, and so on and so forth. I think that would be in line with the timeline we have followed.

On the other hand, starting by the end would allow us to have an up-front discussion on maybe areas that are more controversial. But, again, those three last paragraphs, that would be addressing in case we decide where to go. Just recall that those are paragraphs formulated by myself, that were not developed by the group as such.

So I am in your hands. I maybe have looked for some guidance from the meeting. I'm in your hands. Anything that is decided by you I will go along.

I have a few requests for the floor. United States and Germany.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think just now, without a strong justification, I would recommend we just go in the order of the report as we've been doing all day. Thank you.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. There is a strong logic for not going in the order and going to the last part first. Because the last part deals with what possibly is enhanced cooperation. There are differences. But it's talking about what is enhanced cooperation.

The earlier part talks about what are characteristics of enhanced cooperation. I, for one, am in no position to once again talk about characteristics of an unknown thing.

It's not possible for me to talk about transparency of X. I remember how they used to teach algebra that, if you keep on -- if you don't know something, you designate it as X. And, if you give enough

attributes to X, the X will reveal itself. So somehow, if you keep on talking about transparent, collaborative and so on, it seems enhanced cooperation will reveal itself. It has not revealed itself in the last five or six meetings. So the only way we can do is go to whether we have an agreement on what is enhanced cooperation or have an agreement on how to express and what our different views are on enhanced cooperation and then talk about what can be the qualifying features of that particular thing?

We've gone through it again. I mean, I don't know I would stop at inclusiveness and what discussion we would do at inclusiveness. And then people who come up with no inclusiveness, there should be social justice as well. But I think at this point, second last or third last day of our WGEC meeting, we should not be going into that. We should go to the meat of the issue. And the meat the issue is clear in our mandate. It is to give ways to implement enhanced cooperation. We have to go to what is dealing with enhanced cooperation implementation. Whether we agree it or not. And then go to the qualifying features. So makes sense completely to start from the last point and move upwards or at least do the last point and then go from top down.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. And I'll give the floor to Germany. Apologize to Germany.

>>GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Germany as an attentive observer tends to support the view of the United States. We feel that going through the points in the order proposed would inform our discussion and better prepare us for discussing the option, which, as you stated very little bit reformulated by yourself and justly so. So I think we would have a better basis if we go from point 1 to point 16. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Given the recent discussion, it is appropriate to start the recommendation from the bottom. So to have a continuous discussion and to link the discussion with the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K., Marilyn Cade, and Jimson.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, we agreed this morning that we would try to do a first reading of the report. We're here to try -- we've had many discussions. We're here to try to agree a report. And this draft is a good basis for that discussion. We are trying to do a first reading now. And we think we should continue in the way we agreed and then continue working our way through the report as a first reading. There will be issues that we will need to come back to, of course. But we think we should continue in the same order that we began. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn.

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

I'm going to try to be a little bit humorous but also a little factual. I was taught to count from 1 to 10 forward in more than one language. So that's the humor. No test for my accounting capability later.

But I do think we should start at 1 and move forward. I also think that much of what is in the first 11, 12, 13, 14, it's really low hanging fruit that we've always -- we have discussed and discussed and discussed, and I hope we will continue to find agreement. But I also think, to reflect again, we must always keep in mind we're writing this report for others. A transcript that starts at 16 and goes backwards is probably going to be a little confusing if others in the world were taught to count from 1 to 10 forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair, distinguished colleagues. I have high hopes that we're going to have a very good outcome at the end. And I think you guys are going to be very positive, if possible. I will recommend as we agreed at the beginning that, as the chairman suggested, we should go through the report, draft report.

And in that case, I support the last speakers, U.K. We need to pick the low hanging fruits, basically. And I believe, by the time we get to the other part, the ground will have been properly wet for us to achieve desired outcome. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Poland. And then the last intervention will be from Richard Hill. Poland.

>>POLAND: Thank you very much for the floor.

I just would like to underline as a legal advisor that every recommendation are kind of the law. And every law is based in the same way, just kind of a system. So on the beginning, there are always the most important paragraphs. And there are so-called specialties. Specific acts. And this is just important to work in the other way.

I note that there's a good way for the newspaper corrections that you read from the end or to the beginning. Because you just don't read the sense, you're just checking the comments and points. And that's all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. Well, since there's this agreement, I would propose that we delegate the decision to you and you decide and we all agree to follow you. I hope colleagues will agree to that.

Then I have two possible compromises. They're somewhat tongue in cheek but not entirely. We could alternate, start with the first, then do the last, then the second, then next-to-last. I'm able to count that way.

[ Laughter ]

The other possible compromise is to start in the middle and then go up one, down one, up one, down one. So, Chairman, please make a decision.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, you are forcing me to do it. I will do it after hearing Russian Federation. You want to intervene on that.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Regarding what should be in the middle and what should be first, it's a good question with no answer mainly.

