

This transcript was produced in real time during the meeting and may contain minor errors.
The views expressed in this transcript do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations.

Unedited Transcript

First Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

30 September 2016, 09:30

Geneva, Switzerland

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Peter, can we have the agenda?

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the first meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation here in the UN.

We have a very challenging task to do, but I'm sure that we will be able to do it, but before we start, let me give the floor to Ms. Shamika Sirimanne. She is the new director of the UNCTAD, head of the CSTD secretariat. So, Shamika, the floor is yours.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, Peter.

Excellencies, distinguished delegates, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen.

As head of the secretariat of the CSTD, I wish to extend you a very warm welcome to this first meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. And I see there's so much energy in the room, and I think you all know each other. To me, I'm coming new to see you and it looks, seems to be like one big family. So that's a good thing.

Today we are here in response to a request from the General Assembly. As you know, the General Assembly at its 70th session, undertook a comprehensive review of the ten-year implementation of WSIS outcomes. The review assessed the progress made so far, and it also identified gaps and challenges, and also made recommendations for the future.

In its outcome document, which is resolution A/70/125, the General Assembly also reaffirmed the WSIS vision of a people-centered, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society, and called for a close alignment between WSIS process and the 2030 development agenda, highlighting ICTs' cross-cutting contribution to the achievement of many of SGDs that they are confronted with.

The General Assembly welcomed the rapid evolution and diffusion of ICTs, and at the same time expressed concern about continued digital divides within and between countries. And further, the GA also agreed on -- reached agreed language regarding ICT for development, bridging digital divides, the enabling environment, financial mechanisms, human rights, building confidence and security in ICTs, and Internet governance.

In this regard, the General Assembly acknowledged the various initiatives that have been implemented and that -- and it acknowledged that some progress has been made in relation to the process towards enhanced cooperation. And then it called for continued dialogue and work on the implementation of enhanced cooperation, and requested the chair of the CSTD, through the ECOSOC, the Economic and Social Council, to establish a working group to develop recommendations on how to further implementation enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda.

And the GA requested the working group who report to the Commission at its 21st session, which is in 2018. Springtime.

I'm glad to inform you that on 27 July of this year, ECOSOC adopted resolution 2016/22 on the assessment of WSIS outcomes. In this resolution, the Council noted the proposal on the structure and composition of the working group made by the chair of the CSTD. In the same resolution, the council also recommended that the working group, in deciding on its method of work, should consider ensuring transparency, inclusiveness, and diversity of views, and should aim to adopt its report and recommendations by consensus, reflecting different options and opinions, if necessary.

So given the historical background to why we are here, so, ladies and gentlemen, we have a very busy day ahead, so let me stop here and get you to begin the discussion. And I wish you a very productive discussion and assure you that UNCTAD stands ready to assist you with your work, and my colleagues are here, and also at the back, and please do not hesitate if you need any help from us, and we are here for you.

Thank you.

Peter.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I have a technical challenge here.

Thank you, Shamika, for the introduction. And without further ado, I'm going to give my remarks, which won't be very long. It's about 30 slides, so just lean back and enjoy.

The title of the presentation is Enhanced Cooperation 2.0.

Those of you who are familiar with software, and I think all of you are familiar with software development, know that in case we have small batches to some software which we have developed, we usually come up with a kind of 1.1, 1.11, 1.2, and so on. When we have something more significant, then we come to a new version. And I think this is a new version.

Of course, as I indicated, all of you are familiar with the software development. We don't start from scratch. Usually, when we develop a new version, we take into account the old one as well, and we retain good features of the old one. So basically that's why I thought that this is version 2.0, or two dot zero, of enhanced cooperation.

Next one.

So what I'm going to talk about this morning, well, I will give some history and background. Eventually I will try to summarize the results of the CSTD, the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation 1.0, and we go directly to the 2.0 with the mandate which has been already mentioned. We try to evaluate the new framework we are working in; that is, the SDGs, the WSIS+10, and what are the expected results, what are the timelines. And last but not least, or least, I would like to talk some words about my expectations as far as the first meeting is concerned.

Next one. So just a short reminder that we are here to discuss enhanced cooperation, and I'm sure that most of us know that the whole story started with ICANN and the oversight of the critical Internet resources by the U.S.

The arrangement was criticized first by -- I think by the European Union, and by China and by others as well, and in the WSIS process which was launched by the ITU in '98 and carried out -- carried on by -- by the UN, and which ended in the Geneva phase, 2003.

There was substantial amount of discussion about enhanced cooperation or about the stewardship of the U.S.

Finally, in the Tunis Agenda, in 2005, the enhanced cooperation has been inserted as a kind of diplomatic ambiguity which made everybody equally happy or equally unhappy.

But in the end, no one really understood what enhanced cooperation was or there was not a common understanding about it, but it has become a very, very important issue.

Next one.

So I know that all of you know by heart the relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda concerning enhanced cooperation, and I just put it for reference.

Go back.

What is important that we should keep in mind that in the original text of the Tunis Agenda, the role of governments have been emphasized; that is, enable governments on an equal footing to carry out the roles and responsibilities in the international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues.

And the next paragraph gave instructions to the U.N. Secretary-General to start the process itself.

Next one.

And the process has been started in 2006. At the time, Undersecretary -- under Mr. Desai who was Undersecretary-General of the U.N -- I think he has become special advisor to the Secretary-General -- started the informal consultations on these issues and there was no agreement.

In 2008, the U.N. Secretary-General invited ten organizations to report on the enhanced cooperation process. In 2010, the Undersecretary-General Sha at that time convened a multistakeholder consultation, and you may find the statements and the written contributions and the report itself under these links.

In 2012, the CSTD chair conducted a multistakeholder consultation for one day and you will find a summary report as well under the link. But all these consultations didn't really achieve what was expected. There was some progress, there was some kind of confidence which was built. But still some countries said, well, we weren't happy with the results and some said we were happy.

Next one.

So after these consultations in 2012, the General Assembly of the U.N. accepted a resolution which invited the chair of the CSTD to establish the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation related to the mandate in the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation. And the group was supposed to report in 2014. So the group was created. And I had the privilege and pleasure to chair the group. And I always keep telling that it was really a privilege and pleasure to chair the group. We had very, very good discussions. And my assessment of the whole process, that we have achieved some result.

We had four physical meetings in agenda. The first one, in fact, was a one-and-a-half-day meeting. The second one was a three-day meeting. And, interestingly enough, we had a longer meeting later on. And the last meeting was just before the CSTD annual session in 2014.

Next one.

For those of you who were not part of the discussion of the first working group, in the first meeting we had a very long discussion on the agenda. We had a very long discussion on procedural issues. In the end, we decided to have two breakout groups, one was led by Brazil, the other was led by India.

The purpose of these groups were to establish a questionnaire to identify categories and what were the questions. And I think this meeting was very successful. In the plenary, we finalized the questionnaire which was based on the results of the breakout groups and we decided also on the next steps.

So this experience gives me good hope that we will be also successful during our first meeting as we were during the first meeting of the first working group.

Next one.

The questionnaire which has been made available on the Web site of the CSTD has 18 questions. The first one about the stakeholder, the last one about comments and additional topics. But it reflected the consensus of the working group on topics which were relevant to the enhanced cooperation.

The meeting was open to all stakeholders. And we -- after several extensions, we received about 70 responses--70 stakeholders who gave responses to the questionnaire. And it resulted in a document of about 1,000 pages. 1,000 pages, as you may know, is very easy to handle. But we thought eventually it was a good idea to make a summary of this 1,000-page document.

By the way, the responses have been also made available to you on the Web page, on the CSTD, and also the summary.

Next one.

It was interesting that during the second meeting when we had the summary of the responses, it was suggested that eventually we should go back also to the responses and find out what are the issues which are relevant to enhanced cooperation coming from the responses. And at the same time, there was also a suggestion to have a kind of mapping, whether the issues which are mentioned in the

responses are being dealt with in some mechanism, especially in the U.N. system but eventually outside the U.N. system.

We created the correspondence group to carry out this task. And the working group itself outlined the terms of reference for the correspondence group.

So the correspondence group was charged to identify the public policy issues and to map them to existing mechanisms or to identify gaps.

Next one.

To my assessment, the correspondence group was quite successful. It really identified issues. I think, at the first, they identified about more than 400, 408 issues. It was downsized to about 200 issues and also identified existing mechanisms and pointed out gaps as well.

Next one.

And the third meeting based on the work which has been done earlier, we identified five groups, main groups, where we tried to give recommendations. Group number A is implementation of the Tunis Agenda; B, public policy issue and possible mechanisms; C, role of stakeholders; D, developing countries; E, barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation.

Next one.

We had lengthy discussions on these issues and draft recommendations. And we had quite a lot of proposals and quite a lot of draft recommendations. To cut a long story short, as you may know, we didn't come to a consensus on the recommendations. There was a divergence of opinions, and I have suggested to have a fourth meeting with a hope that we are going to come to some agreement.

Next one.

During the fourth meeting, it has become quite clear that we couldn't achieve a consensus in this very short time. How I think it will be useful for this group to know as has been -- we have been instructed by the U.N. General Assembly resolution to know what were the results, what were the draft recommendations. So I -- I asked the secretariat to make available the compilation of the draft recommendations as they were. It's unedited with all the marks inside. But eventually, they may be quite useful.

Next one.

So to summarize the results of the first meeting, we had the questionnaires, which I think are still relevant, but it's up to you to decide. We had the contributions from the respondents. This is the 1,000-page document. We had the analysis of the responses.

Next one.

We had also the mapping of international Internet public-policy issues, the database, and the analysis of the mapping of the database as well.

Basically that was the end of the working group 1.0.

Next one.

We should also mention at the same time, parallel to the first working group, we had a lot of processes and events which were going on in the world. I should mention the NETmundial in Sao Paulo event. We had the regular Internet Governance Forum, we had the WSIS+10 MPP preparation in the ITU, we had the WSIS+10 process in the United Nations, and last but not least, which is the heart of the matter, the transition of the stewardship of the U.S. government of the IANA functions.

So that's where we are.

Next one.

