

Fifth Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

29 – 31 January 2018

Geneva, Switzerland

DAY 3

DISCLAIMER: This transcript was elaborated in real time during the fifth 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.

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Fifth Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland

31 January 2018

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So, good morning, colleagues. I hope everyone had very good night's sleep and at that we are re-energized for today, our last day, in our fifth and final meeting.

For those of you who were not in the room yesterday at the end of the day when we had that sort of informal meeting, we were working in an informal. And for those that were there, I would like to recall that we took some time to look into the paragraphs that addressed the issue of how to deal with proposals that did not lead to consensus, how to reflect them in the report.

Actually, we did not look at the paragraph. We did not address language itself. We addressed the issue. So we discussed the issue. And I think it was, at least for me and I hope for others as well, very helpful from the point of view of having a better understanding of the assumptions and some of the background we have been hearing in the room.

So I would say, on the basis of the discussions we had yesterday, from the perspective of the chair, I have a very clear idea on -- and a proposal that I'd like to revisit later on on how we can address that. As I said in the beginning of the session -- at the end of our plenary meeting yesterday, just before we broke for these informal discussions, in the rest of most -- in relation to most of other paragraphs, we have had extensive discussions in plenary. I have carefully read all your inputs. And, in the course of the discussions, I think those -- the positions were very well-explained. So the reservations, the emphasis. So I feel that, as the chair and having the responsibility to propose some text for you, some draft, I would be in a position on that basis to propose some text. You could, of course, revisit once again and discuss once again. But I would think that it would not be productive at this point in time to go back and have a second read of the full text.

We don't have time for that. Experience has shown that every paragraph -- or almost every paragraph we address takes a lot of time. So I certainly don't have time for that.

So my idea would be to come forward with a revised text. Besides the issue related to how to address controversial issues, this is the one we addressed yesterday.

There is, however, another set of questions that for me and for -- to have your guidance, and to be in the position to propose something that might be acceptable, I'd like to have some further discussion but very focused discussion on those remaining sticking points. Basically, as I have anticipated yesterday, those refer to the issues addressed in the last three or four paragraphs in the recommendations section.

Let me see.

Yes, it is -- well, basically, I would say those issues that refer to how we want to -- whether we want to be in a position as a group to recommend some way forward, be it in the context of existing mechanisms within the General Assembly, ECOSOC, and so on and so forth.

And also there is an issue on how we wish to address the relationship with IGF and whether there is a role for IGF to -- through which working with the IGF we can have support for the process towards enhanced cooperation. So I'd like to propose to you that at this -- in this morning session, at least part of the morning session, we can have some more discussion on that. And that will provide also some guidance for me.

After that I would suggest that we break earlier for lunch in case we can finalize these before 1:00 p.m. So that will allow me sufficient time to work with the secretariat to prepare what I would say a final -- a third proposal of a draft. Depending on the time we finish our discussion, we could break -- we could anticipate our return from lunch to 2:00 p.m. So you would have before you a full -- an entire text -- a proposal from the chair of a text that would try to achieve the balance that we have been hearing that would be needed to finalize our work.

Of course, this would not be a take it or leave it document. We still have time to go through it to make sure that the formulations I would propose address our concerns or not. So -- it's on the part of the chair final attempt. But, of course, this will have to be digested by the group and discussed by the group. And, wishfully, we'll have time to go through it and to make sure whether we can agree or not to have that report agreed by consensus.

So this is my plan for today's meeting. I'd like to hear your views if you -- if anyone would like to make a general comment. Otherwise, I'd like to immediately start discussion on the topics addressed in those three last paragraphs. And then I would invite comments focused on each particular issue. We'll address one by one and try to be -- well, I think the format we worked yesterday was very interesting, was very productive. So I would suggest even working plenary that we try to follow that same approach that we focus on a particular topic and try to have views very focused on the item on the discussion. I think, again, this will be very helpful from the perspective of allowing me to come up later on with something that might be wishfully acceptable to everyone.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone.

Chair, I think your plan sounds like a positive path forward.

One comment I wanted to make at the beginning of today is I think you've done a great job as chair of maintaining -- I'll say a civil, collegial environment for negotiations. And I think part of that is ensuring that we don't waste each other's time. And I have seen similar negotiations. I feel like at times there was some animosity created by just staying too late, drawing out arguments too long. So I would encourage -- because I know that there's many people in the room that have flights, family commitments, what not, that we really push to complete our negotiations at a reasonable time within

the time we have. And there's not this assumption that we're going to be sitting here at 3:00 in the morning, because I do not think that that is -- I don't think it's fair to those that cannot do that. And I don't think it's beneficial for the work of this working group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I fully concur with you. I do not expect our meeting today to go beyond the time that we have allotted to us because I'm aware, as we have said, that even some people have flight arrangements for tonight. So I think it would not be productive for the group to work in a diminished space as it might lead to issues regarding the legitimacy of any decisions that would be taken. That's why I'm trying to devise some plan to make best use of our time and to allow ourselves to go and have a final look into a full text covering all the issues in the advisory on the basis of the discussions we had here until now. Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: [Speaking in a language other than English]

>> CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I'll have to respond in English. Sorry, I don't speak Arabic. But just -- sorry. Just to make sure that -- I think it's a good thing to resolve sometimes to make sure you have a very precise message you want to send. So I thank you for this.

No, I -- again, my -- what I said and what I would like to repeat is that we had extensive discussions yesterday -- not only yesterday. I think since day one we have been discussing those issues. There are many proposals including our own and a joint proposal and so on and so forth. So I don't -- I do not have a text now. That's why I'm saying to you I'll have to cede to the secretariat at lunchtime to revisit the inputs. We have been receiving also some written inputs from participants. So we want to look at this whole set of -- that wealth of information to be able to come up with something for you.

So at this point, I would not wish -- and I would not be in a position to state explicitly what would be the substance of the proposal. I can only tell you I'll do my best to reflect on paper in an appropriate way that to my understanding might lead to consensus on the basis of everything we heard.

And, again, I repeat what I said. I think it's important for the group to have a full text before you. I think we have been discussing bits and pieces extensively and I think it's okay. It's just right to do that. But at some point, I think we need to see the text in its entirety. And that's why I also would beg your indulgence to wait until we have that text. I would not be in a position to anticipate this now because it needs to be further refined on the basis of what we heard. And I want to have some time to work with the secretariat and to revisit everything before I come to you with this.

If there are no further interventions in regard to that procedural aspect of our discussion, I'd like to propose that you could turn to the issues that were addressed in paragraph 14. Paragraph 14, you recall, it was a proposal coming from the chair about reflecting discussion we had in the room, proposals that were discussed and inputs I received in between my first and my second draft in relation to how and whether we could suggest to the U.N. General Assembly to have some more in-depth discussion on enhanced cooperation, taking advantage of the fact that the UNGA already discusses it in the context of the item Information and Communication Technologies for Development.

So there was, I think, some very interesting discussion. Some proposals came forward. We heard from Anriette, for example, that there might be a possibility maybe to recommend that those dedicated discussions on enhanced cooperation, Internet-related public policies to be held as needed so it would not be set as a permanent agenda but we have "as needed" in the context of U.N. bodies. So we would not address specifically the UNGA so it would be a more general call including among others UNCSTD, General Assembly, blah, blah, blah.

We also heard from Parminder that he would expect that besides -- in addition to the discussions in the GA, there would also be an open-ended working group of CSTD. I want to address the open-ended group on CSTD separately later on. But just to recall that was also a proposal.

And there was a discussion whether we would be by recommending the GA or any other U.N. body to take that issue, whether we would not be interpreted as not having been able to do our work and to be reverting back to them. And I think that was a very interesting discussion in relation to the differentiation of the work we have been doing and what would be requested or suggested for the GA.

So there were a number -- and, of course, there were many objections to that, opposition to that because, first, it is not the usual practice to do it. Second, it's up to the GA itself to decide on how it wants to organize itself and not ourselves and even the practical aspects of that.

But I'd like, if I may request your views -- additional views in regard to the ones we heard yesterday, I think the points that were made yesterday maybe we could take into account what was said and try to further reflect on that overall issue. Again, I do not want to discuss particular text. I want to have a discussion on the idea, on the concept whether it's appropriate or not to recommend that the GA or other U.N. body would have dedicated debate, taking -- again, taking advantage of existing discussions that have already taken place there. We're not proposing something new, but take advantage of the fact that those discussions are already going on there.

May I invite comments on that, if there are anything that should be added to what was discussed yesterday? It's not that we should have the discussion. I'm not saying that that we should discuss it again. I'm just inviting if there are anything in addition to that, any further reflection that you think might be helpful in regard to what has been already said.

Yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So I think when we look at -- when we raised our concerns with this paragraph yesterday -- I don't want to repeat arguments. I think we need to move faster today. I'd like to just talk about this UNGA proposal with the CSTD proposal that follows it because I think what we're talking about here is some follow-up review discussion.

My concern with the UNGA proposal is that UNGA has already decided the follow-up and review process for all of WSIS. That was discussed at WSIS+10. And effectively UNGA and ECOSOC through repeated resolutions, including WSIS+10, has given up the -- has mandated the follow-up and review

process for all of WSIS to the CSTD and that's its role. So I think when we make proposals like this, it seems to circumvent what has already been agreed and decided and is in place.

Now, UNGA has decided that in 2025, it will do a review of all of these issues. And the details of that I'm sure will be a long negotiation that will be a lot of fun. But for now, the follow-up and review process is established.

And so I think that the UNGA proposal goes too far, particularly noting that there's already a discussion on enhanced cooperation that happens within ICT4D. It's been there. I don't think there's any reason that needs to be elaborated on, added to, and particularly not as a recommendation when our focus should be, I think, more in the CSTD lane. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list -- I do not know exactly the order. Maybe somebody can help me out.

I have U.K. followed by Parminder and Richard Hill.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everybody.

First, we would like to just say we support your approach for our work today. We think that's a sensible way forward, and we also support the comment that we need to start making progress now. Some of us have family commitments. Some of us have flights booked. Our work so far has been based on an inclusive process, and we think we should be respectful of that and make sure that the decisions we take have the legitimacy of the whole group, as you've said. That means we need to start making good use of our time now.

We also said yesterday that we are open to finding ways forward. And we know that if we are going to have a report, we will all need to show flexibility and be open to compromise solutions.

Yesterday on this question of UNGA, we suggested that this paragraph should be deleted. We think it's not appropriate for us to tell the General Assembly how to manage its work, particularly when the General Assembly is already discussing many of these issues. In order to try to find a way forward, I think we should keep our minds open and perhaps we can find a form of words which would invite the General Assembly to continue discussing these issues, invite the General Assembly to take account of international Internet-related policy in its work or to continue perhaps through the ICT4D resolution to address these issues.

Perhaps there's a compromise way forward that we could consider if there is language that, perhaps, you might be able to propose. And if that takes us forward, then I think on our side, we're willing to be flexible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your statement and for the call for flexibility to be exercised.

In the line of what you have said, I forgot also to mention a proposal that was coming from Lea, that we could recommend the General Assembly to review the progress of implementation of recommendations, so an etiology of how we could address the General Assembly.

Parminder.

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

This is a very interesting place and text which holds some promise.

Responding to some comments made by the U.S. and the U.K., it's not that we are telling UNGA to -- ordering them to do something. As a group, which has been working for four years now, they were given a very important task. When it concludes that we were not able to fulfill the full requirement of the task, it is the responsibility of any group to suggest what should, therefore, be done. I mean, it's not just the task of any responsible political group to say, okay, we didn't do it and I don't care what happens now.

It's obviously up to the people who have authority to do it or not but is the task of this group to tell that not having been able to solve this very important problem -- and the importance of it cannot be denied since the Tunis onwards because half of those countries or more have been asking that this is the most important thing. You may not agree to their views, but you cannot disagree with the importance.

The group is supposed to tell -- it can't just go and say, no, we didn't do it. It's an opportunity of the group to tell that what does it think should be the course of action after the group is closed. So this is a part of that suggestion, which could be anything. And right now we know that -- we shouldn't be proposing, forming another group. We think the kind of political agreement which is required is not to take place at a high level. That's the view -- that could be the view. And in that sense, we ask General Assembly to keep on discussing (indiscernible) this particular issue.

And this issue is not the same as WSIS review and implementation, which is different. This is an issue which was contentious inside the Tunis Agenda. It's not implementation of something. IGF is implementation issue now -- or a review issue. But enhanced cooperation is different. So it's not just a part of what will happen in 2015 but it's a certain track of responsibility which is different.

So what we are trying to say is we think that the political parties at UNGA need to make it a constant process to find a solution to it. So I was just trying to place that argument in context of the comments which were made. Thank you.

And I think it's very important that we tell something about what happens next. Without that, it's difficult, just say we didn't do our task.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Yes, I agree with Parminder and I'll complement what he said somewhat.

I think there's a risk of confusion. The WSIS follow-up is not related to enhanced cooperation. We've always said that the WSIS created two processes, the IGF and enhanced cooperation. No, actually, it created three. It created the IGF, enhanced cooperation, and the WSIS implementation review.

And it's clear enhanced cooperation was not part of the WSIS implementation review. Otherwise, they would not have had a paragraph saying that there should be a process for enhanced cooperation.

If it were already in the WSIS review, then you wouldn't need the separate process. This is clearly an entirely separate beast.

Now, as Parminder said, the General Assembly asked us to recommend the process of enhanced cooperation. As U.K. correctly said, we can recommend that the process be the U.N. General Assembly actually perform the enhanced cooperation by discussing the substance of various matters more than they already do because it is true that to some extent, they discuss these things. So for a procedural point of view, that's a perfectly appropriate recommendation.

Now, the group may or may not want to go there. But it's certainly fully within the mandate of the group in my opinion to do that. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have on my list next Saudi Arabia, followed by European Union and Nigel. Saudi.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, sir. Thank you, Chairman. We remember the discussion yesterday on this topic, and it was explained very clear the intention behind this recommendation. We remember during the WSIS high-level event the G77 (indiscernible). In its statement, I would quote there is a need for us to address Internet challenges such as privacy, data protection, cybercrime, network security, equal access, and participation by all candidates and ensuring the ability of usage of local context.

We recognize that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed in this context. It's important to be united, equal, open, transparent, fair, and a balanced platform for which to recognize all government on equal voice.

This recommendation goes in line with the need of the G77 and other countries. It's not acceptable to shed the voice of some at this stage.

It was very clear yesterday. We have two views. We reflect the two opinion. But to shed the views of other for no reason, I think this would have been not acceptable. And we need to experience from others as we did some flexibility.

It's not acceptable to shut the voice of some of the state. It was very clear yesterday we have two views where to reflect the two opinions. But to share the views of others for no reason, I think this is -- would be not acceptable and we need to experience it from others as we get some flexibility. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: European Union. Okay. Thank you. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning to you and colleagues. First of all, completely agree with your strategy for the day and yes, indeed, hope we can make progress as we have done throughout this negotiation.

On this particular substance, I was quite optimistic hearing what the -- what you said and what the U.K. said as well. Clearly, I think we would see a -- a linkage here, and I know we can't flip from paragraph to paragraph, but last night we were discussing -- or before we had the discussion last night we touched on the paragraph concerning the role of the CSTD and the discussion that one could have in the CSTD. And notwithstanding the points that Richard made -- and I'm not here to have an argument about the Tunis Agenda or the division of the WSIS and the enhanced cooperation and the IGF -- but I do recall that in -- when we've been crafting the CSTD resolution, the WSIS resolution over the years in this room, usually late on a Friday night, we have touched on enhanced cooperation before. I mean, perhaps we shouldn't have done, but we certainly have mentioned enhanced cooperation in those -- in that resolution before.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would see a -- a sort of -- we would see a path here in that -- in that particular recommendation that we'll come to later that we do ask CSTD in their work and however we frame it and in the context of their work on WSIS or whatever, to look at the -- to look at the implementation, to look at the progress of the recommendations made in this -- made under this report and that they reflect that in their report from ECOSOC to the UNGA and therefore the UNGA in their deliberations and looking at that report from ECOSOC could indeed review the progress of the recommendations in this report. So it does seem to be that there could be a path here whereas whereby the UNGA actually do, from time to time, look at the progress being made on enhanced cooperation. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Russian Federation followed by India, and U.S. will take the floor again on this. So Russian Federation, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We actually agree with other participants that we are short of time and we need to use this time effectively and we welcome everyone to follow this -- the feeling, the understanding. That's why we do not -- do not -- would like -- do not open discussion with other issues like, you know, difference between enhanced cooperation/WSIS implementation which we believe there is a difference. However, don't discuss it now because we're really lack of time and enhanced cooperation is the very important point itself and the public policies, international public policies, are already developing on the regional and subregional level. And we have the example of GDPR, for example. We have a lot of examples of the public policies. So, of course, it's an important point to have the equal understanding on the international level of how it should be done is very important. And we think that yesterday we had very open-minded meetings and, you know, all delegates were very straightforward in explaining their position, and we believe the Chair have the good understanding of their positions and we believe that we provided all text in the report already and we really would like to see the result of this. And we really would like to see the whole picture in order to discuss the output. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Russia, for that statement. I give the floor to India, followed by the United States and Egypt. And immediately after that, what I would suggest is that we move directly to the discussion on CSTD. I have noticed that many of you, when referring to that particular topic on how to -- whether to recommend anything to the GA also made reference to the CSTD. So I have taken on board some comments, but I'd like also to open up to have a focused discussion on whether CSTD should also have a role. So after those three speakers, that would be India, U.S., and Egypt, I'll open the floor and request comments in regard to since we have discussed the UNGA, if you think about what could be done by CSTD, would there be some differentiated comments on the part of participants. So India, please, you have the floor.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would like to -- we have been following these deliberations very closely, both inside the room as well as distantly. Some of the experts from our capital are watching this live streaming. So there are certain points which it's our responsibility to make here. So which would help us guide, you know, our work forward.

The work for this working group should actually reflect accurately what we did over the last two years in these five sessions. We should be able to articulate what all we did and what we could not do. So with all due respects, we are not in the business of archiving. We are not creating a report just for the sake of archiving. It has to have some functional role. It has to have -- it should have -- it should be a guiding document which can be put across to UNGA where various options are available. The mere fact that there are two options which are going in opposite directions does not cancel each other. This is not a mathematical equation where plus X and minus X cancel each other and there is zero. The end result is not zero. This is a complex problem and cannot be solved just by mathematics. We have to have various options in front of us and we have to give some guidance to UNGA how to proceed forwards. This is -- a lot of hard work has gone. We all have sat together, sometimes late nights, and not only in this current session but in the last two years. In the first working group when it was established. So all this has to -- this is a work of summation. This is a work which is accumulating over the years, and there has to have some distilled report should come up, some guidelines and various options available on the table. And then acceptable UNGA members to decide how to proceed further.

So we have to have some concrete recommendations to them and we should be accurately reflecting what happened in this room over the last two years. With these words, I would like to thank you once again.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your statement. I give the floor to the U.S., followed by Egypt.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and apologize for coming in twice on this issue but I want to respond to a couple of points that were made. One, this notion of reporting, and you asked should the CSTD have a role in this? I think the CSTD already has a role in this and it's well documented. Richard made that there's three processes. I don't know if that's accurate, but let's assume that there are. When it comes to follow-up and review of the Geneva plan of action, the role of CSTD is well established in that and I don't think debated at all.

When it comes to follow-up of the working group on improvements at the IGF, UNGA and WSIS+10 says we call on the commission within its regular reporting to give due consideration to the fulfillment of the recommendations in this report and the report of the working group. For enhanced cooperation which it was forward looking because the group had met, it said the report would serve as an input to the regular reporting of the secretary general on implementation of outcomes of WSIS. This is all within the followup and review process. It seems clear to me that that was the intent. It's been the intent. And it's the established process. So I think if we're moving to it next, I kind of preface the point. I think CSTD has a role, and it's well established.

But I also wanted to respond to comments of our Saudi colleague which I think really illustrates the concerns we have with going down this divergent path and agreeing to just disagree because there seems to be two streams right now. One is proposals are made and they're heavily edited. There's compromises made. We try to find a middle ground and we try to work together. And a lot of us lose the intents or some of the things we wanted. But then there's this other group, this other stream where, here's our proposals. If there's any pushback on it, well then just reflect our views in the report as is. And I don't think that that's divergent views. I think that's just our opinions have to be represented. It's just not compromise, it's not negotiating, and I think that that mentality has a potential to really break down the negotiating -- the negotiations that happened at the U.N. to try to reach some kind of common ground on issues. And I think it's very problematic that we just go down that path and always throw up our hands and say, we'll just list your proposal and say there was an agreement on it. I just -- I don't think that's a good place to go and it has a lot of concerns.

With that said, we try to be, I think, open to find a way forward in this report. Try to be as flexible as possible. We're looking for solutions. But I think that we need to come off this position that if there's any pushback on certain proposals, then they just have to go into the report and note that not everyone agreed it to. I think that's -- that's very problematic.

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

One thing I'd like to stress once again, if I may, is that the purpose of the discussion I'd like to have here is to have a focus on whether the GA has a role or not and I am expanding. I would like to expand the scope because I see there may be -- it's not feasible maybe separate these, but also whether the CSTD has a role, and we have been receiving some inputs on that. We are not addressing here how we are -- we want to address divergent proposals and divergent views. I'm not engaging that discussion here. I'd like to invite you not to engage in that. Let's keep the focus on whether the GA, whether the CSTD should be the object of some recommendation about that, what regardless I need from you. We have had extensive discussions on how to address divergent proposals, whether it's acceptable or not. So I do not want to repeat that discussion. If I can maybe plead with you to stick to that because I think this is what also needs to be the part of the puzzle. We would need -- at least from the Chair's perspective -- to be able to devise, let's say, an overall entire text, I think the line of what Russian Federation has indicated she'd like to see. I would like to have that piece of information coming from you. So I'd like to, again, stress that we do not deviate discussion to the divergent proposals, how we address it. We have already discussed it. We are not going to discuss it again here. I want you to discuss this in the

light of the text I'm going to propose you. So let's focus our comments and interventions on GA and CSTD. That's what I'd like to kindly ask you to do as of now.

I have on my list Egypt, followed by Anriette, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Richard Hill, and I'm taking over a couple other speakers. Egypt, you have the floor, sir.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to everyone. First, Chairman, I wish to commend you for your work yesterday till the very late hour. I wish to thank colleagues for the openness yesterday and the genuine effort that everyone is doing.

Second, Chairman, we also trust your proposal for how to proceed forward for today and we wish we can still be as productive today as we have been in the last two days.

Chairman, on the question on enhanced cooperation for us is not -- is actually means to an end. It is not the ultimate objective, just to put the tag. But it's means to an end. And the -- the differences we might have on understanding the definition or the modality of how to achieve it, we might be coming with different views on this, but we -- we still all agree that the -- the ultimate objective is to enable governments and on equal footing, to perform their roles in international Internet-related public policy. Previous speakers yesterday and the day before highlighted in the discussion the importance of government engagement in public policy on Internet and whether we -- we have different definitions or not, but this is an ultimate goal that we all aspire to.

We have specifically highlighted to this group yesterday the challenge of promoting further meaningful engagement of governments, especially from developing countries in IGF processes which we have also touched upon the relevance of government engagement in this process to the enhanced cooperation since the IGF contributes to the public policy at the international level when it comes to the Internet. So we see this question as significant in that we also consider the same question. I know that MAG has highlighted this among the strategic points to work here in Geneva last year, but I think this goes beyond the efforts of the MAG and we appreciate the effort of the MAG. But we think that this question goes beyond the efforts that MAG is doing. And we should also bear that in mind.

The discussion, dedicated debate on enhanced cooperation is helpful. Yes, I do agree. But coming from a developing country and knowing how colleagues in Africa also are engaging in these discussions, I think that dividing the question of how to promote government engagement between New York and Geneva is not helping developing countries to actually engage.

So my view, Mr. Chairman, is that we -- we need this discussion to happen, but we think that Geneva is better situated and we need this discussion also to cover the aspect of government engagement in Internet Governance Forum. It is an international forum for -- that touches on public policy at the international level, and we don't see that we should divide these two questions between two venues. It doesn't help our discussion forward. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt, for your statement. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: (Off microphone) Actually, Hisham, I think I really identify with your remarks, both in terms of what the goal is of enhanced cooperation and on the Geneva/New York issue.

