

Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

3-5 May 2017

Geneva, Switzerland

DAY 1

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Geneva

03 MAY 2017

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Good morning, everyone. I think if you settle down, we can start. I think the room is full. Everybody's here. Nigel just said, "Reporting to duty," so I think that's a sign for us to begin.

Distinguished delegates, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, so this is the third meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, and as head of the secretariat of the CSTD, I'm very happy to be here and to welcome you.

So I know during our last meeting, the second meeting last January, Ambassador asked us to -- you know, there was submissions that had been already made on the recommendations, and then Ambassador asked for all of you to go back and take a look at the compilation here made out of all the recommendations and to see whether your recommendations were properly reflected and also, if necessary, to submit amended or additional recommendations.

And some of you came through with additional recommendations, some of you put forward new documentation, so with the guidance of the ambassador, we have -- we collected the input and updated the recommendations list and then they're all now in one single document, what you have proposed before and what you have proposed between the second meeting and now. So I'm sure you must have - - you have seen it. It's all in the Web, and so everything on recommendations hopefully are reflected here now.

So the moving forward, I just want to let you know I think we were thinking ourselves and also talking to the ambassador. You know, I don't think the timing is on our side, unfortunately. I think we will have time for two meetings, one in this year. We are looking to see what time and how the rooms can be booked in here in Geneva. And then one probably in January, because I think that's the time line for us to get something submitted to the CSTD, so January is a drop-dead deadline for the group to come up with the documentation.

So I guess since we have two meetings and the time is short, now we have a valuable document here which has compiled all the recommendations in one place, maybe it would be good if we now begin to focus on the recommendations and, you know, get to the endgame.

So on this account, we are here to help you and, you know, please do not hesitate if you need any help from the secretariat, and then of course, you know, we will -- we are always standing behind the ambassador fully.

So having said that, thank you so much and I hope that this session will be very fruitful and, you know, you will move forward and move forward rapidly. Thank you so much.

Chair, you have the floor.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Shamika. Good morning to you all. It's a pleasure to -- to start this meeting with you. I'd like to welcome all of you, those who are based in Geneva, those who have come from capitals. We really look forward to a very fruitful meeting, as Shamika has said.

I'd like also to thank the secretariat for all the support and all the assistance that has been provided in between those meetings, and also to thank all those who have contributed with your inputs, with your ideas, in the first phase of consultations and now very recently at the second phase in which we have 12 responses to the call for new ideas, revisions, amendments, in regard to the first version of the compilation of recommendations document that was circulated last time.

So I'd like just maybe to spend one or two minutes to try to sum up a little bit what we have done so far and to explain to you or, rather, to convey to you my views on what we should be doing for this meeting.

Well, last meeting we had, I think, a quite interesting discussion on -- in regard to the first -- the topic of the first question that had been agreed in our first meeting last September regarding the high-level characteristics, what are the high-level characteristics.

So after some discussion on the organizational flow of procedural aspects, we engaged in this discussion on high-level characteristics. Of course this was not -- we didn't reach any final decision on this, but I think that first exchange helped us to have a better understanding of what of those characteristics that were proposed by you and observers could make it to our final report as consensus characteristics or characteristics accepted by consensus by all of us, which of those characteristics that were proposed were rather -- should rather be seen as outcomes, desired outcomes, rather than characteristics, and some other elements that even though they had value and they should, in a way, be reflected in our document, they should not be seen and portrayed as characteristics.

So there was this initial exchange. I circulated a very short synthesis trying to be very accurate in regard to the -- even the terms we had used during the conversation, and this was circulated to you yesterday.

But I just wanted to recall that we have, in principle, decided not to address this paper again at this meeting, so this is something we want to look at it back again at some point in time in the future on the basis -- and this was what was proposed -- of discussions of the other facets of our work.

And basically then we are referring to the topic that was covered by the second question that was agreed and proposed to us and to observers in the first meeting.

That second question refers to recommendations.

So for this meeting, as it was anticipated in January, we want to focus on discussion of recommendations. We, last meeting, documented with a compilation an attempt -- a attempt to compile the recommendations that were contained in the documents, and the inputs that were submitted by you and observers was circulated for your initial assessment. We did not discuss this document at all last meeting. I want to be clear about that. But there was a call for you to revise this document, and on the basis of your assessment, to provide new ideas, new -- or to -- either to revise or to amend or to add.

And this was done, as I said, by 12 of you who reviewed this document and made proposals to further adjust it and you have before you this revised document. It was posted by the secretariat. And that should serve as the basis for our work today.

It should be noted that one aspect of this document which was not discussed last time referred to an attempt by the chair to try to provide for some organization of the discussion and to provide for some categories of issues.

In my assessment, this was a way to try to avoid duplication in discussion as some -- clearly when we looked at the various contributions, some recommendations were addressed to existing institutions, others were addressed to future possible new framework on the economy.

So we tried -- those are two categories. I think there were five or six. That was an attempt just to organize, but there was no intent, of course, to preempt the discussion or to make any judgment on the outcomes.

However, I must be very transparent that in response to our call, some of you argued -- and I think to some extent correctly -- that those categories were not discussed in plenary so we should not be working under categories but, rather, looking at the actual recommendations on their own merit without trying to categorize them. At the end of our work, we would have, let's say, a number of recommendations but not with any tags attached to it.

So we try to reflect this in the new version of the compilation document of recommendations. So those of you who reacted to our call by providing responses that fitted into those existing categories, that was done; so we started there. Those who objected being categorized, they were set in a different section of the document.

So it's not a perfect solution. This is something to be discussed by you. We could maybe simply just delete categories and look at ways -- I don't think we are -- we have time now to engage in that kind of procedural aspect.

The important thing for us in this meeting, my opinion, would be to focus on substantive discussion and avoid the kind of exchange we had last time. I think we lost one full day just discussing procedural aspects. And in the life of the time we have, we should certainly avoid that and maybe go for simple solutions.

So before turning to you and receiving your reactions, my assessment is that now on the basis of the responses we have from you and others, all the inputs we need to do our work are already on the table. So it is up to us, up to the group, to decide on how to organize discussion, how maybe to prioritize or to establish criteria for discussions, maybe I use that word, not "prioritize," because I don't want to give the impression that I as a chair attach more value to one category to the detriment of others.

But as we look into our mandate, we were mandated to provide recommendations on how to further implement the concept of enhanced cooperation but also to take into account the difference of views. So in my opinion, that means we should on a priority basis maybe focus on those proposals that could lead to consensus because this would be the core of our mandate, to provide recommendations. But, of course, we should not be detained from discussing issues that we know will not lead to consensus but that they are important in themselves because this will also feed into the other part of the mandate that needs to reflect the diversity of views.

So I think we need to decide on how to do it in the appropriate ways and maybe to establish some criteria to look into this document of compilation of recommendations.

As you can see, the document is a 44-page document. It encompasses a total of 105 recommendations and some of them -- some of them extensive. So it is not feasible at all to look into detail in each one of them. I think this is something that must be understood by all of us from the start.

And I want to hear from you on how this can be done. But as a chair, I'd like to submit for your consideration that we should establish some criteria thinking about the kind of outcome we were mandated to produce. We think it would be out of scope of our mandate to look into issues that would in a way duplicate work that is being done elsewhere. So, again, I'm not saying that some of the ideas that were proposed are not important but to the extent that they duplicate work or duplicate discussions that are taking place in different fora, organizations, I think this should not be the core of our work here. It's not within our mandate.

Another important thing that I'd like to propose for your consideration, I think that when we look at the ecosystem of Internet governance that, of course, encompasses a very large number of organization -- foreign processes -- and as we are trying to propose some interventions in the ecosystem that can improve its functioning from the perspective of enhanced cooperation, it is also important to take into account the different mandates of those organizations and to be very -- to take a very sober view that what we can do here in regard to some organizations, we cannot influence directly what is taking place in each and every organization. So it is not realistic that any recommendation emanating from here will have influence on different organization's bodies that have their own governing bodies, that have their own internal rules. And I think that would be a little bit in my view out of scope if we are -- we are not mandated, I think, to provide that kind of prescriptive advice. But it is for your consideration.

I think, also, another criteria that maybe could be accepted by us would be not to duplicate or try to elaborate on language coming from the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS outcomes -- outcome documents in general.

I think you may concur with me that we are as a working group operating under the overall framework of the WSIS outcome documents, so all -- all those notions that are there including everything that is in the Tunis Agenda has been already endorsed at a very high level and reaffirmed at WSIS+10 meeting in New York two years ago.

So I think we should take it as a departure point, as a given framework. But I think it's not necessary either to duplicate the language that is already there or try to rephrase. I think it's outside of our mandate to try to engage in that kind of exercise. So I think this is something else I would like to propose for your consideration.

And, again, some recommendations refer to -- rather to principles, what principles should be applied. And here I would like to refer to the first part of my statement, that we looked in our previous meeting at the principles and we should revert to this after we discuss actual recommendations.

So I would think that it would not be a priority for this meeting to focus on what are the principles that should be guiding. Rather, this is something we had in initial discussion. We have bracketed for the moment, and we are -- at some point, we will try to tie the two things together. But I don't think it's up for this meeting.

Again, I think we have on the table all we need for our work. Very interesting ideas were proposed as I have looked at all the contributions you have made, U.N. observers have made.

I think there are many, many good ideas, many good proposals, and sometimes innovative things, I must confess. Some of those proposals I have not -- I do not have recollection of having seen in other circumstances. So I think it would be very appropriate and very consistent with our mandate if we could look into those ideas, into those actual -- maybe try to clean up a little bit of those things that do not belong to the core of our mandate.

Just to give you a flavor of some of those -- maybe I'm already anticipating something. But I would be very much interested, for example, in discussing some important and, I think, very innovative ways of dealing with some -- I want to be very careful about it -- some new -- I don't want to say "mechanisms" or "framework." But, for example, when we talk about frameworks, we are consistently over the years talking about a new institution, a new body.

But I have seen a number of proposals, some ideas, that would have I think what Anriette -- and forgive me just to mention it directly -- have stated could be some incremental approaches. For example, to establish some kind of discussion or some kind of agenda item under one of the other institutions. That would lead us to have some kind of regular discussion on this topic, maybe not with binding -- of a binding nature but to provide space for discussion and for a structure. So this is, I think, the -- just give you an idea of some of the things we should be discussing. But, again, not to duplicate discussions that are taking place elsewhere which would not be solved here, which would not achieve consensus here. Certainly not to try to reformulate or rephrase the agreements that were reached under the WSIS documents and so on.

But I'd like to turn to you. I -- as we have seen, the agenda we proposed for this meeting is very slim. It's just indicated welcoming remarks by Ms. Shamika and opening remarks by me, and then we are proposing to adopt the agenda. And in that regard, I just want, maybe just before proposing adoption of the agenda, to say that we need to spend the time we need to get ourselves organized, so "Procedural issues: Organization of the meeting," that now appears as a very slim topic that would be exhausted at 10:20. We'll allow the time needed for us to get ourselves organized, so don't worry about that.

And after that, we'll be just in a working mode, and I didn't want to indicate exactly how this will take place. That will depend very much on your collective guidance to me on how we should proceed.

So I'd like to -- also, in order to follow the formalities of the meeting, just to propose the adoption of the agenda before we move to discussion so we could proceed in an orderly fashion. But, yes, I see Richard Hill. You have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I'm just going to repeat what I said by email. I agree with your approach, with some comments, but we'll come to the comments later.

Just regarding the agenda, I just thought we should make it a little bit more precise.

So we will introduce the 12 new contributions and then discuss the individual recommendations, with a view to achieving consensus, but then we should also discuss the structure of the outputs of the group, and I propose we do that no later than Friday morning at 10:00.

And then I have some proposals for the structure of the outputs but I'll save that for the discussion.

So I'm just suggesting we make the agenda a little bit more precise along the lines you suggested.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

So if I understood you well, so when -- in the text that reads now, "Procedural issues: Organization of the meeting," you propose to add two subitems here. That would be presentation of new contributions and discussion of individual submissions, contributions. And on Friday morning, 10:00 a.m., we will have a session to discuss the outline of the documents.

So this is what is being proposed for -- by Richard. I'd like to hear your views.

If there are no comments, I think that could be accepted, then. We will proceed in that way. I don't see -- don't see no objection, so it is accepted. Thank you.

So with this, the agenda is adopted.

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Let me just do it for the sake of --

[Laughter]

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Thank you. Thank you. I think we have a good omen for the meeting we have.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We made that decision that last time. Took us one day and a half to do it. Thank you very much.

So now then, I will immediately open the floor, give the floor to all those who have made new or additional -- have sent out additional comments in regard to the compilation documents.

All those who wish to take the floor, I will give the floor to -- in the order they have requested.

Richard Hill and then U.K.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. No, Chairman, I just had a procedural question. You've made some introductory comments.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>RICHARD HILL: And I have some comments on those. When do you want to take the comments on those?

I think maybe we could take them after we've introduced the contributions, when we start the substantive discussion on the recommendations, maybe, if that's okay with you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. I agree because my comments, in a way, referred to how we want to get ourselves organized to discuss the individual recommendations, so I think that that would be the appropriate moment.

So I invite you now, if you want, to present your new contribution.

And just also for everyone's information, of course, we have seen that Richard Hill has provided two documents. An additional document in regard to his previous contribution for recommendations, and also a separate document in which he provides comments on the initial contributions presented by members and observers.

So with this, I give you the floor, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Actually, I'm trying to open the documents. Perhaps we -- you could take the U.K. first and then come back to me. I'm -- you went so fast with the agenda I don't have my documents open yet, so perhaps you could take other speakers and then come back to me. Thank you.

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

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everybody. It's very good to be here again. And thanks also to the secretariat for all the work that they have done for us in preparing our documents, and to -- and to colleagues who have been considering the issues further and making further contributions to take us forwards.

We are happy with the change to the agenda that's been suggested. We have a couple of comments on the organization of our work. We certainly agree that there should be now an opportunity for people to introduce the new contributions that they have made, and we agree with you, we need to spend most of our time at this meeting looking at the proposed recommendations.

We do think, though, that on Friday it would be helpful to have an opportunity to make some comments about the high-level characteristics. You sent around very recently a very useful and very interesting document regarding our discussions on high-level characteristics. We think it will be a good idea to give colleagues an opportunity to respond to that and share views on the high-level characteristics on Friday, perhaps, and this would help us as we think about those issues in advance of our next meeting.

So we would like to have some opportunity, perhaps on Friday morning, just to have an exchange of views on the question of high-level characteristics. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, I am, as always, in your hands, so to the extent the -- the group will -- we have not, for -- in regard to our agenda, I gather, initially anticipated this, but this could be done if the group wishes to do so. I will submit that to the group on Friday morning. Thank you. Yes, Nick?

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Not surprisingly, Chair, you'll find that I'm much more interested that we stick with the agreement we previously made and spend this meeting on recommendations. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would say that, before giving the floor to others, we don't need to make a decision now. I think we must see how the meeting unfolds. The priority for this meeting clearly is to discuss recommendations, but if there is enough time and interest on the part -- that could be done. I think what Paul has suggested is a good thing we must keep in the back of our minds, and then, if possible, this could be undertaken.

I have on my list United States and then Marilyn Cade and Jimson.

So U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everyone. Good to see everybody back in Geneva.

First, just on the agenda, I'd like to thank the chair for adding the coffee breaks. I know that was a recommendation raised last time and that was nice. It's also helpful, and so we appreciate the response

to this by the chair to accommodate, you know, hopefully some informal consultations amongst members.

You know, I understand the kind of sentiments going around about discussing recommendations, which we didn't get really into a lot of detail last time. I do think that it's useful to go back and discuss some of the characteristics so we don't lose any time and we can understand what we need to prep for for the next meeting.

But I also think that it's important, as we kind of continue our work, that we start to envision what we're trying to produce, and I know last time there was some conversation about an outcome that starts to have some preambular text and then goes into high-level characteristics and then starts to discuss the recommendations, and it's -- I think it's important that we kind of always remember those three, because as we get into recommendations, just like as we got into characteristics, some things might -- we might not want as a recommendation but it's a characteristic, or might not want as a characteristic but it went into the preambular text. And so if we understand kind of how that's all coming together, maybe it gives more flexibility and recognition from some that might not belong here but could go elsewhere.

And so at some point in week -- maybe Friday, if we have time -- I think it is important to revisit the characteristics to see where we are and what needs to be done, but also how that fits with preambular text or chapeau language or something that we discussed last time.

And then certainly, I think the chair's recommendation of trying to go through the recommendations and find those that have broad support and the greatest chance of consensus is a good approach and it could really put us on -- I think on a good track to start achieving some of that type of agreement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn Cade?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

Good morning to all colleagues. It is, indeed, a pleasure to be back working together, and I want to thank the secretariat for the supportive work, as well as the chair, but also the colleagues who took the time and effort to make the additional submissions.

I look forward to our work on the -- discussing those contributions. I do think, along with others that I've heard suggest this, that it is useful for us on Friday morning to spend a little time. I like the term that was just used by our colleague from the U.S. Government, "envision our report and its content." I think that would be very helpful for us to begin to think about what the report's going to look like and what -- how it will be organized and the general areas that it will include.

I also agree that it would be useful to talk a little bit further about the characteristics, and I think if we are diligent about focusing on the submissions and the recommendations for the next two days, that Friday morning would be a good time for us to launch that further discussion.

I, too, think that it would be good for us at some point to try to identify those recommendations which have the broadest support and then figure out how we work on the ones that are sort of in the middle category, and then how we are going to identify and at least have some reference to the full set of materials that were received, such as maybe in an annex or something of that nature for the report.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair.

Colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, welcome and good morning.

It's a great pleasure to be here with you, and following the request of the chair with regard to additional inputs made, I would like to make the following submissions.

I noted that two of my recommendations were not captured, so I responded concerning that, and that is number one. To say that all government on equal footing should participate in the work of the Governmental Advisory Committee of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers in the management of the critical Internet resources. That's one.

And the second one was that recognizing the capacity gaps in addressing Internet public policy matters in developing and least developed countries, appropriate support mechanisms should be enabled to bridge the gap. I also provided a suggestion on the category.

Now, there was a third additional recommendation. This is a fresh recommendation. In fact, I've been thinking about this since the first meeting of WGEC, that is WGEC 1.0, and that is that the CSTD convenes a yearly forum where all governments on equal footing can discuss public policy matters pertinent to the Internet with the participation of the business community, the technical community, the civil society, and the academic community.

As a business -- one of the business delegates from developing countries, I note the value of government participation, actual participation in economic development, and the mandate of the CSTD working group itself, and so I feel that an opportunity for CSTD every year -- it could also be true intersessional -- that to have a focused discussion on public policy matters, with active participation of all stakeholders would be very useful.

So that is the recommendation -- fresh recommendation I provided. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. Just in regard to your first observation that some of your recommendations are not captured, I -- I think they were, indeed. I'll turn to the secretariat just for clarification.

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ-SANZ: Thank you, Chair.

Just to clarify that these three recommendations are included in the revised compilation under the uncategorized recommendations because we didn't receive any indication of where -- under what category of those proposed by the chair this would be placed, so they are at the end of the document.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. Just to concur with the secretariat, because when -- and I was consulted by the secretariat in regard to -- because there was those -- that issue about the categories, we were very careful of not placing, without the consent, explicit consent, of any proponent, new proponents, anything under categories.

So we consulted, the secretariat consulted, and he indicated there were no responses or in case the proponent had already indicated he didn't want to be categorized, we placed it in another section of the document. But it is there. You may -- it will be -- it is for the consideration of the plenary those ideas you have suggested.

May I just make one additional comment in regard to what Jimson has said?

I think this proposal regarding establishing a space within CSTD for discussing this topic on a yearly basis, I personally found this was one of -- kind of a new idea, a new approach we should be discussing this meeting, that this is one of the topics I think should be -- have one of our priority attention. Not priority, but to deserve enough time to discuss it. Because I think this is the kind of maybe new thinking that was, I think, anticipated that this group could produce. So I thank you very much for that proposal and look forward to having the opportunity to discuss it further.

Let me turn then to -- I have on my list Japan and then Parminder and Cuba.

So Japan, you have the floor, and Parminder. So Japan, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everybody. I'd like to make a comment on the previous speaker from the U.K. suggesting that we should also have some time for discussion on maybe Friday morning concerning the high-level characteristics. We agree on this.

Because the purpose of this discussion on the high-level characteristics is, after having some consensus on what it is we are pursuing, then we can find the recommendation that we all agree on.

So I think to have some consensus on these high-level characteristics of what is enhanced cooperation is quite important. And I also agree -- in this respect, I agree with the U.S. saying that maybe we need to start have some vision of what our final report will be.

The U.S. said that maybe the structure is first preambular text and then high-level characteristics and then some recommendations. If so, maybe on Friday after discussing the possible recommendations, maybe it's a good idea -- maybe it is good idea to have some time for discussion on what kind of characteristics we can agree on.

And lastly, I'd like to make some comments for the chair introductory remarks.

I understand chair's suggestion is in this working group, we should focus on the -- mainly on the recommendation that we can all agree on, and Chair, I understand the chair suggested to do that we use some criteria, like we should avoid duplicating work that is already going on in other fora, we should avoid some -- avoid to do some directives to the other organizations and other -- and that we should also avoid repeating what has already been agreed to in the Tunis Agenda. I agree with this. So -- but to do that, I think maybe we should have the discussion on these criteria.

So I -- after hearing from the maybe two new proposers, maybe I like to suggest that to do -- to facilitate our work to find some consensus on what we can agree on, maybe it's a good idea to first discuss these kind of criteria and maybe these three criteria, and based on these three criteria, maybe I'd like to suggest that we should consider what kind of recommendation we can find consensus. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan.

I turn now to Parminder and then Anriette.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone. In this round, I would be commenting on the initial comments made by the chair and not presenting the additional recommendations which were made by some of us.

