

Transcript Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

24-28 February 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Day 5

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

28 February, 2014
Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
10:00 a.m.
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. I will start in one minute.

Good morning. Welcome to the 5th day of our meeting. I can see that you are fresh, relaxed, happy with a good sense of consensus, optimistic, smiling.

Yesterday we didn't have a good day. It was raining outside.

[Laughter]

Today it's sunshine. It gives us all the hope. It is our last day. And I would like to make just a quick run-through what has happened yesterday.

So as always, I start with the mandate. I understand that even the mandate doesn't mean the same thing to everyone, but it's okay.

What does it mean to fully implement? Does it mean that we haven't done anything? Does it mean that we are nearly there? So it's really up to you to have an interpretation of that. But I have to stick to the mandate, and I encourage you also to stick to the mandate.

In any case, after this meeting, there's an obligation to report to the CSTD. And even that has been questioned, the ways and means, in case we don't have agreement. So I will get back to that.

I think there's a big expectation from this group, but we have also to keep in mind that we are not alone. We are a part of a process. This process is the WSIS +10 process, and we are going to contribute to this process. So we have to keep that in mind that while we are just a small contribution and this is not the final result -- and as I always told you, we are not drafting a treaty. We are not even drafting resolutions. We are just drafting recommendations. These recommendations may or may not be considered. So we try to do our best.

So what happened yesterday? Yesterday we have discussed in the plenary draft resolutions in Group B and C, let's face it, with moderate success. We had some positive results, some consensus, but I could sense more divergence.

At the end of the day, we had some cleaned document with some approved recommendations, more recommendations to be revisited. And, of course, in addition to this document, we had other documents as well. For instance, we have quite a bulky document with draft recommendations with no consensus. Yeah, that's a bigger part. We have to be frank with each other.

So what I plan to do today, I plan to continue our work because we have to finish our work one way or another. I prefer to finish it in a very positive way, but I have to be realistic.

So I would like to go through Group D and E and to revisit what needs to be revisited. And hopefully after this discussion, which I plan to do very fast -- because we have already told everything we wanted to say, I'm sure. I cannot find anything new in the argument, so probably we can go through quickly. And I have to tell you, it is very painful for me to see all the efforts which have been put into this process not being able to achieve something really substantial.

But we have to be realistic about it. Probably that is the limit right now and right here we can achieve. And probably as -- I told you, it is a process. So probably at some later stage in this process, we can achieve something more.

Yesterday we had the meeting. But for me, informal consultations are also very important. They give me the feeling of some delegations, the sensibility of some delegations, the concerns, the perception of problems as well.

And I have to be very attentive to the words which are being used. And yesterday there was one word which really stuck me, that was the "irreconcilable." And I tried to put it in perspective. And I still think that it is -- it is a function of time and place.

So even if we think now that we cannot get an agreement or cannot get a consensus on some issues, probably at some later stage we can get there.

So I have a big question mark. I hope by the end of the day this question mark will be an exclamation mark. Well, we have to be realistic. You know me, I'm always optimistic. My whole life is for this Internet ecosystem. It is something I live with, and I really do care about it. And I -- as I told you, I feel privileged to chair this meeting and to be somewhere where we can really contribute. And you don't

really have always the opportunity to do that. So, please, consider it and be extremely positive and try to have some consensus.

We have a lot of work to do. I told you how I think we shall proceed. And, basically, whatever will result, we have already something and I'm really positive about that. We have reached out to a large community. We have received a lot of responses to your questionnaire. Based on the questionnaire and the issues in the questionnaire, we have managed to -- with the help of the correspondence group, to have a mapping of the issues which are of great concern to a large community.

We have a lot of information and it needs time to analyze this information. So probably that is what is lacking -- what has been lacking, probably the task we have in front of us was too big. I don't know. So we still have this one day. I know that you have flights to catch, so I plan to finish our meeting by 6:00. I don't plan to have a late-night session.

So whoever wanted to leave, of course, you can leave and there will be no late-night session. And I hope during the time we have, we can achieve something.

Before the meeting, I have been asked by Richard Hill, that he wanted to make a statement. I give him the floor to make his at the same time. And after that, I would like to resume our work. Thank you.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate your indulgence.

I feel it necessary to mention an incident that happened yesterday, not because of the incident itself which is not important. And in any case the other person involved has apologized and the apology was accepted. So the incident itself is closed.

But I think it needs to be mentioned because it may help everybody in this room to understand why it is proving so difficult to reach agreement on certain issues being discussed here, in particular the proper role of government.

So what happened is one of the participants here, a person who has strongly supported human rights language, took a picture of me and certain other people here in this meeting room without our knowledge and tweeted it without our names attached. Now, it happens that I dislike having my picture on the Internet, especially if it has my name attached. So I complained to her about the picture. I don't have any problems with the text.

She was very surprised and replied that since this is a public space, she naturally assumed that she could post my picture on the Internet.

Well, Chairman, I'm sorry. This is not a public space. We need badges to get in here. And anyway, we're in Switzerland and under Swiss law, a person's image is protected by the data. In Switzerland, even in a public space, you can't just take a picture of a person without their consent, much less publish it on the Internet with their name.

Now, the significance of the incident is not that the person did something that may or may not be appropriate or did I think inappropriate. Everybody makes mistakes. That's not a problem.

The significance is that the person did not realize that she was doing something that I consider offensive. And this is not an isolated incident. Other people in other meetings have also made what I would have considered to be inappropriate tweets. And that's what's significant here, Chairman.

I believe that the principle that offline rights apply online is not just the slogan to be trodded out when it suits us. It is the fundamental legal principle that I first encountered some 20 years ago when I started to study the law with electronic commerce. That principle is embodied in all of my academic writings, in particular my recent academic articles on Internet governance. And the principle actually can be traced back to telegraphy.

The principle applies to all aspects of the online world, including privacy and including policy making. As a citizen of Switzerland, it is my right that public policies regarding the Internet be made by my government which I can influence through elections and even a popular referendum.

Nigel correctly reminded us that governments should not make policies on their own. Indeed, they must consult. In most countries, policies are decided by parliaments, not by the executive branch.

Chairman, you and I have had the privilege of being public servants. Many of our colleagues here are or have been public servants. There is a certain gravitas or solemnity attached to that task. And there are formal mechanisms for ensuring that what government representatives say is aligned with what office formally decided by the government.

I have often seen similar gravitas on the part of representatives of business, and I also have been privileged to be a representative of business.

I know that no government representative and no business representative would have even dreamed of doing anything remotely inappropriate, not even at the bar after drinks. And this is because they are accountable, Chairman.

All representatives are accountable to their constituencies but only government representatives are accountable to the people as a whole, to their citizens, and that is why the Tunis Agenda correctly states that governments are responsible for public policy making. They should not be considered equal partners with entities that are not accountable to the people as a whole. And they should surely not be equal partners with people who don't understand that the principle offline rights apply online means exactly what it says and not something else and that there are no exceptions to that principle, none.

As I said, Chairman, apologies have been given and accepted so the incident is closed and nothing more need be said. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. As you said, the incident is closed.

I think we are going back now to your daily work.

Sweden, you asked for the floor.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I think it's really important that we all respect each other in this room and, therefore, what happened yesterday was regrettable.

Now let's move on, and we think also that the sun is shining today, and we should be positive about what we have achieved actually.

I reiterate that we are on our way to success and we are fulfilling our mandate. It is very clear from the mandate that this group's task is to come up with some recommendations and the method with which we are doing so is by consensus. We already have three consensus recommendations. We have not even started our work with Group D and E. So there is definitely room for further improvements.

Do we have agreement on everything? Of course -- of course not. Did we expect that? Probably not. If we did expect that, then probably our expectations were too high.

Is there a need for future work? Most probably yes. But the spirit of this group is that we work by consensus and then we cannot expect to come to this meeting and get everything that we want. So we are on a road to success, and we are fulfilling our mandate, and we are looking forward to working with everyone today to improve our work and to hopefully reach consensus on some more recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning to colleagues in the room. Chair, do we have your permission to start discussion on Group D?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>INDIA: Can I continue on?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Before you do that, I think U.S. would like to make some general remarks. And then we can start.

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I would like to make a general remark.

You know, you started by saying that you were privileged to be Chair. Chairman, of course, we are privileged that you are Chair and that you have worked so hard as we all have to do the work that we need to do.

Yes, it was raining outside yesterday. But we do see glimmers of sunlight. Chairman, it is never any -- it is never really big news that people in a room representing many different countries, many different points of view don't agree on everything. And that is perhaps no reason not to forge on. So I want to give you courage for this first.

Secondly, Chairman, I do think we should be sobered, however, by a mission that we have here in this room, which is to try to assist as well as we can and with a myriad of views. We should try to assist -- I'll be grand here -- the world in making use of the promises of the Internet. We think that this -- the issues for development and the import of our work for development is critical and it is key.

So, Chairman, we're very interested and very eager to work collaboratively with others as we now go into issues that specifically address the development agenda which is so important to support and to give recommendations to the CSTD on.

Chairman, you mentioned that you thought -- or at least I heard that, you know, the correspondence group's work was important. I would like to say yes, it is. It was very important. We haven't had a lot of time to discuss it.

But let me just say that the facts are always important for achieving ends so that we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this correspondence group output in more detail.

So, Chairman, just in summary, I think we can achieve something, look forward to that, and look forward to today with the sun shining and the possibility to work on key issues of development. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marion.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. At the outset, Chair, since we're discussing this Group D on developing countries, I wish to make two general comments which have relevance to this and also importance to my delegation and perhaps some of us in the room.

Firstly, Chair, I would like to, first of all, thank you for the continuous encouragement that you are giving to us to see if we can forge consensus and move forward and come up with some concrete recommendations.

I think from that point of view we are here to support your efforts, and we will be as much ready to do - - go in that direction.

Having said this, Mr. Chair, I just wish to also make one comment on the recommendations itself.

I think you have repeatedly indicated that these are important. At the same time, they are not necessarily part of a resolution or not part of a treaty or they need not reflect. But I tend to slightly defer on this assessment, Mr. Chair.

It's for the simple reason that this particular mandate, the mandate that's given to this working group, is to fully realize -- fully operationalize enhanced cooperation, however it is understood, and it is a U.N. General Assembly-mandated working group.

The inputs are going to vary through the channel of communication that is provided for. It is the CSTD, the ECOSOC, and General Assembly. And in this connection, I think they will become part and parcel of various inputs that will be coming to the General Assembly, and I think on this element, they will become an important contribution which will be reflected during the discussions as this process moves upwards.

Having said this, Chair, yesterday -- I mean day before yesterday there were deliberations started in New York with the two co-facilitators. They have relevance to us because it is a U.N. General Assembly-mandated process. I think it would be useful for my delegation to reflect on this, and I will not take too much time.

In this, two co-facilitators of Tunisia and Finland, when they opened the discussions, the Group of 77 and China made a statement in that particular meeting where of course there's a difference in the magnitude of the issues that were being dealt with there. There was oral review -- modalities for the oral review of the implementation of the outcome of the WSIS.

But one of the important components that was highlighted by the Group of 77 and China, if I'm not mistaken, or 135 or 36 countries, is -- relates to the work that we are doing today here, and that brings us into focus and how important it is for this group of countries, in which they have said that the review must take into account the call made in the Tunis Agenda's Paragraphs 69 to 71, which I quote: "Recognizing the need for enhanced cooperation to enable governments on an equal footing," and asking the U.N. Secretary-General to start the process of enhanced cooperation by end of the first quarter of 2006 besides the Internet Governance Forum, which is IGF, which is a multistakeholder body.

This specific mandate involving governments of member states on an equal footing is extremely important and this would be crucial in determining the public policy on Internet governance. Therefore, the G77 endorses the enhanced cooperation recommendation of the Tunis Agenda and calls for its effective implementation.

And something more equally relevant, towards the end, they also feel that -- which is not necessarily relevant here but they made calls on having a summit in 2015 and also it to have it to be convened in the U.N. General Assembly.

