

**Transcript Second Meeting Working Group on Enhanced
Cooperation
6-8 November 2013
Geneva, Switzerland**

Day 2

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

7 November, 2013
10:00 a.m.
Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please take your seats. I'm happy to see you. You seem to be fresh and ready to work, even though it's a beautiful day outside. So I would like to give you a short summary of what we have done yesterday and what I propose for today.

So yesterday we started with the introductory remarks and the most important part is the mandate we have so everybody is aware of the mandate and I would like to continue our work in this spirit. We also agreed on the modalities of the work, that is, we are going to base our discussions on the contributions and we have a document to help us, that is the summary, or the analysis of responses. Which there was an attempt to streamline and downsize the contributions.

We also agreed that we are going to discuss the questions in groups, and we had a very good discussion on Group 1 which was about enhanced cooperation, meaning significance and degree of implementation. And there was a kind of agreement that we can we may consider it as the glass half full, half empty. I expressed my wish that we approach in an optimistic way, that is, the glass is full -- half full, and we are going to make it complete. That is our task.

In the second group we had public policy issues, mechanisms, and question pertaining to the IGF. And there was a proposal to map different issues. There was a voluntary task force which promised me to have the document by this morning, and I'm happy to report to you that the document has been prepared. So I congratulate to the participants of this voluntary task group and they have done a great job.

So after that in the afternoon we discussed the questions pertaining to Group 3, which is about the role of the stakeholders, especially the governments. I sensed a kind of agreement on the multistakeholder approach. Naturally there was -- there were divergences as to the interpretation, what it means. Some said that the role of government may be underestimated or even belittled, and there was some discussion about the interpretation of the Tunis Agenda. It is also felt that the Internet seems changing and it has changed rapidly since 2005 and there are emerging issues, and these emerging issues also create public policy issues.

So basically I think that's what -- where we stopped yesterday. I think we had a very good and constructive discussion and what is very important to me, that there was a kind of mutual trust. So I really congratulate you for this very constructive approach.

Now, we have the document. I think it will be made available shortly, which was prepared by the voluntary task group. What I propose is just to go over the document. I don't really want to have detailed discussion of the document because I think it's rather complex and it needs further consideration and probably some members of the group would like to take it back to capital and discuss it with other stakeholders or other colleagues back home. So what I propose, once we go through the document, we try and concentrate on Group 4 and 5 questions and eventually, depending upon the discussions we are going to have, we may request the Secretariat to prepare a kind of more elaborate document, a detailed one, in the style we had for the analysis of the responses. And probably this background document may be made available eventually for our next meeting, depending, naturally on us, when we decide to have our next meeting. And this is also depending on where we are going to stop tomorrow at 6:00.

So this is my proposal, and I'm just asking the Secretariat if the document is available. So we need five minutes. So in the meantime, I suggest to you that we start discussing Group 4. But before we're doing that, I would like to ask you if you have any comments, remarks, observations, questions, whatever. If not, I would like to ask you to look into the questions in Group 4. They're all of the developing countries, and probably we may continue discussions in five minutes with that. And we may come back to the document after the coffee break which will be, as we agreed yesterday, at 11:15.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You're still reading or would you like to continue? It's up to you. If you need some more time. But I think we can start the discussions. Unfortunately, it seems to me that we have some technical problems for the remote participants. The microphone doesn't seem to be working. So I would like to ask remote participants in case they want to contribute -- eventually -- I believe they can see the captioning. And they can send in written form. Okay. So they can't hear but they can talk. Okay. Good. Okay. So we are going to discuss Group 4, issues related to developing countries. I can see Carlos.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Good morning. It's just information, and I don't know if this is already known but in the summary the responses to the questionnaire by APC are not actually theirs. The ones that are quoted as APC, according to the APC itself, are from the Best Bits responses to the questionnaire. This is just information.

The second thing that I would like to note is that most of the quotations in the summary are from developing countries and interesting that I think the emphasis should be more on the opinion of the developing countries than the developed countries themselves. No big deal, but I think it's a bit unbalanced. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos, for this contribution. I believe we tried to make the group balanced, and probably in the room we have representatives who can contribute in this sense and I really encourage everyone to contribute in general and specifically to these questions we are discussing now. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Distinguished Chair, Excellencies, Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, Jimson Olufuye is my name. Good morning. As you know, I am the chair of the Africa ICT Alliance with the alliance of ICT, private sector groups, institutions throughout Africa. We started last year to bring together the voice of the private sector, and as of now there are about 12 African countries involved that is truly a private sector organizations, the ICT industry groups. I myself, I used to be the president of the Information Technology Industry Association of Nigeria, up to 2011.

While talking about developing countries, can be enhanced to effectively contribute to the discussion. I would like to say simply that Africa in particular is very much aware of the impact of Internet to its relevance to development right now and as Democratic Republic of Congo nation in the submission that we need to be very careful with regard to the new mechanism and trying to know -- I want to be aware of the current deliverables and possibilities.

So within that understanding, several other states in Africa came together last week with many of the ministers across Africa, we came together. We were in Tegali with regard to transform Africa and they came out with the manifesto that talks about Smart Africa, Smart Africa manifesto. And there's one principle in that manifesto which I found very, very interesting with regard to our government, what's the intention of our government, is that they are going to put private sector first in all their discussions. The manifesto is available with me, I will share it if so required. The African government felt that all stakeholders should be involved in the socioeconomic development of the continent. The summit was shared by His Excellency, president Paul Kagame and was co-hosted by ITU, Dr. Hamadoun Toure, and as I said six other African head of states dealt with many, many stuff. So that is the direction that everybody should be involved at all level of discussion. And in fact, I was privileged because I'm visiting Abuja and I was preparing for this meeting that I have to come to be part of it, as I have the privilege of leading the private sector ICT group for Africa.

So when we discuss enhanced cooperation, as we have seen in the mapping, there are a lot of dimensions. Africa needs more engagement, (indiscernible) in the current situations, and also not to take any mood out to drop the momentum that has been contributed positively to the development we're witnessing on the African continent. That's what I want to contribute for the start. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. And I think it's very important what you have said and very instructive for us. I can see Grace.

>> GRACE GITHAIGA: I think this is a very important question to discuss because I was just looking at the other contributions even to the questionnaire and there was very little participation from African governments. In fact, I don't even think there was. And Africa, being, you know, a continent with I don't know 50 countries, it's really outstanding that they did not participate.

When it comes to issues of like IGF, national IGF, I know, for example, in Kenya it's been accused of just being a talk shop and not contributing practical solutions to the process. So just thinking about the role of developing countries and how it can be made more effective, I think I would want to support what APC suggested, that we have seen developing countries be excluded at different levels. But also self-exclude. So, you know, addressing this problem is actually not trivial. So the way in which Internet governance for development has been conceived and addressed in IGF and in other global spaces has not been useful. It's been seen as narrow and top-down and often does not go beyond access issues. So probably we need to start thinking of a distributed structure of Internet governance that is well-defined with aims and policies that may resolve this problem and make it obvious to developing countries that the process is worth our time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Grace. If I've got you right, raising issues is one of the things you think we should be doing. It's very useful. We are heading toward some kind of recommendation. I think that's a better way to go ahead. Baher, and then I see Iran. and Virat. Yes, Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. I'm Baher Esmat with ICANN. On the question of developing countries, I think the responses -- or many of the responses that came to the questionnaire illustrated, you know, some of the efforts in building capacities in developing countries, whether in the global space of Internet governance and Internet policy issues or even within the technical space. In the past years -- and being, you know, myself I come from a developing countries -- we've seen a lot of capacity-building initiatives undertaken by Internet organizations, particularly Internet Society and the regional Internet registries in cooperation with national institutes and technical organizations, national technical organizations such as ccTLD, ccTLD managers and areas like IPv6, DNS -- DNS and DNSSEC and so forth. So this is one area that there is, I think, clear recognition of progress made that --

and also for a need for further development and improvement and more sort of engagement in that regard.

The other aspect is the national and regional IGFs also in the past couple of years have seen development and progress made in this area. I've been part of one of regional IGFs, the (indiscernible) IGFs, for the past couple of years. We've had two successful annual meetings. We managed to -- we as community managed to attract participation from the global Internet community in the Arab region, particularly from civil society and end user community. And I'm sure that in other parts of the world there have been success stories about national regional IGFs. I think the good thing about the IGFs like the global IGF itself, it provided the platform for the Internet community in developing countries to engage in discussions about Internet policies. This is something that is not often provided at national level in many -- in many countries.

Still on capacity building and on the IGF in particular, in the last IGF meeting in Bali we've seen a special track for capacity building in that meeting. We've also seen a daily session, orientation session for newcomers trying to explain, you know, concepts and trends in the Internet governance space, and the feedback we've heard in Bali and afterwards about this session -- about those sessions was very positive.

One last remark on developing countries and the sort of enhanced cooperation development in developing countries, the issue of language or the multilingualization aspect of Internet governance, and I understand that there are maybe a couple of questions that deal with this, this aspect separately. But I would like to note that one sort of remark that we often hear from participants in the Arab region is about lack of materials and lack of tools in the Arabic language, for instance, that could encourage and help more participation and get more people to participate in Internet governance fora. This is -- this could cover a range of issues from making materials available in different languages, making tools available in different languages, and also maybe trying to develop a glossary of terms, Internet governance terms in different languages. And one of the recent initiatives that UNESCO, together with ICANN and The Internet Society are undertaking, is to develop a glossary of Internet governance terms in Arabic language. And the announcement of this initiative was made in Bali a couple of weeks ago, and the three organizations will start working on the project in the next couple of weeks and we hope by mid next year we'll have a draft product for discussing these terms. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher. Then I think it was Iran who wants the floor first and then Virat.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. Regarding Question 10, or this group of questions, I think we need to reply to a primary question first. If the developing countries have a role in global Internet governance and then ask how this role can be made more effective, according to what we have received from developing countries

through questionnaire and what we heard in the room, many steps should be taken to consider the developing countries has a role in global Internet governance.

I believe there is somehow a link between responses to Question 10 and 3. We need to look at what developing countries reply to Question 3. If their responses to Question 3 shows a good extent of enhanced cooperation has been implemented, then we can say they have a role. But as we have seen, the response is different. If we want to hear how this role, which has not been established to be made more effective, it can be done by implementing the Tunis Agenda. Especially paragraph 35, 69, and 68. Participation of developing countries in global Internet governance cannot be done only through participation in dialogues or discussions. That's global level. It's their sovereign rights that has to be exercised, according to paragraph 35a of Tunis Agenda. I believe that investment, technical cooperation, education, capacity building, and so on are necessary but not the main factor in this regard, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. From the replies that have been received, it is quite clear that -- as my colleague stated some time back, that many of the replies that have been quoted are from the developing countries. But, in fact, the substantive issues have been highlighted by those who have contributed from the developing countries.

First, if you turn to the Tunis Agenda, Section 3 through 28 are devoted to the issue of financing. I know comments have been made about how important financing is of infrastructure. But if you read through the documents, sir, I would urge that nearly a third of the entire Tunis Agenda not only concentrates on the lack of financing as a major issue but, in fact, lays that as a precursor to the Internet governance issues that begin after Section 28. In fact, it also recognizes in Section 13 that til recently and in the past, public financing was being used for building infrastructure. But that is no longer the case and private sector investments are required.

So I would argue, sir, and submit to you that financial investments in infrastructure in a world where merely 40% has access to online services of which Africa at 16% and Asia-Pacific at 32% of the citizens is particularly underserved is a significant and major issue as we discuss the entire proposition of enhanced cooperation.

Thank you, an ITU report of 2013 shows that the gender distribution and access of online services is much better than it was when mobile services were penetrating the world. In terms of online access, 37% or 1.3 billion women and 41% men or approximately 1.5 billion men have access to online services totaling to a total of 2.7 billion online people and about 40% households across the world.

If you turn to the responses that have been given beyond the point of investment beyond the private sector and the contributions of the technical communities to reduce the cost of access by

constantly innovating technologies as well as mutual discussions between carriers to reduce the cost of interconnection and international cable bandwidth, you would see that the IGF both at local and regional levels have received a thumbs-up from nearly across the board from all the communities who have responded. Two from India, Internet Democracy Project and SFLC have been particularly clear about the need and the importance of the idea of processes and the issues that lead to free speech where developing countries are concerned.

I would just wrap up by submitting to you in India we have, after hosting the first IGF in 2008, initiated a program to link together multistakeholder groups on a common platform in 2012. It was an informal initiative, a first step to a formal IGF. It was attended by nearly 400 plus stakeholders, 12 bandwidth sessions across two days, 60 speakers. And they covered everything including access but also free speech, issues of capacity-building, net neutrality, and many others which are specific to India but have a linkage to the global five themes of the IGF.

This year we congratulate the government of India which has called in a formal process for a national MAG that has been formulated, and we expect that that meeting will be called soon.

We also hope that more developing countries will generate local IGFs and issues such as enhanced cooperation are those that are represented by stakeholders at global fora would be discussed nationally and that there would be sufficient opportunity for developing country citizens to participate in a forum such as this through the domestic engagement and also in the global IGFs such as the one that will occur in Istanbul next year.

It is not easy for everybody to travel. Each of these cost between 3,000 to \$5,000. And so I think the emphasis that has been provided in the questionnaires and the responses of national IGFs as a formal process for not only a dialogue but also development of policy eventually is an excellent step, something that we support and hopefully will participate in actively in the future. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. Very useful thoughts and very elaborate intervention. One remark, the IGF in Hyderabad was the third one. Was preceded by Athens and Rio. (saying name) was the first one, and this was a great IGF.

Parminder.

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

Developing countries have a host of problems, and I would focus on the issue of the mandate of this working group which is, in my understanding, international public policy making processes and the extent or absence of developing countries in international public policy making.

For that purpose, I would separate the technical processes -- technical policy development processes, ICANNs and regional RIRs, which have their own problems, but that's not what I think primarily we are dealing with here.

I would also exclude the (indiscernible) dialect processes, which is the IGF, which has its own issues about developing country participation. But that again is not the principal purpose of this working group's deliberations, and the principle purpose is international public policy making processes.

And to understand where developing countries stand in this regard, we have to understand what are the current processes of international public policy making with respect to the Internet. Where does the international public policy making take place? If we understand that, we probably can comment on whether developing countries participate or whether participation has to be improved. Again, removing the technical policy side.

We need to focus, what is it that development of public policy making is taking place? And it is my summation that it takes place -- (echo).

Is it okay? It's okay now. Yes.

>> (speaker off microphone).