As for the comments made by the chair, thanks so much for kind of circumscribing the area of our work and how we can move forward productively. But I have two comments on the initial comments of the chair.

The first is the chair said we should be discussing things which could possibly achieve consensus, which is always a pragmatic thing to do and would, of course, remain an important criteria.

But I think even higher than this criteria is the criterion that we should be discussing, the precise subject matter of this group.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Excuse me, Parminder. I have a point of order. I would just like to -- I understand it's a point of order from Richard Hill.

That's exactly why I just indicated organizational fora because I anticipated it would be very difficult to keep statements in regard to very prescriptive items.

But you have the floor maybe for your comment.

>>RICHARD HILL: I was withholding raising the point of order but I couldn't resist, Chairman. I am totally confused. As many know, that often happens to me.

I understood we had approved the agenda. Once we approve the agenda, we follow the agenda. U.K. and others are now requesting that we modify the agenda. I don't have a problem with that if there's

unanimity but there wasn't. Nick objected to modifying the agenda. I also would have objected. I have no problems with reopening it.

And I think, Chairman, you indicated a very reasonable compromise. And I agree with U.S. and others. When we discuss the structure of the final report, we will naturally want to return to characteristics. So let's have this whole discussion on Friday. That's my first point of order.

My second point of order is that we're now going into a discussion of your opening comments. I asked you explicitly are we going to discuss your opening comments now or will we do it after the introduction of the contributions. You said after the introduction of the contributions.

Chairman, please, can we just follow the agenda at this point and rule out any other comments on the agenda. We'll take them on Friday morning. And I appreciate that we can reopen the agenda, but let's do it on Friday and not now.

So I suggest we stick to the agenda and we go into the introduction of the contributions. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So let me rule on that. But, again, I want to repeat, when I proposed just indicate procedural issues, I think there are so many elements in the discussion on how to organize the work, that I thought it would be difficult to try to -- but we have decided to do it. And I think you have a point that we should stick to the agenda. It was adopted.

In regard to the high-level characteristics, I want to be very clear that I think it's a very important topic. It's something we have added. In September we decided it is not in our mandate, but we decided it would be something that would be useful for us, a tool, to assist us in discussing recommendations. So the first question addressed this. We just had some discussion last time.

The focus of this meeting is not high-level characteristics. But as I had indicated and Richard has already said, nothing keeps us when we look into how we want the outcome document to be outlined to refer to this and to have some thoughts on this. I think this would be completely appropriate to do that at that point in time.

So I would very duly urge colleagues not to come back to this topic again with regard to high level. There will be an opportunity for this, not as a priority topic for this meeting but in conjunction with discussion of the outline of the outcome document. And this is reflected in the agenda we have adopted. I'm not reopening the agenda because I think that would lead us to discussions that are not helpful at this moment.

And I will -- in regard to the decision we made, I will be forced then to ask for some discipline in the comments. I initially was not intending to do it because I would like to have a freer flow of thoughts. So I would invite those -- I would ask maybe all those to take down your plates.

I apologize, Parminder. We will come back to your comments in the appropriate time.

Now I would like to give the floor for only those who have made additional contributions and want to make a presentation on this. And I would suggest that we keep interventions to a limit of three minutes, if possible.

So could I then ask you just for those who have comments and have sent additional comments to keep their plates raised? Thank you.

So I have Richard. I have Cuba. And I have Anriette. I give you the floor in that order.

Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I will only introduce one of the two. So if I could be allowed six minutes, I would appreciate that.

So this combines some comments on contributions made by others and some new recommendations. The main point I want to start with is that I believe all the recommendations that have been made by everybody are very much within scope. I do not support any development of any criteria that would rule any of them out. We're all here. We understand what the scope is. And if we made recommendations, we made them because we believe they are in scope.

And in particular, let's start by looking at what's really going on in the world. And we know that Internet governance is very significant in what's going on in the world. It's not just me saying that. It's pretty clear that there are large masses of people who believe that we focus too much on efficiency in global trade and deployment of ICTs and not enough on equity. And that's leading to votes that some people consider to be regrettable like Brexit, the election of Trump, and a good score for certain candidates in the French elections and poor scores for other candidates.

So I don't think we can sort of close our eyes to this and say, "Well, we don't have to do anything about it."

There's a little bit more detail in the paper. I am not going to read that, and it gives references and data.

Then I want to focus on some specific issues. One issue that's also emerging is that people are not using the Internet as much as they could because they are concerned about security and privacy. Again, we can't ignore that.

The U.S. has a certain view of privacy. Other countries have other views of privacy. We need some -- we need some harmonization.

Then I've also pointed out another recent example of where both sides -- I have to say both sides of this debate -- do not really negotiate in good faith. Now, the problem with that is eventually if you keep doing that, people will stop discussing. Maybe that's the point, stop discussing. But I don't think that's right. I think everybody should make an effort to understand the positions of others and to find some sort of reasonable compromise.

Then turning to specific recommendations, an issue has been raised regarding the ability of people from certain countries to participate in ICANN meetings. So ICANN within existing U.S. law, of course, can do certain things about it. And there's a recommendation on that.

A major computer company has called for -- I'm sure you have all heard about that -- a digital convention on certain aspects of security. And I think that that's worth including in our recommendations. And I give some introductory text and have a specific proposal.

And then I'm supporting -- I won't go through that -- several of the proposals made by colleagues.

But in particular I think we all agree that transparency and inclusiveness are key elements. So I hope that we can all agree that Internet governance matters should not be discussed in the World Trade Organization and related public party trade negotiations because those forums are neither transparent nor inclusive. In fact, they are not transparent to the point where the documents are actually secretive. If you remember parliament, you can't get the documents.

We believe transparency should also apply to disclosure of funding sources for different entities participating in Internet governance as well as telecommunications in general.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard, your first three minutes are up.

>>RICHARD HILL: If you can restart the clock, I will finish within the next three minutes.

Thank you for reminding me.

Then I have some comments on the other recommendations; but I will just focus on my new recommendations here, not comments on what others said.

I actually think that... yeah, that was it. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Parminder for your comments, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chairman.

I think we have been talking of many criteria of what we should be doing. The biggest criterion which should be, as Richard said, to look around what's happening in the world -- we can read about it daily in the newspapers -- and how our public is concerned about it.

And whenever I meet anybody to tell him that if we need a global body to talk about global health, global education, and global agriculture, people don't believe that we don't need a new body to talk about Internet artificial intelligence, IoT, job displacements and everything (indiscernible) and every sector being changed by the digital phenomenon. And everything has been hit so hard, and people are really wanting some kind of leverage over it.

So my first recommendation is we need a human-based mechanism, a body, that enables all governments, as is the subject matter of this working group on equal footing, to develop international public policies pertaining to the Internet and its associated digital phenomenon.

It would be similar to how there is there a WHO for health and UNESCO for education and (indiscernible) for food and agriculture. There is no reason the Internet should not have similar treatment as it is a global phenomenon.

So this body would establish relationships with all technical and non-technical bodies and pass inputs across so it would be working in a network form. It's kind of a meta-issue, and this body would also have a meta-relationship with other bodies. It will keep abreast of global Internet issues under discussions of research, analysis, especially from a development country's viewpoint and shape a development agenda for the digital society.

It should have sufficient resources to be able to do the enormous cross-cutting task which it has because the digital phenomenon touches everybody. So you have to work with ILO. You have to work with ITU, work with agriculture organizations, with UNDP, and provide them inputs on the digital aspect of issues.

Stakeholder engagement is very, very important. It should be a multistakeholder body in the same manner as the Committee on Digital Economy, policy of OECD is a multistakeholder body. Everybody here, the OECD countries, the technical community, the business community and many civil society groups call OECD EP as multistakeholder. So -- and actually it is an intergovernmental council which decides and taking suggestions from -- and inputs from other stakeholders. So that would be a good model for this U.N. body, which will also anticipate criticism that it's not multistakeholder because it should be multistakeholder if it's designed on this committee of OECD, which is called multistakeholder by everybody.

So on technical issues, it should not get into the operations which is a part of Tunis Agenda, but Tunis Agenda also says that it would develop globally applicable principles and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources.

And it will maintain an organic relationship with the IGF as a primary and multistakeholder participation in Internet public policy development. And many resolutions of UNGA have already clarified that IGF and enhanced cooperation are two distinct, two complementary processes and they should remain distinct but hugely connected. And an agenda often could come from the IGF for this committee. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I turn now to Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. Thank you, Chair. Thanks also to the secretariat for the preparation.

The proposal that I submitted I did present verbally during the first meeting but then did some consulting and modified it a bit.

The problem we see, similar to what Parminder just said, is that, in fact, the Internet-related public policy issues are so vast and they, in fact, overlap and integrate with broader public policy issues. You can no longer deal with educational public policy, for example, without also addressing Internet-related matters. Same applies to human rights, agriculture, transport.

So our position is, in fact, that that is precisely why establishing one agency to deal with Internet-related public policy issues would not be feasible.

But at the same time, governments have repeatedly -- or many governments -- have stated their concern, the fact that they don't have a space where they can in a future-oriented manner talk about Internet-related public issues and share information.

Our mechanism that we propose, therefore, is a mechanism that can facilitate dialogue. We propose at this point that it's attached to the Internet Governance Forum. But as Jimson has proposed, it could theoretically be CSTD. So we think that the link with the Internet Governance Forum has various advantages.

We see that this mechanism could facilitate government-to-government discussion on Internet-related public policy issues but in a capacity or a space where they have easy access to other stakeholders, to current debates, to the research and academic community, for example. That's what the IGF provides.

We see this mechanism as enabling them to have access to cross-cutting issues -- again, the IGF is good at providing that -- and as an opportunity for them to be briefed on what issues are being dealt with by other policy fora. For example, UNESCO, World Intellectual Property Organizations, other international institutions could present to this forum what policy issues they are currently dealing with.

We see that it could share information among governments. While we don't feel it should be a coordination mechanism, we think it's a mechanism that can facilitate a more coordinated approach.

We also think that we'll strengthen government participation and engagement in multistakeholder processes such as the Internet Governance Forum, which is a dialogue platform, but others as well. We see this as particularly important because without the participation of governments, the Internet Governance Forum will not achieve its potential.

We see this platform not as a policy-making space, not as a new agency or intergovernmental body. And we don't see it at this point in any case as changing the mandate of any existing U.N. process or body.

We also believe it won't duplicate what's being done anywhere else.

We have some suggestions on how the agenda could be set. We see CSTD as critical. We feel that the annual CSTD sessions and even the intersessional session is an opportunity for member states to begin to develop agenda topics for this mechanism, this dialogue mechanism among governments.

We also propose that at every preparatory meeting --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Could you close, please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I will finish quickly. Again, governments take the opportunity of IGF preparatory meetings to meet amongst once another to develop agenda items for this platform.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Saudi Arabia followed by the U.S. and Pakistan.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Cuba was raising the flag before me.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I apologize. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, colleagues. It's very nice to be with you again in this.

The proposal that Cuba presented this time is very simple. It's not that's the only thing that we think about the issue. That's very clear. It's simple because of the context in which we are now in this working group. So if you allow me, I will refer a little bit for the context because this explains why the proposal is so simple.

The context is that we have a mandate given by the General Assembly in its resolution of 2015. In paragraph 65, it says that what we have to do is to develop recommendations, with a S, plural, on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda. The terms of reference are very clear. It's the Tunis Agenda.

I was telling some colleague beforehand that I always am amazed how the Tunis Agenda has so much wisdom. After so many years the basic principles are still there. So we don't have to reinvent the wheel in that sense. So we have the mandate.

And I am -- we are working on the premise that this working group will succeed and will fulfill this mandate. In order to do that, we have to present a report already at the end of the year, early next year at the most because it has to be translated to the next session of CSTD. So I think that we -- and I urge the secretariat to start working in reverse with a clear time line of how we're going to advance in this report that as the mandate says, it has to develop recommendations.

I'm not naive, we are not naive that we are certain that we may not get consensus on many things. But at least we'll -- in that report, we have to have the recommendations that everybody here makes. If those recommendations can be merged in order to have a small and more condensed, concrete document, good, best. But at least all recommendations by all parties here should have to be in that report.

I don't think the characteristics -- that we already had time for characteristics and all the philosophy. We have been discussing for 15 years what enhanced cooperation is.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just, please, just for the sake -- if you could stick to the points in your additional contribution, please. Focus your intervention on --

>>CUBA: Yes, but I said I put my context for why I'm going to devote only ten seconds for my -- for the recommendation of Cuba. So I will finish the context, if you allow me. Please, because that is very important. We can speak ages, ages, about what is the need for Internet governance and all that and all the models and all the things that -- because Internet has become part of life and -- as life is so complicated.

But here we have a mandate for this thing that was called very vaguely "enhanced cooperation" in Tunisia, that in a nutshell is that governments need to enable -- to be able to participate in development of Internet public policies between ourselves. That's the recommendation.

That is the same of many surrounding here. The recommendation is very concise. It has two parts. One, that we need a space for doing that, an intergovernmental space, of course open to the rest of the actors, as the Tunis Agenda said, within the roles and responsibilities. It's not only closed for the government, it's intergovernmental, the deliberations. It's not for policy dialogue. For policy dialogue, there's many forums in the world. It's for real deliberation and to raise concerns and hopefully to develop policies, as somebody mentioned, that's already in so many other subjects of the world, of the economy, of food or health or whatever.

That's one thing.

To develop -- there's many ways. We will have to agree in which way, or if it's not agreement, put all the different ways. It can create a new body. It can be an open-ended group with a specialized secretariat. But what I'm -- I think it should be open-ended. It should not be closed by -- even by selections by CSTD or like this working group. It should be open-ended. All state -- member states of the United Nations should be able to raise their concerns and make their proposals in this kind of thing. That's one recommendation.

And the other recommendation that is independent from this but of course is related, that we need to have in the General Assembly general dialogue yearly one day to Internet governance. I already proposed that could be in the Agenda Item 17 that is already there in the information on communication and technology for development, that agenda item, under the heading "Promotion of Sustained Economic Growth and Sustainable Development in Accordance with the Relevant Resolution of the General Assembly and Recent United Nations Conference."

If we allocate one day yearly in the General Assembly debate, general debate, for this issue, then maybe states can present in due time with due process a proposal for resolutions and to have this discussion in an open and transparent way in the General Assembly, as many other important world issues are discussed in the General Assembly.

Those are the two recommendations. I know that we will have time to come back to them because it's at least the first time -- the first one to have this body, its recommendation that many other members of this working group has made. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I'll turn to the other speakers, but let me again urge colleagues. I think we have a shared interest in working in a very cooperative environment. I do not want to be too strict in regard to compliance of rules, but I would urge colleagues once we have agreed to some rule for the meeting that it should be accepted.

At this point, we are focusing on the actual recommendations that were contained in our additional inputs and I thank Juan for doing it, but again, we don't need any additional comments. So we have been discussing the context for this meeting since September and even before that, so I'd like to -- for us to have a productive meeting, a very results-oriented meeting, to focus on the items at hand. I would urge colleagues to stick to the points that are contained in their additional recommendations, in respect for the colleagues, because I think all of us have been educated on what we are doing here. So thank you very much.

I turn to Saudi Arabia, then the U.S. and Pakistan.

Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, our submission to the recommendation of the working group are focused on the mandate of enhanced cooperation as it was in the UNGA good resolution, so looking at Paragraph 69 and 71, these are the essence of our recommendations is to establish mechanisms or a body that will enable government to develop international public policy issues. This is the focus of the working group.

A track of discussion is already established years ago with IGF, so we leave IGF as a separate entity. We have no authority, according to our mandate, to discuss IGF or to enhance IGF. Our focus is enhanced cooperation and that's why we are precisely recommending to have a body or an entity to develop all governments on equal footing to develop international public policy issues. This is in the general. I don't want to take too much time to explain my recommendations, as it's along the same line as Cuba said, and partially Parminder already intervened on this. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S. followed by Pakistan.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And just as a reminder, from the -- the U.S. made a contribution to the second meeting but more focused kind of on what this working group should do, we made another contribution for this meeting that is more proposed recommendations that would come from this group.

First off, we don't see the need for a new process or organization, but we believe there are some general improvements that we can recommend to help further enhance cooperation in existing institutions and processes dealing with international Internet public policy.

Those would -- those would include recognizing the principles and spirit embodied in the outcome documents of WSIS, WSIS+10, and the NETmundial principles, encouraging and facilitating the full participation of all stakeholders, encouraging the participation of developing countries, women, persons with disabilities, youth, and unaffiliated users, being open to learning from other institutions, being open to strengthening and improving their existing structure and processes in order to continually improve the Internet-related public policy discussions, and avoid erecting barriers that impede or prohibit the full participation of all stakeholders.

We also think that stakeholders should avoid promoting the interests of one stakeholder group over other stakeholder groups in these discussions, and as appropriate, we encourage the full participation of all stakeholders in the annual IGF meeting, the national and regional IGF initiatives, and other bottom-up multistakeholder fora at the international, regional, national, and local levels. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I'd like to turn then to Pakistan followed by ICANN, Nigel, and Mr. Singh.

So Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, colleagues. First of all, I would like to thank, Chair, you and the secretariat for the hard work that you and the secretariat have been doing in the background.

I will not go into the detail because most of the comments have already been included in the compilation text. I would only refer to the comments made by Parminder, and we fully subscribe to what he said. Actually, those are the comments that we made in the -- in our previous interventions in previous sessions.

With respect to one or two comments that were made earlier on that what our recommendation should look like, I think we should be very clear that W-S-I-S, WSIS, is relevant. Some people -- delegates have made comments that now we have -- we are in 2017 and there are issues which are beyond the scope of one body or one mechanism. I think it's true for every mechanism. It's not only about Internet. Now things are cross-cutting, interrelated, and we cannot really box them into one.

But we should certainly try to improve this --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I interrupt you? I'm sorry, I made a mistake in offering the floor up for you at this point in time because you have not submitted an additional input, so I will just ask your indulgence and we'll come back to you when we come to the point we will be discussing how we will address the individual recommendations.

I'd like to turn to those who have made additional comments. That's -- that's the agenda we agreed. So -- but please, you have your -- you may comment, yes. Yes, please.

>>PAKISTAN: Chair, I think we -- of course I have a comment on the agenda as well, because we found proposal by Richard very useful and we agreed to it, but we have not seen that reflected on the screen and we are a little bit confused where we are in terms of agenda.

I think we should -- we should be -- it should be clear on what the agenda is.

We still have old agenda in front of us, so at least my delegation is not clear as to where we stand. This is one thing.

And of course I'm wrapping up. I will only take 20 seconds.

One thing that is very important, because that has been mentioned, I think the exercise is not about making comment -- making comments of our own but to have a detailed discussion on what has been said here, because only with this we have the chance to come up with something.

So only one comment with respect to policymaking mechanism.

I think this -- this is what exactly we have been tasked to do, so we should be very -- very clear that policymaking mechanism is the -- is the mandate of this working group, that we propose something, we propose some recommendations as to how to improve enhanced cooperation.

And lastly, Chair, I think our discussion would not result in any outcome if we continue with this session. I think all of the comments made by different stakeholders, made by different delegations, are already in the compilation text. What we need to do is to have a draft outcome proposed by you, with the help of the secretariat, and then we comment on it, we negotiate sort of on it, and then we can come up with something that is tangible. Other than that, we can continue with discussion -- this discussion forever and there will be no outcome.

So I would really ask for your indulgence that by the end of this meeting, at least, we should have a draft outcome that we build upon in the next session so that we can have something tangible before us. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

Well, two points. I think you have a point that we should reflect on the screen the agenda we have agreed, for everyone to have clarity of what we are doing now.

So my understanding of what we are doing now, there is a presentation of new inputs. That should be a very brief part of the meeting. That was not intended to develop into reflections on other -- on the recommendations. It should be an opportunity for the proponents just to make a brief presentation.

And following that, we would turn then to the discussion on recommendations.

At this point in time, I think that's what all of us, we want to get to that point in which we can have substantive discussion on the recommendations, with a results-oriented approach and looking and trying to organize our discussion in the way that will lead to us to have clarity on how this would be reflected in our outcomes.

So we are, I think all of us, on the same page, but again, I would urge colleagues that in order for us to -- for us to get there, where we want, where we all want to have substantive discussions, we all want to

have clarity on what can make it to the document or not, I -- I count on your contribution, all of you, for -- at this part of the session in which we are just making short presentations of new inputs that we stick with and then we move to the other part, which is the most important.

If we -- if in your comments you start discussing other things, we'll not get to the important part of the meeting that brought us here.

So it is up to you. It's up to the group to help me in doing this. I can, of course, guide you towards that. I want to do it in a very smooth way, with your contribution, but I would have to count on your discipline towards that.

So thank you, but -- and I thank the secretariat, then, for -- for this.

I would suggest that what appears now, just before turning to the other people who have asked for the floor, Point Number 3 I think would be retained here maybe but it should be reflected in Friday's agenda as well.

So Point Number 3, I think it's important that -- yes -- it would be reflected at the beginning of that. I think that's what we have agreed. And we have -- at the beginning of the meeting. So I think now we have clarity. So thank you.

So we are now dealing with a presentation of new inputs. We have heard some of you who have made inputs. I'll turn to Nigel Hickson, I saw. I'm seeing the list that Nigel has made an additional input. I'd like him to refer to that. I'd like to have the same by the U.K., by Nick Ashton-Hart. Oh, Nick, you have not provided input, so I'll leave you for the next round.

ICC/BASIS and Russian Federation.

So with this, I think we will exhaust the list of presentations on new inputs and we can move to the more important part of our meeting, with your indulgence.

So I will then give the floor to Nigel.

Nigel Hickson, please.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you and good morning to all colleagues. I'm glad I made it onto the floor. I did doubt it at one point.

I'd also like to echo what other people have said and thank the secretariat for all their work on this -- on these documents, which I think are very timely.