Having said this, Chair, specific comments with regard to this particular paragraph, it's important for us that we are here not to discuss -- I mean, I suppose I shouldn't use the word "not" -- to, rather, discuss in a manner that there is a prioritization. I think this paragraph could be relevant, but in the sense -- since we're talking about not necessarily just a small group of international Internet organizations, but rather, a larger group of member states, civil society, private sector, and technical communities' relevant role in promoting developing -- how to promote this particular Internet and its realization or effective use in the developing countries.

From that point of view, we'll reserve our comments on this, because in terms of priority, it will lie very low in our priority.

As we see the other comments, then I think we'll be in a position to comment on this. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Very useful information. However, I don't think it has changed our mandate. Our mandate, as you rightly pointed out, was given to us by the General Assembly resolution, and I have no knowledge of this resolution has been changed, so I intend to proceed according to this resolution and to this mandate.

But you have also rightly pointed out, as I have mentioned, that we are not working in isolation. We have to keep in mind that there are parallel processes or complementary processes going on, and at the end of the day we are going to feed into this process. I still think that we give recommendations and it's up to the CSTD to decide how to take it on board our recommendations.

So with that, I would like to concentrate now on Group D.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone.

Mr. Chairman, just a point of clarification. On Group A and B and C, there are some revisited -- I mean there are some paragraphs that needs to be revisited.

When are we going to get back to those paragraphs, Mr. Chairman? Are we going to keep like that or we have -- we are going to work on them? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As I indicated, I intend to go through draft recommendations we haven't seen yet, at least to give a first reading, and if we still have time, we go back to recommendations to be revisited.

I think I -- I owe to the proponents of these draft resolutions -- I have an obligation to go through all these submissions, so I believe at least we should go through and find out how useful they can be.

Iran, you would like to -- okay.

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

Sorry to take the floor again. Just I wanted to express my concerns on leaving those paragraphs as it is. Therefore, we need to, I mean, be clear on what will be the future of those paragraphs.

I prefer to -- to be clear, and I don't prefer to leave them as revisited in the document. Therefore, if -- that -- I need to be clear on that matter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: If your concern is about the status of some recommendation, then the indication to be revisited doesn't mean that it is approved. The recommendation which has been approved are the recommendations which have been approved. Those ones which have no sign of that are not approved.

I -- as I indicated, I intend to go through the recommendations, just based on the experience we had yesterday, relatively quickly, and I don't really want to have statements or the same arguments repeated again.

So it's very clear where the borderlines are, so I would like to encourage you to do relatively quick work.

So let's start with the first one.

U.S., would you like to introduce yours?

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

Thank you. Happy to refresh the memory of this recommendation which we submitted sort of at the end of the week when we met here in Geneva in November.

The idea was to reflect the submissions in response to the questionnaire which addressed the participation of developing countries in various Internet institutions.

So the attempt was to capture where those -- where there may -- participation may be hampered that the Internet governance community should endeavor, as it says in the last sentence, to help find ways to enable such participation.

I'm happy to address any questions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

I open the floor for comments.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you and good morning.

I think that this recommendation reflects a lot of what we heard both in the questionnaire and in the mapping in terms of people recognizing one of the gaps we have is that it's the difficulty in getting increased participation from the developing countries.

So I think in that regard, this is responsive to the input that we got from the processes we ran.

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

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think taking forward our comments made earlier, I think we see the usefulness of this paragraph. I've already said, in terms of prioritization, this should prioritize -- it should come at its own level.

But if you wish, we can also strengthen this paragraph and make it a little more -- rather raise its priority, from our point of view.

If you permit, then, I can suggest some comments and --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Go ahead.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

In this, perhaps you could consider, instead of restricting it to the international Internet organizations, I think we might consider using the phrase -- not the organization. It would be -- we could start at the beginning.

"All intergovernmental, as well as multilateral organizations." I think this would -- this would -- instead of the Internet -- yeah, that could be the substitute for this. That would expand the scope of this. However, subsequent paragraphs would require some amendments down the line in terms of...

If someone wishes, they could even use the phrase "comma, including international Internet organizations." I mean, "apart from." Not "including." Sorry. "Apart from." No. "Apart," a-p-a-r-t. "Apart from." In which case, you can keep this phrase of "international Internet organizations," again, "comma."

At this state, I think it will capture a slightly wider -- and of course we will come back to the lower part of the paragraph, which is where we have some clarification to seek, particularly the word "political priority." What does it mean? It's not very clear to us, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

Good morning.

It's perhaps too early in the morning. I don't understand -- I understand the words. I just don't understand the meaning of "apart from international Internet organizations."

If, perhaps, I could have some more explanation of what the intent is, perhaps I -- it would be useful.

Perhaps I'm just suffering from not eating enough cookies, Chair.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil, for reminding us of the cookies, which is a generous offer from Marilyn Cade, and -- to make all us a bit sweeter.

Yes, India. Can you answer?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think -- I guess this is English we're talking about, so let me say "apart from," they're excluded, number one.

Perhaps we can find a -- let's say a British English word, rather than an Indian English word.

Here we can look at "in addition to" or --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right.

>>INDIA: -- if that works.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>INDIA: I mean, I'm open to the -- the idea is that they're not -- I mean they're there but there are others also who also need to play a role in evolving all this participation and other elements in the developing countries.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Ah. I understand now.

So perhaps I'll try my version of English and say "as well as all intergovernmental" -- hang on. It's changed. "As well as" -- "in addition to." Yeah. Something like that I think makes it clear that it's not excluded but included. Yeah.

So something like is on the screen is fine.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. It's more or less the same line that I'm thinking that this recommendation will go to colleagues that -- my colleagues in the Mexican government and in the last stage of the chain will go to my colleagues in New York, and I was just wondering, "all intergovernmental multilateral organizations," that probably lacks a little bit of context. Maybe with the additions, it gets clearer, but probably just to give it more context of which organizations and which intergovernmental -- we are not going to list all of them, but probably a little more into the context. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Good morning.

Just a question. I'm wondering whether there's a reason for limiting it to international Internet organizations. It strikes me that, as an example, how individual ccTLD organizations can be encouraged in the same way.

So I'm just -- I'm not -- I don't know if there's a reason for having it limited to international, but thought I'd raise the point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chris.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, and thanks to the United States for proposing this recommendation and for -- and to India for their -- for their comments.

We think that the original text was probably a little bit clearer. We think that intergovernmental and multilateral organizations that have bearing on the Internet or deals with the Internet probably are already included in the original -- or would be captured by "international Internet organizations," so we think that that would be -- well, the original language would be preferable.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia?

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

I mean as you are under Group D, developing countries, I mean I would feel better if we say "to evolve to meet the needs and facilitate the participation of developing countries," rather than "all stakeholders." "Of developing countries." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia, you prefer the text instead of? It's reflected, but you want it -- okay.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: I want to thank all the colleagues for this contribution, and I'm quite impressed, actually, at some of the themes that are inherent in it now that I think are very important to --

In particular, we're taking this up in the section, it is under developing countries, and I really appreciate the fact that there's an emphasis in this resolution about ensure- -- focusing on overcoming barriers for the participation of all participants from developing countries.

I wanted to ask a question about perhaps better understanding multilateral organizations. Remember I'm a business person and sometimes I need a code book.

Multilateral organizations I've often thought of as also encompassing what might be a regionally-focused organization and so I'm just asking a clarifying question.

Would I, for instance, find that this includes ESCWA, as just one example? Because I think we want to include the regional organizations of the U.N. and of the -- of the regions as well as the regionally-focused or country-focused organizations that Chris mentioned. So might I just ask that, in the interest of making sure we're being as inclusive as I think we want to be?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I welcome the contribution of the United States and also the comments from Saudi Arabia trying to give more evidence to developing countries. However, I think we should keep the spirit of also giving evidence to multistakeholderism. So I suggest another alternative

writing here that participation -- that "all stakeholders especially those from developing countries," so without the brackets. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. I, too, wanted to emphasize "participation from stakeholders"-- or "of stakeholders from developing countries." And I thought -- I'm not sure if I heard the distinguished delegate from Saudi Arabia correctly, I didn't think he wanted to strike out "stakeholders." I thought he wanted to emphasize the participation of stakeholders from developing countries.

But I think -- anyway, the other thing I'm struggling with is that I feel the second part of the text is somehow repetitive when we say all groups are encouraged to engage in those Internet institutions to further realize and so forth, so I think -- I'll attempt to do a change here. I'm not sure I'm going to be successful.

If we say -- so I'm here reading the second line, "continue to evolve to meet the needs," and I want to move "and facilitate the participation" for now, I want to move it to say "to meet the needs of all stakeholders especially those from developing countries and facilitate the participation in their collaborative mechanisms." And then there is no need to say again "stakeholders from all groups are encouraged to engage." We can say "collaborative mechanisms in these institutions to further," and then to the end of the text. So we'll take out "and stakeholders," strike out "and stakeholders from all groups are encouraged to engage." So how it reads now? "In these collaborative mechanisms in these institutions to further realize the benefits." We will strike out "in those Internet institutions."

"To further realize the benefits." So, I mean, yes. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher. It is getting clearer.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While supporting the addition by India and Saudi Arabia, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the room that we are in Group D, which is on developing countries.

When we are talking on all stakeholders, it means out of developing countries to be included which is out of context.

I prefer to see after "developing countries," which has been added by Saudi Arabia, "and their stakeholders" to be clearer. And, Mr. Chairman, at the end of the paragraph, we have some qualifiers. As we remember very well from the beginning, you advised us to have recommendations which is feasible but it's not clear to me how come it is, I mean, applicable.

How come we can do that, to assess which part have lack of awareness, educational opportunities, political priorities? Therefore, I think we can leave it out and to delete the last sentence of the paragraph, from "where" to the end, "where participation may be hampered." Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I would like to borrow some ideas given by Chris as well as Marilyn on the relevance of reference to regional Internet organizations. So keeping that spirit, can we have the word after "international" in the second line, the beginning, "and regional." Because that would at least give a sense that others also have a role, and they do have a role.

Secondly, to give emphasis to developing countries, I'd like in the third line, "to meet the needs of all stakeholders," at the end of it instead of saying "especially from those," you can simply say "all stakeholders from developing countries." Then you are not excluding the stakeholders. You are not excluding the developing countries. And that would capture mostly the sense, I think -- and then its relevance under this particular group of recommendations. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. When we're reading this text, we are a little bit confused about the difference between intergovernmental and multilateral. We think, though, that maybe we could say "all multilateral as well as multistakeholder organizations." It could be an alternative because I think then we would have the proper balance between intergovernmental or multilateral, which word we choose to use, and the multistakeholder organizations that we would not like to be left out of this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. We support the last intervention by Sweden. We think it's -- as I mentioned before, it gives us more context and it will be clearer. But as well, I like -- we support the intervention from our colleague from Iran, saying that -- stressing "should continue to evolve to meet the needs from developing countries." We believe -- we agree that this category is related to developing countries. But as well, as he mentioned, we can after that make reference to other stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico. Anyone else to make comments? Any volunteer to read out the text? I have no clue where we are.

Okay. Let me try. But stop me if I make a mistake. "All intergovernmental as well as multistakeholder organizations in addition to international and regional Internet organizations should continue to evolve to meet the needs of all stakeholders from developing countries and facilitate the participation in their collaborative mechanisms in these institutions to further realize the benefits of their participation."

Is this the one? It is agreeable? Approved.

India not approved. United States not approved.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we're almost there. We would like to see reference to multilateral in this because there is considerable amount of -- for example, just take the example of United Nations and its specialized agencies. A number of them are having their specific programs on how to improve, let's say, Internet access in terms of awareness raising in their own limited capacities. And they are using these Internet tools effectively for reaching out to the lowest -- rather, those particular parts of the world as well as individuals who are in need of help and support. So I think that will be important for my delegation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mr. Reddy, correct me if I am wrong, I have always believed that U.N. and specialized agencies are intergovernmental organizations. During my 23 years with the ITU, I was always told they were intergovernmental organizations.