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: So it is either made by the big countries, which is where the biggest international -- Internet business is. Concentrated. And by default, it then gets reflected in the global Internet business. And that is take-it-or-leave-it policy for the whole developing world. That's where public policy making takes place, largely in the U.S. in that case.

Secondly, it takes place in rich country clubs like the OECD. OECD, as you all know, has a very strong Internet policy making organ which is called the Committee on Computers, Information and Communications Policy. It is an emerging platform, does public policy development.

However, I'm very surprised that when that particular Internet policy mechanism is so active and the most active of the OECD parties, the logic is used at the global level that there is not enough public policy issues to be dealt by a divergent mechanism. That escapes my understanding. But in any case, that's where a lot of public policy making takes place. And as you probably all know recently, OECD developed the Principles for Internet Public Policy Making. That is public policy by its own name. Principles for Internet public policy were developed by an intergovernmental process through advisory structures. The same which was India's (indiscernible) proposal which was rubbished on the global level. Exactly the same processes developed public policy principles. And, importantly, they did not develop it only for the OECD.

The real intention is to see global adoption of these policy principles. And it is almost formal that it has been sought that country to country, the goal was to say, okay, why don't you agree to these principles because these principles already exist.

And that's not a new model. We all know about the Budapest cybercrime conference and the convention. There are a lot of mechanisms which tried to pursue developing countries to sign on

by saying it is a good instrument and it is already existing so why don't you just sign it. It is a good instrument, I accept, and you can sign on it. But the process of such kind of exclusive policy making takes place.

The (indiscernible) process is a similar one, which a certain number of countries decides certain principles and then we have a bigger country -- group of countries which are cooped, et cetera, et cetera. I think we need to understand where global public policy making takes place and what is the role of developing countries. More or less, they don't exist. They are sold well-prepared governance and a policy framework as take it or leave it.

And being on the global grid of the Internet, there is not much option for countries not to accept what is increasing because most of the richest countries have the dominant model.

I think what we need to focus on is that this is where public policy making takes place and where developing countries are with that and what is needed to be improved in that respect.

Therefore, I would easily say if OECD's CCICP is one of the principle organs for global public policy making, it should be inclusive of all countries. If it actually does become inclusive of all countries, that's precisely the proposal which India gave to the U.N. two years back. There is no difference between that model and the global model which India proposed.

So I think we need to focus on where public policy making takes place and the role of developing countries.

And capacity-building, yes, is very important. But as we know in WIPO and WTO areas, capacity-building has to be seen as separate from the participation issue. They are two different issues and should not be seen together. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Sweden, then Brazil, and India.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning to all colleagues. I agree with what has been mentioned before, that it's primarily a task for developing countries to define what are the main public policy issues of relevance to them and also, of course, to assess to what extent they feel that they can participate in existing global foras that deals with these issues.

However, I just wanted to respond a little bit to what Jimson said because we certainly think that it was very encouraging to see the Smart Africa manifesto and some of the -- some of the areas that were identified there such as access, the access issue, accountability, accountability in the sense of better communication between government and citizens, better communication between government and private sector which leads to improved functioning of the society, improvement of democratic system and the enabling environment for the private sector which I think also was highlighted very much.

We just want to say that we see that as very encouraging and a sign of a number of developing countries playing a role and taking up a role in Internet -- related to Internet governance issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Brazil, please.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is an issue for Brazil that's very dear. Usually we -- as we look into our participation in Internet governance, we used to say there are two basic parameters for our initiatives. One of them is our full adherence to the multistakeholder model. This is something that is very embedded in our positions and have strong reference to the model we embrace nationally.

And the second one is the development by nation of issues that we also seek to highlight. And we are, of course, aware that the problems around participation of developing countries in Internet governance fora are not exclusive to Internet governance. It relates to development, the problems related to the condition of development: Financial constraints, lack of personal capacity-building.

As has been stated before, each of these should be looked into its own merit and deserves specific answers and initiatives. And it affects all stakeholders. It affects governments. It affects civil society. It affects -- as we look into a room which we could adequately face multistakeholder participation, but we clearly see lack of participation from developing countries at all levels, the governance, civil society. (indiscernible). It is of concern to us because it has an impact even for the agenda setting of discussions.

I will give an example. I participated in the IGF meeting in Baku, and I thought it was productive and very important for my own understanding of the process. This was my first IGF. But I was a bit frustrated by a discussion we had. There was a session that was termed "development issues," issues of concern for developing countries.

And I was a bit surprised to realize that the most important topic on the discussion was how to expand in the developing world the new generic top-level domains. That was the issue. What can be done? Why did not developing countries adhere en masse to this initiative that is so good, so -- that was devised to address developing countries? Why did it not happen? What can be done to address this?

Of course, even some developing countries members took -- had an apologetic tone and said in our case, maybe there was not much awareness about this, what can we do. We need to develop business.

And I took the floor and I said, I feel a bit frustrated because I thought we would be discussing issues that are on the agenda for developing countries that are not only in this forum, like access,

finance, capacity-building. And all of these were not in the discussion. And I tried to provoke a discussion on that. There was no discussion on that. And people started -- again, were: What can we do to foster gTLDs in developing countries? So I think even for the point of your agenda setting, it is important to have developing countries' participation in order to impact on the agenda.

And then it brings me to think how can we reconcile these constraints for participation and that leads sometimes to a call for -- to have a single fora to deal with all the issues since there is difficulty to participate in a multitude of Internet governance-related fora.

So maybe an easy way is to let's make one single place where we can discuss one thing and make decisions for. I don't think that would work to that extent because we, of course, want to make sure we keep in mind a distributed structure of Internet governance that is something that could not be touched and should not be touched upon. But.

How can we reconcile this need for more meaningful participation, involvement with this distributed structure of Internet governance?

For myself, I think one clear answer is to provide some ways in which information could flow more. I think it's important to devise ways in which the lack of physical participation could be compensated by access to relevant outputs, information arising from those fora. I think this would be one way to maybe -- a limited way to address. But, of course, we will not be looking to all -- I seen a number of 150 processes that deal with Internet. So maybe you do not need information on everything that's going on in all fora. But as regards relevant things that are taking place that could impact on developing countries, I think we should devise maybe a friendly user mechanisms in which information could flow better. I think that would be one way to assist.

And from our perspective -- and then we refer to the proposal regarding enhanced cooperation as such, this difficulty regarding participation reinforces our understanding and our conviction that we need some platform that would enable for discussion of issues related to Internet governance in a holistic, integrated manner. I think this would be an additional benefit besides filling a gap in the overall structure. That would also assist developing countries, but participation enables to have a more comprehensive view of issues.

Even if this platform, I think how that should be devised, would it lead to decision-making or would it be of a more informative and policy discussion, this is something we should maybe evolve discussion. But, clearly, there is a need for a place in which such a discussion could take place.

And I would see an additional benefit regarding this as a tool to assist developing countries' participation. And here I mentioned at all levels, not only governments but also stakeholders.

So I think I will stop at this. But I think this issue is very clearly linked to the notion that we need to put in place some structure that will allow -- what issues will be dealt with by this, how this could be addressed. I think it's something for further discussion. But, clearly, we see a need for this as a way to assist and to foster developing countries' participation on Internet governance-related discussions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ambassador. I share your impressions about the Baku meeting when we were confronted with the reality. Reality is always difficult to face.

After that, I think it was India who asked for the floor. And then we have the remote participant, Joy Liddicoat. And then Carlos and Marilyn.

Okay.

So India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to colleagues in the room. Today I think we are confronted with this very important dimension of our discussion. As we see it, there are two key pillars on which we could perhaps look at coming up with some recommendations.

The first pillar is where we are talking about countries or regions or places where there is no access to Internet. That is one dimension of the issue, where if they're not part of this process, there's no question of their seeking any role in the governance eventually.

On that I think we have come up with any number of subproblems within that category. The issues, how do we improve this which is leading to a digital divide of a kind, which in 2005 and 2013/14, I think there were regions that have been left behind. The divide is increasing exponentially. They lag behind in an exponential manner because the speed at which progress on Internet is making would make them deprived for eternity if we do not address that. So that's an important dimension. As a working group, we should look at recommendations under which I think very eminent suggestions have come earlier. The speakers mentioned about the need for financing. How do we touch upon the issue? Should we make recommendations on that? Secondly, whether capacity-building in terms of the latest technology transfers or training programs, et cetera.

Then coming to the other side of it, wherever there is access to Internet, then the second challenge is those regions and countries respective of the origin, in this case largely we are talking about developing countries, whether they have any significant role in Internet governance-related policies at the international level. I think there's the second challenge.

If you are looking at the later part of it, I think we are about to discover that we are all wanting to be part of a process through a mechanism but that mechanism at the international -- or global level is not present.

We have forums for discussion. We have forums for dialogue. But forums where we can actually make a contribution to the extent of being able to decide, again, is something which is lacking. A recognition of this fact has come through in the replies that have been given as well as in our discussions.

I think it will be very important also to touch upon this issue as we make a recommendation, at which point in time then the participation of developing countries in the Internet governance would become a subset of that particular larger recommendation we intend to make.

I think that's where Tunis Agenda has made the recognition that we should maximize the participation of developing countries in Internet governance.

But if we do not even have a structure, then why talk about developing countries? I mean, they are part of the subset of the global community. So I think it remains in a vacuum. If we do not create a structure or a mechanism for effective participation of -- I think it is at all levels. I think as the Ambassador of Brazil very rightly pointed out, this gap exists at all levels, whether it is government, whether it is civil society, private sector, or academia in developing countries. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

I think now the floor is the remote participant. That is Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Can you hear me? Thank you. I wanted to -- (background noise). (indiscernible) -- I see the participation is indiscernible. If the secretariat could advise (indiscernible).

Okay. Thank you.

I wanted to enter a question and just emphasize that while I agree capacity of developing countries necessarily (indiscernible), I think it's very important to remind ourselves in this working group that the (indiscernible) is not conflicting and that (indiscernible) does exist in developing countries and that all (indiscernible). In other words, I think we have seen new leadership and new development from developing countries including India (indiscernible) policy issues. And I would (indiscernible) very strongly that developing countries are part of this and somehow should be (background noise) (indiscernible).

I was thinking of the Human Rights Council with a notion on (indiscernible) --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Joy, I'm sorry to interrupt you.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: The Human Rights Council has been (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We have technical problems. And I think if you can write it down, your contribution, in a brief way, probably the secretariat can read it out and we can take it into

consideration. But I'm sorry, at this point in time, I think the technical problems just prevent us to follow what you're saying. So if you could do us the favor to go to the chat box and write down what you wish to say. Thank you.

I think the next one was Carlos, I believe. No, sorry, sorry, Saudi Arabia. Sorry, sorry. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning to everyone. In regards to Question 10 about the role of developing countries and how can it be more effective in the global Internet governance, as my intervention covered well by some of the previous speakers, however, the sequence of the questions that Number 10 came after the questions that we asked how enhanced cooperation could be implemented to enable governments. And then we said how can enhanced cooperation enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

And when answering this, and even looking at the report, there was many inputs that the missing of having a fora for countries and governments to sit and discuss these important issues in regards to the global Internet governance does not exist.

And with Saudi Arabia, when we came to this question, we already stated the need to be a fora or a platform for governments to discuss these issues. And how can this be made more effective taking into consideration -- into consideration the establishment that this platform is through balanced equal footing participation through all countries.

However, in regards to the international Internet public policy issues, Question 15, that are of special relevance to developing countries, I can list some which is a very important such as multilingualization. This includes the local language content search engines and multilingual e-mail. International Internet connectivity, this includes affordability, Internet exchange points, and differences in the cost of carrying traffic. IPv6 transition, most developing countries have limited fixed line infrastructures, and communications is primarily through wireless technologies. IPv6 is much better suited to mobility than IPv4.

And as has been stated, contributions to capacity-building for Internet governance, this includes financing, training, and support. Developing countries must be involved in the development of public policy and must be able to present their interests in the evolution of the Internet. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I can see Carlos, Marilyn, and I think after this we are going to break and we come back after the coffee break. It's 11:45, and we may continue the discussions on this issue. Carlos, please.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Just basically to complement what Benedicto said besides the example of this issue of gTLDs and the (indiscernible) of discussing the developing issues, et cetera, there's another example which is the famous cybercrime convention of Budapest in which some developed countries got together, drafted a convention (indiscernible) and then came to us,

developing countries, and said look, why don't you sign it? You should sign it. It's a great convention. And we replied no, we didn't -- we don't sign. Why? Because we did not participate in the discussions. Where are the -- where is the equal footing, you know, that we all keep raging about. So these are examples of practices that we have to try and avoid, and really in the convention the question of subsets, developing countries being subsets, I don't think we are subsets. We have to be equals. And the governments of developed countries must, you know, act on an equal footing with us, if they want our participation, those initiatives and structures, et cetera.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Before I go on to make a statement about Question 10, I want to respond to the comment about that particular workshop and a couple of other workshops that are like it. I was, too, fairly disappointed in what I thought came across as a -- what I -- I'm from business, we call that mar com, marketing communications. I didn't like it at all. I didn't think it was within the spirit of what we should have been planning for a particular workshop. And particularly not with a title that it belonged in. However, the Baku IGF overall was filled with rich and interesting issues and workshops and we met in a country in a particularly geographic sub-space that we had never been to before in the IGF. So I just wanted to not lose sight of the -- and to note that as the ambassador said, he was focused on a particular workshop, and I really share the concerns that he expressed.

But I want to go on to say that I think it's actually fair to say that within the IGF we are still working hard on how to thoroughly incorporate the development discussions into the IGF, that that is very much a work in progress. We made progress, but I want to just say I think we can do more. And when we talk later about mechanisms, I will probably say more.

Now I'd like to make a comment about I'm obviously not from a developing country. I live in the United States, or on united.com. I'm not sure which it is. Most of you know that I travel a great deal. I go to many, many different countries and I -- I also teach a course that is a survey course that is attended only by citizens from developing countries, that is focused on cybersecurity, the use of ICT's and disaster remediation, and Internet governance. The course attendees range from system administrators to managers in telecom companies and IPs to regulators to boards of regulatory authorities to people who work for ministries. And in the survey course what I talk about is the Internet governance ecosystem. And I talk about how to get involved in the GAC and how to get involved in the IGF and how to learn about whether there is a national or regional IGF in your country or region and if you're not engaged already, who to reach out to to become involved. I have never had any of the students, the attendees -- there are usually about 22 to 24 -- I have never had a single one of them say I don't want to go to an ICANN meeting. I don't want to go to a national IGF. Instead, they say how can I get involved? How do I find the resources? How do I get my management, whether it's private

sector or government, how do I get them to understand the importance of Internet governance and why it's important to decisions we're making about our country.