I should also mention that in addition to our world, or WSIS world, there are other global issues. First of all, I should mention also the sustainable development goals, which is a determining program of the UN. It is the most important program of the UN. It has been accepted by all the Member States.

Of course, we have the WSIS+10, which is also very important, and it has -- the outcome document has been negotiated very carefully, crafted very carefully, and I think it has been also accepted without any objection.

I should also mention the COP21 about climate change, and of course there are other processes as well.

Next one.

You have heard the mandate of this group. I think the first part of the mandate that is to establish the working group has been accepted by ECOSOC, noted by the resolution itself, so it's time for work.

Next one.

I should call your attention to the fact that we are limited by time, and unfortunately by resources as well. I will mention that we have to report to the CSTD in 2018, and knowing the rules in the UN concerning translation and all the administrative problems, we are to finish our work by end of January, beginning of February of 2018.

So keeping that in mind, I would encourage you to be very efficient.

Next one.

This is just a recap of the process which have been carried out. We started the process over this year in January, during the intersessional meeting of the CSTD. There was a call of nomination of members of the working group. We had extensive discussions and nominations within the stakeholder groups. And

during the CSTD annual panel, we drafted the -- we noted the establishment of the working group, and it was in the draft resolution which was accepted by the ECOSOC.

So that's where we are.

Next one.

You may know the structure of the working group. There are 20 governmental representative from the members of the CSTD, and we have two representatives, Switzerland and Tunisia, who were host countries of the WSIS in 2003 and 2005.

We have five -- five representatives from each of the nongovernmental stakeholders; that is, civil society, business, academia and technical community, and international organizations.

Basically we have followed the approach we have had before with the first group which was established for the working group for the improvements to the IGF, which was a successful working group, and we have followed the same approach with the previous working group as well. And I think it worked. So I should also mention that in itself, the existence of a multistakeholder working group within the UN system is kind of unique, and I think it's also a success.

Next one.

The approach we should take during our meetings. First, first of all, we should comply with the mandate. That is very clear. As I told you, we have a multistakeholder approach, and I think by now, we have built a mutual trust.

During the whole processes -- that is, when we had the working group, the first working group on the improvements to the IGF and followed by the enhanced cooperation -- we have built mutual trust. This should have results, and that is the most important part. And these results should be based on consensus. So I really encourage you to look for issues where you think you can achieve consensus.

I have issued some papers concerning observers. Here I would reiterate that, as in the past, ECOSOC rules apply. So I try to open the door as much as I can, but I have to apply the ECOSOC rules, and observers with ECOSOC affiliation -- or accreditation, sorry, and the WSIS accreditation are welcome to attend the meetings.

As I mentioned to you, we have constraints. The first constraint is given by the mandate itself, but we have also constraints on resources. In the previous meetings, we had generous donors who helped the work of this working group. I know that there's a big competition to get funds for such meetings, but I really ask you to go back to your constituency, to your ministry, and tell them that the work we are doing is important, and we can do a good work only in case we have adequate resources.

As for the venue, I intend to have the meetings in Geneva, and, of course, in the UN. And I would like to ask you to share your information with -- within your stakeholder group.

I want to have this meeting as often as possible. I want to have this meeting as transparent as possible.

Next one.

We are going to discuss these points as well. Just these are my proposals for the first -- for the meetings and the schedule.

I -- After this meeting, I propose to have the second meeting before the intersessional meeting of the CSTD; that is, back to back. I think it will be the third week of January, starting from the 16th.

I also propose for the third meeting to be back-to-back to the annual meeting of the CSTD, which will be, I think, the 8th of May.

I think it's premature to propose an exact date for the fourth meeting, but it should be sometime around September-October time frame in 2017. And as you can see from the slide, I am very optimistic because I stopped here because I have trust. I am confident that you will be able to finish this work by September-October 2017.

In the very, very unlikely case when something comes up and you won't be able to finish it, we still have the possibility to have a fifth meeting. What is certain is we have to present the report and recommendations to the 21st session of the CSTD, which will be May 2018.

So basically, this is the proposed schedule, but we are going to discuss it during the meeting.

The next one.

I would like also to call your attention to the mandate of the CSTD itself, because we don't have to forget that we are in the framework of the CSTD.

The CSTD is a focal point in the system-wide follow-up to the outcomes of the WSIS. It should advise the ECOSOC -- that is, the Council thereon -- including through the elaboration of recommendations to the Council aimed at furthering the implementation of the Summit outcomes. Summit is the WSIS. World Summit on the Information Society.

Next one.

The second mandate or the original mandate of the Commission acts as a forum for the examination of science and technology questions and their implications for development. I stress the word "development." The advancement of understanding on science and technology policies, particularly in respect to -- in respect of developing countries; and the formulation of recommendations and guidelines on science and technology matters within the United Nations system.

Next one.

So what is our role? The role of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation 2.0. We should contribute to the WSIS process, recommending ways and mechanisms of cooperation. We should contribute to the implementation of the SDGs. We know the importance and complexity of the issues, of our tasks, but I'm sure that we seek points of agreement and compromise.

And has been pointed out in the opening speech, the resolution of the UNGA allows different opinions. So if we don't come to some consensus, then we shall just cite the difference of opinions, and eventually it's up to you, if you would like to do it, to include them in the recommendations.

And of course it's useless to say that we are motivated and very ambitious and realistic.

Next one.

This working group has been tasked, and the meeting has been tasked to work on methods and modalities. I don't recommend that one.

[Laughter]

This is probably not the best way to do it. It may be quite efficient, but this is not the best way.

Next one.

That is the one we should do.

Okay. Thank you for your attention.

And without further ado, I go to the next point, and that is -- Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry, Chairman. Before you go to the next point, I want to first thank you for this -- Sorry, I wanted to thank you for this excellent presentation.

I would like to request that this becomes part of the documentation for the meeting, the same as the email that you sent, which I thought was very helpful. I see you're nodding, so that's fine.

And then I just wanted to reinforce the point that you made here. In the extremely unlikely event that we fail to achieve consensus, I think we should do what we did last time, which merely note some people said this, some people said that.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

Yes, Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Good morning, everyone.

Thank you, Peter, first of all, for your presentation. It was very fruitful and it's very helpful for us to understand what we are about. We have a history.

And we have some points, two comments. Well, one comment is that you started about the history from -- that the point was from the status of ICANN that led to WSIS process in 1998. I think that ICANN was established in 1999, so it was a bit historical note in this way.

And another thing, when you mentioned the items of Tunis Agenda which we need to discuss here, we looked into the UNGA resolution 71/25 and saw that enhanced cooperation is actually three points: 69, 70 and 71.

So from our point of view, what we need, to look carefully into three of these items and to clearly understand what does it mean, what we can realistically and clearly propose as the steps for implementation of enhanced cooperation.

Another just small comment, that when it comes to WSIS+10 preparation, it was actually not only ITU way of making it forward. It was the joint way forward. It was a lot of international organizations and the full participation of multistakeholders.

So it's a small comment, but it's a very important comment.

And once -- another one, question about COP21. From our understanding, it's child online protection, or it's....

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: I'm referring to the Paris meeting on climate change.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Okay. It's climate change.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: That was a -- This was the last meeting of series of meetings which was labeled as scope 20 and 19, and so on. But this was about climate change.

I'm sorry, I know that the different acronyms -- the same acronyms appear in different contexts. This has got nothing to do with child online protection.

And as for your previous comments, ICANN was created in 2000 -- in 1998. It is going to celebrate its 20th anniversary in -- in 2018.

Your comment about the MPP, I fully agree. I made a mistake here, and I fully agree that we should consider all the relevant points of the Tunis Agenda which were mentioned in the resolution of the UNGA.

I'm sorry about these inaccuracies I have made.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: And can I also add some points at the end?

I fully agree that we need to demonstrate respect to each other; that as we know also from the mandate and from resolution, we have the origin situation with divergency of view. It's a known situation.

So of course we need to do a lot of efforts to do our best to come to consensus; however, if it's not possible, we should understand the challenge from the very beginning and to follow that all views should be mentioned in the output of the working group.

Thank you.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Yeah, I fully agree with that.

I cannot see anyone asking for the floor. Yes, Nigel.

>>ICANN: Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Nigel Hickson, ICANN. Thank you for your introduction which I think was very lucid to move forward. Thanks for your clarification. I wasn't around in 1998 -- well, I mean, I was around but, I mean, I --

[Laughter]

I understand from reading that ICANN was created in '98, which means, yes, 2018 will become 20. If we are still meeting in this working group, I will buy everyone a drink.

[Laughter]

So that's an incentive -- not an incentive for us to carry on, so to speak.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on a more serious point, the linkage between the process of enhanced corporation and different views that were taken in the WSIS process on the management of the critical Internet resources and the IANA process, at some stage during this working group, not necessarily today, of course, would be quite happy to explain some of the detail of what the IANA process entails. Thank you very much.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel. It has been mentioned that we have remote participants, quite a few. And I would like to give the floor to the remote participant. First, Marilyn Cade. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, chair. And greetings to all who you are in the room. I really appreciate the excellent effort that our CSTD has undertaken to ensure that those of us who are participating remotely are fully integrated.

I'm going to make four comments. My first is going to be an appeal to you. If you are in the room and you are participating and you have an online device, it would be a great courtesy to the rest of us if you would join the Webex so that there is chat possible between all of us. That, of course, is up to you. But it would be a great courtesy to us.

Let me go to my substantive comments. I really want to commend you, chair, for this excellent rendition that brings us from the past into the future. I particularly like your analogy about a new version. I come from the computer and Internet history. I must confess, I was eminently involved in the processes that led to the creation of ICANN, having organized the private sector engagement in that public consultation that eventually led to what we called NewCo, the thing that became ICANN. Indeed, we did launch in September of 1998. I remember it well having been there. And we will celebrate our 20th anniversary. So I think also I want to reference that while the concerns and uniqueness of ICANN at the time perhaps led to many parties not fully appreciating whether we might go with multistakeholder engagement acting on an equal footing but also fully respecting the role of governments, I think we have come a long way. And I think you have captured our challenges in the PowerPoint presentation you provided.