I just wanted to comment again on the edits I proposed to paragraph 14 on these dedicated discussions on Internet-related public policies. I had said that they should take place among others at CSTD and then we have the General Assembly. I didn't specify, but I think as a working group we should at least show that we recognize that there are other U.N. agencies where there is discussion on Internet-related public policy taking place. They take place at the ITU around infrastructure, amongst other issues. They take place at UNESCO. They take place at the Human Rights Council. So I think it would be -- it would be -- it would reflect quite badly on our work, I think, if we don't show some recognition of the fact that there are these discussions taking place and that -- and that we think they play a role in facilitating governmental involvement in Internet-related public policy. So I'm not -- Benedicto, I'm not suggesting we add a list of U.N. agencies. I just think that the text should convey that there's awareness in the working group that these other U.N. bodies are engaging in Internet-related public policy issues.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette, for your comments. Next on my list is Iran followed by Saudi Arabia. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And good morning, colleagues. Mr. Chair, thanks for your hard effort. Mr. Chair, following the last night discussion I have a general comments. It's including three points just I would like to point it out.

The first point is that the Tunis Agenda is our roadmap in our discussion and negotiations for drafting the report.

And, as some of the previous speakers pointed out, the main recommendations that reflected in the Tunis Agenda, like the public policy in international level, digital divide, equal footing, technology transfers, cyber security, capacity building -- and these items has reflected in the text and we have negotiated during the last two years.

So we should follow these items and follow these ways that enable the government to a fulfillment of their commitments.

My second point is that we should be able to reflect what happened in our discussion during the last two years. And, whatever we have discussed, it should be reflected in the report.

And third point is that consideration of the U.N. procedure in drafting reports that should be reflecting all the views in the main reports. These items should -- if we consider these items, I think we should be able to finalize our discussions today. And we are able to draft the report for the General Assembly. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran, for your comments. I will now give the floor to Saudi Arabia, followed by Richard Hill.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Our work here is guided by this little book, the WSIS outcome, which is an outcome of the summit.

It does clearly say in paragraph 71, "The process towards enhanced cooperation to be started by the U.N. Secretary General."

It doesn't say about CSTD. That's why we feel attached to UNGA, because it is the home of enhanced cooperation. CSTD is mandated for the implementation of follow-up, which is a different section than Internet governance. And there is no mention of Internet governance in that section.

So, from our view, CSTD is mandated to do the follow-up. IGF and enhanced cooperation is elected to the U.N. Secretary General. This is very clear to us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

Richard followed by Cuba and the U.K.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I will do exactly what you asked. I will give you my views of what should go in the report so that you have some guidance for drafting it in terms of what I would like to see in it.

But I'll get to that specifically at the end. I want to give a little background so you understand the thinking so you have some flexibility to accommodate what I'm asking for. And I'm going to really build on the comment from India.

Basically, there have long been kind of two camps in these discussions. There are those who believe that the current mechanisms are working well and we only need some relatively minor improvements, in particular, more transparency, more inclusiveness, more Internet Governance Forum and so on.

And then there's another camp of which I am in, obviously, that believe that the current mechanisms are not working and we need something very different. But we have different views about what those mechanisms should be.

So back in 2003 when these discussions started, the main driver was the digital divide with spam being somewhat of a secondary issue.

Now we're there 15 years later and what do we see? Digital divide is worse; spam is worse; and security and privacy have become key new issues that are driving these discussions.

So the evidence for those who are evidence-based shows that the current mechanisms are not working. And, if you don't believe me look at my paper and the numerous references or just read the little Google pizza story that I just posted.

Now I believe that it is fundamental that the report of this group should fairly reflect the differing points of view. And I believe that's what I heard India say and others also. The problem I have is that the proponents of the current mechanisms don't want the report to include -- or as I understand -- maybe I misunderstand them. But I understand their interventions to the effect that the report should not include any meaningful critique of current mechanisms. And also they'd like to minimize or possibly even suppress proposals for other mechanisms.

Now, what really makes me worried -- and I think you've all seen that -- I do this because I believe in it. The proponents of the current mechanisms are actually actively working to put into place new mechanisms again inside the WTO or ad hoc trade negotiation groups.

And we heard Canada explain the rationale. Spam is a trade issue because it reduces consumer confidence. So is security. And, by the way, it's been -- explicitly data privacy has been brought into the WTO because, obviously, that really is a trade issue. So everything becomes a trade issue. And the WTO will become the new body that some people here say they don't want. If you don't believe me, go look at the proposals that are WTO.

Now, in reality, if you look at the intent of the proposals made from the WTO, it's to facilitate the expansion of the Google pizza paradigm. And this is going to lead to the Alibaba pizza. Although I think that a lot of people don't really understand that that's what's going to happen.

Furthermore, the WTO is neither transparent nor inclusive. So I have a problem when the people who are proposing things in the WTO come in here and propose transparency and inclusiveness. Parminder - coming to a specific proposal. Parminder has just sent some text to the mailing list. I don't know if anybody has seen that. I support the inclusion of that text in the report. And I think it should be there.

Now, Chairman, as I told you privately, unfortunately, I will not be able to stay after lunch. So I will rely on Parminder to represent my views. And I don't know if we have a concept of formal delegation or not. But, please, after I leave, view all of Parminder's interventions as also coming from me. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard, for your comments. And I appreciate -- although, again, I'd like to urge colleagues to be focused on these discussions and try to prompt on the role of GA and CSTD.

Next on my list are Cuba followed by U.K. and Marilyn Cade and Parminder.

>>CUBA: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to take this opportunity to avail myself of these interpreter colleagues this morning to be able to speak in the beautiful Spanish language.

Chairman, we agree with the way forward that you've proposed to finalize the work that's brought us here together.

However, we would like to make a couple of comments about two aspects, one on procedure and one of a more substantive nature.

On the procedural point, we fully endorse what's been said by the distinguished delegate of Iran in a sense that we must align our work with the established rule of procedure within United Nations for this type of document.

Thus, I would insist that the concept of consensus should apply to the document as a whole and not as a way of applying to individual paragraphs. In other words, we cannot accept paragraphs -- whether they be recommendations or not, we cannot accept them being paragraphs or recommendations of

consensus. What, essentially, it has to be is a document of consensus, not paragraphs of consensus. And the mandate from the General Assembly does mean that we have to reflect the different views of participants. So we might say that all views have -- enjoy different levels of acceptance. So all views or no views are fully enjoying consensus, if you will. So you'll remember that when we looked at paragraphs 1-9 in the recommendations section, our delegation did insist that everything should enjoy consensus. And we insisted on the option of their being deleted if they didn't enjoy consensus.

Although some views are supported by our delegation, our delegation must respect the views of delegations which it does not support at the same time. And we hope that other delegations will be able to respect the views of our delegation and of other delegations alike.

Having said that, from a procedural point of view, I hope it's been made clear that we mustn't classify the different paragraphs into first and second category some which enjoy full consensus and some which don't. We all have different views. And we have all been able to express those views clearly to the body which convened us to undertaking this work.

Now, having made that point on procedure, I'd like to move on to something a little bit more substantive, if I may.

Now, once we've recognized that all views have equal weight and are equally important, I don't then think it relevant to debate whether something should be discussed in New York in the General Assembly or whether something should be discussed in Geneva as an alternative, one excluding the other. Given that we're on substantive matters, let me explain why. We are all aware that, despite the fact that Geneva is a part of the United Nations, it focuses on different things. It addresses matters on the international agenda in a different way.

New York often has more political debates. Whereas, in Geneva, the debates tend to be of a more technical bent. And, as many delegations have said, in Geneva, delegations and missions are more prepared from a technical perspective when it comes to discussing issues such as the Internet and so on. Bearing in mind in Geneva there are other United Nations specialized agencies related to the issue such as the ITU, WIPO, and others.

But we cannot deny the importance of the United Nations General Assembly as the most democratic and inclusive body of the United Nations community. So I think, Chairman, any proposal for follow-up on this issue must cover the two options. It must consider the two options that this issue might be discussed properly. And I think the discussion that has been begun by the delegation is proper on the best way forward where this can best be discussed to prevent overlap, to prevent our unnecessarily doubling efforts.

Now, let me repeat. The issue is of such importance that it does need to be dealt with specifically in the two spheres -- in the United Nations General Assembly and in another appropriate organization here in Geneva, which may be the CSTD, It may be whatever this group decides to propose as a further way forward. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention, Cuba.

Next on my list U.K. and Marilyn Cade and Parminder. And after that I'd like to suggest that we could look into the other set of issues related to IGF, unless anyone wishes to make some additional comment in regard to what we have been discussing until now, which would be the -- whether there be some way to make recommendation to GA and CSTD.

So, after those three speakers, unless there are any -- yes, Canada.

I'd like to turn to the -- let's say the IGF package so we can have some focused discussion on that.

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

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Yes, you asked a question about CSTD. So we'd like to try to address that question in order to help us find a way forward. And it's clear to us that CSTD has a very clear role in monitoring and follow-up of WSIS including enhanced cooperation. In fact the Tunis Agenda called for the mandate of CSTD to be changed in order to give it that role. And that mandate was changed over 10 years ago.

So CSTD is clearly the body that has this role. We do not support the creation of a new open-ended working group. The General Assembly asked us to set up a working group to make recommendations, not to set up an open-ended group. And we think that, after we have agreed to their recommendations, the focus should be on implementation, not endless further discussions. We want to see implementation, real change, real improvements to Internet governance processes to public policy processes in the real world. And CSTD is clearly the place to follow up and monitor that.

And we think that the General Assembly already provides us with a guide on how to do that similar to the follow-up to the working group on IGF improvements. And we suggested some language yesterday for paragraph 16.

Actually, we think that we will be in a much -- a much stronger ground if we follow the language that was used by the General Assembly in the WSIS+10 outcome document.

And in paragraph 63 of WSIS+10, the General Assembly called on CSTD within its regular reporting to give due consideration to the fulfillment of the recommendations in the report of its working group.

That's what the General Assembly said at the end of 2015. And we strongly suggest it will be wise for us to follow the same approach as the General Assembly, perhaps with a stand-alone paragraph and use the same language from that resolution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I have on my list Marilyn Cade followed by Parminder and Canada. And after that we are moving to the other set of topics.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Good morning, colleagues. I am enthused about the progress we're making. Having been engaged as long as everyone else here in our ongoing discussions, I think sometimes we forget that, if we don't know where we've been, we can't figure out where we're going.

And I do think it's really important for us to recall, not in our paper, but recall that there have been previous instructions and reviews and reports that have come at the request of the U.N. Secretary General himself. There have been resolutions which have guided the work of CSTD. There was a full day open consultation in 2010 on -- that CSTD organized on enhanced cooperation.

So I personally do not see how we can separate the fact that work on implementation of enhanced cooperation falls within the purview of CSTD.

I also want to support, with Jimson's endorsement and instruction to me, the comment that was made by a colleague from Egypt. When people say that the technical expertise, technical work is done at the Geneva agencies, I think there's a need to understand that that means that, from developing countries and businesses from developing countries, it is more efficient and productive for them to be able to engage here than it is for them to be able to attend a 30-minute discussion or half-day discussion at the United Nations in New York.

So the priority I convey from developing country businesses at Jimson's encouragement is that strong support for the work focused here but a recognition that of course there has to be feedback into the UNGA. And, in fact, the mere fact that the U.N. Secretary General does request an update each year

shows us that we should expect outputs coming from continued work at CSTD which would go into the Secretary General's report and also would need to go into other U.N. general organizations.

So I hope we will begin to draft language. And I think that, as we do that, I have one final comment that Jimson asked me to convey.

He did not propose a permanent and open-ended working group. He proposed a continued work effort at CSTD.

So I just want to make that clarification when we get to wordsmithing this language because that is what I am supporting as well. Continued work effort on implementation at CSTD. But also a recognition that there must be reporting into ECOSOC and into the UNGA. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments and your suggestions.

Next on my list is Parminder followed by Canada. And after that we are turning to the other set of issues.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Chair, my first comment is on Anriette's suggested text in which she wants other U.N. agencies also to be indicated. I think the problem here is that we are perhaps mixing two things. One is whether public policy related to Internet is being made or discussed somewhere, which is one

thing, which is possibly UNESCO is now doing general elections and Internet and that's happening in some way.

And second thing is discussion on what is an adequate implementation of enhanced cooperation. That's a particular question. That's not public policy making on Internet issues.

We are talking about discussions on this particular question which was given over to us. We couldn't do much about it. And this discussion should continue. This is not developing public policies on Internet matters.

So this discussion, it would be very odd for UNESCO to now be told that you should start discussing what should be the meaning of "enhanced cooperation." That's not what we want to see.

And that's the reason we want to tell UNGA to do this, which is only body which can do this kind of big political thing and not all the U.N. bodies. So I think that confusion should be avoided.

And why should we, as it were, people were saying, kick the ball back? It is not kicking the ball back because everybody agrees that we have done a lot of work whether we put different views in the main report or not. They're certainly being forwarded upwards. The documents are on our Web sites. We have done a lot of work. There have been different positions. A lot of technical work has been done.

So what we are saying is we did a lot of that technical work. We could have possibly agreed to also the final closure. We couldn't agree to the final closure. So we say that the area is important. UNGA should have a dedicated discussion on this area. And we have given you our work for four years. We had a public policy document in the last WGIG. We have so many contributions now.

So these contributions are now going to UNGA. We are saying obviously when there is a dedicated day on enhanced cooperation discussion, that broadening of the previous week, the delegates would go to WGEW Web site or our report next year and read these inputs and these inputs would inform their discussions.

And what we are saying is that this decision now belongs to a political discussion at that level. We couldn't close those differences.

So that's the meaning of saying that this is the work we did. And now I think we need to track -- put the track into the UNGA dedicated discussions.

And in that context, I would go with the original language which Chair had proposed in the draft, which Chair forwarded.

And I think also to briefly comment on what Paul, the U.K. delegate, said about we need not have further discussions. We should be implementing what we have agreed. And I'm sorry to say that it presents a certain insensitivity to trying to claim that we have agreed to something and we should hurry to implement it when a lot of us have been saying it continually, no, we have not agreed to anything.

So to say we should know how to implement it and no further discussions, we may not agree with the other person on what their view is. But to say that the discussion is over and exhausted and finished is not, I think, appropriate. Let's accept that a lot of people with a lot of sentiment think that there is a need and the differences have not been closed, which really means that the discussion has to be done somewhere.

So to say that it's relevant for some people to say that the discussion should be continued, I think, in my view is inappropriate.

So what we are looking in this particular UNGA-related recommendation added to it the CSTD working group discussion is not a resolution of what we wanted but an avenue of continued discussion because the subject is important taking in view all the work we have done.

So this track is just to say this group doesn't agree with the resolution but it agrees that the discussion should be continued.

And if you don't think that a discussion should be continued, that to me is a very one-sided view. That to me is a little -- that's the exclusive view, excluding view. Please don't take that view. Please accept that a lot of people are very, very clear here that their concerns have not been agreed. Whole of G77 is very clear. There is a statement of G77 where they have asked for a new institutional mechanism. Whole of G77 is not happy in the manner in which Internet-related public policies are being dealt by in the U.N. So don't tell that question has been exhausted. Please don't say that because that's not the statement of the fact.

And to say that there should be no further discussion or we are not ready to agree to the avenues of further discussion is, I think, the more blunt view and not the view which says -- put some avenues of discussion in our proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Canada followed by Timea and then we move.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. I will also take advantage of the fact that we have interpretation, and I'll speak my mother tongue which is French.

So I will answer your question on the General Assembly and the CSTD. But, first, I would just like to recall a few facts. In our group during our first meeting, some participants, including our colleague including Parminder and our distinguished colleagues from Cuba and the Russian Federation, nonmember countries, Saudi Arabia as well, came to our first meeting telling us we need a new mechanism.

During the following meetings, we talked about the merits of this idea and it was clear that there was no agreement on that proposal. Still today at the last meeting, their position has not changed. There

has not been any compromise. They are adamant about their initial position. So when I hear these people saying that we've made compromises, well, personally I don't see them.

However, we have committed ourselves to this process in good faith. We had put forward several contributions. Our initial proposal was that we would prefer our report to be entirely based on consensus and that there was no difference in opinion expressed in the core of our report.

Now, following the discussions of the last few days, I think Canada has reached the point where we are prepared to look at the contributions such as (saying name) sent us yesterday, last night, perhaps the one that Parminder sent us earlier. Now, these are perhaps proposals that we could look at within the framework of our report.

This would not be a major section but just a paragraph that would go to the core of the differences. So that is to say whether we should have a mechanism or not. Strengthened cooperation is a mechanism. The other option is not. So this would be a compromise.

Yesterday -- and I recall this very clearly -- I had proposed that in the recommendation section under section 16, Canada was not in favor of establishing a special working group for this purpose. However, our proposal was that we would need to take out this point, 16A, outside of paragraph 16 and have it as a separate point which would state exactly what the U.K. proposed earlier; that is to say, within the mandate of the Commission which is to ensure compliance with WSIS, there would, indeed, be a dedicated section to strengthened cooperation.

This is something we were not prepared to do at the beginning, at the outset of our meeting but that we are prepared to do now. So, once again, this is an example of a compromise we have made.

So to explain and answer your question explicitly, Mr. Chairman, for Canada, it is clear that the CSTD has an explicit mandate for that purpose. And we would like to see an explicit recommendation in the report, not for a working group but rather to say that the Commission must report in a clearer fashion on the different ways of implementing reinforced cooperation, or enhanced cooperation. So clearly that is our preference and not the General Assembly's.

So if the clear positions of Parminder, Saudi Arabia, Russia, and Cuba that are so stringent prevent us from moving forward, I have some fears about the outcome of today's meeting because we had had proposals, recommendations which were on a consensual basis. And now these delegations are moving us backwards.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I take your point. I'd like to say I think everyone has been working in good faith. I don't have a doubt about that.

One thing that I think will be key in our report is the length of the report. We are tied -- and I think this is something we want to look at some point that is a technicality about the report, that we need to be very careful about how we craft the report because there is an issue about the extension of the report. This is yet another thing I'm going to take into account when I will be drafting it -- drafting a proposal for you to consider in the course of the afternoon.

May I have Timea and then should we -- could we then move to the next item? I do not want to engage in some kind of acrimonious debate. I think I would like to focus on substantive points. Otherwise, we may lose the opportunity to go through.

But I give the floor to Richard. But Timea and Richard Hill. After that, I will beg you, let's close the discussion here. Russian Federation, if you want to in on this or the other topic? On this topic.

Timea, Richard, Russian Federation. With your indulgence, I'm closing the list now. Saudi Arabia after and then we close the list. Otherwise, we will not be able to discuss the set of paragraphs of ideas -- not the paragraph, the ideas related to a particular role that IGF may have. And I think this is important guidance that I need from you in order to prepare another draft proposal for you to consider in the afternoon. So, Timea, you have the floor. And I beg you all, please, if you could be as brief as possible.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you very much, Chair. I'll be brief.

I would just like to support an approach you have asked us to take this morning. And we have achieved considerable progress in our meetings these past 18 months. And our time has now come to complete the work as best we can in the time that we have left.

As others have said, this is not the beginning. It has even been recently discussed in the UNGA doing the WSIS+10 negotiation. It was discussed in CSTD before. It was sent here for discussion again. We have agreement on some aspects that take it forward. It would be a shame to lose that now.

I would like to support my colleagues in saying that we need to respect each other's time and focus on a genuine effort to find a balanced language. We know that the CSTD has a very clear role in monitoring follow-up of WSIS, including enhanced cooperation. And enhanced cooperation we continue to develop. So we support what Canada has just proposed earlier and the approach of the United Kingdom. I think that would be something to take us forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I heard Canada's statement in the original language, but I have to confess that sometimes I'm not sure I always understand when there's a Canadian accent.

So I'm not sure I fully understood. But to the extent that I did, I have to confess that I don't agree that there has been a consensus on anything. We are always in the process of discussion, and we understand that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So for us, it is not the case that there was a consensus and now we're moving back on it. We're still in a process of discussion.

And as you said, Mr. Chairman, until we have a final package, there's no agreement on anything. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Please, let's -- Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia. But let's move on because if we start commenting what anyone says, we don't get to the substance. And I'd like to very

frankly to at the end of the session to have a very clear understanding of the points here in regard also to the other set of subjects.

Please, Russian Federation followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We believe that -- well, we are talking about the very important point is the mandate of our working group. And we -- the fact is that we have diverse views on the main point of the mandate of our working group. And we need to understand that -- well, in this case, we cannot say that we reached the consensus. We are still discussing. And it's not that, well, somebody take the view and others doesn't want to take this view. It's also, you know, the different understanding of the task of the group because we see the mandate. And we also can refer to the General Assembly resolution, not 70/125 but the recent one. It's from the 72nd Assembly, Resolution Number 200.

And it also gives the view on our working group. Let me just refer to this. Para 19 notes the ongoing work of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to develop recommendation on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, stress the need for the working group to enable full involvement of all governments and other relevant stakeholders, in particular from developing countries, taking into account all the diverse views and expertise.

Encourage participants of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to take forward their effort and fulfill its mandate by submitting the report on the Commission on Science and Technology for Development at the 21st session which would serve as the input of the regular reporting of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the outcome of the World Summit of Information Society.

So we see it as the vision of UNGA. That's the group that has the diverse view, and this should be reported. It's not regarding that somebody understand this. We have -- like India said, we have Tunis Agenda. We are reading Tunis Agenda. We need to understand how to further implement enhanced cooperation according to the Tunis Agenda. So we read it and we need to reflect our points of view on this. If the group have diverse views, we need to accept it as a fact, just a medical fact. And we need to reflect it in the report. Otherwise, what we are doing now -- otherwise, we are not fulfilling our mandate. Thank you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We apologize for requesting the floor for the second time.

However, we now find ourselves in a situation which forces us to take the floor after Canada's statement. We did not discuss the institutional framework at the first meeting. And I'm very surprised to hear such a statement. The document we had before us shows clearly what the positions of member states were with respect to two working towards a consensus. And it is not referenced to certain dates or statements that were made in the past that we have here.

Our kingdom is always in favor of solutions which are satisfactory to all parties. We would like to see a document which shows everyone's positions in a balanced fashion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I -- well, I would like to kindly request you, as I think all of you -- I've heard from all of you an expression of an interest in seeing this document. As I said, I tried to reflect in this document the point. I have been listening to you, to all of you. I -- since day 1, the oppositions have been expressed and we have been looking to different issues and trying to get assessed what can be agreed by the group, the idea that can be reported back as a group's output in regard to those issues which does not mean differences are not there in regard to an approach, in regard to the substance, even to the scope of work. So it's a very -- as we have been realizing across all over our work -- it's a very delicate balance how to do it in one single piece of paper. We tried to do it. I am very grateful to all of you to entrust me to come up with something that you may look as a package. I tried to do it.

And to do that, I'd like to suggest that now we could look into the other set of paragraphs that elicited a lot of discussion in our previous rounds of discussion relating to the role of IGF. If and whether is there some role, is there some room to make recommendation addressing the IGF through which the work of IGF could support, not replace but could support, the process towards enhanced cooperation.

So I'd like to draw your attention to the ideas that are contained in the paragraph, not the specific language again. I'd like to avoid discussing at this point particular language.

But paragraph 15, paragraph 15 relates makes a proposal that for the IGF -- that the IGF may provide support for enhanced cooperation, development of Internet-related international public policy and should be, therefore, be strengthened by increasing participation of all stakeholders. And there was a discussion whether we should have a particular focus on governmental stakeholders (indiscernible) sessions and also whether it should mention whether or not there are other instances of work.

I recall in the previous discussion we have an alternatives proposed by Canada, Turkey, ISOC, Mexico, and others that's consistent with Tunis Agenda, the IGF should continue to support. The support should be for the strengthen by encouraging and facilitating the participation.

Yes. I'm sorry?

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: It was circulated, I think. Could you please send it back to Juan and any others who did not receive besides -- okay.

So there was an alternative proposed by Canada referring to all stakeholders. There were proposing for deletion of the paragraph. There was support to keep the paragraph but put increased focus on governments. So there was some interesting discussion on that. So that paragraph 15 focused on enhancing participation of stakeholders as a way to strengthen IGF and through that means also to provide support to enhanced cooperation.

Then we have 16B and 16C. I think at this point we should discuss the whole package regarding IGF. 16B captures a proposal towards the establishment of a permanent mechanism. It is not fair it's an

intergovernmental mechanism. It could be a mechanism that could meet on the margins of the IGF and all sessions to discuss the complementary between both processes, IGF and enhanced cooperation.

And then, finally, 16C regards proposed establishment of a facility within the IGF to optimize the role the IGF can play in providing governments with an opportunity to access knowledge and shared information on critical and emerging Internet-related public policies.