So now I'm going to use an analogy. In the days of the narrow band Internet when we coined the words "E-commerce" that was only talked about in very specialized places. Today much of commerce is online in one way or another. We talk about the implications of the online world and about doing business online in a widely distributed number of places. I think for myself that what we need to focus on is strengthening and deepening the awareness about what Internet governance policies are and how you need to participate, both at a national level and to strengthen -- now, some in the room may still at the end of the day think that there is a need for a separate and new. But I hope we don't lose sight of the importance of definitely strengthening and deepening the mechanisms we have now. I'm going to go back to a comment made by Barat (saying name). We need to find more mechanisms to provide initial funding to bring participants from all stakeholder groups, including business from developing countries, into these mechanisms. We can't stop by saying there is no money. My experience is once an NGO or civil society or business or government comes to a couple of meetings, they become much better able to justify the participation and to articulate the value to their management stream. And after a couple of meetings, they're able to then become an ongoing participant and they're also much more able to use online participation when they have a network of colleagues to relate to. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I promised you that we are going to have coffee break, but I also promised yesterday that we are going to have a segment for observers. Now it is your time. So if you have some comments to give, please do.

>>MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Chair. And good morning. Matthew Shears with CTD. Just two very quick points. With regards to the comments that are in the summary document and the comments that have been inputted by participants to this process, speaking as a representative of civil society, there are a significant number and a great diversity of views coming from civil society that have been inputted into this process. Many of those organizations that have submitted comments are from developing countries, or represent developing country interests. And I would like to suggest that many of those views do not recommend, do not suggest that moving to a global mechanism is necessarily the way that is going to particularly solve the issues that developing countries have in dealing with public policy and public policy issues at the international level. So I think it's -- it's a leap, if you will, certainly from civil society inputs to go from a concern about developing country interests at international level to a global mechanism. And I would recommend that people look again at some of those inputs.

I'd like to also very firmly agree with the Brazilian ambassador. This is very much an issue of information sharing. I'm not so sure I'd go so far as to agree with a need for a platform, but certainly there are information sharing platforms that are under development and one is the European Union's new platform that they are establishing for global Internet policy observatory

which I suggest the -- the aim of that is very much what we've been talking about, the need to provide information -- on organizations to provide policy information and to share information globally. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India, I can see you want to take the floor. Let me ask for your indulgence and let's come back and I'll give the floor -- you will be the first after coffee break. So we are going to have a coffee break, up to 50, 10 to 12:00 and come back.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back. You have copies here on the table.

Another thing, we had Joy -- Joy to intervene and we had technical problems. So I'm told by the Secretariat --

[Gavel]

Can I have your attention, please? Thank you. I'm told that the technical problems have been resolved for the remote participation so I suggest you listen to Joy Liddicoat. Joy, the floor is yours.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We can hear you.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. I wanted to make a point in relation to the last discussion.

In particular to emphasize that while it's important to acknowledge the concerns about capacity building for developing countries, and certainly on the (indiscernible). I think it's also very important that this working group acknowledges that developing countries do have many capacities so leadership and a variety of (indiscernible) that are critically needed, not only in relation to the Internet governance fora itself but also in other areas such as in the Human Rights Council, (indiscernible) and leading discussion of the relation of the same human rights as offline as online and I would be very consumed if there was any suggestion in the summary from this meeting which inquired that also civil society from developing countries are of the view that new mechanisms are needed to deal with the variety of -- some variety of issues on the discussion. Often civil society in developing countries provides barriers to existing mechanisms and assume a new mechanism would pose more difficulties. So I think I want to emphasize that point and think more discussion about the particular issues which I believe the changing needs and the mechanism exercise is specific issues which are not adequately covered by existing mechanisms and to understand those issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Before the coffee break I promised India, and I always keep my promises. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Quickly just a small clarification. I think Carlos had referred to subset and the context in which I was mentioning was that the global Internet public policy issues which we will discuss, those are relevant to the developing countries with a subset of that and not the countries a subset of anyone else. So thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think the point is well-taken. Grace, you wanted to take the floor? Okay, please go ahead.

>>GRACE GITHAIGA: Thank you, Chair. In the morning during my contribution I did point out that one way of dealing with this issue of making countries participate in Internet governance would be to have a distributed structure of Internet governance that is well-defined within said processes and then, you know, in a way it will make developing countries know which processes are worth their time. I want to note a number of questionnaire responses emphasized a value of a distributed approach to policy-making. And I think this is very consistent with the assumption that different policy issues may imply different mechanisms and that actors who should be involved -- and which actors should be involved in related policy divisions. So my suggestion is before we start thinking of establishing a new platform, as has been suggested, I think we need to map what the issues are, whether they're being addressed now, whether this is adequate, and whether we need new mechanisms to address them. And I think this is an exercise we started yesterday by compiling a list of issues mentioned in response to Question 4 and my suggestion is that we continue with this process.

And lastly, it would be important for us not to forget that the IGF has been central platform to addressing Internet-related public policy issues, which is truly inclusive in multistakeholder. So before we start building new structures, new mechanisms, perhaps it is time we thought of improving of how -- or how we can strengthen the IGF and what would be needed to implement this improvement as recommended by the previous CSTD working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Grace. It is my understanding that the IGF has made a great progress in this aspect and it's trying to implement the recommendations of the previous working group. Just let me remind you of one of the main recommendations, that is IGF should discuss policy issues in its program and that's actually what has happened during the Bali meeting. There were policy questions which were discussed, and I think the output will be made available to all those who are interested and naturally, including governments, all stakeholders will benefit from this.

I can see Japan, Brazil, Ellen, Virat. So Japan, please.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As other colleagues pointed out in the morning session, in order to increase the participation of developing countries in the global Internet governance, I

think it is very effective to consider under implemented the measures to enable the developing countries to attend the existing international fora dealing with the Internet-related public policy issues such as IGF and to utilize (indiscernible) fora effectively, sufficiently. For example, raising awareness, information sharing, and enhancing remote participation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan. Talking about remote participation, we have one request but I'm not sure if Avri is -- would like to take the floor. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Can I be heard? Yes. I hadn't actually requested the floor, but since I had got it, I had sent a note and basically at that time I was very much (indiscernible) with what Matthew Shears had said and wanted to indicate that civil society from developing regions has its own voice and that voice is conflicted with the new favor of multistakeholder mechanisms, the multistakeholder mechanisms that are existing with perhaps a single or a few other exceptions. And until such time as we concentrate on remote participation that meets current standards, it will be really difficult for these existing mechanisms to reach their full fruition and for people to actually participate in those venues. The technology does exist for supported, very full remote participation, but we need the (indiscernible) and perhaps the financing to make sure that those things exist.

The idea that -- of creation of new structures would help. It's really difficult to understand, as those who present us with new opportunities, for difficulties in participation. We really need to focus on the (indiscernible) we have, especially the IGF, and strengthen them as opposed to dissipating our energy, which is small, in new directions. So I'm really entreating us to really focus on strengthening what we have and truly focusing on making sure that remote participation is really a method of participation for people from developing regions of all sorts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I think your intervention was a good example that remote participation is working indeed. I can see Brazil and then I -- Ellen, you wanted to take the floor, Virat, and Jimson.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I took the floor to complement what was pointed out by Carlos Afonso in which the Budapest convention also provided an example of the need to involve developing countries' participation from the start. He mentioned an important point for us, principle that we follow that usually we do not adhere to an instrument in which we did not participate. But this is not an absolute in itself. Otherwise, we would not adhere to any organization and be global -- regional in which we were not in the initial group. So this is something that we could be flexible about it. But there is a practical reason why we want to be involved in -- especially in global negotiations, because others make sure that the outcomes will be in line also and will be acceptable for us according to our constitutional legal requirements and this is not the case at this convention. As it is now, it would require from us and others to change national legislation. Which is something we might do in case there is national consensus for that, but this is to indicate the need to fully involve in global negotiations some aspects because

otherwise we might be found in a position in which we (indiscernible) at the Budapest convention. We see a lot of (indiscernible) in its purpose in the instruments that we are -- it is difficult for us from the point of view that this would entail internal changes that we are not prepared for the moment to make. And this leads me to indicate and to reinforce the need for developing countries' participation at large, to make sure that the -- and I repeat, the agenda (indiscernible) from the beginning will address also developing countries' concern. And if we think that one of our overall objectives regarding this review, 10-year review, we think largely in terms of outcomes, is that we want to make some substantial input for the millennium development goals follow-up. So I think we should give very serious consideration to mechanisms and ways we can collectively devise to enhance participation because otherwise the input that will come maybe will not correctly address developing countries' participation. And this is one point. And I'm also prompted by the comments that was made by Ms. Grace, I'd say we fully concur with this vision. I'd just like to read out one part, small part of our contribution in which we say, "The discussion of any new suitable framework or mechanisms must be preceded by the assessment of those current arrangements." So that is why we think the mapping is a very -- is a prerequisite to discussion. We need to know what is there, what is on the table, so we can provide for some intervention on what exists and if there are any -- and the second part says, "The discussion of any suitable framework or mechanisms should be guided by the purpose of addressing perceived needs or filling gaps." And to that end, Brazil proposes first to deepen discussion on what we want before discussing how to achieve what we want.

So we -- we really think we need some good information. I think this -- we thank the group that prepared this initial work on the mapping. I think maybe we'll adjust this later on, Mr. Chair, but I think this is a good way forward in providing us with more good information which we can build upon. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. India, this is my intention, that we shall briefly discuss the paper because of the indications of this paper are much greater than to be discussed in a very short time. But before doing that, probably we proceed with the discussion we are having right now. So it is Ellen who asked for the floor followed by Virat and then Jimson and Marilyn. Ellen, please.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. This is Ellen Blackler. I'm one of the business representatives from The Walt Disney Company. I wanted to add something to the discussion so that we continue to be aware of the less formal ways that the community moves to address issues of concern raised by developing countries. Over the past year or two for the discussion at the IGF and other forums, as well as empirical research documenting the availability of content to driving adoption, we and others have put a focus on how to create an environment that encourages locally-relevant content creation. By way of example, at the IGF for the first time there was several sessions on encouraging locally-relevant content that were well attended by participants from developing countries. I attended two sessions, one organized by Google and one organized by Disney and UNESCO, that shared specific best practices in areas that are

necessary to develop a robust content creation environment. The panels addressed a range of issues from developing local hosting capabilities to creating sustainable business models for content creators and other efforts such as the partnership we've developed with the Bandung University in Indonesia to encourage an app development industry by creating a prize contest for a locally-developed app. Attendees at these sessions were engaged and I hope came away with some helpful ideas and information. All of that is an -- activity is an organic response to this concern that we've heard about the need for local content development. And I'd like us to keep in mind the important role of that kind of activity when we talk about ways to address these issues.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen. Virat, you asked for the floor.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to endorse the point made very strongly by the honorable delegate from Brazil about the fact that we need to carefully evaluate first the issues at hand and find out whether there is an existing mechanism to resolve those issues and whether there is an existing home for those. The working group has prepared the list that was circulated earlier and has about 465 word issues listed in what is lovingly called the laundry list. But I can assure you that after we've taken away the duplicates you will still have about 100-plus issues left there. This is based on the estimates that we did yesterday.

It is also important to note that apart from existing homes that might be available by way of existing mechanisms, a large number of these issues are purely domestic, for national governments to resolve. For example, a deep discussion on access and how important that is and whether there is a role for global governments and global stakeholders or whether that's mostly a national issue will have to take place before we discuss the final set of outcomes and mechanisms that are available or need to be made available. So I suppose the task would include both evaluation of this list of issues, whether existing mechanisms and a division between national and global issues. And after that exercise has been completed, we can proceed to have discussions on the options.

The last pass that I wish to submit, Mr. Chairman, is about the IGFs and the fact that the speaker on the -- on the remote participation spoke about technology, and we strongly endorse the fact that this is a group dealing with technology and Internet. We must find ways to ensure a higher level of participation, especially from the developing world in global events using technology because currently it would seem that the use of technology is a fraction of what is possible, if everybody put their minds to it. So whether it's a matter of cost or technology, I think that is an important area of focus. We should note, however, that to ensure participation from the developing worlds the IGFs have been held, including the next two, in the developing world so that cost of stay, travel, et cetera, are lesser than they would be if it was in a capital city of a developed country. So there are some efforts underway. More have to be made. But before we discuss the issue of mechanisms it would be important to allocate them into existing homes and domestic forces global. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Jimson, please.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you. Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen. Well, I just also want to underscore this viewpoint who have been expressed before but to relate it to my own direct experience. First, as far as remote participation, it cannot be overemphasized, the need for us to get it right at every meeting. I recall the last IGF in Bali, well-organized and also I appreciate Chengetai and Steve and the government of Bali. I could not travel, but Baku and Abuja I could still contribute in my sessions, in the workshops. Though I have to wake up 1:30 a.m. until 5:00 a.m. in Abuja to be connected, but, you know, I was so happy. You know, with the webcast I saw everybody clearly. They could hear me. There is some little glitches here and there, but I could send my contribution and it was so beautiful. So we need to strengthen that. It's so important. And I will give that channel for developing nations, countries, for their voices to be heard. And really even in Africa, in our own organization, you know, that spans 12 countries in Africa, we meet every month and we use remote communication to move -- to move on, to communicate.

I also want to recognize or say that really we have some group of people calls SMEs, small and medium enterprises, that generally need to be heard. There's no doubt, to be there physically is better than remote because now you can hear me clearly in this hall than breaking.

So small businesses have challenges in terms of funding. It's not cheap. Virat said it. Many of us agree, it's not cheap. Must have a way or mechanism to enabling this sector of the voices to be heard. Many are willing to be around now, representatives but are not able to. For example, I have to sponsor myself to be here, and it's expensive. So we need to look at, you know, business financing for that. Then more investment in awareness, synergy, and collaboration. For collaboration is so important. Among all stakeholders for different organizations, countries, collaborating together. Even within the countries, collaborating together, creating more awareness so that we can have a grasp of what we have attained already, and that will help a great deal. So that just briefly what I want to add to the discussion on the ground. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. Yes, I can confirm that remote participation has challenges and has costs. But this is probably the way forward to get more people on board. And I was really happy to be with you on the same panel, your being I don't know how many thousands of kilometers away.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yeah, so I was trying to pass on to the mic to any potential speaker because my issue is a little different from the one under discussion. It came to mind because Virat was talking already about already dealing with the questions kind of thing. Since I have the mic, I will make my point.