I echo Richard Hill's suggestion that your document must become part of our record and that we, as members, must read the background documents. And I do know some of them are going to be overwhelmingly complex. But I urge all of us to take the opportunity to fully understand the work that has been done before.

Then I want to go to a comment about working methods. I really appreciate the challenge that you face as chair about needing to comply with ECOSOC processes and rules. I am hoping we will be as transparent and open as we can be, and I hope also that some of the participants in this working group and also in the CSTD who may be able to contribute resources financially might be able to contribute to the ability to Webcast the meetings and continue to provide the transcript of the meetings, both of which will fully -- I think those will really help us with openness.

I look forward to our work ahead, and I will probably have comments at a later time.

It would also be helpful if you could figure out, chair, perhaps with the help of secretariat and maybe it could just be posted so those of us who are remote would know who's actually able to attend and who is in the room from the working group. Thank you.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

We have another remote participant, Jimson Olufuye. Jimson, the floor is yours.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much. Can you hear me?

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

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay, thank you. Good morning, everyone.

My name is Jimson Olufuye, and I'm speaking from Abuja. (indiscernible). It is a good pleasure -- (indiscernible). I would like to thank Chair Major who chaired the last session for his presentation and introductory remarks. Also thank the head of CSTD and the secretariat for your remarks.

I want to begin by saying that I have hope we are going to have good output at the end of this meeting.

The last meeting was very inclusive and constructive. (indiscernible) -- have some agreed recommendations. I am hopeful we will have input with regard to developing countries (indiscernible).

The structure is very important. But at the same time, (indiscernible). Also with developing countries (indiscernible).

We have made a lot of progress. In fact, there is the Africa ICT Alliance (indiscernible) process. And I think with every one of us, we cooperate and lift the concerns of others into the framework, we can, indeed, make good progress going forward.

So I would like to thank you for this opportunity of remote participation. And I look forward to being inclusive down the line. (indiscernible) funding support for planning going forward. Thank you very much. Thank you all for listening. Thank you.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson.

I can't see anyone -- oh, yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Good morning. Good morning to everybody. Thanks, Peter, for giving us a very good introduction and bringing the history of the work of the earlier version of WGEC and other historical elements into our work.

The first point I would like to make is that we should continue the work which was done by the earlier version of this working group which was a lot of work, and we should strive to take that work forward and try to reach our recommendations. The second point is that there has been talk of making the document which the chair presented as a part of these proceedings. And I liked the presentation very much, and I think that should be part of the proceedings.

But I also refer to the earlier note which was shared by the chair on the eList which again is a very good document which gives us the details of our mandate and the mandate of the larger CSTD itself.

However, I would like your attention to be brought to the second-to-last sentence of that email which says that, "I'm confident that the WGEC in its deliberations will respect the mandate given by the U.N. and ECOSOC and prepare recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda with the view to help the implementation of the SDGs."

So I wonder whether this is completely appropriate in the way the description of our work is because it seems to say as it is worded now that the recommendations would be such as they help the implementation of SDGs, which I think is limiting the agenda because I think the agenda of this group is the larger set of Internet-related public policy issues which are structural issues, which are society-wide issues. And development is one subset of those issues.

And the SDG implementation, I would like very much for our report to have a section on Internet-related policies which help further SDGs but to limit the mandate as it seems to me to be worded at present to producing recommendations that helps -- I mean, that helps implementation of SDGs but perhaps would be limiting. So I wanted a clarification on that. Thanks so much.

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

The note I sent out was a guidance, a guidance in the sense that to remind us that there is a large program, the biggest program of the U.N, which is the 2030 agenda. And all working groups, all study groups, all activities in the U.N. should have some reference -- and that's what I really meant. I didn't want to limit. I don't intend to prescribe the outcome. But I would like to remind us that there's a bigger program which should be taken into account, and that was the only purpose.

I have another remote participant, Janvier Ngnoulaye.

>> JANVIER NGNOULAYE: Can you hear me?

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>> JANVIER NGNOULAYE: Thank you, chair. I wanted to say hi to everyone from (saying name). (indiscernible).

I just wanted to say thank you.

>> Thank you so much. Good morning.

(Background noise).

>> -- or maybe after the nomination or the election of the chair. Just a clarification on procedure. Thank you so much again. And I hope we will have a -- (background noise).

>>ACTING CHAIR MAJOR: We have applied for the earlier working groups. There's no change in that. And this has been endorsed by the ECOSOC. This has been endorsed by the CSTD. This has been endorsed by the working groups themselves. So that is my general comment.

If there are issues concerning this working group, probably it will be up to the chair of the working group to conduct the discussion on that.

And if there's no one else asking for the floor, I really would like to go to the next agenda point. And I would like to announce that I would like to nominate Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca from Brazil to chair the working group in the first meeting and the subsequent meetings. And I would like to ask for your approval.

Mr. Fonseca.

[Applause]

Richard.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I think that's an excellent nomination. I have no problem with it at all. I am a little puzzled by the process.

If this group was expected to approve, then perhaps there should have been some prior consultation. I see from one message that at least one member of the group was aware of this nomination, whereas I was not. So I would ask that if the chair, you or in the future Benedicto, were the secretariat, consult members of the group, then all the members of the group should be consulted and not some of the members of the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning to everyone. I wanted to start by thanking Peter Major for the opening remarks, for his introduction, for the history he has provided us on this process. I am very honored to be in that position. And as he has indicated in his slides, I'm surely motivated about the outcomes we can achieve. Although his second-to-last slide has made me a bit reluctant because I certainly don't want to be that guy in the middle like the others. But I hope this will not be the approach to be taken here.

I would like to thank all of you and I look forward to working with all of you towards fulfilling the mandate we're given by WSIS+10 and the mandate, the mandate from the Tunis Agenda itself.

Thank you. With those words, I'd like to suggest we could proceed in the agenda. I think we have somewhat limited time, and we have a daunting task ahead of us.

I'd like to submit to your approval the agenda that has been proposed by the acting chair. Basically, after, we will initiate discussing the goals and target dates to meet the request of the UNGA resolution, methods of work, review of work and documents related to enhanced cooperation, proposals for topics and format of next meetings, proposed date for the next meeting, and then any other business.

Could that agenda be accepted?

Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: No problems, Chairman. Just a clarification on agenda item 8. Prior to the meeting, I'd had an offline discussion with Peter, and he clarified that the agenda of this first meeting will be limited to a discussion of methods of work, including modalities and not look into substantive issues, and that's why there are no contributions on the substantive issues.

So agenda item 8 I think should not go into substantive issues but cover only procedural issues.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So if I understand correctly, you suggest to move to discuss agenda item 8 together with methods of work. That would be discussed under methods of work? Is that what you propose?

>>RICHARD HILL: No; I'm fine with the agenda item. It's just that when we get there, I think the point has already come up, we shouldn't suddenly say we're going to work on this and not on this. At this stage, that would not be appropriate, but we can discuss on how we would decide and things like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay.

Are there any other comments?

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes, yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We have remote participation. Marilyn Cade. Please go ahead.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Thank you. And welcome and congratulations, Chair. And thank you so much for accepting this role.

I'm going to follow on Richard's comment but perhaps make a slightly -- I just don't -- I think it's important to discuss the options to how we identify topics and thus the overall schedule of our next meetings. We have a draft approach. I think it would be good to not just focus on the date for the (indiscernible) next meeting but to look at the overall schedule.

But if we can, under 8, if Richard would agree that we could identify neutral approaches, I think that would be very helpful because I made a proposal online, and I'll address this under 6, that we try to take up a significant pledge that is inclusive of online consultation.

So perhaps if Richard would agree that under 8, we could have preliminary discussions, I think that would be very helpful for us in planning our work.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Thank you.

I see Richard and others nodding so I think we'll proceed in that way.

So the agenda is approved.

We'll move to item 5, goals and target dates to meet the request of the UNGA. We have heard already some ideas on this on the part of the acting CSTD chair. I'd like to request secretariat to make some initial remarks in that regard and then I will also make some remarks.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, Chair.

I think much of this was covered by Peter's presentation.

Let me take you through again. It's -- We are talking about resolution 70/125, and it's the paragraph 65 of the GA resolution that requests the working group to submit a report to the CSTD at its 21st session. And this is in 2018. Normally we have the CSTD in May. And the intention is to include that report in the annual report of the commission to the ECOSOC.

In fact, in addition, this report will also serve as an input to the regular reporting of the Secretary-General on implementation of the outcome of the WSIS.

And, thirdly, the report of the Secretary-General is usually submitted at the end of January for processing. As Peter said, we have to do a lot of translation, a lot of administration (indiscernible), so this would mean that the report of the working group needs to be ready before the end of January 2018.

You know, going from that, the last meeting of the working group needs to be held by January 2018 at the very latest.

And as Peter mentioned in his introductory remarks, it would be desirable to schedule the meeting of the working group back-to-back with the intersessional panels and the annual meetings of the Commission as you, you know, go forward with these meetings.

Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think in regard to this agenda topic, the goals that are set for us are very clear in paragraph 65 of the WSIS.10 outcome document. I'd say it is -- I don't see a need to discuss those; however, I'd seek some comments if there are.

My comment is, though, we are tasked to prepare recommendations. I see this as the -- this is the final stage of our work. I am fully aware that as per the work that was done before in what Peter has rightly termed WGEC 1.0, there are a set of recommendations, but those recommendations have never been owned by the group. They have not achieved the status of a document on which we can build on. So I think that as we look to the goals that are ahead of us, to prepare recommendations, I think the initial task for us would be to -- to decide on the starting point we want to have for our discussions. And I think there are a number of options that take into account the work that has been done before. As Peter has recalled, we had started with a questionnaire. The question has no, I understand, controversies regarding the questionnaire. That was developed by the previous version of this group.

On that basis, we have the responses, the 1,000 page responses, and the analysis document. In a subsequent phase, we have the work that has emanated from the Correspondence Group, and then the work, the final report on the mapping and its addendum.

So there are a number of resources we can tap into in order to decide where we want to start from. And then we have the draft recommendation document, the one that was not fully developed, that you have many brackets and areas of disagreement.

So as -- I'm just inviting you, and maybe we are starting with item number 5, but we are already dealing with issues that will come up later.