>>INDIA: Chair, even if you say it is a subset of it, but intergovernmental would mean it could be a group of two countries, three countries. It could be the entire world. But I think multilateral is -- gives that -- for the reasons that are explained, that there are organizations of multilateral in character who have given significant contribution. And I don't think these are mutually inclusive groups. These are mutually -- they could be a subset of that but not necessarily one gets subsumed into the other. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for the explanation. So I ask you: Do you see any harm to include "all intergovernmental, multilateral as well as multistakeholder organizations"? U.S., yes, you wanted to take the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just want to refer us to the intent that we had in crafting this resolution at the time, which was rather than to compel governments or compel intergovernmental organizations, it was really more to urge and encourage international institutions. So in a way the intent has now changed, and we're considering that change and would like to take some time to do that.

Secondly, I just want to -- in that vein, I just want to refer to the last sentence which has now been deleted and suggest again that the intent was really to compel the Internet governance community to assist with the participation of developing countries.

So one thing I might suggest, as we continue to look at this, as an alternative edit for consideration "where participation may be hampered," keep, and then pick up at "the Internet governance community should endeavor to help find ways to enable such participation" as an alternate suggestion.

So as we consider the new compulsion for additional players to participate in this, I just need to take some time to consult. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Liesyl, can you repeat the edit?

>>UNITED STATES: In the last sentence, retain "where participation may be hampered" -- oh, okay, "where participation may be hampered, the Internet governance community," and retain, yeah.

It is a suggestion for the concerns raised by those in the room, but it is -- the intent in the beginning is what we'd like to take some time to consult, if we may revisit, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. I would like to delete "multistakeholder" and to keep "developing countries and their stakeholders" because it is not only focused on stakeholders. It is on developing countries and their stakeholders.

And the last sentence which is alternative given by the United States, which I thank you -- thank the United States for proposing that, I still have a problem with it because I don't think we need to put qualifiers here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think that we could simplify a little bit and clarify the first sentence because we think that there is -- it creates some confusion and it is a little bit repetitive in our views. So we would propose instead to have all intergovernmental, multilateral and multistakeholder organizations dealing with Internet-related issues. And then we would strike out "in addition to international and regional Internet organizations." We think it's quite confusing to have -- yes. Yes, that captures, I think, what we wanted to say.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I deeply appreciate the U.S -- the proposal alternative. And thank you for Iran's intervention. I think -- I'd like to propose to keep the alternative of the U.S. proposal because this is the recommendation for the developing countries to enable to participate -- enable the developing countries to participate in enhanced cooperation. So I think it's -- this alternative is very, very important. So I'd like to retain this U.S. alternative. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. This particular alternative given by our colleagues from U.S., now in the context of the changes that we brought in in the earlier part of the paragraph, we are now referring to a group which is much larger than just Internet, Internet governance community. So from that point of view, I'll request we wish to find -- I mean, they're included. But in the earlier paragraph, earlier part of the paragraph -- we're talking about many other governmental, intergovernmental, multilateral, multistakeholder. So they're not yet part of the governance community, I think. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I support the new wording that U.S. introduced. And as for the last alternative sentence after U.S. formulated, we appreciate that. And reading a little further down, we find that there are some other contributions that have the same spirit. So I don't believe that there is much difference from one -- the importance to eliminate or form -- I mean, form a (indiscernible) to

participation of governments in particular from developing countries. So it's more or less about the same. So I think we can work on that and have some suggestions. It is, basically, the same that was written in some other recommendations. Either we can take it when it comes down to read some others or we live it -- or we will revisit just to avoid duplication. But, Mr. Chairman, we support that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to say that we would welcome the alternate language provided by Sweden at the beginning of the recommendation and thank Mexico for their astute reading of the remaining proposed recommendations and happy to work to adjust that to include all the sentiments that were provided by others as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. I thought the last three lines were really key for, you know, improving and extending participation from developing countries and I'm not clear on the rationale behind striking them out, but I would try to propose maybe an alternate text.

So maybe instead of saying "the Internet governance community should endeavor," we can simply say "the aforementioned organizations should endeavor to help find ways."

So instead of saying "Internet governance community," we can just make reference to "the aforementioned organizations" to help in that regard.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Aforementioned. One word.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: One. A-f-o-r-e-m --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher. Especially for the "aforementioned." Very much appreciated.

Saudi Arabia. Then Marilyn. And then I would like to close after that.

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

Can we go to the wording proposed by our distinguished colleague from Sweden?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I couldn't get you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah. I mean can we see the wording proposed by Sweden?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are asking for --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay. So if we say "dealing with international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn? Where is she? Where are you, Marilyn?

You didn't ask for the floor?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry. I was just going to speak in support of Baher's --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>MARILYN CADE: -- idea about "aforementioned" so that we could shorten the number of words but keep the meaning. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

Well, we managed to have some wording and to have some kind of recommendation which can be as weak as it can.

It says almost nothing, and we encourage -- go down.

"Should endeavor to help find ways," and we are discussing it for one hour, to endeavor to help find ways.

I am really disappointed. I was already disappointed yesterday when Nigeria submitted a recommendation and we didn't approve it, and now we are discussing something which has no obligation to whoever is going to read it.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to address the proposed edit from our colleague from Saudi Arabia and again come back to the intent of the original proposal, which was to compel, again, the Internet institutions to evolve to meet the needs, which we believe is a public policy issue.

So limiting it to -- limiting it to organizations dealing with Internet public policy issues dealing with the Internet actually changes the intent, and again, I would have to consider. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So let me suggest that we put on this draft recommendation the stamp to revisit and move forward.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran.

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

No problem. I can accept to be revisited, but without the last two paragraphs, the alternatives. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: In that case, let me put the question --

We have no consensus on that.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: On this proposed --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Whole thing.

So in that case, we don't revisit --

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair.

In the -- in realizing that I'm standing between the room and the chocolate chip cookies that I baked with my hair dryer in my hotel room --

Okay. You know, we need to remain -- retain a little humor here.

Is it actually that we don't have consensus on the entirety or we don't have consensus on the last five lines? Can I find -- can I find hope for consensus in the intent of the -- not compelling, but recommending that the aforementioned institutions find ways to enable participation from countries and their stakeholders?

I can see that even the chocolate chip cookies didn't get anyone's attention. Sorry, Chair.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. It's very useful, not only the chips and the chocolate and the cookies, but your remarks as well. And bringing back humor helps a lot.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think we think we are reaching to a good conclusion in this.

In Alternate 1, if we could borrow the phrase that was used by our colleague, Baher, on replacing the word "Internet governance community" with "aforementioned" which means -- yeah, borrow that to Alternate 1 -- I think there is no characterization of what types of situations are causing or hampering the growth of Internet or use of Internet. So without qualifiers I think it might find better traction in the room.

So Alternate 1 with this particular phrase which we could perhaps consider forging some consensus on this.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India, for your spirit, and for your encouragement.

Okay. So I -- in that case, I retain the word "revisit" and let's move forward.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah. A question, Mr. Chairman.

Are we going to revisit the whole paragraph or which one?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably, yeah, when we come back to that, we try to clean it, with the hope of having one recommendation. Yes, Iran.

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

I think I made myself clear that I have problems with qualifiers. It's really difficult, Mr. Chairman, how we are going -- and who is going to assess that the participation is hampered or the -- part of the population which their participation is hampered. Who is going to decide on that and how?

That's the problem. We have to be very careful on the language we are proposing here. We need to -- to propose something which is feasible, not to make it more complicated.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it agreeable to you that we drop the first part and just say "aforementioned" -- what?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: -- "organizations should endeavor to help find ways to enable such participation"?

Iran.

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

That is one part of the problem, but the other part of the problem is my question I made.

Who is going to assess that this part of the population is hampered and how it is going to be done?

That's the question.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran, I dropped the "hampered." I dropped the first part in my proposal.

You have nothing to do. Either you decide that you will endeavor to help find ways to enable participation or you don't do it. It's as simple as that. You don't have to evaluate.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Can I have the -- the part that -- clearly? Because everything is now a strike-through.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: "The aforementioned organizations should endeavor to help find ways to enable such participation."

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: In that case, Mr. Chairman, we can keep it as revisited but I'd like to get back to that later on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran. And probably I didn't have a chance to ask the U.S. but they are going to come back to me anyway, so I propose to move forward.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Yes. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, I can see that the second alternative is still there. I accepted the first alternative with your proposal, not the second one.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it okay like that?

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

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden?

On the next one. Okay.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we would like to thank the Russian Federation for this contribution. We think it includes a couple of very important messages about the openness and unfragmented nature of the Internet, as well as the importance of creating an enabling environment for investment in broadband infrastructure.

We have a couple of suggestions on how we see that the text could maybe be improved.

Starting with the first one, right now we think it takes maybe the form of resolution text or a statement and we would propose that we would -- we could change the text to "All stakeholders should endeavor to ensure that the Internet should remain an open and unfragmented global resource with a fair and" -- then we would strike "truly" because we don't think there is a need for this word there -- "international governance," and then it would continue as it is.

So "All stakeholders should endeavor to ensure that the Internet," and then we would strike "truly" because we don't think that there is a need for that. "International" is good enough.

And then as for the second paragraph, we would probably change it to "All stakeholders should be invited, and particularly those from developing countries."

And then we would strike "promoting their countries," so we would strike "countries." "Promoting their interests."

And then in the last one, we would also like to change "governments" to "all stakeholders," and we would strike out also "formal and informal." We think it's enough to acknowledge that we should endeavor to eliminate barriers for participation for all stakeholders.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Avri, then Chris, then India, and of course Russia.

>>AVRI DORIA: My point was long lost on the previous point, so I have nothing to say about this one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: This was a quick one. Thank you. Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a question for clarification for me, if you wouldn't mind.

If I heard correctly in the discussions of the last proposed resolution, there was discussion about the fact that these are under the heading of developing countries and therefore should be resolutions limited to that context, and it strikes me that if I'm right about that, then there's a significant amount of context in here that is sort of globally applicable but only with particular reference to developing countries. Which is fine. That's okay. But I just wanted to ask the point of clarification. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chris.

Well, they are not resolutions, they are recommendations.

There's a significant difference.

If the floor feels comfortable to have it here, I feel comfortable. I have no problem.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

Since we are -- in the first paragraph, in the first line, the thing that should remain -- or rather second line -- "Internet should remain an open," we'd like to add a few more phrases if we can. "Comma, secure, universally accessible." We are trying to find a word which is -- I -- at this point in time I think it still doesn't include --

"Comma, accountable, and comma, responsible."

I think the -- in terms of language, "responsible" really doesn't gel well, but I think we'll see -- we'll hear from the room if there are any comments on finding a better word to this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it's not my role to qualify any of the words, but probably Internet as being accountable sounds a bit strange to me.

Russia, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah. Actually, we prefer to have the word "governments" because there is a certain difference between the -- I would say the composition of stakeholders in developed countries and developing countries because of the, well, logical and reasonable lack of international forced global business in developing countries and they do not have enough power and intention to have the force on the international arena.

And in this case, the governments of developing countries should take the responsibility on before saying the developing the economics of the country. That is why the key role of governments on the -- in this issue.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I would just like to add some comments to the edits provided by our colleagues from Sweden.

In the first one, we would like to add the word "multistakeholder" between "international" and "governance." "Multistakeholder," mm-hmm.

And then we had a confusion about what "equal capabilities for" means, so we would suggest striking that.

And then with regard to the comments provided by our colleague from India, I think we would echo your confusion with the word "accountable for the Internet." So probably would not include that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm not confused. I simply don't know what it means.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay.

[Laughter]

I would never accuse our Chair of being confused.

And, again, retaining the edits by Sweden, referring to stakeholders at the beginning.

In the third one, we would suggest ending the recommendation at "capacity-building" and striking the rest because we are talking about -- this is all pertaining to Internet issues. So I think it is redundant and confusing.

And would strike "equal possibility for." Again, confusing as to what that is intended to mean.

Some suggestions. Thank you, Chair.