I think as we have this long list of issues, when we go through, it gives you a good mental map of what kind of things need to be dealt with.

I remind that I and Marilyn were agreeing on some categories of issues which was like already being dealt somewhere. Second was being dealt with but not in a holistic matter in the sense of connecting with other Internet issues. And third was largely not being dealt with anywhere. And the fourth one which Marilyn added which is more of a trend, which is something in the future, and probably policy work is a great focus in that kind of thing.

So once you start kind of bunching --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder, excuse me. We haven't closed the discussion on Group 4. We come back discussing the paper. I'm very sorry about that.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So if anyone would like to contribute to the questions in Group 4, then this is the time to do it. We have had very, very intensive discussion on that, very interesting one, and very constructive one with a lot of proposals, a lot of interesting ideas. And we have to continue to think about these proposals and how to synthesize them into a set of recommendations.

So I'm really happy that this discussion has taken place from so diverse aspects and so diverse points of views.

If you still want to contribute to that one, this is the time to do it.

If not, then we can go to the discussion -- a short discussion of the document which I think will take us to the lunch break. And in the afternoon, after lunch break, I would like to continue with the questions in Group 5. Hopefully, we can finish with Group 5 during this afternoon. And as you know me, I'm always optimistic. But eventually tomorrow, we can start drafting some recommendations. And it seems to me that the best candidates for the recommendations are the questions we have discussed now.

So even though there was a big discussion, I could feel a lot of convergence of ideas and a lot of convergences of recommendations.

So, Marilyn, if you would like to comment on Group 4 -- No. So anyone on Group 4, questions, development issues?

In that case, let me ask the members or one of the representatives of the voluntary task force to introduce this paper for the group.

Any volunteer? Thank you, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Well, I'm going to open my introduction by asking two people to please stand up, Lea and Sam. Please stand up. That's why you have this document. So can we start with a round of applause.

[Applause]

Now I'm going to try to explain it.

When we spoke yesterday, we were taking Question 4 and doing a mapping exercise. And we had a number of categories that we proposed. So I agree with Virat. We have down the left-hand column the laundry list. Let me tell you where we got the laundry list.

The team went into the submissions and pulled out every bullet and plugged them into this list. So there's a terrific amount of duplication, and we are going to talk about how to synthesize the duplication.

But we felt it was important that you have a sense of the depth of the contributions in a single document. We added a column that's now called "draft categories, work in progress." And this is an effort to use your expertise and contribution to come up with a more homogenized list to go down from 400 and some duplicative into X number that are categories that everyone feels comfortable with.

So the labels need to be descriptive enough that the submitters agree with them and that all of us understand what they mean. I'm going to give you an example.

What you have in the draft categories is our effort to come up with labels or terms. Those aren't cast in concrete. The next category is called "consolidated groupings." That's where we want to plug in the actual headings or issues that the room agrees with.

So let me pick an example. We -- if you look at Number 7, it's called "IPR." We would -- and it appears in several places. We would assume that IPR, or intellectual property rights may be spelled out, would be a common term that if everyone agreed every time we see IPR, we would put the discussion about that topic and we would accept IPR under "consolidated grouping."

If you look at Number 1, the administrative of root zone files and system, we call that "critical Internet resources." The room might not think that that's granular enough. So you might decide you want to call it something else. All we're trying to do is give you a framework to build on.

I will just say a very interesting thing, if you look -- if you glance at this, you can begin to see -- And we started out, Ambassador, we started out with the list from Brazil because it was in the document and then we added on from there.

But if you go over to -- I'm just going to point to 117, 118, 121, 122, 133, 134, you're beginning to see as you keep going through the bullets the same phrases being repeated. So, obviously, our

next step -- we did about a hundred. Our next step is to get rid of all the duplication and come up with the consolidated grouping list using terms everybody agrees with.

The next step we talked about doing was to identify the current activities and approaches that are underway and then to Parminder's point, then have a conversation about I'm calling it the "how satisfied are we." And I think Parminder -- Parminder, these four categories, that's right now under a heading called "status" because we didn't really know what to call it.

So you've got a document that we really need everyone to look at and to think about are you happy with the draft category labels that we provided to you to think about. Do you want to change some of them? And how do we do this quickly so that we can actually go ahead with the next step?

But I don't think this small team is volunteering to do all of the work without more help.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I would like also to thank all those who participated in establishing this list. And frankly speaking, the list is frightening.

[Laughter]

>>MARILYN CADE: I'm sorry, Chairman. I thought you meant exciting.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, that's exactly what I meant. It's really exciting and probably we have to calm down. And we need some time to think about. I don't assume that the horrendous task of merging and eliminating duplications is within our capacity right now. But we are probably -- it gives us a lot of thought for -- to think about in the upcoming days.

I reiterate what I said in the morning, that this is a very good beginning to take stock what we have and what we called the mapping exercise. So probably this is a very good first step.

But I would suggest that we might think about going further. As I said in the morning, I would like to ask the secretariat to provide this in one of the future meetings we have with some background document in this respect about the existing mechanisms and existing examples of enhanced cooperation.

So I believe it will be extremely useful for this group. And it doesn't mean that we don't have to work on this document ourselves but probably not right now. You may take your time probably. You may like to consult with your colleagues back home as well. So it's really up to you. It is really your decision what we're going to do with this document.

So any comment regarding the document itself?

Parminder, please. And then Chris.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'll continue with the comments which I was making earlier.

So I think we have a nice list here, and I agree with the categories as they are, including up to the status which is where we would be able to say whether we think they are being dealt with, they are being dealt with but not in a holistic manner, they have largely not been dealt with, and they are future trends which require a lot of policy work because the idea is that this is what -- and I agree with both the phrases, frightening and exciting but definitely enormous set of things which are needed to be done and which is the mandate of this group to figure out -- not to do it but to figure out the mechanism of what could start to do something about it, the mechanism and not addressing these issues.

Therefore, from these issues we have to go towards mechanisms, which is our mandate. And I think the translation starts from the status which is the four categories we mentioned, and then also the categories which I tried yesterday which is the technical policies, oversight and public policies. Like, the one, administration of root zone file and system, it is either one or two in that case. And as Ambassador from Brazil said, these three categorizations already exist in the relevant sections of Tunis Agenda. They have very clearly said day-to-day operation is one side, principles related to CIRs is another thing, which is oversight, I understand, and other public policy issues is three. So they have that.

So after the status, if we do that, we can then start entering what needs to be done under each category. And that's where our recommendations of whether we are satisfied, we think, you know, it should be done in a distributed manner, we need a new body, et cetera, comments can start coming. Last one even, role of stakeholders.

I think from issues, therefore, the conversion into the real elements of our mandate would that way be possible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Chris Disspain.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. So thanks for asking about what we should do with this document. And I'd hate to see all this hard work go to waste. I think we should decide to move on, the way forward with this. And maybe the way forward is for a small group, sub working group if you'd like, to take this and move it down the line over the next few weeks.

I wanted to support Virat's very clear point about a number of these issues are not actually global issues; they're national issues. So as part of the process of going -- I think the next step is to go through and look at duplicates. I think that's really important because obviously there is a heap of those.

And then I think the next step after that is to say: Is it actually an issue relevant to this working group? Because if it's not an international global issue or for that matter an Internet governance issue, then it can go into a separate category.

And then I think we can start to look at rating them and doing what Parminder was talking about.

But I'd like to suggest that we do agree to have a small working group take charge of this document. I appreciate that the two or three people that have done this work so far can't do it on their own and we continue to work on the document. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chris. As far as eliminating duplicates, I think this is doable and it is relatively simple. As far as evaluating the relevance of some questions, I have my doubts that in a small group we can do that. Probably as the issues which have been raised came from contributions asked by the working group itself in the questionnaire. So probably those who contributed have thought about the relevance of the issues. So I don't believe that a small group may like to judge whether this is relevant or not.

So probably we have to be very cautious about that. I have nothing against, however, setting up such a small working body -- shall we call it a working party, using the ITU terminology -- to do a kind of reduction of the number of issues we have, retaining everything -- I'm just talking about the duplications.

I can see Virat asking for the floor. Sorry, sorry. India, you asked for the floor? Oh, Brazil. Oh, my goodness. We are approaching lunch break. I'm sorry.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I have some comments that were already covered by others. But one thing that occurs to me that has just been said, Mr. Chair, that it is doable towards having a more workable document, to eliminate duplication. I think that might be something more easily done. Just by looking at the pages, I identified eight references to multilingualism, either with a single word or multilingualism including internationalized domain names. So maybe we can retain both. But at least if we eliminate six, I think this would be the case in regard to other issues. So we may come up with a document with over 100 may be but more workable.

And in regard to the small working group that would be tasked to further elaborate on this, I think that's probably the most efficient way to go about it. But I would also think that we would need this group to be open to contributions because since we are dealing with a universe of issues, I think expertise and inputs would be needed from various parties that would not necessarily be in this working group.

And the most -- of course, the most burdensome issue would be to fill in current activities and approaches. I think the real challenge would be in regard to this column to identify exactly what are the current arrangements or what is being done in that regard. And we don't need to identify what interventions we might propose or agree to recommend or at least to identify.

So I think this -- I don't have any idea of the amount of work, but I think it might require some extension of time that I think if we can aim at having this by our next meeting, that would be, I think, maybe a big challenge enough for the working group to work around this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. Probably you don't need my advice of how to eliminate duplicates. Probably a simple sort on the Column 2 of this issue list will do and it will help. And then we can proceed on that.

So I can sense that to establish a small working party may be agreed upon by this group. So probably you would like to think about how you would like to establish this working party which will be naturally open to anyone who'd like to participate from this group.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Quickly, first of all, we wish to place on record our sincere appreciation to our colleagues led by Marilyn for coming up with this list which, I guess, is largely based on the contributions that we have. I think it is a very good basis to start with, though there are duplications, and I'm sure there are a few things which we need to look at.

At the same time, the recognition that we could have at this point in time is if there are more additions to be made by any of the members of the working group, you could, perhaps, set a particular time frame during the course of the day by which time then there is a more acceptable list of issues. I'm not saying everyone agrees to what's in here but at least if there are any new areas, which the small group or the larger group would look at it subsequently.

And, again, with the clear provision that you could at any time if any member wants to add a new issue to be added, the flexibility exists. With that understanding starting to begin with, we have the issues settled to begin with.

And the second step would be, I think, on the lines of categorization of these issues. The two approaches I think as we heard, one approach could be on the lines which we already have -- where we have mentioned in our contribution that the last working group on Internet governance did classify them into four categories.

Perhaps if that is one basis or possibility, yeah, if you want to add one more -- there are four listed here. One can be there.

And, thereafter, the other suggestion was to look at just what Parminder has summarized based on what earlier I think were his discussions with Marilyn. So perhaps that initial kind of determination could be made in the larger group on categorization.

And then the smaller group would be tasked with the responsibility to place them in different groups and then thereafter come in the larger group to see the next steps. I think that could be perhaps a logical way to go about as we see it. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. I think this is a good way of moving forward. I think the voluntary task force was looking at the contributions, took the input from the contributions but nothing prevents us to give additional items. However, I caution ourselves as far as the extent of expanding.

We have constraints, meaning that we have to come up with recommendations according to a mandate for the next session of the CSTD which would be May. That is, we have to finish our work by end of February, beginning of March.

We have to be aware, also, we shall do our best but it is not going to perfect. We have to make some compromises.

So there's always room for improvement, I understand. There's always a possibility of taking up new things, but I caution you to be very, very careful how we are going to proceed.

As for the categories you suggested, I think this is a good way forward. It is the bigger group, that is the whole working group, which may establish the categories. And probably the working party we are going to create can work on the basis of that; that is, eliminating duplication and putting the issues into the categories or putting categories to the issues, whatever way you would like to put it.

Any other intervention? Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So just trying to consolidate some of the points and clarifying them. So the step one, I suppose, we're moving towards clearing the duplicates because we've got to come down from this list of 460.

Step two, I think a determination would have to be made about whether the issues that have been mentioned here fall under the overall ambit of Internet governance and lend themselves to the dialogue on enhanced cooperation. That's a key threshold through which the issues must enter the door for consideration for this group and its mandate.

The third would be whether these are national governments and domestic issues or whether they lend themselves to a global dialogue and a global discussion or policy making as some of my colleagues have called it.

The fourth step would be to classify them as -- I think the Indian delegate mentioned about the working group on IGF improvements. But I suppose it's WGIG that he might be mentioning. The four classifications are in the WGIG document. I suppose it is that document, unless I'm wrong.

Then there is the WGIG document versus the formula that has just been sort of offered by Parminder here.

And the last would then be to sort of qualify it as whether there is an existing home, whether the existing home or mechanism is doing sufficient work, and whether there is nothing currently available and, therefore, something needs to be found on a way to handle it. It could be about five steps.

I would say one -- I would just make one submission that whatever the smaller group does should be submitted on a no-judgment basis as a preliminary report to the entire group so that they're able to requalify an issue if they believe that needs to be mentioned separately and doesn't fall under the duplication because the smaller group, as you have mentioned, may not be sort of entirely authorized to strike off an issue as already exists. So I think we should provide that, maybe a week or a ten-day opportunity, to everybody to look at that list in case they absolutely insist that their issue has not been included. And that would be immediately after step one, which is when we clear out duplicates.

So I submit a five-stage process could be followed and the Brazilian Ambassador's point that we should have this by the next meeting so we could have a sensible sort of time period in which we can conclude this exercise. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think we are getting there. If there's no one from the group who'd like to take the floor, I would call on the observer.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Lea Kaspar for Global Partners.

I was one of the people working on the document. And I just wanted to say that perhaps it might be helpful to note that if the group would find this useful, we can just delete the duplicates today and have that ready by tomorrow so we can just go on to the second step as was noted now. So just I want to offer my time to do that if the group would find it useful.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Definitely I find it useful if you deleted the duplicates. As for the continuation of the work, I would like to think about how we are going to proceed. It's very tempting to work on this document. However, we shouldn't lose sight of our main task. So what I suggest now to have our lunch break and let's discuss it after lunch, consider what we are going to do and how we are going to do.

Before breaking for lunch, Joy wanted to take the floor. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I apologize for keeping people from their well-deserved lunch break. Just one suggestion to assist the smaller working group. I notice that a number of people offered to assist in preparing the document, and there are one or two people who are indicating they might like to also contribute to this task. And I am just wanting to make sure that would be possible, for example, Anja Kovacs from (indiscernible) Project, who wishes to assist. And if there are any others, I think that would be a useful contribution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. I'm going to consider it. Thank you.