I think the main task for this inaugural meeting would be to decide on the starting point we want to have. My impression is that we need to take into account the work that was done before. That is clear, as per our mandate. I think we must recognize, acknowledge the work that has been done, even though there are some shortcomings or deficiencies that may be perceived on the part of some.

On the other hand, we need also to have some update. I recall by reading the report of the mapping exercise, and even the terms of reference we have for our work calls for a continuous update. We are continuously encouraged to innovate, take into account innovation, to take into account development that have taken place in between each stage of our discussion.

As we look into the report, that even those sections of the report that were not consensus, there are many information that should be updated.

So I think the main task before us will be to take into account all that huge amount of work that has prepared the way for us, paved the way for us. I don't think we should repeat each and every phase that the first version of this working group went through, but, on the other hand, we need to make sure that the starting document, the starting point for us will be one that today reflects the reality and the issues and the topics that should be discussed.

In that light, I think it's very -- for me, it was very helpful to have that very historical overview, and I take the point that was raised by Peter that the whole process started with the perception of ICANN versus the other (indiscernible). But personally, I think that so many things have taken place from there that I think that this maybe was the starting point for this exercise. I do not want to diminish the importance

of the ICANN transition, but I don't think that would be the central -- or that could be one of the central elements but not, certainly, the only one that should hold our attention.

In my view, and as we go through all the amount of work that was done, there are so many areas of work, so many public-policy issues that are involved that will not have anything to do with ICANN. ICANN would be one subset of our work.

So I would maybe encourage colleagues not to focus too much on one single process since we trying to have a very comprehensive overview of what are the Internet related public-policy issues associated to our work.

So with these initial words and on the basis of the presentation that was made by Peter and complemented by the secretariat, I'd like to open the floor for comments and views.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I fully agree with your approach. The world moves. The hot issues of last year are not the hot issues of this year, but more importantly, we need to focus on the future here and make some recommendations for the future.

So I think you're perfectly correct. We need to look at everything that was done and then come in and say, okay, but now, today, we should be discussing this because this is what will be interesting in the future and look less at the past and more at the future.

So ICANN may or may not come up. I agree with you, this is not a central issue. We should not focus on that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Russia. Yuliya.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. I actually fully agree with what you said. Of course, we need to use all the work done for the previous part of the working of the working group. And unfortunately, we don't have enough time to make another research or questionnaire, but fortunately, we have a lot of material for our homework. And it is important now to -- to look through on this, to make our homework and then come to some output of this material.

When it comes to the -- the topics of the discussion, we agree with you and Richard that ICANN should not be the focal point. It should be more about the mandate of the working group and we need to look focusedly on the item 69, 70, 71 of the Tunis Agenda and concentrate on these items to understand what recommendations we should go with.

Another thing, that what we need to start with is that to make vision on the deliverables of the working group that will be presented at the CSTD 21st meeting. And we would like to share our vision, how we see it, and we think that we need to start from the reports because the delivery should be the report, and we need to understand what tasks should be included into this report. And that will help us to come with our homework to the next meeting, because if we know what the items report will have, we can learn the material from the past of the working group, from the mapping exercise, and questionnaire,

and come with that -- with our recommendations for this particular items, then we will have the material what we can discuss during next meeting.

We think that will be easier to proceed, and to come with some easy-to-understand and easy-to-implement recommendations.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is Peru, and then the U.S.

>>PERU: Thank you very much, Chairman, and congratulations on your assumption as chairman of this working group.

I would like to refer to a previous topic that has been already raised, which is the calendar for our meeting -- for the meetings for this working group.

In that regard, I would like to support what was proposed by Mr. Major in the sense of having the second and third meeting of this working group back to back with already calendarized meetings of the CSTD. This is important and this is a very practical use of our time. For countries and delegations that have to travel long distance, having a one-day meeting in isolation sometimes represents a real challenge to participate.

We would also like to encourage, as we are doing in this first meeting, the remote participation, because even if it is the case that we are having these back-to-back meetings, might be the case of certain delegates that they are not able to participate. So having remote participation is really important.

And then on a more (indiscernible) issue, we also support what has been referred by others that we need to start -- it's a very good starting point, the previous work that has been done in the first version of this working group. We really want to commend the efforts and all the work that has been done by Mr. Major as chairmanship of that work, but we should not limit our scope to that, what -- to the recommendations that we are not in a position to (indiscernible) recommendations at that time. So if we are going to stick to that positions, we don't have to have (indiscernible) recommendations have been achieved, so we need to be flexible in our views on this.

Thank you.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, and good morning, everyone.

>> (Off microphone).

>>UNITED STATES: Good morning, everyone.

I think our intervention was largely kind of highlighted by our Peruvian colleague on some clarity going forward on the schedule and then also flexibility about how we kind of -- how we engage in those discussions.

I appreciate the slide on scheduling. I think that's very helpful. But one thing that we would encourage is that moving from tentative dates to confirmed dates as soon as possible. Remote participation and other means are very useful, but the standard is in-person participation because that's where we're really going to have the best participation and the best kind of exchange of ideas, and that really necessitates planning that allows certainly all stakeholders to attend these meetings and be able to arrange their travel.

Second, the previous work that's been done on this is extremely valuable and should certainly be a part, but I believe we need the flexibility and not to be constrained by what's been done previously. There's been a lot of work done since then. Just to name some of the things that have already been mentioned, NETmundial, WSIS+10, improvements in the IGF process and others, we need to be able to take those into consideration, but also, there's a lot of experts in this room and hopefully there will be a lot of new ideas brought to the table that haven't been considered yet. So including those as well.

And I want to agree with what our Russian colleague said about homework. These meetings are full of conversations, but really a lot of what needs to be done will be in between those meetings, preparing -- tapping into the root resources that many of the organizations and stakeholders in this room have at their disposal. So having clarity on the topics for the meetings, the questions that will be discussed, and then having an opportunity for written inputs before those meetings so we have an idea of what will be brought to the table, what will be discussed I think can enrich our conversation and make it much more productive when we can actually get together.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I fully agree with everything that was said before. I think at some point, I suggest not right now, we will try to get out of these meetings the confirmation of at least the next two meetings ahead. I think it's a group initiative on our part in order to secure as large participation as we can and all the preparations would be in place.

I have Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. It's a great honor for Japan to be here as a member of working group. And I would like to make some comments for the presentation made by Mr. Peter Major for the schedule.

He suggested that this meeting, this one-day meeting, is going to be last for this year and we're going to have three meetings in next year: January, May, and September. And we support that.

As Peter and colleagues mentioned, Japan is also very far located from Geneva. We appreciate the January or May meeting is going to be held back-to-back with the CSTD meeting.

As far as our goal, I fully agree with the proposal from the chair that our goal should be to make some recommendation for the CSTD session in 2018. And to do that, we have to be very effective, efficient.

And as for the chair's proposal concerning (inaudible) carefully has been done in the last working group, I also agree with that but also support the man from the U.S. saying we also need to be more flexible. We have to consider what has been also achieved in the different Internet-related fora like ICANN, IANA transition, and so on.

So maybe -- I would like to make one suggestion. If we need to achieve some consensus, if we need to make some recommendations, that should be not so -- cover wide on details. Instead of that, why don't we make some simple, high-level recommendation that we can all agree on. This is my proposal.

And as for the proposal from the chair saying we need to work on -- depending on our homework basis, we agree with that.

And so maybe next meeting is January. In next meeting, maybe we should discuss what kind of written questions that we should work on. And the next meeting in May maybe we should work -- depending on that written questions, we make some proposal concerning what kinds of recommendations, what kind of principles be for the enhanced cooperation, and we can have some substantial discussion in May meeting. This is my proposal. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Japan. I think those are all very helpful ideas in the organization of our work.

I'd also like to comment we received some comments from remote participants. There was an expression of support for addressing SDGs in our work. That came from Marilyn Cade, I understand, and support of Nick Ashton-Hart and also Janvier Ngnoulaye.

In that regard, I would like to just make a comment. I think working in the context of the U.N., I think all of us, government or no government, are interested in supporting as much as we can SDGs. I think it is one of those, like the MDGs (phonetic), you need some time, and it would be an effort that we governize international effort. So it is appropriate for us to take fully into account the SDGs. Actually, at the SDA forum back in May, I think, in June in New York in preparation for the high-level political forum, there was a clear recognition of the failure that ICTs and particularly the Internet bring to the achievement of SDGs. So certainly this is something that should not be out of our minds when we do our work.

I'd be a little concerned, however, if we would try to frame our work in terms of SDGs. I have some difficulty in seeing how we could do this without losing some very important optics of the work regarding enhanced cooperation. So my personal opinion would be that, yes, SDGs should be one of our central concerns but maybe we should not try to align our work with SDGs. Otherwise, I think we would move apart completely from the approach that was taken by the first edition of this working group and I fear would be leaving out some important areas of work that are expected from us to come up with some suggested ideas.

But on this topic and others, I turn to other comments. I recognize Pakistan, and after that Richard Hill.

Pakistan, please, you have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you.

>> And sorry --

>>PAKISTAN: Congratulations on assuming the chairmanship of the working group. I hope you would be able to lead us to a concrete outcome of the working group.

I have few comments on different items as they are being discussed. I'm not sure whether we are strictly following one agenda item right now. I think we have discussed at least two or three different agenda items in various interventions before me.

First of all, on the meetings, I think you already said, and I fully support you, that we should at least have exact dates for at least the next two meetings. And if I already make some suggestion for our next meeting, I would propose that the January meeting is fine but it should be towards the very later part of the month due to various reasons.

I think most of the U.N. is -- of course, there is a lot of activity going on but most of the U.N. is not around, also many of the delegations during the first part of January. So I would say maybe from 25 to 30, 25th to 30th of January, maybe we can see some slot. Of course, it's a proposal and it requires concurrence of other members.

As far as participation is concerned, actually we were looking for something of funding for participation, especially from developing countries, which is not forthcoming unfortunately. But I think it's not too late even right now. We should look for something. I'm not sure how we do -- it. Maybe we can interest you, the chair, to look for various proposals. Of course, secretariat is there to help you -- because it's very important for the participation of developing countries. Of course, we note that there is a possibility of remote participation. But it's not -- it's not, of course, ideal. And at best, it's -- it is limiting to a certain extent.