So I think this refers to making sure that the wealth of information that circulates in IGF, that there would be a mechanism to facilitate its dissemination to countries also in support of their efforts towards enhanced cooperation. So there were a number of comments in regard to this either support or call for deletion. So I'd like to invite you to discuss on these -- on the whole concept of the IGF, vis-a-vis enhanced cooperation what could be envisaged as some appropriate way. We could refer to that in regard to the accommodation we have to provide.

So I have on my list Richard Hill and Marilyn Cade. And we take from there.

Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I believe that we need a single paragraph to merge what we have in 15 and 16B and C. And I think we can shorten it a little bit. Whether we can keep this in or not afterwards will depend on the remainder of the document. If it's a balanced package, I would have no objection. However, if it remains unbalanced, of course, I will not be able to accept it. And it will be there. I will trust my colleague Parminder to verify whether this is acceptable or not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm going to offer a couple of ideas for us to think about. One, I will just say that I don't really think it is the function of the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to be suggesting operational changes to the IGF or structural changes.

So my comments are going to be made in the context of suggesting instead how we might offer ideas that could be considered within the IGF secretariat and the MAG about interrelationships and exchanges between the IGF and continued work which I believe should continue at the CSTD on enhanced cooperation.

First of all, I will note that in the past when there was a full-day consultation organized by CSTD on enhanced cooperation that was followed by an open discussion at a follow-on IGF. So, clearly, there was the opportunity for an exchange of views. So I'm not suggesting that it's not appropriate to have feedback and information exchange between the IGF and continued work on enhanced cooperation at the CSTD.

But I think that skipping A, which I have already made comments on and will come back to, I find the ideas presented in B and C to be a little too specific and would prefer to use instead of calling for establishment of a permanent mechanism that would meet on the margins of the IGF, that seems to be

much too instructive. And I would prefer to think about language that calls on feedback and exchange of views, providing information into the IGF events that would come out of the continued work.

I think also we have to remember that the IGF itself has significant work underway. And I will just make one comment about the national and regional IGFs which I think all of you know I'm very heavily involved in. They set their agenda from the bottom up at the national level.

So if we wish to encourage the national and regional IGFs, then we would want to encourage the participation at the national level to be aware of the work on enhanced cooperation so it could be taken into account as they plan their events.

We have, I will just say, at the IGF USA where I act as the chief catalyst, we have discussed enhanced cooperation but it has been because it was called for from our planning organization.

On C, I really challenge the suggestion that we would call for establishment of a facility within the IGF. I think instead I would support language like, "We support the strengthening of the materials and the packaging of the information that comes out of the IGF so it is more easily used" -- obviously it would need to be wordsmithed -- "and more effectively targeted for use by the governments themselves." Thank you.

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

Are there any further requests for the floor on that topic? Yes, Egypt.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, this issue we have raised yesterday and we think also it related to para 15, 16A, and 16B. Maybe we didn't want to (indiscernible) in the discussion on the working group since our proposal is already reflected in the secretariat document. And on this note, maybe we just want to draw the attention of the secretariat that the abbreviation of open-ended working group should be reflected as OEWG instead of OEGG, just that we are sure we are talking about the same thing. And I think this should be reflected on the version on the screen as well.

Mr. Chairman, we think the overall question of government role and government engagement and Internet-related public policy issues should be looked at in a holistic way. Both the IGF and enhanced cooperation are two distinct processes as we have all reiterated yesterday. But we all acknowledge the complementary nature between the two. And we are open to the idea that 16B and 16C actually is trying to achieve.

We think that a working group within the CSTD might achieve a continuation of the discussion on enhanced cooperation that is also consistent with the outcome of WSIS+10, of a continued dialogue on enhanced cooperation.

This is something that we believe that belongs to a Geneva discussion, and we trust the CSTD is well-equipped to have this discussion within its remit.

We also think that this complementary nature with the IGF can be achieved if this working group is meeting perhaps in the same week with MAG meetings so we can look into the possibilities of having a joint day, for example, to have this exchange and this liaison facilitated.

Obviously the MAG is looking into the issue of how to promote government engagement. And this is something that we are also trying to achieve here in this working group.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, the way forward is to have a working group within CSTD and to keep it open-ended with balanced participation of all stakeholders, of course, as we always used to work in the CSTD.

There are still questions on the modalities and for how many years this working group can extend its work. I think this is a discussion that we should also focus our attention to. I know there has been a number of other proposals on the table. So this might have come a little bit later in the discussion. But I think it's worth our attention even at this point that we are trying to make this work.

The discussion on enhanced cooperation has to continue. It is not ending here today. And we all agree that -- at least some of us that our discussion in Geneva is better for us than to have this discussion hence-with. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt, for your statement.

Next on my list are Anriette followed by Germany and Switzerland.

Anriette, you have the floor.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair.

So this is a proposal for 16 -- text on the IGF on 16B and C combined. And it really does represent a compromise. This is from Lea and myself. It's very different from the original IGF-related proposal that - certainly that I had put in.

So the proposal from me and Lea, I will read it. But I have also sent it to the list. "The complementary relationship between the Internet Governance Forum and the development of international Internet-related public policy can be further strengthened by encouraging greater participation of governmental stakeholders in the IGF's intersessional work such as its best practice forums, the annual IGF sessions, as well as in national, subregional IGF initiatives.

"To this end, WGEC also recommends that the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group and secretariat give further consideration to optimizing the role the IGF can play in providing governments with the opportunity on a continuous basis to access knowledge and share information on critical and emerging Internet-related public policy issues."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. Thank you for your statement and for your proposal.

I take this opportunity to kindly request all of you who want to send -- since I would be -- as I have anticipated, after we finish this session, working on a text I can provide to the secretariat. If you wish to

send any written comments, that Egypt has just mentioned a proposal and now Anriette and others, so please let us know because this will add to also to the discussion we have. It may assist us as well. So please in relation to the full text in addition to what we had, this will be, indeed, very helpful for us.

I have on my list Germany followed by Switzerland. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In Germany's view, this aspect of strengthening the role of IGF within the concept of enhanced cooperation would be a concrete deliverable of our work here so we support an inclusion of that aspect in our report under the section of recommendations.

We believe that para 15 as it is phrased is a good basis. We look with interest to proposals regarding 16B and C.

We are not quite -- we are not quite at ease with how they are formulated right now. So we could maybe imagine also to merge 15 and the proposals in 16. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Microphone.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: -- with 16B and C integrated. My apologies. I should have mentioned that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. We'll be looking at that.

Maybe it's not necessary now to insert anything in the text. We will receive many inputs. Again, I do not want to discuss the language here. I'm just trying to get the concepts behind them.

Switzerland, followed by the chair -- former chair the IGF MAG. Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone. I think that Marilyn really made the points that I wanted to make on specifying more of the goals of what we would like to see from the IGF instead of being overly prescriptive on the one side and on the other side I think that Anriette and Lea came up now with a very useful proposal which responds to such concerns and at first sight covers most of the goals or the requests we would like to make to the IGF but leaving it to them on how to formulating specific responses. So I think that's a good basis forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Now I'll give the floor to the former and if I can say hopefully the future chair of the IGF MAG, please, Lynn, go ahead.

>>LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Chair. And I appreciate fully my role here as an observer. So I simply want to say that we've been listening very carefully. There are a number of MAG members here, or MAG members who just stood down or served quite recently, as well as, of course, Chengetai Masango from the secretariat.

So we've been listening quite carefully, in fact, watching all of the preparations and we'll be taking those back for consideration of the MAG and the IGF community. Very much appreciate in particular, I think, the last set of discussions from Anriette and Lea, and the MAG has had, as has been noted several times, I think mostly -- most succinctly by Egypt, we have had for some years now a goal of really increasing and deepening the participation with governments. It also has to be said with private sector. As I said yesterday, they are very clear participants in the Internet's development. And again, just wanted to be very clear that we are listening very carefully to the discussions and we'll be taking them back to the IGF community and MAG. So thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much. Those are very encouraging words. Nigel, you want to take the floor.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I'm going to just very briefly endorse, as others, I think the -- what Anriette said and what Switzerland just said and what our distinguished chair of the MAG has just mentioned is, I think, a real way forward here, that we combine the important notion of the -- the issues that were raised in paragraph 15 with the two subsequent bullets. In paragraph 16 I think Marilyn Cade was very instrumental as well in sort of framing what can happen in the IGF and where it's most effective. And if we can -- if we can take text that Anriette said to reflect that, then I think that's a good package for 15 and 16. And then perhaps we can address, as we were sort of getting towards in our last intervention, the notion of the first bullet in paragraph 16 in terms of the CSTD with a more sort of positive text that says that the CSTD -- and I'm not trying to draft on the fly here, but the CSTD should be requested at its annual session, et cetera, et cetera, to monitor and reflect on the implementation of the recommendations of this -- of this working group and to reflect on them in resolutions that it puts forward to ECOSOC or whatever, something in that nature that would carry on this story. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Netherlands.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair. Just to say that we take a positive stance to this proposal brought forward by Anriette and Lea to combine 15 and 16B and C. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Is there any member who wishes to take the floor on this? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: (non-English word or phrase) Do you have translation? (non-English word or phrase)

Thank you. The question regarding the two recommendations in the mandate of this group. However, we haven't yet received a clear answer when it comes to the relationship between the IGF and the implementation of our mandate and our functions. We are all aware that enhanced cooperation does represent a way forward, but the IGF has its own way forward. So these are two different avenues essentially. We need to prevent any amalgamation at the current time. That would be counterproductive. We need to focus on specific recommendations to ultimately result in enhanced cooperation. If we were in a group that was tasked with drafting recommendations for the IGF, then we would have agreed and we would have supported these recommendations entirely. However, this is a

working group tasked with looking at enhanced cooperation and we must respect that. The mandate which has been entrusted to us by the General Assembly is that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: (Off microphone) I really want to thank my colleague from Saudi for asking this question because I began thinking, after I spoke, that perhaps I wasn't being clear enough about my vision for this. I do think that the work of continuing to focus on implementation of enhanced cooperation belongs here at CSTD in a continued, focused, I'm not going to use the word "working group" but "activity" or "track" or "focus," something of that nature, as a part of the work of CSTD. And quickly I will say it could be undertaken by identifying the particular topic that would be discussed on enhanced cooperation, could begin at the intersessional and then have further work done and then come in to the main day that we focus on during the main session.

However, what I was proposing is that the output of that discussion, which obviously would go into our recommendations that go to the secretary general and to UNGA, the output of that discussion could also be reflected into the IGF, among others. So I hope -- I'm not saying my vision is shared by anyone other than myself, but it's not inconsistent, I think, with recommendations that had been put forward by others. But it does not move the work about implementation into the IGF. It merely uses the IGF as a place to further understand the work that is going on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Marilyn. Trying to catch up while drafting. It's a bit difficult. So my understanding, Marilyn, is that your proposal is not mutually exclusive with the IGF proposal, that what you're suggesting is a new paragraph on CSTD and that that would replace the current text which is referring to a permanent and open-ended working group to an ongoing work (indiscernible) or work area. So, I mean, Chair, would it be -- would there be opportunity, or Marilyn, would you be willing to draft something? But in principle, I certainly would support that as its own free-standing paragraph so that in line with the Chair's suggestion yesterday that each paragraph be viewed in its own right. I think it doesn't contradict or conflict with the IGF proposals.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. I have been listening to you, to all of you, and differentiation of positions and sometimes contradictory opinions, so I think -- I'd like to thank you. I think at this point I would strongly suggest that we -- unless there's someone else -- anyone wants to make any general statement, I don't think it would be helpful and want to work in plenary. I suggest we could suspend the meeting, vote for an early lunch, come back at 2:00 p.m., and have a look at the text I want to propose to you on the basis of the discussions we had so far. I think it might be better, as many of you have said, to look into a text that tries to address the many aspects of our discussion in its entirety and therefore, it's important I think for everyone to assess whether the balance is there that would be necessary for you to accept the text. I'll try to take on board the -- all the comments I've received, all of them, i.e., I -- it would be -- I'll try to the extent I can to the best of my capacity to, to reflect on paper the reality. I think we all want -- and I think I am encouraged by hearing from you, that all of you want to see reflected on paper what took place in our meeting. So I think this is what I'll try to do. And I hope that

hopefully we'll have an opportunity when we meet at 2:00 p.m. to look into the text, to have yet another opportunity to -- if necessary, to revisit areas in the text and hopefully that could lead us to some report we can agree by consensus. Is there any further request for the floor? Otherwise then, I would thank you. I would then adjourn the meeting until 2:00 p.m. Meanwhile, I'll prepare text with the secretariat to circulate for you. Thank you very much.

(LUNCH)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd like to request you to take your seats. We will resume our meeting. Well, colleagues, this is our very last session on this effort we have been undertaking for one year and a half in the reply to the mandate that was given by UNGA and in the context of the community group that was set up by CSTD.

So at this point, I'd like to -- as I have said at the beginning of today, I think this is -- I'd like you to consider and I circulated -- I apologize for having circulated it with some delay in what we had originally intended -- one document that represents the view of the Chair in the light of everything that was said and written and all inputs that were provided by you on how the different parts of our discussion could fit into the report.

So I -- if you indulge me, I will just very briefly to what in my opinion are the key changes that I sought to make in order to try to make this text more palatable to everyone.

If I can have the support of the secretariat to walk us through the text.

So let's just, for the moment, jump the executive summary. And so we move to the introduction. Introduction. Then we have paragraphs 1-5 that did not receive a lot of attention when they made the first reading. There are some proposals, some changes that were made in paragraph 6. I'll not dwell on that.

And then, of course, paragraph 8 reflects the outcome of this meeting should be completed after this meeting. After that, I thought it would be important to introduce a new section of this document that would differentiate the introduction from the development of the meeting in order to convey an idea to those who are outside this process of what were some of the key issues that were addressed by the WGEC. Provisionally, this is titled "Key Issues."

I take the point that maybe not all the key issues -- maybe in the light of some of you some issue that is very important is not here. So I would say the intent is to differentiate from the introductory part that is more like a very factual and procedural, I would say, aspect of the meeting.

So in that section, as we had agreed, that language entertaining in the case of proposals that not lead to consensus, that we could entertain in that part some language regarding the different approaches taken by different participants.

You'll see there are a number of paragraphs that refer to that issue in an expanded way in addition to the second draft. So I tried in paragraphs 15-20, to put in paper some language regarding the different

approaches that were followed in regard to institutional -- new institutional mechanisms, which you'll recall from my first draft, I identified as one single issue that should be highlighted in that part of the report. So we could expand it. And trying to give some more elaboration on that.

I thought that that part of the document should also have some text on the discussion we had regarding the role or an expanded role, if I could say, of that U.N. General Assembly or even CSTD and ECOSOC could have in the discussion around -- towards enhanced cooperation. So it is paragraph 21.

Paragraph 22 refers also to the possible role to be played by IGF. So, in those two paragraphs, you'll see that some topics that were before in the recommendation part were moved to that part because I felt, as per our discussion in this morning, that it would not be possible at all to reach consensus in regard to those proposals, although the points are -- the discussion regarding those topics for me are very -- and I assume for all of us -- are of very great importance. But the difference of approaches did not allow for a consensus view on how to do it.

I'd like to highlight two additional points. In paragraph 13, we -- I made a point to start -- when I start talking about the divergence to highlight the positive ambience we had.

So, starting from the second sentence there we say, "During the discussion held within the group, several areas of commonalities were identified. The commitment of all WGEC members to advancing improved understanding of different views and concerns was reaffirmed."

But I thought it was important to highlight at this very early stage -- and it follows -- "while the divergence of views among WGEC members with respect to the process towards implementation of enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda" -- I think we have here -- "persisted."

So this is a reference to a discussion we had in the negotiation of the WSIS+10 outcome. And you'll see that paragraph 65 of the WSIS+10 outcome document that is reflected, that is transcribed in paragraph 1 starts by saying: "We note, however, the divergent views held by member states." So the notion that the differences persist in relation to something that was already there back in 2015. So I tried to balance this paragraph, although in a general positive note, but noting that that divergence of views even in relation to the process itself persisted. And I thought it was important to highlight this up front to -- for people outside to understand that everything that follows was discussed in this context.

And I tried to reinforce that notion when we would move to paragraph 23 of the key issues section when I proposed to say, "The following recommendations agreed by the WGEC should be considered in the light of this background."

So what I am trying to convey here is that everything that will follow that reflects, to my view, the consensus that could be achievable within the group should not be -- should be seen in the context of this more complex background in which there are differences of view even in regard to the interpretation of enhanced cooperation to how new mechanisms should fit in or not. So this is to convey the idea that, by providing -- or, if this would be the case -- to provide some recommendation by

consensus, this does not exhaust the discussion because it is in the context in which things are much more blurred than that.

And then we move to the recommendations part. You'll see, basically, I have worked around on the basis of discussions we had in regard to existing paragraphs that were there. I tried to take into account and to accommodate the views that were expressed. In some cases they were very separate and apart. But I tried my best to come up with something that would be acceptable to you.

And, again, I thought, since we are looking to recommendations -- and I think this was something we discussed since our first meeting -- that we want to produce an output that is meaningful from the point of view of being relevant, actionable, and that can be taken up by our colleagues as maybe a starting basis for incremental efforts to be pursued.

So, for that to be a reality, those recommendations should be adopted by consensus, should represent views that the group as a whole can embrace.

I would say maybe thinking about how -- this is not a U.N. resolution. But, when you come to an imperative part of U.N. resolution, could be adopted either by consensus or by vote.

So I think it was within, I think, a general understanding, we are not resorting to a vote. So I think we want to give some messages that will be accepted by consensus.

So that led me, again very reluctantly and very frustrated in some extent, to remove from that section a few areas, a few topics that in my view I think could have made a way to -- and give rise to meaningful recommendations in case those could be entertained by the whole group. But I think I felt -- and after having five meetings with the meeting we have today -- that we can go on discussing many, many issues but this will not lead, probably, to a consensus. So those were removed. Either they -- as I say in the case of the GA and ECOSOC, they were moved to the key issues part and in other cases they were totally removed from the text.

So this is basically what I would like to report. I, again, tried to take into account to the extent possible all positions that were expressed. I know that some of you may think that your own position was maybe not be totally reflected, and that's right, because there were, in some cases, so much conflict in the position that we cannot certainly have -- give satisfaction to everyone. But then two criteria were adopted basically by myself to be able to offer something that can be of relevance and to be of relevance for me means to be embraced by the group as a whole. And especially we are talking not only about intergovernmental group but multistakeholder group, I think, which makes things much more complex, if we are talking about things that are not accepted by consensus. So this was one criteria. And the other criteria is to fully document the discussions to convey even in the report, to highlight issues of major importance, but most importantly to make sure that we do not lose anything that was said. That there will be a way to refer to that. And this is, I think, done in this context of the draft report that you have before you.

So at this point, I would like to express that from the perspective of the chair maybe this is not -- of course, this is the text that could be approved that could be maybe in the course of the discussion will have to be further refined, but I think the main concept and the main structure, I don't see a reason why we should at this point to try to reopen this because we do not have the time and certainly this would not lead to an agreement among us. So I have at this point, like I say, exhausted my resources. My toolkit was totally used in this, so I am totally in your hands.

One thing I'd like to -- by thanking you for your continued participation is to very strongly recommend -- and I'm sure you'll all do it -- that in your interventions you will be positive to the extent possible but most importantly collegial towards each other and that we work in mutual respect and recognition.

I recall one meeting I participated here in Geneva, I think it was one meeting within the ITU, one of these working groups, and there was an image that for me was very relevant when Fadi Chehade, the former ICANN CEO and the former head of ITU, they got together and they had blue helmets and they shook hands. So I think again in the case there are very strong differences that may -- let's keep a good working ambiance in full respect and recognition. I'm sure you'll accept that and so that we can end up independently of the outcome of this meeting on -- we keep this very high level in our working ambiance.

So with this, I'd like to open the floor for comments in regard to the third draft of the report. And in the light of the comments I receive, we could certainly devise a way forward if there is to be a way forward. But, of course, I need first of all to have your reactions to what is being presented to you. And I'd like then to request your comments.

I have first on my list Turkey, European Union, Parminder. So we'll start with those three speakers. Turkey, you have the floor, madam.

>>TURKEY: Thank you, Chair. First of all, thank you very much for your efforts. I think it's some of our -- some of us are very disappointed by the report, but as you said, we have to make an incremental improvement. So if I may make an analogy to (indiscernible) technologies there will be an evolution, not revolution. So I think this report will be another brick in the wall. So we support the report with this format. But we have little editorial recommendations, if I may make. It's about -- it's for executive summary part. In the sentence before the last sentence, I think "pertaining to the Internet" is not necessary. We believe that we can delete it because it says already "internet-related international public policy." Yeah, I think so. And another little editorial change is to the "recommendations are offered not only for governments but to all stakeholders," it says, but I think we have to make the second too as for also. That's all. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for -- no, no, we are not -- yes. We are just receiving the actions. We're not negotiating. But we took note of your comments. Thank you. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues. I think you did, given the time also and the pressure, you did a remarkable job of trying to condense on this, and we thank you for this effort.

Regarding now to be constructive what you provided us, I think in general, I think it goes to the right direction. However, we want to make some remarks which is regarding the way the report is presented. Throughout all these discussions I think our participation and the wait -- because I'm coming from an organization where the consensus is very important and that's the way we build the consensus with our member states. I think the recommendations of the second part should be put in more evidence. And I say this after participating in all these meetings because I think it is fundamental when we talk about cooperation. The word "cooperation" needs to have consensus. You cannot cooperate with other people if you don't have the very basics agreed. And I think we did a very good job in the previous meetings of having all those recommendations. So I would support that we put more in evidence.

The second part of this, which is now, I think it's not watered down but I think it's not having the value and the -- and the efforts that were put in our meeting. And I would balance it a little bit better compared to the first part where our differences are presented. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for the excellent and certainly very deep effort put into this along with the secretariat. And I'm sorry, but I have to express my dissatisfaction with what we have here in front of us. As a person who comes from trying to represent the interest of marginalized groups, for me it's very important that public systems get strengthened and public policymaking moves forward. So any setback is something we try to avoid. We want to strengthen public systems. So we normally, therefore, go to incremental benefits. Bricks in the wall are good enough for us, but the problem is that this is an effort which seems, for me, to be going backwards to the extent

these recommendations are not the ones we agreed to.

I'm happy to have a text which deals with issues before recommendations as something which we sent out but not the portion which is in recommendations. I'm very, very conscious that our job was to create recommendations. That's precisely our job. But this doesn't fit. Therefore, the earlier text is final with me. Why doesn't this fit? Is this not -- the intent made here is that on the top we state that there are two views about what is enhanced cooperation. And then we come to something which is neutral between those two views. And, therefore, each can absorb it in their own view. But that's how it is made to look, which is okay, which was the reason we were trying to give the difference of views enough prominence as something of a product of the system. Thereby, we could accept all these as neutral things which could go into either. That was the box which was rejected.

As it stands, the situation is that everybody knows that every group deals with a lot of issues. Not every group -- there's no group which job comes together and agrees to all the issues. They discuss all issues. And there are differences, and things are not accepted. That's true of all issues.

And, if every group lists the kinds of things which were not resolved, that's fine. Nobody goes to that. That's the factual report. That's not important. People go to recommendations and say this is what was

agreed as the definition and fulfillment of enhanced cooperation. That becomes the definition of enhanced cooperation.

People say what was this working group asked to do? Working group was given a very precise mandate -- develop recommendations in order to further implement enhanced cooperations. Cooperation.

So what happens is, whatever are our recommendations, are considered the agreed way to further enhance cooperation. So replace the recommendations in our mandate with this text. And this is held as something the committee agreed is what constitutes further implementing enhanced cooperation.

We don't simply agree with that. We don't agree that this is what constitutes further implementing enhanced cooperation. And we are conscious that other groups sees this as the definition of what is further implementing enhanced cooperation.

So we go back and actually say, no, we have figured out what constitutes further implementing enhanced cooperation. This is what -- because we are supposed to give recommendations to further implement enhanced cooperation. These are our recommendations.

Just look -- just four months or five months down the line people are going to say, oh, this has been resolved. This goes into ECOSOC. ECOSOC puts it into its own text. General Assembly says this is decided by the committee. Every government was present or a lot of them were present. So we have sorted it out. we have sorted out that what is enhanced cooperation. Read number 3, if we can go to number 3 recommendation. The three is very clear.

"The process of further implementation of enhanced cooperation should take account and avoid duplication of existing work and aim to improve existing international fora." This is going to become the most oft quoted sentence. The recommendation is clear. Further implementation of enhanced cooperation is to take account of the existing work, avoid duplication, and improve existing international fora. The way we got Tunis Agenda from the back of our hands, this is the line which is going to become most famous as what constitutes further implement of enhanced cooperation.