I fully concur with what other people have said in terms of the structure of our work, and hopefully we can arrive at Friday with at least some element of consensus.

Also, very pleased that Cuba -- sorry, that Richard Hill raises ICANN. That gives me an excuse to be here. And also reflecting on the comments of our -- my Cuban colleague, clearly we can all talk at length about what enhanced cooperation really means and perhaps we better do that later on.

In terms of what ICANN has proposed, it's very simple, indeed. We think we did excellent work on the high-level characteristics. We think they are important. Like others, we don't think they're a mishmash or anything like that. We think these characteristics are the essential part of the whole process of enhanced cooperation and that's the whole process of discussing Internet governance issues and therefore any recommendations that come out of this process we believe should pertain to those high-level characteristics. Those high-level characteristics should, indeed, be taken forward so that governments and other stakeholders can rightly discuss Internet governance issues in different fora in an enhanced way. And that's what we're -- that's what we're aiming for. We think the characteristics will -- sorry. We think the recommendations that we come up will need to be renewed. We think the high-level characteristics will need to be reviewed at certain points. We think the high-level characteristics should not just be in a report that goes onto the desk of ECOSOC; that they should be, indeed, be sent to other organizations that discuss Internet governance issues. They should be sent to the WIPOs and the WTOs and the ITUs in Geneva and the OECDEs and the UNESCOs in Paris and the UNODC in Vienna. And as we said, we think this group has come together and we think you should adhere to these characteristics, that you should consult, that you should be transparent, that you should have respect for human rights. These are important characteristics and we need to promote them.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I -- I have on my list U.K., ICC/BASIS, Russia, and Iran. I was thinking of making a go in trying to finalize this first round of presentations before our coffee break, so I would urge you to stick to the time. U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, from our point of view, enhanced cooperation is happening as the WSIS review recognized, but it needs improvements and it needs to respond in different ways to a very quickly changing technological environment, and this group is a really important opportunity to help shape and drive those necessary improvements.

So in our contribution, we made 10 recommendations.

In the compilation document from January, it said that we made one recommendation, Recommendation 84. In fact, we're making 10 proposals for recommendations, based on our previous contribution.

And the first five are about how stakeholders cooperate. So we talk about consultation and engagement, making information available, opening up policymaking processes, trying to achieve a balance of stakeholder representation.

The other proposals we make are more about the outcomes of enhanced cooperation, and again, we talk about sustainable development, about investment, and about innovation.

And we also talk about developing existing forums, including existing international organizations. We do not recommend establishing a new body. From our point of view, there are already many, many

bodies dealing with Internet-related public policy. The question for us is how to make that more accessible, more transparent, and more inclusive, particularly for developing countries.

We're pleased to see, looking at other colleagues' contributions, that many of the points we make are also made by other members of the group, and that gives us some optimism for this process.

And when we look at contributions from other colleagues from ISOC, from Pakistan, from Iran, from India, from Mexico, from APC, from many other colleagues, we may not agree on everything; but there are things that other colleagues suggest that we can agree with. And for that reason, we would certainly support an approach for this meeting of trying to identify the areas where there is consensus and then building out from that. And we think that would be a very productive approach to our meeting this time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Paul.

I turn now to Timea Suto from ICC-BASIS.

>> TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Happy to see you all again here and look forward to a successful meeting.

I would like to say a few words about our submission to this meeting. Our responses submitted for the previous meeting focused on the consideration of the nature of recommendations we are to make here. We built our response on the clues the Tunis Agenda gives and the premises expressed and a description of the attributes. So in the view of the high-level characteristics that we've discussed before, we are of the view that any recommendations we make are to be based on three pillars. They should be general in nature and mindful of how different stakeholders in different parts of the world facing different issues have implemented and will need to implement enhanced cooperation.

Secondly, they need to be based on commitment to openness, inclusivity, and outreach so they encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in discussions that are critical through responsible development of the Internet.

And, thirdly, they should be responsive to innovation or, in other words, future proof, developed with the mind-set cognizant of the pace in which technology evolves and changes by the minute.

Thus, ICC-BASIS emphasized that recommendations should be general and flexible in nature and not prescriptive. We highlighted then that enhanced cooperation is a method of cooperation which is already in use in many fora, as outlined in the examples provided but far from exhausted before.

These fora have various processes for consultation and collaboration with stakeholders. Our recommendations should look at what can be done to improve this method of cooperation in a manner that could be applied by different stakeholders across different organizational configurations with the goal of well-informed, better-equipped deliberations on important public policy issues concerning the Internet and ICT4Development.

We also propose to look at options and methods to increase participation in activities where enhanced cooperation is implemented, not only in terms of materially supporting stakeholders to be present at meetings but by opening up existing processes to involve relevant stakeholders, by awareness raising, information sharing, connecting local actors, capacity-building, remote participation, et cetera.

Our amendments provided ahead of this meeting maintain these recommendations. In fact, we only provide a few language edits in order to put in context excerpts from our recommendations and to group certain ideas under a single recommendation as part of a non-exhaustive list of possible actions, a menu if you will, rather than a stand-alone recommendation.

We also added an additional recommendation that was implicit in our earlier submission but not to transfer it to the first compilation document. And the name of this recommendation was that we should strive with the recommendations we make to consider the benefit of our work as it contributes to a collective effort to advance a 2030 agenda and the sustainable development goals. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Russia followed by Iran.

Russian Federation, please, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to explain our position and our output.

First, we would like to say that we think it is very important to have the discussion on the structure of output document because it's actually the success factor for our result of the work of the working group.

That's why we actually try to structure our contribution as we see the output document. We think the main point should be, number one, formats of enhanced cooperation; second, scope and focus area of enhanced cooperation; third, high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation; four, international organizations to be involved in the enhanced cooperation; and five point, recommendations.

So coming to each and every -- first point, the format of the enhanced cooperation, we believe that the format should be -- should contain two levels: The policy-making levels, so-called decision-making levels, which should be made between governments participating on equal footing to take their decision-making role on public policy issues, international public policy issues. And the second level is the discussion level which contains all stakeholders to discuss the public policy issues.

We believe that the complicated -- how to say -- to reach consensus on the format as our distinguished chair says that contribution shows that diversity of views on how the format should look like. But we think it's not a problem at all because our mandate clearly said that recommendations should contain all diverse views. So we think it's not a catastrophe at all to have two or three views on formats of enhanced cooperation.

Then, second, scope and focus area. We -- at our last meeting, we already started to discuss this and we believe that we took a lot of steps to this point. And we actually proposed also the scope and area, how we see it. And we actually -- for the consensus point of view, the purpose, consensus purpose, we

propose that the same structure of scope and focus area as was proposed for some report done for ICANN which shows that the area of Internet governance is very complicated and takes a lot of issues, not only technical and infrastructure, but also edict levels and social and a lot of things.

Then high-level characteristics. As we also remember last meeting, we discussed a lot of it. And we think that certain steps already make it as we just need some actions to come to the consensus.

Then, international organizations to be involved in the enhanced cooperation, we believe that this is a very important for -- and since the Internet is so big, is so huge in the scope and focus area. So a lot of U.N. and other international organizations should be involved according to the applicable competence and responsibility to this work.

However, it should be some kind of coordination mechanism also in order to put it to work to each other together.

So we actually propose that there should be UNESCO and UNCTAD and (saying name) and ITU, definitely ITU --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Could you come to a close, please? Could you finalize your -- please, take the time but, please --

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: To cover the scope and focus area of enhanced cooperation, we need to make the recommendation how these organizations should be involved in enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your understanding.

The last speaker on this agenda item is Iran. Iran, you have the floor for your presentation on your new additional input.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your hard efforts. And let me also thank the secretariat for preparation of the document.

Mr. Chairman, Iran has already sent its additional comments to the secretariat. There are useful recommendations in the compilation text. And we see in some recommendation divergence and we have seen some recommendations convergence between the member of the working group.

In our discussion, Mr. Chairman, in the previous meetings, also in these meetings, we should -- our discussion based on the Tunis Agenda, especially Article 69 to 71.

And the outcome of the working group should be -- lead us to establishment of the new mechanisms. And the new mechanisms should -- could enable the government to do their responsibility in the Internet area.

But I would like to mention that this new mechanism should add two important issues: Transparency and inclusiveness. And it should be -- transparency and inclusiveness should be in all of the areas and all

of the grounds. And it should also include the transfer of technology and capacity-building and providing financial resources because right now, we are discussing about enabling of the governments, especially of the developing countries, to do their responsibility in Internet areas.

So if the new mechanism, an outcome of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, could lead us to meet and to address these issues, we could also be hopeful for outcome and our working in the future.

Otherwise, we also -- actually we also go the same way up to now that we did in the working group, the old working group and also the new working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. With this, we have concluded the first topic of our agenda presentation of new inputs received.

I will now call for coffee break. We are 15 minutes behind schedule. I beg you to stick with a 15-minute break and we will be back at 12:00 sharp. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you, colleagues, and welcome back to our meeting.

We are turning now to the agenda item in which we intend to discuss recommendations.

The -- you have on screen the document of compilation of recommendations that were contained in the contributions received from members and observers to the two questions that were agreed during the first meeting of the WGEC last September, and this document was updated on 26 April and incorporates additional inputs that were received in response to the call we made last meeting.

So this brings us back to the discussion we had, in a way, initially at our previous session, I think even my own comments in that regard, and I want maybe to repeat them because I think as we look into this document, this compilation document, I am in your hands, of course.

We can go one by one in the order they appear in the document, but I don't think that will lead us to have the best use of our time for this meeting.

I would suggest strongly that as a group, we could establish some criteria for discussing the document.

I will repeat my proposals, my opinions, and this is for your consideration. I don't think we should be discussing here issues that duplicate work that is being done elsewhere. I think it is not -- first of all, it's not practical. It is not -- I would say it will not lead to any concrete result, because anything we can do here is not realistic that this will impact on things that are taking place in other organizations.

We could do it for -- let's say as an academic exercise, but I think we are tasked to do it for this meeting.

I refer to the mandate that was given to us by the General Assembly, and I think we -- I am convinced we all should have in mind that we have a shared responsibility to live up to that call; that we should, of course, take into account all the views, the diversity of views, but to come up with recommendations.

I think that should -- again, I am not saying that anything that was proposed is not important in itself, but from the perspective of the mandate we have of what we are tasked to do, I would strongly recommend that we seek not to duplicate work, that we avoid giving instructions or directions to other processes or fora in a way that impinges on their own decision-making methods or procedures.

I -- to be very frank, for example, in regard to what takes place in ICANN or WTO, it is not realistic to think that this working group will have any impact on any decision that is taken in those fora. They will look at it, they will put it aside, and if we load too much the document with that kind of thing, again, it might be kind of an academic exercise but will have no concrete result from the perspective of what we are mandated by the General Assembly.

I think we should also avoid repeating or restating things that are in the WSIS outcome documents because this is the framework we are working in, so I think it's not relevant unless we put some -- I'm not sure. We're not redrafting, but some element that is helpful. I am not -- I do not think we should concentrate our work in trying to reassert statements that are contained there and we should not focus on principles.

I think that if we can agree to this as we go through the recommendations, we might see -- establish some kind of prioritization for our work. This is one way maybe to address it.

Another way would be to work on the basis and prioritize those recommendations that get more support from the room. We have done this in regard to the discussion on high-level principles, as you may recall. We started discussing those principles that had more support, and those that were proposed by one single proponent were further down, and so that that -- this is also a way to organize. The document does not provide for this at this moment, but that could be done, we think. Or we could do it even in the room. We are free to do -- to do that if we wish.

We could go, for example, one by one recommendation and seek some kind of feedback from you.

I do not want to be too prescriptive, but even by show of hands if we want to -- I don't know. There are methods we can do to assert where there is some support or not.

But my basic comment in that regard is that now, as we move to this document, if we do not establish some criteria or some methodology to address those recommendations that are relevant from the perspective of the mandate of the group, of the kind of output we want to produce, be it that they -- they will be adopted by consensus or not, I'm not -- when I talk about the criteria -- and I'm referring to a comment that was previously made by Japan -- I am not proposing criteria to select a recommendation that could be adopted by consensus. This is not the case.

Because I think in our document, of course, it should reflect consensus, if there is any area of consensus, and areas that have no consensus, they should be indicated, of course. There will be ways to do it.

So I'm not discussing here criteria for consensus-making but criteria for things that are relevant for -- from the perspective of the mandate for what we are tasked to do.

So I would maybe seek some reactions on this, because my intention would be that starting this afternoon, we could focus on a more limited number of recommendations upon which we could have really substantive discussion focused on the recommendation, per se. I would at this point be very strict and not -- and limit interventions to the recommendations that will be under scrutiny at the moment, but then for doing that -- and we have one day and a half before we move to Friday morning to have, let's say, this overall assessment -- we need to have a shorter list.

So I would like to hear your views in that regard.

There are ways we could do it once we have, let's say, your assessment that that's something that could be made. We can address it either through -- I could do it myself but I would prefer it to be done maybe by a smaller group that could assist me, or all of you, maybe, even, to assist us to come to that shorter list.

So I would like to hear maybe at this point some comments in regard of the process we should follow in order to have productive discussions.

I agree with all of you when you say we need to move to substantive discussions. On that basis, I can happily provide you with some draft document, if you wish, at some point, but I need to have some feedback from you on the proposals that are on the table to do that, and for that purpose I think we should focus on those -- on a smaller set of recommendations, but also making sure that all ideas that were put on the table will, in a way, make it to our report, be it through some link or some annex or -- there are also ways to do it.

But for the purpose of this meeting, then this is my suggestion to you and I'd like to hear your views.

I have on my list Richard Hill and then United Kingdom and Parminder and Russia. So -- yes.

Richard, please, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I fully agree that we need to reduce the list. I like your suggestion of having a methodology. I do not agree with having criteria and I'll expand on why I don't want criteria. And I agree with the methodology you suggested that we could do something similar to the characteristics, either in a smaller group or in plenary, where we simply go through and we take who is objecting strongly, who says maybe this has some hope if we massaged it a little bit, and others.

And personally, as you know, I've read all of the recommendations and the documents very carefully. There's a lot of them where we can reach consensus, in my opinion, and there are many where we're simply not going to reach consensus, and then some are in between.

So I would propose we move to that.

I agree with criteria because just taking the ones you mentioned, I've looked at all of these, Chairman. They're all relevant, and in my opinion, all of them are in scope. I would really have a problem with anybody saying that any of those recommendations are not in scope. Now, they don't agree with them.

That's something else. That's not a problem. But I don't think it's correct to think that anybody who input anything into this meeting misunderstood the mandate of this meeting. I don't think that anything is duplicating anything. Others may disagree but that's fine. And I don't think that it's impinging on an organization's decision-making power to say, "Look, this group thinks that you should consider XYZ." That's just something that we are entitled to do. And then the other organization may or may not take that on board.

And as you said, I think it's perfectly appropriate to start with WSIS text and then take into account the fact that it's later now and so we can now revisit that and make recommendations on that.

And then I have to say -- you know, I'm always very honest -- I listened to the various characteristics that were proposed, or the various criteria that were proposed, and I'm sure this is just an accident and nobody did that on purpose, but they will result in the exclusion of all of my recommendations, and obviously I'm not very happy with that.

So just on that grounds, it's a nonstarter.

But I think we all agree that the output must reflect all views. Nothing is out of scope. So let's simply do what you suggest, which I think is very wise, which is to have a prioritization where we identify the ones where we all agree, the ones where with maybe some massaging we can agree, and then the ones which -- and I agree, mine are mostly in the third category -- are going to be minority views and we just capture that in the final report in that form.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. May I assure you that the intention was not to target you. I was thinking about some -- again, some ways to organize our work with some prioritization, but I repeat what I have said. I am not taking out of the table any of the recommendations. I think all of them are relevant since they were -- have been proposed by -- at least for people who have proposed, they are relevant, so they are members of the group and the group starts to reflect the diversity of views, so it's within our -- the scope of the group to keep it in.

When I'm talking -- when I said "duplication," I'm thinking issues, for example, that are taking place within ICANN, for example. In ICANN, in Work Stream 2, we are discussing jurisdiction issues. This is something that is being discussed at this very moment there.

Of course if I look from the -- my national perspective, the way discussions are taken, they are not the ones I would favor, but I should recognize that there is a process for that.

So I would be concerned if this group would -- I don't think if an organization -- in my position, I would adhere to some recommendations that are impacted there because it would seem from the outside we are trying to influence something, that we are there inside working on that.

And the same applies to, for example, to the language coming from WSIS outcome documents, because this was revisited in '95. Actually, we discussed some of the issues that are proposed, and by

coincidence by you, for example, in this paragraph on the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, this was discussed in New York at a very high level and it was discussed -- it was decided to keep it as it is. So I don't think it would be the group's mandate to revisit something that the body that mandated us to work decided to keep it as it is.

So I would -- having been there in '95 and making -- participating, I would not adhere also to some recommendation to change the language which we agreed to, to keep it as is. So that's just to put in context the kind of criteria I propose.

But we will come back to this, of course, in the course of these meetings.

So I have on my list U.K., Parminder, and Russia.

U.K.?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, we support much of the approach that you have suggested. I think we would agree with Richard that perhaps "criteria" is not the right word to use. "Criteria" suggests that some proposals do not meet the criteria and should be excluded for that reason. And for us, we don't want to exclude people's proposals.

So we think "criteria" perhaps could be quite a difficult word to use and could cause long discussions and get us into some problems.

Also, perhaps the word "priorities" is not the best word also, because it suggests that some people's suggestions are more priority than others, and again, that's perhaps not a very positive way forward.

We would suggest, instead, we use the word "category," and perhaps our task now is to categorize the recommendations, and we would like to suggest three possible categories.

The first category would be recommendations which have consensus now, recommendations that we can all agree to right now.

The second category could be recommendations where there is some consensus, there is some support, but it needs more editing, more drafting, perhaps a little bit more discussion.

And then the third category of recommendations where there is not consensus now but more long-term discussion is needed.

And that if we had -- if we had a sort of quick exercise not to put forward our own positions but simply to decide which recommendations fit naturally into which of those categories, it could help us in our work and make our work manageable going forward.

So I'll just repeat very quickly. That's three categories.

First, recommendations which we can all agree to now by consensus; second, recommendations which need some more editing or drafting; and third, recommendations which need more long-term discussion.

You suggested a small group. I think that could be helpful. Perhaps over lunch, even, just to do a very quick job and bring it straight back to the group to have a look at. That might be helpful. I think it's important that we keep the discussion in this group here, with all of us, but maybe a small group could just help provide a quick draft for us to look at after lunch. But we would suggest that those three categories might be helpful in managing our work over the next couple of days. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments, and I see a lot of convergence with part of what Richard said, and I think that might be the way we'll be moving, but I want to listen to others.

Parminder and then Russia and Kenya.

Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I have two different comments to make. One is about the general principles you have discussed about what should we do or not, and second is how we could move forward with the recommendations. If I'm able to do both in three minutes, I'll do it in this intervention. Otherwise, I'll take it to the next one.

I would like to respectfully disagree with a statement made -- an assessment made by the chair, and perhaps a few others, that it is not our job to tell anything to other organizations, and in the same vein, duplicating work, what is going on in other organizations.

And I think in my humble view, it's the wrong view of what this body is. You all have much more experience in this area, and I stand to be corrected, but we are a body which is an advisory body to the powers of the U.N. General Assembly. When we think -- we not think of -- I don't think we can give any direction to any body at all, even if it's a very small body here. But to talk about a big body, our powers are about what we tell UNGA, because UNGA being a general body asked a specialized group to think about what it can do and then their power is exercised.

Now, if I'm an advisor to the prime minister of India or the president of the U.S. or anybody, I am not thinking of my powers, I am thinking of the powers of the person or the body to which I advise, and I give my advice according to that, and in that sense, we are perfectly in order to suggest that the whole U.N. system should be reorganized because the Internet has reorganized the whole society and it will change all organizations.

Of course I don't think any earthshaking thing would come out of this group, but I'm just putting up the nature of the job which this group has, and the nature is to advise UNGA about what UNGA can do and not what we can do.

And UNGA, I have much respect for it. When I addressed the UNGA in '15, I bowed to it and called it the parliament of the world and I think it can do anything. And our job, therefore, is to see the context, see the global public interest, how best it is met in a plausible manner, of course, and suggest to UNGA within its power and not in our power to do what it can do, and therefore it is within our power to suggest any kind of most profound institutional change, including to one nonprofit organization in the U.S. which presumes to do global governance.

So I think all these are in order.

And the second point is about how -- okay. This is over.

The first part is over. And the second part is our recommendations could be considered by us.

I think some categorization is needed but not categorization which my same colleague from U.K. perhaps put it. I would preface some other categorization. And I don't -- political systems are a whole. They cannot be constituted in part. And when we say how public policy making should be done in a particular space, it's very difficult to join up systems and make that public policy system.

I think we need to be able to say what in our view is a method of operationalizing enhanced cooperation or implementing it, which is our mandate. And I see in this room -- I take just a minute more -- I see in this room two kinds of views which are emerging. One set of people think that there are certain characteristics which we should decide and then look at how those characteristics can be applied to existing organizations. I would be interested, of course, to know what would be the delta they would offer and how they mean to actually apply it to the organization what would be the process to sending those to them, taking reports.

I want the full institutional proposal around that kind of thinking. And there is another subset of people who think that there is a (indiscernible), there is a gap for public-policy making in Internet space and, therefore, we need a new institution. And there's many proposals which talk about a new institution. And if we are not able to get consensus in one step, I think it's good to try it in two steps, have a semifinal before the final, and have two set of -- two groups here develop in full institutional detail what they want the two sides that just talked and then bring them back and see where we stand. It is possible there could be a third side, for example. Anriette and Jim talked about some (indiscernible) body attached to either IGF or CSTD. So there could be three, two or three. And then we're really talking about consolidating the possibility of actual systems working out.