And now I think we are going to break for lunch and we come back at 3:00. Thank you.

[Lunch break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon, welcome back. You look fresh. You had a nice lunch and the weather is beautiful outside. I imagine you would have liked to walk down to the lake. Can I ask you to take your seats, please? Shall I sing something?

[Speaking non-English language]

[Laughter]

Okay, I would like to start now. I would like to the Swiss delegation to take their seat. Thank you.

Okay. So before lunch break there were a lot of things going on. First of all, we discussed the questions in Group 4. We had a very, very good discussion on that. I'm really happy to have all of these ideas confronted. And we had the short presentation of a very good paper containing a few issues, if I'm not mistaken there are over 480 issues. And we agreed that there would be additional work done on this paper and eliminate duplicates. I was promised to have this paper by tomorrow and eventually tomorrow morning we may start some kind of relatively short discussion on this paper.

What I suggest now to do is to attack the questions in Group 5. And I hope to finish it by 6:00. Leisurely we're going to take a coffee break at around half past 5:00. There's one thing I want to ask you if you have any comments on the discussions we had this morning or any observation concerning the way we are proceeding. If there are no comments, I would like to add once again that my target is to start drafting some recommendations tomorrow. There are a lot of issues which I -- I think that we may agree on, there would be a consensus, or close to consensus, and I want to repeat that this is a drafting exercise. It is not a final recommendation. We are just drafting something we can build on for the next meeting. But I find it extremely important that the -- at the end of this meeting we already have some things to build on for the next meeting, which I still don't know and it very much depends on you, how you feel it. It may be one or two meetings next year. I'm inclined to think that we may need to have two meetings, but it's up to you to decide.

Okay. So I suggest to go into the Group 5 and look through the questions pertaining to this group. I -- as usual, I'll give you about five minutes to go through and to concentrate and I'm expecting your comments after that.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So I think you had some time to review the questions in the Group 5 which is about barriers for participation and enhanced cooperation which is very close to what's been discussed previously. So I invite you to give your comments. So who would like to take the floor first? Yes, Grace.

>>GRACE GITHAIGA: I would like to just articulate some of the points that APC had raised but then, you know, they say they are the reflections of -- the comments are not reflected. And I just want to say some of them that in the barriers they highlight the absence of common principles for Internet governance at substantive and procedural levels. There's also not even a common understanding what the Internet is from an economic or legal perspective.

The second barrier is the geopolitical arrangements among states, and interventions by states and global policy processes appear to be aimed at protecting the specific business or political interests rather than reflect a broader mandate from all their citizens. There's also an equal distribution of power among governments in global Internet governance basis. Some are simply more powerful than others. And often positions are shaped by this powerful configurations rather than by a desire to achieve the best possible public interest outcomes. There's also limited financial resources, time, capacity, and knowledge operate as barriers for the participation of the Internet governance ecosystem by civil society, by small- and medium-sized business, and governments from developing countries. And then, of course, there's also the barrier of diversity, different political and cultural backgrounds and traditions, different understandings about the role of governments and different approaches by governments to inclusive policy processes.

In terms of actions required, one of the main things is that there needs to be more work with marginalized communities for us to develop local content in all languages that meets the needs and tells the stories of these marginalized communities.

In terms of how EC can address issues to a broader socioeconomic development, one of the key factors is that it should ensure that stakeholders from all sectors reach agreement on a common vision and go through ICT support and socioeconomic development and by respecting that they can contribute to meeting these goals. It is also important to manage conflicts of interests and put human rights and public interests first.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Grace. Any other comments? Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Just on the (indiscernible) of the group, since nobody else is commenting, I will talk to keep the discussion rolling. Two small points. One is that it was pointed out earlier, I think by the Indian delegation, that though we are talking about participation discretion is linked to the question of mechanisms because many of us think the basic barrier is a fact that there is no peer mechanism on which policymaking development takes place and that itself is a barrier. And if we have a mechanism, then you will have different kind of barriers. But a big barrier right now is an absence of a mechanism.

Second, because there are a couple of issues, a couple of questions under this set like the affordability question. In an effort to what a lot of you have said, that one of the (indiscernible) which should be applied to the issues is whether their relevant to our mandate, which is international public policymaking, and whether they are national level issues.

So I would think that in our discussion we should focus on the international public policy aspects. I do think even access and local content may have an international aspect, but we as a mandate of the group are discussing international public policy issues and that (indiscernible) should be applied when we get into these questions to make the most productive use of our time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I think I just want to comment on your last point, which I think is a valid point. We have formulated questions, we have received the input, and that is part of our mandate. But it's up to us to decide upon whatever we take on board and whatever we think is not so relevant to our mandate. And we can naturally contribute ourselves. So we ask the (indiscernible) to contribute in forms of recommendations based on the inputs we have. But naturally, we can -- we should do our homework. So any other comments? Jimson, thank you.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair. When it comes to Baher (phonetic), I just look back that now I'm involved and there are still many stakeholders that still need to be involved in the process. Thus far. And one of, I think, the finest new job (indiscernible) is gap in internal processes, even at the national level. Also regional level and then international level. There's no doubt about that.

When it comes to national level I can recall when we are talking about dot NG Nigeria there were a lot of issues. There was no understanding among the stakeholders, but until the government took the leadership role and brought in everybody, that was when there was peace, there was harmony. We are now working together. I now have the privilege of being a part of ICANN, basically playing at least some very -- I appreciate the leadership there. Some very neutral positions there, roles there. And that is business. The Government Advisory Committee too, at least from my experience from African perspective, awareness is a challenge because many government are not even aware that it could be involved in decision-making when it comes to the critical Internet, you know, resources. Talking about the ccTLD and the new gTLD and even the other issues that (indiscernible). But also this was a lot of language, you know. We have language barrier. Like Africa with more than 4,000 languages and 3,000 -- more than 3,000 ethnic groups, so it was also challenges. Before you get information to the grass-roots it takes a little while.

So more information, the challenge of submitting information, and also bringing people together. And also funding to do this campaign. I think that we also see an important job to do here, to

develop some good funding to proper awareness, even down to the grass root. Because they are not aware, they don't know what they need to do, you know. And this is very, very important.

Then at the international level, well, it's an evolution. The process is ongoing. And I'm optimistic that by the time we're able to use the bottom-up approach we need to be clear what we need to do at the international level. But basically, the challenge is getting the home together. They say charity begins at home. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. One comment I can make is about the GAC and the ICANN, as far as I know, right, there are about 120-plus governments who are members of the Advisory Committee, Governmental Advisory Committee, but you have a point here that naturally out of this 120-plus countries, only about 60-plus who are actively participating or physically participating in the meetings. But I think there is a progress there as well. And all the points you pointed out are extremely variable and we should concentrate on these points. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Something that Jimson said really sparked -- and Grace's comments really sparked my interest in commenting on the aspect of informed awareness. And informed participation and how much more we need to do to explain the relevance of Internet governance to the decisions that affect the use and the usability and the availability of the Internet and the online world.

We often use the word "internet" as a code word when we actually probably mean the World Wide Web, social networks, all of the rich sources of stored data as well as the Internet which connects those together. And I think one thing when we start thinking about where's work being done, we may actually find ourselves needing to parse that a little bit more to think about whether we're talking about online content or we're talking about transport. But in terms of thinking about awareness, I think explaining in more citizen-friendly language what we would say in business is layman's language, but citizen-friendly language what is going on in Internet governance that is a policy or a decision that may affect legislation or it may affect a regulatory change or it may affect an initiative that your government is going to be taking. If citizens are reading in the local media or seeing -- I was privileged to be invited to speak at AfICTS summit in July in Lagos and spent a fair amount of time talking to the Nigerian press about what Internet governance is and why it matters on a global basis. Because they were looking at it -- they were very interested in why AfICTA would be engaging in global activities as well as -- and why they would be engaging and working with the Nigerian government to focus on policies that the Nigerian government was addressing.

So I'd like to put my vote with, I think, both Grace and Jimson and others about the need for us to think about the importance of lack of awareness as a major barrier to how stakeholders can learn about the activities and how they can participate.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Raising awareness is the expression I hear most. Saudi Arabia. Majed.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a -- a very good and important question in regards to the barriers, for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance.

Among the various stakeholders groups identified in Tunis Agenda, we believe that it's only the governments who are unable to participate in their role in Internet governance. As I stated earlier, there is no effective mechanisms for them to undertake that role, which is the development of international Internet-related public policy in consultation with all stakeholders. Enhanced cooperation was intended to provide this mechanism and the process toward the implementation of enhanced cooperation was to begin by first quarter of 2006. However, governments supporting implementation of the WSIS outcomes have reached the point of creating this group and its mandate as it's stated in the UNGA resolution. The purpose is to make recommendations on how to fully implement the mandate of the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda.

In regards to the other questions, how can enhanced cooperation address the issues toward global social and economical -- or economic development, bring us back to -- I mean, the creation of this mechanism -- and this relates to Question 6 is how to implement enhanced cooperation. We proposed that to establish a body, regardless it's a new body or under the U.N. system umbrella, and the enhanced cooperation body is a body and its related process mandate to (indiscernible) international public policy pertaining to the Internet. The processes will address the details of how issues are introduced, studied in consultation with all stakeholders, debated, agreed, disseminated, adopted, and implemented. But the first is to establish the body. Or to provide the platform for the government. As I stated, in the U.N. family funding, Secretariat support, high-level processes, these details will follow. But first we have to provide this platform. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Virat, please.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification. There are four questions here. Are we going one by one or can we go for all? How do you want to proceed?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As you wish. I would like to take the whole group together, and if you want to spec -- treat questions specifically, feel free to do it.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question I wanted to remind myself, Mr. Chairman, is about barriers that remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in the representative roles in global Internet governance. This is not specifically about enhanced cooperation. So I just want to be sure that we sort of attack that question. And I would argue, based on the comments that have been received from 60-odd bodies, that it would seem that

governments and business have most access to information, activities, and events related to Internet governance. I would also argue, based on the evidence here, that the technical communities have perhaps the second best access and the civil society and academia easily the least access. I would quote, with your permission, from the submissions of Anja Kovacs for the project director for Internet Democracy who seeks distributed Internet governance process where she lists two specific reasons why civil society specifically is unable to participate. The first being procedural matter where much of the events that is organized are very last-minute and in developing countries and so information, availability, et cetera, is a challenge for civil societies, except those who are the regular players in this arena.

The second that she lists here, and correctly so, and this seems to be affecting more than just the civil society, is the issue of funding. Since we have not explored technology to its fullest extent, I think the point of funding is coming in the way of making our processes multistakeholder and certainly becoming one of the most significant barriers that are listed here.

I would also quote from the inputs provided by the United States where they have proposed solutions, including outline clear modalities with the default being the civil society can attend and participate on an equal footing with other stakeholders, provide advance notice -- meetings for notice -- notices for meetings, make available travel fellowships, publish all relevant material with no passwords, et cetera, and more participation. So I think excellent suggestions here from the inputs which we've included which I urge that the house consider as we respond to this question.

I now turn to the second question in the group of four which relates to how can enhanced cooperation address the key issues towards global social and economic development and here I quote from the India submission from the government -- sorry, it's a submission from another civil society from India, SFLC, which talks about the fact that infrastructure can play a major role in bridging this divide and any discussion or decision that allows for all stakeholders to act together in a covenant manner nationally will then become an example for what can be done globally. I think sort of evidence has been provided here.

On the third question that we're dealing with relating to what actions are needed to promote effective participation of all marginalized people in the global information society I again turn to the government of India -- sorry, the Indian submission by SFLC which states, and I quote, "that an established need to identify areas where further efforts and resources need to be pooled for the marginalized community. Firstly, affordable access to information and communications technology, digital literacy, for the rural poor and other marginalized groups, including women and children, should be assured." Much of what has been spoken by my colleague Jim here. And I think a very special effort. But this, to a very large extent, is about providing physical access and multilingualism. In a country like India, for example, we have 22 recognized languages. There's a dialect almost every 20 kilometers and hundreds of mother tongues. The rupee note carries 15 different scripts of how the rupee can be mentioned. So it's -- you know, we're rich in

diversity in that sense. And so if it was taken as a microcosm of what the issue is globally, I think we have a good example to start.

I come to the last question, with your permission, Mr. Chair, and what are the key issues to be addressed to promote affordability of Internet in particular developing countries and the least-developing countries, and here again, the multistakeholder role of all the parties is critical. Private sector, as we have often spoken about for the last day and a half about investment, innovation, technology, human resources, infrastructure, et cetera, capital, the technical community, which is working very hard across the world to lower the cost of access, 85 to 90% of the remaining world, 60% of the unconnected world will connect on mobile devices. Prices of mobile devices are being dropped sharply across the world with innovation and help from the technical community, so they have a significant role also to stretch the limits of spectrum and what it can do with regards to data because the facility that provides with regards to voice are quite different than data and online access, civil society which drives transparency, which drives accountability, and strives for lower cost.

So if you look at this holistically, even in this role of providing access to developing countries and least developed countries, each one of them has a role.

I will close by saying that the government in India, just as an example, has made a decision about two years ago to transform a universal service obligation fund which was collected from a 5% of every mobile bill that was paid by a mobile subscriber and was originally reserved for connecting rural India has been changed and the law has been changed with an agreement of all parties to the parliament. And now \$4.5 billion are being deployed to build a national fiberoptic network that will soon connect 250,000 villages purely for online access for the most part. So this is a remarkable case where consumers using mobile phones have deposited money in an account which is now being used to provide rural access. And so each one of those stakeholders I have just highlighted have a role in providing access especially with developed and underdeveloped countries. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Two comments. I wouldn't call India a microcosm with 1 billion plus people.

The second comment is when you mentioned "spectrum," did you mean frequency spectrum?

>>INDIA: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Well, we -- I would like to start with saying that we do think that there are barriers left that we have to deal with when it comes to participation of all stakeholders in Internet governance. And some of them have already been touched upon like the financial restraints, lack of awareness and not at least the issue of language, multilingualism.

Those are definitely restraints that affect participation of all stakeholders, I would say, but maybe particularly civil society, academia and technical community.

We also think that another barrier is the lack of policy transparency that still exists on many levels, both nationally and internationally. There is often a lack of consultation with stakeholders before new policy is put in place, legislation is put in place. And that is definitely a challenge for many stakeholders.