We agree to a large extent what has already been said, of course. We need to base our work on the things that have already been done in the previous working group. But, of course, we need to see innovative ways how we can move forward because, clearly, at least a few things didn't work the last time.

And on the SDG thing, actually, of course, it's quite important for all of us. But we are not talking about even 2030. It's -- the process if it comes up with some recommendations, it's beyond 2030. It will have ramifications for foreseeable future unless we come up with something that can replace it. So SDG implementation is fine. But we are specially talking about structural issues and fundamental issues.

So just to give an orientation to our discussion, SDG implementation is the one thing that we are all aspiring to, but we need to look even beyond that. I thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

And I agree with you that we have been discussing on more than one topic. I would like to exhaust the list on this, and then I would like to say -- to entertain discussion on a more focused way on the method

of work. But I will allow those who have asked for the floor, those would be Richard Hill, then Iran, then U.K. Then we move to more focused ways -- and also the remote participant, and then we move to the discussion on methods of work.

So, Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we have been anticipating a bit but I think there is no harm done because that means we're actually ahead of ourselves.

I just wanted to comment on two points made by Japan and their extremely help intervention. The first one is, yes, I fully agree that if we can agree on some principles, that's good. I think that should not be too difficult. I'm sure we can all agree that the Internet should be for everyone, for example.

We all know, as they say in English, the devil is in the details. The difficulties are in agreeing how to bring the Internet to everyone. And I don't think that we can restrict ourselves to just overall principles. I think we do have to get our hands dirty and go into some of those details. And to the extent that we don't agree, as we said before, we are simply capturing different points of view.

The other point that perhaps I misunderstood, Japan. I would not expect that at this meeting we would choose what topics or questions we would work for. I expect that the members would input suggestions into the next meeting and then we would have that discussion at the next meeting.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Good morning, everybody. And before making my remarks, I would like to thank Peter Major for his interventions. And also congratulations, Mr. Chairman, on your chairmanship.

I have a couple of points to make with regard to provisional agenda item 5 and 6. With regard to the proposed dates, I found myself in agreement with the proposed dates. They are fine. But at the same time, I think in each session, we have to reach consensus with regard to the next meeting. But with regard to exact date of the other meetings, I think it's not necessary to have agreement from now because we have to see each time at the end of each meeting that which exact date would be appropriate.

The second point I would like to make with regard to method of work, I propose that the secretariat would provide us with certain draft recommendations which had been agreed upon previously or they feel there is consensus on that in order to speed up our work. This is on that purpose if they provide us with certain agreed recommendations. And at each meeting, I think it would facilitate our work and discussions in the future.

And I think from the beginning of second meeting, if you try to reach consensus on a certain recommendations gradually until the end of the fourth meeting, we have concrete proposals at that time. I'm making this proposal in order not to have a heavy work at the end, long discussions, and even over

the night in order to reach consensus. So if we gradually reach agreement on certain recommendations from the beginning, that would facilitate our work at the end.

This is certainly a proposal I am raising. And at the end, we obey this unwritten rule that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed at the final work that we have.

I would like also second the proposal that we have to bear in mind the contribution we can make to the realization of SDGs. That is very important. That is in the agenda of the U.N. during the 15 -- next 15 years, and we have to be careful about that.

And my last comment is with regard to facilitation of the participation of (indiscernible) developing countries. It is very important to encourage them and facilitate their participation in order to have diverse views in this discussion and reach our final outcome. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Javad.

U.K. and then I'll make some comments with regard to what has been said. Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. And good morning, everybody. And, first of all, congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for taking on this very important role.

We're very pleased to be taking part in the work of this group because we think we have a real opportunity now to develop recommendations which can help deliver real progress. And we think there's a real positive spirit since the WSIS review. And we appreciate the commitment and goodwill that exists from colleagues all around the room.

We'd also like to thank Peter Major for the detailed presentation and very useful presentation that he gave. Clearly, there has been a great deal of detailed work done so far. And as you said, Mr. Chairman, we need to take that fully into consideration. But I think we would agree with points made by Pakistan and I think some others that that working group had some severe difficulties. And we need to be honest about those. The group didn't reach consensus agreement. The group failed essentially. And we need to be honest about that. And there is a risk that if we go back and try to do exactly the same thing, we will have the same outcome.

So we think that we need to proceed very carefully and we need to take a step-by-step approach which starts by trying to find common ground, trying to find the things we agree on, the consensus that we can find and build from there because with any project, with any successful project, before you start building the detail, you need to agree on some shared objectives. So we think the first stage of our work should be to step back and consider what we mean by enhanced cooperation. What's that shared understanding of this concept? Because so much has changed since this phrase was first invented in 2005. The Internet has been transformed since 2005. The engagement by international bodies in Internet issues has been transformed.

We now have the sustainable development agenda, and we fully support the remarks that Peter Major made about how important that agenda is. And we are coming to the conclusion of the IANA transition process.

So we're looking at a completely different picture now in 2016 to the picture in 2005. And that picture will look very different again in the future.

So we think that as a first stage of our work, we should start by trying to find consensus around the characteristics of enhanced cooperation. And if we can identify consensus there, it will help build confidence in the work of the group and it will guide us when we come on to the more difficult issues. And we might look at other work that's been done in this area. NETmundial principles HAS been mentioned, for example, and there are many other sources of work that we COULD look at.

This first day shouldn't take too long, but we do think it's an essential first -- (background noise).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would like to thank you and all other colleagues for their comments. We had some technical difficulties, but I think we are back.

It's important when we have this kind of difficulty that we make sure we solve it in regard to -- in respect for those remote participants.

But just I see other colleagues taking the floor.

(Background noise)

-- and make a proposal regarding to our method of work.

But, first, India, Cuba, and Russian Federation. You have the floor.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the of the delegation of India, I would like to congratulate you for assuming this important leadership role of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

I want to make a quick point. The work of this group should be a continuum of the intensive work done by the previous working group.

We are flexible about inclusion of newer ideas which have come up during the period between the previous WGEC and the current one, including the 2030 development agenda, SDGs, and other important ideas which have come up. However, the foundation, the bedrock on which we need to build up our work should be where we left so that we do not lose the valuable material which we were able to create together when -- even when there was no consensus on certain concepts. We need not to lose sight of issues that were done previously. The draft recommendations are still relevant and could be used as a springboard to agree on the working methodology in this working group.

Mr. Chairman, consensus building is a dynamic process, and we hope that this time around we will be able to bridge our position gaps and arrive at common landing zones on various issues in front of us.

The delegation of India would like to show you and other members of this group that we will constructively contribute to concrete results of this group.

On a lighter note, the participant list mentions that I will be having a remote presence. I would like to confirm that I am very much present in this room.

With these words, I thank you.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your words and for your presence in the room.

I turn to Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you very much, Ambassador, and we also join all the colleagues to be very honored to have you as our chair.

We are sure that you will be doing a great job.

Also, let me tell you that for Cuba, it would be very important to be joining this group. Our expert is in capital, so we join other (indiscernible) countries on trying to find resolution for sponsorship of those expert that are not able to come due to the lack of funding. If it is possible for the secretariat to raise some resources.

The second element that we would like to state here, like our colleagues, is that this group should not fail like the previous -- like the previous one. So we will make all of our effort to have a concrete outcome of this working group and to find specific recommendations to implement the agreements by head of state and government in the Summit.

We feel that the group should be based in the mandate established by the Summit, as I mentioned, and we should find mechanism or institution -- concrete mechanisms and institutions -- within the United Nations to implement that mandate.

We believe, the third element, that some processes outside the United Nations that have been taking place regarding Internet governance should not be part -- should not be part of our review and examine all consideration. We should concentrate our efforts to build our own perspective within the United Nations' mechanism and within the task and goals that we will set for the future work on the basis of new topics that we could discuss.

We believe it is important to have an intergovernmental perspective counting also with the view of the different stakeholders as is the nature of this working group.

We feel it is important to also have a component on development, a perspective, it is crucial for developing countries to count. When we discuss Internet governance to count in a development approach, that will find or identify benefit for developing countries to be part of the implementation of the future recommendations of this working group.

Another element that is important for Cuba is to incorporate the discussions on cybersecurity, because we feel that the issue of cybersecurity is interlinked with the issue of Internet governance and enhanced cooperation.

Another element is the human rights-based approach linked to Internet governance. We feel that this link should be balanced in all of our discussions and to be in line with the balance we found in the resolution 70/125 of General Assembly.

I repeat, for us it will be crucial to have a continuity of discussions coming from the previous working group. We feel that the basis of the document and the work done by the previous working group, we feel that previous work should be the basis of our discussions. So all of the discussions, documents that were considered by the previous working group should be the basis for our discussions. And of course it's clear that we will develop any new elements, principles, or paradigms, but let me be clear, we are not ready to redefine mandates that already were established by the Summit.

So in this, we could identify actions, principles, recommendations, but all of them should be in line with the mandate of the Summit. We are not ready to redefine the mandates of the Summit.

So we will be very active working together with all of the colleagues from governments and stakeholders, and we -- we could say that you can count on our support to move forward the discussions on the matter.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I would give the floor to the Russian Federation, and then we'll hear some remote participants.

So, Russia, Yuliya, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Coming to our discussion regarding how can we make the recommendation, because we are not against innovation. We are about innovation. However, if we come to the mandate of the working group, we believe that we should take information from the resolution 70/125 and this resolution says not principles or any other's format but recommendation on how to further implementation enhanced cooperation.

So for us it's clear what this group should do and how the deliverables of the working group should look like.

Another point that the discussion of what is enhanced cooperation. We absolutely agree with U.K. that we need to have such discussion, and this discussion should be meaningful, and we need to come to -- as much as possible, to come to one understanding, what does it mean, "enhanced cooperation"? However, however, we think that, once again, from the resolution 70/125, it is clear what particular points we have to discuss. We should not discuss some principles Internet governance or another kind of principles or whatever output of what platforms of -- it was made.