We believe that for us it's okay to leave it right now. But in the second reading, we will decide whether it should go in the whole session because right now we do not see the report how it will look like in the end. There is the possibility of no report also. It's just we are taking the item but without the discussion and placing it inside the report.

Coming to that, we believe that this wording on visioning the Tunis Agenda should guide it by --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. We are not yet starting discussing the paragraphs, but we'll do it immediately. Maybe you can just hold for a moment and then I will come back to you. You'll be the first speaker.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah.

So having heard you, it's clear there is no consensus in the room in that regard, although I heard a slight majority of views in favor of maintaining the original order. And I think that's what we should do for a number of reasons. First of all, because I think that relates to the way we have been working. Since the beginning, you recall there were two guiding questions. The first related to high-level characteristics or our first substantive meeting was on that. So we are following the same time line.

Another reason is that those initial paragraphs were paragraphs that were developed by you, by yourselves. I think they reflect a lot of work that was invested by the group as a whole, trying to refine the language.

The three last paragraphs said some proposals coming from myself on the basis of proposals coming from you but rather things that were not as such have that same nature. So I would suggest we start with -- we follow the original order. So we are going to address Recommendation Number 1. And as I had said, Yulia, Russian Federation, please, go ahead. I think you have comments in regard to that first.

Take in mind -- and I think it's also a point that was made by Russia -- that nothing is being decided for good. We are making a first reading. In the light of the discussion we had before, it is clear to me -- and I think to all of us that many of the recommendations that are going to be revisited are not the main -- is not the core of what should be examined by the group. There are some controversies, divergent views.

But I would like to encourage all of you to look as positively to each recommendation in respect to the fact that these were extensively discussed. And the formulations that are here basically are coming from you, from your peers. So I'd like to move as positively as we can knowing that there are some other more difficult issues that are yet still to be tackled.

So may I have then Russian Federation commenting, and then I have Cuba and Richard Hill.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Actually, looking at the text here, we would like to point that the wording "should be guided by the following set of high-level characteristics" looks a bit strong. And we propose to change it to "taken into account the following set of high-level characteristics."

Instead of "guided."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: After "guided by" put in brackets, "should take into consideration"?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: "Take into account."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: "Take into account," yes. Okay. Thank you. I have Cuba and Richard Hill.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Chairman, just to save some time and not to have to ask for the floor one and another time, we considered that paragraph 1 to 9, including paragraph recommendation 1 and including Recommendation 9 are generalities that could apply not only to Internet governance process or enhanced cooperation but almost to anything. So I think some delegate mentioned that this was apple pie or sky are blue kind of thing.

So I will ask because we don't know what we're talking about, to put in brackets my request. And it's old paragraph between paragraph 1 and 9 included, to put in bracket and we reserve the option to revisit it and to check in the text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

This is being done by the secretariat. But to my mind it's even unnecessary. As I said before, everything that we're doing is subject to be revisited. And we understand there is no agreement until everything -- so it's clear that anything that we'll do will be seen in the light of the full text. But it is already there.

>>CUBA: No. You don't understand, what I'm proposing, if we can put it in paragraph and move on to Number 10.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- to discuss one by one.

I will move to the next speaker which will be Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I have two suggestions. So after the Tunis Agenda, Secretariat, if you could type, I propose to insert the following text, "Which we" -- are you ready? "Which we reaffirm in its entirety (including in particular paragraph 35)." The joys of strange keyboards. It's okay for now. Yeah. Great. Got it. "Including in particular paragraph 35."

Thank you. And then the other -- I have a second editorial addition on transparency. I propose to add a footnote. You can do it inline for now, on "transparency" behind the semicolon, first bullet in "transparency," behind the semicolon, "add footnote reading, 'we note with concern that proposals have been made to discuss Internet governance matters in forums that are not sufficiently transparent such as free trade negotiations and the World Trade -- and WTO,'" capitalize -- yeah, thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

Can the secretariat put a single page on screen, the full paragraph? Is it possible? Okay.

This demonstrates -- while we'll have to look at the text again as a whole because the first proposal by Richard, which I thought was important, I tried to reflect in a previous paragraph. You may recall we visited a paragraph which reaffirmed the Tunis Agenda in its entirety. So there was an attempt. So we'll need to -- I think it's important that notion that we are reaffirming.

I deleted reference to a particular paragraph because I received from others expression of concern that would be highlighting one single paragraph and not others. So this is -- I would suggest that could be retained for our second reading.