In the international arena, we see this as well. Just to take an example, documentation in some international organizations like the ITU, for instance, is only for members. My government has certainly pushed this issue on many occasions, that we want to increase access to relevant documentation to all stakeholders. So that is -- that is another issue.

I think when we're looking at Question 12 about marginalized people and how marginalized people can be more -- can participate more in the global information society, we think that that is part of much broader issues, empowerment issues.

For example, we have the question of gender equality which is very important. We know that women today are to a lesser extent users of Internet, for instance. So I think that's part of a broader issue of trying to empower citizens and empower stakeholders.

When it comes to the issue of affordability, we certainly think that it's very important to create an enabling business environment through deregulation, predictable business environment and definitely fostering competition because we know from experience that competition brings down prices. So we hope that we can work on some of the -- some recommendations that points in that direction. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. I think we are on the right track. We are working towards recommendations.

I can see Baher. You wanted to take the floor?

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chair. I'm Baher Esmat. I'm with ICANN. So I echo the views of colleagues about -- on the question of barriers, about raising awareness and funding as key barriers for participation in Internet governance, particularly from developing countries.

I also echo the views about language, language barriers. Marilyn made a valid point about making information available in laymen language for the broader participation.

One of the -- one other related issue we noticed in our engagement at ICANN and developing countries is the relevance of the issue itself. And it was mentioned by the distinguished delegate from Brazil, you know, the example of, you know, the session at the IGF about developing issues and, you know, the new gTLD issue and whether it's relevant or not. So the relevance of the agenda itself is quite an issue.

And that's why I'm not in agreement with the view that the lack of a mechanism or the lack of mechanisms is the main barrier because oftentimes we have mechanisms in place. But the issue is more about whether the issues and discussions are relevant or not.

At the same time, there are key governance issues for developing countries that are mainly national issues. They need to be addressed mainly at national issues like access. Many of the contributions to the questionnaire recognized that access remains to be a key issue for developing countries. And I would say that 99% of policy discussions about access, whether in terms of broadband access or availability of content in local languages, all these policies are more relevant to the national sort of governance dialogue.

So I think it's more -- the other point I want to raise is, again, in relation to access and in relation to the question about the social and economic aspects of enhanced cooperation. So there was the study of OECD, ISOC and UNESCO, I think, which identified one key fact about the correlation between the development of the infrastructure and the availability of local content. And, again, this is something that is very challenging for developing countries. And this is something that needs to be addressed more at national levels.

And if we're talking about mechanisms to address these issues, then we have to go back and, you know, using the term that many people use "that Internet governance starts at home."

So I'm more towards, you know, wanting to see more discussion or more listing of issues in relation to barriers and all this. And I think the exercise we're going to do shortly will identify whether those issues are relevant to the global agenda or the national agenda or elsewhere. So I'll stop there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher.

Well, for the time being, we have heard very interesting contributions. Some of them were controversial -- I mean, contradictory to each other. But it just reflects the complexity of the task which is ahead of us.

So I wonder if you would like to comment on this group of questions about the barriers, local content?

I turn to observers, if you have any comments.

Well, in that case, I think we have concluded the first round. We have gone through all the questions. We have given our comments, and we have had a rich discussion about all these issues.

So what is ahead of us is on one hand to formulate recommendations. On the other hand, we'd like to revisit the document which was offered to us by the voluntary task force and we were promised to have it by tomorrow.

So, I'm reminded that Joy would like to take the floor.

Joy, the floor is yours.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Thank you for checking in. Can you hear me?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, very well.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the barriers to participation and to emphasize the barriers for particular groups that are listed in some of the submissions. And I'm quite concerned with some of the submissions in front of us. I'm a little concerned that some input seems to be repeating the (indiscernible) that we focused on, a particular concern about whether a (indiscernible) is needed or not. And I think that's doing a disservice to the hard work of submissions who have been active and taken submissions seriously.

And I would ask you to be reminded about that and to focus particular on the barriers of civil society from developing countries and particularly those who access -- have a really significant issue and for those half of the world's population who do not even have access.

In particular, I am also concerned about the barriers for women and particularly for women's participation in Internet governance. And this is the subject of a working group recommendation to the Human Rights Council.

And I would ask the secretariat perhaps to consolidate a list of recommendations in relation to participation from some of the other U.N. bodies. I think that would be a useful input, if the working group could (indiscernible) as part of the recommendation acknowledge the other mechanisms and statements within Internet governance that have reached these barriers and made recommendations and actions on them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

I believe in our discussions we tried to touch upon all the submissions we received. And we provided the kind of summary, which to my best knowledge, tried to really encompass all the relevant points and making an attempt not to forget about any of the contributions.

In the group itself, I think there are representatives of U.N. bodies. And as the meeting is open, there is nothing to prevent other U.N. bodies to follow what we are doing here.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have listened with good interest to the interventions in regards to the barriers and to the understanding of how are we going to approach forward from this group.

However, Mr. Chairman, as the Saudi government, we came to this meeting and we have a mandate from the UNGA resolution. And when we say "enhanced cooperation," it has to be as referenced in the Tunis Agenda. And we are coming from paragraph 69 that there's a need for enhanced cooperation in the future to enable governments. And being as a government, we are here to try to accomplish or start this mandate in regards to the enhanced cooperation and able governments to develop international public policy issues.

Also, our references in regards to -- I have listened to the IGF dialogue and the enhancement and raise awareness of these, and we support this but in the same time, there should be in parallel the enhanced cooperation. And I'm also referring to UNGA resolutions that the two -- the IGF and enhanced cooperation is two distinct processes. The IGF is to provide the platform for all stakeholders to discuss dialogue, and the enhanced cooperation for governments is to provide the platform for governments to undertake their role.

But I'm trying to speak here and try not to use the word "enhanced cooperation" or "IGF." I will try to tackle the issue as it's facing the global as a problem.

I heard that there's -- I believe that the existing processes are adequate and there is no need for governments to assume a larger role in Internet governance.

However, last night, my colleague and I were thinking of various issues on the Internet and how the current mechanisms are simply not able to handle them adequately. So maybe when giving an example, we will be more clear. And since I'm speaking in English, excuse me for my diplomacy. I would rather we have this in all six languages, but I will do my best.

Everyone is familiar, for example, with the prevalence of botnets, phishing, malware, viruses, identity theft, online fraud and sadly child pornography. Who in this room has not received numerous spam messages containing an infected attachment or asking for the disclosure of personal identity information? Recently Saudi Arabia was the target of denial of service attacks against two of our largest companies in the petroleum industry, Saudi Aramco and Sabic. There are many more prominent examples around the world.

Countries also face major difficulties dealing with the practices which is dangerous or illegal. Most content providers are responsive to the hosts of their home base country.

The governments of these countries will intervene with the content providers when they believe that content is inappropriate or unlawful according to their laws or norms. But those governments are generally unhelpful when asked to intervene with content providers on behalf of other countries.

A recent example for Saudi and many other Muslim countries was the YouTube video defaming the Prophet Muhammad based upon him. Can someone tell me how existing mechanisms will solve the problem when someone in Saudi Arabia or any other countries loses their life savings in

an Internet scam from another country or a major oil exporter has their operation shut down or major structure is turned off or government services are destructed or bank records are stolen?

Can someone tell me how the private sector, civil society, standard bodies, academia, can possibly handle these issues alone? Of course not. The only chance for success is the active participation of governments and their full role developing and implementing international cooperation and public policy in full consultation with all stakeholders.

We also have heard about the equal footing in regards to the decision-making policy, equivalent to the governments. It is important to realize the governments are the bodies who have obligations to their citizens, to protect them from harm and to establish and maintain their rights both offline and online.

No other stakeholder and group can perform this role in an unbiased manner. Unfortunately, because if they are at the governments in the multistakeholder Internet governance model and the Tunis Agenda has not been implemented, many countries cannot adequately benefit from the Internet or help their citizens solve the issues they are facing online.

In addition, some governments also cannot protect their rights as states when it touches the sovereignty of the states.

There's an entity or one entity has tremendous advantage of being able to enforce its law simply because it controls or manages or has access to so much of Internet infrastructure but also great influence over content providers operating within its border and exercises influence when it suits its purposes.

But it shows no willingness to extend the influence when governments requested to court content be considered insensitive or is morally offensive.

What we want is the following. International cooperation agreements are necessary and important and have proved to work well and to the benefit of all in the field of ICT.

Good examples are frequency interference, spectrum harmonization, satellite orbits and compatible numbering. Any government when presented with a claim of cross-border frequency interference, for example, will investigate and take action to correct the problem irrespective of what entity in its jurisdictions is causing the problem. This could not happen without the direct involvement of governments. No other stakeholders' group could do it or would even want to do it.

The same problems face all governments when trying to provide the benefits of the Internet to their citizens while protecting them and at the same time maintaining stability and interoperability of the Internet. The protection of citizens is the mandate of the governments. No other stakeholders group can do it, and most have no interest in doing it.

The current governance mechanisms do not and cannot successfully address most of the critical problems and issues within the Internet. Governments should be able to protect their people and their entities in their territories both online and offline.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Any other comments? If not, I think this is the proper time to break for coffee. And then I would recommend you to come back at :35, 4:35. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back. May I ask you to take your seats, please? Thank you. Before the coffee break we discussed Group Number 5 and more general questions, and I think we have come to the end of discussing the responses based on the inputs to the questionnaire. We have gone through all the questions and it is my feeling that there's a sense of understanding, we understand each other, we know what -- what are the concerns of some of us.

On a more positive note, I can sense some kind of consensus on some issues. So I would like to concentrate on those where we have the hope to achieve consensus. We don't really have to agree on everything. We don't really have to have all parties agree on everything. We may have dissenting voices. We have to keep in mind that we are formulating recommendations. It's not a resolution. Just recommendations. And we try to fulfill the mandate we have been given by the U.N. General Assembly.

So right now I suggest to you to start the exercise of drafting. It will be a process. We are not going to draft, right now, the final text. I have asked the Secretariat to take the notes, your suggested text, and you can see it on the screen where our captioning will be available on the other screen. I'm sorry for those of you who are -- who have your back to this screen, and some of you who are more fortunate can see both.

At this time I would like to concentrate on questions where I sensed a common understanding, and I think that was Group 4 and Group 5. So what I really want to do, the structure of the recommendations, I would follow the groupings we have been following during the two days up to now. So we may like to put them -- the groups and start by Group 4, that is questions of developing countries, and I'm expecting you to provide some text, what are the recommendations you think should come to the document we are going to provide for the CSTD next May. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair, and I think we have come to the perhaps the very important task which is of preparing a report of recommendations, a report with recommendations. I think it's --

while the approach that you proposed which is to take those areas where we seem to have a broad consensus and thereby focus on that and leaving those where we feel that there are -- obviously there's still not convergence of views at a later stage, I think we have some reservations on this approach. I'll explain why. Firstly, we all agree there needs to be critical discussion within the U.N. fora. We tend to leave the -- we tend to address all issues to start with and thereafter leave the final decision on those difficult areas to the last day. Taking that approach I think is sometimes useful because you tend to see that -- well, unless there's a certain amount of pressure that has been brought on purely on the issue of time, there is no -- no serious effort by the delegations to sort of arrive at a consensus.

But having said that, in the current approach that we intend to follow, one -- there are issues which are difficult ones, we acknowledge and we have seen the diversity of views that are there, particularly on Group 2 and 3. Completely leaving that to a later date might not be an appropriate way to go about because these differences persist in the last day. Number one.

Number two, there are decisions which are not to be made here. They all require certain inputs from the capitals and require certain kind of consensus building not -- outside the room, as I said. So my suggestion would be, Chair, would -- should we not start from the groups that we have prepared from the beginning and see whether there could be some consensus in terms of not necessarily the entire text but certainly on preparing some kind of, you know, (indiscernible) kind of language which would accommodate perhaps the idea that we intend to follow. Because at the end of today -- because we already -- two days of our discussions are almost getting over, and on the third day we have -- unless we have something to take back to the capital at the end of this working group meeting, it might be difficult to get decisions during the next -- and which will be the last meeting for all of us. So bearing that in mind, because if you have those issues which are difficult and they're presented on the last day of the meeting of the last session of the working group, I think we would not be in a position to mitigate some instructions from the capitals and thereby we would perhaps end up not making recommendations. Which is not -- which is a sad story. So I think as sometimes they say let's catch the bull by its horn and then see whether we can stand in front of it or we just run away from it. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. I am ready to consider your suggestion. The reason I am suggesting the approach that what I suggested is to build on something, and that is your approach as well. You want to have something to build on. You are suggesting to at least to have some (indiscernible) on the different groups, that you can take back to capital, which is also a viable solution. But we have to take also into account that during our discussions there was an effort made to identify issues and we have come up with 480-plus issues, which I don't think we can manage here, right now. Even if they are been downsized to 150, we can't manage. So I am not against making (indiscernible) and start with this text, but I can also see the danger of in case we don't agree on some text now, then all our future meeting or meetings -- because I'm not very sure that we will have only one meeting. It very much depends on you and the results we achieve during the one hour we have now and tomorrow, the whole day.

So I'm just offering one option. I take your option, but I'm also wondering how others feel about it. Chris, please.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I'm -- I find myself slightly confused. I -- I thought we had undertaken -- we're undertaking a mapping exercise where we've got some issues listed and someone I believe is going through them and looking at duplicates and we're supposed to be having an exercise where we see what we end up with and see if they can go through a test as to whether they apply. So how can we be working on resolutions until we've at least figured out what we're talking about? I may have misunderstood, but it struck me that we were trying to work on a mapping exercise. I'm lost.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Chris, I would like to make it clear to you we are not working on resolution. We are working on recommendation. Now, the -- it's not but it's -- it's -- it's a very important distinction.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I appreciate that. Sorry.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And I've made clear that probably the mapping exercise is being done -- well, the technical part to downsize it will be done by tomorrow and we may have a dry run on the basis which has been suggested, the five-step approach on some questions. But I also made it clear that we are not going to continue it here because some delegations or many delegations are not in the position of going through this. So they would like to take it back to capital. And I also made it clear that I intended to have some kind of draft recommendations on some issues which we may have consensus on. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. From our perspective, we think that it would be beneficial for the group to start with the two last groups because we have the same sense as you do, Chairman, that that's probably the areas where we have the biggest chance of, at this stage, reaching consensus on some recommendations. And I think it would be to the benefit of the whole group and contribute to building trust in the group if we can actually move forward with some recommendations since we're already at this stage. And I think also that we can benefit -- and I have at least benefited from the discussions we have had here these two days, and I'll bring that back to capital and to stakeholders back home and maybe work a little bit back home on potential thinking around recommendations on the more difficult issues. And I think we can also utilize the time that we have from now to the next meeting to discuss with each other also in different constellations on those more difficult issues so that we can come better informed and to the next meeting and start working on some of the more difficult issues by then.