Of course from ten years, it was a lot of changes in the Internet governance and Internet itself. However, the resolution 70/125 is quite new. It's from December last year, so it's less than one year. And this resolution actually said that enhanced cooperation is still three points, three items of Tunis Agenda. So we, once again, would like the group to focus on these three items and to read it carefully and try to answer all questions from -- which we have from these three particular items. Because if we understand in one way what these items is about, then it will -- for us, it will be easier to understand what recommendations, how to implement this enhanced cooperation should look like.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Yuliya, Russian Federation.

I'd like to turn it two remote participants, and I'd like to apologize because I have jumped over those remote participants before. So I will give the floor first to Marilyn Cade, then to Jimson Olufuye.

Marilyn, you have the floor.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair, but I'm going to defer my comments because I think there are two other requests, one from Jimson and also another from a speaker from a developing country who hasn't spoken. So might I suggest we reverse the order?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay.

Jimson.

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

I would like to first congratulate Chair Fonseca (indiscernible) chair the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation 2.0.

And also to recall your comment that (indiscernible) because work has been done the previous working group. In particular (indiscernible) proposal made by the representative from developing countries (indiscernible) capacity building on the public-policy matter pertaining to the Internet, and (indiscernible) issues like that.

So from my point of view, with due respect to the comments of previous speakers, like (indiscernible) and Russia, I would (indiscernible).

(Distorted audio)

Some speakers have mentioned that in there as well. So we have a number of recommendation, a lot of insights were provided on enhanced cooperation.

So we need some good progress, and I think that we can continue. But concerning definition of enhanced cooperation, I can recall in the (indiscernible) or thereabouts (indiscernible) a lot of ideas, a lot of definitions, of point of views about enhanced cooperation.

So it's really complex. It's quite complex. (Indiscernible) the comment of the last speaker, (indiscernible) are there in terms of (indiscernible). This is true, and there's need for (indiscernible).

(Distorted audio)

And lastly, concerning the (indiscernible) end of January, and I think it will make a lot of sense if we have it in two days -- two, three days -- to justify extensive travel and as (indiscernible) goes a long way.

(Indiscernible) for the illumination of ideas. So that would be very useful.

And in between, (indiscernible) upon consideration, we can have homework. The first consideration could be made that we should look at (indiscernible). Certainly no consensus and the outcome will (indiscernible) that. And then we need to have open minds, indeed, concerning our inputs. We can gather our input, delegates' inputs, about (indiscernible) and about consideration going forward on this.

So I think we have really done a lot of work before, and we can make progress on this or we can build in our views again concerning this (indiscernible) content thoroughly at the next meeting.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson.

I give the floor now to Kenya followed by remote participant Mr. Ayman El-Sherbiny from ESCWA. And then we'll have ICANN, European Union and UNESCO.

So Kenya, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. I take the floor (indiscernible). Thank you, and say I'm happy to see after long time in the chair. And I believe you'll steer the work of this group during this meeting and thereafter to a successful outcomes.

I also want to hail Mr. Major for the introductory remarks and the history of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation has come this far.

Our expert handling this subject is not here with us today, but I just take the liberty to make a few comments that are not covered.

Mr. Chairman, we get it that a lot of work had been done before, and some good work had been done. Yes, there are some comments, to point at the previous sessions, might not have been very successful but I believe there are some good lessons and some good elements that we need to pick out from the previous work to give us some foundation or preaching points to where we need to go.

So my request would be to use the work done before to be a basis for which ever that we are going to do for the future to us concluding the work of the working group.

And then second, Mr. Chair, I think it's important to reflect on the original mandate of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation vis-a-vis the changes that have taken place over time.

The concept of enhanced cooperation came in some years back, and we know the shift in the way the international community, even national governments or regional groupings are trying to focus their implementation is changing. Right now we are talking so much about the 2030 agenda and the sustainable development goals. Of course I got your view of how do we focus our work based on the sustainable development goals. But the issue is how can we harmonize the new focus to sustainable development goals so that they be complementary to the work of enhanced cooperation in this -- in this field.

So I think much as it's work in progressing we need to really make sure that the previous focus in development and the changes that have taken place are taken on board so that we don't leave out some important elements that have emerged over time.

And, three, Mr. Chairman, I would like to support participants who have hailed the fact that we need to ensure that this group is all inclusive and participation from all regions or from all sectors is supported and ensured so that, at the end, we benefit from all -- all participants in a fair and equal way.

And looking in this room, I got somehow concerned because there is an element of why is it better. I think there are some regions not equally represented, and maybe recent. And we can start there, to find out why I don't see much of Africa in the participation, unless I'm not looking very well. So the issue of ensuring all-inclusive participation is very important, and, where necessary, some experts who can be supported to really make their input into this working group is very important.

And then from -- Mr. Chairman, I think from the outset, we need to define the scope of the work of the working group. From what I had today, a mention of very many elements that need to be put into consideration which are very important, but I think we need to, from the outset, highlight those -- all those elements and see which ones we need to move on with and which ones we move on in a different manner so that we make sure that the interests of all the participants are taken on board or those who cannot taken on board, they understand why they're not being taken on board as such.

I thank you, and I hope we shall have a fruitful discussion by the end of the day.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your words, Fredrick. We used to call out by first names when we were in New York. Very pleased to see you as well.

In regards to the comment you made in regard to representation -- and I think we should recognize the work that was done by the CSTD acting chair to try to ensure some balance. I think unfortunately those representatives from Africa, also not all the main stakeholders could not be present at this meeting.

But I see in the participant list of the working group that we have other participants coming from civil society, coming from technical community, and coming from the business sector. I think this shows the difficulty we have been discussing about how to make sure we have the resources we have to make the people present in the meeting, not only by remote participation.

I thank you for your comment because I think we feel it is a fact there are members of the group but maybe not only for that reason but they couldn't make it here. But I think this is something we should look into.

I give the floor now to Mr. Ayman El-Sherbiny.

>> UNESCWA: Good morning, everybody. Do you hear me?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, yes, we can hear you.

>> UNESCWA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thanks to the acting chair for including UNESCWA as one of the (indiscernible) of the United Nations. Of course, I'm here representing myself as we agreed that this is on (indiscernible) capacity. But I'm also representing this group of intergovernmental organizations as well as (indiscernible), which is ESCWA, and allow the community experts on the Internet governance field and the developing part of the world. So there are a few comments I would like to make to share, or thoughts to share.

First of all, the idea of putting the SDGs in front of us while we are pursuing our mandate as the working group is to be taken very positively and to be taken also as enlightening or guiding our thinking processes that eventually this would be a strategic goal in mind. And the couldn't be a better goal than a sustainable development of the whole globe, humanity, and member countries, citizens of the world. This is not just a program but it's an overarching mandate by member states, by heads of states, and by communities of the world regarding the need for sustainable development for this generation and generations to come which is naturally the same goal of Internet governance when some of the people before me said that this is going to live even after 2030. This is true. So we are at the same wavelengths. There's no harm to put it in front of us as a guiding objective or guiding principle. This is the first comment.

And this, of course, is to replace --

(Silence).

Sorry. Regarding enhanced cooperation as was in the Resolution 125 (indiscernible). And this working group needs to think of ways to implement this process.

Hello? Hello? Can you hear me?

Okay. So the main point here is in order to be effective, you have to define the (indiscernible) question that we are trying to resolve. This is a process mandated by the Tunis Agenda. This process is (indiscernible). Our working group is (indiscernible) of the mandate. So my idea is we don't have to (indiscernible) ourselves with topics that are trying to be (indiscernible). We need to focus on the process (indiscernible)). And from that, we can drive the working masses. So this would be the main focus of our work from which we can derive the working method and time lines of everything. Those are my comments regarding the continuation.

(indiscernible) that we continue (indiscernible). Thank you very much.

(Background noise)

And how to complete what we have started. So (indiscernible) on what agreements, what are the disagreements. And based on that, other than that we would like to (indiscernible) reinventing the wheel. (indiscernible)

Thanks again to the chair and to all members. And best regards.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Irman. I turn to Nigel Hickson from ICANN and then Marilyn Cade.

Nigel, you have the floor.

>>ICANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning again. And congratulations on your appointment.

Just a couple of points taking up the various comments that have been made on how we move forward on this important dossier. And I think our distinguished delegate from Kenya summed up many of the important parts.

Clearly in any process -- and many of us being involved in processes that have been running a lot longer than enhanced cooperation -- I mean, 2003 and 2005 is not long ago really in many other processes.

As we move forward, of course, we must learn from the past. And, indeed, if the past offers useful experience, then we must gain from that experience. And quite clearly the first working group or the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation that met several times -- and I had the privilege of coming along as an observer to some of those meetings -- made substantial progress in terms of the mapping exercise and some of the other discussion points.

But, clearly, as others have pointed out, nothing stands still. Nothing stands still in the technology. Nothing stands still in the business processes that are being undertaken. Even although sometimes people would not agree with this, nothing stands still at the U.N as we saw last year with COP and, of course, the sustainable development agenda agreed, and, of course, what we agreed at the U.N. General Assembly in regards to the WSIS review.

So I think there are a number of factors that are enable us if you would like to move on from the recommendations of the first group. And although, of course, we should take regard to the recommendations, I do think it would not be appropriate to start our work with the recommendations. We need to start our work thinking about what we need to come out of this particular working group. Certainly I think thinking about high-level principles, thinking about some sort of high-level document is, indeed, a positive way forward drawing perhaps on some of the experience we had at NETmundial, some of the experience that we discussed in the OECD ministerial earlier this year. And, of course, having agreed high-level principles, if we can then go further and detail what those principles mean in terms of actual actions or whatever, then great. But I think we have to go step by step.

But really encouraged by the positive energy in this room and participation. And it's great to see so many people participating here and both remotely. Thank you very much, indeed.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel. Next on my list is European Union and then UNESCO. Then I revert to Marilyn Cade and Pakistan Nick Ashton-Hart.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Good morning. Thank you, Chair. And good morning to all. Allow me, first, to congratulate you for assuming this task for us all. I would like to concur with other delegations that have pointed out before that it is essential to maintain some flexibility with regard to job done before. Many things have happened. Particularly in 2015, it was a big year for governance. You don't need me to repeat. And some others are coming on. So that is something that has to be taken into account and reflected into the work of our new reinvigorated group.