In regard to your footnote, Richard, if you want to retain it, of course, for colleagues to comment but I would certainly encourage you to remove that because I think that would be in line with what we had discussed previously. And we have documented that some proposals did not get traction to be discussed. And I think that's part of the package of proposals that addressed -- and a set of proposal addressed to institutions outside, let's say, the usual setting in which enhanced cooperation is discussed, the U.N., and ECOSOC. I think that was not a decision -- there was not traction to discuss those including at the WTO.

So since that footnote would refer particularly to that, I don't think it would be in line with what we had decided to state and to document that was the kind of proposal that did not get traction. If it did not get traction, I don't see why it should come here.

But I leave it for second reading and look forward to other comments.

I have on my list Anriette. Saudi Arabia, you request the floor? United States. Anyone else? Yes, Lea.

Anriette, please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I think that it is important that we discuss this text, not only that we spend a lot of time on it, we also put out a public call for input on characteristics. So I think it would undermine the integrity of our process if we did not discuss these.

I'm happy with the paragraph as it is. I mean, Richard, I feel there's a bit of a redundancy to say we reaffirm the Tunis Agenda in its entirety in particular certain paragraphs. So I'm actually happy with the text as it is.

My suggestion is that we change "collaboration" -- or collaborative in nature" to "collaborativeness" to be consistent. And I did check that it actually is a word. It is a word.

And then also "sustainability" to "sustainable" to make it sound more like a characteristic.

I did want to ask the U.K. if they just could elaborate, again -- and I apologize for not remembering -- what specifically is meant by "international extent." Is it perhaps international reach or -- just the last characteristic in that list I felt would not be entirely clear to everyone reading this recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, thank you for your proposals.

To my recollection, the "international extent" -- and then I decided to provide some detail including regional and subregional levels. In the course of the discussion, I think some proposals are addressed to domestic policies that could be adopted by governments. And I think there was some discussion that these would not fall within the concept of enhanced cooperation.

Saudi Arabia followed by the U.S.

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

With regard to paragraph number 5, we said that we had an initial discussion on the characteristics. We haven't had very full, rich discussion on all characteristics. So we should be very careful to reflect something as a recommendation which only had very initial discussion.

And as we said, previous stated Tunis Agenda already have paragraphs on transparency for Internet governance. So it's not that we bring new language but it already exists in Tunis Agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think somebody already mentioned as two of our guiding questions that we agreed at the first meeting were about high-level characteristics, I think that a paragraph like this is very useful in this document.

My one concern right now is with the proposal made by Richard because it's -- in our opinion, this working group doesn't have the ability to reaffirm or renegotiate anything related to the Tunis Agenda. We're guided by it, and we referenced that earlier in the document. So in this context, it makes no sense and it really seems inappropriate to include a reaffirmation of that. And so we are recommending not including that addition.

And then certainly we agree with the chair. I don't think the footnote related to other organizations is appropriate for this report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is Lea Kaspar followed by Parminder.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair.

I'm glad we're going to discussing recommendations or the text on the screen right now. I was happy with the original text that you proposed. And if we are amending text, ideally actually I think that this

could be stronger rather than weaker and would prefer keeping the original language rather than the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation.

To be completely honest, if we are talking about -- what we are really talking about here, imagine if we were to say to this body or to this working group that it should take into account transparency. To be honest, I don't know what that means. Ideally, in my view it should be that these efforts are transparent. These efforts should be inclusive, should be collaborative, should be blah, blah, blah, rather than "guided by these principles."

So I would definitely not want to see this watered down. If anything, I would like to go back to the original "guided by" language that we had. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I may be repeating myself, but I need to know what is the discussion about to be part of the discussion. And I frankly really do not know. I say it with full honesty. What is it that we are arguing about? I try to explain it.

In the morning Paul said that we are not doing an academic exercise. We should be very effective and clear. A lot of people said these are wise people who got together and what they write should be useful.

So can one of you tell me a use case of -- let's say we accepted this. Tell me a use case. What happens? What changes in this world? And my demand is real so I request one of the supporters of these points to tell me a clear use case because people have made a lot of good speeches about our effectiveness, our usefulness, our being precise, not academic, and all that. So I don't know.

There are just two views about enhanced cooperation. One is that it needs a new mechanism, and other is that Internet-related public policy making is actually taking place in many other foras.

So are we saying, if it is the second, that wherever Internet-related public policy making is taking place, we should especially be looking at these things because Internet is special. Its policy making requirements are different. Therefore, if UNESCO makes Internet-related policy, then in that part these become these things. There are only two ways to see it. One there is a new mechanism or enhanced cooperation is taking place in different bodies. If the second -- and for the sake of argument I accept the second logic -- then only meaningful thing we can say even when they do Internet policy making for that particular purpose, there is a certain Internet exceptionalism involved, which I don't subscribe to. But whatever.