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

Sweden, then Saudi Arabia, then Iran.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. If we could go up to the first paragraph again. We would have problems with "accountable and responsible" because the Internet is a space and a space cannot be responsible or accountable. So those two -- we would request those two to be deleted.

If we go down to the second para, we think that we could accept "governments and all other stakeholders," if there is a need to single out governments. We don't think there is such a need, but we could live with that if we can also include other stakeholders because if the spirit here is that we want to ensure that the Internet is open, accessible, and unfragmented, that it should work well. Governments can't do it alone. And, therefore, we need the participation of all stakeholders.

And for the last -- for the last paragraph, we agree with the deletion made by the United States. We think the last sentence there, we think we are also getting into complicated territory of definitions. We have been discussing this at length, whether or not Internet infrastructure is included in the international telecommunication networks or -- and I don't think it would be to the benefit of this meeting to start at this point to discuss the definition of international telecommunication and what's included. So we would suggest that we leave that part out. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As was said by Russia, we would like to see "governments" in the second recommendation. And then after "international Internet governance," we'll add "for ensuring the stability, security, and continuity of the Internet." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could we have the first paragraph on the screen. Mr. Chairman, I agree with you and Sweden that "accountable and responsible" is not in a proper place. Therefore, we suggest to move it to the first line, "all stakeholders should be accountable and responsible to ensure." "Be accountable and responsible to ensure" and delete "endeavor."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: And to delete "endeavor." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Chairman, I propose to go paragraph by paragraph because we lose track of the proposals the colleagues in the room are making. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I agree with your last remark which reminds me that we didn't have coffee.

So I propose to try and complete our discussion on this issue after the interventions ahead of us and then get some coffee.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. A minor point. The first paragraph where the cursor is right now, "unfragmented global public facility," "public facility" is a term used in both Geneva output documents and Tunis Agenda. "Global public facility" instead of "resource." Thank you.

And in the last line "social economic development" for "economic development," "social." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see Sweden, United States, then Ellen. Oh, Avri, I'm sorry. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: I thought other people were before me. Thank you, Chair.

I have to confess that as what happened with the previous recommendation has happened with this one, that they've been sliced and diced so very completely and we have so many phrases that are ambiguous and don't quite connect to each other that I can no longer find the meaning that would allow me to say whether I agreed or didn't agree with the recommendations before us.

And so I must admit to the fact that I've become hopelessly confused by the juxtapositions of words that we are attempting to call recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have been told previous times, many times, that the whole concept of enhanced cooperation was brought in to the Tunis Agenda in this spirit. So we are just following, I think, the spirit.

But we can -- I fully agree with you. We can do better. I'm sure we can do better. We will do better.

It may be not during this meeting, but I'm sure we can do better.

So USA, Sweden and Ellen.

>>UNITED STATES: I have to agree with Avri, we have a juxtaposition of words at the moment, but we are endeavoring to put them together in a way the results will make sense and be helpful.

However, having said that, I have to admit that "all stakeholders should be accountable and responsible," with that edit, it's confusing about accountable to whom and responsible to whom. I think that some of the other attributes for Internet was -- that are earlier on.

With regard to the edit regarding a public facility, if we are going to, quote, the WSIS text in that regard, then we would need to actually do that and say "facility available to the public" rather than "public facility." Thank you, Chair.

So you would take out "public," "an unfragmented global facility." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden, then Ellen.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We cannot agree to the proposal made by Iran just now to include "accountable and responsible." Just to try to make an example. How can a company that trades on the Internet, which would be a stakeholder in this case, how can a company ensure the openness and the security of the Internet?

And if you don't have the tools to ensure something, you cannot be accountable or responsible. So what stakeholders could do is to endeavor to ensure the best. And for that, they cannot be accountable or responsible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I like the idea of accountability, but -- though, I have a suggestion of maybe another way to frame it because I agree with what Sweden and the U.S. have raised. So I'm thinking perhaps we can add in the last clause where it says, "which should be able to engender trust," perhaps we can add "which should be able to engender trust through an environment of accountability." That was one comment.

My second comment is back to this question back of "facility and resource," I like the "resource" word better. I think when we talk about facilities, we start to limit the ecosystem that we're talking about to something that maybe is more in the physical side and doesn't encompass the whole ecosystem. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comment is on our distinguished Swedish delegation.

I totally agree with him that the other stakeholders cannot be responsible and accountable. But I have a question. If they cannot be accountable and responsible, why are they trying so hard to have a role in public policy issues which require to be responsible and accountable? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you, Chair. As member of group of stakeholders non-governmental and part of the developing countries, nations, all of our nations in LACNIC region are developing countries. I would say that we have never intended as an organization not to be accountable. Also, not only in our operation or role that we have in the Internet but also with our intervention in public policy issues.

But I guess what Sweden is proposing, it is not that. And I want to be very clear that be I guess -- I don't know if I can speak for the rest, but I guess at least for our organization, we have never been -- intended not to have accountability at all. It's that we have a limited accountability. We are -- at least our organization is a membership organization. We are accountable to our members. We are accountable to our community.

But what Sweden was proposing was to open the possibility to the ones that don't have the tools to -- or the ways to be accountable as the government has in order to develop that possibility or capability.

And in our case, we want to be able -- we want to remain accountable as much as possible.

So I want to avoid this perception that only the governments are the ones that want to be accountable and they can be accountable. So they have a responsibility, that's great. But other stakeholders also need to be accountable and want to be accountable to their communities. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden, then India.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Well, my understanding is that stakeholders want to be involved in public policy development because they are affected by the decisions made and they are directly affected by the public policies. And they also provide expertise. They provide technology that are needed to make informed decisions and that are needed for ensuring what we are trying to get at here, ensuring that the Internet remains open, stable, accessible, unfragmented because that's totally impossible for governments to do alone because that's not just -- the way how the Internet works or how the information society works. So that's just an attempt to answer the question by the distinguished colleague from Iran. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I give the floor to India, then I would like to have the coffee. I don't know how you feel about it. I need it. And at the same time, I would encourage you to sit down and have this extremely important and interesting discussion over coffee. It is very instructive. I learned a lot.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think so far the comments I've heard on this paragraph, everyone wants to be accountable and everyone wants to be responsible. So what is the problem in keeping these two words in the text? Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As I indicated, probably you might like to sit down and have coffee and have this discussion continued in that relaxed way. And you want to be accountable for that.

Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I would like to speak to the importance of continuing to discuss the recommendations and remind that we are in a section dealing with developing countries, which I feel has been lost a little in the discussions, particularly on the first paragraph.

And I think it's really important, particularly from civil society perspective, because we need to acknowledge that developing countries are excluded in many ways and in different levels and even self-exclude. Being involved in discussions, not only amongst other governments but also with other stakeholders. And they're excluded for a whole range of reasons and face barriers for a whole range of reasons which I think need to be acknowledged. And we need to understand more and listen to more intents of ways to respond to those very real issues.

In particular for civil society in those countries as well. We have forms of democracy, and forms of participation are still evolving. And where civil society voices are not enabled in the same way that they are in other countries.

So I think -- and I think if we don't acknowledge that, I think we're going to struggle to come to some agreement about how to address the barriers, the very real barriers, that developing countries face.

I just want to speak to the importance of continuing this focus because it really is very important for civil society. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy, for reminding us of our task.

Before coffee break -- one minute, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I think actually Sweden made a very important point which is nobody can do this on their own. So perhaps the formulation in the first sentence should be "all stakeholders should cooperate to ensure," blah, blah, and you can add "in an accountable and responsible manner" somewhere. Even there, should cooperate in an accountable and responsible manner to ensure, et cetera, et cetera.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I propose we continue from here at 15 minutes' time. So it's 12:20 I expect you back. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. I think this is the time to approve all the resolutions.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, good afternoon. It seems to me we have lost half the group or they don't find their way back. Before coffee break, we stopped on the submission from Russia. We had a lot of amendments and proposal for amendments, so as I can see it now, the first paragraph looks pretty complicated to me.

I think before coffee we had a proposal from an observer, and I read it out.

"All stakeholders should cooperate in an accountable and responsible manner to ensure that the Internet remain an open/secure, universally accessible, and unfragmented global resource with fair and multistakeholder governance which should be able to engender trust for social and economic development and confidence for everyone."

That was the first paragraph.

The second paragraph was "Government" -- I think it was "governments" -- "and all stakeholders should be invited, in particular those of developing countries, to play more effective role in international Internet governance for ensuring stability, security, and continuity of the Internet, promoting their interests, making the environment more attractive for investment into national broadband infrastructure and development of local content/services."

As for the next paragraph: "Notes the importance to eliminate all barriers to the participation of all stakeholders, in particular those of developing countries, in international public policy issues pertaining to Internet, to ensure economic development and capacity building."

I hope I reflected what we have more or less suggested.

I would like to ask you if you have any comments on that.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to check and see if my -- my understanding of English is correct.

"Governments and all other stakeholders," on initial reading -- I mean "and all stakeholders," as opposed to "as well as all other stakeholders" seems to indicate that governments are not stakeholders.

Is that the meaning that we mean to convey? Or I mean just, you know, as opposed to "governments as well as all stakeholders," which would convey that they were indeed stakeholders and -- and I'm just trying to understand what meaning we're trying to convey.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for the question.

Anyone from the members?

India, please, then Iran.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think the easy way to fix that would be "government and all other stakeholders." That means -- "government or" -- "government as well as other stakeholders". That way you would have captured governments also as part of the stakeholders.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Iran? You still want the floor, Avri?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran, please.

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

For the first paragraph, I think we can stop up to the "unfragmented." So I don't think it's necessary to -- "should be able to engender trust" and so and so. We can stop there.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yeah.

And the second paragraph, Mr. Chairman, since we are in Section D, which is on developing countries, Mr. Chairman, we don't need the first line and a half, so we start "Developing countries are invited" -- "are invited" -- and to delete from the beginning up to "developing."

No.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: "Developing countries" should be there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I just have a clarification question.

So in response to the contribution from Iran, how would the first one read? I see where it ends, but what would you see the beginning being? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Iran.

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

It will read, "All stakeholders should be accountable and responsible to ensure that the Internet remain an open/secure, universally accessible, and unfragmented."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen, you referred to the first paragraph or the second one?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: No, that's -- that was the question I had. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I could agree to end the first paragraph after "fragmented," but I think on -- on the basis of the excellent wording that's been suggested that "all stakeholders should" -- I think it was Richard who suggested it -- "all stakeholders should cooperate in an accountable and responsible manner," I really don't think it makes any sense to say that all shareholders should be accountable and responsible to ensure.

And in respect to the second paragraph, I'm comfortable to take out the first line and a half, but I think in order to -- in order to concentrate it on developing countries, but in order to maintain the context, I think it's important that it says "developing countries and their stakeholders are invited."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you.

Support the previous speaker. We cannot accept the text in the first paragraph as it stands now for the reasons that we explained previously.

It must be -- we could go along with "cooperate in an accountable and responsible manner," but we cannot accept the text as it is now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Just to express our support to the second paragraph with the inclusion of the stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

On the second paragraph, with the addition on the screen, Iran?

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

I have no problem with the addition and I would like to thank the proponent for it. "And their stakeholders" is acceptable. Thank you.

But for the first paragraph, Mr. Chairman, if the "accountable and responsible" is not going to be in the paragraph, we prefer it to be deleted. I mean the whole paragraph to be deleted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see a proposal to include "accountable and responsible" in the context that all stakeholders should cooperate in an accountable and responsible manner.

Is it not acceptable to you? Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, I will get back to you later on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Let's move to the third paragraph.

I understand the second paragraph is acceptable to everyone.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: It would be acceptable if we add between the brackets "and their stakeholders," "in their respective roles." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Can you repeat?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: After "stakeholders," "in their respective roles." "In their respective roles." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. In this form, the second paragraph, Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would request to also insert "openness." For "ensuring openness, stability, security and continuity of the Internet." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

Just to seek a clarification.