So what has happened with WSIS is first we were told to define what is enhanced cooperation. And then in WSIS+10 review we were made to dilute that without giving everything in place of it by saying it is further implementing enhanced cooperation. But now in 2018 we have been told that further implementing enhanced cooperation is to take into account existing work, not duplicate, and improve existing international fora.

The whole of the recommendations is one cogent world view. Which is the other view? So what has happened is that one world view has been given the status of recommendations, and the other world view is out there as one of the two views. That's not balanced. We are not ready to accept these as the recommendations as what fulfills the definition of further implementing enhanced cooperation.

By the way, just as an example, I would like to go to 19. No, 9. Recommendation 9, please. Can you take it to 9, please. Okay.

"Multistakeholder fora dealing with international Internet-related public policy should consider how best to balance stakeholder participation."

I asked in my earlier comments to the Chair report, what is the multistakeholder fora dealing with international Internet-related public policy? Can you give me an example? Because the definition of what is multistakeholder fora is a problem here.

>> IGF.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Okay. That's fine.

So the multistakeholder fora dealing with international Internet-related public policy should consider -- so it's not for public policy making. But it's only for participation and consultation. So we should make that clear.

So what happens is that this 11 constitutes a model of status quo of what one side views as fulfillment of the definition of enhanced cooperation.

I know I'm taking time, but that's probably the last intervention I need to make here. Because this is not working, from my point of view.

And we can deal with the first part. Just say that this is what were the key issues. And we have made binaries of major issues. And these are things which other states can consider in ECOSOC and the General Assembly. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

May I just, before turning to the other speakers, just to provide some clarification on what I have done.

First of all, I think one point you have raised, with all due respect, you seem not to have heard what I said -- that the paragraph that I inserted in the section that I entitled provisionally at least "Key Issues addressed by the WGEC," particularly from 15 onwards, they aim exactly to provide a background to explain that the context is very complicated, that particularly paragraph 23 that says that the recommendation has seen that light. So we are not saying it is exhausted. We're saying it is very complex, very nuanced views, very -- even opposing views. The recommendation I would like to say a minimum common denominator that is accepted by the group.

One thing I'd like also to comment is -- and I repeat what I said yesterday. I think those recommendations are neutral from the point of view of the addressing existing -- or if we stick only to the existing of -- if we had made new mechanisms, they are neutral from that perspective. They would apply in any case. The proof of that you may see in paragraph recommendation 1. I took on board your proposal, Parminder, that "the working group recommends that existing as well as any further efforts to implement should be guided by." I'm just saying it's neutral from the perspective of what exists. It's something that applies everywhere. It's not that we're saying -- I'm making this point, because, when you refer to recommendation 3, at least from my perspective, I would -- I think in line with the spirit I

had when drafting this, I would certainly indicate that the same expressions should appear here, "should take account and avoid duplication of existing work and any work that would be undertaken in the future." That's the spirit. I think it was missing here again. We had barely enough time to -- but I think your point allows me to make explicit that the intent was not to limit to the existing institution, but to put it from a neutral point of view. Otherwise, it would be meaningless to say that there's still an ongoing discussion regarding whether we did or not..

In regard to paragraph 9 which you have mentioned, I think in a way it was already -- in your own presentation, I think you developed that. We are not saying that those multistakeholder fora they develop Internet -- international network. They are dealing with issues that address -- an example is IGF. But an example is ICANN as well, for example. And I think that call contained in mine maybe addresses IGF, but maybe more importantly, ICANN. That in ICANN the government perspective should be there in a more balanced way. I think that was -- if I can be very transparent about the intent of each paragraph, that was the intent. So it was not something that was -- that should be interpreted otherwise.

But, anyway, I will proceed with the list of speakers. I have on my list, Australia, followed by Cuba, U.K., Anriette.

So Australia, you have the floor, sir.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I won't take too long, because I'm actually running pretty late for my flight now. So we are here as observers. And we don't have any say in whether this report is agreed or endorsed by the group. But we're very thankful for the group to allow us to come and observe and make some constructive inputs and work with you all to achieve, hopefully, a report at the end of this.

And I hope, when I get home very early Friday morning, after some very long flights, that that's what I find in my inbox.

I am a bit surprised at this negotiation, if this is where we're still at, that we have a "key issues" section that has paragraphs that have very long sentences and points about certain points. And then the counterpoint is about six words long. If we're going to look for a balanced report, this has to have point and counterpoint addressed equally.

The other thing that surprises me is that we're constantly going down this road of pursuing an agreement on what should be in the report, where it should be in the report.

People -- some people want things in the report. Others want them in the recommendations. Every time there's an agreement made for some input, the goalpost gets moved.

If this is a negotiation in good faith, then, if we're going to make agreements about how the report should be done and people are going to allow things in that they weren't going to allow in the first place -- people are working flexibly here to reach an agreement on this report, because that's what we all really want and what we all really need -- then we need to know that some of us -- none of us are going to get what we want. This is the U.N. Let's be real.

Some of us will get some of what we want. Some of us will get some of what we want. No one here is going to come out of here winning, and no one is going to come out of here losing. We all lose if there is no report.

Thank you, again, Chair, for your work and your efforts to bring this report to a conclusion. I think you've done a magnificent job over the last three days, as I'm sure you have in the whole process. I'm sorry that I haven't been able to be involved in the whole process. People like myself and I'm sure others here are kind of looking at the clock and about to head out for flights. I think we need to lay it all on the table and make a concerted effort to get a report here. That's the only way there will be progress. Thank you.

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

Again, I agree with you. There is an issue about the balance of some paragraphs in the text. This is something we could not address in this very hasty drafting, but we tried to reflect on what was said in the room and the points we have.

May I just also, before turning to the next speaker -- as I said, we're not engaging in drafting exercise. But the point raised by Parminder is still ringing in my head.

So may I ask you please to roll back to the document and recommendation 3. In regard to recommendation 3, please,

I would like to propose -- because it's -- to reflect the spirit in which I prepared the report -- just to delete the words "existing."

So we should say, "enhanced cooperation should take account and avoid duplication of work and aim to improve international fora." So this is what I meant, I think the "existing" there may give rise to that interpretation which is not what I meant. Please, if you could do that, because I think maybe an objection raised by Parminder, that could be -- I don't know -- addressing that form. I just want to make sure the intention was not to say it as it was before. So, with that minor addition, I think we can move on.

Cuba followed by the U.K.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair.

Regarding your draft -- the third draft of the report, in the first page, in the executive summary, we're proposed to stop the paragraph when this refers to the Tunis Agenda. So the paragraph would be "Tunis Agenda for the information society, taking into consideration the work that has been done in this matter thus far."

Then we leave the rest of the paragraph.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We are not in a drafting mode. We can take these proposals. But, basically, I wanted to hear from you your reaction with regard to the whole text. Whether, if the text as presented,

is something that could be entertained by you or if it would give rise to some objection of that kind that you could not accept. Because we'll not have time to go through each paragraph.

>>CUBA: Thank you, no. Let me clarify. For us, to be able to accept this paper, there are pieces in the paper that need to be deleted. So I wanted to tell you that we have 10 deletions for the text to be acceptable.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Please go ahead.

>>CUBA: Okay. So on page 1 in the executive summary, we propose to stop when it says, "has been done in this matter thus far."

So delete the rest.

In page 5, paragraph 13, we propose to delete the second sentence that says, "during the discussion held within the group a list of commonalities were identified."

Then in paragraph 14 -- paragraph 14, the beginning of the sentence when it says, "A considerable number of topics that were addressed in the various contributions submitted by the WGEC members and observers in the course," we propose to delete all of that and to begin the paragraph saying, "Nevertheless, the group's proceedings did not lead to consensus recommendation."

So to delete from "a considerable" to "observers in the course." And insert the word "nevertheless" and then you can continue. In the same paragraph, we propose to delete to stop when it says "WGEC membership" and then to delete the rest. I mean, when it says, "they include both proposals" and so on, we propose to delete that part.

And I have a question. When you referred to Annex II, we do not know what is the Annex II. We'd like to see the Annex II that you are proposing.

Then on page 6 we propose to delete paragraph 23. And we also propose to delete the chapeau or the title subsection referred to recommendation. We agree with Parminder that it's not possible to have agreed recommendation as a result of this working group.

So, as an alternative, the following paragraph under the characteristics -- instead of saying "the working group recommends," we will substitute the word "recommends" by "discussed."

Then in page 7, paragraph 2, we prefer to delete paragraph 2 to avoid entering into negotiation of the various elements that are listed in this paragraph. We believe it's better to delete it.

Paragraph 3, as it was proposed by Parminder, we support this deletion of paragraph 3.

The rest of paragraphs 4, 5, 6, is okay.

7 is okay. 8 is okay.

Paragraph 9 we believe it could be deleted.

And then we're fine with 10 and 11. So it's very simple for us. If you insert this and show us the Annex II. How it is going to be reflected, we could be ready.

I will repeat what Juan mentioned in the intervention before you presented this text. Our main concern is that, for example, in paragraph 14, there is, like, a categories of ideas or recommendations. Those that have consensus, and those that do not have consensus. We should try to avoid that. Why? Because there isn't agreement. At the end the group is not having as an outcome specific agreed recommendations as it might appear in different paragraphs. It's clear that the different sides or whatever -- delegations or members have expressed that there are no common agreed recommendations. So the best way is, I agree, you're making an effort to reflect that diverse views. But I -- we encourage, as Juan mentioned, to avoid to say that those recommendations did not find consensus or others -- I think it's better to avoid it.

And you have done it in an elegant way with different parties, would you say. Some parties say this. Others did not agree. You have two parties saying, on the other hand, all the parties felt that it was not necessary and so on. So that's the best way, but not to qualify it as consensual recommendation. We did not consent -- did not agree.

With this maybe we could accept the proposed report -- not the report -- the draft report but without the section on recommendation because the reality is that there are very divergent views and while at least we will be producing something, that is not -- it's not responding to the mandate of General Assembly. Unfortunately this paper will not respond to the mandate itself of the General Assembly, but at least it's -- it's the reality that we have in -- in front of us.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba, for your statement. I -- well, I should say we have been working with a view to -- (indiscernible) to fulfill the mandate should develop recommendations and that's -- that was my intent of my -- my third report. Of course, it's up to -- my third draft. It's up to the group to discuss, as we are doing now.

In regard of your proposals for deletion -- and I'd like subsequent speakers to also speak to both what Parminder has said and you because I think we are -- we have to try to come to some common understanding of where we are. But in relation to recommendation 3, you may not have considered, when we asked for deletion on the paragraph, the proposed amendment I have made now from the podium that the reference to existing work should be deleted in both. So we are not anymore referring to -- that was a way to try to make a recommendation that would be neutral from that perspective. I think as I was trying to reflect on Parminder's point, of course, it's very difficult to reflect on your points because they are so comprehensive. So I'd love for others to comment. Next on my list are U.K., followed by -- [no audio]

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: ... for both those who are in favor of new mechanisms and those who are not. So I -- I mean, I have some -- we're not drafting now. There are some minor changes. And I would suggest that the consensus about balance can actually be fairly easily addressed by paragraph 20 being expanded a little bit. Just elaborate in a little bit more detail on why some parties felt that there was no need for additional mechanisms. And I have some text for that which I can send separately. I know we

are not drafting now. But I think for that it would be a simple way of addressing Australia's concern about balance.

And I feel with regard to your paragraph 23, I think -- I know you've drawn our attention to that. I want to, again, draw everyone's attention to that. I think that is a very significant paragraph and perhaps should be put in bold face so that the reader reads it. It might even be included as a preamble to the recommendations, but I actually prefer it the way you have it at the moment.

And then just in response to Parminder. I agree with the U.K.'s points. I think I'd much rather that you look at the text and see if there aren't some deletions or some changes that could be made to address your concern.

I actually think the Chair took great pains to express that text in such a way that it doesn't contradict or undermine the demand for a new body. But I understand what your concern is. I just think that the Chair has already addressed that concern.

One minor addition, if people are willing to accept a compromise change would be wherever there is a reference to "further" -- to just insert "new or further."

That might be a way of building compromise by including the view both of those that see enhanced cooperation as being implemented and needing further implementation and those that feel that there is new initiatives needed. So that would just be one can do that for the whole "recommendations" section.

So, yes. I feel -- I also just want to assert, perhaps as a civil society voice who had an outlier proposal, to have a mechanism inside the IGF, we've compromised on that.

I think there are not only two main camps in this working group. There actually were diverse range of opinions. And I think -- I don't think it's appropriate to not recognize that there has actually been compromise from multiple voices and parties in this process. And it will be really regretful if we're not able to produce a document -- some form of outcome document for ourselves as well as for others who work in this space and who will do so in an ongoing manner.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette, for your statement. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the outset I would like to thank you profusely for your huge efforts since this working group was established. We all know that the IGF is an extremely important and sensitive issue, and it's been discussed for years now. And, therefore, it is sensitive because the Internet is so important for societies, individuals, governments, and the economic and social importance of the Internet. Therefore, we believe that our discussions on this matter will necessarily be lengthy. And the kingdom of Saudi Arabia had supported the multistakeholder fora for the IGF in accordance with the Tunisia program of work. And the summit, after lengthy and laborious discussions, that the concept of multistakeholder fora is an important concept for the administration of the Internet, and this is why the -- what relates to enhanced cooperation and the policy making is a sovereign right of governments. Governments must be able to draw up these policies on an equal

footing, and these are the cornerstone of our work here in this working group. And in spite of the Tunis Agenda, enhanced cooperation until now has not been implemented. And it is regrettable that the third version of the draft report also tends to favor the status quo when it comes to the IGF and has -- is ignoring, in fact, the outcome. We have also noted --

[no audio]

... and does not reflect all of the remarks and the observations made in past meetings. And focused on issues of lesser importance.

[no audio]

... will be in accordance with the outcomes of the summit and that it reflect all contributions in a balanced and transparent manner.

And finally, we agree with Parminder and Cuba on this matter. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. One point I'd like to stress once again is that, at least from my perspective upon proposing those recommendations, there was an attempt to draft them in a way that would be neutral from the perspective of existing or any event of future mechanisms or framework. So you refer to status quo, I think. From the perspective, some of those recommendations is seen as only favoring the present (indiscernible). Maybe some amendments can be made, as, for example, the one I proposed recommendation 3 to make sure we are not addressing just one part of the -- just one side of the discussion. But I just make --

[no audio]

>>UNITED STATES: ... given the time constraints, this is a good effort to take all of the concerns that have been raised, the interventions made, try to find a path towards consensus, which is hopefully what we've been trying to achieve, some of us.

I think the document still has some challenges. I think we have time to work through those challenges. We are open to finding a path forward. We're trying to offer flexibility and compromise, as much as we can. We've been clear about some of our -- our strong limitations and parameters, but within that we really are trying to find a way forward. And, you know, frankly, we'll talk and engage as long as we continue -- as long as we're doing so in good faith. We'll talk with members as long as it takes to get consensus.

But I think if Cuba and Parminder's interventions are serious, then I'm like the U.S -- I mean, I'm like the U.K., that I'm afraid that there just will be no report. And there will be no report because a few members of this group made one argument for four meetings and now have moved the goalpost on what the requirement is to get to a consensus report. There will be no report because we as a group have decided that the U.N. and U.N. processes should no longer strive towards consensus. There will be no report since a few members have shown no flexibility or compromise at this last meeting. And there will be no report since we -- we basically -- some arguments are made shouldn't even try to do our basic

mandate from the General Assembly, which is to create recommendations to further implement enhanced cooperation. That's the mandate. And we don't seem to be doing that.

I think this is very unfortunate, if this is the path we go down. Of course, we can't change the positions of other participants. So we'll have to deal with it. But I think last night we talked a little bit about the implications of no report, and it's a good time to go over that again. This is the ninth meeting basically together of a Working Group On Enhanced Cooperation. And we are at risk of producing nothing from nine meetings to Geneva for many countries and stakeholders. I think with that, if this working group fails to produce a report, I think within the WSIS process discussions around enhanced cooperation are really not going to go anywhere. They seem to be exhausted. And I really don't know where this conversation will continue. I think that's unfortunate and I don't think that's what people in this room want. But I just don't see how you continue a conversation when after nine meetings you can't make any progress whatsoever. But again, as I said last night in the small group, I don't think that's the end of the world because I think enhanced cooperation, no matter how you define it, whether it's gov to gov, multistakeholder, on equal footing, however you define it, enhanced cooperation is happening. And this is what WSIS+10 and all these discussions and proposals that were made there, that is what WSIS+10 said, that it's happening. Maybe it can be improved, maybe it can happen faster, maybe there's other ways, but that it's happening. And they tasked us with providing recommendations. Not to deliver options. Not to go take one proposal that was made at WSIS+10 and consider it further. It was to develop recommendations.

So to me it's frustrating that we're not doing that. That we've kind of decided we're not going to get consensus --

That's a time limit --

[echo on audio]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: It seems it is okay now. Now you can proceed.

>>UNITED STATES: Last comment. I think it's happening. However you define it, it is happening. This is what WSIS+10 had decided after a long discussion at a much higher level -- CEOs and heads of states and ministers and all that -- than this working group, that it's happening. But we need to make recommendations -- [no audio] -- the last 15 years, 12 years, whatever it's been, there really hasn't been a strong voice by the U.N. in that process because it's been held hostage by one issue that has been repeatedly rejected at multiple fora. Discussed. This is not new proposals. They get proposed all the time. And they've been discussed and rejected. And they've never achieved that critical mass.

And so I would encourage folks not to hold this whole process hostage over that one issue. We're trying to be as flexible as possible. We're willing to work to find a way forward. But there has to be some reasonable expectation on what the outcome will be from this meeting.

And it's not we won't do recommendations, because that's our mandate. And it won't be that we just reflect the views of one group because they think their views are more important than everyone else's. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Marilyn Cade followed by the Russian Federation.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. So I guess I will have to declare myself one of the oldest veterans of all of these discussions having been involved in all of them from the private sector. The WSIS, the WSIS+10, both working groups, et cetera. And I want to compliment the Chair.

And, like Peter Major and others here, I've been in this room and negotiating language and in other rooms in this building sometimes until 2:00 a.m. in the morning. And we have been in situations where we have had much further divisions among each other. And yet we have achieved a report and reached finally some agreement on what our outcome and our recommendations would be.

So I remain very optimistic. And, particularly, I thank the Chair and the secretariat and all of you for the amount of work that you've done. I think -- I know sometimes it gets very stressful and very tense. And sometimes it's a bit easy to say somebody else is not compromising, but I am. But I think that's actually not a useful phrase. So, although I may feel that Jimson's proposal and what I support is not as well-represented in a certain section and I would like to see a little more language in paragraph 20, I'm not suggesting that I am not continually willing to compromise and to work. I am saying in fact I am. And I hope everybody else will say the same thing.

I think we have the opportunity to make some recommendations. I agree they're not going as far as I would like them to go. I know they're not going as far as some of the rest of you would like them to go.

I appreciate the fact, Chair, that you've already offered some editorial language which opens up some small edits which open up the flexibility to say new or future as well as existing. I think we can work on that.

And I hope we will.

But I also am going to plead with some of my colleagues to remember that already the Secretary General of the United Nations publishes a report on progress toward implementation of enhanced cooperation. Already. We know there are discussions.

It would be a personal failure on every one of our parts, if, as experts appointed to this working group, we didn't try to enhance and contribute through making some recommendations. They're not going to be perfect. I particularly feel like I'm not going to get everything I want. But neither is anyone else. But let's get something. So saying thank you again, Chair, to the work that you and the secretariat have done and to everybody else. It's not 2:00 in the morning yet. So I'm going to stay. And I hope some of you will stay and supervise me.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The secretariat is telling me the room is booked until 12:00. But I am afraid we -- I don't think we should entertain that. I think we had agreed to -- and also, in the light of the fact that

we'll start to lose people very shortly. So I think that we should -- I want to listen to the other speakers. And then I'll make some final comments. And, as I see it, I think we may have reached the end of the road in some way.

Russian Federation followed by Nigel, Switzerland, Iran. And then I have again Parminder and Cuba. So Russian.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I would like to say that we are prepared to work even for midnight. No problem. We are always ready. And so we would like to thank you -- first of all, thank you for your tried to make the report. And it's really with a great effort. And we think that it was the really the big step forward to hear the points of view inside the discussion inside this room and the group.

And we think that there are some -- well, first, there is some small editorial. If we go to 15 and 17, we actually have duplication here.

"While others propose to expand mandates of existing entities.' And this same wording in 15.

So we think it's kind of duplication. And so -- well, let's delete 17 in this case,

if we already put it inside 15.

When it comes to the whole concept, we appreciate to make it, sir, this separate session for key issues addressed.

However, when it comes to recommendations and to the number 27, we -- no, 23. Sorry. 23. We do not consider it's the whole set of consensus recommendations.

And so we apologize for those who think that all of us was working on this recommendation, because definitely that was not all of us.

And we checked the last version of the report from yesterday. And we checked each and every recommendation. And we didn't reach the consensus on each and every. Definitely. And so we cannot say that this is a consensus recommendation.

We actually can agree that, from our case, some of them are more acceptable; some of them less acceptable.

But in the whole set, we think represents the point of view of kind of the number of delegations who really want to stress an only multistakeholder models approach. And that gives us not a very much balanced approach.

So we propose number 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to be deleted or to go to the key issues as the point of view of only part of the group or try to find the -- some wording around it to make it more balanced.

Because number 3, the proposal made by the Chair actually looks positive for us. And so we think we can accept it in the new wording.

So, basically, there are -- we have a different way. We can delete from the recommendation. We can move it as the point of view of the part of the group, or we try to find the balanced wording. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon.

First of all, repeating others, perhaps, but, clearly, thank you very much for your chairmanship and thank you for your leadership and thank you for your inspiration and thanks for this report. Clearly, this report has changed. And you've made substantive effort to take on board the numerous suggestions and the numerous recommendations and the numerous speeches that people have made on the different aspects.

I mean, clearly, as many others have said, in any negotiation there has to be compromise if one wants a consensus outcome. And, clearly, some of the paragraphs, perhaps, could be more balanced.

We agree with Russia, perhaps, that paragraph 17 perhaps is already accommodated in para 15. And no doubt there's other adjustments that could be made. Anriette, I think, made a good point on paragraph 20.

We're, obviously, prepared to work forward and try to get an agreement on this basis.

Mr. Chairman, I think we agree with you that we should go through the recommendations. Perhaps we should try and accommodate some of the points that have been made by Russia and Cuba and others. We should look at these recommendations, of course.

But, of course, we can't have a report that simply discusses things and doesn't make any recommendations. There's no point in that either. We have to be realistic.

But, finally, Mr. Chairman, in taking account of what the U.S. and others have said, we really do want a report. And we don't just want a report because it's a report for report's sake.

We want a report to put a stake in the ground that, yes, we recognize that enhanced cooperation is taking place in certain areas. We recognize that there has been progress, but there's more work to do. But, more than that, we recognize that many bodies discussing Internet public policy issues should be more transparent, as Richard Hill, of course, said in his numerous interventions in this respect, should be more transparent, should be more accountable, should involve different players.

And this is what some of these recommendations gives us. And I think that's very important.

And the second point is that, of course, we will go on discussing these issues. I know. But can we at least make some progress so that in other foras, when we're discussing Internet governance, we can discuss development; we can discuss access; we can discuss marginalization; we can discuss the sustainable development goals; we can discuss what's really important to individuals and people.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chairman. We'd like to share with you first a general thought. And this is the following: Our mandate from the outcome document from WSIS+10 was to continue a dialogue because there was an assessment that there was a divergence between the different parties

and that we would deliver recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation.

I think it would be naive to think that, after 15 years in this small working group at our level, we would come up with a final and perfect solution to enhanced cooperation.

I think that we have to accept that our task is to deliver one further step in this process of dialogue, that our task in the end is to put another agreeing to this work on improving and furthering enhanced cooperation.

So today what we can get is not a final perfect optimal solution to everything that has to deal with enhanced cooperation. We were not able to come up with a solution to all the issues we have been having divergence on for the last 13 years.

What we can have is a snapshot of where our dialogue is. And that snapshot will include some areas where we have divergence. And there we can improve the good text that you have that you have delivered. But we also can deliver in that snapshot the areas where we have found consensus. Perhaps it's not a consensus on everything related to enhanced cooperation. But it's the consensus of the agreement, the rough agreement or the issues that we can live with on certain useful recommendations. So I would very much be sorry if we are not able to reflect those two elements in the report. Okay. We have still long way to go in areas of divergence. And we are having a dialogue that will continue, because we're not making decisions here. We are putting it up to the hierarchy of the committees. And it will end up in the UNGA.