Internet being special, when you take Internet policy, please do this checklist. UNESCO should do it. WTO should do it. ITU should do it. That would be meaningful. If we are not ready to do that, I'm completely failing to understand what use case this recommendation has. And this carries words like can we -- can somebody be more condescending than to tell an organization that you should be

effective. You should be goal-oriented. I mean, it looks like we are teaching high secondary business management to people (indiscernible).

So what do you mean by transparency? I can understand. But can you tell a group you should be more effective?

You should be goal oriented.

I think this is a -- sorry to say -- complete smoke screen to talk about things that do not have any meaning much less matter. We do not talk about these paragraphs and come to the basic issue of enhanced cooperation.

And I still want to ask people to give me a use case of what happens if we accept any of these. What really changes in the real world? Thank you.

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

I think this discussion around enhanced cooperation has -- in our group we have addressed it in many ways. I think I would say maybe in a more sophisticated way than just restricting it to the discussion whether we need or not a new institutional mechanism. I think there are many dimensions of enhanced cooperation that were discussed.

And I think we're in line with the WSIS+10 document. We cannot undo what was done by our representatives. And the WSIS+10 outcome document says that, in my interpretation, that enhanced cooperation is an ongoing process. The glass is half empty, half full, depending on how you see it. There is a clear recognition that there has been efforts in that regard. But these need to be further implemented. That was the compromise that was achieved there.

So in regard -- there was not an attempt there to define and to have the kind of precision of what this process is as you are requesting now. So I think it's very maybe not at this point that, if we can't come to that kind of precision, I'm not sure we would be in a position to do so.

But when we are addressing a recommendation to something the UNGA said has already taken place, that needs to be further implemented. And we are providing some advice on how this can be further implemented. So I'm not sure whether -- yes, please. Go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Sorry, Chair. I would really not like to take the mic back again. But I'm ready to accept the second version for the sake of argument that it is already taking place. But still our recommendation has to be meaningful. I'm ready to accept that there's no new mechanism Internet public policy making in response to UNESCO, ITU, UNCTAD, WTO, I accept that. Still what does that recommendation mean to them unless it means that either, therefore, all these organizations should change their nature and become all these things, which I think is too much to say. But I'm happy to hear that. Or we say that, when you do Internet public policy making, our recommendation is that, because Internet is such an organism, policy making around it should have some different characteristics. So

check these boxes. When WTO talks about e-commerce, UNESCO talks about freedom on the Internet or something, that still makes sense. We're making a recommendation. We can't force them.

But to say that neither this nor a new mechanism -- right now talking about new mechanism -- in that case we should be able to say that, whenever Internet-related public policy is made because Internet is bottom-up and so on and so on thing, all Internet-related public policy mechanisms should take care that they do something like that.

I mean, I'm just trying -- I'm not now getting into controversy about the two groups, what they did WSIS+10. Even then I don't see any meaning to it. We know that, when you make Internet policy, you do these kinds of things. That's what Richard Hill was trying to do. You don't put one name or the another. You can see all Internet-related institutions, when they do policy making around the Internet, have to do these steps. Get into more detail. That's what wise work, impactful work, useful work, which are the terms used here would mean. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would suggest we could proceed in the work we have been doing trying to revisit the document. Maybe at the end of -- we'll have a clear idea on how different bits and pieces will fit together.

Maybe, if we discuss each and every paragraph, we try to have the overall view of everything, it might get very difficult.

So my suggestion is to hear other colleagues who also want to get in on this.

And, again, I think the point you raise is very relevant. And it should be seen I think in the light of the whole document. I hope that your queries can be addressed adequately when we look at the whole document to see what we're talking about in all the different areas of the document. Hopefully.

So I have on my list Canada followed by Nigel Hickson, Richard Hill, U.K. and then I would suggest we close the list, and we close our work for today. Unfortunately, we could not go beyond the first recommendation. But I hope we can come back tomorrow refreshed and do some more efficient work.

Canada, please. You have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I was quite happy with the first recommendation as it was drafted, but including Anriette's proposals for changing the terms collaborativeness and sustainable.

And I had the same question in terms of international extent. And I wondered if the word would not have been international in reach. But I have no firm views on this.

On the last point which Parminder made, I think that, you know, it might be a direction that we might want to entertain. You know, his point about the checklist and when you're making Internet-related public policy, please try and abide by these principles or these characteristics.

You know, maybe that is a direction that we can explore a little bit further.

But my initial feeling was I like the initial paragraph. But following Parminder's discussion now, okay, perhaps we can elaborate some more. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just briefly agree with I think we should keep the language at the beginning of this paragraph, should be guided.

We also made some proposals in this area. And I'm glad that the consultation that Anriette referred to was referenced.