A developing country. A country has all stakeholders. It has government. It has civil society, private sector and technical community. So "developing countries and their stakeholders," I think I can't comprehend.

So maybe you ought to say "governments of developing countries and their stakeholders" or "and other stakeholders."

"And other stakeholders" instead of saying "their stakeholders." Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So as it stands, the second paragraph, it's okay?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Can we have the clean version of the second paragraph so we can know what -- thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Clean version. You are asking for too much.

Ellen? No?

U.S.? No? Okay.

I can see a lot of flags. I take from the back, India. I can see you as well.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. As you start cleaning the text, my confusion is growing. There is some belief in this paragraph that stability and security is in the hands of developing countries rather than from it. So I'm trying to understand the paragraph as it stands now. I think what was initially intended and what emerged is entirely different to begin with.

So as you are reading this paragraph, you would see that developing countries will have to ensure openness, stability, security and continuity of Internet. And, obviously, it in this paragraph, I thought the intent was not this in the paragraph. In this particular subgroup, the intent was to bring in those aspects which would enhance enhanced cooperation in developing countries. But we are adding responsibilities to them which is no problem but with no substantive support. So you can continue to reiterate their responsibilities, which is good, provided they feel they are responsible enough because those aspects which are listed there are not within their realm to a large extent. So my submission to you, Chair, is as it stands, it's confusing, and I can't really make out if the paragraph has any meaning at all now. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. We had the feeling that it was a meaningful paragraph and after a suggestion to clean it, it turned out to be not so meaningful. So how can we revert back to some meaningful paragraph?

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While supporting what was just mentioned by the Indian delegation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have in the first line before "stakeholder" "and their stakeholders" because when we say "other stakeholders," it may also include the outside country stakeholders. But we're talking stakeholders of the developing countries. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Chris. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree with the Indian intervention about that -- let me deal first with the first couple of lines. It would probably make more sense if we said "governments and other stakeholders," brackets, if I'm allowed to use brackets in the context of actually brackets, parentheses, I guess, "in their respective roles of developing countries are invited." That groups governments and other stakeholders together rather than splitting them in terms of developing countries.

Having said that, that achieves absolutely nothing in assisting the Indian intervention because it's correct -- I wonder whether -- if I can just as an experiment, if we stopped -- does it make sense if you say "are invited to play a more effective role in international Internet governance," full stop for a moment. So if that's the intent, then is everything else really necessary, relevant or, to use your term, Mr. Chairman, useful?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So how do you feel? India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. We really want to thank Chris for coming up with some valid suggestions except that to note that the last part of it, maybe the later part of the sentence we are deleting, if you can start the deletion from the sentence "up to their interest" in the next line because you can still have an environment, more attractive investment. I mean, it is certainly the role. Everyone has a role.

But those -- "ensuring" parts, if you could delete, and make the environment attractive as well as development of local content and services, I think that could still have relevance in this paragraph.

So with those amendments from Chris, if this is accepted, then I think that's something we can all read and make some sense out of this. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think if we change the word "are invited" to be "should be enabled," this makes sense to developing countries. Enabling them to participate in enhanced cooperation. Thank you. So "are invited" to be "should be enabled."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India? Are we there? It is just one paragraph.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We wonder if maybe we could improve the text by saying "should be supported to play a more effective role." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: My personal view is it is better to be "enabled" than to have some support.

Saudi Arabia and then U.S.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Is my language for ensuring stability, security, continuity out? I would prefer to put my language back. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: I just wanted to come in in support of Sweden's edit "should be supported" instead of "should be enabled." I mean, they are able to do it. They may just need assistance or help. So who would be doing the enabling? And what implications does that have? I think "should be supported in their efforts" is another way to strengthen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. The thought the whole emphasis of this subgroup is how to enable the developing countries to participate better. So I know the support is there to substitute, but not kind of a true substitute in the sense that I think it's important to recognize that at present, it is -- this particular working group is looking at those ways of realizing enhanced cooperation from a developing country's point of view.

They should be enabled, not merely supported. It is more than that. Support alone is not enough. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Chris, then Mexico, then Phil.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Two points. I just -- yes, I think I would favor "enabled" for the reasons just stated. I note that putting back the text on -- "for ensuring, openness, stability, security," et cetera, has effectively returned the problem, which is that, it doesn't mean -- it doesn't mean anything specifically. It is difficult to see how developing countries to be enabled to play -- I can see how they can be enabled to play a more effective role in international Internet governance with the rider of making the environment more attractive, et cetera.

I can't see how they can play a more effective role for in international Internet governance or ensuring openness, stability, security, and continuity of the Internet. It may just be the use of the word "all" that is causing me a problem. But it doesn't make sense to me.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What do you propose?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I originally proposed taking it out because then it doesn't make sense. I'm struggling to come up with any wording that actually encompasses those points that could fit into that sentence.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden. Oh, sorry, Mexico, please. Sorry.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Also to support the "enable," should be "enable." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I'm aware of the time. I think the description put forward by India which is sort of reflected now on the screen is, I think, sufficient. As you've reminded us, Chair, this is not necessarily treaty text. It is trying to capture, perhaps, a philosophy of an approach. And, therefore, I think as it stands, it makes sense going forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. After the explanation from our distinguished colleague from India, we can accept that text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just also to lend support to the wording of this one as framed, particularly the wording "enabled," which I think acknowledges the need for capacity-building, strengthening, I think that's quite critical wording. Just to support that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Carlos.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Quickly, in other parts of the recommendations, people have used the word "encourage" instead of "enable" or "support" or "invite." I think it should be "encouraged" just for consistency, and I think it encompasses all the other possibilities. It is more generic and broader.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos. My feeling is that we want to convey something stronger but it is up to you, of course.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I'm hearing much support in the room for "enabled." And rather than support it, perhaps my comment is offered in terms of a nice compromise because we don't want there to be any implication that there is an institutional barrier to participation.

So, perhaps, could we suggest "should be enabled in their efforts" as a compromise. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for the proposals in this paragraph. Mr. Chairman, in the first line, I would like to see "in the respective roles" out of the parentheses.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I have a question to those who ask for "ensuring" to be deleted. How come it can be done to play more effective role in international Internet governance than to make the environment more attractive for investment? So it totally different issues because you are asking them to open or to be open for more investment. There is no link with international Internet governance and the national part on openness for investment. It is not clear. Therefore, I think we need those to be there. But I have -- I have problem with "openness," Mr. Chairman.

[Laughter]

No, really. I explain why. I explain why. Because we believe that some Internet content is insulting our culture and our religion. We cannot be open to everything on Internet, Mr. Chairman. This is why I really have a concern about it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jafar.

Chris, then Baher, then lunch.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. So in an attempt to reach consensus, so I heard the concern from the Indian delegate about the link between the first part of the recommendation and then the ensuring openness, you know, part. And I do agree with that.

And then I also heard the concern from the delegate from Iran on importance of including this second part. So maybe one suggestion would be instead of saying "for ensuring," we can say "in relation to" so now we make the link between the first part and then the Internet governance plus the investment part. Thank you.

I have no comment on the "openness" part. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't intend to open the floor for the "openness."

Chris, you don't want to take the floor? Okay.

So we have one more thing on my list, that is lunch.

But before going for lunch, as it stands -- Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. For us, there are only two alternatives when we are talking about this text in the middle. And that is either we keep it all, including "openness" or we delete it all.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Including "openness"?

>>SWEDEN: Yes. We also delete "stability, security" et cetera, et cetera, which we think would be unfortunate because it is important aspects of the Internet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Carlos.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: I think that last paragraph is completely -- the rest of the paragraph is completely inconsistent with the first part. You are calling governments or encourage governments or invite governments or enable governments to play a more effective role in international Internet governance. What does this have to do with their internal policies regarding stimulating broadband infrastructure and so on? It is internal government policy, national policy. You should separate both things.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, I have a feeling now that it's not a kind of lack of consensus but a lack of understanding what we see here. So I find it preferable to have lunch and come back at 3:00 and give a lot of thought. I really beg you to go through the previous paragraphs and the subsequent ones. And I also want to remind you that we have a lot of things to do today, and I really want to stop at 6:00 so we have this constraint.

Anyway, I expect you back by 3:00 and bon appetit.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Welcome back to the last afternoon.

I can observe that we have achieved a lot of results eating all the cookies. Or almost.

So we have about 2 1/2 hours to finish our meeting this time, so I think it's appropriate now to think about the way forward.

As you know, I'm always optimistic, and I think we can achieve some results. In fact, considerable results. But I'm also realistic and I know that in the remaining 2 1/2 hours, we can only provide some -- a few recommendations, if any.

So what I propose, in order to finish our work as a working group, another meeting.

I have already anticipated before we started the whole exercise, and I already suggested that we should have two meetings in 2014. However, by the circumstances, we haven't had the chance to have an earlier meeting this year and so I am proposing you to have another meeting sometime late April, eventually after the Rio meeting. Sorry. Sao Paulo. It was wishful thinking. Sorry.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Or I had another idea that ITU council will be from the 6th to the 15th of May, and not all of us are council members so you may like to consider that eventually our meeting may be in parallel with the council, ITU council.

It may give you opportunity as well to see closely what's going on in the ITU council.

I have to admit that this solution personally is not my favorite one, but I also have to admit that I realize that this may be less burden for most of you.

So as for the first option, I suggest from the 30th of April to the 2nd of May here in Geneva; and as a second option, I would suggest to have -- well, that would be a three-day meeting.

For the other one, I would suggest -- as a second option, I would suggest a 2 1/2-day meeting, and it would be from the 7th to the 9th -- 7th in the afternoon, starting, up to the 9th of May.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: May. I'm sorry, I'm losing my voice.

So I want to repeat that I know, I am a hundred percent convinced, that we can achieve substantial results. I know and I can feel that there is a willingness from each of us to achieve this result. But I know that we need some time to digest what has happened during this week, because I made a big, big mistake. I told you to listen, but I forgot to tell you that you shouldn't only listen but you should hear as well what is said, and understand.

So probably this two months I suggest as a kind of interval break will be very useful to process all the ideas which came up here and will bring us much closer to each other.

At the end of the meeting today, I -- of course I'm going to consult all of you -- I will announce the following meeting, if it's agreeable to you.

Well, this will give us an opportunity to report according to our mandate to the CSTD and just to feed into the process in a proper way.

Okay. So that's how I see things right now, and I believe this is a kind of compromise solution between crying success or crying no, it's a complete failure.

I don't think in either. I don't think it's a big success which we have achieved here, but I don't think it's a failure. I think we need more time.

The issues are so complex that we are about to understand what we are talking about.

Right.

Now, with this introduction, I would like to go back where we have left off before lunch. It was quite a promising start, and I believe we have discussed a submission from Russia, if I'm not mistaken. Probably Russia can't recognize anymore the submission, it has changed so much.

And I can see Marilyn so please take the floor.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, thank you for introducing the -- at least one of the options, which --

Should I take it that after presenting this option and -- because there may be some clarifying questions, there may be a couple of other options as well.

Would you perhaps want to give us some guidance that perhaps after the coffee break it would be useful to return to consideration of this option plus what others might be?

I just had a clarifying question. I'll state it now but we could come back to it at another time.

And that is maybe advice from the -- information from the secretariat about any deadlines that we would have to meet in order to make sure that materials were still able to be taken up at the -- at the CSTD in May.

But I take it by returning to text that you'd like us to think about this and then have a time to talk about the options later.

Is that right, Chair?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That is correct. That is correct.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

Giving us time to digest and to come back to you with our -- you know, our reaction would be helpful.

Chairman, in terms of our time management now, are we going to reach discussion of "The report will be" -- or "will do this," as we have the discussion of a possible additional meeting, or when does the subject of the report -- when will we have an opportunity to talk about that? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for bringing this up.

And as for the report, after informal consultations, I have the impression that a report from the working group as-is now, in the status we are now, we cannot produce a report in a positive way.

There will be a report, naturally, which is the report of the third meeting which will give factual information about the -- what has happened during this meeting. It will give all the links to documents which are available, which are any way available, but it is my impression that it is premature right now to talk about the consolidated report.