And another comment from our side is that -- made by you actually, Mr. Chair, before, that while the SDGs should not become our main focus, we still need to keep in mind -- it is important to keep in mind and incorporating our work how enhanced cooperation should support the SDGs. Thank you. That was it for now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Next on my list is UNESCO.

>>UNESCO: Thank you, Ambassador Fonseca. Congratulations on your appointment as a chair. I'm going to make a very brief comment from the international organization perspective. First point is to acknowledge the fact that cooperation has been existing. We are not inventing anything new.

The WSIS review 2013 was organized by UNESCO. ITU organized 2014 WSIS review. We have been working with UNCTAD, (indiscernible) ITU, UNESCO. We also have a group called the United Nations Group on Information Society. So this is to highlight the fact that cooperation has been existing.

Now, under the framework of the SDGs which was -- which was mentioned by Mr. Major at the start of the session, I think enhanced cooperation in many ways and from our perspective should be focusing on how existing cooperation can be enhanced, number one. Number two, how member states, U.N. agencies, civil society groups, everybody can work together in a very concrete and focused manner.

I would disagree with my dear friend Nigel that 2003 and 2005 is not that far away. I think it's a long time away. And let's not start discussing (indiscernible).

So I would plead you, Mr. Chair, that there a lot of stakeholders around this room that we find out what -- to what extent cooperation has existed, what has succeeded, and how we can enhance that cooperation rather than going back to the drawing board and starting to discuss cooperation again. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I revert now to Marilyn Cade. You have the floor, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, chair. I am really impressed, and I want to open my comments by, first of all, apologizing that I did not recognize the new leader at CSTD and to welcome you and to also congratulate the staff provided by CSTD in ensuring such fantastic and well-supported remote participation for all of us who are participating remotely.

Some of you in the room know that I never want to be remote. I always want to be in the room. But I am benefiting from the great work that you, the CSTD team, has provided. So let me open my comments by saying that and putting that on the record.

Now let me go to substance. I want to review first the comments. I planned to make other comments of my own. But after listening to UNESCO, I'm willing to enforce UNESCO's comments. I think that, in fact, we need to (indiscernible), recognize the work we've already done, recognize the aspects including the importance of the 2030 review and the SDGs, and that we have made progress but measure the progress, measure the progress.

I have listened very closely to governments that perhaps have said not enough progress. I agree, perhaps not enough progress. That is why I advance the idea that we do a gap analysis in our last work. Let's build on the work we've done but not assuming that work is the end all, be all. Let's be very broadly and openly about how we enhance cooperation.

I would just say two other things. I was appointed by the IGF MAG chair to be the substantive coordinator for enhancing the engagement of the national and regional IGFs. And we are doing significant work to bring forward the engagement of governments. That's not documented in our work that we've done. But I think we should be thinking how are we open to hearing what's gone on in the last two years, how do we listen to the community? That means online contributions.

Then I'm going to make a comment that I think is progressive of Kenya's comments and Jimson's comments. We cannot hold these meetings and not understand that we must provide and recruit funding support from different companies and perhaps different countries to ensure that physical attendance is supported for the participants from capital from the developing countries. I think that has to be a priority for us and a call to action so that we have present not just those who are able to self-fund but also the participation from the experts from capital, whether they are from governments or they are from civil society or business or the technical community so at most of our meetings we have face-to-face engagement. Thank you, chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn, for your comments. I will turn to Pakistan. You have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you so much. I'll take it very positively the different -- although there have been many views around the table, around the room on this very important issue, actually I wanted to touch it before U.K. I didn't do that maybe because I thought it will open up a whole area of discussion.

But actually this is something that we need to do, essentials and basics of enhanced cooperation. Although I would urge that if we do it, we have to do it in a very structured, very -- in a very meaningful manner. Otherwise, we will lose sight of what we are doing in the longer term and inside the working group.

Of course, we have so many views and we have discussed it previously I think not only in the working group but elsewhere whether enhanced cooperation is a process, whether it's a product -- or it's a project, one-time thing or it's an ongoing thing. I mean, all the discussions around these issues is

something that's there. And, of course, as a result of this working group, if we come up with any recommendation would there be any standing mechanism.

Now, the problem is that we do have many forums. IGF is there. WSIS is there, NETmundial, so many things. But the problem is that for many countries, for many members, and for many probably civil society organizations, international organizations, this is more of talk and less of substance.

So our basic challenge would be to come up with recommendations which would be implemented and which come up with something that is tangible and concrete.

So to sum on this issue, actually I completely agree with those who are saying that we have to have an understanding on these issues. Of course we do have, as Russia said, that we do have basic elements in there in the resolution as well, and we do have -- we do understand. But if we -- if we need to -- need to expand it, we need to, so to say, give it a contemporary element, then we have to do it in a very structured manner. Otherwise, it will be very, very dangerous, I would caution, because if it goes on and on and on and if we do not come up with anything concrete, then I think it's not going to serve anyone's purpose.

On matters of work issue, I wonder -- of course we are discussing different elements. I wonder if we do have something in writing or it's, like, we are discussing, and some sort of understanding, back of our minds or something? Because I think it's important, because sometimes when there is issue, of course we are working in a very conducive and cordial manner. But we need to have an understanding where we are. And I think it's also important that participation from -- from -- from civil society, stakeholders overall, actually, should be limited to -- to those who have already registered. For example, I see other stakeholder observers. We need to be really clear on who they are and what's -- what's the idea behind their participation, because right now, we were having, like, very bulleted manner of the number of participants, list of participants from each categories and we know, but we need to be clear on these participants as well. Observers, so to say.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. You have raised a few issues, and others have done it as well, in regard to matters of work. As I said, I was trying to exhaust the list of speakers and then move in a more focused way to this discussion. So I will touch on this in a while. I just would like to listen to other views.

I have next on my list, Nick Ashton-Hart, then Ms. Timea Suto from ICC BASIS, Richard Hill, and then Mr. Makoto Yokozawa. Sorry for the pronunciation.

So first of all, Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thanks very much. Good morning to everyone.

Firstly, it's certainly off to a good start that we have you in the chair, Benedicto. If you cannot herd us in the direction of a successful outcome, probably nobody else here can. Not to put any pressure on you or anything.

There are so many things to agree with from the past, so I'll try and be quick and mostly agree with other people.

The points about the funding for participation of developing countries is obviously important, and it's very regrettable that we don't have that in place now, actually, but hopefully everyone can chip in a little effort to make this -- to make some effort in this way so that for the January meeting, this will be more possible, because it would be a shame if that was the reason why people couldn't come, instead of some, you know, schedule conflict or the like.

I would agree with the comments of the UN and UNESCO in particular. With respect to the SDGs, it seems to me the point of public policy and international cooperation is the public good, and the SDGs are the roadmap to achieve measurable outcomes in that direction. And this is the way in which the entire international community is structuring its work. It seems to me it would be pretty strange were we to come up with a result that was contrary -- given the breadth of the SDGs, it would be odd if we came up with something that was contrary to the spirit or the content thereof. And we should at least -- This is a difficult area to measure and many of the SDGs are difficult to measure, too. But we should try to find ways not only to measure what has happened but to give people some idea of how to measure whatever we come out with, and whether or not it actually produced the results that we all had in mind.

It seems to me that there's general agreement that we should leverage the work of the past. How central to leverage it seems to be somewhat in question, but it seems to me that there's enough room within there that everybody can be -- be made happy in bringing up subjects from the past that they felt were important to continue working on and -- and/or agreements.

At the same time, I think we have to accept that if the first working group had been truly satisfactory in its results, we wouldn't have a second one. And so we have to accept that there is -- there is more -- there have been events, as others have said, that have happened. Quite significant ones in terms of the development of the Internet, its dispersion, its impact on socioeconomic life, and so many other areas, and, indeed, in some of the cooperation that has taken off with respect to some of the issues that are of the greatest concern.

So we won't -- we don't want to have a third working group because the second did not manage to achieve what the first didn't, or this begins to be -- to be exhausting. There's many words one could describe it with, but that would certainly be one of them.

So I would hope all of this is useful, but it does seem like we have a good spirit and a good start has been made.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I'll give the floor to Ms. Suto from ICC BASIS.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. I am here as one of the five business representatives representing the International Chamber of Commerce and its Business Action to Support the Information Society -- or, shortly, BASIS -- initiative.

We would like to recognize and thank Ambassador Fonseca for taking the chair in this group and stand committed to support the goals articulated earlier today in establishing transparent and respectful working methods to help us move forward collectively in finding a common ground and recommendations with a consensus support.

There is a lot of material that can inform our common understanding of what has been done and covered on this topic in the past, and I support the comments of others that this is our study material or homework, if you will, to have all of us be informed at the same level.

However, this is a new group with diverse and new talent brought into discussion to help us reflect where we are in today's context. So knowing where we work, where the work has come from, (indiscernible) help us learn where stalemates came from in the past, and then we can innovate and move forward in different ways, and not just simply find ourselves stuck in (indiscernible) divergent views.

So we support the comments made earlier that we cannot start this new group from the report of the last working group. We support the comments of the government of Kenya and others regarding the important framing that the sustainable development goals can provide offering a valuable common direction to set our compasses by.

Finally, I would like to correct the notion that we are here representing ourselves as individuals. I don't feel this is accurate. No government representative in this room is speaking as an individual, and for most stakeholders, there is a constituency of members to whom we are accountable.

ICC is the International Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest and most representative business organization with over six and a half million members from different sectors and regions, representing 130 countries. Thus, when we gather to provide input to discussions on behalf of the private sector, I am not speaking to you from the perspective of a sole company or a regional business organization. I am acting as a spokesperson for the collective business voice made up of members.