Otherwise, we are just -- excuse me words -- just dealing with words and more words and really not making any change. And we should be looking as a group, if we do this, what change, therefore, happens in the world in pursuance of public interest. So my position to sum it up is that we ask two groups, or at the most three groups, to develop three solid proposals and bring them back in one session and then see what can be done about them. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Parminder. I will announce the names on my list and then I close the list to make sure we have enough time to hear all of you before lunch.

So I have Russia, Kenya, USA, Nick Ashton-Hart, Japan, Anriette, ICC-BASIS, and Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. With this, I will close the list here.

And I don't want -- after that, I will make a proposal for our way forward. But I think it seems to be emerging the idea that we could be assisted by some smaller groups, either to help us to organize a discussion or, as Parminder has suggested, to work -- to give some more elaboration to some proposals.

I just note that you mention those two or three groups that link to the framework part of the discussion, which is part of the discussion. That does not exhaust the whole discussion. But let's see. We'll come back to that later.

So I will give the floor first to Russia. You have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Sorry, chair, we didn't ask for the floor.

>> REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. I think we were too close with Russia so you saw us at the same time.

I just take the floor, first of all, to thank you for the manner you have set for this meeting and how we are proceeding. I'm sure by the end of the two days or three days we shall have some good results.

I also want to belatedly take the floor to thank the initial observation and comment by our colleague from Pakistan, that we need to set our discussion, I repeat, at a higher level where we need to look at concrete proposals on paper which we need to narrow down, not to open up our discussion.

And the good thing with that is we are discussing how we shall reach there.

Chair, my proposal would be in line with your comment at the beginning. Yet, I've seen the compilation we have. There are more than 100 proposals or recommendations. And it might not be very easy between now and Friday to really discuss in detail all these recommendations and agree on some kind of way forward. That is why we need your good guidance on how best to go about this.

In my view, I would have brought you an idea that we need a certain kind of criteria in which we can use to sift out or identify proposals with the kind of prioritization so that we don't leave out any as such. But as we did with the high-level characteristics, we identified those recommendations that are in favor of the majority, according to numbers. I remember you did some tabulation that really helped us say that, okay, if we go like this, we can treat up to the first ten. Then we say we can go this far. Then the remaining we can continue discussing.

And one of the colleagues that have spoken earlier have given some kind criteria along which we can use that is consensus now, some consensus or some further discussion, and long-time discussion.

But in my view, I could also suggest something different but not really to insist. Like, we could have something like institutional kind of recommendations. We could have programmatic or operation at the end of recommendations. Because if you look into the recommendations, they fall into those kind of categories. And there are those recommendations which fall within coordination, just kind of framework how enhanced cooperation should be run in between or among different types of organizations.

So what I really wanted to insist is it would be very good after listening to what members have said or are saying, you could take some time, then you identify some kind of criteria which can help us instruct

our discussion so by end of tomorrow or early Friday, we come up with some concrete proposal that we can narrow down to.

Also, to comment on what you say that, yes, some of the recommendations, they seem to direct what other organizations need to do. But I really don't know whether that would be the measure or the priority of our work. That is telling WTO what to do or telling ITU what to do or what. I really don't know.

But if we have concrete recommendations that can cover an institutional framework or a coordination mechanism that can be accepted without directly pointing out specific organizations in my view, that would be a better way to go than to strictly pinpoint certain organizations and we say what they need to do.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

We'll listen now to U.S. followed by Nick and Japan. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. First, we agree with the chair on the need to limit this list of recommendations or frankly -- probably won't get done this week. Probably won't get done next meeting. We might never get done with all of these recommendations and going through them one by one.

I think an innovative or an interesting way forward could be the small groups or breakout groups that identify recommendations that have strong consensus and then bring them back to the group. That might be one way.

We also support this phased approach idea where we identify recommendations with broad support and then those that need more work and so forth, which would be a good way to organize our work.

Finally, you know, whether or not we agree to a criteria first or start to agree to the recommendations themselves, we agree with the chair that this working group should not produce recommendations that seem to duplicate or circumvent conversations that are going on elsewhere and could potentially undermine the independent governing bodies of those organizations.

But, also, we believe this working group should avoid recommendations that specifically call out named member states and call on them to change domestic laws or make binding agreements which we also believe would be inappropriate from a working group like this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: (off microphone).

>> NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. Firstly, I would say I'm attracted to the U.K.'s proposal. Though, perhaps, one, I hope, friendly clarification would be the exact wording -- there will probably be some issue with the exact wording of every single recommendation but there may be general agreement with the essence of the recommendation's point. And so maybe it can be clear that

whatever goes into the first column can be reworded and perhaps those interested in working on the wording of specific recommendations could identify themselves to that point.

I don't think we could break ourselves formally into three because aside from anything else, we can't break into three as people. I don't know how we would actually manage to do that. Are there any delegations here which have three people?

So I'm not sure how that would work just structurally. But I also think it would be perhaps useful to have a small group of people to perhaps put things into categories.

On the institutional point, one thing I would say is I think we should keep those -- anything which has to do with another institution, we should keep separate because aside from anything else, the General Assembly cannot actually instruct the WTO on anything because it's not a U.N. body, for example. Nor can the General Assembly instruct ICANN. It's not a U.N. body either. I think we're just going to find that it's going to be hard to gain consensus on some of the institutional instructions anyway. But it does make sense perhaps to keep them and cluster them together and see what reactions people have to them. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick.

Let me just maybe with indulgence of Parminder, and to avoid Parminder to request point of order, I think when he referred to break into groups, he was referring to the idea that people who had similar thoughts on some issues could get together to develop a proposal on that particular topic. And he was referring to the institutional framework. So those who defend a new body would get together and make a unified proposal on that, and those who don't want -- I think -- so those people participate in just one single group, the one he or she identifies with, but not in three groups simultaneously. But thank you for your comments.

So I have Japan, Anriette, followed by ICC-BASIS, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan.

Japan, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. I also agree with the proposal made by the U.K. to streamline this many number of the recommendations into more manageable numbers.

So we support this approach to delegate these tasks, specific tasks, to small group, not here in the plenary session. But to delegate these tasks to small groups, maybe we need to give some instruction to the small group. We need some guidance to the small group. How can we categorize the ones with the consensus and then the ones who is almost possible to fit -- almost possible to make consensus but need more discussion, the ones that may be desperate to get consensus. How can we do that?

My idea is, as chair suggested in his opening remarks, we should first consider -- keep in mind that we should avoid duplication that is already going on in other organizations.

The second, maybe we really need to get a recommendation that is approved by all of us. Maybe one simple condition is it needs to be high-level principle applied to all stakeholders. Otherwise, in my sense it's not possible to get consensus in this meeting. So as long as it is high-level principle that apply to all the (indiscernible) organizations, including ICANN or WTO or whoever, I think we can make it as a recommendation of this group.

And I also agree with the comments from the U.S. that the naming of specific organization and making some recommendation to this organization to do something, I think it's not something we can agree on in this group. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan.

I turn now to Anriette followed by ICC-BASIS.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I also support the U.K.'s proposal. I have one question, Paul, which is the third category and recommendations where there's no consensus and long-term discussion is needed. Do you mean by that, longer term discussion outside of the working group or within the working group? Just clarification on that.

I think we need to keep the categorizations simple at this point. I agree with Parminder's point that we can't exclude recommendations that could address other institutions, maybe not name them very specifically, but I don't think we should filter that at this point. We can filter that at a later stage.

My only additional suggestion for the categorization would be assigning priority for those that need discussion, those recommendations that need discussion, just as a form of helping us.

And then I would actually prefer if we as a room broke up into groups and discussed the different categories of recommendations and apply the categorization filter. I would prefer that to a small group working with the chair. But if there's consensus that a small group should work with the chair, I'm happy to help with that group.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: On my list, ICC-BASIS, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan.

ICC-BASIS.

>> ICC-BASIS: Thank you, Chair. I would like to lend support to my colleague from the U.K. and reaffirm our wish to see with the group what we can agree on to give ourselves a foundation and momentum for further discussion and to discuss what needs more understanding and consensus building to take forward.

We have a good opportunity for early harvest here, I feel. There is some low-hanging fruit we can reach if we start with those areas we can achieve agreement on and then enter into discussion on those elements where there is more difficulty of defined agreement.

It seems to me from our previous meeting and from reading all the contributions from colleagues that there are many things we all agree on. The easiest task at hand would be to gather these ideas that are common to all of us.

I will, of course, support the course of action that our chair proposes on how best to proceed with the recommendations but I would see value in a similar exercise we went through with characteristics and consider the recommendations under the categories presented by the U.K. So look at the recommendations that seem to have brought agreement first and list those. And as the meeting progresses, we can proceed to those recommendations that require further debate and discussion.

Showing progress and building on what we can agree on more readily is important both to extract the value from the effort we have all made in our contributions but it's also a way to gain momentum and help us work through the more challenging parts. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

I have also requests from the floor from additional participants on the list, Richard Hill, Cuba, and U.K. I had closed the list, but I think in the interest of inclusiveness, I would like to offer the opportunity for you to intervene. I would like to urge you to be very brief when you have the opportunity to have very concise comments. So I will offer the floor right away. So, first, Saudi Arabia and then Pakistan.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Listening to colleagues and working by the guidance of UNGA, UNGA asked to develop recommendations that we have a consensus and semi-consensus and no consensus. We are developing a recommendation to the higher level with no limit to the General Assembly, relevant to the enhanced cooperation paragraph in Tunis Agenda. So our guided target is that paragraph relevant to enhanced cooperation. We should put this in front of us in writing and get a recommendation or develop a recommendation, by looking at what kind of recommendation that we could have consensus, what kind of recommendation that needs more discussion in the future. And this categorization was not intention of UNGA, is to have agreed recommendation that will operationalize enhanced cooperation as Parminder said. It's very clear from the list there is two views on these issues. And I think saving the time -- it's now 1:00 p.m. Let's break up into two groups. Each group will bring their common proposal. And we can have a discussion and two or three proposals rather than have a discussion on 93 recommendations. I'm not sure we will finish it by Friday, but even by January. Let's be realistic. And I would support Parminder's recommendation to observe the maximum. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Pakistan?

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair.

We have a lot of proposals here, but coming back to our initial proposal, actually, the one thing is very much clear that we need to go beyond this stage where we are only commenting on the proposals that have already been made and already set in the compilation document.

Of course there could be more than one way to organize our further work, and we think the proposal that was made by Parminder and other colleagues although are different how we categorize, but I think those are quite valid.

But I think the U.K.'s proposal to categorize them in three categories is also sort of, you know, making criteria; that we give a value or some kind of criteria to certain proposals that -- whether they have the likelihood of consensus or not.

Although this would be, on the surface, very much a feasible thing to do, but, you know, it will certainly discard many proposals which are very important for many delegations, and I think it will be hard for many, many of us that we can go along with this.

But what we can do is to go into a small group with the president and with the help of the secretariat and we can develop -- we can narrow down proposals, because we have different proposals but it's very much clear and there is sort of consensus in the room that those proposals can be narrowed down.

Let's say that there are 50 proposals. I think there is a likelihood that we can narrow them down in three hours' meeting maybe to 10 proposals, and then if we work more, we can further narrow them down.

So ultimately, it's my understanding and the understanding of many delegations that we can have -- we can shorten them to three or four different proposals. As Parminder was explaining, that essentially we can break them down into three categories that -- whether we work within existing institutions, whether we have new different institutions, mechanisms, or we have sort of a mixed approach.

I think we shouldn't discriminate to different proposals. All of them are important.

So my proposal is that we break into small groups and further work on the -- on this proposal that we categorize them in terms of their value, in terms of what they want to achieve. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So now I -- so just before turning to those who have asked for the floor, because I had closed the list, let me ask the Russian Federation if you want to take the floor now or -- or --

You did not ask any more. Okay. I do not want to impose on you to speak if you --

So I will just turn, then, to Richard Hill and followed by Cuba and U.K.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Yes, I asked for the floor because I wanted to clarify some misunderstandings, and to the extent that my contributions were not clear enough, I apologize for that.

Of course the U.N. cannot give instructions. I think you know that I'm well versed into what the powers of the U.N. General Assembly are or are not. In particular, it cannot instruct sovereign institutions like WTO or ITU or WIPO, for that matter, to do anything.

On the other hand, it can invite them to do things, and it does so routinely.

In fact, if you go back and my memory is correct -- but I'm pretty sure my memory is correct -- that's how the WSIS was convened. From a formal point of view, the U.N. invited the ITU to convene a summit. You also have an example of that in Paragraph 70 of the Tunis Agenda which calls on other organizations to do XYZ.

It's not uncommon to name specific organizations, recognizing, of course, that they're sovereign, so we're not telling them what to do, we're inviting them to do something or to consider something.

ICANN is, in particular, mentioned in various agreed documents, in particular, of the ITU, and if people here don't remember which countries insisted that ICANN be named in certain resolutions, come to me at the coffee break and I'll give you the list of countries.

Now, my recommendation regarding WTO, perhaps it wasn't clear enough. It's actually not addressed to the WTO itself, it's addressed to the members of WTO. It's suggesting that the members of WTO should voluntarily agree to stick to the agreement that Internet governance issues should be discussed in inclusive, multistakeholder forums, and the ITU is not one of those. Now, if the ITU -- WTO. ITU also.

If WTO wants to change its ways, then that's fine, but for the time being, it's not, so it's addressed to the member states.

And finally, regarding duplication, I fully agree on that. In my view, all of my recommendations are actually identifying gaps, so in my view, this is a complement to the previous mapping paper, and so I believe that none of my recommendations involve anything that is being done at present. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: (Off microphone.)

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I will be very brief because my previous speakers are -- reflected my thoughts. Especially the representative of Pakistan.

But I was just wondering the following: Because at the end he made a concrete recommendation, you know, of three categories of the recommendations or the way to put it or to gather them, and here in the document in the screen, the categories are different but I -- I presume that those categories of this document was for cataloging the -- the --

So I think that maybe it could help. I don't want to interfere with the accepted agenda but I think that our work could be more streamlined if we could agree roughly in what the document contents will be,

the actual report, because maybe we can agree that that report could be with an annex in which the full text of recommendations will be there in the annex for everybody to see.

But if we can agree -- for instance, the distinguished delegate from Pakistan recommended three things. You know, one of -- that it says improvement actual mechanism, other that is new things, and some mixed, was his proposal. There could be some other way of doing it. But I think if we can agree in that, maybe that could streamline how we'll move forward.

Because I'm not saying that -- that the recommendations are not all valuable. On the contrary, I say that all are very valuable and all should be contained, even in an annex, but what I say is that in the main course, because in this recommendation, this wide variety of things, that maybe it extends the mandate and maybe in the core document will not be reflected exactly as that, because here are some reflections, some considerations of background and so -- and interpretations.

So if we -- you say that you want to do that Friday, to the skeleton of the -- maybe if we can go to -- into the skeleton of the document, that will help us to move forward. Thank you.

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

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Very briefly to respond to some of the points, including points that were raised to the U.K. delegation, we want to make positive progress in this meeting and we would be worried if we divided ourselves into two extreme camps and we went away and only spoke to people who agreed with us and developed our own particular proposal.

We shouldn't divide ourselves into extremes. The reason we have come here is to try to find consensus, and colleagues have made a range of proposals covering a wide range of issues, and we should look at all of them on their merits and not exclude any of them, we think.

So the proposal to have categories is not to say some proposals are good and some proposals are bad. It is only to manage our work, to help us find a way forwards.

Responding to the points that were asked of us, in terms of the three categories, the first category where there is consensus now, yes, perhaps some small editing will be required, but the point is it should be very clear what the recommendation is saying and clear that we think everyone can agree to it.

The second category, perhaps some more work is needed for the next meeting because it's not quite clear what the recommendation is saying and we need more discussion.

And the third category, to answer Anriette's point, we would like to be able to agree it, but we know it's a difficult issue and it's going to take a lot of time before we come to consensus on that.

So I think the categories, they may not be entirely perfect but I think most people could kind of understand which recommendation is in which category.

But in particular, we think that the discussion needs to be in the big group. We should not take the discussion out into a small group. We need to keep it here.

So really, we are just looking for a few people, perhaps, to do this initial task very quickly for us, perhaps even over lunch, to come up with some quick ideas on the categories so that the main group can then look at that, everyone can participate in the discussion, and we can see if we agree with what the small group decided or not, and that's what we think would allow us to manage our work over the coming days. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you.

Well, having heard all of you -- and I think very important points were made -- my --

First of all, I'd like just to come back to the -- my initial statement in regard to that part of the meeting, now we should examine the recommendations. We should excuse the substance of recommendations.

So basically what I propose to you -- and I received many interesting feedback -- was how to get organized for this to take place in a way that will allow us to make good use of our time.

So we are not at this point, let's say, in a drafting mode in regard to any particular recommendation at all. We are just trying to make a decision on the method we'll employ to discuss the recommendations that from the perspective of the group are meeting certain guidelines or some orientation or criteria -- I'm avoiding "criteria" maybe at this point, but should be discussed by the group.

So for that purpose, what I would suggest is -- and I said there was a lot of support for this -- that a small group could convene at lunchtime. I would suggest maybe at 2:00 a.m. 2:00 p.m.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Not 2:00 a.m. Sorry.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: 2:00 p.m. or 2:15. I will look for the secretariat's guidance where this group should meet.

I think at the end, I will ask that my recommendation for the group not to engage into substantive discussion but just to think about what should be the methodology to be followed.

Initially, I proposed some criteria and there was some -- also some proposals on categories that could help us in identifying those recommendations that we should be discussing on a priority basis, so it would be up to the group to decide.

So the group can -- and we would expect -- I would be there to -- of course to assist you, but I would expect the group to provide us, for the afternoon session, some guidance on what would be the procedure to follow on the basis of some decisions to be made, how -- in which order we should discuss the recommendations, if we -- if the group will decide and we'll propose to the plenary, the decision will

be to the plenary, of course, maybe to clean up the text or not to clean up but to keep all the recommendations there and then to apply some guidelines or some character- -- I don't know. It will be up to the group to come to us. In case all the proposals will be on the table, maybe just to have some guidance in how to address, in which order. So it will be up to the group not to discuss substantive but rather, to come to us. I would strongly suggest that those who have participated actively in these discussions should -- would join us for this meeting.

Without being exhaustive, according to my list, I have, for example, Anriette, I have the U.K., I have Parminder, Richard Hill, ICC/BASIS, Pakistan.

So no one is obliged to come. Of course you're invited to come. Anyone else would also be invited. I'm just speaking from the top of my head just looking at the list of interventions here. Nick. Anyone would be invited and most happy -- most welcome to participate with that particular purpose. Just to assist us in organizing ourselves for discussing it in the afternoon session.

So I would suggest we meet at 2:15, and I turn to the secretariat for -- to indicate to us where that should take place.

And immediately that, we would resume here in plenary for the substantive discussion of recommendations.

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ-SANZ: We have the alternative of going to one of the secretariat's offices because we don't have any conference rooms available today. Provided the group is not bigger than eight to 10 people, we can fit in one of our offices. That will be 7077, on the seventh floor of this building. Otherwise, you have this room. We can meet in one of those tables. It's up to you, depending on the number of people who want. But if it's below 10 people, I think we're probably more comfortable in my office.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I assume we'll have probably more than 10 people, but I -- I'll turn to your feedback.

I have Richard and Marilyn Cade.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. I think we should stay in this room, and it wasn't quite clear to me whether you would chair that small group, which is fine for me. On the other hand, if you don't wish to chair it, then I would like to propose that Mr. Blaker from the U.K. chairs it, even though he's shaking his head no, with the full understanding that he would also -- you know, he'd be a dual hat. He'd also be presenting the U.K. position. He's saying no, but I -- maybe you could persuade him. Unless you want to do it. That's fine for me.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn -- I'll come this. Marilyn Cade.

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

I would propose that we use this room because even though we may start out with only seven or eight people, we could end up with 13 or 15 and it would be very difficult to crowd into a smaller room. So if other colleagues agree, staying in this room and perhaps, you know, trying to move around just one table with additional observer seats in the back around a table might provide sufficient seating space.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel, would you want to take the floor on this?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Just to really concur with that. I mean, I think it's best to have a group meeting that people can come in and join, so I think this -- this location is best. And I -- I do think that this is a good way forward, but I certainly wouldn't want lots of parallel groups meeting. I think that's -- that would be unfortunate, as others have pointed out. But having some sort of agreement on these -- on these characteristics, I think -- or, sorry, not characteristics -- on these methodologies is a good idea. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you. So we'll meet in this room at 2:15. I would be available to facilitate, of course, but if anyone else would like to take the chair, just think about it. We'll -- when we resume, I'll be more than happy to be in a more facilitative mode than the chairmanship. Maybe we'll need a co-chairmanship of this meeting. Maybe people reflecting different views in regard to this.

But anyway, let's address this and I'll leave this for your thoughts and meet you -- all those that are interested -- here at 2:15 and we'll work maybe in the central table so we'll have enough space, if we need some more seats behind, and so with that, I wish you a good lunch and for all those interested, please be here at 2:15 for this discussion on the methodology to be followed for discussion of recommendations, and wishfully at 3:00 p.m., we could start the plenary meeting.

Thank you.

[Lunch]

(Breakout group discussion.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your patience. I suggest we should resume our work.

So on the basis of the discussions we had, my proposal is to work on the basis of some preliminary work that was done by some people that got together and looking at all the recommendations they identified those that in their assessment could lead to consensus or could make it to the document as recommendations or in other form but that the idea is that first list of inputs could achieve consensus.

They have also identified proposals that may achieve consensus with further amendment, stated as Category 2. And then Category 3, propose that we file for the long-term discussion.

So my proposal is not to look at proposing the (inaudible) of the document. We will follow the order with regard to Category 1 because those are the ones that may, if the plenary thinks so at least, make it to our report in terms of consensus form. And then we have to discuss whether it would be as

recommendations or some other -- with some other formulation. I will request each one of the proponents of these to make a short introduction.