And also in relation to the mapping exercise, I think the mapping is very important and our sense is that it especially benefits the questions in Group 1 and Group 2, maybe Group 3 and therefore, we think that we can do things in parallel. We can do the mapping exercise to help us with moving forward on those issues in Group 1, 2, and 3, and at the same time we can actually start to work on recommendations for Group 4 and 5 where we have more concerns. And so we agree

with your approach. We think that that would help us build confidence in the group and maybe then that we would -- we can use when we approach those more difficult issues at a later stage. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Actually, Chair, both that Constance and Phil had their -- and also Parminder so I will just wait my turn.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Two set of issues trying to comment on how we are working and how possibly we can give a productive outcome at the end of the whole period of our working group.

One is about our express mandate, and the other is about expectations of the world from us.

And about the express mandate, first, and as the Chair reminded us oftentimes that there is a mandate, and let's stick to that. And the mandate is to examine the Tunis Agenda's mandate of enhanced cooperation and to give recommendations to fully operationalize it. Now, that's the mandate.

If we have to do something on the mandate, we have to go to the Tunis Agenda and do a search of the word "enhanced cooperation" and read each section, 68 and 69. Yeah. 68 first. No, no, 68, 69 and then 70 and 71.

And it says that there is enhanced cooperation which is defined as the issue of international public policy issues. Whoever has to do it, I'm reading the question out because that may be contention, equal footing of the governments or not or all stakeholders.

But it is very clear. We need to deal with international public policy issues related to the Internet. There's clear pointing to the fact that there are international public policy issues to be dealt with. They are important. And, obviously, that's why you find mention of the words in the document. And they need to be dealt with.

We need to figure out how to deal with them and that's the principle mandate.

The question of whether developing countries participate in that -- and "that" is not known yet -- or what are the barriers of participation, otherwise to "that" does only come after we have discussed to some length what is "it" we are talking about, how are we going to address international public policy issues, multistakeholder, multilateral, only private sector, whatever.

But that comes before we talk about the role of developing countries or various participation because I can't talk about the role of developing countries -- in what? In keeping their citizens happy? In warfare? What? It is about their responsibilities in international public policy issues. And if that is not spoken, I don't see how 4 and 5 can be spoken.

And to speak about 4 and 5, it anticipates that there is an existing mechanism in some ways which is doubted by many people here, not a consensus but some people doubt it.

So I don't see how -- till we deal to some extent, whatever level we can reach a consensus, with the issue of mechanism, we discuss the role of developing countries in that mechanism because I don't see 4 and 5 as role of developing countries -- I'm repeating myself -- in just something but in that particular mechanism, whether it exists or not and, again, barriers to participation in that particular thing which can be defined only by 2 and 3.

The second part of my intervention is about a certain kind of disappointment with the fact that this group sits with a global responsibility to address questions which are bothering a lot of people everywhere. The newspapers are full of it. Stories are being written. People are discussing in their bedrooms. And we seem not directly addressing questions which people are bothered about. The U.N. working group is supposed to be addressing the world's problems. The world's problems are of many kinds. They are not just related to what has been called recent revelations but many other Internet-related issues, the consumer rights across borders, the cross-border data flows, Internet connectivity.

Taxation, where does value accrue? And where does tax take place?

Cybersecurity.

There are huge issues that people are talking about, to see that those issues either do not exist or are being dealt with at the present is the core we need to address.

After that, we address how to enhance the system by increasing participation of different people. So I think both ways we need to go to the meat of the issue, see where we can converge.

There was a lot of work happening outside this room. ICANN goes to the President of a country, makes some offers. They say that we should hurry towards internationalization of oversight. Those words are not being mentioned inside the working group which has the global mandate through a legitimate global U.N. process to be looking at those questions. It is something, I think, which is not quite right when we are well past the halfway stage of this working group.

I think we need to directly address these questions, find the views of the people, try to converge them as far as we can. But I think we cannot avoid those key issues to be dealt with first. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think during the two days, it has been said many times that we have a mandate and we try to stick to this mandate. We have compiled a questionnaire. We have received inputs. We have discussed these inputs, reviewed them, and we have spent about two days reviewing and having some sense what are the main concerns.

I have nothing against bringing on board new issues as I told you because we are really mandated to give our opinion as well.

However, during the two-day discussion we had up till now, we have been discussing the inputs and some comments we have made on that. So it was my understanding that the group would like to work in this way.

And I repeated many times that we are going to work in this way and I had no objection to that. So I reiterate my proposal to work the way I suggested.

But I'm ready to listen to other voices.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I think listening to discussion thus far in your proposal, Chair, has been quite interesting. In the two days that we've sat here, I think it has been recognized that since the agreement of the output of WSIS, the world has moved on. We are more than halfway through what we think is our term of activity. And even in recent weeks, there has been activity that we couldn't have perceived six months ago being of interest to us in the discussions.

If we look at the mandate which says "to examine the mandate of the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation," there are some things that I think we have talked around as the distinguished delegate from Sweden suggested, which is there are recognized barriers and issues around participation. And I think there is some value in looking at or trying to look at through the eyes of required activities to ensure that all voices, all stakeholders, are engaged. It is right to say that not all stakeholders are engaged. And we should work to ensure that our recommendations or at least one of the recommendations, I'm sure, address and endeavor to resolve those barriers.

Will we completely resolve those barriers? I would like to think yes, but I suspect not. I think in taking it forward and looking at Groups 4 and 5 which are fairly wide areas, I do think applying some sort of mapping exercise to try to take elements of 4 and 5 to make sure that what we are recommending on specific issues are of value and can be seen to achieve consensus within the room. It is not to say that we do 4 and 5 here and then walk away from it, but I think it is a part to say we try and do one, one issue that we have some sort of agreement on is important, that we can try out the mapping mechanism. Does that work? Does that have to be changed? Have we got it right?

One of the issues I think we are facing is we're trail blazing. We don't have a process. We are making it up as we go along almost. And I think while that's good and it proves that we're responsive to the needs, it takes time for us, I think, to come to some sort of agreement.

So I think if we are looking at our mandate and looking at a way forward, I think taking a very specific approach to the areas where there seems to be consensus, trying to select an issue from those areas and seeing whether or not there's some value in taking those forward, I think, would be a useful way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

While you have the floor, can you give me some concrete example how you think the way forward is in Group 4? Any concrete...

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I think I would pick up on the debate that we had before coffee and I think specifically referenced by the delegate -- distinguished delegate from Sweden on access to all multistakeholders in this debate.

I think Grace made a very useful intervention prior to coffee as to what the barriers were, and I think there's some activity there that we could look at to see whether or not we could make a recommendation going forward as to how we might address or suggest that those barriers be addressed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As far as I can see, this is very much along the line I suggested. Constance?

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. I would just like to support the point Phil made and the distinguished delegate from Sweden.

I think Parminder raises a very critical point which is the global responsibility of this group which is to look at hard issues. And a lot of work went into trying to list these issues, including emerging difficult issues.

And in terms of methodology, I would propose that we follow the path discussed before the coffee break and try to have a rigorous approach in looking at these issues. We could start with access. We could start with multistakeholder participation. And that exercise would naturally lead us to possible recommendations. Rushing to recommendations without having done this mapping exercise seems difficult from my perspective. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance.

Saudi Arabia. Brazil? Brazil, okay.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you.

Well -- sorry, I lost my notes.

I'd like to say I see merit in the two approaches. I think we -- well, first of all, I fully agree with India in that the most central issues we should tackle are contained in Groups 1 and 2. Clearly, for example, the way Question Number 8 is drafted: What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda? This links directly to the mandate. And also when we asked: To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented? So these are the core issues that are at the heart of our mandate.

So clearly this -- if we have to dedicate -- if we have limited amount of time, this should clearly be the focus of our work.

However, I also see merit in starting with Questions 4 and 5 in the spirit Sweden has mentioned to build confidence and establish models of parameters and also thinking that in the second stage we could benefit of the mapping exercise, a tool that would also enable us to tackle questions in Groups 1 and 2 more efficiently. So the Number 4 and 5 would be, let's say, the low-hanging fruit that we could go and have a more concrete outcome.

But, however, this -- I don't think you can disassociate this with the time constraints we have. I think the most crucial issue -- and I don't feel there is clarity at this most whether we are going to have one or two meetings. If we are going to have two meetings, I think we can allow us the luxury of not engaging to Groups 1 and 2 now, allow us some more time to go about it in our next meeting but with the assurance that we will have opportunity for that.

And I fully agree with India, that if we have just one more single meeting, it would be very difficult to tackle at the same meeting, to start dealing with different issues and at the end of the same meeting coming out with solutions.

So maybe, Mr. Chair -- I don't know the appropriate moment. But I think this decision on how to go about it should be linked to the decision whether we'll have one or two meetings. I think that might provide some more clarity for all of us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Very helpful. Really, really helpful.

So before I give the floor to Saudi Arabia and then I can see Jimson, I would like to think about the possibility of having more than one meeting next year. I suggest us to have one meeting in January and one meeting in February. I leave it to you now.

And let's listen to Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I understand the time constraint that we are facing for this very delicate job to come up with the recommendations. But we can have a recommendation, I believe, by this meeting, but is it going to relate to the mandate of the

group or not? That's the core -- I mean, that's the importance, that the recommendation relates to the mandate of the group.

And I would like to bring the attention that the Cluster 4 and 5, it has been answered based -- or after the questions that relates to how to implement enhanced cooperation and what are the mechanisms. And when we answered that, we got the input. Then we reach a consensus in regards to the role of the developing countries.

So the core is to undertake Question 2 and 3 first. Then we will have, I mean, no difficulties going to 4 and 5. But we cannot talk about participation. Participation in what? The role of the developing countries in what? So it is very important to start with 2 and 3. And even if we are going to have two meetings, that as of to date puts us 50% of the work of the group even if we have two meetings. This is the second meeting. And we are approaching half or almost 2/3 of the second meeting. So it is very important to start with the core mandate to get the recommendations. Then it will be very easy to decide the role of the developing countries in the recommendations that we have and then how to enhance the participation in enhanced cooperation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I think we had today discussions so we don't have to pretend that we haven't discussed these issues. And we don't have some kind of understanding what is on the table. So I believe that all of us have kind of an understanding what we are discussing.

Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. Please permit me to just make a few comments with regard to the issue at hand.

Shortly before we went for tea break, there was an intervention by the distinguished representative from Saudi Arabia with regard to the role of government and the mandate as has been well articulated by Parminder and many others that have spoken.

Well, from the business constituency, from the business and from developing countries, we do know clearly that government have a very clear role. Governments are the sovereign rule in the face of citizens.

What we also are saying is that, yes, there is some dynamicism -- there is some dynamic evolution. Saw that while the government leads, it also leads with business and stakeholders so that we can all have the people together.

I would say this. I also want to illuminate the fact that when we talk about rule of law, it's already agreed that rule of law offline is the same as rule of law in the online world. And as such,

how has it been tackled in the offline world? I believe through a lot of collaboration, through a lot of bilateral agreements. A lot has been achieved.

Even when it also drags into the online world, let me give you this illustration, something that happened in Nigeria not too long ago, maybe about four, five years back. There was a case of online fraud performed by a Nigerian citizen in Brazil. And the guy ran to Nigeria and (indiscernible) mighty structures in Abuja and many places. A true cooperation between Nigeria and Brazil, the guy was tracked down and (indiscernible). And the company back in Brazil got at least some of the -- got justice.

So what I'm saying is that government has their clear role and it is not in discord.

What we are also saying now is that we need to walk with existing mechanism, strengthen the existing mechanism. For example, it is such a great privilege that I'm here with my colleagues here, government, all the stakeholders, discussing this international issue. We are already discussing it.

And I believe, Distinguished Chair, after this time out, whatever we agree will go to the CSTD. What the recommendation is, it will go to the CSTD. We are a composition of CSTD already. And CSTD, from there, it will go to ECOSOC and ECOSOC to G8 where governments really persuade it.

So my submission is that, yes, we are making progress. We can actually really start some form of recommendation. Once we do the mapping, clearly everybody sees. And we also have some middle points, some understanding.

So we have existing mechanism. We need to recognize this. The government already played the role, and we also support it and play also a role -- important role.

And after this, CSTD will -- I have the privilege of being in the CSTD meeting, one of the meetings. And there's room for improvement. But we're making progress. So what we have currently can really pack in a lot of things if we focus on it, bilateral agreement, collaboration, cooperation, can pack a lot of things while we look forward to the optimum solution as the case may be.

I just want to illuminate this question with regard to the role of government, which is undeniable very important. Sovereign rule is very important. There is a mandate for government which we will respect. Our government takes the lead in Africa and we follow. If government does not really move, we are happy the government is willing to come with them to move together. So we understand the role of government. But at the same time, at this top level, we should not complicate the matter necessarily.

Finally, we got to the meeting periods, well, I wouldn't mind being around if you want to have three more meetings. But the funding issue is a challenge. So it is a major program we're into, and there is no funding. So is that a demonstration of the seriousness at the top level?

So there should be some really commitment from the part of government that set this up.

So this is good, Chair and colleagues. I just want to say that, well, as much as we can, if it is just one meeting, I personally will still be able to still try to fund myself to be here for one more meeting. Two more, I will need help. I'm a small business. And I feel that I have constituency, a lot of constituencies, as a matter of fact. So if we start making progress with recommendations and tidying up the mapping process, it will be better for us. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. I fully understand your concerns and naturally take note of that. And probably if I suggest to have more than one meeting, I would suggest to have one meeting in January and eventually, if needed, to have an additional meeting in February in order to be able to have some contingency to be able to finish our work.

Marilyn, you wanted to take the floor?

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes. I think both the U.S. and Phil were -- and Virat. But I'm happy to speak, but I don't want to get in front of other people who have their flags up.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have a list and you are on it.

>>MARILYN CADE: Fantastic.

[Laughter]

What I wanted to -- first of all, I'd like to echo the comments that my colleague Jimson made.

Even when there is funding available, that funding goes, first of all, to governments, to civil society and to academics. It never goes to small businesses. And this is a significant burden particularly for small businesses to participate. And we need to be really committed to having the diversity of participation. The vast number of businesses that will be starting in all countries are going to be small businesses. And that is where the engine of economic growth and bringing the kinds of public policies and access to the world that we want to see happen.