But, for the time being, in this snapshot of our dialogue, we can also deliver some recommendations, some areas where we agree, where we at least don't disagree so absolutely that we have to really in the end limit the report to what would be, in essence, a secretariat report reflecting what has been discussed.

I think we are able, with some adjustments, to still keep the -- this snapshot between divergence and agreed recommendations.

So I would really urge all colleagues to remind themselves that we are here just in one step of a long process of dialogue, that it's not our task to come up with a final perfect solution, to get a little bit of pressure off our shoulders and to remember that we will continue debating this, and that the perfect is, of course, enemy of the good. So thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Switzerland.

I have on my list Iran. And then I will give the floor to Japan who has not yet spoken. And I revert to those who have already spoken request for the floor, Parminder and Cuba. Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me appreciate you for your hard work during the three days' negotiations. Mr. Chairman, let me start from the key issues addressed by the group.

I have some concern on some paragraphs. As you remember and other colleagues that in the previous meetings and also during the three days this week, we have discussed crosscutting important issues that are reflected, obviously, in the Tunis Agenda. And we emphasize that discuss continuing issues is important for enabling the governments to fulfill their commitment.

We have also discussed that enhanced cooperation should be enabled to support the sustainable development and SDGs. And, unfortunately, at the last version, the sustainable development is missing.

Another crosscutting issue that we have discussed at previous meetings is the transfer of technology.

At least on five articles of the Tunis Agenda, the transfer of technology has reflected in the articles 8, 9, 49, 54 and 89 as a divide digital opportunity to support the governments and enabling the governments to fulfillment of its commitments.

So it is considered crosscutting issues that we need to reflect, at least in the changes.

My second point is that regarding to the recommendations part. And as we heard that there is no consensus on the recommendation items. And some delegation, some members has concern on that. It seems that there is no consensus on that. But we should work and capture our consensus. Iran believes that we should have a report at the end of our meeting. And I think Russia has suggested a good point, that move some paragraph from the recommendations section to another section. That's, I think, a good suggestion.

But Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion. I'm not sure that it's correct or not and is acceptable for colleagues or for you or not. Could you -- could we divide the consensus -- could we divide the recommendations paragraphs in two parts. The first part, recommendations that group has consensus under and second part recommendations that group has not consensus. At least we could agree on our disagreement on some paragraphs and then better that we do not have a report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I agree with you. I also would like to have a report by the end of our meeting. The problem is that our meeting is expected to finish in 7 minutes and I don't think we'll have time for that, to complete a report.

The difference you suggest that we could make between recommendations, meaning consensus recommendations and what is non-consensus recommendations, is exactly what was aimed, and I think actually when we say those are recommendations, those are consensus, and the proposals because there are tens of proposals. Many of them were not even considered by us but they are important for

the proponents. So the proposals will be there. They will be recognized as such. So that differentiation is already provided for in the text I have provided to you.

But let me continue the list of speakers. I have Japan on my list, and then I have Parminder and Cuba who have requested the floor again. I would like you to be as brief as possible since we're running out of time and I'd like to make a few comments just before we close the meeting. Japan, you have the floor, sir.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I thank the chairman for the great effort of making this draft report. I think this is very difficult task for everyone. I'd like to make some brief comments. Japan thinks this draft report is reflecting the reality of our discussion and Japan supports the chairman's report.

Of course, this report is not perfect, however, this is a consensus report. Our task is to make recommendations, and we have had many meetings to make recommendations. I think everyone in this room should be flexible and realistic. Japan thinks we should accept this report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: ... wishes to make comments. I can comment later. That's fine.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. Our delegation wants to do two clarifications for the record. First, we are not rejecting this report as was presented by you, the third draft. What we're saying, that with some work it could really be accepted. And I will come back to that later. But I want that to be on the record.

The second on the record is that some delegates here as being interpreting our mandate in a very particular way, and I want to say that our mandate, of course, I have it in front of me, the paragraph 65, is to do recommendations. But it says, taking into account all the diverse view of all the stakeholders. So in order to have recommendation, you have to take into account all the diverse view. We cannot have recommendations when only taking into account the views of part of the members here. But that - - now I come back to the first thing, that it's clear that that is our mandate. And as was said by some of my previous speakers, that can be solved over in several ways. The -- either by removing from the recommendation part some of the paragraph or moving into the recommendation some of the things that, for instance, a recommendation could be the group recommends to give further study to the things that you have put in some of the paragraphs there like the UNGA or the other. That could be a recommendation to have further study that, as was actually in one of our earliest versions.

I agree with Marilyn and the Swiss delegate that I have seen documents that are more divergent than this and was solvable. I really believe -- and now I am talking personally from my experience -- that on the basis of this draft that you put together very intelligently, I think there's room to work and iron out the difference and to have a report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have a few other requests for the floor. I have Lea Kaspar, followed by Egypt, Belgium, and Hungary. Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. And first of all, thank you very much to you and secretariat for your work in preparing this. Just like to add my voice of support for the point where you got us to with this draft. I have to say, I was a bit surprised by some of the comments I've heard and it sounded like all of a sudden there's a sense that there is no consensus on some of the recommendations which I thought there were consensus on. It would be really useful I think at this point, and I'm trying to be practical here, to figure out which ones -- what are we actually talking about? Where are we actually not -- what are the recommendations where there is no consensus.

I take note of Russia's comment which said, I think from between 4 and 9, that those recommendations were the ones that were potentially objectionable but the rest could be -- could be accepted. I -- I mean, that might be a -- and then the recommendation, I think, if I'm interpreting you right, was that those be reflected as something that we discussed -- the ones that we don't agree on, where there's no consensus to move and reflect that in the introduction.

That might be a way forward. I do worry that the balance will then -- how the report will be balanced in that way. However, I just want to say that I do think that between the options of no report and a report that moves us along on this I think evolutionary road that we've been set -- that we've set ourselves upon, it moves us in the right direction. I think it's better to have something than nothing. And I don't think that something that does not fully implement enhanced cooperation is nothing. It is still something. And if we have three recommendations, that's still something. So I would just -- just to see if we can identify areas of consensus and see how we can balance out the rest of the report. Just hopefully and reach -- reach something by the end of the meeting. I'm really curious to hear your -- your views, Chair, on how we're going to proceed because I'm not clear and I have a flight in a couple of hours, so it would be really good to hear your views on how we proceed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Let me just briefly make a few comments before I turn to the other speakers because I fear, in the light of what some people told me, that we may lose people very rapidly. I myself would be ready to continue with that. I do not have any problem. I can -- I can go on. I fear, since I know some people -- and even yourself just said you had to leave and others -- that to the extent we lose a lot of people, even the legitimacy of what we do will be in jeopardy. So this is something of concern to me.

But I could go on, if the group so decides, we could go on and maybe devise a way through which those who are not present can still be consulted. We can put back some silent procedure, a document, that kind of thing. It's possible. It's -- those are things that have been done.

So just to -- on the part of the chair, you can count on me to continue as long as possible to try to achieve that. My only concern, in the light of some comments I have received, I have heard, is that I -- I ask myself whether it is possible and viable and realistic to undertake that exercise. Because I think some of the comments give -- if I can use that expression -- a subtle glow to the basic assumptions under which we have been working. And in that regard, I'd like to say the following: For me, at some point

consensus was reached around some notions, those that are on the recommendations section. At some point everybody in the room was okay with that. But in fairness to those who are now opposed, I should also say that for me it is also clear and they made their point also very clearly that their consensus was contingent upon other things that for them were more important than those formulations. So for me, it was quite clear that we were building consensus but there -- the final package was what everyone wanted to see. I think in fairness to those, because I think we have worked in good faith. I don't put in question the good faith of those who accepted at some point and also because it's part of the package thing and I can understand that now they cannot support.

But one thing that I asked myself when we started this exercise, what was the expectation of us in the room? I think if someone who defends -- I'm speaking to those who defend a new mechanism, was the expectation that out of this meeting there would be a clear-cut decision in favor of creation -- I think that was unrealistic. I think if that expectation existed, I'm not sure if I would accepted that at all because I think this is an expectation that would not be met. On the other hand, those who do not favor the creation of new mechanism, if they also thought that by developing a few recommendations that do not address substance and address procedural aspects, that the other camp would be fully satisfied and not have any reference in the text on new mechanism, I think it would also be unrealistic.

So what I think would be realistic, and I think this text before you conveys what I think truly and honestly convinced that is the realistic thing that could come out of this group is a compromise. A compromise in which we would say we have -- everybody could say by doing this, doing that, which basically are the recommendations, any efforts would be to those who exist or any future efforts will improve and will benefit from those things. And this will not solve the issue whether we need -- we cannot solve it here. We cannot solve it in 2015 and then we had very high-level people working there and -- they could not do there, so my realistic expectation I set from the beginning was that our -- what could be achieved would be of somewhat limited scope because we could not solve the whole picture, but that would be an incremental gain that could provide something that could be used in the future. My concern, and then speaking on -- on also a national capacity, is that we have been engaged in that process for so many years and now we are tasked to do something and we say that we cannot because there -- the stalemate that is there for a number of you that will go on has prevented us to recognize that some things could be done in any scenario in a neutral way, that would help towards enhanced cooperation. But if we cannot come to that, I think, basic conclusion amongst themselves, I think it needs --

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, we are losing time. So if the expectations is higher than that, is that we can, by working this working group, we can solve something we could not until now, it is unrealistic. That's why I'm keeping say, I think the recommendations provided are neutral from the perspective of whether you want a new mechanism. And then we are documenting the process. I think that's -- that reflects what we have done, and that would be an honest representation of our meetings.

But what I'm hearing from some comments and interventions say that some parties are not prepared to take that role. They would prefer then to have nothing or they are making amendments that would kill the proposal because they know they will not be acceptable by the others. So I would think I would not like to lose your time or my time going on a road that is -- if the map -- roadmap is this, I think it will lead nowhere.

So I apologize for being a little bit too frank about that, but then I'd like to turn to Egypt, followed by Belgium, Hungary, and Canada. Egypt.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I wish first to thank you for the effort that you have done on this draft and to fully support what you have mentioned in your last comment. I think the way forward in any discussion is for parties, especially when there are these differences, it has been there for some time, to also acknowledge the limits of what other -- the other side could agree to. And I do appreciate this, and I think the -- the draft that you have put forward, to a great extent, put this into perspective. Perhaps a few amendments can get us there, perhaps not. This still remain to be seen in the coming -- I don't know how much we are prepared to go on.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's important also to stress our support for the approach that you have taken in the report that is to supply the important views that were expressed in this -- this discussion, in this meeting and in these meetings, and to separate this from recommendations when we're supposed to be some sort of consensus. I don't think that we can call areas where we have not reached consensus anything but views or issues that you have rightfully reflected in your report.

And then the section of issues that were raised in the meeting, I wonder if there could be some effort also to distinguish, to some extent, between similar proposals that in this context seems to be put in the same basket. I know we are not in the drafting for the moment, but I think some -- some effort could be made to make further distinguished between some of the proposals that are currently presented in the same basket Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt, for your comments. I turn to Belgium.

>>BELGIUM: Thank you, Chair. We just want to intervene briefly as an interested observer to thank you for your tireless efforts to achieve an outcome here and also reaffirm with our EU colleague said earlier about the principle of consensus that we really also feel a basis for U.N. discussion and negotiations and going down the way of a non-consensus recommendation would seem very dangerous to us. That's all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your comment and for your support. Hungary. Peter do you want to take the floor?

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chairman. I take the floor as vice chair of the CSTD. Mr. Chairman, when I first approached you to chair this meeting, I remember that you had reservations and it took me quite a time to convince you to take up this extremely difficult task.

Irrespective of the outcome, I would like to congratulate you, Chair, for your effort and expert leadership and for your patience and the excellent work. I'd also like to acknowledge the excellent work of the members of the working group and also the contributions of the observers. As for the report, I think this is a good basis. As it has been mentioned, the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation of the CSTD had previously four meetings. And now we have five meetings, and I believe we have something. We have something in hand. We have something to build on. This may be a very small step. But at least we have made this small step. And we know that each road starts with a small step.

So I think it is possible to go ahead. And the way forward I recommend to do, what we usually do during the CSTD discussions when we discuss the very easy WSIS follow-up resolutions, which you remember I have chaired four, five, six times -- I don't remember how many times. So it is always useful to stop the formal discussions and get together and have small informal discussions at the end of which we can achieve some kind of compromise. And I'm confident that we can achieve this compromise.

So what I suggest for this meeting is, eventually, if you agree, to stop the formal meeting now and break it for the informal one. And come back, say, in half an hour, one hour time with the possible compromises and with a possible report. Thank you, Chair.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please be informed the interpretation services will now cease. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think a very helpful and well-informed suggestion. I really -- I should say I really thank you. As you said, I was a bit reluctant in the beginning. And, although the outcome may not be maybe the one I would expect, I am grateful for having had that experience. It was very enriching from a personal point of view and from the perspective of getting better knowledge of the issues as well.

So thank you very much for your suggestion.

I -- again, I am available, if the group thinks it is useful and helpful and that might lead to some outcome. I think -- I concur with you. I think it might be possible, working in a more informal environment, to try to bridge some differences that maybe appear to be irreconcilable at the moment.

So I'd be ready to do this, to the extent the group will be ready to stay. And I thank you for being very clear about the proposal.

I think we have one problem that is the timing. As I'm sure this text could be further massaged by us and examined and maybe there will be some -- the problem is now we have run out of time. And I think we have taken -- and may I recall it was a decision of the group from the beginning to work in a very bottom-up process to start building, to start -- at some point, I was approached by many participants that wanted immediately to start more negotiating mood format. But the group as a whole preferred this.

And maybe you should have started earlier, even in our last meeting, to start looking to text. But there was no condition for that.

So that -- in case there will be a WGEC 3.0, don't count me to chair this. But I know there are candidates in the room for that, good, good candidates for that. Maybe one thing is to allow us enough time to do the job or to do the preparatory work but then to have enough time for the final stages.

So I think if we -- I am willing to give that yet another -- dedicate some more time to this. I'd like to hear from colleagues and from the WGEC members, when they take the floor, those who are to take the floor and others, whether that possibility could be entertained. And I make this proposal as my own proposal to the group. And I'd like also to hear that in addition to the comments you are already prepared to make.

So I have on my list, Canada, followed by Mexico, Netherlands. And, Anriette, are you requesting the floor? I just see one -- it's Parminder, yes. Okay.

Netherlands and Parminder. Canada, please, you have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

And, before I launch into my presentation, I just -- they're leaving now. But the interpreters have signaled that they were finishing. And I want to offer thanks. And thank you to the secretariat for having allowed us to benefit from the talents of the interpretation. It was very satisfactory to be able to interact in my mother tongue. And I'm very grateful for that. So thank you very much.

On the matter at hand of the report, as you will recall, Canada was initially quite opposed to having a report which would spend too much time or any at all, in fact, delineating different views. We had always understood that our report should be a report that would contain recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation.

I think that we understood that it was not going to be the be all and end all of enhanced cooperation, that there probably would be more to be done in the future. But, certainly, that that was maybe a modest but at least a very first and important step to state these very basic principles such as the characteristics, the need for transparency, the need for noting that all institutions that do Internet-related public policy -- that they need to embrace the idea behind enhanced cooperation.

After the discussions particularly this week, I think that we had come to a point where we recognized that, in order for us to have a report that would be of value for everybody, that we needed to include a section that would indeed talk about this misalignment of understanding of what is enhanced cooperation,

i.e., is enhanced cooperation an institution or is it a tool to facilitate a process?

You have in this latest draft made proposals in that direction. For Canada, I think that was -- there is a bit too much there. And we'd be happy to work with the current draft if we could find an agreement to say, well, can we take all of these 14 paragraphs and summarize them in two? I think that would be -- that would be where we would like to go with this existing draft:

And the changes that you've made with the recommendations certainly we could endorse that fairly easily.

However, in light of the interventions that we've heard in the last two hours now, the comments by Cuba and by the Russian Federation, by Parminder and by Saudi Arabia, that, in fact, all these recommendations, well, they don't have consensus. They mean nothing if there's not a mechanism associated with them.

I think that we are clearly at an impasse, as much as I regret to have to admit that.

At the moment Canada is willing and happy to entertain further exchanges on this. But, if, as you point out, we're now at a point where it's unlikely that we'll reach a report that meets what our mandate says, that we need to produce recommendations, then perhaps you are correct that we need to take what we have learned in all of these five sessions -- I certainly have gotten quite a bit out of it -- and then go home and then leave it into the hands of the secretariat to prepare a Chair's report.

If ever there is a WGEC 3.0, we may be faced with the same challenges that we have today if, again, the understanding of enhanced cooperation is it's a mechanism versus it's a tool.

And there is no overlapping space between those two views. So having four or five, six new WGECs might not really help us in this regard. Maybe what we need is time to let understandings evolve for all of us.

Maybe one day we will come to the conclusion that, in fact, oh, yes, we need a new mechanism. But, certainly, that's not the case today. Therefore, at the moment happy to continue working on that. We'd have some language we'd propose to summarize the key issues section to make it more succinct and ensure that the recommendations have the -- reflect the importance of what we're trying to do here, which is making recommendations. And happy to continue discussing on the matter, as you see fit, Chair. Thank you very much.

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

Next on my list is Mexico, Parminder. And then I'd like to make a comment to propose to you some way forward, if I can say it at this late hour. But Mexico followed by Parminder.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

I didn't want to miss this opportunity to recognize your effort. I think you did a very good job. And you show a very professional -- in a very professional way how we can -- you can combine and you can put together in a text all different views and at the same time identify areas of agreement. I think you did a wonderful job, and I want to recognize that.

As others mentioned before, and yourself as well, Mexico had the understanding that there was a general consensus on the recommendations section.

We observed that you tried to reflect the debate on this idea of the mechanism.

To tell you the truth, we identify a kind of imbalance. Because, as others mentioned, paragraph 20 is like a single paragraph flying alone in the middle of the other paragraphs referring to the mechanism. But even though we were ready to accept that, because we understand there are some delegations who are -- who have concerns on this area. So we were ready to support that although we observed some kind of imbalance.

As for the -- some proposals to delete the section on recommendations, we were so struck. Because, again, we had the understanding that there was some general agreement on that. And we invite delegations to consider the option to have something, to have some recommendations.

Because I think many in this group -- we want to do that. We know there are different opinions. But we really believe it's possible to reach consensus and to present recommendations on this matter.

As for the way forward, I -- for Mexico, we are in your hands, Chair.

If you are willing and you feel it's accurate to continue, we will be with you. And we will accompany any effort. Because I think, at the end of the day, we must -- we must have a report.

I will say it would be a very negative sign not to have one.

So you can count on us. And we will follow the way you decide to continue with this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Mexico.

I have on my list Parminder, Netherlands, Timea, and Germany. But I would anticipate that after that, my proposal, following Peter Major's very wise advice, is to propose to you to suspend the meeting. And we can resume at 7:00 p.m. and make a final effort to try to see if, in that informal setting, we can bridge some difference that may allow us to have a group's report in a position to the chairman's report or secretariat's report that would otherwise be produced. So this is just to anticipate what I intended to do.

Parminder followed by Netherlands, Timea, and Germany.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I would actually like to give maximum time for Chair to propose a new proposal and any new process. And I'm ready to be here until any time.

I wish to be able to get something out of this. So that's why I took back the earlier time I wanted to make an intervention.

But I think I still need to say this, because it's been made to look like -- because certain interventions have given a fatal blow to the whole process. Before that I must clarify that I consider that finally whether the report is to go or not is to be considered by member states. I, as a non-governmental stakeholder, have been invited to actively participate in the working group. I completely recognize my status here. As I normally believe that public policy making is a government province, I do agree that my input here is consultative. And, therefore, I give my assessment of where the situation is for whoever wants to use that. So -- that's important, because that's how I see the situation. About the fatal blow,

I'm sorry those words are being used. I know, when there is on one side a status quo defense and another side an attempt to change, it's a very unequal situation. And things can be made to look in ways which in present context are very unfortunate.

We did not put any fatal blow. We fought to get this working group. And I know what I did, what other people did, and what India was doing at that time. And we wanted this working group. We wanted outputs. So we're not putting any fatal blows to anything.

People have given fatal blows to the earlier proposal which the chair had put and circulated and was not accepted. And I was ready to accept it. And I think they should also be named as people who delivered fatal blows to the processes here.

And I'm sorry. It's, just because we make our position clear, which is consistent with all the positions we made earlier, does not mean that we are damaging the process at all.

Now I do not understand what the compromise is. Because there is a section in the report which says, "Issues discussed." Can you deny that those were the issues discussed? After all, it was decided very early that there are two big aspects of our discussions. One is high-level characteristics, and another is the institutional arrangements. It was even decided at one point that institutional arrangements is a rather important one. And we're just starting with high-level characteristics. Those high-level characteristics are actually moved to the recommendation to put the fact that institutional mechanisms weren't discussed. In a list of issues discussed it's shown as a big compromise that some people have offered to developing countries who for 12 years have been asking for a new mechanism. And it's not a small matter. We're talking about governance of the most important phenomenon in this world today, which is the digital and Internet governance. Go on the street, and they will tell you that they need governance. You talk to those people in 2003 and '5, they would have said why would you want to touch the Internet? It's doing well. Ask anybody in the road. Ask the carpenter in your house. He will say no, I need something.

So it's a very big beginning. It's not a small thing and you can just kind of make a compromise because we want to be smiling and friendly with other people.

So I don't think there is any compromise being offered. Those issues are listed in a list of issues discussed. I mean, that's a fact. Institutional mechanisms were discussed as a big part of the agenda. And you just put it there, no compromise, nobody ceded any ground to anyone. The recommendations actually contain a particular model which is status quo, which is the model -- and I'm repeating it -- which says things are fine. And this is tweaking to be done, and this tweaking is called enhanced cooperation. That magic term which never had a definition finally has been clarified by consensus. What is the further implemented enhanced cooperation is to go and see that these high-level characteristics are out there.

This is not acceptable, and this is not a small thing. We are not just holding up. From the very start we were very clear and repeatedly said that anything that is talked about in transparency, collaboration, et cetera, will only make sense if it is placed in context of institutional models we will give. We were

ready to make a compromise. You were ready to make two boxes, which is something WGEC had done earlier with recommendations. That's called compromises. So please do not belittle the compromises we were ready to make and tell we were out here to destroy the process.

The Chair asked what was our expectation at the start? Were we looking to get a new institutional mechanism? No. We were very clear. We told there is nothing wrong for people to actually get conscious of the fact that in their own countries they're doing digital governance in big ways. And at the U.N. level, because digital is global phenomenon, something is needed. We could have expected it, but we knew it would not come. So we told you that we're ready for focusing on one or two institutional models and send them up.

Later we were even ready to say keep the process of discussion open, at least in the General Assembly and in a working group in CSTD

Okay. You don't give us anything, but don't close the process. You didn't agree to that. These were the compromises offered. And these were the fatal blows which were made to the process. And please name those fatal blows and the people who made those fatal blows.

By the way, Canada clearly said enhanced cooperation is either a tool or an institutional mechanism. And I quote there's no overlap between the two, yes? There's no overlap. the recommendations talk of enhanced cooperation as a tool. The guys who thought it's an institution are out forever. A definition of enhanced cooperation has been moved. It is a tool. And what does it mean by a tool? See 1-10. That is what has been achieved. And, of course, we cannot accept that.

So sorry. In any case we're still ready to work further to see what can come out of it. We'll still be fighting this battle now tomorrow, for 10 years. And we're not going anywhere, and we're ready to talk. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. Just -- if you'll allow me just to comment on a few aspects of what you just said. I think all we members here have an equal status, be them from government, civil society, business, international organization. Each was selected either by -- for their government or by their constituencies and they have the same (indiscernible) from the chair. I tried to make sure there was no differentiation. And if I had done otherwise, I think the legitimacy of the exercise would be in jeopardy. So just to say that each member has the same status within the group. Of course, when it goes out here, it goes to CSTD. It will be something else. But within the group, the same status. And each collectively and individually, each one is responsible either for the success or for the failure of this. So it's something that, from my perspective, is very clear.

The second is when I referred to fatal blow, I was not specifically thinking about what you had said because you may recall that immediately after your intervention I tried to come up with some amendments that would try to fix the points you made. I thought the kind of comment you made, at least in your initial presentation, was -- could be addressed by language and would be in a way -- could

be accommodated in the -- in this draft report, which was not the case. As regard other comments that were made that yes, by shifting things and calling for total overhaul of the document, I think then it would be very difficult to entertain. But just to -- to be clear about what I have meant.