So that's why I'm suggesting to have an additional meeting, with the hope of having this consolidated report including the recommendations and hopefully more and more recommendations.

Okay. So I leave it at that. I know that you have a lot of questions.

Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First question is: What is the plan for today? You said that we are going to finish at 6:00. Is it -- if we're going to have another meeting, how meaningful do you think it is to continue on -- just continue on where we stopped before lunch, and for how long? That would be my first question.

Second question, or just comment, is that, well, although we are not extremely enthusiastic about another three-day meeting, that could possibly be something that we could live with, but it's really important that we have a clear idea of what we want to achieve with such a meeting and how we should structure it, so that we really do not waste time and that we come here with a very clear sort of indication of what is it that we are going to do at our third meeting.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

To answer your first question, I indicated that I intend to close the meeting at 6:00 this evening, and in the remaining 2 1/2 hours, I intend to continue business as usual. That is, we go through the recommendations and we go through as many as we can. And we have to keep in mind that we have a lot of recommendations which haven't been discussed yet.

There are a lot of recommendations which we have remarked as to be revisited. And we have, in addition to that, the question of the report. And I'm sure we can't deal with that during the 2 1/2 hours.

And even if I extend the meeting up to 9:00, we can't -- we cannot finish. There is no way.

I can extend it up to midnight, but even then, we cannot finish. Of course I'm not going to do that.

So that's why I suggested that eventually the issues which were already discussed and we have -- we were quite close to some agreement might be discussed in a subsequent meeting, with indications from capitals, you go back to capitals, you have a consultation, you may have other meetings, you may have bilateral meetings. I mean, there are a lot of ways to handle things. And in this spirit you come back and we can continue and finish our work. So that is my idea.

Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, for the clarification.

Just to give an indication that we would probably have preference for having the meeting in May, back-to-back with the CSTD main session. That would probably be a good utilization of people's time, for those that are traveling here to the CSTD.

And also, it's really important to -- maybe to highlight in the report of this meeting that agreed text is agreed text and we're not going to reopen it at our next meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. That is my understanding as well.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Chair, thank you very much for your guidance on how to move forward, but I have a few questions which, perhaps with the help of the secretariat, we can try and get an answer.

One, of course, is relating to the sequence. It is our understanding that the General Assembly mandate given to this working group is till the next CSTD. That means, it's supposed to provide a report to the CSTD which will look into this.

Last time when we had this -- when we started the discussions, we heard that the secretariat needed a clear 12 weeks notice before the reports are prepared, translated, and submitted for membership, wider membership, in the U.N. system.

If you intend to have a meeting in later part, how are we going to bridge this particular dimension?

Particularly given the point that the moment the CSTD begins, this working group will have finished its natural life. Beyond the CSTD, the working group does not exist, technically, because the mandate was to report to -- unless it's -- it is in between -- it is extended by the General Assembly.

So I mean these are questions we have to -- we have to honestly ask and get an answer from the secretariat.

What is their understanding of this?

And secondly, I entirely agree with you that we live in hope and hope is a sense of life, so I'm sure -- I'm going to use the word "irreconcilable" -- at that point, given the fact that we're looking at a time frame

and given the divergence of views, perhaps in this space, they appear to be irreconcilable, but I'm sure with the passing of time, with more ideas coming, I hope we'll be able to come up with some solutions.

So we'll request you, Chair, through you, we perhaps get some answers from the secretariat on the procedural dimensions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy.

As for the last part of eventual extension of the mandate, which I hope we don't need, well, we had an experience with that in -- with the previous working group on improvements to the IGF, and I had also the belief that it is the General Assembly which should extend the mandate, and I think it happened --

Well, it was the ECOSOC, in fact, which -- it was the CSTD in the draft resolution proposed an extension of the mandate and naturally, of course, it was endorsed by the General Assembly.

So the bottom line is probably it's the CSTD who should be proactive in this way and it's up to the CSTD to take appropriate measures.

It doesn't mean that it will be extended in case CSTD suggests it.

As for the first part, I leave the -- give the floor to Anne to reply.

>>ANNE MIROUX: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

When I was mentioning the 12 weeks rule last year, which is actually between 14 and 12 weeks, I was referring to what is actually U.N. document with numbers and so on, documents which are formatted and translated and which are usually mentioned in agendas of U.N. meetings.

In this particular case, there is always the possibility, as you know, during meetings to have conference room papers which can be produced always usually at the last minute, and if, for instance, this working group would have the report on the 9th of May, it would be, yes, logistically quite difficult to put everything together, but still I would say possible.

The only thing is that there would not be any editing, any formatting, and no translation. And the U.N. offices are usually wholeheartedly reluctant when we arrive very, very close to the meeting. But it's possible.

The 12 rule is applied for really the addition and most of all the translation. Beyond 12 weeks, it's impossible to get any translation.

But you have some leeway, as I said.

For instance, if you had had a report this year -- this time of the working group ready next week or the week after, it's possible -- it would have been or it would be possible to distribute it, but it would be now a conference room paper, CRP.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Thank you, Anne. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, secretariat, also, for the clarification. I take it the next question would be that if we met, let's say, a couple days before or back-to-back with the CSTD or whichever format the group agrees to, would that mean at that point in time, are we looking at presenting recommendations to the CSTD? Or what is the format of reporting? It has to be a report. Or would the report -- can it still say it would fill any time for further consultations or for the mandate to be extended?

Given the nature of the areas where we need convergence, I think we need to be prepared for that eventuality. Should there be a similar situation? Are we going to present a report which would have certain mere facts as statements listed in the report and with the conclusion to the CSTD requested to further consider allowing having more meetings? And thereafter present it to the ECOSOC for additional -- to the General Assembly in addition to give it a renewed lease on life for this group.

The sequencing is not very clear for us. Chair, I'm sorry to indulge you on the subject again. It is not clear. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I'm referring back to the previous working group I chaired which was previously chaired by Mr. Riehl from Switzerland. The previous group or, rather, this stage where it was in the situation where it was just they couldn't come to a final conclusion and it was clear that they would -- we would ask for an extension. And it happened that Mr. Riehl, who was at that time the vice chair of the CSTD, presented his report. And in the report, I believe there was a request for extension. And the CSTD decided to allow for an extension.

After the second phase, the presentation of the report, it is my strong belief that we will be in a situation that we can present the report on behalf of the working group. And I will be presenting this report naturally to the CSTD. CSTD doesn't go into details about the recommendations. It didn't go into details in the recommendations. Recommendations were attached, I believe, as an annex -- no, it was part of the report, but it didn't go into details. It didn't ask questions about why this or why that. Well, it took as a complete document and took note of that.

What is more important is the WSIS follow-up resolution. And in the WSIS follow-up resolution, you have one paragraph saying -- it is an ECOSOC resolution, of course, which says that the working group has completed its work and the results are in the resolution -- in the recommendations. And it is going to be forwarded to the U.N. General Assembly. That's it. Okay?

So I really ask you to think about my proposal to have an extra meeting. We've heard it is feasible, it's doable. We have no technical problems with that, procedural problems with that. I note it is not easy for you to cover everything.

And I can identify Joy and Iran and Constance.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of reflections. The first one being just on the practicalities of another meeting. I will just recall that one of the reasons that we agreed upon a five-

day meeting for this session was to avoid the need of two meetings. And so it is with some reluctance that I want to consider another meeting, but I wouldn't rule it out. I just want to remind us of that.

Secondly, just from civil society perspective, I think another meeting is also difficult, certainly from my personal perspective. And I would need to talk to the secretariat -- sorry, to the Chair about whether an alternate might be possible and the circumstances.

And the third point I'd make is that I appreciate the desire and the strive for consensus which I think we've worked hard towards. But I think, to be blunt, I think in the last 12 hours of our working, we seem to have reverted to a veto situation where objection to wording, however grounded -- we are not saying those objections may be unfounded -- but nonetheless seem to result in no consensus. And I think we would need to rethink afresh and reflect on our working if we are to get meaningful progress at another meeting. Thank you.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. Apologies. Marilyn was distracting me.

[Laughter]

Just thinking about the calendar and understanding that there is a tight time frame and a deadline for submitting contributions to the CSTD and also potential requests for an extension of the mandate of this working group, I'm thinking we might want to have a combination of both an additional meeting either in April or May or whenever it's suitable and put in a request for an extension of the mandate. Maybe having both options would give more flexibility for the future. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon to everyone.

Mr. Chairman, I remember that in previous meetings, we heard from the secretariat that having additional meetings will have financial implications. That's another issue that we have to be very careful about.

And the other one, I agree with the previous speaker that our schedule is very -- I mean, full of the other meetings, especially related meetings and WSIS. Therefore, we may make us -- I mean, make it difficult for us to have additional meetings on the same matter, Mr. Chairman. And it will be very hard for us to survive in that case. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I know it's very hard, and I know it's -- sometimes for me it is even harder. I have to be at the ITU Council, and I have to be here in case we select the date I have suggested. But as I told you, I believe in quantum physics, so I can be at two places.

But most seriously, it is a challenge. It is a real challenge. I understand it. That is the best I can think of now.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay, Chairman. Let me just say it. It would be our view that progress has been made at this meeting. Progress has been made at this meeting. Why do I say that? I say that because

we've had a rather serious dialogue. Are countries and other participants telling us their views? They are. Is it possible to meld our views quickly? It isn't. We would take away from this experience that the experience has been fruitful. We are very receptive, Chairman, to the idea of trying to think through how we can further progress the work. You have given us a proposal. We would like to think about it. We will come back to you at coffee break and to see how -- see what we can do with it.

So, Chairman, happy to take the mic. Happy to express what we think is true, and we will be coming back to you with our position. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I really welcome what the U.S. just said because I'm reminded, as I look around the room, about the opportunity that I had to be on the CSTD working group on improvements to the IGF which was a two-year experience. And we were more stuck -- I'm trying to think of a word to describe how mired we were at the end of the first working session. There was mud up to my hair I was so deep in it. We were very mired.

Through the -- and I think we reached an almost cathartic moment of realizing that we did not want to stay in a crisis mode of not being able to find agreement and work toward each other. But it did take another year of work for us to achieve what I think is a very consensus-based recommendation that came from that CSTD working group. So perhaps I take heart from the idea that we've learned -- we've been learning a lot about each other's views. We may not have found exactly the compromised language that we can all agree on. But I do think with more work, we can make additional progress. And I think additional progress will benefit an outcome that I think everybody in this room wants, and that is to ensure that developing countries are able to participate much more actively in all aspects of international policy activities in public policy.

So, Chair, I will consider all options for improving and enhancing our work. And I'll promise to bring lots of cookies to our future meetings. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Looking forward to it.

U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just echo some of the comments other people have said. I think it is important to recognize that we are making progress and that some of the conversations we have had have been difficult but they have been very useful. Obviously, I will need to consult with my capital, as others will, about a further meeting. But something for the group to agree, I wondered whether if and when this decision is finalized, it might be worth us taking some time to consider whether between now and then it would be useful for us to -- if the correspondence group were willing, to take the opportunity to further refine some of the work that they have been doing on

the mapping exercise as a useful and constructive input into a meeting. If we're having another meeting, that might be a useful input into it.

I leave it to the correspondence group. I realize I have just volunteered them for a lot more work. They may have very strong views on that, but that's a suggestion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.K.

Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you, Chair. Of course, for us, another meeting has budgetary implications. And much more than that, I am here on personal capacity. Of course, my delegation is covering the expenses. But I really find I need to find a moment to be able to come and also considering the time frame. But the agendas are really time for many of us, and the schedules are (indiscernible).

Let's imagine that we can do -- achieve all that. We have resources. We have the time. We are on time to provide something to the CSTD. The CSTD would accept these new contributions.

I really -- I wouldn't say this meeting was not fruitful because there were interesting discussions. There were useful outcomes in terms of those discussions. But the consensus was really little, was absolutely disappointing at least for my vision. And I really don't see a lot -- maybe I'm missing some information. So I do see a lot of differences. And I don't know what else we can achieve in another meeting. You sounded quite -- you didn't sound optimistic this morning. And when you did the proposal, you said that you really think that with another meeting, we could do some more progress.