I mean, clearly, this is a subset of the characteristics that you could indeed elaborate on. And, indeed, there's some good wording in some of the further paragraphs that we come to.

And I'm also glad, along with Canada, that Parminder has raised this point. Because surely this is one of the strengths of this -- of this approach. And it's not -- these proposals and -- I mean, Cuba said earlier you could apply these to other situations. Perhaps you can. But, in this particular context, surely they are important. They're important for the reasons that perhaps Richard Hill raised. And some processes between governments are not as transparent as we might wish them to be. Perhaps for good reason and perhaps not for good reason.

Some processes in terms of standard making, international standard making perhaps aren't always as transparent as they should be amongst standards bodies or whatever.

There's a number of processes where you're effectively putting together Internet public policy which aren't as transparent as they might be or aren't as collaborative as they might be.

And this is I would have thought quite a powerful sort of message to international organizations whether they be multilateral, whether they be multistakeholder, et cetera. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard, followed by the U.K.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I wanted to kind of reinforce what Parminder said and provide the use case. I understand and I've heard also both here in not this particular session but other times when we discussed this both publicly and in the meeting and privately, it would be useful to have this criteria so that we could go to these organizations and say you need to be more transparent.

And

I agree with what Nigel didn't say but implied. ITU should be more transparent. I've long been advocating that.

Now where I have a problem is, in response to my footnote, several delegates said no, but this doesn't apply to WTO. So this is a joke. I mean, how can we say we advocate transparency as a principle but

then we would go to different organizations and say, by the way, be transparent. But, at the same time we say, no, this isn't going to apply to WTO?

I'm sorry, Chairman. There's no consensus on anything. What we're talking about here is variable transparency. U.N. should be transparent. ITU should be transparent. But free trade and WTO, no. I find it very difficult to have a productive discussion given these attitudes, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

Well, I'd like to hear colleagues on this. But, to my understanding, once you have that kind of language coming from an expert group and wishfully endorsed by ECOSOC and IGF, it has some strength. For example, when you have the human rights council that adopted the famous resolution saying that the same rights that apply offline should also be applied online, there is no footnote indicating that that should be done by either -- or anyone. It's something that U.N. has strength in itself.

So I think, in line with what we had discussed before, that we avoided to name explicitly any institutional body outside the scope of what is in our immediate reach. That's why I think it would be out of scope to put it here. Not that it should not be heard by WTO or UNESCO or anybody else. As Nigel has said, there are also other instances in which a call for more transparency could be made.

But I think the added value of having it here is it provides a very strong message, I think, that is addressed to all institutions and processes and organizations. I don't think it would be helpful to highlight one of them especially in the light of the fact we have not taken this approach so far and we have agreed that some recommendation drafts those institutional bodies will not be entertained by the group as such.

But, again, the mode is there for the second reading. We can come back to this.

I have the U.K. on my list.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I think we'd agree with Canada and Nigel and others. This is really helpful, because we see it as a kind of checklist. If you are developing international Internet-related public policy, you can ask yourself are we being inclusive? Is this process inclusive?

Maybe it is inclusive. Can we improve it? Can we make it more inclusive? We can ask ourselves is this process sustainable? It's a useful checklist to try to improve enhanced cooperation.

Of course, it's not a definition of enhanced cooperation, and it's not a legal measure. It's their characteristics. Characteristics are already very loose, I would say, kind of terms. And it's not exclusive. And we would need to apply these characteristic differently in different circumstances depending on the issue. There is that flexibility there.

But it is a very helpful tool, I think, for us to just ask ourselves are we doing the best kind of enhanced cooperation that we can? What are the things -- what are the issues that we need to look at when we're thinking about that question?

We think it's also useful in terms of building up shared understanding of enhanced cooperation. Particularly for perhaps people outside this room, other stakeholders who are not familiar with this term. It's a particular term of art that we are very familiar with. But not everyone else is.

And other stakeholders quite fairly ask themselves what is this enhanced cooperation thing? What kind of a thing is it? And, again, these characteristics are very helpful, we think, in describing the kind of thing that we mean when we talk about enhanced cooperation.

I think those two things make this a particularly valuable part of our work. As I say, it's not fixed. It's not a legal requirement. It's not a definition. But it does provide that useful checklist against which all of us can use our judgment and try to find ways in which to improve processes of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Lea, are you taking the floor? Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair.

I wouldn't usually take the floor again on the same point. But I do think that what Parminder said is incredibly important. And I just want to agree with him. And I think he was hitting the nail on the head, two points and the use cases.

And for the last I don't know how many years a number of civil society organizations have been arguing in various organizations where Internet-related public policy has been discussed that these conversations should be more transparent and should be more inclusive, should be incorporated and take into account various stakeholder views. I think that this paragraph goes to the core of that.