So if we don't have the ability to have the participation of SMEs in our considerations and our deliberations, we are really missing a critical element of those who can help to provide thoughtful solutions. So I want to just reinforce the concern about that.

I think we also have to understand that it is important to bring experts from capital for governments and to bring experts from the other stakeholders, not just to rely on the folks who are here in Geneva or are local from any stakeholder group because of the expertise and the depth of understanding that is needed.

I would much prefer, Chair, that if we have -- that we have a longer meeting, even as long as four days, and that we dedicate our work. Many of us participate in other U.N. entities and activities, such as the ITU. We're quite familiar with multi-day meetings. So if we had this much work to do, one approach would be to have a four-day meeting and have only one meeting and to really dedicate ourselves to be able to diminish the cost implications of travel.

But I took the floor really to make a comment about the Group 4 items. I've listened to concerns expressed by some participants that we can't talk about participation in what but, in fact, we ask questions. And over 60 respondents found answers to questions about participation in what. We may not be able to address the question about participation in a new mechanism since I don't believe there's consensus in the room on new mechanisms. But we certainly could look at Question 10 and Question 15. I think there is one other question. Because we have robust answers.

We are an expert committee and we ask people to provide comments. And I want to be sure that we are living up to our commitment to those who submitted comments that we are focused on their answers. And there will be when we start talking about solutions probably some differences of opinion. But I do think we could start with Group 4.

And generally I found in the long number of years I've been working in these fora, it's always better to start with the low-hanging fruit and have a couple of successes before you start diving into the deep end of the ocean.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

As for the suggestion of having a four-day meeting, eventually a five-day meeting, I have to tell you that I'm really enjoying your company.

[Laughter]

It is a real pleasure to be with you.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I hope you are not going to take a poll on whether everyone else agrees.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, no, no.

So I am ready.

[Laughter]

I'm really ready to have a four-day meeting or a five-day meeting. So much the better. And eventually it may be a good idea.

So I had to fight to have a three-day meeting because originally it was meant to be a two-day meeting. But I'm ready to have the four-day or five-day meeting and probably it will have small businesses to come and civil society and all of our representatives because the extra cost is much less. Probably we have to ask other stakeholders how they think about it. But that's another issue. I'm ready for that.

As for the low-hanging fruit, I like this expression, of course, and personally I'm all for it. But it's up to you naturally what you choose.

So next one on my list is Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the house would agree that three or four issues that have dominated the discussion over the last two days is about government's role in participation. The very difficult circumstances that is placed over developing countries are to participate in the Internet governance processes, even more within that the civil society groups and to some extent academia, and moving forward to identify what could be the mechanisms as well as said on day one that the heart of the problem is between Question 4, 8 -- 4 and 8 essentially.

But I think we need to remind ourselves that we can't be a solution in search of a problem. We can't start drafting recommendations unless we have -- and most of us have agreed on that at some stage or the other -- a clear problem definition which is identified by the issues and a mapping exercise which tells us through the five-, six-step process, whatever we finalize on, which of the issues that need the kind of mechanisms that have been suggested by some.

And I think the importance of the mapping exercise is underscored by the fact that if you look at the responses of the people who took the time to respond to us, the 60 responses, they've done a very elaborate job of putting those down as bullet points or numbers. And I think they deserve the importance and the consideration as we drive towards identifying mechanisms which is principally at the heart of Question 8 or Item 2, as it were.

A question has been asked about what should be the role of developing countries in what. I think a similar question can be asked that we start writing recommendations for mechanisms to address what.

So I suppose this is a chicken-and-egg story, and we have to begin at some stage where we can all find a basic consensus. My guess or assessment at least is that the last two buckets found a fairly high level of consensus in the sessions that you chaired earlier today. And that might be the appropriate place to begin work.

I would also argue that with regards to the meetings, I think there are 15 participants here who have traveled from outside of Geneva that are on the three stakeholders that are seated at this table. And there are about six or eight on the observer side who have traveled. You have very kindly allowed 20 observers but only eight -- seven or eight have come in. In the civil society,

there are only two participants. On the technical community, there are three out of five. So I think there's -- sorry, three participants on the civil society side.

I think it's clear that these are the groups that are having difficulty even coming to this meeting. So given that they're having such difficulty even coming to a meeting which was planned for months and funding could have been arranged, I think the point that was made by my colleague here, Jimson, and others, we need to focus firstly on the latter two buckets.

And, second, if a meeting has to be held, we would request two things of you. One is try and combine it or bring it close to another event which allows the participants to defray their costs. And look for a four-day meeting because I think it is -- while it might be an imposition on the time of the governments which are in Geneva because they have many, many things to do, I think the incremental cost of staying for a day is a small fraction, 150, 200 Swiss francs at best, even lower in some cases, than all of our costs of flying and sort of parking yourself twice over for three days. So if you could please consider that suggestion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat.

As I told you, I have nothing against having a four- or five-day meeting, on the contrary. And your point is taken. Jimson's point is taken. And probably all of us -- or many of us are sympathetic to this solution. And thank you for offering that.

I have Iran on the list and USA and we have Avri who is a remote participant from the civil society.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your efforts. You're trying to solve the problem as soon as possible and as much as possible.

I may have been on your side first that we have to start with the easiest issues to solve, to make an example of our cooperations. But listening carefully to the room, I think the matter is not to start from deep ocean or shallow waters. I think the matter is to start with the core issue, which is more important.

We need to finish first the core issues. As you heard from me in the morning that the other questions like 10 or 15 are very much related to the answers on Question 3 or 2, therefore, when we don't have -- or we have not reached any conclusion on the core issue, how come we can go to the end of the matter?

I can make this example that we are constructing a building. Do we start from finishing, or do we start from the foundation? So the core issue which is the first and second group of questions are the foundation. Let's start from the foundation, not the finishing. That will help us to go faster in the other steps we are going to take.

On having the meetings for four days, Mr. Chairman, we are in your hands. We are ready to whatever the room is going to decide to have four or three days, two or three meetings, no problem. But let's start from the most important parts and very hard part of our job. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, this is to signal our support for your approach to meet our mandate and to show progress as soon as possible.

Chairman, we think it makes very good sense to approach first those issues that are likely to reach consensus.

I think Brazil put it first, low-hanging fruit. And we agree and I think other speakers did as well.

We think it's important to allow the mapping exercise to move forward so that we can be informed on difficult issues that we wish to find consensus. Again, I'm remembering words -- if I'm remembering correctly of what the Ambassador from Brazil said, it would be very helpful to know where we are to better inform where we're going.

We think it is important to take the time we need, whatever time that is in the estimation and assessment of this group, to address all issues, important issues, core issues, all of them, to find consensus.

So, Chairman, for these reasons, simply to come in and to support you in your approach. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

And, finally, if I'm not mistaken, it's Avri. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Am I muted? Am I unmuted?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are unmuted, Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: I'm unmuted now. Thank you. I join those of my colleagues in the room who have suggested that we need to do the mapping exercise before we start to make recommendations. I guess I'm among those who do not understand how we can make any recommendation if we haven't finished the analysis. We have done a first discussion of the comments we received, but we have not done yet the analysis that the mapping exercise represents that brings all of these things together, that maps them against existing institutions and that finds the gaps, the gaps that I believe were our mandate to go back and see what they fill.

I also agree with those that say we must start with the most important part, but I for one still don't understand which part is the most important until we have done a mapping exercise. We may end up solving the problem for which there is already a solution if we try to do it before we have fully understood.

I also have a question. At the beginning of the inception you said that we would not be working on a basis of consensus. Perhaps I misunderstood when that statement -- when I heard -- or when I thought I heard that. I'm being very careful with my words, spending all day at the IETF where one speaks one way and spending all night with this meeting where we speak another way has been very confusing for my brain. But if -- if I didn't misunderstand we're not working on a basis of consensus, on what basis are we deciding what it is we, as a group, are recommending?

And finally --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: I support Marilyn's call for a longer meeting, if needed.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: I believe it -- yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sorry to interrupt you. We are working on the basis of consensus, which does not mean they are not -- we don't allow dissent.

>>AVRI DORIA: I'm still confused. So we are working on a basis of consent.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You're not muted. Consensus means consensus.

>>AVRI DORIA: So we're working on a basis of rough consensus. Okay. Thank you.

Finally I wanted to say I support Marilyn and the other people who have called for a longer meeting. I actually also believe that it is better to maximize the time spent at a meeting as opposed to dealing with multiple travel events which cost people a minimum of two days, sometimes for some people it's four days just to travel to and from a meeting. If that needs to be done, fine. But if we can maximize the time, and again, I think it's very important for various reasons to have a very strong notion of remote participation for whatever meeting we do. In my case I had a conflict because of an important technical meeting. In other cases it might be funding, it might be other events. Participating in a meeting from 1:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. is okay as long as one can do it. And I appreciate all the efforts that have been made to make it possible. But I think that is essential medium in terms of supporting everyone in this group and supporting all the important observers who can contribute to this important role. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Anyone else who would like to take the floor on these procedural issues? India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. The debate seems to have started from this end of the table. I think, you know, we again have a bit of a Catch-22 situation here. One, as I said, the particular -- we are talking the process now. We aren't talking the substance. I think to be very clear, some colleagues have gone down the path of, you know, looking at the substance and drawing conclusions and others are not interested. I don't think that's the case. The (indiscernible) for arriving at very positive and concrete recommendations is when we actually come to do -- as we know, let's at all agree to that, there are some difficult areas. Our difficulty sitting as part of the representatives of the government is that these decisions are not made just in this room. They are to be made back home. There will be consultations. All that we need is, if we decide to go down that path, we need to know what are those issues. Because we cannot come to the last meeting and be told this is the last meeting and then we are presented with a situation for which we will not have answers. And that's the short point I'm making.

So if we can find the solution, we should be able to do that. Whichever way we go, I mean, we have great confidence in your leadership -- I use the word "leadership" -- and to take it back there. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I'm listening to you very carefully, and I can't help thinking about the questionnaire we had, the answers which have been made available, and the summary which was made available as well. So we cannot pretend that we don't know the issues. We cannot pretend that back home people didn't know the issues who are responsible to -- for all discussions on the governmental level. So I don't think that this is a proper way of putting it. I fully agree that we need agreement, some of us need agreement from back home, or at least need to consult. But having said that, all the information was available and we knew the issues, we knew what we came here for, and we knew what was ahead of us. We have to work. Now we are discussing how we are going to work.

The easiest part is whether we are going to have -- well, probably we are not going to have two meetings, we are going to have one meeting. And as I hear from the room, there is a kind of agreement that we shall have a four -- eventually a five-day meeting. Which should be back-to-back to some other important event. Probably we have to consult our calendars. There's an IGF open consultation on the one hand, there are important meetings in the ITU, council working groups, this is (indiscernible). So probably we have to go back to your calendars and find out the appropriate way to handle it. It's most unfortunate that we cannot really take many more events into account which may be conflicting. I'm referring to eventually to IETF meetings or ICANN meetings or -- I'm referring only to meetings which we have in Geneva. That's one point.

And so the second point, how we are going to proceed. I heard three approaches. One approach was, don't do anything until we go through the mapping exercise. But we have -- we have heard as well that if we go into the mapping exercise, we need support for some of us. We need support from back home. Because we are going to make kind of value judgments and we are going to set categories and we are going to classify different issues which have been submitted to

us which probably those who submitted to us vote -- or felt very important and they are very important for them.

So I believe if we go into the mapping exercise, a full mapping exercise, it may take the whole day tomorrow, but it will take a couple of more weeks. That's one point.

The other point is, I heard the approach that eventually we should go and tackle the core issues. I heard also that we cannot tackle core issues before we do the mapping exercise. I heard as well that we need some confidence building. And it -- it was said that eventually some questions in Group 4 and 5 would serve this purpose, to help us to build some confidence and to find out for me how this group can work together. Up to now, we have been discussing, we have had very nice debate, very good discussions, very good ideas, but as of now I think we have to work.

So I really think that probably as a compromise we should give a try to the mapping exercise, to start for a very short while and I have had the promise from observers that I will have a reduced list, and we can try, how does it work. But we're not going to finish with that, and I don't intend to finish it here. As we agree that we are not going to finish it here. We agree that we are going to have a kind of working party which will be an open and developing party in the same way that we have the working group here.

Now as for the core issues, if we agree that core issues are extremely difficult and may be some time damaging for the confidence if we fail at the very beginning, then probably I wouldn't think it's a wise thing, even though I -- I appreciate the logic concerning the foundation and concerning the building from bottom-up, but I also believe that at the end of the meeting we are going -- right now if we can have at least some kind of mechanism we can agree upon that is how to come to some consensus on recommendations, it would be extremely beneficial. And it doesn't prevent us to attack the core issues when we have the result of the mapping exercise, when we have a clear picture and we will be involved in that, to attack during a long meeting, which I suggest to be sometime, as we have agreed, next year, to attack the core issues and all issues and we can come up with appropriate recommendations.

So what I suggest for tomorrow, after having received the document, we start discussing the document. I would suggest to have this discussion for about an hour, and then I also suggest to try the procedure how to achieve some kind of consensus on recommendations. I hope this is agreeable to all of us. Yes, Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Can you hear me?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Joy, we can hear you.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: A brief comment. Thank you to the Secretariat for sending the document to the list. I wonder is it possible for us to make amendments to the document and post those back to the list. I'm asking because some submissions are not included, and it might be helpful to

get those. But I also don't want to unduly (indiscernible) later a briefing on the document. I think if there's some guidance on that I would appreciate it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Joy, I consulted with the Secretariat and probably your request will be taken into consideration. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a five-minute spot for the observers before we break, and I -- I hope you are going to tell us good news.

>> Thank you, Chair. So we've been working on removing the duplicates from the document now and while we have some time to go yet but it should be done today. So it's probably ready for tomorrow.

To answer Joy's question, perhaps not to confuse anyone, it might be best to send the list of issues that you have, Joy, to either me or the Chair and then we can get it and then we'll include it onto the list that we're working on now, if that's okay. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That would be a perfect solution. I'd prefer to send to -- to send it to the Secretariat. Thank you. Well -- just a request to observers, do you think you can make it available by 9:00 tonight? Okay. In that case, the Secretariat can send it out for the beginning of tomorrow's meeting.

So in this spirit I wish you a nice evening and I see you tomorrow at 10:00. Thank you.

Live scribing by Brewer & Darrenougue - www.quicktext.com.