And I really don't see that, but maybe some information that I am missing. So it would be nice to see if there is another attitude in some of the colleagues of this group or if there is any way -- in the same line, I saw the delegate from Iran, he didn't pronounce himself about how useful we could be in another meeting. What he said is that there are financial implications.

I guess there are some delegates that have very, very strong positions here in this week. I would like to know what they think about our possibility to have a different approach or consensus in another meeting because it would really be very, very hard for me to travel and coming back again one more time here and having not very much progress.

Thank you very much, Chair. I'm traveling three times a month so this is really, really hard. Everybody is in this situation, I guess, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres.

I forgot to tell you that May is beautiful here in Geneva.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I was going to say -- start off with commenting on some previous comments. But I couldn't let the point pass to thank my distinguished delegate from the

Commonwealth office for volunteering us for some further work. Of course, I will address that outside the meeting.

[Laughter]

And if that is the will of the group, then, yes, I'm sure the correspondence group can continue.

I've sat and listened to the discussions and the debates. The distinguished delegate from Iran made some good points about being split in two places. And I have a lot of empathy with that view.

But I also think that we have made progress. We have -- given the fact we have disparate views in this meeting, have carried it out with humor. And in some respects, it has been an excellent meeting to participate in and to discuss the issues. It is not that we have always agreed. But I think the fact that we have all respected each other has been a very positive mood.

And I think with that in mind, whilst was very much like how this would have budgetary implications for a further meeting -- and there is no guarantee that my budget in the next financial year for us would be extend to another meeting, it is not something I would want see ruled out if we could make progress.

Whilst I'm not the optimistic you are, Chair, you say you are an optimist, and I believe you. And if you think there can be progress made, then let us try and see if we can actually make that progress. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I think I would like to have a little bit of a clearer sense of what we would do during this other meeting, how we would do it and what our vision of success is there. I think - - we may have addressed that at the beginning. My mind was occupied with the dates, and I may have missed some substantive discussion about how you think those days would go to get us to a different place. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen.

Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to support the U.K. proposal because there are so many excellent inputs from the correspondence group. But we do not have enough time to analyze the input. So I think it is very important, crucial, to analyze the input from the correspondence group in order to understand the situation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan.

Well, I think we have made -- oh, Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. Just want to join my colleagues in, first of all, supporting, you know, the view of giving us as a group another chance for convening for a meeting at the time that works for us.

Also, I support what U.K. and others have said about the work that has been done over the course of the past few months, particularly with regard to the mapping exercise and the amount of effort that was put in that regard. I guess it deserves more time to be looked at and analyzed.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, we are in your hand. We are ready to support any recommendation the group would make in that regard and ready to be in Geneva one more time in the next couple of months. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher.

Well, I can feel substantial support. I can appreciate and I'm sympathetic to the concerns. I have my concerns as well, as I told you.

I try to reconcile different possibilities and come up with some kind of optimal solution.

I will let you think about possible options during coffee break, which I think this is a good opportunity to have this coffee break now, and you will continue your discussions during the coffee break and I would like to have you back by 20 minutes time. That is 20 past 4:00.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Shukran.

I have some news from the secretariat. Rooms -- in fact, Room 25 is available from the 7th of May in the afternoon to the 9th of May in the evening.

So if you agree to have the next meeting, it will be a 2 1/2-day meeting here in Geneva, which will give us ample time to continue considering the input we had and it will give also possibility for the correspondence group to fulfill its mandate which is written down in the terms of reference.

So that's what I can propose to you.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your encouraging work.

Mr. Chairman, as the Iranian delegation, we are open to any constructive, transparent, and accurate idea which is result-oriented, Mr. Chairman, but I think before -- but Mr. Chairman, I think it's good if we think about the next meeting, what we like to do and what we are going to do. That's very important.

In that case, I think 2 1/2 days will be more successful than a week we have spent on the text. I still call it successful work what we have done during this week. I think we have been very clear in our positions, all of the members, and I think now we are in a position to understand ourselves and the others clearer than before.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from you about what we are going to do in next meeting and the suggestions from the room on that.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Before I answer, I would like to give the floor to U.S. and then Mexico, and I can see Marilyn, I can see Andres.

No, I can't see him.

Okay. U.S.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We agree with your proposal, and also it will be a very good opportunity for developing countries to participate in that meeting, taking into account that developing countries have financial support from the secretariat for the CSTD meeting, so they can probably stretch a couple of days more and it will be really productive to have them here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden?

I'm sorry, Sweden.

Marilyn asked for the floor first.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair.

Yes, I was just trying to get clarification of what Mexico said because I -- you had turned and I couldn't hear everything you said at the mic.

Could you just -- thank you. And then I have a quick comment.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Go ahead.

>>MEXICO: I said it's a very good proposal from the Chair because we will take advantage that some of the developing countries will be here in Geneva because they are paid by the secretariat of UNCTAD for participating in the CSTD meeting, so probably they can stretch a couple of days more.

Thank you.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Then I'll make my follow-up comment, which was somewhat similar, actually, but builds on it.

I want to note and recognize that this will be the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday before we have our CSTD meeting, and of course we all recognize that we'll have very senior attendance. Ministers and --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Take your time, take your time.

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry.

-- ministers and others in that first couple of days.

So in order to ensure that we have a well-organized report to give in to this meeting, will we be keeping aside a half day, then, for the secretariat to be able to consolidate the discussions, Chair?

Is that why we're doing a 2 1/2-day meeting?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I know it will be a challenge. I afford the secretariat -- I'm told that the secretariat -- I have assurance from them that they will cope with the problem.

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Before we broke, you said that you had a sense of the room as supporting your proposal. I think you got it right. You read it right. In terms of this administration, we would like to support our friends from Mexico to have this meeting in May for all the reasons stated by Mexico. We associate -- we associate with those remarks. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, we would like to echo Iran. This has been a successful meeting. We are fulfilling our mandate. We have managed to reach consensus on some recommendations, and that's really important to keep in mind.

We also recognize that maybe we haven't had enough time, we haven't finished the read-through of all of the recommendations for different reasons. Lack of time might be one of them.

So we could also accept to have another meeting in -- preferably in May, for the reasons that Mexico articulated, that it would be back-to-back with the CSTD and that would facilitate participation from developing countries.

We think, though, that it's very important that we have a clear objective for the next meeting and that a couple of principles would apply or let's say that we would agree on a -- on a couple of points before that next meeting.

The first one, which is the most important one, in our opinion, is that we all agree that agreed text will not be reopened.

The second one would be that we should not open up for new draft recommendations.

And then we would strongly advocate also that the correspondence group would be given a mandate to continue its work to further improve its important work.

Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair, for giving me the floor.

Just to reflect on your suggestion of having another meeting, I think that's something we will be guided by you, as since the beginning we have said we are in your hands and we will certainly support that proposition.

Secondly, with regard to what are the objectives of the next meeting and what would -- what could happen between now and the next meeting, one suggestion we have, Chair, is that we have this correspondence group. I know -- I'm not sure how much time Phil and Joy will be able to further lend to this, but in the sense that the mandate that we had given to the CG, or the terms of reference, under Paragraph 5, there were four specific aspects.

We could perhaps request them to focus, if possible, on C and D. For the benefit of the room, I'll just read these two subitems, which says, "Identify, if possible, the status of mechanisms and any limitations therein.

"Attempt to identify the gaps in order to ascertain what type of action may be required."

I think since it's part and parcel of the mandate and some work has already gone into this, perhaps if there is consensus in the room, the CG work I think is -- it is useful and we will continue to benefit from that particular process, and that's the suggestion we have.

And secondly, with regard to some suggestions that -- of what would be the, let's say, basic text that we will have at the time when we start our discussions, Chair, I think from the beginning we have maintained this position that -- I mean also it's a very common principle that we follow in the various U.N. bodies, that unless we agree on everything, there's nothing that gets agreed, and it will be very premature to suggest that we have agreement on some aspects.

But that is -- perhaps we have agreed on certain text at that point in time.

As they say in politics, one week is quite a long time. In diplomacy, I think even a day is much longer.

So there is a lot of developments that we are going to see between now and the next meeting. We have the Net Mundial in Sao Paulo. Thereafter, the discussions are also on in Geneva -- in New York where the colleagues are discussing the WSIS modalities, WSIS+10 modalities.

So we would have the benefit of their -- those outcomes. I'm sure it is a different frame of reference that we might be talking at that time. I'm just speculating, but I think -- so we should be just mindful of that.

So keeping that in mind, I think it is very premature to make a comment on the status of the text.

I would urge colleagues not to -- not to insist on such principles because we know that -- I mean while saying this, I do acknowledge that we have spent quite a lot of time in the room to arrive at those conclusions, or certain agreements on a few paragraphs, but I think we have to see this in the larger perspective.

We've also, at one stage, even proposed certain -- made some suggestions but they were not given the kind of weight that they deserve.

So I do want to draw -- bring that discussion now so we would come with an open mind, look at the whole text with a sense of a better appreciation and with a greater flexibility if there is a -- there is room for that.

And certainly it will be helpful at the end of this meeting, whatever documents we have in the current shape, if -- they're already available but then if they are made available to us, it will help us to reflect on them and see whether we can, on our own, come up with certain agreed paragraphs, in a sense, and not agreed. If we can suggest some modifications which, knowing the general sense in the room so far, if there were particular formulations, I think that would be a better approach rather than taking certain predefined assumptions on this process.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

As for your comments about the work -- further work of the correspondence group, I think this is reasonable and I think it coincides with the wish of most all of the members of the group.

As for the approved texts, they are approved in the sense that they were approved in first reading. We have envisaged to have a second reading, of course. And yesterday, we agreed that in the second reading, we may have changes which will be editorial in nature.

I don't think we should deviate from that approach which we accepted yesterday, so it would give us some kind of sense of achievement and it will give something to build on, and basically, that's what we want. To build on some results we have already achieved. And we have achieved quite a lot. Let's face it.

So I don't want to repeat the questionnaire itself, the responses we had, the work of the correspondence group, and last, but not least, the work we have done here with the very valuable submissions from members and the discussions we had here.

So I really encourage you to build on these results, with the sense of the possibility of second reading and consolidating the text in the form of the report we have agreed on.

Having said that, I can identify Saudi Arabia.

Iran, you asked for the floor. Yeah. Iran, please.

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

I will be very brief. I would like to support the Indian delegation, in particular, on his remarks about the very clear principle in negotiation, which is, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, in short, I would just align myself with Iran and India. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

The distinguished delegate from India made reference, for which I thank him, to the work of the correspondence group. I have spoken to my merry band of helpers, and along with Joy, we have anticipated the request for some further work.

We take guidance from this group as to the work that we should do, and if it is indeed as has been suggested, that it is C and D and the working group agrees to that, we would focus on those activities.

We would take one further step, which is to perhaps consider a better presentation of the information rather than in its raw form.

I would ask that it also be minuted that the deadline of submission from the correspondence group to this group is two weeks ahead of time. Whatever date you set for the meeting of the working group, the correspondence group will present its material to the working group --

[Audio interference]

>>PHIL RUSTON: I think I have just been muted.

[Laughter]

>>PHIL RUSHTON: They wish.

So as before, the correspondence group will take no decisions. It will look at C and D.

And I would also ask that when we come to the meeting in May, that some time is given for a further review and discussion of the material that emerges from the work of the correspondence group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Nigeria.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say that I so much appreciate the extent we have gone. A lot has been achieved and a lot is yet to be achieved. It is a step in the right direction that we are scheduled for another meeting, by which all of us probably (indiscernible), so just like the distinguished colleague from Sweden said, it will be good and helpful enough if there is some clear objectives on how the meeting will go, so we can let know in advance to members, and equally, that members come with an open mind and possibility so that we will make more progress.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigeria.

Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just wanted to express our strong support for your suggestion of having another meeting. We prefer the dates from May 7th to May 9th. I think it will give us enough time or give us some time to reflect upon each other's arguments, each other's reasoning, positions that we have sustained here.

I think it will give us also time to reflect upon the valuable output of the correspondence group, and I hereby would like to also support that they would present their work in a -- perhaps in a more readable format. I think they didn't have that -- didn't have that time before, so I think now they would have time for that.

And I want also to remind that it would be two weeks after the Sao Paulo meeting which has as, let's say, objectives to present a set of principles of Internet governance as well as a roadmap for the evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem, which I think aligns quite well with the subject under discussion here.

So I think these two outputs will be of great value for our next meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. Sao Paulo meeting, I assure. You don't plan anything in Rio. Okay. Thank you.

Sweden, then after, United States.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think the United States was before us.

Okay. Thank you so much. Just to say that our understanding is that the second reading will only include editorial -- will be of a strictly editorial nature, and we would like to have that reflected in the report of this meeting because it is really important if we want to build trust in this working group, that we can be sure that what is agreed text is agreed text. And we really have to avoid a situation where some of us are coming here and saying that if we don't get everything exactly what we want, we're not going to agree to anything.

So we would really like to have that clearly stated in the report, that the second reading is just about editorial -- of editorial nature. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. We simply wanted to circle back to you given that there has been comment on the floor regarding the meeting in May. We wanted to, first, support Brazil in its suggestion that we try to put -- or we attempt to put whatever output is coming to us from the correspondence group in readable format.

To Mr. Rushton, this is no criticism. It is simply to say there is an appetite for the information. If you could make it easy for us, it would be well-received. Certainly, we support the comments of Sweden who, as we understand it, is attempting to get meaningful specificity in terms of how we will proceed in our next meeting.

And, finally, Chairman, I would just like to recognize Nigeria's comment which I understood to be, if I may, a plea for progress. And we would like to have the progress, perhaps of the kind that Nigeria imagines.

We return to the WSIS documents and their declaration of principles where it speaks to, and I quote, "the common desire and commitment to build a people-centered, inclusive, and development-oriented information society where everyone can create access, utilize, and share information and knowledge, enabling individuals, communities and people to achieve their full potential.

Chairman, we think it is incumbent on this group to give emphasis to the issues of development in our next meeting. We've certainly had a lot of conversations about a lot of things.

But, Chairman, we would like to endorse the proposal of Nigeria that we make progress in this area. Thank you very much.

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

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First, I welcome the desire to meet again and finish our work and support the decisions being made in this regard.

Secondly, though I see some conflict in trying to freeze the work here and a lot of statements which talk about the correspondence group doing some work and then people looking at it and coming back with a fresh or an informed or both fresh and informed mind, talk about Net Mundial contributing things and people rethinking and all that stuff, and how that matches with freezing the stage of the work as it is on the screen and in the room. So that needs to be clarified.

Secondly, even if there is a tendency toward retaining the work we did here, I should like to mention that yesterday I pointed out to the fact that I was not clear in the manner in which -- what I thought was some disbalance in which it appeared and not that it was intentioned. Some statements were dealt with -- were similarly removed and not there and others were reformulated and came back, and I did not understand the process of who was advised to reformulate and who was advised that, well, it's often because there is no consensus. And a lot of the text disappeared in that manner, and that confusion was never clarified.

In addition and in continuation to that, there was also a proposal for contributions part of -- day before yesterday, I think, that there would be opinions which would be kind of converged and Chair specifically spoke about a one-pager.

And some of us took that approach. And actually you are seeing some of the writing at the end of the room. Some of those proposals were put in that form because that was the understanding that was probably one way the process was going forward.

And now that process is not on, and I don't see those proposals. And what happens to them?

So there is all these factors to be considered. And I would, therefore, request that while the work we have done is valuable, there are going to be a new text. And at least those text which went out in understanding that we are working in this limited framework needs to be able to come back. In any case, at least I would forward the work which was done by many members of the group yesterday as something which was supposed to be contributed. And it was not contributed because there was a lack of clarity of the process which was not fully what I or we was responsible for. There was really lack of clarity about whether that kind of opinion should be contributed.

But in any case, I'm going to send that one-pager to the secretariat and that should be included in the rolling document at least, while I think that it should be kept open for other considerations as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Anyone else? Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a couple of remarks. Firstly, to reflect that, yes, during the break, we've had discussions with Phil and in relation to the correspondence working group, and just

to express continued desire to work with and support the work of this group by assisting with that. And also to emphasize that it's really important that where there are follow-up requests for assistance or advice, that they have responded to promptly so we can be really well-prepared for that work. But definitely happy to help and willing to help.

Also just a note in terms of the May dates, of the dates that the May meeting is a preferable date as opposed to the April one.

And also just then to reflect, as delegates were talking, I was casting my mind back to 10:00 on Monday and remembering where we were and thinking about how much actually has been achieved during this meeting under your guidance, Chair, and with the support of the secretariat and delegates.

We have had a lot of discussion. I think it would have been good if we would have had more time for discussion on the substantive issues. And so I welcome the opportunity to do that at the next meeting.

And then perhaps to look at the recommendations in light of -- in light of the evidence about gaps in the research and information on that.

And, also, I just wanted to thank the secretariat for their work this week. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As mentioned by Parminder, there was some approaches -- you said to us yesterday there would be two opinions and two views, an A and B. And now things are changing with another meeting.

Our understanding is the hard rolling document between square brackets at our next meeting, I would like to have this referred in the summary report -- thank you -- of our meeting. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Chair, thank you very much. Just to seek some clarity that I don't think there's any report that's coming out of this meeting. We just want to continue our discussions in the next meeting, and we'll start looking at a report at the next meeting. Can you kindly clarify that? Because I heard that some delegates were saying that possibly we are going to write something about this meeting. This needs some clarity. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mr. Reddy, as you know, after each meeting, I have my report about the factual information, what has happened in the meeting with the annex about the attendance of the meeting, and eventually reference to the available documents on the Web with no judgment, no -- I mean, it is the usual thing a Chair usually does with the help of the secretariat.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and for the clarification.

Mr. Chairman, in line with what Indian delegation asked, I would like to point out to the final report, one of those issues we -- which we need to be sure about how we are going to deal with the final report, whatever the result is, consensus or no consensus. We would like to hear now how we are going to report to the CSTD, the -- I mean, the result of -- the work of this working group. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jafar. If I give you the optimistic view, we are going to have a beautiful report having about 50 recommendations --

[Laughter]

-- and which will be extremely useful. And the CSTD will give us a standing ovation. That is the optimistic one.

There's no pessimistic one. There is a realistic one. And the realistic one will be that we are going to have quite a few recommendations. We are going to have an accurate description what has happened. And in case you think it's needed, we will reflect opinions of like-minded people in the report. That's how I see it now.

The report will be discussed in the meeting, and it will be finalized by you. And I hope we're going to agree because we have the possibility of expressing divergent views. So I cannot see how we cannot agree on that, in case you have the possibility of expressing divergent views. That is the realistic view I have. And I hope we can proceed in this way.

As for the organization of the next meeting, I fully understand your concerns about the square brackets. And nothing is agreed unless everything is agreed.

But I would prefer to have it in the report. I mean, I would refer to the report. I would like to build on something, meaning that I wouldn't like to start with something which we have agreed now. I would like to start with issues which we haven't discussed up till now. I would like to have the correspondence group also to report to us in an allocated time of 1 1/2 hours, 2 hours.

And I would like to discuss issues which we have marked to be revisited. Once we are done, we start the discussion on the report. And that is the point where we should revisit everything. And that is the point when I indicated you can express your divergent views as well. I hope we don't have this. So, basically, that is the way I would like to proceed. And I know that even if we have the extra meeting, the time is very limited. I'm really confident that we shall have a clear view by then. We have more information which will help us to come up with better recommendations.

Now, as for the new input, I don't expect to have new draft recommendations. I think we have enough recommendations which we have to go through. I would like to discuss them.

Even the time we have allocated for the next meeting seems to be very, very tight. I strongly encourage you to concentrate on the issues which we have in front of us so to come back to this meeting in May in a constructive way.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. This is to come in to support your procedure forward. We think it's fair. We think it does justice to the time and treasure that we have put into this meeting to develop agreements, consensus where we are, where we can. And I think it has exactly the benefit that you say it will, which is that we will be building on what we've accomplished.

So, again, Chairman, this is to endorse your procedural path forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

Parminder, I can see you and I know that I haven't answered your questions. You have raised a question yesterday about some kind of lack of clarity. I would use the word rather "confusion," and it was on our part. Probably we were doing something in a hurry and that's why you had the impression that it is a lack of clarity.

Basically, yesterday, we identified recommendations where we didn't have consensus. We weren't always successful in identifying. But with your help and from the floor, in the end we could identify. We hope to have a clean document with recommendations with the remark that "approved" or with the remark to be "revisited."

I intend to make it available on the Web site, with your approval. And I also make available the other lists where we didn't have consensus on.

I hope that we will be able to -- we will cover everything with these two documents.

I'm not sure if I answered your question.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes, that's considerable light thrown on the subject. However, I still -- one clarification. As I heard you say that the next meeting would only consider issues which are either agreed or to be revisited in this document and none else. Do I hear that right? No, so that's not how it is.

However, there would, as I heard -- the other document which says there was no consensus, and that also remains a part of the document. And that contains those text which I have been speaking of, and that's very clear. And thank you, Chair, very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: My intent is to do away with the document where we have no consensus. I know that I'm very optimistic, but I would like to have consensus on those issues as well.

So probably I'm too ambitious. I would like to reduce, let me put it that way, the number of recommendations where we didn't have consensus on.

And I really need your cooperation for that. And I'm sure you will cooperate with me.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. In terms of modus operandi of circulating this document, since we already have -- what do we call -- the email list of a group, I think it would suffice if it was circulated on the email group rather than putting it on the Web site because it is just perhaps then the world will know how confused we are. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm in your hands. If the group feels that probably we better keep our secrets to ourselves about the state of mind of confusion, it is up to you. It is really up to you.

We have made it possible, however, for the external work to listen to what we are doing here. We have transcripts as well.

I don't think we are that confused as it seems. But I'm in your hands, as you wish. Naturally, we are going to circulate among the members. And in case you agree, we can put it on the Web site. In case you don't agree, we don't put it on the Web site.

So just additional information. The -- all the documents are available on Google Docs, and it's only members who have access to the Google Docs.

Any other requests for the floor?

So everything seems to be clear. I hope at least you can see clearly. I wish I could.

Well, I have strong hopes and I am really happy to reestablish the confidence in the room, the trust, the mutual trust, because without that, we cannot achieve anything.

We still have 40 minutes --

Well, okay. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Just a question for clarification.

Our proposal has been on the table until the next meeting or what will happen to the Saudi proposal? Just for clarification. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I indicated that everything is on the table.

Do you have an urge to treat further recommendations right now or do you feel relieved and not under any pressure?

Phil, I know that you are full of energy and you want to work. Please go ahead.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Chair, thank you for the mind-reading experience.

No, I was going to say if -- if you do finish early, I would just like to use the time to plan the work of the correspondence group. We are a disparate band of merry people, and the time spent together in this room, say, for the next 40 minutes could assist us in planning our work for the next seven weeks.

So whilst I know everybody in the room would be willing to work on a Friday evening and to work into their weekend, I would apologize for the inconvenience of releasing them early from the room and would ask that that be considered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Good of you to remind me that I have to have the approval of the group to extend the mandate of the correspondence group.

I do believe that we all agree to extending and providing us with input.

I can see nothing, so thank you.

Okay. So let me take this opportunity to thank you all for your participation, for your cooperation, and in spite of the differences we had, I think it was a very good meeting. I am really grateful for that. I particularly want to thank the conveners of these breakout groups.

I would like to thank again Mr. Reddy for his efforts to come out with a structure for the report.

And I would like to thank each and every one of you for taking your time and spending this time together and having these fruitful discussions, so I hope to see you next time in May. Thank you.

[Applause]

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