And, I mean, at least on my side, I think coming out of the working group with this recommendation would give a really clear and strong signal to all of those organizations on how to carry out those conversations when it comes to Internet-related public policy. So, yes, I think that, in terms of use cases and to the point that I think Richard was making, I don't know whether it's a footnote or making it more explicit to what we're referring to here, I would actually say let's not do that. It's the flexibility in this paragraph that allows you to take it and then go to wherever that discussion may be taking place and say, like, okay. You're discussing Internet-related public policy. And go through the list. And say, like, are you compliant? Or maybe that's too strong of a word.

But whether it's the OECD, whether it's the ITU, whether it's the U.N. General Assembly, that would be the checklist that we would be using in those advocacy efforts. And I think that would be an incredibly useful tool to have at our disposal. So, yeah, just to, you know, echo that and say that I fully agree with Parminder's point. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder, are you -- yes.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chairman. Very short point. So this point should not only characterize new mechanisms but also existing mechanisms.

Which point I will say with reservation because I accept existing mechanisms only if new mechanisms are accepted to which we'll come much later. But for present, I would prefer the first sentence is that recommends that existing and further efforts to implement. That existing and further efforts to implement.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this is a good addition. Although we have two "furthers" in the same sentence. We'll address it later on. Further efforts to further implement. But I think the idea is there. I think it's in line with the WSIS+10 outcome document, if I can say so.

I have Saudi Arabia followed by Russian Federation.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We're listening to the discussion. It seems that we're putting a checklist for something that does not exist.

Do we have an enhanced cooperation and apply this on? As I said, paragraph 61, 62, earlier we speak about transparency, innovation. So why are we wasting a lot of time discussing something clearly adopted at the summit? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'll listen to the Russian Federation and try to wrap up the discussion and provide some thoughts on that. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We've got a short point regarding the last one. We checked the materials of our last meetings of the working group. And it was only international without extent and without testing the brackets. And we think that just international gives clear understanding of the characteristic. So please delete the rest. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation.

Yes, I just relate to that latest suggestion. International law is indeed in my first draft. I expanded a little bit in response to some inputs I received from you because I thought that would give more clarity because the following set of characteristics should be there when developing international -- my thoughts to that extent or, as Canada has said, maybe international in reach. This is more aligned with the chapeau. This is something to be discussed and not the major topic. And regional and subregional was just to indicate that the international element is not only global but also includes the regional and subregional.

Again, it was something that would be further entertained by the group.

You got the point made by Saudi Arabia and others. I'd like to support also in line with the discussion we had previously that we know that many, maybe even all the concepts that are here are not entirely new, are not new. But they are -- I think we are bringing together in one single document what has been stated me and others. We are sending a strong message to the overall ecosystem that that should be done. So I -- as if we walk through the Tunis Agenda, we'll find these words here and there. But I think here we have an added value of having a structured -- and the U.K. used the expression a checklist

of things. And I think that was totally in line with what the approach we have taken before when discussing this.

So, again, this is for -- should be revisited by us when we finish the whole document, come back to those areas in which we still have some alternative languages.

We are now 18 minutes beyond the time we should stop. I'm not sure if -- I'd like to propose maybe we could try to wrap up discussion also in regard to the second paragraph because they relate -- it relates very closely to this. But I'm not sure if that could be accepted by the group.

Otherwise, we -- I'd be ready to stay a little more because I think maybe if we address also paragraph 2, we exhaust the discussion in regard what we want to discuss with the high-level principles.

Could we do that? I see no --

[ Laughter ]

-- no one walking out of the room, so I think we could try.

In case the discussion gets too long, maybe then we could stop. Let's not go beyond 6:30 then. I thank you for this.

But then could we then park the discussion here and move to paragraph 2? That also relates also to the background for this paragraph. That also relates to the discussion we had in regard to the inputs that were provided to the first guiding questions in regard to the high-level principles. Those what I called elements -- and I'm not sure this is the right word to use here. I think Parminder made a point about this while recalling these elements.

But I recall very clearly that all those points were raised when we were discussing high-level characteristics. There was, as I could feel it, an overall acceptance that those were important things to be considered when making efforts to further implement enhance cooperation. But they were not characteristics but they should fit some way in the document. So, again, this is an attempt to not lose that part of the discussion we had when we were discussing high-level characteristics.

In that second draft, I tried to accommodate and to take on board some proposals that were made, I think, particularly by me in regard with how to align with the initial sentence.

And I took on board the Russian Federation proposal to put respect of sovereign rights of states, establish, implement public policy up front. So a few changes were made in order to try to accommodate everyone's views. So it's for your consideration whether that could be acceptable for the moment for the sake of just making the first reading of the document.