I would expect us to go one by one. I think the secretariat has sent to all of you the list we'll be working. So we will exhaust that list of topics under Category 1. I would invite -- and after that we'll not move automatically to Category 2. I would invite all of you, any of you, who think that any other topic that was categorized under 2 or 3, if in your assessment that would also lead to consensus, please bring it to the attention -- or anything that is missing in this document, bring it to the attention of the plenary. We will wishfully have a quick discussion on this.

And immediately after that, we'll move to discussion on how to deal with institutional framework or the mechanisms and interventions we need with regard to the overall framework for discussion of enhanced cooperation.

So we basically would follow what is in Category 1, plus any other topic -- any other item you want to add. And after that, we'll not go to Category 2 but we'll focus on the block of recommendations to address institutional framework.

I would -- with your indulgence, I want to be very strict in that part of the meeting because we want to have a productive meeting which unfortunately we have not so far.

And for each recommendation in the discussion, I would not admit comments that would go beyond the scope of what is in the paragraph. So you are asked to comment whether you agree to that, if you think that this is something that could be accepted by consensus or not. Or you can give any opinion on that particular formulation. I would not accept comments regarding the overall work or the philosophy of what we are doing or the historical background. I think we are past that. I want to focus on the actual text before us. Otherwise, we'll not get to the end of our work.

So with this -- and I will invite the secretariat to show on the screen each one of those -- of the actual recommendation we'll be working on, start with 26 according to the list. That was proposed by Anriette Esterhuysen from APC. So I would invite Anriette to make a brief comment in regard to what was proposed here, if you wish. And then I would invite comments on whether this could be accepted as consensus conclusion by the group or whether that would fit under a recommendation or not.

Is it a point of order? Yes, please, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just before moving into Recommendation 26, I wanted to restate proposal made during lunchtime, was that as we move forward, that any proposer of a recommendation maybe do a scrub of the proposal and make sure that they were intended to be recommendation -- proposed recommendations coming from this working group in the final report and not some other just theory or statement but actually a concrete recommendation.

And if so, we could perhaps delete some of those before we even get to them so we're not wasting time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. It will be a decision of the plenary if you want to delete any formulation. It's up to the group. I take the point made by many that maybe it would be difficult, unless we have consensus, to delete something because proposals represent important point for those who have made them.

Yes, U.S., you want to follow up?

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, Chair. Just to clarify, I wasn't proposing that we delete anything. I was just recommending that proposers review their contributions and the compilation to make sure that those were intended and maybe withdraw those but not for the group to delete anything. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder, is this also a point of order? Yes, go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Stating the same the U.S. delegate said. I think also the proposer should review to make it look like a recommendation because we are talking recommendations. And if you are asking us a question at this point, then the question person has to give the recommendation. So right now -- and it's possible that the same person may just change that question. But we need to say what the recommendation is rather than having questions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I understood the approach that was taken by the group was to look into the concept, the notion that is there, and the understanding that it will be -- have to be redrafted in a way. But I concur with you. And when the proponent will introduce, maybe he or she may wish to repeat a little bit of the formulation in order to phrase it as a recommendation.

U.K., do you also want to take the floor on this? Yes, please. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Yes, just to agree with you. I think somebody in the small group said there will need to be a little bit more drafting work because the drafting is not always perfect. I think it was my colleague from Cuba. So we are not finally signing off and agreeing anything now, as I understand it. We are just seeing are there any objections to this, does it have consensus. If it does have consensus, then that drafting work can take place.

We also heard in the small group many colleagues saying they would like to get on to a discussion about the more complex issues, and we are very respectful of that. So perhaps we can avoid opening a big discussion on every recommendation in Category 1. Just get through it on a no-objections basis as quickly as we can so perhaps we can finish it today at least, if not earlier, and getting to the more difficult and complicated discussions first thing tomorrow morning. And then the drafting work that needs to be done can perhaps be done in the background. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I will turn now to Anriette for Recommendation 26. Please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. So I would say those are not complete recommendations. I think it's text that I would like to be retained that could be useful in support of some of the other recommendations such as more transparency and access to information by existing intergovernmental Internet-related public policy processes. So it's really, I would say, text that could

make it either into a preambular sections or into some of the other recommendations dealing with how different entities can enhance cooperation.

And the last one was addressed specifically to business and possibly can be excluded. If we don't have a section in our final document that makes recommendations to business entities, that could be deleted as it refers to holding business entities accountable for complying with human rights obligations. The first two are of more general nature.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So I would like just to iterate what was said. Nothing is being fully agreed. We are just making first reading trying to identify elements that would be later on incorporated either in the form of recommendation or preambular language.

I thank Anriette for clarifying that 26 and 27 would maybe better fit as preambular language.

So we are not in a drafting mode now. We are just making a quick visit of this. I see no one requesting for the floor, so I think that could be accepted on that basis, that this will need further refinement afterwards. Thank you for this.

Now we move then to 31 which was proposed by UNESCO. Is there someone from UNESCO in the room? 31 and 32 are proposed by UNESCO. I don't see anyone. Would someone want to -- Cuba, yes, please, you want to speak on behalf of UNESCO?

>>CUBA: I think we can use like the Roman Empire, no? That's maybe in an annex, what has to do with our work.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: Or maybe in the preambular. I don't know. It's good -- because that's one process. I don't know how to put that because this is -- I think that he's asking for recommendation. Well, what recommendations? I don't know. I don't know this. It's very difficult for me.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Benedicto, I would suggest that the IGF improvement text could be covered by our report just reaffirming the recommendations of the CSTD working group on IGF improvements which itself emphasizes the need for sustainable funding around the IGF.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I have Pakistan, followed by Saudi Arabia and Richard Hill. Pakistan?

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. For the past five minutes or so, I'm trying to really assess what's going on in this room and I really don't know what's happening because apparently we are working on the basis of a document that was discussed during the U.K. --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry, Pakistan. I -- no, no. We are very clear of what we are doing now, please.

We are going through the document in an orderly fashion. We have an order of topics we're examining. Maybe you will want to look in your iPad or --

So we are looking to -- we have a -- are following an order and I want to invite comments on the actual formulations that are before you. Now we are examining Recommendation 31 and 32. If you have any comments in regard to those recommendations, I would invite you to go, please.

>>PAKISTAN: Please, let me -- let me complete, because -- because we didn't agree -- at least my delegation didn't agree to this formulation going forward, and I don't think that it's the chair's prerogative to impose on the delegations his will or the will of a select few. I think it's not going to happen. At least under our watch.

We need to first be clear on where we are working, on which document, on the basis of which document we are working. It was a document that was discussed during the small meeting. That's fine. Although we did raise our objections even then because we were not given equal opportunity to come up with our own proposal.

Three people, three persons, were given a chance to look at the recommendation and come up with a table that is now presumably the basis of our discussion. I think we don't agree to it and if we have to do this exercise, we have to do it from the Recommendation 1 because this is a -- maybe a very good effort by those three persons, but it certainly does not reflect many delegations. At least our delegation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

I don't want to expose anyone, and -- but I -- we met as a group. There were differing views. As the chair, I have the responsibility to keep this meeting going, so I understand there are some objections on the part of some, but we need to decide on the methodology. We need to start somewhere. You may understand that and concur with me.

So in the light of the alternatives that were put on the table -- and I don't recall that any feasible alternative was suggested -- my proposal and my impression and my sentiment is that this was accepted by the majority of those who were in the group.

And if you wish, I can ask for comments in that regard, but I don't think it's the case, but I can do it.

We are dealing with a procedural aspect so I think we do not require the full consensus of everyone. I'm proposing some way forward in the absence of full consensus. I would kindly request you to allow us to continue, because, otherwise, there will be no substantive discussion at all in the meeting.

Yes, please, go ahead.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. Of course I think I -- my delegation would be the first one to support you and support the group in its working. Actually, this is what we have been doing. But from a

procedural point of view, we should be very much clear, and I think there have been some lapses since we ended our plenary this morning.

Anyways, I mean, we can continue in some form that we agreed, but this is not actually --

Now, the last comment that you made was that the group does not need consensus to move forward. If this is the methodology that we have agreed with, then I think we should apply it across the board, and for the -- for our future work if this is the case, then we can certainly agree to it and -- but it should be not only for this purpose but for the purpose of the entire meeting, as well as for the entire proceedings of the group.

But I think --

Now, you said that there was no concrete proposal because no opportunity was given. If you give us an opportunity, give us like half an hour to come up with a counterproposal, a proposal that would categorize in a different manner --

As we said during our morning intervention, that it's not only the way to categorize the recommendations. There are at least three different methods, including yours, and we can certainly be happy to support your proposal to categorize and to narrow them down, but I think this is not the only way of categorization.

And of course there is another method that we proposed, and if you give us an opportunity, we can certainly come up with that.

But in the absence of that, we can certainly go along with your proposal and your categorization. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

I just want to reassure you that we are not making any prejudgment on the outcome of the discussion of anything.

I think what was proposed by the three members that met and made their presentation to the wider group that met at lunchtime was a proposal to organize the discussion, and this is what we are doing.

In their assessment -- and I think this was something worthwhile testing -- some recommendations could get consensus. That's why we are doing it now. And I have invited -- and I'm not only referring to their assessment. I'm inviting anyone else who thinks that any other recommendation would also meet that -- might potentially meet that consensus nature could also bring one forward at this moment in time.

But I'd like to offer up this opportunity to -- I really beg your indulgence, because the idea to revert even to my own -- the way the document was organized is not feasible. You see that the order in which the recommendations appear in the present section leads us to discuss issues that could not be central to our discussion, and even the proponent himself was there in this small group.

So I would -- again, I would like to refer to the discussion you were having, with your indulgence, going back to 31, 32, and what we are doing now is just to make sure whether the plenary agrees that these notions that are here could -- if every -- if there is no objection to this, we can decide later whether this will go fit as a recommendation or not.

I don't think of any other way we could do a good use of our time at this point in time.

I have Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, looking at Recommendation 31, I really -- I don't understand how this recommendation could be included in our report either as a recommendation or a preamble or an annex.

We used to have a working group for IGF. I think it was chaired by Mr. Peter Major, if I am not mistaken. Their work has finished. Even in UNGA overall review, we emphasized that the implementation of such a recommendation should be followed on a yearly basis.

So we have two tracks. One is enhanced cooperation and one is the IGF. Let's focus on IGF.

So I would suggest to drop 31. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian -- Russian Federation? No. I'm sorry. Richard Hill and then Russian Federation. Yes, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: I wanted to support Anriette's comment. I think 31, 32, and actually also 33 are closely related, and if anything is retained, then I support Anriette's suggestion. It would simply -- and that might also meet Saudi Arabia's concern. We would simply say, "Noting the report of the CSTD," blah, blah, blah, blah, "on the IGF," blah, blah, blah, blah, something like that, and then not keep any of these three.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation followed by Canada and US.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Yeah. I already talked about this 31 in the smaller group and actually agree with Saudi and with Richard that WSIS Resolution 7125 made the mandate of the -- of IGF for 10 years. There were no questions regarding this and there were not any tasks or mandates to our group to speak about how to improve the IGF. So I think it's not valid at all, and so I agree that 32 is also not valid. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada followed by the U.S. and Cuba.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Agree with the proposal that Anriette had made in terms of simply perhaps our report restating the role of the CSTD working group on IGF.

I would also be open to having both 31 and 32 sort of be part of a preambular text, but I think that they're important references to have in terms of places where enhanced cooperation can have a strengthening role in the outcomes of the both of the work of these organizations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S. followed by Cuba. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I'd just like to agree with colleagues from Canada and Anriette. I think 31 and 32 aren't actually recommendations. I -- notwithstanding another discussion about how the IGF does enhance cooperation and perhaps preambular text, I don't think 31 and 32 are recommendations, and I also don't think they're the best proposed recommendations to address those two issues in the current compilation.

Thank you.

>>CUBA: I'm sorry to disagree. I don't -- I don't think that we should mention in that way as Anriette proposed.

And let me make clear I'm -- I'm truly as an expert and my country defend IGF. I'm a member from the MAG, been for 3 years, and I'm working for trying to be -- that the IGF be better.

But the point is it doesn't relate to our -- to our mandate. In the same resolution that gives our mandate, this Paragraph 63 that if -- that is exactly what Anriette is proposing.

So this will be sort of a loop. The same resolution that asks for the mandate for us, we're telling back the same thing that they already said.

Please, look to Paragraph 30 -- 63 of the General Assembly resolution that had the mandate, you know, the WSIS+10 resolution of December 2015.

If you want to put something about the IGF, what UNESCO said there, UNESCO was asking for recommendations for linking IGF with enhanced cooperation, whatever.

We will have to do that exercise now but we don't have time to make along the lines that was mentioned. You know, IGF could relate with enhanced cooperation if this and that happened. But nobody has done that yet, and I don't think that we have time to get into that.

But to put back, we support the -- the result of the commission and affiliate the implementation. This is already in Paragraph 63. Please read Paragraph 63 of the resolution. Are we going to say the same thing again? We could -- we could end repeating the whole resolution for General Assembly and that does not mean that they are not important. Of course they're important. It was agreed by the General Assembly in plenary, all the countries, not a little group like us.

So please, let's focus in our work. I am asking that. And if some -- and this is not the case. I don't think that this even needs to go to an annex because it really has no substance at all. But if we found some recommendation there, as the colleague from United States aptly said, that the proposers after this new view recognized it was a reflection, it was a concept, that maybe doesn't go to the main report but

maybe, if it's important, it's interesting and could go as an annex. I think that the proposers themselves should have a say on that. But we collectively, we can trim.

Because, otherwise, if this path -- I don't know which one we're going to take out, and then we simply skip this exercise and say all in. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think at this point it's quite clear that this set of recommendations does not have consensus. And there were many comments in that regard. We are taking note of it. I think there might be some additional information to be provided in that regard, if you wish. But I would say for the purpose of what we are doing, it's clear that they do not meet the criteria, the target we have assigned ourselves for this part of the meeting to identify the consensus areas.

So I would for the moment -- if anyone else wants to take the floor, I can give you the floor. But I think it's quite clear there is no consensus in that regard. It also includes what appears now as recommendation 33. The proponents, of course, can revisit and maybe in another occasion come up with another kind of formulation.

Anyway, it is not -- again, this is something we have agreed and that emanates from the mandate we have. We are not taking anything from the table from the perspective that this is an input that came from you. So it is not being thrown out unless the proponent himself or herself wants to rephrase or take that decision. So for the moment we are just saying this is not part of what we could identify as consensus emanating from this group.

So with this, I think -- U.K., you want to take the floor on this? Yes, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We were only going to say what you just said, that we're not throwing out anything. But from listening to the room it's clear there is not consensus on this so we are moving it from Category 1 to Category 2. And that seems to be the feeling of the room, and we are happy with that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We are moving to then recommendation 35. That was proposed by Iran. I understand --

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I understand 33 was also addressed in the context of our previous discussion. Unless anyone wishes, I think we have already settled it.

So 35 would -- and I think that -- 35, would Iran like to introduce this proposal?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you see in the compilation text, the bulk of the recommendation is based on the Tunis Agenda, especially on -- excuse me -- especially on 65 articles. It's reference to enabling the government and also -- just a moment. Let me find it.

Yeah, I think it would be useful for outcome of the working group and according to mandate of the working group should be work based on the Tunis Agenda, especially 69 to 71 articles. So Iran has proposed this recommendation based on the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any comments? Yeah, U.S., please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. On recommendation 35, I think we discussed at the last meeting that within some preambular or chapeau language would be the opportunity to reaffirm agreements from Tunis since we can't recommend things that we've already agreed to through Tunis. So we would reaffirm those within the chapeau language, and we would think that's the right approach. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. You may recall that this was my initial proposal at the beginning of this morning's session, that we should not replicate language that is already contained in the WSIS outcome documents in general and Tunis Agenda in particular.

So I think if Iran and others agree, we could take that approach that we -- this is an important concept, of course. It's something that should guide our work but that does not fit as recommendation per se. It should be part of our report in some other area, preambular or chapeau. I think that would be in line of what we have done so far.

Well, with that, then, if there are no further comments, I turn to 36 coming from Canada. Canada, you have the floor if you wish to make any introductory remarks.

>>CANADA: Perhaps just to say, Chair, that this is aspirational. It's not a specific recommendation. I'm happy to put it in Category 1, but it's not a specific recommendation. So -- can you hear me? Yes? Okay.

Yes, so, like I said, it's not a specific recommendation. It's an aspirational. We had answered the question in terms of what kind of recommendations, so a kind of recommendation would be one that would remove these barriers. So if you -- you don't have to have this specifically reflected as it's worded in our final report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. I take your point. I think maybe at this point the difficulty -- and maybe it would be some homework for you -- to try to formulate these as recommendations. We need to have some more clarity on what we are talking about, what are those barriers. I think maybe we need to revisit this to see what is intended if we are asking to remove barriers.

Would maybe it be acceptable to invite Canada maybe to look into this and come back to us in some -- I'm not sure on how to deal. Maybe we can have some input from this. While you think, I have U.S., Parminder, Iran, and Richard Hill.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just very quickly, this recommendation is very similar to a recommendation that U.S. made in our second contribution which I think we worded a little bit more in recommendation form. So we would be happy to work with Canada to consolidate and bring back a proposal on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. This is very helpful.

Iran, are you requesting for the floor or is your plate from the previous discussion? Yes, thank you.

So I have Parminder followed by Richard Hill, Cuba, and Saudi Arabia. I don't know in which order. You decide.

So I give the floor to Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'm having some difficulty commenting on these proposals. I wanted to speak at the IGF proposal, I didn't do it. I put my flag down. I, again, have a problem with this. I agree with them, but I also not sure what I agree with so I can't communicate that agreement to other people.

I want IGF to be strengthened, for example, if there's an enhanced cooperation mechanism, however it is defined by group A, B or, C. Without recognizing that enhanced cooperation mechanism, I agree that IGF strengthening --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. What recommendation are we referring to?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Recommendation 36. But it's the same, same response to Canada. IGF improvement as such is not our mandate. But IGF improvement with (indiscernible) to enhanced cooperation would be our mandate. And I can't say anything about IGF improvement because I do not know what it would improve.

And exactly the same response to 36, that, of course, I would like the barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation to be brought down. But I do not know what the barriers in participation are being brought down. And this clearly points to the problem that central issues and peripheral issues have a relationship of dependency. And we cannot discuss peripheral issues without discussing central issues, which we are doing unfortunately. I could have not spoken, but this problem is coming up again and again.

I do not want to say it's not good. I can't say it's not bad. So we can carry on, but I wanted to point to that problem.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Let's make sure we have in our discussions some incremental gains. For now we have been discussing how we're going to discuss -- I think for the first time we are starting to discuss substance. So let's give a try and try to say I think we are moving in quite an acceptable pace. We have covered some ground already, and I would certainly encourage us to continue to do so.

I have on my list Richard Hill followed by Saudi Arabia and Cuba and Congo.

>>RICHARD HILL: I think this is easy, Chairman, and we can move faster. Basically this is moved from 1 to 2 with an invitation to Canada and whoever to come back and redraft it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think we are probably accepting this as final for this discussion.

I see Saudi Arabia has withdrawn. So, Cuba.

>>CUBA: Yes. I think this clearly was an important suggestion but for ourselves, for the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, to look at the barriers. It's a recommendation. So to put it in the report, it's a big, you know -- I don't know. It's a bit funny to put this in the report for outside. Like, we as a group should have looked to what barriers. So if barriers were to be mentioned, this will have to be rephrased. And, of course, as our colleague said, we will have to look at it again and see if it's again. But as it is, I think this should not go in the report. We are biting our own tail. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Congo.

>>CONGO: Thank you very much. I'm sorry because I'm in a bad position. This is my first time I attend this meeting. But when I see different recommendations, frankly, I don't understand because, one, we talk about recommendation in term of project. That means something we have to do to make the project successful or to make big impact in society for the project.

So, when I see this recommendation, they don't -- in term of content and in term of the form. So it looks like we say what we have to do, but we don't see the impact or how we can make this project successful. I don't know if I'm wrong, but this is I understand the recommendation in term of the project. That's what I want to say. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comment. I don't see any other flags.

In light of what was said, I think we should invite Canada and U.S. to come together and try to work further on this. And I'd like to endorse the point made by Cuba that we should -- if you refer to previous work done by us, we should do it showing a step forward in regard to what we have done, maybe providing some more (inaudible), not just revisiting something we have done before.

But with this, I think for the purpose of what we are doing now, it is understood for the moment there's no consensus here in paragraph 36. We are coming back to this in a second reading. But it certainly would not make it as something we should accept as consensus for the moment in the current formulation. Thank you for this.

I would suggest then we move to paragraph 37, recommendation 37. This is coming from Jimson, from AfICTA. You have the floor, sir.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, colleagues. This particular recommendation takes its inspiration from the scenarios that led to the question of enhanced cooperation and I believe many of us are fully aware during the WSIS in terms of the governance of the critical Internet resources. And we do know that (inaudible) resolved now with the IANA transition,

successful IANA transition. And I took a quick look and saw that there was a real high spirit of cooperation, high level of cooperation among stakeholders globally. And that led to that success.

So since we are talking about enhanced cooperation moving a step further with regard to public policies related to the Internet, they now recommend that all governments on equal footing should participate in the work of the Governmental Advisory Committee of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers with management of critical Internet resources.

Chair, if you would permit me, I also looked over time that the government -- the GAC have done very well in that they have opened up. Before now, some business cannot participate in that discussion, but it's now open. So governments are transparent. And I think governments yet to be there need to be encouraged part of what's going on in that committee. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. I must confess I was somewhat confused about what was the meaning here. Thank you for providing some clarity.