Next on my list is Netherlands, Timea, and Germany. Netherlands, you have the floor.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair. First of all I would like to express my gratitude for your leadership and your tireless efforts which led to this latest version which we're now discussing.

When we started our journey, I was quite hopeful, especially when we reached an agreement on the list of high-level characteristics. But it seems that we are now stuck in a deadlock and that would be really a pity after more than ten years of hard work. But having seen your latest version and listened to others, I see some room to maneuver. I think I'm fairly convinced that we could reach a point where we can meet each other. Not on all the topics, but on several issues. Mind you, we should work still today to get a report where we can find some consensus recommendations. Not all of them are acceptable, of course, we realize that, but we can have -- better to have a report with some consensus recommendation than no report. And I'm ready to contribute to that work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for your flexibility. Timea.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. Just briefly. I want to commend you first for your -- for you for skillfully and firmly trying to stay the (indiscernible) course. A course that remains consistent with our mandate. To come up with recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. We have all been meeting here together to prepare a report with recommendations. And I want to thank you for the inclusiveness and openness with which all stakeholders were welcomed to the table.

We were asked to take into account divergent views, and we understand that our deliberations have done this. We did not engage in this process and understanding that our goal would be to produce a report on divergent views. We understand that in this period of compromise it may be achievable to work to find balanced language that can factor the concerns and perspective of where the vast range of views may span on mechanisms and finish a report that we can all accept. But as noted by others, we seem to have found our impasse.

With much respect to all colleagues and their time and effort and genuine commitment to the process we went through, we cannot support a document that does not include the recommendations we've been working on.

We do appreciate your frankness and observations and respect for everyone involved. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Last on my list is Germany. You have the floor, sir.

>>GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let me join in with others to congratulate you on your tireless effort and the very circumspect way in which you have presented the latest draft version to us.

As for others, for Germany, too, this version contains elements which are not very acceptable but the draft strikes a balance, especially then counterbalancing part 2 with the recommendation part which is not -- which is necessary for us in order to reach a decision here at all. And we are a little bit astonished by ideas and comments made at this late hour who believe that this compromise effort of yours would still be negotiable but, of course, we support you if you wish to continue and we would like to see a positive outcome if possible of this long process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. As I said before, my proposal would be then to suspend the meeting for a few minutes for refreshments and then come back at 7:00 for a final attempt for those who could be here to try to work around the text and see what can be done. In spite of the huge differences that may seem to exist in some cases, I feel encouraged by the fact that all of you seem to convey the notion that there should be a report, that you would be ready to work towards a report. So I think this is maybe sort of kind of common ground needed to achieve some result. And, of course, at this very late hour we need flexibility, the compromise, and I will say not to lose sight, not to lose sight of the political relevance of what we're doing, of the practical impact that could come out of this in spite of differences. I think if we could, in a way, as we try to (indiscernible) those differences, encapsulate them in a way that will not diminish the impact or the value of positions that would not harm each one trying to do it by explicitly saying that anything that would be said as commonalities, it does not imply that anyone is giving away the vision on how enhanced cooperation should proceed. So I think if we can work around that, that common ground, I would be more than ready to be available here for you at 7:00 p.m. I would say, in 20 minutes, so we could try to make a final go on this document. I'd like otherwise if someone has to leave -- the translators have already left and I couldn't even address them and thank them. It's part of these -- the kind of situation we've got in. So in case anyone has to leave, just I'd like to say it was a real pleasure to work with each. But I'd like everyone to stay, if possible, so we can resume in 20 minutes and try to have a final say in these documents. Thank you. So we adjourn the meeting. Lea, do you want -- I'm sorry, do you have a question?

>>LEA KASPAR: I'm sorry, Chair. Yeah, I feel bad now because you have already kind of closed the meeting. Can I make a -- I'll have to leave and I won't be able to stay for the rest of the meeting. And both Anriette and I are taking a car to the airport.

So just very briefly, if you will indulge me. If the group comes up with a consensus report I'm very happy to go along obviously. You know, hopefully that happens. If it doesn't happen, and if there is no consensus and we don't come up with a report, we would just like to say that we hope that the recommendations that we have been discussing can be duly reflected in the Chair's -- in the Chair's report for record. I think it will be important to have that reflected.

May I just say one more thing and to address, Parminder, your point because you made it and I haven't had a chance to say this to you. But from what it sounds like to me, if the priority you said you understand will not be achieved which is getting specific recommendations on a new mechanism, that doesn't go -- it's obvious that that's not going to happen. If the second order of priority is to keep this conversation going, then how does having no report, even if it's a compromise report that you're not completely happy with, how does that not, sir -- not serve that purpose? And if you don't have the

report, then the conversation stops, then how is that serving the purpose of keeping the conversation going. So that's all. I mean, we're happy to talk to you informally later, but let me just end on that.

And thank you so much, Chair, again, and thank you to the entire group for everyone

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, thank you. And thank you, Anriette, for your very meaningful contribution throughout those meetings, and I wish you safe travels back home. Thank you. So we --

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. We adjourn now, and we meet here at 7:00 p.m.

[Break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We want to resume the meeting. We are adopting the same format we did yesterday evening as was anticipated.

Let me make another announcement. I am very happy to hear that there's some informal, spontaneous discussions going on and that people need some more time maybe to come up with some proposal that we could look at. I think it's worth to spend a few more minutes to wait for this to take place. So apologies for continue. We'll take -- we'll need like 10 or 15 more minutes. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I'd like to invite colleagues to take your seats. We are trying to work as we did yesterday in this format around this central table to the extent that people can sit at the table or close so we'll try to be as informal as we can. I'd like to thank all of those who have got together and tried to bridge the differences that appeared in plenary in regard to how the report should look like. I acknowledge that an extensive effort was done in that regard, and I'd like to -- we have on screen something that I understand could be the -- could provide some basis for agreement and I'd like to request -- kindly request the U.K. representative who together with the representative from Cuba co-organized those consultations, to report on his outcomes. You can go ahead, please, U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Prepare to come here to -- you can have some.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, we have quite a large number of people in the room. To the extent if people can be sitting here, if possible, I think that could facilitate our discussion.

So yes, Paul, please go ahead.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And first of all, thank you to Juan for trying to work with me on developing something to bridge the differences that still exist. What you see on the screen is a proposal that we developed together, and there have been some consultations on it. I'll just run through the proposal as it is. A suggestion is that the key issues section in the introduction to the draft report is deleted and that instead we make a number of changes to the recommendation section.

First of all, we would add a chapeau at the beginning of the recommendation section which says, "The group recognized that divergent views continue to exist. The group offers the following non-exhaustive list of recommendations," and then we would list the recommendations as they appear in the draft that was sent around this afternoon. Except we would delete recommendation number 2, which I think we both thought added lots of extra complexity and some problems and didn't add very much more.

We would then add one additional recommendation which is number 12 on the screen. And that would say, "Recommends that governments and all stakeholders continue to consider how to further implement enhanced cooperation, including the possibility of new institutional approaches." And the thinking behind this was that for many the -- and I think it's true for Cuba, he can correct me, of course, if I'm wrong -- the text in the introduction is not so important as what goes into our recommendations. And by having a new recommendation which tries to address the issue of whether there should be new institutional approaches, whether there should be a new conversation going on, tries to find language to address that in a way that all of us can feel comfortable with. By putting that in the recommendation section, it would give it a different status, and so for that reason we could delete the key issues section.

I've had a few consultations with colleagues who think something like this might offer a way forward. I put "institutional approaches" in brackets. There may be better ways or better alternatives. I think we will need to find language which is open and inclusive here and not jump in with very specific language just for our own proposals because this does need to bridge some very different views. But we'd suggest this is something for the group as a whole to consider and whether it's possible to find a solution like this to take us forward. And maybe we could ask Juan if he has anything to add or if he disagrees with anything I've said. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Paul. May I ask Juan if you want to complement or comment on it.

>>CUBA: Well, first to say this was not my idea. It was my colleague's idea. So -- and she's sitting here, so -- and the second, of course, this is an exercise of flexibility and we should not feel bad about this because we were given what is such a mission impossible. In paragraph 65 of the UNGA resolution that creates this group, it recognized the divergent views. And if it recognized the divergent views among states, they want us to get -- to do recommendation, taking into consideration all the diverse views. So this is a very difficult job.

So the key thing here is to try to put in the recommendations the key thing, as we say in Cuba, the chicken of the rice and chicken food. That we have to put it in the recommendation. But in a way that everybody could be evenly happy or evenly unhappy.

Having said that, we have worked that out. Of course, you will make your recommendations, and the only thing that I should ask now, now, if it's in the proposal that it's in brackets, I don't know if when you were talking there, what about -- what happened about adding "within the U.N. system," that is very difficult to add. In the brackets "institutional approaches within the U.N. system." If that is possible it will go a little step to make people maybe a little more unhappy and some other a little more -- less unhappy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. And thank you, Paul. I see Juan has just made an amendment. Maybe I should refer back to Paul and -- yeah. You have also suggested to -- maybe it should be reflected on the screen so we have -- can the secretariat include their adds in brackets as something that is being proposed now? So we open another bracket, "within the U.N. system." So this is then for your consideration. Yes, Russian Federation. Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, unfortunately we should say that as we said before, your try with -- Chair, with the text was a good try. And we supported this. And this particular text, from our point of view, doesn't give any value to the process. Because what we have at the beginning, "group recognized the diverse views." Well yeah, it's already recognized in the resolution which made the mandate. So what's the value of this phrase? It doesn't give anything to the process. Then when it comes to the number of recommendations, we can check together, based on the file of the last day. There was no consensus on this particular text. We really don't understand why 2 disappeared. We were not actually -- well, happy with 2, but at least we -- we used the whole data, produced something together. It was recommendation and it was number 2. It was -- it was something which produced by the group. It's not ideal, but it's really the product of the whole group. Because others -- mainly it's the work of the part of the group. And those are not consensus. How can we put that here in the recommendation? I don't understand.

Then when it comes to the deletion of the key issues, we really want this group to fulfill the mandate. The mandate was to reflect the views, diverse views on the main issue of the mandate of the group. And we -- you, Chair, really tried hard to write something which reflects the picture of this complicated discussions. And we think you succeeded in that. And how can we delete it? Because it's actually reflect the actual discussion. So we disagree with this. It should be in the report. Otherwise, you know, those who read the report will not understand the meaning. What is the different views and what brings the different views, so we cannot agree on that.

And our solution was already set, keep the key issues and delete the number of recommendation from 4 to 9, up to 9, delete or put it into key issues because it's not the whole group opinion. That's it. Very easy. Quick solution.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We thank U.K. and Cuba for their efforts.

However, we feel this is a bit too much, deleting the key issues section. And then, to have the same recommendation in which you had questions and concerns yesterday and the day before yesterday, we have many comments on that. So, to take them as granted and to delete number 2 and then 12 and then to say the same thing was said in 2015, we don't see this as progress.

We don't see this as progress.

So with this we cannot accept.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, you're the next.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I have a question that's pragmatic from the business point of view. And I will only speak at small business for Jimson and myself. Of course, we care about having a recommendation, a set of recommendations, because we're business. We can only participate and continue to support the work in support of governments continuing to work together on implementing enhanced cooperation or having a future opportunity for other stakeholders to engage if we continue work.

So I want to be up front about the motivation that we have in liking at least a last recommendation about acknowledging the need to do more work or continued work or however it's phrased.

I'm not opposed to moving some of the recommendations into another status, Yulia. I'm not. I'd like to look at what that would look like. Rather than just reading out 4-9, I'd like to look on the screen about what it would look like if we moved those, if we kept two and moved those. I see people shaking their heads. But I learned a long time ago that a negotiating tactic, as a business person, is you don't say no when you start. So can we look at it? I'm asking, as a member of the group, to just look at it on the screen. I'm not saying anybody has to agree to accept it. I just would like to look at it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think we can go that way the group wants. However, I'd like to further explore the formulation that is before us. Because I think that reflects a lot of work that was invested. If we go that road, we'll have to invest some efforts that we could not do until now.

My comments here, in regard to this -- and having prepared the previous draft -- is that, in my third draft, I -- this kind of compromise I saw was that we would have a section with the key issues documenting divergent views, including the issue of institutional mechanism. And the recommendations would be to only restrict to those issues that at least seem to have consensus. So that would be some kind of compromise. We document divergence here. And I think here that's another kind of compromise that is being sought. Because we would up recognize divergence of views, and the group would offer some non-exhaustive list of recommendations including those that seem to have consensus. But it would add something that would relate to the notion that something institutionally new is needed that was before -- so it would come here. So it's another kind of compromise.

So I think that -- I'd like it to be seen in that light. If, with that, if that would address, let's say, the kind of thought that was sought through another very creative and intelligent way, some other way of trying to come to the compromise.

I have U.S., Switzerland.

U.S., please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thanks, Chair.

So I think before -- I appreciate innovative kind of ways forward and other creative ideas. But I think, before we get there, I wonder, this is -- we've come a long way today over five meetings.

And there's a proposal that's been presented. And I admit I think we've sent emails back to Washington asking -- because there are things in here that are very uncomfortable for us, right? But we're trying.

And I appreciate our Russian colleagues. But I think making -- when the group has come this far, making the request to delete half of what this group has done, our mandate -- and I get that Tunis and WSIS+10 aren't as clear as they should be. But our mandate was to produce recommendations. We've produced recommendations over the course of at least three or four meetings and several trips to Geneva and intersessional work. We thought we had a list that was more or less supported the group. We're being asked to delete half of the list in order to move forward with anything at the last meeting.

And I just -- I think, before we pursue any other options, I would just like to know is there any other member of the working group that is opposed to this? We've heard Russian. We've heard U.K. I can tell you the U.S. is uncomfortable with some of this, but we're willing to kind of pursue this.

I wonder if there any other members of the working group -- we're heard from Cuba. Are there any other members that have concerns with this? I think it would be helpful to understand that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: It's a fair question. Switzerland and then Parminder.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Well, while I'm thinking about a response to the question, I have to admit that, if you look at the new recommendation 12 and you -- perhaps it's my legal mind -- and you apply a systematic and structural interpretation to the rest of the text, it really changes a lot of the meaning and also of the impact of the other recommendations.

It really puts them into a different light.

And I guess that this should be considered very thoroughly by those who are so adamantly proposing institutional options.

Because I don't know if I were to ask my capital what would be the reaction?

So I think we are at the border of what can be really accepted. So it has this effect of changing and also putting the other recommendations in a different light.

And it's different from what we have in our mandate. In the mandate we don't have any reference to institutional approaches, options, or whatever.

That might be implicit for those who have always thought that enhanced cooperation is about that. But it wasn't there. And now it would be here as a consensus recommendation of this working group.

So I think that this is really a probably -- and it's also a consequence that this is a common proposal by the U.K. and Cuba, by the both of them, although Paul presented the other proposal.

it really strikes a balance that is really at the middle of our different positions. So I wouldn't really want that we engage now in many more different discussions. Because this is a proposal which is on the table for being taken. And probably it's the best way we will get this evening.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jorge. At some point I was not clear whether you are supportive or not. But one point that you mentioned that the mandate was not -- I think the mandate we are given allows us to propose anything that the group will find will be useful to further implement, be it through the creation of new things or -- I think the mandate is -- allows us to do anything the group decides to do in which format. They're only expecting from us some context. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chairman. My comment is short. I would still be listening to other views around this approach.

I just wanted to say something around -- non-exhaustive list is not very clear. But I think I wouldn't want to get into that kind of level here. But just wanted to say that I would want to talk about that a bit.

And I'm listening, and I will comment later.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, Egypt.

>>EGYPT: Well, I am -- I'm glad that Parminder also called the phrasing of non-exhaustive. In my mind, I don't know how it translates into a meaningful term in terms of implementation as well and how these recommendations are to be considered further up the line.

Also, coming back to the discussion, maybe it would be helpful for some of us around the table to understand. Because, obviously, some items in the issues section are not making some of us comfortable. Some parts in the recommendations are not making others comfortable. So maybe, if we can just understand -- and this is a question to everyone -- if we can just highlight -- for example, we have heard from Cuba that recommendation number 2 is -- might be problematic for them. Russian Federation have expressed an opinion on recommendations from 5 -- from 4-9.

And the issues sections, the U.K. has expressed view on it as well.

So, if we can just understand where exactly are the problems, if we can highlight the most two items in the recommendations and then issues sections, if we can just highlight these for the discussion so that we know where we're moving.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt. It occurs to me that it might be -- it might facilitate, if we could see on screen -- and I talk to the secretariat -- if we could put the text of those -- so we can see the full -- no, no. I'm meaning that we keep the chapeau. And then we import the text of the recommendations that were there. You understand. So we can see how this new proposal would read in its entirety.

So, after this chapeau, we put except for -- maybe we even keep 2, just to have a look at the text of 2. Because it seems to be the one that would be -- there's a call for deletion. So just to make sure that we understand what is being done.

So thank you.

So the proposal would be then just to -- yes, Juan. Jorge, please. Would you -- please.

"The group recognized that divergent views continue to exist. The group offers the following non-exhaustive list of recommendations." And of course we have to adjust the text for style.

But then it would come one paragraph referring to the high-level characteristics. That's the -- just going through the process. The proposal would be to delete 2. So just put in brackets and maybe even highlight or put in italics so we understand it would not go into the proposal. So the third paragraph would be kept.

It would be first applied duplication of work and improve international fora. You recall I deleted the "existing" that was creating some difficulties. So 4 would be the recommendations addressed institutions and processes to engage in consultation, encourage participation of governments and so on and so forth.

5: Stakeholders to make factual information available.

6: Refers to the opening up of policy-making process to input from all stakeholders.

7: Institutional processes should give appropriate consideration to proposals and encourage results and take into account.

I'm going rapidly but just to have these -- so 8 would also be there.

So here we are referring to things that we would expect to emanate from the development of international Internet-related public policy including regard to capacity building, enable participation of representatives from developing countries,

support the achievement of the SDGs. Development goals including the SDGs. And to take into account the need to promote public and private investment in infrastructure and to increase affordable connectivity.

Next, please.

And also to promote an enabling environment for innovation. We keep multistakeholder fora. This is addressed multistakeholder fora dealing with international Internet-related public policy to balance the stakeholder participation.

And, as I have done previously, I think the intent here is to send a message to institutions like IGF and ICANN that there should be a better balance. And, being a government, I would say that would apply to governments, how government operated. So it's something that is to the benefit of government to have that proposal there. It's not something that could -- it's like -- I'd like us to be very clear about that.

10 would also be there. Capacity development efforts to include and monitor gaps and challenges with a view to develop appropriate solutions. 11: Refer to cooperation on emerging topics.

And then we add 12. That I think Jorge is correct. When we insert 12, everything that goes before acquires a new meaning. Because you are saying that those things are not being exhaustive. It's all there. It's not exhaustive, but we're saying that we should continue to consider how to further implement enhanced cooperation, including the possibility of new institutional approaches within the U.N. I'm not sure whether this would be accepted or not. But then there is that call.

So I think that there is some kind of balance there, in my view, in my personal view.

And I think maybe you see it on screen, it might help people to get a better understanding of that.

I have Nigel. You have requested for the floor.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. I agree with Switzerland. I think this is significant, and I'm not speaking as ICANN here.

I'm just trying to reflect on the million negotiations I've sort of been in. I think that certainly many of us entered this negotiation, if you like, with the wish that this working group would come up with a report that, if you like, would end the debate. With some seriousness. I mean, ending the debate, if you like -- the debate always goes on.

There does come a point where you hope that you can go on and look at something else. It has become clear -- and one was saying in the break that these recommendations -- and I think some of them are important. I don't think they're all absolutely crucial. And, if there's one or two that Russia feels perhaps are needed, I picked out 5 and 8 or something that perhaps aren't germane to what we're discussing, then perhaps they can come out.

I think you'll admit that these recommendations go towards what we're aiming for but don't go the whole way.

But 12, if you like, is very significant. Because what 12 is saying, which is opposite to what many of us have been arguing that there is a case for continuing this debate -- and I know this has been said before. This is a recommendation. It's not in the issues section. It's not saying some people want this debate to continue and others don't want this debate to continue where we were.

This is in the recommendations section, and this is important. And I know we can all say when we go back to capitals we'll be asked. But I know my boss will ask about this because they read these texts. So I think it's significant.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Any further comments? From what I heard, if I didn't misunderstand you, I felt that there's a concern on the part of both Saudi Arabia and Russian Federation in regard to the -- that package I can say that is being proposed here. And then, without wanting to put you on the spot but maybe to understand, do you think there would be any way, if we delete the key issues, to address your concerns working with these recommendations to put some more language there that would accommodate your concern? Or, as you have said, by deleting the key issues, you think that there's no

way to come out of this? So just for us to understand whether it would be feasible to try to work on that. Yes, Saudi.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We should keep the key issues section.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We should keep the key issues section, and we need to treat the recommendation according to our comment yesterday. For example, the recommendation number 3, we've added that in Saudi Arabia, "This process also could (indiscernible) the creation of a suitable framework of mechanisms for enhanced cooperation." And this is now recommendation number 3. So this kind of treatment should be done in order to have a balanced recommendation. As we said yesterday and the day before yesterday. Otherwise, these recommendations are going in a (indiscernible) that focuses on multistakeholder, and when it comes to number 12, we recommend the same recommendation in 2015. So further treatment to the recommendation, according to our comment yesterday and the day before yesterday. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just follow up, just for clarity. You have read the text you wish to have there, but now we say the possibility of "new institutional approaches in the U.N." Don't you think that this could address your concern in -- it's a different way of saying things but in a more, let's say, subtle way but you -- yes. Do you want to comment?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, we believe that if we delete the key issue section and just leave this one, it will really give the wrong signal. It's really, you know, changed the whole picture of our discussion. And it doesn't bring the value. So what kind of institutional mechanism? In what case? In what format? "Within U.N. system" in kind of words here. IGF is in U.N. system. In what respect? So it's -- it's not a discussion really. It's -- there's not really a discussion. And when we take the whole recommendations, yes, of course, there is some issues but what we discuss it was -- all this recommendation goes to like 5% of the scope of our discussion, and where is this 95%? So it's just going out. So we take the baby with the water. Everything is gone.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, one thing I'd like to comment here is that in my opinion, and just my personal opinion but also on the basis of the experience of working the context of the U.N. and others, if you have that kind of language, "governments and all stakeholders continue to consider how to further implement, including the possibility of new institutional approaches within the U.N.," we are not addressing the issue exactly in the way you want. It is a very general statement. But that allows you to result of this to keep the discussion alive. Otherwise, you have nothing to refer to -- we go back to square zero. You see, it's -- it's something that sometimes in text you know better than me because you've been around also for -- sometimes we have some kind of ambiguity in people's language, but that allows you to pursue your objectives without clearly undermining others. So I think that may be the kind of ambiguous creativity that we need at this point -- at this stage to get out of this stalemate. Just consider that with this, it doesn't take away from you the (indiscernible) to say that the group entertains, in general terms but an idea that you are pushing forward without being so explicit because this will not certainly be accepted but you have pushed the group to a point in which everybody stretch a little bit. It's bound at least to accommodate something that is important for you. Maybe I -- if you

could see under that (indiscernible) just as a recommendation. Are there any other comments? Yes, Timea.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. First of all, thank you for all of you for this effort for, you know, trying to reach compromise. We've really come a long way. However, on behalf of the business members that I represent, I have a comment to make regarding point 12, proposed point 12. In the way that it is now written on the screen with the two square brackets, "institutional approaches within the U.N. system," that would be something that we cannot support in this form. Perhaps we could say "new innovative approaches." That would be something we could live with. But in this -- in this form, as it's written here, I don't think our members would be able to support that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So, I mean, I really appreciate that this offer was brought to the table. In kind of going around, it sounds like one member has a concern related to losing the previous section and that that -- some of their concerns related to these recommendations need to be addressed. Sounds like another member has some concerns with the formulation which I share, to be up front. I think, though, that there's a way forward using this. I think perhaps, and that if we just have a little time to come up with maybe some creative word choices or way to assuage concerns, qualifiers, I don't know. But I think that during our last break we moved maybe further than we did in the previous 5 or maybe 18 months. But maybe if we have a break where we can address the concerns raised by a member related to that and the concern raised by Timea related to paragraph 12, and maybe we can figure out a way forward. I just think that that might be our best approach at this time. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Chair. Yes, I think so as well. We have been close to our borders to accept what we can accept. I also do believe that recommendation 12, as Switzerland said before, it changes the whole thing. It is like my same -- my same reading.