Are there any reactions to this? Yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: If we're going to discuss paragraph 2, I think that we missed in the first element when it says the respect for sovereign rights of states to establish and implement public policy, I would please ask to

introduce the word "international public policy" because, of course, it's implicit but I would ask if it's possible to put "international." This comes from -- as is mentioned there, from Tunis Agenda, that it's always -- when it's the word "public policy" is mentioned, it always comes with "international" before. So agree to put "international." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I request the secretariat, yes, to reflect it. I don't see a difficulty. I think that is what what's in line with what's the understanding in that regard.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I would just disagree, that's not based on the Tunis Agenda. So we would not include "international" there. Thank you.

>> (off microphone).

>> Microphone, please.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry.

>> (off microphone).

>>UNITED STATES: I'll read 35a, the sentence that includes about sovereign rights of states. It says, "Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is a sovereign right of states."

>> (off microphone).

>> Next one.

>>UNITED STATES: We are talking about what are the sovereign rights of states.

>> (off microphone).

>>UNITED STATES: If there's an "and," okay. But we are not going to in this context conflate two sentences together.

>>CUBA: You can put it as in 35a. If you like that word "input" put it there because that's how it is. Of course, national policy, issues, every country, it's a given that every country can have policy to its country. For instance, every country can do this and that, enforce net neutrality or delete net neutrality. That can be done. Every country has a sovereign right to do it inside the country.

What Tunis Agenda said very clearly is that international public policy issues are the sovereign rights of states. And that is the first principle to be there.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I would suggest maybe we could align this element or this topic to the language in Tunis Agenda to make sure we do not lose or add anything. Maybe that would be a way out.

Yes, Richard Hill on that point.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, with due respect, I don't see what we gain by reinterpreting or adding the Tunis Agenda. It's there. It's true that the sovereign right of states to regulate telecommunications, that's not disputed. That's in the ITU constitution which is signed and ratified by everybody, 192 member states. I believe one country takes the view that Internet is not telecommunications, but that's only one country. Everybody else agrees that Internet is telecommunications. So at the national value, I agree there's no value added in the statement this is actually international law.

And then it's true that WSIS went further because it said something about international. But we've reaffirmed the Tunis Agenda in its entirety. So I don't think we need to rephrase it or add it here personally. I think that's implicit.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

We can't see any sentence in the Tunis Agenda that includes the word "sovereign" and international. We are a bit concerned about doing that here.

We had this in our meetings for a number of meetings now, and it hasn't been questioned before. We are a little worried that if we keep making small editorial changes to things that have been established for a number of meetings we're going to get into trouble. So unless there is a sentence in the Tunis Agenda which includes those two words, which I have missed and I may have done --

[ Multiple speakers ]

-- we would prefer the existing text.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Even myself I was a bit surprised about this controversy because I think here the elements in this paragraph I think they should be read together. They provide some kind of balance among the different elements. So first reaffirm. We want to make sure we reaffirm -- yes.

Can we have one single meeting?

[ Laughter ]

Otherwise, it will be difficult.

No. What I was going to say I think the balance in this paragraph refers to the notion that is described in 35a with also the multistakeholder approach involved that follows. So I think we want to make sure we refer to the language that is there because I think that was the original intent, so to say that these efforts should take that into account so when we balance with other aspects that are contained also in the paragraph.

Yes, Parminder, I see you.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Sorry. If I can be helpful, I think the right wording is -- where is it -- "respect for rights of states to establish and implement international public policy." The "sovereign" word has a conceptual problem. The role of a state in international law is not sovereign. The meaning of

"sovereign" is that nothing applies on the top of it. The right of state to make public policy within the country is sovereign and outside the country is -- I mean, the word "sovereign" is different. So it's just the right of the country.

And that's why Tunis Agenda actually says right of the states to establish and implement public policy and uses "sovereign" only for national law. I think there is a problem with the word "sovereign" because international law is, of course, not sovereign. Because India, for example, allows some other law to apply on India. That's actually taking sovereignty in a sense. That word "sovereign" does not apply in international law.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think at least for myself that provides some clarification.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

I remember very clearly when that paragraph was negotiated for the Tunis Agenda. It was negotiated in a prep com in the (saying name) convention center in the basement. And as a matter of fact, that paragraph was given by an Austrian diplomat. And here -- I have to disagree with my friend Parminder.

We are not here to reinterpret Tunis Agenda. If delegates don't want -- don't like it like that, please put it as it is in 35a completely. The first part that mentioned sovereignty of states, rights of states, and the second mentioned international public policy because that was almost two days of negotiation for that. And that is a very important principle that is trying to be -- because the keyword is not only "sovereign," it's "states" in plural. It's not one state that can do it to international. It's states in whatever form they organize to do it. "States" in plural. They have "states" in plural in sovereign rights to international public policy. By the way, for everything. And that's how it is in international relations.