But just being a participant in the GAC myself, I think all governments are free and are invited to participate on an equal footing in the work of the GAC. So within the work of the GAC, there is no restriction for governments to participate on an equal footing. I'm not sure if you mean among themselves or in relation -- or you also want to invite other stakeholders to participate in the GAC on an equal footing. But this is one of the points I would like to seek clarity.

And then in the management of critical Internet resources, all governments are invited to participate in the GAC in their -- let's say in their role assigned within ICANN, which I'm not sure it could be portrayed as in the management of critical Internet resources, full stop. They are -- the governments have some advisory role, so we cannot say for sure they are on an equal footing, the management of critical Internet resources.

So maybe I just would need some more clarity of what is meant here because there is no restriction for participation for governments in the GAC. At the same time, the GAC does not have, let's say, that kind of -- so much influence in the management of critical Internet resources.

Maybe while we think about that -- if you want to respond now, it's okay. Otherwise, I can give the floor to some other members and then come back to you.

So I have Cuba and Parminder on this.

Cuba?

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. I am confused as you are because I think this -- at least the way it is drafted, it's confusing, because to say that all governments on equal footing should participate, I think countries are invited. If they don't want to participate in the GAC, that's their sovereign decision. Maybe they can say "all participating governments on the GAC should be on equal footing," or whatever. As you explained, that's already happening.

More complicated is that the GAC should be on equal footing of the rest of stakeholders that govern on the board of Internet because that is one of the problems that has happened with the GAC. That is, advisory position and very low chain of command. I don't know the way of saying. It's something ridiculous.

So I think that this paragraph -- and I don't know the -- if we should mention it at all, but if it's mentioned, it has to be redrafted and that we advise some expert on ICANN issues like Nigel or Richard Hill --

[Laughter]

>>CUBA: -- to help to put it in a way that it conveys some positive energy to our work. We need the positive energy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Parminder, followed by Saudi Arabia, Canada, Russian Federation.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I also was not clear whether Jimson thinks that governments do not participate on equal footing within the GAC, which he may explain, but I think he wants -- encourage governments to enter into GAC.

So but my objection to this recommendation is at another level.

Our task is to operationalize enhanced cooperation, and the definition of enhanced cooperation is that which enables governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities for international public policymaking, and GAC, in my view, does not enable states to carry out their responsibilities for public policymaking because whatever I've read in political science and the practice of democracy, public policy is superior to technical standards and supervises technical standards and does not advise technical standards so what they do is not public policymaking. They are in their advisory capacity, thanks so much to the ICANN for that, but that role is not public policymaking and therefore does not go past the criteria of what is defined as enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

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

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, indeed, governments participating in ICANN is in an advisory role, which really something doesn't have to do with enhanced cooperation, so we cannot implement 69 by telling governments to go to ICANN and participate on equal footing in an advisory role under a different law. It's not even under international law. How can all government goes under local law to -- on equal footing?

So we're here contradicting with Tunis Agenda and we think 37 is really not relevant to 69 and Resolution 7125. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation -- I'm sorry. Canada followed by Russian Federation.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

This is -- I think perhaps Parminder was starting to hit on the point that I was going to make, but Paragraph 69 talks about Internet public policy issue and not the day-to-day technical and operational matter, which is what I thought really ICANN was focused on doing more.

So if -- and I'm happy to be enlightened on the difference. But in that sense, I think that our -- you know, Paragraph 69 to me says that ICANN is not -- is not our -- is not our focus here.

So I would tend to agree with Saudi Arabia that says that the Recommendation 37 has no place here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

I have the Russian Federation, Pakistan, and then I'll turn to Nigel for a final word on this.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Yeah, actually, I said the -- have the same points, actually, that ICANN have public policy issues in their work, but only limited to their mandate to the numbers and IP addresses.

But how it says here "management of the critical Internet resources" is not a public policy issue but day-to-day technical and operational matters which is not part of enhanced cooperation as it's envisioned in the Tunis Agenda, and, well, I agree with Canada that ICANN is not the point of discussion here and so that's why we should not put it into the text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think Richard might not be happy to hear that ICANN is not under our purview here, but we'll get to that. No, please, you don't have to respond to that, but we'll come to your proposals in regard to ICANN later on.

So I have on my list Pakistan and then Nigel Hickson from ICANN.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. As far as I understand, actually, there are two aspects to ICANN. One is -- one does relate to public policy issues as far as its structure is concerned, its mandate, its overall management is concerned. I think it certainly relates to public policy issues. But of course when it -- when it comes to its day-to-day operation, how it does work, it's something that is not in the purview of the public policy issues that have been referred to in Paragraph 69 of Tunis Agenda.

But I think it's -- it's quite confusing, this 37, because when we say "Governmental Advisory Committee," of course it has its own role, a very specific role, and of course it is in -- with respect to advice that is to be given and not in terms of providing guidance that would certainly fit into a public policy kind of a framework.

So either we rephrase it or, as others recommended, that we take it away and don't include it here.

But we are open to it. We can even revisit it. But in that manner, we would not be referring to Governmental Advisory Committee because it has a very certain specific role, but when it comes to

overall ICANN, it is our understanding that it certainly -- some of it is high-level management. It certainly relates to the Tunis Agenda 69. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel is next, and then I have additional requests from Anriette.

Parminder, are you also requesting? Yes. So.

Nigel followed by Anriette and then Parminder.

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

Well, I mean, first of all, to thank Jimson for his proposal here for this recommendation. I mean, there's 171 governments that are listed and take part from time to time on the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN and 36 international governmental organizations.

So it -- it encompasses a fair spread of participants.

I think our distinguished delegate from Pakistan has put it quite correctly, in that ICANN specifically does have a technical day-to-day role which I think is specifically referred to in various ways. Not just ICANN's role, but the role of other actors as well in terms of the Internet technical resources in relation to the Tunis Agenda. But of course there are public policy issues that are addressed by the Governmental Advisory Committee in ICANN in relation to intellectual property issues and data protection issues pertaining to names, and there are GAC members here that could no doubt give an explanation of some of the issues that they look at in relation to this.

But having -- having said that, I think I would say that for now, I think although we very much welcome this statement by -- or -- by Jimson, I think in the overall context of what we're doing here, that ICANN itself doesn't necessarily fit within the structure, but, you know, we might well want to come back to it.

What I would say is that the -- what we have shown in ICANN is that governments do have an effective voice. They are technically an advisory committee, but 99% of the recommendations that governments make to the ICANN board are implemented in one form or another. And, yes, I'll finish there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So next on my list is Anriette, followed by Parminder, and the list keeps -- and then after Turkey, I'm closing the list on this because I think it's quite clear we do not have consensus in regard to that recommendation, that we need some redrafting. We may come back to this in a future sense, but for the moment, I don't see -- for the purpose of what we are doing here, it's clear there is no consensus. So I thank Anriette and Parminder, Turkey. So thank you for this.

Let's turn then to Recommendation 41 that was proposed by the European Union, and just -- there are quite a few bullet points in this recommendation. I would like to invite European Union to address one by one so we can hopefully rapidly go through, even if it is quite extensive.

So European Union, you have the floor.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like here to say that maybe according to procedure, this is under one recommendation but, as you say, there are several bullet points here.

What is on those bullet points is that we try to defend some of the European Union principles. There are some of those that are also taken in your synthesis, in the discussion synthesis report that you made.

In this sense, I don't suggest that we go in the list in an exhaustive way, if you want to save time. I suggest that if there are objections in any of the bullet points, from my colleagues to come back, and I'll also give the opportunity because I believe that some of the members -- member states have similar positions, that I'm very happy to see a merge of those recommendations with others so we can have a more concise text.

So please.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Your comments are very helpful. I'd like then to seek the -- any comments from the floor in regard to the full proposal, particularly if there is any objections or reservations about qualifications in regard to any of the ideas that are being proposed.

I have on my list Richard Hill, followed by Saudi Arabia, Parminder, and Russian Federation and Pakistan.

So who I said first?

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I think the suggestion from the representative of the European Union is correct. Some of these, as they stand, are rather phrased as recommendations of this group rather than as output recommendations, but I think that's just a matter of drafting.

So I think the position that the European Union and like-minded countries would redraft these is a good one.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, as Richard had said, if we use this as ideas to the working group on how to properly assure or draft the recommendation, I mean, E.U. and others are free to revisit their submission and make it in a form of recommendations and we'll look at it at an earlier -- at a later stage. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, and thank you to the European Union delegate.

I would request clarification from the delegate on how all or any of these points enable governments to fulfill their roles and responsibilities regarding public policies pertaining to the Internet, which is -- alone is the mandate of this group.

Again, it goes back to the original problem I've been talking about. None of them is wrong but this is not the place this should be, and I don't see how and why would this group recommend these things, whose entire and only job is to enable governments to be able to fulfill their roles and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policies. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

And, yeah, if the E.U. wishes to comment, of course it would be more than welcome, but I -- I would take the point that was made upon the initial presentation that many of those elements here refer to the principles and also should be seen in the light of other things to be discussed, and I see many of them relate to an effort to provide for more tools for engagement or more information, and I think in a way, the interpretation of some. And I've seen, for example, in other contributions the reference that the promotion of best practice, for example, should be one of the recommendations because by promoting best practices in -- that can assist governments in enhanced cooperation. This is a view for some that of course should be passed.

So I'm not sure at this point we need to kind of discussion. Maybe we -- I understand you are placing some reservation on the full paragraph in that light, so we may wish to revisit this in the light of not automatically consider that everything that is here is under consensus, but I'm not sure we should open up the discussion on how each of these elements referred to relate to enhanced cooperation or not.

I have on my list Pakistan and the U.K. and Russia.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. I would thank the E.U. delegation.

Actually, we found many of the points quite relevant. For example, the point with respect to stakeholders from developing countries is very relevant and something that we have been saying quite - for quite some time. Balance of stakeholder representatives. Sustainable development. But as Parminder said, there are -- these are very valid points but more clarity is required.

The second-to-the-last point is quite interesting, duplicate -- "while duplicating existing work."

Of course this is something that we have seen in the recommendations of many colleagues, but what is quite lacking is elaboration of how to do it.

It says that building understanding of multistakeholder enhanced cooperation processes of existing international organizations, but we understand this -- this is a proposal, but what it certainly lacks is how to -- how to do it, how to build that process, how to formulate such a -- such a process with which this could be achieved that there is no duplication of work but enhanced cooperation is achieved.

So, again, many of the points are very valid but more elaboration is required, and certainly, as Parminder said, that what we have been saying in this meeting, that these are very good principles and priorities but needs to be anchored somewhere. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian -- I'm sorry. U.K. followed by the Russian Federation.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We think many of these recommendations will help the process towards enhanced cooperation. They are directly relevant. "A process towards enhanced cooperation," paragraph 71 of Tunis says, "will involve all stakeholders." And it's very good for our group, we think, to be able to talk about the different approaches that we should be taking that involve all stakeholders. And that's why we think these are relevant.

I wanted to mention also that the proposals from the European Union are almost the same as proposals from the United Kingdom. As you would expect, we are still a member of the European Union.

[Laughter]

At least for the next two years anyway.

And when we get to the end of the document, on page 34, we will get to the U.K. proposals, which are almost the same except we have expressed them as recommendations rather. So the grammar is different, but the substance is the same.

I'm pleased to hear this is support for these. I understand some colleagues feel they don't go into enough detail and they would like more detail of how things would be achieved. But from what I've heard, at least there is support for this in principle.

And as my colleague from the European Union said, we are happy -- where there are overlaps or duplications with proposals other colleagues have made, we're happy to look at streamlining or drafting for that purpose. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have next on my list the Russian Federation followed by Cuba and European Union. But just before that, let me maybe just try to anticipate that for the purpose of what we are doing, we would not say there is full consensus in regard to what is proposed. There are notions that can be accepted but with some rephrasing, additional -- some more information.

I would like to draw the attention, for example, for the third and fourth last bullets that read, "Promote and enabling environment for investment and promote and enabling environment for innovation." Think about the kind of work we did with regard to the high-level principle. I think this would be more of a kind of desired outcome that recommendations should lead us to this to promote rather than recommendation per se because it seems more than the goal we want to achieve than the recommendation.

So I think for the full paragraph some further work should be done. And I feel a lot of (inaudible) to revisit this and to seek the right place in the document, in the report for this.

So I turn then to the Russian Federation, Cuba, and European Union. Russian Federation has the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Just would like to remind you that our position that enhanced cooperation should have two layers, one layer between governments on equal footing to make a decision on the international public policy issue with consultation with other stakeholders and another layer between stakeholders.

And we think that these particular recommendations could be accepted as the integral part of the whole concept. So we think that it should be recategorized to number 2 so something which has the part of consensus but should be -- should have another part to be added. And this part is the part related to between governments on equal footing part of enhanced cooperation, should be integrated here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Cuba followed by the European Union.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm going to be very fast. I think I recommend this to move it to number 2. It has interesting concepts there. Some are even practical. I like this thing of how to select the representative stakeholders. That's a pending thing that whatever mechanisms arise, whatever, that's interesting. But this clearly needs some elaboration to put it in recommendation form and to look at it again. So I think the proposers should do it, and then we'll take a look.

So -- and I recommend to you, Chairman -- excuse me for being a little bit -- to put in your shoes -- but I think that things like this, when it's obvious that there's some -- at least I will give you the prerogative to move faster to move it to number 2. Because this is nothing against the proposals. I am the first to say that all proposals are relevant, and all proposals should be in a way or another in an annex, just not in our report.

But I think for the essence of time, you should move a little bit faster or we should move a little bit faster. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

I have on my list European Union followed by the U.S. and Japan. And then I think the list will be closed for that topic.

European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to all colleagues here, I don't know what is the best way forward. I understood that there is -- to my initial question, whether there's an objection to the bullet points that are in the recommendations by the European Union, I didn't hear any fierce at least objections on all of these matters that are listed there.

I heard, however, requests for further drafting of clarifications. I would like to see if there are specific bullets from the colleagues that they need to do so. I would not suggest that all of those go directly to Category 2. But if they need some of the bullets to be clarified further, I think it would be possible.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, E.U. And then I would also ask colleagues if you wish to comment on the points that were raised by the E.U. regarding to -- assisting them in providing some revised version of this, if that is the case.

So I have on my list the U.S., Japan, Saudi Arabia, and Cuba.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. I actually was just going to echo something that the E.U. colleagues beat me to.

But I think for one, just on a lot of the principles there seems to be support for but maybe there's some editing just putting them into recommendations, which sounds like the U.K. has already done in their proposal.

But my broader statement is, I think when recommendations were handled like this, I mean, this is -- the European Union has one recommendation that has multiple recommendations in it and others have had a lot of individual recommendations. I think that we should break these out and consider them individually because a lack of consistency on one part of, I don't know, eight bullets should not eliminate the whole thing. And I think the U.S. proposal later has a similar structure in the document, and I just don't want to lose something because of one small part when maybe there is agreement on the broad -- on others. So thank you.

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

Yeah, you may comment proposed initially to discuss bullet by bullet. But I used preference to address the section as a whole with the hope that there would not be many, let's say, complex discussions. But in the light of the discussion, I think we should have taken maybe that approach and go ahead and go bullet by bullet.

I don't know if it would be the best use of our time to do it now because, as Cuba said before, it's quite clear for the purpose what we're doing here. There's no clear consensus at least in the way it's formulated. We may wish to revisit it in light of the principles, in the light of some additional information to be provided.

So I would be very reluctant to further engage on that particular recommendation, the ebbs and flows in so many different areas. And, of course, I would give the floor to others who wish. I think we need to come back to this at a later stage. For the purpose of what we're doing here, I think we can adhere to all of you. But the final decision would be to refer back and certainly not include it for the moment as consensus language that could be accepted.

The U.S., you are seeking for the floor. So I have U.S., Japan, and Cuba, and European Union. U.S., you have spoken already. Yes, yes, I'm sorry.

So Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair.

We support the idea of what is written in recommendation 41. And I also noted as U.K. has already noted that these ideas already reflected in the form of proposed recommendations as a new U.K. proposal. And I believe we are going in the course of Category 1, we are coming to these new version. I think it's unclassified 4. The current title is "unclassified 4." So I suggest that we are going to have a detailed discussion, bullet-by-bullet discussion. I think in total there are ten bullet points in this recommendation. So I suggest we do this discussion when we come to the U.K. unclassified 4 recommendations.

And we fully support this idea of promoting the participation of multistakeholders in the various institution and existing agencies.

And actually these kind of ten bullet points, it's a high-level principle that's addressed to all stakeholders, all relevant institutions. And I think this is at least the area where we can make consensus in this group. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia followed by Cuba.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Listening to the distinguished delegates from E.U., in my intervention I said these are not recommendations. These are either principles or ideas for the WGEC. Looking at this paragraph 69, 77, not really relevant how to enable government on equal footing. So having this in the current format is not really a recommendation to be included. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Cuba and then Parminder and the U.K. But I'd like to anticipate my -- at least for me it is clear there's no consensus as they are drafted here. But as U.K. has mentioned, basically the same concepts would be -- we can have a look at it later on on the basis of different formulation, presentation in the form of recommendation. And by coincidence, it's our very last item for our work in that regard for the moment.

So I would suggest that we could maybe leave it for the moment and revisit this in the light of the formulations provided by the U.K., that we capture the same concepts and have a very quick look because we do not want to duplicate the discussion we have here. We can have a very quick look and see if on a no-objection basis something could be made as consensus relevant for the report.

Then I have Cuba, Parminder, and U.K.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

I was going to leave this to the judgment of the proposer to really scheme that because in these things, there are many bullets that are simply wishes. There's something that are good; but they're already, you know, truths that are already in the Tunis Agenda. Tunis Agenda mentions investment, mentions innovation. I don't know what we have to put here or what it has to do with what we're doing. And, also, there are some other things that are really controversial to say the least because the participation - what I said -- to make -- to open up the policy-making process to input scrutiny from other stakeholders. We're going to request that to member states of United Nations? That's really controversial. That would need much discussion. So I think really that we should have the same bar for everybody.

We said some previous proposers that their recommendations were already in the Tunis Agenda. So anything that is already a wish list in the Tunis Agenda, the Tunis Agenda is mentioned, as I remember sustainable development -- it's not that that's not important. I agree that those things are important. But to put it again in our report, I don't know why we have to do that. If that's the case, we then have to revisit some things that we said we cannot put it because it's in the Tunis Agenda and then put it right there how it is. So we have to have the same criteria throughout the board.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder followed by the U.K. No, okay.

U.K., do you wish to take the floor on this?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I agree we should treat all the recommendations on the same bar. We have a slight issue with the compilation document in that some people's recommendations have been given a number each. Notice, for example, my good friend Richard Hill, the first 23 recommendations are from Richard Hill. When the E.U.'s recommendations were made, they were made -- although there were actually ten, they were only given one number. And the same for the U.K. So we understand we've had an initial discussion of these discussions from the E.U., and we understand you want to move on.

But to be very clear, when we reach the U.K. proposals, the ten recommendations of the U.K., we would like to look at them each as a recommendation and decide which category they should go in on their merits one by one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. This was what I was proposing to do. And I wish we can move fast to make sure we get to that point.

We are moving in that direction if all of us have agreed. European Union. No, no, no, no, not now. When we get to it.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: I don't want to block the process here. I just want to make sure that we don't leave behind any of the points because we treat them as a group. This was already mentioned. And I think that's why I started my proposal by saying -- talking about the objections to take them out and stay

only with the consensus. So the risk here -- and I would like to highlight that -- is that we miss some of those at a later stage. But I don't want to block the process.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: When we come back to, I think, the same idea on the basis of the language provided by U.K., just make sure we do not lose any of your own proposals. And I take on board the point that was made by U.K., and I think I should take the blame together with the secretariat. Perhaps when we selected the -- put it in a document, I think we should have taken the same approach. So ten recommendations come from the European Union should deserve ten numbers and not just one. I think this is something -- but we can address this in the course and make sure we do not give less time just because they are in blocks. In that particular case, we will have to revisit this when we come to the -- yes.

>> CUBA: Point of order.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Point of order, yes.

>>CUBA: I think that if the decision is to treat this independently, we should do it now as the rest of the things that we're doing. If that takes time, well, sorry, that's the way we're working with the rest of the things. We can now move bullet by bullet.

If you want, I can start but I think we should do it now and not leave it, you know -- not to give special treatment in this direction either. Thank you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I think you give us the option, speaking of E.U., either to take this bullet by bullet or in general. And they choose to take it as a general discussion. So why do you blame us now in the group? You give us the option, and E.U. choose one direction. So we are happy either way.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. What I was saying in taking the blame, not for the approach we took in this meeting but in the preparation of the documents not to have given the same balanced approach we give to other proponents.

But, again, you are right, at the beginning of the meeting, that option was on the table. We will have to revisit it when we come to U.K. proposal.

My suggestion now is that we move to recommendation 42. And we have on the screen 42.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>CUBA: And when we're coming back to this Proposal 41, when we're going to discuss it?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- on your laptop. It is there, uncategorized 4. That refers to the proposal made by the U.K. that basically captures the same point, so we'll get there.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: It's the very last one under Category 1.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CUBA: -- in that document, the screen where it is.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Cuba, because we do not want to stop the meeting --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can we move to Recommendation 42? Can the secretariat -- yes.

So this was proposed by ISOC. Is there someone from ISOC in the -- yes, please. Carl, you have the floor.

>>ISOC: Thank you, Chair.

I just want to start briefly with reiterating our understanding of enhanced cooperation, which is about collaboration among all stakeholders, and not only at the international level but also at the regional and natural levels.

And I apologize, I missed the opportunity to speak to the Recommendation 33, but if we could come back to that, that's part of the sentiment of we recommend strengthening the IGF model at the regional and national level.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry, I think this one we have already addressed as -- in plenary. I'm sorry you were not in the room, but this is -- we are past this. Could you focus on Recommendation 42?