And the final point I want to make is that the way it is written now, as Timea said, for us as well, is a little bit problematic. That within the U.N. system in particular. If it stays like that, it's (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, one thing I'd like to suggest then, following up on Justin's suggestion, we take -- I think we should all at this late hour, in spite of the late hour, try to make our very last attempt to walk an extra mile to achieve -- to try to see if we can get consensus, is to allow for that (indiscernible) to proceed. The secretariat has just checked and we want to make sure, because we're meeting there -- this room, the room 1058 will be available so people could move there, more comfortably sit around and try to talk, if the group find it's feasible and helpful. I'd like to concur with Justin that we should make that last effort, since in this very formal, informally formal way we -- there seems to be some progress. Maybe we can try to do a little more (indiscernible) in that regard.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, not everyone would be there.

>> I think you should take a show of hands.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: But it's better than to stalemate.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: In groups like this. Okay. Well, the room is available. If you want to go there, it will be there. Just -- yes, just do it. Okay. Do the way you find better to. Okay. So we suspend for 15 minutes. Okay.

[Break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I invite you to take a seat, so we can resume our meeting.

I have been talking to different members and observers that have participated in the latest round of informal consultations. I understand a few other formulations have been explored. However, it is not clear to me whether that -- those -- whether those discussions have helped us to advance.

So I would maybe request anyone who had participated to provide some more detail in order for us to be appraised and maybe to assess where we are after that latest round of consultations. Would anyone who has been involved like to comment on this? I understand the starting point was the proposal we have on screen, which was the proposal emanating from a joint U.K., Cuba effort.

There were some issues that were brought in regard to this. First of all, in regard to deletion of the key issues part, there was an objection from some members in that regard. And also there was a concern about paragraph 12, how -- there was an objection to the way it was drafted.

I'd like to maybe have some -- if someone could share. And we can take stock of what has been done so we can move on and decide what would be the outcome of this group.

Yes, Paul. Would you like maybe to kick start?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. So, yeah, there have been some further informal consultations. We think that we did make some really good progress an hour or so ago when we were looking at this new idea on the screen. And we really welcome the support that it's had from all around the table.

But, at the end of our last discussion around this table, it seems to us there were two sticking points.

We heard concern from the business community particularly in the way in which 12 is drafted and concern from Russia particularly that the way the diverse views being presented or not presented, et cetera.

These seem to us to be the, if you like, the final two obstacles that we just needed to get over. And we had some consultations to see if we could find solutions, some creative solutions to get over these final two hurdles.

I think a lot of my colleagues who I spoke to were really, I think, pushing themselves as far as they could and stretching the lines that we've all been given as far as they could stretch in order to find a solution.

In the conversations that I've had, I'm not sure if we will be able to bridge it. However, the proposals that were offered are still on the table. And we would hope that it's not too late. But, at this stage, after the consultations that I've been aware of, I will be fairly pessimistic. But it would be good to hear - that's just to kick us off maybe. Good to hear from others around the table what their perspective is. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, I don't see people wanting to speak.

Yes, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think just because it's almost 20 until 10:00, to be clear -- and I asked this question earlier -- can we just be clear what members of the working group oppose moving forward on this approach? I think it's an important question at this point to understand who opposes moving forward with discussions on the approach that has been presented. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The question refers to the language that appears on screen. Just appeared. To be clear.

>>UNITED STATES: There is, I think, a couple of modifications that could be made to assuage concerns that have been raised. But I don't think that we're talking about a couple of language modifications. There seems to be more deeper, more kind of broad general concerns with this approach. And I think we're getting to the point where we just have to understand where the lines are and who opposes moving forward with this. Because it's important to understand -- if there is any potential to get to a final report at this time, then we need to be clear about what the objections are at this time. And so my question is simple. Who opposes this approach right now?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, just don't want to repeat myself, you know. Because, when we come to what we have now on the table, we have a number of recommendations, without key issues and diverse views and the story of the disagreement.

And, when we see this number, we see almost all these recommendations on consensus. Why we're selling these as consensus when they're not and we have to get into the consensus during the normal session. We didn't come to the text that agreed, agreed, agreed. It hasn't been agreed. So it's not consensus.

So what is our point? First, that don't call non-consensus as consensus. This is the first point. That's why we asked to delete them or we asked to deal with them as another status of one group of participants point of view in another chapter of the report.

In other cases, do we have the balanced text of recommendation out? We don't see the balance. We see these -- the -- I would say 95% of multistakeholder approach. And we have only one recommendation with the slight approach to say something about intergovernmental. But we don't have any on governments. We don't have any on intergovernmental. We have in the institutional approach in the brackets. That's it.

So it's not a balance.

So we all here during the discussion. We know the discussion. So it's not something new for us what we have discussed. We discussed that the point with the approach in Tunis Agenda how we see it in 35, how we see it in 68, how we see it in 69, how we make the practical change on the governments enabling them on equal footing to make their role and responsibilities in international public policy issues in consultations with other stakeholders. This was the point of our discussion. And now we have at the table the number of recommendations with any words about this role. And not only the role, because role already exists in the Tunis Agenda. About any wording in an approach to reflect how this role will be practically implemented. How, where, who will do this? What organization? In what format? Nothing, nothing. We really welcome the report what was done by our Chair. Because, eventually, a lot of our delegates said that the report was good and the key issues session was good. Why we delete it? Why we delete it? We don't understand. How can the person at the U.N. who will read understand the point of discussion?

>>UNITED STATES: Can I ask a follow-up. Just a follow-up. The concern is that some of the recommendations aren't consensus recommendations. So could I ask which ones -- which recommendations -- because there's none of these that you believe are consensus?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: No. I repeat. 1, 2, 3 --

>>UNITED STATES: That's the old one.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, and let's try 12.

>>UNITED STATES: Can we -- so -- but can I just ask what is the objection to institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policy -- and this is just the first one -- should engage in mutual consultation for sharing knowledge for mutual benefit and taking advantage of successful approaches in regard to procedural and participatory interventions, best practice, and lesson learned?

I just -- I -- and I ask this -- I'm not trying to be difficult -- well, I'm trying to get to a resolution here.

But my question is: I understand the concerns. And I think we all understand each other's positions. I don't know how this violates Russia's long-standing position.

This seems like, whatever institution that you favor, however you favor that it's structured, that these are recommendations that really should be encouraged. And we -- that we promote within the U.N. system as good management practice, best practices, things of that nature. We promote outside the U.N. system.

So I think that these are things that we can come around. And I -- so I don't understand why this one -- and there's other ones. I don't understand why the development of international Internet-related public policy should not support the achievement of internationally agreed development goals including the SDGs and help to bridge the digital divide. I think that -- I haven't heard anybody dispute that in the room, so I don't know how that is not a consensus recommendation.

So I'm just trying to understand the concerns now. Because I hear you that maybe we haven't agreed finally to any of these recommendations. Because we always know that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

But, through the course of our conversation, there was a strong sense that this did have consensus report, many of these. So sitting here in the room it's surprising to me to hear that half of these recommendations do not have consensus support. Because I think that that's not the impression I had coming in to this week or even actually coming in to today. So it's surprising.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I should say that there are too many. And to cite 1, we have difference. And you put everything inside 1. And sustainable development goal and everything. You know? And without understanding who do this, how, what roles and responsibilities? Everything is in 1. It's like your garden grew by itself. But it's not like this. Garden will not grow itself. It should be some kind of order.

And we do not have anything about use of intergovernmental format in relevant U.N. organization for development of public policy by government in consultation with all stakeholders. We don't have this. We have it in Tunis Agenda. But we don't have here -- you oppose this. It's to cite Tunis Agenda, you oppose this. Why should we put it here? Let's balance.

Let's balance.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: If I can just jump in and summarize, I think I interpret, if I may -- correct me, if I'm wrong -- what you have said, that you think that proposal has two main problems. One that by eliminating the key issues part, you eliminate the context and history behind what we are meaning. And that the formulation, particularly paragraph 12, that does not adequately reflect your concerns. And so, therefore, the whole balance is affected. I think -- because you have been making the point of the balance. So I would say maybe try to link with that -- there is not a specific objection to some formulations. But the overall package is not acceptable for -- yes. Maybe it's a fair conclusion of what you have said.

Yes, Saudi Arabia. Thank you for waiting in line.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And highlight what UNGA said in its resolution, ensure the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders. Comment diverse views and expertise. So respect not only a member of this working group to decide on this recommendation which will go to all member states. Others also have a say.

So, if we came at this late point and we asked what members have views, I think this is a dangerous term that we are having here.

We were very clear from the beginning that we have some comment on a number of recommendations, as it was said by Russia. If you go and read the rest -- copy was circulated by the secretariat --all recommendations have comments

and questions.

So this is an issue of bringing those recommendations as an agreed concept, which I think is difficult. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: In regard to that, I think this is my understanding. I -- maybe Peter, correct me, if I'm wrong. But we have established a group. So the -- my understanding is that the group -- the members, they have equal status because they are independently coming from government or have equal status. And, when we talk about the consensus, we are aiming at consensus from the group.

We decided in our method of work, in line with what was expected by the General Assembly, to have inclusive participation, inclusive from observers. And I think you may agree with me, I do not differentiate in the course of the discussion statements coming from members or observers. I try -- and I think we achieved that. So but -- but I also want to be very clear about one thing: if we came to a point in which there would be some differences, it would be up to the members, designated members, participating members to decide. Even if some observer group would be against, it would be up to the members to decide.

If they oppose the observer -- if member states, I think that would be, let's say, some kind of artificial consensus because it would go up to CSTD, to Peter. The problem will be there anyway.

So I think it's in our best interests to bring on board or to make sure that everyone, member and observer, member states are taking into account. And, wishfully, all stakeholders from all. But, just to make sure that, strictly from a procedural point of view, our final decision would lie in the members' hands, if that would be the case to come to a point we'd have to make such a decision. But I hope this would not be the case. Because, otherwise, we'd not be solving the problem. We'd just be pushing the problem to someone else. Yes, Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Well, as everyone knows, I believe in always being able to find a path forward. So I have an idea. I'm not saying it's a good one. It's just an idea. I could understand that when you count and you count from 1 to 11, and there are -- there seems to be an imbalance in the number and maybe even an imbalance in the number of words because some of the recommendations have subpoints, that it can convey visually and even intellectually a message that some may be uncomfortable with. And I have an idea. There's some recommendations that at least from the small business perspective and particularly from developing countries I think are taken care of elsewhere. That is, I think it might be useful to repeat some of the language, but I'm not sure that it is actually brand new language that doesn't exist elsewhere. And when I look at 4, for instance, if I look only at B in 4 and the new language in B, it would read, "Encourage and facilitate the full participation of governments as well as other stakeholders in their respective roles and responsibilities when considering international Internet-related public policy issues." It would give more visibility to the recognition of the full participation of governments. It mentions -- as well as other stakeholders but it also includes the language, "in their respective roles and responsibilities." If I took out the A and C, I'm not actually sure that this is -- C is an aspirational statement to me. When it says that everyone should reach out

proactively to all stakeholders informing in a meaningful way, that's even difficult to explain about what the action would be that we're expecting to happen.

So I'm not saying anybody else would agree, but I am suggesting that if we pulled out B and we had only B in 4, the focus would be on the full participation of governments and use the words, "in their respective roles." So that's one idea.

On 8, I must say, I think this is -- I think the language in 8 is largely elsewhere. And it's good language and from a business perspective we might really -- I'm speaking again only from small business, we might really like to see it, but I would just like us to ask ourselves, hypothetically, if we changed 4, if we could consider changing 4, and we removed 8, as you ask, would that help to shift the balance of focus?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. I thank you for this attempt. But I think the points that were made by both Russia and Saudi Arabia do not address exactly those points. I think it's more -- but one thing I would like to, maybe at this point very directly address a question to I think four participants that have expressed strong concerns. Russia, Saudi Arabia in regard to this and ICC Basis and European Union with regard to paragraph 12. Do you think, is there a way to fix this by addressing some language and try to accommodate your concerns but working on that basis, because I think this reflects the state of what we have been trying to work around. Would there be some way to address your concerns there? Maybe I will just give you some time to think. Turn first to ICC Basis and European Union because you have raised objection to 12. How do you think we could fix 12 if there is a way to fix it? Yes. If you will.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Okay. We could be within the U.N. and elsewhere or delete this completely, I think. Say new institutional approaches as such.

But since I have the floor, Chair, I would like to say that if -- if the proposal is to strike out half of the resolutions that we already have agreed, which is kind of the progress that this working group made (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So just to stay on 12, maybe if we say within and outside the U.N. system that would address your concerns?

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Maybe our colleagues would have other ideas.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. ICC is going to comment on that. Within and outside the U.N. would meet your concerns.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Maybe it could be but as we said before, the way it's said now it's -- for us, it's not acceptable. If we work around maybe striking the last two comments that are in brackets now altogether or say "new and innovative approaches," maybe --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: To be very frank, because we are at the very last meeting, I don't see, frankly, why there are objections, because we are saying "institutional approaches within the U.N. system." That can mean many things. IGF is an institutional approach developed under the U.N. The consideration of this

working group is an institutional approach developed within the U.N. So I cannot understand why there should be some particular concern about that. But maybe there are things that I'm not seeing from my perspective, my naive perspective, and other goals that I can't see, but I think it's comprehensive enough, it isn't prescriptive. It doesn't say it will be excluded because I think this is the concern of business, that it will be excluded. It doesn't say it. So I'm leaving just something to think about. And if I can turn maybe to Russia and Saudi Arabia, I'll come back to poll for comments. Is there a way you think it could fix that? Is there some language that could be inserted there that could address your concerns?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: As I said before, that's -- I already thought I see this language very weak because it's definitely IGF. IGF can be -- everybody supported and what add value we propose. That was my -- my first speech. Why we need new IGF really to think we need another one at IGF.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, no.

>> No, no, no.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: New institutional approach, we are saying something new from what we have.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, we have a lot of stuff here, and don't push us to say that we're against sustainable development. We are not against. But we think that mandate is enhanced cooperation and enhanced cooperation, 69, 70, 71, there is nothing about sustainable development. We're not against sustainable development goals, but we want something -- if you --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, that's something I'd like maybe to have some clarity. What is that something on your -- that if we add here could make the text acceptable.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, I can read it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I already "Recommend wider use in governmental format -- or formats and relevant U.N. organizations for development of international Internet-related public policies by governments in consultation with other stakeholders."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Could ask maybe to repeat? I'm not sure we should insert that, but just to make -- to have clarity on what you mean, maybe I ask the secretariat and you can dictate it.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: "Recommend -- recommend wider use intergovernmental formats and relevant U.N. organizations," yeah. "For development of international Internet-related public policies by governments in consultations with all stakeholders." This is from Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Now, I think it's very clear now. Thank you for this. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Chair. This is one option by Russia. Another option is to have a general debate in UNGA, as we said yesterday. So chapeau, "Recommends to the UNGA on annual debate on enhanced cooperation (indiscernible). Recommend to UNGA to establish an annual debate on enhanced

cooperation to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities. Their roles and responsibilities within the international Internet public policy issue to the Internet."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So okay. Thank you. So those would be the additions that, from your perspective, would allow for this text to be accepted.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, plus revising the text as Russia said, the existing recommendations. Because we commented yesterday and before yesterday. So we should do originally the current -- (indiscernible) the recommendation as Russia said. We're not against sustainable development, but recommendation should focus on the mandate. So this, and we do (indiscernible) language with the mandate of the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just for clarity -- so first of all, I think it would not be out. It would be bis proposal from you and 12ter from Saudi Arabia. And in addition to this then we should work around the other recommendations by deleting I think some of -- or moving to some other part of the text.

Well, I'm doing this just because it's very important for us to also have clarity in regard to what are the options seen by the different participants for accepting the text. I see we really are very -- differences remain very big. Does anyone -- Paul, you wanted to take the floor before that. Sorry to keep you waiting.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah. This is new, so I want time to give it proper attention. Question for clarification from Russia. Is there intention that we would have 12bis as well as all the other existing recommendations? So is the package that I presented at the beginning of the evening plus this new suggestion from Russia, is that what they are proposing? Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Or as an alternative. Yes, I was interpreting bis but maybe yes, Russia. Yes. Okay.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, yes, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, first of all, it is our proposal and you think it will be acceptable for you to make it in the package.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: I still don't understand. Are you suggesting that we keep recommendations 1-12 plus your new recommendation? And the report without the key issues? I mean, I -- I don't know what's being proposed really.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Oh. What we propose we haven't changed, you know, the idea of key summary, key issues. Because as we said before, this is the main idea, to explain our point of view, to give our view.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, I got confused myself because I thought that would be something added there, but to maintain the integrity of what was there, so the key issues would be removed. But I understand that would come in addition to retaining the key issues. Yeah, it's a bit confusing.

So just for clarity, because when I asked you, I asked in relation to the proposal to delete key issues how you thought you could accept that proposed deleting key issues. So you suggested 12bis. But if I maybe also I had the same understanding that now you are saying 12bis plus retaining the key issues.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We have different discussions also in the key issues and that was the -- the idea to modify key issues. So is it still on the table there to modify key issues? To come to the equal views?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, yes. I don't know if you have any follow-up.

>>UNITED STATES: So I just -- and this is with all due respect. I think that many members in this working group have very different views, and most members have been coming together, and I say this, I think, Russia has been not wanting to go along with that agreement. I think that now, with this proposal, is the first time I've seen today a potential compromise on these issues coming from the Russian Federation. So I could speculate on what might be acceptable or might not be, but I would ask that since this is a time when Russia has put the proposal on the table, I think it would be helpful to be clear on what the proposal is. What is this being added to and what is the rest of the package. And that's not having any prejudgment on views on this paragraph. But I just think it's -- for the sake of kind of openness, what is the proposal.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Germany.

>>GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. Factual question to Russia. I would like to know where the wording comes from in the Tunis document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Maybe Parminder, I think you were waiting in line before I turned to Russia. Do you want to intervene?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Actually I think that exchange is more important what --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'll do that later on. Please, let's -- I'll do that when I ask Russia to reply.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I think Russia and the U.S. discussion right now is more important. But if they're considering it, I think we can do some stretching around 12 which should satisfy people. And just asking Russia the problem with 12bis -- not the problem, but I understand that they do not want 12 to be used to curtail the role of any existing institution in public policymaking related to the Internet. So -- but the problem with bis is, we are saying use wider use of existing intergovernmental format and organizations which is what the other group has always been saying, that UNESCO is doing public policy and UNCTAD is doing public policy and we just now come and say that all them carry on doing it is not what we were really agreeing on here because that system of public policy making is what so called other group has been saying. So we always have been looking at the new institutional mechanism. And that has been, I mean, Russia's approach, Russia's statement as well in this -- the contributions as well.

So I think the concern that Russia may have can be put into 12 without changing so many things by saying "including using current institutions" because current institutions is something I think U.S., U.K.,

and all would also be very happy with. And it may reduce the problem which Russia has with the problem of 12 being limited to only new things.

So we just say, you know, and "within the U.N. system" and another square bracket, "including using existing institutions." We can change the language.

And just last point about key issues, if we can consider whether -- because Russia insists that key issues are important, and I understand why they are, we can reduce it to just two paragraphs. And this also gives more space and this time will give more space to those people who want to put arguments on why institutional mechanisms are not needed, which is actually not said anywhere in this thing. So if these two paragraphs could deal with the key issues but quick two paragraphs and we come to 12 and quickly go through the rest of them and remove any problem we could possibly. Go ahead.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We have many possibilities. I think one, Yulia, one -- I'll come to you later. I'll give the floor first to Cuba that has not participated yet. But, after that, I'll turn to you. Because I think it's important to have the clarification exactly what would be the scope of the proposal. Because it proposed to have -- I called it 12 bis. And now I'm not sure if it's 12 bis or 12 out, if it would replace 12 or if it would be added to 12. If you could clarify that.

And also, by adding this, if you consider that the key issues to be deleted or it should be retained. I think we need clarity exactly to the full package as you see it. So -- and there was a request of information from Germany in regard to the language that is being used whether you are resorting to some agreed language or where that language came from. So before -- so maybe it can have some -- just to keep on your mind.

Cuba, maybe you can add some --

>>CUBA: No, I think it's good to follow your lead. But we only want to say that, in any case, we are fine with the new proposals from Russia and Saudi and Saudi Arabia. You know, it's Saudi Arabia. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: First of all, I can tell only from our proposal. It was not the group proposal.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, your proposal.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I cannot -- I will propose this with a package of that. Because, you know, it's another delegation who made this proposal. So we support it, actually.

Regarding the -- the 12th which was proposed, as I said before, it's too weak. And what we want is just that our point of view should be reflected. And this is only one point where it is reflected, basically.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So replace 12. Not -- because 12 is weak, you're proposing 12 --

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: No, I said what we propose is we propose. It's minimal. Because the only -- the only place we can put it.

That's why we cannot say that we can live without key issues session. We need to keep it.

Probably we need to make it smaller. But for us it's important to keep 16 and 21.

And, you know, the -- our proponents can choose their own word. 1 or 2 or whatever.

12 -- from our point of view, even three of them cannot balance the text. We need to balance it, really. Because we have so many, so many recommendations. At least something to be added for the balance. We don't think we ask for too much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

Well, the same question was raised by Germany. What are the other recommendations that is coming from Tunis Agenda? Is it relevant to Tunis Agenda? So, if we're looking for a balance in the key issues, we should again look for a balance in the recommendation. It's not a balance to have 10 recommendations on one side and two recommendations on the other side. That is not a balance. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I'm not sure where we stand exactly at this point.

U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I'm not sure either. This is, I think -- first of all, I should say we welcome the fact that Russia has suggested something. I feel like we have been compromising a lot today. And it's good to have this step from Russia.

Having been involved in some of the consultations so far, I know that any new recommendation along these lines is going to be very difficult for many people.

So I can only speak for myself. I think I would say that the text from the screen is not something that the U.K. can support.

Having said that, I don't think we object in principle to the idea of a recommendation on the role of intergovernmental organizations. Because we've always said intergovernmental organizations do have a role to play. So it is worth perhaps exploring this. It will be difficult, as I say. I will need to do some delicate work on the text.

Maybe some more informal consultations to look at that would be a good next step.

Maybe another short break for people to just reflect, consult with one another, and maybe look at other options for language.

So, as I say, I welcome this step, don't object in principle to the idea of a recommendation on intergovernmental organizations. Not this one. But perhaps we can explore it further, and it might help take us forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>UNITED STATES: Can I just make a suggestion? Maybe I agree maybe more informals would be useful. We seem to be dancing around roles and responsibilities this whole week. And that language seems to be a hangup, I think. Paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda is what we've been talking about. We've talked about it in certain instances with rights and responsibilities and the role of states and international Internet public policy versus -- but I think 35. And I think that, you know, a proposal like this sounds very similar to 35d. "Intergovernmental organizations have had and continue to have a facilitated role in the coordination of Internet-related public policy issues."

Is that what we're -- are we just trying -- and I'm just trying to understand. To get to a recommendation form of paragraph 35d. And that's just a question I'm just asking to try to understand. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think you're both -- Paul's -- actually, Paul's suggestion, I think, is the road we should take at this point. I regret that we should maybe lose some more time. But I think that is very important. I think, unless we have some more informals, we may get out of the room without clarity of where we stand exactly. Because there are some elements that, for me at least, are not clear. So I think we need maybe some face-to-face and interaction in that regard.

Nigel? Do you want to facilitate this?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Yes, indeed.

No. I -- and no objection to what the U.K. said about having informals and the U.S. and very useful indeed. And, of course, willing to explore any recommendation on intergovernmental organizations. That's not a problem.

But I -- I just -- I think we need to be clear. Because, if we are going to have this sort of recommendation, I don't quite understand how it fits with what we were crafting earlier, which was a recommendation that we should have a continuing process and perhaps new sort of approaches in sort of outside institutional or U.N. bodies. So is it -- I think perhaps this was asked before. But, if this is a replacement for that -- and Marilyn also referenced the paragraph that already has the Tunis Agenda reference in. Paragraph 4, recommendation 4 where you have those three. I think we need to be clear where this fits before we carry on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So let's break for those informals. I'd like just to suggest to the secretariat. After 12b keeping a shorter version of key issues, I'd like just to document also what was said by -- so we keep -- the proposal is to keep at least paragraph 16 and 21. I think to have clarity on what is meant by a shorter version of the key issues. At least paragraph 16 and 21.

And, if we can have some printed copies of this part, I think that will help for those informals.

And so we will resume as soon as possible. In 10 minutes. And I'd like colleagues then to join in those informals.

[Break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Colleagues, I'd like to invite you to take our seats. We're going to resume our informal discussion on the report. The secretariat will put on screen the latest version of a proposal that is under consideration to -- for comments and deliberation on the part of this working group.