But here if you want, you can put it for Internet matter, if you want. But actually that's how it is. And if we are not here to reinterpret Tunis Agenda -- so if some delegates have some concerns, put it 35a completely there as one element to remember. Please.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I think the point made by Parminder before is maybe the right way out because 35a has two parts. The first part --

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>CUBA: Pick and choose from the Tunis Agenda --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Juan, please. Let me complete. I have respected your right to speak. Please, let me complete. I think the point made by Parminder, I think it's very relevant that the part that refers to international Internet-related public policy issues in 35a does not contain the word "sovereign." I think the explanation provided is very accurate. So I think this is something we should revisit and make sure we have here the right formulation aligned with the Tunis Agenda.

I think we are getting a bit tired.

[ Laughter ]

I think the discussion is already coming to some kind of difficult points. But I'd like to give the floor to all those who have requested and then we are closing for today. Anriette -- let me make sure I have everyone.

So Anriette, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and Richard Hill. So in that order those will be the last speakers for today and then we are closing business for today.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I also support Parminder's suggestion.

I felt that the second clause of that, just to refer to the multistakeholder approach is not sufficient. I actually think the Tunis Agenda itself places more emphasis on how important it is to be inclusive. So I would like to suggest that we just modify that somewhat and change it to "the multistakeholder approach, which requires the full and effective inclusion of all stakeholders."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm not sure the secretariat has taken that --

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I just feel that "multistakeholder approach" is perhaps a little vague in this respect. Sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So can you --

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Do you want me to repeat it? Insert "the" before "multistakeholder approach." So "the multistakeholder approach, which requires the full and effective inclusion of all stakeholders." There's actually very good text in the Tunis Agenda about developing countries. But I think we -- that is implied. Perhaps we don't need to add that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yes, we are a bit tired. That is true.

[ Laughter ]

And we just would like to shortly comment on the situation that we strongly object the way of reading Tunis Agenda, you know, taking just one sentence and without taking the second one from the same item of the Tunis Agenda. And if we want to pose it, then we should put the whole text in here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Aside what Cuba and Russia said, sovereign rights and international public policy issues are clearly mentioned in 35a. And regarding the proposal by Anriette, the multistakeholder approach, which require the full and effective inclusion of multistakeholder, we agree but we should add "in their respective roles and responsibilities." So if secretariat can add -- all the stakeholder inside the bracket, yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just to differentiate, maybe we need to copy --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Copy and paste?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: "Their roles and responsibilities." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, my opinion will not work to start quoting bits of the Tunis Agenda because 35a talks about states. And if we put that in, then we're not talking about what the other people do. As a representative of civil society, I don't think that's correct. So I will go back to the proposal to simply delete that particular bit, which is respect for the sovereign rights of states, that stuff there, delete that.

That whole item -- no, no, no, not the whole thing. Just the bit up there. Secretariat, I will tell you where to put it.

Where it says "Anriette," before "Anriette," "bracket, Richard Hill, delete respect for," blah, blah, blah and then three dots.

And the reason is that why should we favor the paragraph about states and forget B, C, D, and E. There's no reason to do that. So I don't think we're adding any value by selectively quoting from the Tunis Agenda. We have already reaffirmed the Tunis Agenda in its entirety. We don't need to reproduce it here and then reproducing some of it gives the impression that we're favoring that bit over the rest, and I don't think that's correct.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I propose we should at this point stop. I have -- I have, however, two comments. The first is that I interpreted. When I made that proposal, I tried to balance the different inputs I received from you that, on the one hand, it is not that we are restricting the discussion or the scope of governments but in recognition of the facts that paragraph 69 says that enhanced cooperation goes to enable governments. So I think there is a reason that government is being highlighted here in that context.

But I think one thing that complicates, when we read 35A, with all due respect for the Russian Federation proposal, I think when we will have introduced the word "sovereign," I think that was already said by Parminder, we confused the issues. Because 35A does not say the sovereign right of states to engage and to develop international Internet -- it says policy authority for Internet-related is the

sovereign right of states. And I think that implies domestic context. And then they have rights and responsibilities

for international, national Internet-related public policy issues. So maybe, if we stick to that second part to recognize the rights and responsibilities for international -- by states, maybe that could do the trick. And then we have the multistakeholder approach. But then you have some kind of balance here. Because, in recognition of the fact that paragraph 69 highlights and respects the role of governments.

But I would suggest we should stop here for today and come back tomorrow and resume. Hopefully, we can gather the whole document and come back to some of the topics that are being discussed. So I thank you very much. Wish you a good evening and look forward to seeing you tomorrow here back again. Thank you.