>>ISOC: Absolutely. And in that regard, what we believe stakeholders need to focus on is the continuous issue about expanding Internet access, and we believe that the creation of an enabling environment is critical to that, and that the -- the collaboration among stakeholders is critical to ensure that enabling environment.

So that is what this recommendation is referring to. Collaboration to establish the enabling environment to expand Internet access. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So Thank you. As I see the proposal from ISOC here, it refers to the establishment of priority areas around which stakeholders would work as -- to enhance -- and that would fit and help in furthering enhanced cooperation.

So can that notion be taken on board by the group?

And I see no objections.

I was too quick.

Yes, I have Saudi Arabia followed by Parminder.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, Parminder (indiscernible).

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Three issues with three parts of the proposal, so almost all parts of them.

First is that though the listed priority areas are important, I do not think we are into an exercise of listing public policy issues.

We did it in the previous WGEC on the insistence of some governments who promptly, at the end of the track of that exercise, disowned that document, but that's entirely a different matter.

But now we are not visiting public policy issues. I have got 40 or 50 already public policy issues which are important. That's not a discussion we want to get into, which the priority ones.

So the problem is on process here, not on substance, that we shouldn't get into listing priority public policy issues here.

Second, all stakeholders have a role. I'm a civil society participant. I see my role and -- but this enhanced cooperation is defined about roles and responsibilities of the government. That's clear. So this is not meeting the definition of enhanced cooperation.

And it is also clearly defined that it's about international public policy issues and not about national and regional public policy issues, so again, we can talk about many things within Internet governance, outside Internet governance, about governments, about climate change. We can talk about many things which are important. But we need to stick to what we have been asked to talk about. All aspects of this proposal unfortunately, in my view, do not meet that criteria. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I have Saudi Arabia, Cuba, and Anriette.

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

Well, we thank ISOC for their submission. However, looking at these priority areas, in order to understand the WSIS outcomes, it's great that it's in a different paragraph or a different section but enhanced cooperation show expanding infrastructure, fostering skills, entrepreneurship, supporting governance, support of governments is something that has nothing to do with enhanced cooperation,

either with capacity building or network call-out, but how can we have this to operationalize enhanced cooperation is -- is not relevant.

And as Parminder said, our focus at the international, but here we see national, regional, so we see no direct link to this recommendation and the mandate of this working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba, Anriette, and then Nigel, and I'm closing the list on this particular topic.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I don't want to repeat the -- what my colleague just said, but it's obvious, you know. This is international public policy, not national. And also expanding infrastructure and fostering skills, that's also in part of the Tunis Agenda and some other places, so -- if we're following that criteria.

But I want to make mention here something that could be valid for going on. We are doing this as a U.N.-mandated group and we have to stick to the U.N. concepts and wording and not to use or -- to use coined phrases that have not been agreed in the U.N. system because I don't know what is meant by "supportive governance." That's a concept that has not been approved. And of course this has no sense to be here in the whole recommendation. But I'm making this point that maybe is sometimes along the line we find this coined expressions that have not been agreed on, and we should not use them. We should have to use expressions that are already used in the United Nations family.

So to finalize, the other things I think are mentioned elsewhere in the Tunis Agenda. We should follow that recommendation and not put it, because we could put there also that we should have everybody that have -- worked in Internet governance should be in better health. I would agree to that. We should all feel better if we have health, and that will usually -- of course will help Internet governance, but I think that's not the thing to put it here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Anriette, and last on my list is Nigel.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I just want to first say that I don't recall us making any consensus decision that enhanced cooperation -- enhanced cooperation refers exclusively to cooperation among governments.

It's not in the synthesis document on high-level characteristics that the chair compiled for us. I think there are different approaches.

We just heard Russia made a very interesting proposal that there are two levels to enhanced cooperation.

But I've heard several speakers refer to an assumed consensus that we are discussing this in a -- in a manner that -- that's restricted to cooperation between governments, and I don't recall making that decision.

Secondly, on this recommendation, I -- there's clearly not consensus on it. I would agree we can move it. But I think what's interesting about it is that it's referring to national and regional, and Juan, I think even if we are talking about international public policy, discussion of that and engagement of what -- what is -- what a government does internationally should be backed up by consultative and transparent inclusive processes at national levels. So that was how I understood that.

And maybe we can ask ISOC to revise their recommendation.

And then just a final point.

I think some of these that don't fit right now, once we've worked out the structure of our document and the different types of recommendations, it will probably become much easier to deal with text, such as, for example, the European Union text.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Last on my list is Nigel.

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

I mean, I'll be very brief. I think this is an interesting discussion. I didn't intervene under the European Union proposal. It had many different attributes to it which I thought were very positive. And this ISOC proposal also, whether we discuss individual elements of it or whether we reflected on it later, I think, is also positive.

But the discussion that's just taken place, Mr. Chairman, I think is significant, but also I think we do need to reach some sort of consensus of where we're going on this.

We heard this morning from various interventions --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Nigel, I'm sorry to interrupt. Could you please comment on Recommendation 42, if you have any comments?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Because we need to move and complete the reading of our comments and then we discuss how we want to move forward.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Well, all I'd say, then, is that I think we should -- we should certainly come back to this and we should come back to other elements and define amongst ourselves what public policy issues we are pertaining to here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just before I move to the next recommendation, which is 45, first sentence that was proposed by Iran, I have the Russian Federation, but I'd like to comment that although, for example, in this case there is no consensus, clearly, to take this on board as some kind of common language we want to have included in the report, maybe ISOC can revisit in the light of some of the comments, but I take on board some comments that are very straight in the sense that they don't

think we should be prioritizing issues, that there is an issue of process, and it does not fit into enhanced cooperation.

There are different views, of course, of what enhanced cooperation encompasses and the way it should develop, but what we are looking at at this particular point is what are the formulations that are proposed that can get consensus.

So for this purpose, we are -- clearly this will not meet this target.

Which does not mean that our discussion is useless. It has been very useful for me, as the chair, to get a sense of some ideas that are being discussed by you that could either be addressed under one form or another. It should not be reflected in any way. So I think it's very important for us to have that kind of substantive discussion for -- even for those who probably will be in some kind of drafting mode at some point. It's important to hear the views even if this does not lead to consensus.

So with this, I will give the floor for Russian Federation as well to speak on this, and we turn to 45.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Actually, we will be short in this.

We would like to say that it actually has the interesting point about focus area. We also propose some focus area because, you know, the -- it's not only about infrastructure. It's more than that.

We agree with Cuba that it's better to stick to U.N. terminology, if we come to this, but however, what we tried to -- if we try to -- to make focus area for enhanced cooperation, it would be better to -- at least to try something.

We also have this material with the gaps analysis from the last group also who addressed this issue of the focus area on enhanced cooperation.

This particular paragraph, we think should be re- -- should be rewritten in the context of enhanced cooperation, so it should be put to the area of public policy issue and we think and would like to reiterate again that if the public policy is the sovereign rights of states, of course it should be considered for intergovernmental decision-making. Thank you.

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

So with this, we'll turn now to --

So, again, the final discussion on this has indicated this does not meet the -- our goal of identifying what are the consensus notions emanating -- that can be accepted by this group.

I invite ISOC to reflect on what was said and maybe to come back with some formulation.

45, first sentence coming from Iran, I would invite Iran to comment on this.

Just to recall that when we're discussing the high-level principles, there was a discussion on the need to promote technology transfer and the decision at this -- at this -- this discussion was -- not only the decision but the outcome of the discussions showed that there was a feeling that this should be seen as some kind of desired outcome for enhanced cooperation and not as a characteristic. But I turn to Iran for your comment on this. Please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do believe this is a very important recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, actually we have a serious concern regarding the digital divide between the developed and developing countries. One, there are closer and closer relationships between the two in all walks of life. Wide progress has been made in terms of closing the gaps and differences in some area, as considering technological divide still exists between and -- between the countries. I think such divides often acts as impediments in harnessing the potential of science, technology, and innovation for the ongoing potential of science and technology.

Mr. Chairman, also according to the SDG, we know that in the 2030 agenda and also in the Tunis Agenda, there are many -- there are several paragraphs that reference to the technology cooperation and technology transfer between the developed and developing countries, and as we are working, we are discussing in the group that one of the mandates of the working group is shortening the gap between the developed and developing countries regarding the fulfillment of a commitment of the government on international -- on the international policy.

So we believe that if we include it, the technology transfer, in outcome of the enhanced cooperation, we have helped to fulfill commitment of the developing countries on international policy public [sic].

And if we disregard this recommendation, I believe that we have helped to more gap between the two sides.

So if we are going to enable the governments to fulfill its commitments in the international policy regarding the Internet, we need to include technology transfer and outcome of the working group. Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- just, of course, now we are looking at it from the angle of recommendations, but when we look from the angle of principles, I think it was -- I want to say it carefully because it was not a final decision but there was a very generalized sentiment that it is an important notion to be retained in the report, with an indication that it is -- that anything we do in regard to enhanced cooperation should aim at promoting technology transfer.

This is my recollection of what -- but I would like to hear some comments in regard to that proposal.

Can we take it as consensus from the group that --

Yes. Carlos Afonso.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CUBA: Very quickly, the WGEC doesn't pave the way for anything except to provide recommendations at the end for the development of enhanced cooperation, so perhaps it should be redacted like "enhanced cooperation should help to materialize the access to technology," et cetera, et cetera. And I didn't understand clearly what "it" is that. "It should." Who should? Who should cover the concept of coordination and management of critical Internet resources? This, for me, is a question.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: To my understanding, we are only dealing with the first part. That is, the one that was identified as potentially leading to consensus. We are not discussing the second part. But I assume "it" should refer to either WGEC or enhanced cooperation. Maybe we need some clarification.

But anyway, it is not under discussion now.

I have U.S., followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just looking at this, since we're not drafting or editing right now, it's really hard, I think, to make a judgment on this, because I'm not really sure what the recommendation is.

So my suggestion at this point would be to move to 2 -- to Number 2 in our categories and just ask Iran to redraft it in the form of a recommendation so that we could actually look at it and make a judgment on it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I have a question for clarification. Why this recommendation was split in two parts? Can colleagues tell us why?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think -- yes, I see the secretariat is looking at the document. I think we have to look at the original input from Iran. Probably it was in separate, but I'm not sure. I'm just guessing. But I'm looking to the secretariat for some guidance on this.

Anyway, for the purpose of this meeting -- Saudi Arabia, I will give you the floor.

For the purpose of this meeting, we are going to -- this was my proposal, that we should focus on those portions of the text that were identified as we meet potential consensus. This applies to the first part. I'm just checking what is the reason for separating both parts. But for the moment we are not examining the second part.

Yes, I have Saudi Arabia then Richard Hill. I think both who would like to refer to points of order.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Thank you, Chair. My question and comment on the document was prepared by Richard and the others. If we see four to five between square brackets, first sentence, why we separate "four to five" from the second sentence? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm looking to have also some more clarity on this.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: I think they're actually two breaking into parts. Some of the original recommendations were broken into parts by you, Chairman, in cooperation with the secretariat in the very first compilation. Because in the first compilation, you distinguished categories. And some recommendations, there was one recommendation but in different categories. So you split them up which I think was very helpful actually. And that survives here.

Now, the question here is why in the small group did we feel that the first sentence is a candidate for consensus, whereas the second one not. Again, that was just our guess. And clearly we were wrong because the first one is not a candidate for consensus.

In our opinion, the second one -- and we could be wrong the other way. Maybe the second one is a candidate for consensus.

In our opinion, the second one was not a candidate for consensus because it hinges on the fact of who is coordinating management of critical Internet resources. And the "it" -- we thought the "it" was something like the WGIG or governments and so on and we thought that was not likely to meet consensus, to say that as we know ICANN is a private sector organization, et cetera, et cetera. So, again, we could have been wrong. And perhaps the second part is a candidate for consensus.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I would -- yes, I'll turn to Iran. But I would -- in the light of the discussion we had, my personal conclusion that it does not meet the goal we have assigned to us for this exercise. We may wish to request Iran to revisit the language and come back. But at least for this first reading, this could not -- as we say, we tried easily to take it on board as some kind of consensus recommendation.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. From my perspective, Mr. Chairman, right now I don't remember Iran has separated these two recommendations and send it to the secretariat or the secretariat divide the two sentences.

But I'm flexible for if there's consensus to retain this recommendation and document, I'm flexible to merge the two recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I don't see a point next in the discussion. It's clear there is no consensus in regard to accepting the language as it is. We need certainly to come back to this at some point.

I will just before closing discussion suggest to the secretariat to have some clarity on why this was separated. It will not affect the way we are proceeding but just for clarity of why this was done.

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ SANZ: Very simply because in consultation with Iranian delegation, when we asked for clarification and under what category the different elements of their inputs would be classified, they suggested it would be written like that. And we receive a document in track changes indicating that this sentence would be edited, the second part of the paragraph.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would suggest we move then to recommendation 48. This was, as you can see, proposed by Hungary. I see Peter Major in the room. Are you speaking to this, or is there somebody from the Hungarian delegation would like to introduce this recommendation?

Yes. Well, we have come to recommendation 48 that was proposed by Hungary. I was just wondering if you want to speak to this, some introductory remarks.

>>HUNGARY: Thank you, Chairman. Actually, I try and participate in my capacity as the acting chair of the CSTD. Since I'm also special adviser to Hungary, basically I'm not sure that you need special explanation. To me it's really clear.

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. I fully concur with you. I think no further explanation. I was just giving you the same chance I gave to others to speak to their proposals.

But are there any comments in that regard? Yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: I think like the first paragraph that we discussed, I think in the preamble -- that's why I said that we should do the drafting before. Anyway, we're doing here. In the preamble, we should have all these things about the capacity-building in Internet governance because we are not doing this for the rest. For the rest, capacity-building in ICTs, it's already covered in Tunis Agenda and elsewhere. But to put -- because that's the thing that was mentioned during the Tunis discussion, that in order to enable developing countries to participate meaningfully in the Internet -- global Internet governance, they need to do capacity-building. And we should put something like that in the preamble and cover all that.

And, by the way, we could put some other things that are in some other like Anriette's things in the preamble and so on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think I have the same feeling, that we want to retain the notion that is here but probably not as a recommendation, to see how that would fit in a final outline, a draft document that I want at some point in time to propose to you. So this has been helpful in that regard.

We move then to recommendation 51.

I'm sorry?

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: There is no consensus regarding taking it as a recommendation. But I think there is consensus about the importance of the topic and that should be reflected somewhere in the report. I think maybe I can summarize like this.

U.K., you want to speak to this?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, I understand what we are doing now is deciding which category things should go in and we're not agreeing general statements about the content of the recommendation. So I don't think it's right that we have concluded this should not be a recommendation; it should be in the preamble.

From our point of view, we think that capacity-building skills and education are a very important part of enhanced cooperation.

In order for stakeholders to take part in enhanced cooperation processes and particularly stakeholders from developing countries, capacity-building skills are absolutely critical. From our point of view, this should be a recommendation. We understand there are many others in the room who may disagree with us. That's fine. That's absolutely fine. But we're not having that conversation now and making conclusions on it.

What we are doing now is deciding which category the recommendations come in. So I'm sorry to take up your time. But I just wanted to be absolutely clear, we're not making conclusions now about the content of the recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for clarifying this because I had the impression this was the general sentiment.

Yes, Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. Paul, I believe you were speaking to recommendation 51. The chairman was speaking to recommendation 48. Oh, you were, okay. Then that's fine.

>> (off microphone).

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I never raised part of order but this seems partly to be that. I'm not clear what categories are these to which we are assigning recommendations now. What is that process? I would like to be reminded on that.

I thought the process now is that we go through each recommendation and see if there is an agreement to take it as a recommendation or it goes into the bag that there is yet not an agreement to take it as a recommendation. These are the two things. And this was now taken into the bag that there is not yet an agreement to take it as a recommendation.

And there's no other category assignment in my view that we are filing unless I'm mistaken in. Maybe the U.S. can clarify. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No. I think I should clarify myself because, yeah, what we have been doing is exactly what you said. On the basis of the list that was put together by the small number of people that identified in their assessment potential recommendations that could lead to consensus, we are having that collective -- we are revisiting collectively to make sure whether this could meet that consensus requirement. And so I say that for almost all of those who have seen that there's not such decision.

But at this point in time, we are -- this is the task we assigned ourselves, to confirm whether there's consensus or not to take these recommendations. Any other situation reverts back and should be revisited further. So this is the situation we are.

I see no further comment. Can we turn to recommendation 51? This was proposed by Jimson.

Would you like to speak to that and make some introductory remarks?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. What I would like to emphasize concerning this recommendation is the fact that really there are gaps that are in the technical, whether in the policy ability, or (inaudible) ability of many governments from developing countries, as many of us can attest to.

So this recommendation is made to write the framework to handle that, to raise the capacity of policymakers in developing countries to address Internet public policy matters, to recognizing capacity gaps, in addressing Internet public policy matters in developing and least developed countries. Appropriate support mechanism should be enabled to bridge the gap. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Any comments in regard to that proposal? Parminder followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, chair. Quick. The main issue here is that I'm not sure whether Jimson meant gaps in addressing international public policy issues -- matter or domestic Internet public policy matters. In both, there may be issues of capacity. But here we are concerned about international Internet public policy matters. That's the one thing.

And second thing is that we do not want to reduce enhanced cooperation to a capacity-building program. There has been huge discussions by developing countries between the difference between being on the table and developing capacity being on the table. And this is about being on the table. And while this could be reflected somewhere at a lower priority, but that's really not the matter of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, chairman. And we thank Jimson for his recommendation.

When it comes to international public policy matters, it's the development. So if there is the capacity development, it should be in the development aspect, not in the addressing issue. So we need to build capacity in how developing countries will develop international public policy issues. If this is the intention, we can work out the language. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Anriette on my list.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Benedicto.

Parminder, just to respond to you on that. I always said that I don't think problems of exclusion can be solved with capacity-building. So I agree with that.

But I do think they are not mutually exclusive. I think -- my organization together with an intergovernmental body, the African Union, convenes the African School on Internet Governance. This has been for four years. We already see results in terms of participation and influence from African stakeholders. So I do think we should not eliminate references to capacity-building. We don't have to present it as a problem, as a solution to all the problems of enhanced cooperation. But I do think it is an important component of supporting and strengthening enhanced cooperation among governments.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Final speaker on this my understanding will be Japan. Do you want to take the floor, please?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Japan supports this idea, but maybe we need some drafting work on this. So what in essence here is maybe enhanced cooperation process should support the participation of the stakeholders from different countries. So maybe we should make this kind of editing here. So in that case, maybe we should suggest that this is categorized to Category 2 for the moment. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see there is no objection to the notion, that the notion is important. But I think we need certain work, editorial work, in regard to reflect adequately this issue that is linked to the capacity-building in general. This was also the subject of the previous recommendation we just examined. So certainly we need some more work on that before we can revisit this again.

Yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: Yes, mr. Chairman, I'm thinking along the same line. Maybe the previous proposer for 48 and Jimson make a joint proposal.

But I want to stress what (saying name) just said. It's not about addressing the Internet public policy, about addressing the development or the drafting or the discussion, not for -- when it's a policy, it's a policy. That's it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, on that note, we take note of all the comments that were made, and then we'll come back to this -- I suggest we move to recommendation 53. 53, 54 -- no, 53. This was proposed by Anriette.

Anriette, you have the floor.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

This was in response to the first round of questions with regard to the work of the previous WGEC.

So it's just -- again, I think it's text that can be used. It's not a specific recommendation, but it was responding to the value that there is in the mapping of spaces and processes that WGEC 1 did and looking at continuation of that possibly at the CSTD or some other space. So that was really just a practical suggestion rather than a very high-level recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this clarification. I have Cuba and then Pakistan.

>>CUBA: Thank you. And thank Anriette once more. I think it could be included. I have nothing against that. But, again, I want to point the attention to what is policy spaces. If we put the term "policy spaces," we would have to explain it to the -- I'm always thinking of my diplomats reading this kind of document. They will come asking me, and I don't know policy spaces. It's -- maybe we could change or put directly the meaning of what you mean by "policy spaces," it will be okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. This looks like a good proposal and a very interesting one as a sharing of information. I think this goes to the heart of what we have been trying to achieve, because with the sharing of information, a number of issues would result, but, you know, with this recommendation, with this language that has been proposed by Anriette, it's not clear what kind of working documents, agendas, and -- these are being referred to.

Maybe she can explain a little bit more because there are so many processes going on around Internet-related issues.

Is it -- I, of course, get the spirit of this recommendation, the sharing of information, and we certainly go along with this, but the "how" part is still -- you know, we need to elaborate further.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Anriette?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you for that. And Juan, I'll start with you.

I think "policy space," that's possibly language that civil society uses. By that, we mean various spaces where Internet-related public policy discussions are made.

So I think that will take place.

I think possibly we need to also reflect on that in the preamble. I think we do talk and there is general consensus that Internet governance is quite distributed, that one of the challenges for particularly developing country governments is that there are so many spaces, so -- so many places. So we can define that. I'll try and find language.

And then just in response to the question from Pakistan, I mean, one specific example would be what the Human Rights Council is doing.

They have recently worked on privacy, for example, data protection. Our data protection legislation touches very integrally on the Internet. And while that might be too detailed for what we are talking about in WGEC, there was a very valuable report done by the high commission and Navi Pillay -- it was her last report -- on privacy in the digital age.

So that would be a document, for example.

And I think there's also a practice. Many of you are aware of this because your governments participate in the Biannual Resolution on the Internet in the Human Rights Council.

So to be able to share about that, share information about what theme, because every year that they work on a resolution, it's different.

So -- and you can apply this to what is happening at ITU level, at WIPO level, UNESCO.

And I now am going on too long, but I don't know how many of you are aware that UNESCO is just starting a process of developing indicators that are Internet-related which their member states have approved, and these indicators would be used to measure various Internet governance-related processes.

So this is the type of information.