Thank you. So here we have on screen a text that has been considered by the different parties with a view to try to see if with that the different concerns expressed could be addressed. May I request the representative of the U.K. to introduce the text.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. So, very briefly, we've had some further consultations. As we said, we've welcomed the fact that Russia made a proposal. And we were not, in principle, against the idea of referring to international organizations. We felt the proposal that they made was very substantially rewriting the Tunis Agenda.

So what we've suggested is to go back to the Tunis Agenda, the language which we think is very good language and has been agreed as a summit for many years.

So we propose that, regarding the new recommendations, recommendation 12 would say "recommend that governments and all stakeholders continue to consider how to further implement enhanced cooperation."

Recommendation 12 bis is a response to the Russian suggestion of talking about intergovernmental organizations. The second half of that sentence is a direct quote, word for word, from paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda. "Recommend that intergovernmental organizations should continue to have a facilitating role in the coordination of Internet-related public policy issues."

That's an exact quote.

And then we heard the concern about having diverse views represented. We are very, very concerned about -- well, this issue as a whole and also the lack of the need for balance.

So we have suggested two sentences, which we think are balanced. The first one comes from paragraph 16 of the draft report that was circulated this afternoon.

The second one is new text which we think summarizes the other view.

And we propose that that should be inserted instead of the whole section that currently exists on key issues.

And we have -- I would say had some quite difficult discussions amongst ourselves about how far we can push the process. I hope that we have responded positively to try and find a way forward.

And we would as this late hour hope that we can find consensus using this language. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I just request a clarification on one part of the proposal? And I should have raised it before when the first proposal to delete the key issues part was presented.

As we go through the key issues section of the document, there are a number of paragraphs that address the way some discussions developed within the group and some consensus that was achieved. For example, paragraph 9 refers to the -- relates to the part of our mandate that requested us to consider, for previous processes and documents, paragraph 10 that the group decided to consider in its entirety Tunis Agenda, paragraph 11 also has some formulation that was accepted in previous rounds.

So the question is: Because I see, including many of those paragraphs were before what we call the introduction part. So I tend to think that those two paragraphs referring to diverse views will replace the paragraphs in the key issues that refer to the difference, how we want to address diverging views, particularly in regard to institutional mechanism. But the others could be retained. Because they do not, let's say, would not impact on the discussion we have had so far.

Can I have that clarification, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you.

Well, to be completely honest, we haven't really discussed that in any of the consultations. I think it's a very good point that you raise. Because the first four paragraphs of the key issues section are not really about the diverse views. They're about the further -- the previous work that's been done and other things.

So my personal suggestion would be that we keep the first four paragraphs, 9, 10, 11, and 12. And what is on the screen would replace paragraphs 13-23, because paragraphs 13-23 are the ones that talk about diverse issues. That would be my suggestion now, personally. But, as I say, that hasn't been discussed and would need the support of the group for that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Anyway, I think this -- we can elaborate in case the rest of the package and the proposals as a whole can be accepted by others. May I ask for reactions on that proposal that is on the table? Russian Federation?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I would like to stress that it's not the point of view of the Russian Federation only. It's the group of participants of the working group.

And, first, we would like to say, if we agree on the only Tunis Agenda language and if our partners check the proposed language by us saying that it's not Tunis, first proposal, we ask, you know, to change the whole recommendations to put them into Tunis language.

All wording about stakeholders should go with their respective roles and responsibilities in order not to lose the Tunis understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each of the stakeholders. Is it acceptable? Then we would like to add, before the recommendations, that -- "and with no contradictions with Tunis Agenda." So because we need to evaluate each and every recommendation

with the Tunis Agenda. And, if we see -- we didn't see it now. But, if we see any contradiction -- we need to avoid any interpretations in the favor of contradictions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just for clarification, this would come in the chapeau language.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah. In the chapeau.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So the group offers the following non-exhaustive list of recommendations that should be implemented with no contradiction or something maybe.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Here is the recommendations. When it comes to the correct wording of the process and development of international public policies or enhanced cooperation, always if we take it into -- please, secretariat -- always. If we have this, we need to put also according to Tunis Agenda.

In accordance with Tunis Agenda.

That's to narrow the interpretation.

Then when it comes to the diverse view, as we said before from the very beginning, we think that this is the main -- the main important point that our -- you should be reflected. And we said that at the minimum number 16 and number 21 should be reflected. And what we see now, we don't see 21 and we would like to find the explanation why it is deleted. And we also would like to find the explanation why -- why 16 also not in the -- in the same language. Because it's our point of view, it's our view, it's our opinion, and it should be reflected in our interpretation and in our wording. Don't change it. You can use any wording to explain your position, but our position should be as was presented in the contribution.

>> As usual.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: As usual. Paul knows, we always discuss it. We draft our opinion. You draft your opinion. No problem. And we -- now we understand that 21 is out of the board and 16 now in a shorter version.

>> (Off microphone).

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: And 16 is important point. We do not agree with any -- well, compilation with this text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Maybe could I try to summarize, maybe if I understood. Yulia, please, correct me. So the point you raised maybe could be addressed if in the chapeau of the section of the -- maybe you have this three-page document that starts with recommendations. So if we say, "The group is organized that divergent views continue to exist. The group offered the following non-exhaustive list of recommendations that should be implemented in accordance with the Tunis Agenda and with no contradiction, because this would apply to each and every recommendation." So I think this is one of the points you made.

The second point would be recommendation 12 to follow the same language as in the Tunis Agenda because we are saying there. So we should revisit this to make sure it goes with Tunis Agenda.

And in regard to the diversity text proposed you would -- in line with what you said before, since the first part refers to paragraph 16 that was in my proposal, you suggest to take the full text that was in paragraph 16 and also to include what was in paragraph 21 that refers to there was a discussion on needs to, yes, take profit -- take advantage of discussion in GA and -- I think maybe this would summarize the points you have raised. Yes. So it is -- is that a basis for a deal? I think we are maybe getting closer to something that could be acceptable. Yes, Cuba. I must say I do not see maybe -- because we are moving to the key issue spot so it's not -- the reference to the discussion we had on the - - in GA, so that's the draft. The call to do it in accordance with (indiscernible) seems to me very appropriate, of course. But it is, let's say, an additional reassurance you are seeing that everything -- all the recommendations will be there. So I -- yes. Yes, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. It's only a question for clarification on the first thing you said, which was about including the phrase "in accordance with their rights and responsibilities" or something after stakeholders. To my count in the recommendations the word "stakeholder" is used nine times in different contexts. Is the proposal that we should use that phrase, "roles and responsibilities" nine times or -- because sometimes it seems to me completely unnecessary. Or are there particular paragraphs where you want to insert that phrase in the recommendation? Thank you.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, we are working with the (indiscernible) solution, basically. And that's why even if it's not ideal from the harmony point of view but we want it to be in every recommendation.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Maybe this is something we could look at when we look at each context. I have Cuba and Parminder. I don't know in which order. Cuba first. Yes, please go ahead.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. We want to make two comments. The first comment is that as we talked even before very early, some hours ago, we defended the view that every diverse views from the delegation should be taken into consideration in one way or another. We thought that the way forward was through the proposal we made jointly with U.K. to move it into the recommendation but, of course, this does not mean that we deny the right of any delegation to put their views in the way they see fit. And I think that's the way that it should be. Each delegation should have that right.

And having said that, I then want to talk about the language of paragraph 12, that I think that it really is a -- a step back, in our view, from the one that we proposed. And I think this is totally watered down. It doesn't have any meaning at all. And it's totally unacceptable. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I actually have wanted to say almost exactly what Cuba expressed, but then to put it in a positive language rather than an acceptability of it. The acceptability of it would simply be to just still put that comma and say "including the possibility of new institutional

approaches." Now, why I say that is that is something which U.K. and U.S. and others had agreed. Now, I don't see just for the cost of putting recommend that in which they have already agreed is just cut paste of 35 -- 35 language, what does bringing this in, why does it require removing that part which is -- which is comma, "including the possibility of new institutional approaches?" This part is something which is neutral between all the institutional approaches people have been proposing, whether it's an existing one, it's a new one. I understand Russia wants it there. I understand the sensitivity about some roles may not go from existing institutions. Fine. But it's just something which we already know. And this is nothing new. So we would like just to put comma because that part was instrumental to break a deadlock which happened here on 5:30. That was a big deadlock. We broke it, and I thank everybody who worked on it. By this small thing which was saying that "including new institutional approaches."

That is now gone, so all these adjustments are being done around some progress which has now been taken back so that those things, therefore, do not have a meaning. And I don't think that's really big, so please put that comma back and put that phrase back and I think we are talking then.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So just for clarity, I think I maybe should have asked the secretariat to put on screen to have clarity of what we are saying here. So just for clarity, what Cuba and Parminder said is that recommendation 12 would be okay but provided it would keep the same version that was previously worked by -- jointly by U.K. and Cuba. So it would say, "including the possibility of new institutional approaches within the U.N. system," or as amended by the -- "within and outside the U.N. system." Maybe just to have clarity on that. And then -- okay. Because I'm doing this because I want when we get out of the room to know exactly what was discussed and what were the options it was. So may I -- secretariat is still working on that. I'm not saying we are negotiating, I just want to reflect on the screen things that are being said here. So -- okay. And then in diverse views please after the first paragraph just add that Russia requested to amend with the full version of paragraph 16 as in the Chair's draft and also asked to include paragraph 21 from the same Chair's draft.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, I'm not negotiating. I just want to reflect on screen because otherwise, we will look -- I'm just thinking maybe now from the point of view of the report. And finally, just add just very up front there, at the beginning of the text, for recommendation Russian Federation asks that in the chapeau a reference be made to the needs implementation of recommendations in accordance with the Tunis Agenda.

>> And stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Ah, yes, yes. Be made -- no, no. Please, please, follow what I'm telling you, please. Be made to the needs to implement recommendations in accordance with the Tunis Agenda, and that every time the words "stakeholder" appears should be followed by "in their respective roles and responsibilities."

So I'm doing just for the record because otherwise we may lose sight of things that are being said here. I see Germany requesting the floor.

>>GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two remarks. One, again, guided by the search function of my smartphone there are five appearances of "roles and responsibilities" in the Tunis Agenda whereas there are 38 appearances of "stakeholders." So even the Tunis Agenda is not so generous with the distribution of "roles and responsibilities." I just wanted to caution a little bit regarding our drafting.

On the other hand, and general terms I was also part of internal negotiations between different stakeholders here. I feel that at least from our German point of view we have already given a lot. We are in a dynamic process. We at this stage answered a proposal by another party, and for very good reasons we could not accept at least us the longer version of para 12. It was already bracketed, and we discussed it in detail. And we really see no need, after having moved so far and having made so many concessions, that we detail paragraph 12, which is under a chapeau saying that this is only the beginning of a process and non-exhaustive list and so on and so forth. So I would really plead that all delegations accept this very open paragraph 12. For my part, I do not see space of maneuver for making concessions here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see -- maybe I'll just give the floor to people who have not yet spoken. I have European Union and then Iran, and then I revert to the U.S.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes, thank you very much, Chair. The discussion before was that we should have no key issues. Instead of that, a small chapeau, and that is why in compensation to that we accepted 12 with the brackets. Still the text was in brackets. So now what I see is that we go back to that text, although which we accepted that there would be two paragraphs explaining the condescending views. So I don't see what we're doing here. We're going backwards. I mean, we're in a worse -- I really don't see what we're doing here.

>> (Off microphone).

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, unfortunately step by step the text is diluted. And from the beginning of the negotiations, at least member states and groups suggested at least 150 recommendations. Unfortunately, all of the recommendations led up to now. And also we distance from the Tunis Agenda. Just the previous recommendation 12, we discussed under a new mechanism within the U.N. system and we hope that we compromise on that. And right now 12 has changed. So it's not acceptable for us. Yes. Right now it is written in the U.N. system. If it could be compromise, it's in the U.N. system, 12 is acceptable for us recommendation. But for the rest of the recommendations, we should go back to the Tunis Agenda.

The Tunis Agenda is our roadmap in negotiations. And it's not acceptable for us to any break time we go back with the new paragraph and new language. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

So, as I've said, I think we've tried to be flexible and compromising. I also think that we've tried to consolidate viewpoints maybe amongst the group and come to the negotiating table in good faith and offer compromises.

I think my frustration right now is that we had reached, I felt, some compromises with one group. There was one member that had some concerns. We went and tried to address those concerns. And now we're back here with everything back on the table.

I see coordination happening. But I guess that coordination is just let's bring everything back. And I feel like at 12:30 we're playing games. I think the time for games are over. I'm being frank. I'm sorry. But I think the time for games are over. I think we were narrowing in on a text that I think everybody could have lived with. I really do. But now there's a dozen new proposals on the table, including more roles and responsibilities, qualifiers than was in the Tunis Agenda in this text. And we're being asked to accept that, and this is the minimum? I just -- I find this -- I -- there's limits to how far we can go, and I think we're up against that. And I really think it's unfortunate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Saudi Arabia, do you want to take the floor on this? After that, I'll try to sum up.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We share the views expressed by Russia. And we wonder -- we had another 12 that speaks about UNGA general debate. We didn't see it now. So kindly clarify the status of that recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Well, I think we -- there is the point we have come. And the Chair should recognize that there will be no group support. I don't see a way to bridge at this point differences that still -- that are still very wide apart

I must say that have been discussed in different groups between participants. And I think maybe one -- one of the reasons why I think we cannot have agreement is that I think that the starting point for positions are -- there's not -- and this has been identified as one problem about this exercise. There's not a common understanding of even what is the purpose of the exercise.

For some enhanced cooperation is a tool; for some it is a mechanism. So, therefore, what seems to be a compromise for some is not seen as a compromise for the others.

I see both sides. I have been discussing both sides, I should say, very transparently in my capacity as Chair. And I see both sides are convinced they're making compromises.

It's strange. It's the kind of situation in which, when you talk to one, you see from the rationale that is followed a compromise has been made. I see, for example, on the part of those who oppose mechanisms like new mechanisms like to get out of this exercise with some meaningful recommendations.

And I stress it's meaningful, because I think those would be meaningful recommendations. It is a compromise to accept reference to divergence of views and to have text that will explicitly make reference to institutional mechanisms as something that was entertained by others because -- it's a

compromise. And I can understand from their perspective really understand their paper. But for others who are those who defend new mechanisms, it's far below what they would expect as a minimum not to have something even in, certainly, I think for the key issues part of -- that they would consider it as something fair to be there. And I think all of us can agree the discussion should be documented there. But I also think something should be there also on the recommendation, either through some agreed language that everybody could accept, that through a hint, at least give a hint of that possibility or to have the kind of some said this and some said that. And for that I really feel that for some parties, the need to have this new mechanism is so strong or is so -- there's such -- there is -- the cost of not having it in the recommendation does not compensate for them to have -- not to have a report.

And I think the opposite is also true.

So, frankly speaking, I don't see how to overcome this at this very late hour. Maybe if we had some many, many rounds, if we were at the U.N. so we could postpone it until next year and come back to this. But in the context we work with a very strict deadline. And, as was said, it was half past midnight. And I'm not sure -- well, I'm sure -- I'm convinced we'll not be able to bridge those differences. Because I think some formulations that have been explored in good faith on the one side when presented to others, they do not meet their concerns and the other way around.

So I, frankly, don't -- as a Chair, I feel at a loss. Maybe I can relate to my other colleagues' experience and maybe seek some advice on how to proceed.

But, at this point, I really feel we could call it a night and congratulate ourselves at least for having been here in a collegial way. But, other than that, I -- unfortunately, I think we should recognize we have come to the end of our exercise.

Peter, I invite you, please.

>>PETER MAJOR: First of all, Chairman, I think you did your best. And we are very grateful to you. You had your patience. You tried everything. And we have to admit that as far we could go this time. And I stress the word "this time." I'm still hopeful that we can proceed somewhere. Not today, not tomorrow. Eventually, it will come -- there will be a time. That should come.

So I really want to congratulate you, because you did a tremendous job. And I think it was a very good learning curve for all of us. Let me put it that way. We learned a lot from that. We learned a lot from that.

And probably it will come back to the CSTD during the annual meeting, which I'm looking forward to.

And I am sure that you're also looking forward to this meeting.

Probably we won't be able to finish by half past midnight but a bit later. But, having said that, I am -- we have to admit that's how far we could go. And, basically, I'm really sorry. Because I was very hopeful when I proposed to have the informal meetings and it seemed to be very promising for some time. We have to admit that the differences are so great that we can't overcome them.

So I really want to thank all of you who came to this meeting and stayed for so long.

It's really a surprise to me that we are so humorous here at this table. Full of hope. Or lost hopes. I'm not sure.

And what I can tell that -- let's try next time.

So thank you. And I still offer a round of applause.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for all of you. It's a bit awkward in such circumstances. But, anyway, I appreciate your recognition of the work we have done. I can assure you we -- I did my best. But I think sometimes it's -- that's a reality that sometimes it's not possible under the present circumstances to do it.

I really hope, Peter, that we can -- I think it might be difficult to resume this same cycle of work once again after having two rounds that could not lead to the expected result. But I feel confident that maybe in different circumstances -- because sometimes it's about a good time for everyone to be ready to come and reach compromise. Maybe some -- even the development of technology. And, as we have been saying, things are happening elsewhere. So that maybe at some point we realize we need to have something in place that can meet everyone's concerns.

So one thing I'd like just to make sure that I may adjust with your help to make sure that, when you get out the door, we have a clear understanding of what takes place now. I understand that the secretariat has a deadline that by Monday to produce a report. So it will not be the group's report. It will be a chairman's report, chairman's summary or -- summary. Summary, I think is the technical.

So, just for clarity, I will probably or certainly rely very much on what was in my latest or maybe not in the latest but in these documents I have produced, particularly the two drafts trying to picture what has taken place in the most fair way. I know the status will not be the same as a group's report. But I want, nonetheless, to be as fair and honest to make sure it captures the reflection of what took place. The UNGA and CSTD will take it from there. We'll have a discussion on this. And I cannot participate on what will be the outcome. Probably take note of the report. Probably more of a procedural thing than substantive discussion there.

But maybe Ms. Sirimanne will elaborate a little bit on that.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: First of all, this was a long haul. And the way you handled this discussion was exemplary. And we are really like to have you as the Chair. So I'd like to thank you. I also like to show -- it was quite disappointing to us as the secretariat. This is the second time. It would be good to have some kind of outcome document. I don't think, for me, this is one of the huge issues of Internet out there. I don't think we have actually much.

But, unfortunately, we -- this is the time, as you said.

I don't know when the time is going to be because I think it will be quite difficult to again and again meet and come to the same conclusion, basically, come to an inconclusion and then go away and come back again. I'm not sure whether the taxpayer's money should be spent on this kind of activity. Just like to let you know that.

We'll all see you in May. And we will have a discussion, of course, and take note of this report. It will be the same like the last time. Similar procedure. Just taking note of the Chair's summary. And then we move forward.

So --

>> Bring some food.

[Laughter]

>> Chair.

>>CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes.

>>MARILYN CADE: It's Marilyn. I would like to thank not only the Chair, but I would also like to thank the secretariat and all of the absolutely fabulous support that all of you have given to all of us. So I hope you are feeling like we know you were with us.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Same for the work you did for us.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, just to say obviously very disappointed. But also thankful, as Marilyn said, for all the support and for your chairmanship of this group and for the issues that we've explored. It's a shame we haven't reached agreement. But thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. As many have said, your work, your patience with us has been extraordinary. And I am ever grateful. And, contrary to the discussion we had at our last meeting where people went home because we had achieved nothing, I'm sad that we haven't achieved our report. But, frankly, I have learned tremendous amount of things in these five meetings, not only on the points of views of others but how this whole issue is all-encompassing of so many other issues.

This is not lost. This will continue to flourish in some way, shape, or form. And for this I am grateful that I was given an opportunity to join this group.

The other thing I would like to also echo is a big thank you to the secretariat who has been so supportive and so very helpful for all of us in setting up the Webcast and the participation. And, finally, a huge, huge thank you to ICANN for having funded the transcriptions. Because I think that those transcripts are going to be used in academic papers for decades to come. And I am ever grateful about that, because that means that our work is going to continue to live on. And the discussions here -- what we've been debating -- will be fully transparent to everybody out there.

And so I do hope that in the Chair's summary, all of this material is referenced effectively. I understand that most of your report is already written. And it's basically paragraphs 1-8 of our current draft, which, you know, define our -- the working methods and all that.

And then to link these documents, I think, will be a precious resource for decades to come. So, despite the fact that we don't have a report, I have a bit of a sense of satisfaction of the work that was done nonetheless. Thank you very much to all of you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Does Cuba want to take the floor? And then Russian Federation.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. After giving the warmest congratulations to you for the way that you have conducted the work and also to give my respect to the rest of the colleagues here present, I want to read a draft declaration of Cuba that it will be -- it's been very draftily prepared. But it will be sent to you afterwards in the original language, official language in Spanish.

So I'm going to read a quick translation.

"Cuba regrets that the working group has not complied with the mandate agreed upon by the high-level meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the general review of the implementation of the results of the World Summit on the Information Society. During the four working sessions of the working group, it was made evident that the position of some of its members against agreements and recommendations for the creation of mechanisms or institutional spaces within the United Nations system that allow the strengthening of cooperation and enable governments on an equal footing to carry out the roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues as detailed on paragraph 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda.

In defending the role of multilateralism and re-affirming the position that the Cuban government, to fulfill the international agreed commitments at the level of heads of states within the United Nations, I wish to stress that Cuba will continue to promote the debate on Internet governance with the end that the same will be multilateral, transparent, and democratic and with participation of all actors in accordance with their respective roles and responsibilities as it has been agreed in the World Summit on the Information Society."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I would like to say thank you for everybody, everyone who's still here. And we -- a lot of people were trying hard to proceed the result. And we believe that we were really close to the result. We really needed to go just one step forward. But we -- well, we stopped. And even the respective roles and responsibilities became our barrier.

However, we do not blame anyone. Because we really have diverse views. And these diverse views were really fundamental. And it goes, you know, for the understanding of the mandate and the understanding on the Tunis Agenda. Its vision, its language. And, really, the diverse views represented is fundamental. And, as Canada said, yeah, it's -- if someone reads the transcript here understand that

it's -- well, it's -- it's a big issue. It's really a big issue. That's why -- of course, it's regret to say that those diverse views were not reflected in the report because we think the major point and the major fruitful going forward is to reflect on these diverse views of all the members of the working group.

However, we have -- we always have something. Sometimes results on the paper. Sometimes results in our health in our hearts.

And thank you, Chair, because you are really professional, really patient, really calm. And you support the discussion for the very last mile.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Sweden. And Saudi Arabia.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I would just like to join others in thanking you, Chair, for your efforts and the whole group for your efforts in trying to reach a result in a formal report recommendations. Unfortunately, we didn't reach that.

Could I also be a little superficial and ask if I could take a photo of you on Twitter? Is that okay? Just say if you're not okay. That's fine.

Swedish representation's Twitter account.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. You have to undertake to send a copy to everyone.

Yes, I have Saudi Arabia next. Yes, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Well, special thanks to you, Mr. Chairman. You are, indeed, a very good man, a good leader. I mean, I've known you since a very long time, especially during the discussion happened in New York, 2015, during the (indiscernible) Event. Your views, thoughts were really guided. And we really respect you. I feel here we're in one family. We see each other in many meetings. Not only CSTD. So I look forward to seeing other delegates around Geneva. We show every respect to their views, position. We understand that we came from different backgrounds and with different perspective. But we in the future look for the full implementation of the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So, if I think, if no one wishes to take the floor any more, just then I think I'll have a final word just to thank you for the very kind and generous words that are addressed to me.

I would -- I thank you deeply for that. I would trade those words for a successful outcome document, if I could. But, anyway, it's something that will give me satisfaction, the satisfaction of having participated in this exercise of having chaired this group. I think it was something unique and something very special.

Of course, I think we may have missed an opportunity to, as someone said, to put another brick in the wall and to make some difference.

But I can understand being a diplomate and knowing that each one comes from -- you have instructions. You have your position. And this should be respected, of course. We tried to bridge difference and achieve consensus, but it's not always that it's possible.

So I'd like to thank you all for your participation. It will be remiss on my part not to thank the secretariat through Shamika Sirimanne and her team. Claudia. And I'm sorry if I miss all the names. Those were the ones that were -- Dong, of course, and many others. The translators that are not any more with us and all the staff that was supporting the meeting.

So with this I'd like then to -- I do not have the gavel. It's there, but then the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[Applause]