I think I was referring to intergovernmental spaces, but we could also include some of the other spaces in the broader Internet governance ecosystem.

There is no clearinghouse at the moment, and I know that's a controversial proposal, but there is not a single place where this information can be easily accessed, at present.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think and I would suggest for Anriette and others that may wish to come together on this, because I think we are -- the notion is very important for many, and I personally think it's an important notion, but as Cuba was indicating, maybe part of the problem here is in regard to the technology that was his policy space, that we should maybe seek some replacement, alternative expression. Usually we refer to our processes for organizations, so we should see what fits better that is more familiar to our colleagues that will later on deal with this, and on the basis of the comments that were made, I think there's some editorial work should be needed here. So for the moment, I will --

Yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: Yes. And now that you're suggesting that, also this has -- Anriette, it has to be qualified by something like "as much as possible" because as you know, there are some processes that by their definition, their input documents are not shared until there is an output.

Like, for instance, the GEG, it's all work inside, and we should not pretend now to change the customs or the way that some other groups and some other organizations work. So if you put that -- qualify that and make the explanation of public -- of policy spaces, that could be an interesting thing. Of course we shall see the final wording afterwards.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. On that, I would suggest we turn then to 54 that was proposed by Jimson, and if you wish, you could also address 55 together, as you prefer.

Yes, please, you have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair.

Let me really appreciate everyone. You know very much that I'm not a diplomat so I don't know much about the finesse of language, so for the offer to help restructure some of my earlier recommendations.

Now, on this one, this takes into consideration my thinking and my observation that we already have high-level enhanced cooperation already in place where we have materials to affirm that, and since we know that public policy Internet -- international Internet public policy will continuously evolve, I'm of the opinion that we should have it in place that on a needs basis, all stakeholders -- that is, government, business, civil society, technical and academic community -- should evolve and engage on processes of inclusive cooperation on diverse global public policy matters pertinent to the Internet.

So this is like a principle, a basic framework of recommendation, that prepare the minds of all stakeholders with respect to what appears to happen down in the future.

And do I stop here or just go to 55, Chair?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, if you wish, I think we could take them together, if the plenary wishes.

So you may introduce 55 and then we'll open for discussion.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: My apologies. So on the 55, the recommendation is quite straightforward. That effort be made to increase awareness of diverse global public policy matters pertinent to the Internet, especially in the developing and least developed nations.

This comes from efforts being made already, like the GIPO and many observatory that creates number of awareness. So even in Africa, now, there's a study that has come up that is pushing this.

So the whole idea is to still to make it clear that it's a continuous thing for there to be awareness about Internet -- internationalized Internet public policy issues going forward, especially in developing countries. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I have comments on those proposals?

Yes. I see Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Jimson.

Recommendation 54, the main issue here is it belongs to institutional mechanism, only that is not an institutional mechanism, but it belongs to how there could be a process of dealing with public policy matters.

The first issue is that it belongs with those institutional proposals.

The second issue is that I'm not clear what this proposal is and it should need to be fleshed out.

I think one of the tests we need to do as a group investing so much resources and time and following our duty given to us by the UNGA is that whatever we say, we should be able to say that when this gets done, this -- the effort would change.

We need to connect at least somehow our recommendations to what would therefore change after, if these recommendations are accepted by UNGA.

So I would like to know: What does that do if, let's say, we accepted it and UNGA accepted it? What will happen? Is that today somebody's being prevented on a need basis to get together to do something?

So we need to have institutional proposals -- that's the meaning of the word "institution" -- which should be able to perform a function which then creates an output, and I don't understand what form an output that -- that 2 is about.

I would like a clarification, but in any case, if he's able to give a valid clarification, we'd send this to the institutional basket where we're telling what can be done new. So either way, it would be difficult to accept it as a consensus recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We actually agree with Parminder. It's a bit a surprise how we -- this particular recommendation was categorized as consensus because, you know, evolve and engage to what aspect?

And we have different stakeholders here and we have the wording regarding global public policy matters pertaining to the Internet, but we usually say that in -- according to their roles and responsibilities, and for these particular points, the roles and responsibilities for the -- of these stakeholders differ from each other, and especially related to public policy, it's -- only the states have the sovereign rights to make it.

So we think it's not consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I would then suggest, Jimson, that maybe on the basis of those comments, you could further revise. Certainly there is no consensus to accept those two recommendations, as such, so I think for the purpose of what we are doing this meeting, they certainly will not be incorporated with this qualification.

We are now already a little bit past the time that was assigned for this particular session. I would very happily continue for some time, if you wish. I think maybe my assessment is that we have been doing good progress in regard to try to clean up or to revisit to have a first reading of --

Well, I'll give the floor. Let me just --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No. Let me finish and then I'll give you the floor.

So I'd like to consult with you whether we should extend for some half an hour, maybe, and try to make a go and be more efficient, try to go as far as we can, or if we should break now. I'm in your hands in that regard.

So I have Cuba and Richard Hill asking for the floor.

>>CUBA: Before answering your question, what is wrong with 55? I think 54 was the one with controversy, but I think 55 is okay. I don't know.

And for the rest, I'm in your hand. I came here to do this work. If we want to stay, we stay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So let me first address this comment. The comments that were made that address both 54 and 55, but can I ask maybe you to put your plates down for the moment just to check.

Is there any objection to retaining 55 as it is as a consensus recommendation?

If there is no objection, I think that could go into -- in principle. I -- we are just making a -- there are no final decisions made that --

In regard to 55, then, I think this can be accepted. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: This belongs to an earlier set where we were talking about capacity-building downstream. These downstream issues are relevant at a tertiary level. They are not the primary aspects of enhanced cooperation. If we do agree on -- on some kind of weak, strong, middle level institutional mechanism, then I think these kick in.

So all of them are good, but they're just really tertiary stuff.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So there is no consensus so let's not -- let's just bracket this. Maybe we can come back to this later.

So let's -- so I come back to my question to you, whether we could extend for some more time or if the group wishes to break. I will be more than happy to continue for some time.

Yes, Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Actually, I have a suggestion that might speed things up dramatically.

I haven't been keeping track exactly, but I'm pretty sure that essentially all of the things that we thought were consensus have turned out not to be consensus, and as far as I can tell, that's not so much because there's a problem with the content but because some participants don't think that's the right thing for this group to be focusing on, and that's their point of view, so that's fine, and we have not sufficiently taken that into account when we came up with the consensus thing.

So it might be simpler, Chairman, to simply agree that all of these go into Category 2, without any further discussion, unless somebody wants to come back and say, "Well, no, I think" -- because we still have that option, right? You're still going to let us to come back and say, "Well, I think my Proposal Number XX is in Category 1."

So maybe we should move all of the other ones down to Category 2 and then ask people which ones they think should come back into Category 1 and only take that on the exception basis.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'd like to have -- well, I take your point and I think we must make a decision on how to proceed, but I would be a little reluctant to assume that all the remaining recommendations will not get consensus.

I -- that would be kind of -- there was some judgment that we are assessing on a case-by-case basis. I don't think there is no other way to do it in a responsible way. But I -- I'd be in the hands of the group.

I -- yeah. Is it a point of order? Yes, United States, for a point of order, and then I have U.K. and Peter Major.

>>UNITED STATES: Well, I don't know if it was a point of order but I was just responding to the comments being made.

You know, I think this has been a constructive process. In some way, we have to go through the recommendations and talk about them, and so we really don't gain anything if we change the category and move the line. We still have to go through these in an order. We have an order. I think we should just continue talking about these one by one, seeing if there is consensus. If so, moving them over. If not -- and there's been a lot of good feedback here today. That gives the drafters, that gives the group something to consider and look at the recommendations.

I think that a lot of us should have learned that some of the ways these are framed might not be in recommendation form so they need some editing just so they're more clear what the point of the recommendation is, what it's targeted to.

And so that was going to come to my recommendation.

I'm more than willing and ready to stay and work as long as needed tonight, as long as the group's here, but it might also be advantageous at some point to break and allow some informal consultations, to allow some of the groups to look at these proposals, to have a chance to think through how they might be modified, changed, consolidated, and to give some time for that informal kind of consideration. Thank you.

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

U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, I think we would agree this is a constructive process and some common themes have come out, but we do need to treat all the contributions on a par, and I think it's important that we go through the others. Perhaps we can speed up a little bit, now we've had some experience, but we do need to look at the others.

With regard to the time, we're happy to continue for a little bit longer but we know that some people have had to leave already, some people who live in Geneva have family commitments. So far, in all of our meetings, we've proceeded in a very orderly way and kept to the time that was advertised, and we think it's important that we continue to observe that discipline, we think it will be good for the group, and not extend and extend late into the night at this stage.

So we can work a little bit longer but let's also pay attention to those colleagues who have to leave and bring our meetings to an end at an orderly time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Peter, you were requesting for the floor.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chairman.

I think we have made considerable progress and I think the way forward is to continue this work. As far as I'm concerned, I live in Geneva, I have family commitments, but nonetheless, I'm ready to stay. I recommend you to extend the meeting by half an hour, probably in consultation with the secretariat, because they also have commitments, I believe, and it's the hope that we are going to have some good outcomes and I'm sure the secretariat has taken note of all the remarks we have made during the meeting concerning editorial changes or whatever changes were requested. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you all. I would certainly then, with your indulgence -- and I have consulted with the secretariat who can stay for half an hour. Actually we have already been for 10 minutes, just by discussing this.

So we continue for 20 minutes more and we try to make as much progress as we can. I think we can agree that as a first reading, in case there is any strong disagreement, we just move ahead. We don't take any other speakers on that topic because then certainly this will have to be revisited further on so that might speed up a little bit.

So in regard to 55 that we're discussing, there was a question whether this could be easily accepted, but there was an objection. So there's no consensus here. So these would fall certainly into Category 2.

We wish to invite the proponent to revisit this as it was indicated in light of the discussion of capacity-building. We'll have to address this issue as a group and see how this fits into this document. But for the moment, I would then suggest that we could move to 58, which was proposed by India.

India, do you want to take the floor on this proposal?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would rather like to listen to views because we already put this on the table. We will be repeating the same thing, most of the things which is already -- so we rather get feedback from various members and then based on that, we will probably be in a better position to discuss.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Excellent. Fully agree.

So any comments in regard to -- yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Apologize, chair, for asking a question. Are we to comment if we support? Because I would support this proposal. I think it could be modified a little bit to make it into a recommendation. But overall we support the approach.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Can we just see it on screen?

>> Exactly. You stole my words.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: 58. So it reads, "The WGEC should encourage all stakeholders to come forward, participate, and make their voices be heard in the formulation of public policies pertaining to the Internet." This is a proposal which has received support from the United States with regard to the notion here.

I have a number of -- I have Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and Parminder.

>>CUBA: I'm sorry. Maybe I have a problem with language. But, first of all, I think it's not the working group that wants to do because this is a report to the General Assembly. We have to put who should encourage the rest of all the stakeholders. I don't know who. The General Assembly who should encourage? That's the first thing.

I don't understand exactly what it means to come forward and participate and make the voices be heard in the formulation. I think that that should be simplified, put that everybody, all stakeholders, should participate in some general desire.

I'm getting back to what Parminder said, and I said before. I'm not -- I will have to live with that. But I think the quality of the document will be damaged. If we put just sort of wish list without really saying what to do without saying how because, you know, we said, of course, we need to transparency. We

need this. And maybe one of the documents it's actually how, not what. But if that's the room, I will go with that.

But here it's really very general. And maybe this is a general statement that has to be made. This is more like a call, like a recommendation. You know, and I think that applies to many of the things we're saying. We're saying good wishes. This should be like that. Okay.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If we take the approach that, in case there is any concerns or position -- we'll move to the next item -- that's the opportunity to do it now. But I have on my list -- but I want to check with those who want the floor if they wish to speak or if we can leave with the understanding that we are for the moment then accepting there's no consensus here and moving to other agenda items.

I see some people join. But, Anriette, you want to take the floor?

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I just want to say I really like this text. I think it's important to include it at some point in the document.

Juan, I take your point. Because I think this is not -- our recommendation should not just be about making structural and procedural improvements to existing processes. We also want stakeholders, governments in particular, to take initiative, to make the effort. This is a two-way process.

And I think we can recognize the barriers definitely and try and address them. But ultimately, there has to be an effort, there has to be a drive and a will and participation. Otherwise, we won't change the status quo.

So I was actually -- I really like the text. And I do hope we can retain it in some capacity, in some part of our report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, Cuba. Yes, please.

>>CUBA: I don't say to throw it away. I need -- I think that this needs to rephrase the concept. Maybe linked with the awareness part because it's a complement to the awareness. In order to have people participate, they need to be aware. And I'm aware that this is needed because I realize in many places, even in my own country, there's sometimes not awareness about all these processes and the importance of that.

And I think that that call is also important but to put it in the most proper way. And that's why it's not thrown away. It's going to number 2, no, in order to do that and also to link with the awareness part. That's the thing.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

And I would just like also to recall that this is linked to the notion of the multistakeholder approach. We want to make sure we're making to the report in an appropriate way. I agree that the notion is there, but the way it is formulated needs some further work.

Yes, I turn to Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Again, this falls among those tertiary issues which are important if (inaudible) ones are sorted out.

And I came in just to speak that even as I remember reading the Indian proposal, it is among the tertiary issues in the proposal. Now, what has happened is the tertiary issue has been ripped apart and presented as a stand-alone line, which does make a little less sense than how a composed proposal comes, whereby somebody wants a set of things to be done. In that architecture, some lines and sentences makes important meaning and sense and it should go in revision to the larger institutional system. Each, for example, India also sought.

And ripped apart from it as we are doing in this process and taking and moving around the fences when the playground remains in the middle is a problem.

And sorry to repeat. Just with the problem, good we are reading it. Were are coming to know about things and that's good.

Again, as Cuba said, who should do it? Which is the "it"? That "it" has a ghostly presence throughout most of the recommendations that somebody should do some things. We do those some things, but we never do know who should do those. And that "who" is the primary issue here.

And status quo is not going to change by making recommendations where we cannot say what the delta would be. If these are accepted by WGEC 2018 onwards, this change will happen. No change will happen with the sentence being adopted in this manner. Change will happen if we say so and so mechanism will do this process and encourage stakeholders to do that. Again, the architecture is my problem. Sorry to repeat that point a few times.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I think -- I thank you for your comments. But one thing I would like to highlight is that I'm giving each proponent the opportunity to comment and provide some context to what is here because for the purpose of organizing the document, it would be impossible to put all the language that are containing the recommendations. So I think it's just fair if you wish to provide some more context to do it, and I'm offering each one the possibility to do so. I think we can do more than that at this point in time.

So I'll turn to India for final remarks on this.

Yes.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And, of course, I thank all those who intervened in this. The basic idea is this line has been severed from the main document, you know? So on its own it doesn't stand anywhere. It will fall down.

It was submitted as a structure. It was one of the limbs of, you know, a proposal. So the basic idea I think all of us agree that we need to capture the idea somewhere. And we are flexible if somebody can help draft in more simple and direct manner. We are willing to consider it.

But this idea needs to be reflected somewhere in this document. But, as you say, this is not the primary issue. We first need to sort our primary and secondary concerns.

This is a signaling given by the group to the world outside, like, look, this group wants all stakeholders to come forward, make their voice to be heard. And I don't know how we can -- we can simplify it, I think. And I completely agree with Cuba. They actually have been constructive in this. And I don't read it they are opposing this. We are on the same page on this. So I'm willing to work on this to your actual suggestions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, I still have Richard Hill and then U.K. on this.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah -- And I think, again, chairman, we could be moving quicker because in my opinion now, I see clearly what went wrong here with at least my contribution to trying to get the -- identify what would reach consensus.

The issue here is not the statement per se. Of course, we all agree that all stakeholders should come forward and participate in things and such. It's the context as both Parminder and India and others have said. And the issue is that I was thinking what individual bits of text will get consensus. But some people -- and, you know, they're right to do so from their point of view, that's not what they're looking for. They're looking for a coherent whole that makes sense. So they're not looking for bits of text out of context; they want the text to be in context.

So if you would ask me -- if we defined our own mandate, it was really our own thing. We should have done something different. We should have looked at text that would find consensus within the context of the report of the group. And that's a completely different exercise. And I think that's the one we're doing now. So I think the discussion is positive.

But that's why we're seeing things that in themselves make sense, people don't think make sense all by themselves. They have to put into a context, and that's what we're now seeing. And I think that reinforces your decision to then focus on the structural proposals and see what progress we can make there because that would then be the context where some of these things could come back in.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for this. And just to reaffirm that my intention, once we have a first reading of those potential consensus recommendations, the intention has been defeated. Obviously there's no consensus in most or any of those. But immediately to turn to those real core issues of some.

One thing, I'm just anticipating something I will ask at the end of the meeting. But I will work with the secretariat to make sure that for the next session we have a cluster of all recommendations addressing the institutional framework interventions, mechanisms so there are different approaches, some of them binding, non-binding. We want to have a look at this -- to have enough time to look into this.

But, first, as I have proposed, I would like to exhaust the list of potential candidates for consensus even if at this point in time we know the depth, goal, might not be reached to the extent we thought.

But I think, nonetheless, it's very important the discussion we are having, as many have stated. And I fully concur to the point that it gives us a sense of what -- a sentiment of the group.

If we don't focus on the language, the formulations that have been proposed and we have some exchange on this, it will be very hard for the chair of any drafting group to come forward with some draft because we would be just picking and choosing on our own will. We need to rely on some collective thinking, reflection on this.

And I think even though the ultimate goal was not totally achieved. But it is helping us very much and to provide you later on with some proposal on how to address those issues in its proper context.

So with that -- sorry, yes. I have last speaker on this proposal 58, the U.K. Please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

We would support this proposal from India, recommendation 58. And we haven't heard anyone in the room object to it. What we've heard instead is from Cuba, from Parminder, from others a kind of agreement about there's not enough detail or a feeling that there's only one way to achieve this, which is a new institutional mechanism.

Now, we will have the discussion about institutional mechanisms. We need to have that discussion. But we also need to be clear that many of the suggestions we've discussed this afternoon, for instance, by India, by Jimson, by Hungary, by others are valuable suggestions. They have a lot of support. And we don't think that we should reject or downgrade anything except for a new institutional mechanism because we will lose some very good ideas. And we will lose some broad areas of consensus.

We would ask those colleagues who are supporting the concept of a new institutional mechanism, yes, we need to listen to those ideas and we need to discuss them. But let's not simply knock down widely supported concepts and ideas just because they don't happen to fit that particular model. There's more than one way of doing things. And we are coming to the end of our time. I have spoken for too long.

But I think maybe as we reflect overnight on where we've got to and how we go forward, we all need to try to keep an open mind to all the suggestions that are coming forward and try to find ways through, not only the proposals that have been discussed today but also the proposals that we will come on from Categories 2 and 3 tomorrow and try to keep constructive and open spirits. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We want to take the floor.

Yes, so I will give the floor to Parminder. And after this, we will close the meeting for today as we are fast approaching the extended deadline for today. Just before that, I would make some announcements for tomorrow.

Parminder, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yeah. Sorry to come in at this late hour. But I wanted to intervene and respond to the esteemed delegate because I thought what I'm going to say could clear this -- some notions which may be kind of dividing the room.

When some of us talk about an institutional mechanism, that does not necessarily mean a new building of international Internet organization, which I do believe is needed, finally, as big as WTO is.

But a new institutional mechanism is not necessarily a new body. We are talking about a set of possibilities for us, for me, anything which comes out of this group which is concrete, is a new institutional mechanism.

For example, if we are able to talk about new high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation and members who are pushing that side of the possibilities come out with a process whereby they will put it in their report and CSTD will send it to all IG institutions and IG institutions will have to report back, whatever happens, I think -- I mean, that much we as a group should agree, that this group has to come up with something different which -- I mean, people have agreed in Tunis Agenda that there are public policy gaps and government's role in exercising its role is not sufficient. So something has to be done. And whatever that something is an institutional mechanism.

And once any of those institutional mechanisms are defined, agreed, or a set of alternatives agreed, then many of these things in relation to that becomes irrelevant.

Let's not talk about institutional mechanism as just a new big body. In my mind, there are a series of possibilities including which I see countries like U.K. make. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So this brings us to the end of today's meeting. I would like to thank all of you. I think we made some progress in regard to having substantive discussions on some of the recommendations. It is fully taken on board that for some delegations those are not the main issues to be discussed. But as we -- as I propose to you on the base of consultations we have, we started with those that could possibly yield some early fruit. And unfortunately this was not the case. But I think we should exhaust that part of the work before moving to the more controversial aspects and allowing us enough time to discuss the institutional intervention that are being proposed.

As said right now by Parminder, it spans quite a wide range of possibilities. So we want to have a look at those because for many of you -- and I have been hearing this since the first meeting we had -- this is the important thing to discuss. We have discussed high-level principles. We have discussed possible areas of consensus. So I think it's just fair that we move to discussion for many of the group will be the real core issue to be addressed. And I hope we have plenty of time to do it tomorrow.

My intention tomorrow would be to resume from where we are leaving now, so that will leave us with some recommendations, including the recommendation coming from the U.K. That is, the revision of the E.U., incorporating 10 recommendations.

But I think in the light of the progress we've made this afternoon, I think we could finish these wishfully by mid-morning, so that would give us half the morning and the full afternoon to discuss the framework proposals and any other important issue you may bring to us.

So I think that might help us when we meet in -- on Friday morning to have, let's say, at least a first idea of how those things could fit together in regard to the principles, the consensus part, the non-consensus part of the report.

I think we will be in a position to discuss these on Friday morning in a more informed basis.

So on that note I wish to again thank you for this very fruitful meeting we had today, wish you a good night's sleep, and look forward to seeing you tomorrow then at 10:00 a.m.

As the U.K. has said, we want to be very disciplined about the time we have allocated to us, so I look forward to seeing you here at 10:00 a.m. sharp. Thank you.