It is important that our methods of work take into account the requirements to build consensus across sectors and geographies within our stakeholder groups, so we count on our collective effort to allow preparatory work ahead of the meetings. And as we move forward, we believe it is important to remain sensitive of the limited time, human and financial resources of all stakeholders and (indiscernible) forward to avoid reverting back in time.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

We have a remote -- Ah, I'm sorry. I give the floor to Mr. Makoto Yokozawa.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you very much, chair, and congratulations for your new leadership of this very important fora. And my position is I am joining here in the business person, business representative of Asia and Asian region. So, yes, firstly, I would like to touch a little bit about the technical terms. I'm sorry about that, but my point is from the 2014, where we have discussed in this room in the WGEC 1.0, the a big change has been continuing in the Internet or in the information technology itself. I can actually name some technical term that the IUT or artificial interagents or the -- some other things who are just affecting (indiscernible) our life and the business and work and the other SDG has touching upon.

And so I would like to suggest that the -- yes, we have to revisit the work we have made in the WGEC 1.0, but also we have to take care that which process is very adequate to think about this new style so that Internet is changing.

So I think we have two things to do, is what is WGEC 1.0 has done and also what we can add upon our result two years ago.

So -- And also, I have to add that each representative, nongovernment representatives, just here as individuals, but I mean some sort of the crowd of the individuals, which means that I am representing Japanese business -- not only the Japanese but the Asian business, and maybe I can represent and I have to prepare a little bit more about how the Asian business is thinking about the Internet.

And for the other participants, nongovernment participants, will represent where they are coming from.

So I would like to take to this new formation of WGEC 2.0, and I'm well efficient to have a high-level message at the end of -- at the end of this discussion.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just before turning to the next speaker, which will be Richard Hill followed by Cuba and Turkey, let me just make some housekeeping announcements. We propose that we would break for lunch at around 12:30. So my idea would be to take those three speakers, and then make some initial comments on which you might reflect upon during lunch, and then we can resume in the afternoon. I think the main task for the afternoon will be to set the stage for our next meeting in terms of what are the -- what we want to have on the table as a basis of our work for the next meeting. And I think that might entail a lot of discussion.

So I -- Yes, so I take Richard Hill, Cuba, Turkey, and also the U.S., and I close the list for the moment.

So, Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chair. I have to say I agree with essentially everything that has been said in this long discussion, including the statements from the U.S. and from ICC BASIS. And I hope this sets the trend and I will always be agreeing with the U.S. and the ICC BASIS through the rest of our work.

So I'm just going to comment on a couple of statements that were made which I do not agree with, and the first one is from the U.K. While I agree we should probably work on a common understanding and a

definition of enhanced cooperation, I don't think that that can be a preliminary discussion. I think that that should take place in parallel with other discussion. So I would not agree that we don't do anything except define enhanced cooperation for the first stage. We should simply accept that that is one discussion we must have but in parallel with other discussions.

And then there was a remote speaker, I think Mr. El-Sherbiny, who suggested that enhanced cooperation has not been implemented so we should focus on that, but as others pointed out, actually, depending on how you define, enhanced cooperation has taken place. And I think that's correct, there has been enhanced cooperation taking place, and our task is, rather, to identify areas where we want to do more enhanced cooperation or different types of enhanced cooperation, or whatever.

The comment from Pakistan on observers, I think that all of us in civil society have the same view. If not, my colleagues will correct me. I think we should allow observers, and I would prefer that we didn't have to have a (indiscernible) WSIS accredited, but if those are the rules, those are the rules. And I think that worked very well in the previous meetings of this group. We should continue that practice.

Regarding Japan's comment that the civil society people are speaking as individuals, I don't think that's quite correct. I think they are representing their constituencies, either their organization or a coalition in which they're involved or something like that. So I don't think the civil society people are necessarily speaking as individuals. I think everyone here was chosen to represent a constituency and has the responsibility to speak for that constituency.

And I'll end with a joke. Nick, regarding as whether or not there's a third working group and people want that, I think that depends on whether you're paid to do this or not. And I'm not paid to do it, so I hope there isn't.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I would like to speak in two issues that are related to procedure. My understanding is that we already exhausted item 1 of the agenda, item 2, and then item 3, and then did we already approve the agenda?

We already approved.

Then we were discussing item 5 on the goals and all of those general comments. It's a clarification.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Actually, we have been discussing -- we were focusing on 5, but, actually, some issues from the other items have already come up. So one of the things I would like to do at some point would be to formally discuss methods of work because there are some details that should be further agreed upon us, about you there is no difficulty, no problem about tackling other topics because those issues are interrelated.

So for the moment, yes, formally we are on the item 5 but we are already anticipating discussion on related issues pertaining to the other items.

>>CUBA: Thank you for the clarification. We have a comment regarding the list of participants that was circulated in the room. It's our understanding that the participants in the working group are Member States and were already selected by the regional groups. Also, there was a structure of a representative from business community, civil society, and so on.

For us, it would be important to -- first of all, to approve formally the list of the members that are not states, that are not (indiscernible), in comparison to the previous practice; that is, there is a list of participants that are two categories, in our understanding. One is the NGOs with consultative status by the ECOSOC, and, second, the stakeholders that participate in the Summit, and they have been working with the CSTD regularly.

So we would like to receive from the secretariat the clarification that the list we have in our hands today are the same entities that have been in the past, been civil society or stakeholders or business community that have been regularly working with the CSTD in the two categories.

If there is anybody in this list that has not been in the past, then we need to formally be informed, and of course we could decide if we incorporate or not any -- any entity or person that do not follow the traditional practice of the CSTD.

So we request that the secretariat provide with that information. We take a decision on the matter.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just come back to something that was explained by Peter. The membership of the working group already has been approved by ECOSOC. So we should not be open to this. It's not under discussion here, the membership of the working group.

I assume those nongovernmental members are also accredited, but this is beyond the point. Those members have been approved by ECOSOC at a higher level. So in regard to other observers that are not members of the working group, and this was also part of what Peter explained, working in the context of ECOSOC, the rules that apply to ECOSOC will be followed.

So I take your request to the secretariat to make sure that all those observers from nongovernmental will be accredited entities to ECOSOC, and I think this is the case.

Thank you.

>>CUBA: I'm sorry to insist. We know that there is a list of NGOs with consultative in ECOSOC, and all the stakeholders of different nature that always been participating in the CSTD work. So we assume that that list is the same, that could be part of the work of this working group.

So what we are requesting is to have the list, that you have it, because we have seen it in the past, to compare with the current list that you have circulated today.

We would like to be informed formally if the current list that we have in our hands incorporates the exact same members or stakeholders that have been participating in the CSTD.

If there is any new, if there is any new participant that has not been part of the CSTD work in the past, in the previous list there were, if there is a new representative that has been incorporated in this -- in this working group, not only this list because maybe in the next session we have other interests represented. We need to be informed. Member States. We need to be informed. And also, we need to take a decision if we approve this participation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. And I seen some flags raising when you were speaking, Richard Hill. I will nonetheless grant indulgence to come back to this in the afternoon. We will take the last speaker for this session, which will be Turkey and then the U.S.

Turkey.

>> TURKEY: Thank you, chair. First of all, congratulations for your new assignment.

Today -- I believe today is a historical day because -- not only because this is our -- today our first meeting today but also because unilateral oversight of the U.S. over ICANN and IANA functions stops today. So this is a big step in enhanced cooperation. And I'm not going to say let's go home. But I believe that we can use this platform to improve things. We still have issues that can be enhanced. For example, at this point, I'd like to support my colleague from Cuba, for example, cybersecurity could be one of the issues we can work on.

And, also, I'd like to support all my colleagues explicitly or implicitly saying we cannot let a third Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation be formed. Thanks. That's all.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, chair. Apologies for taking the mic a second time this morning when a lot of people would like to speak.

I just wanted to note that this working group seems to be starting on a positive note, and that's a good thing.

I encourage we start on a humble note. There's been a lot of comments about the challenges with the first working group which was clearly a reality. But I think for us, the first working group which we were a part of didn't have the benefit of a lot of the, I think, really important processes that have happened over the last couple years. There's been mentions of NETmundial and WSIS+10. I'm glad Marilyn Cade mentioned the regional and national IGF initiatives which have been a great improvement in some of the coordination in different regions.

And so as we begin this, that's the reason that we encourage the approach of taking a very broad view of inputs into this process. I think a lot of this conversation is for subsequent meetings. But I think as we move into those subsequent meetings, it's very important that we welcome all those inputs, previous

work, including recognition of processes since then, including new ideas. And I think taking that broad approach will benefit us.

But the reason I wanted to take the mic before lunch is just one issue. I think it would be important for our future meetings but also for today's meeting. And historically and maybe over time, there's been a precedent that's been set or a habit of taking these meetings until extremely late hours. And maybe coming from a country that doesn't respect work/life balance, there's some legitimacy in making this offer. But I would propose that we have some discipline in the time -- or setting some time frame, time limits. I know we want people to come to these meetings in person. But we also want people to stick around to the end of the conversations. And that becomes very challenging with flights, with personal reasons. And I do -- not just for personal reasons, I think that at some point, we reach diminishing returns in our conversation, if not going into a counterproductive conversation.

So I would encourage to try to do the work within the time frame allotted. If we need to go over, we'll be here. But we would encourage having some discipline there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I'd like to make a few comments just before we break for lunch. First of all, I'd like to state that my personal view and the view of my delegation, the first working group was not failure because it as has been indicated by others, it's -- you know, we started from scratch which is something we would benefit from. But it also produced a huge amount of information. And my personal opinion and those who have been in other meetings with me know that I am totally convinced that to make any good decision, any decision that will be consistent, we need to have good information. So I think the first working group should be praised for having established a process which will lead us to make some recommendations to propose some initiatives.

And having worked at the U.N., I say it's very unlikely that in the U.N. setting you would get very concrete outcomes in one-year effort, or one year and a half. That's usually seen as processes.

In that light, I am very confident that we will work very efficiently and we'll come to a result. But I am also realistic that maybe this will be a stage in the building of a body of understanding of what needs to be done in regards to enhanced cooperation.

So I hope there not to be a third 3.0 group. But this is not something that would be completely off the table considering other processes and especially the complexity of the issues that are dealt with by us.

Second point I'd like to make -- and then I'm moving to method of work, but I would like to leave those ideas with you. My intention of those meetings would be to consider the members of the working group on an equal level, equal footing. So those members that were approved by ECOSOC, all members, government and non-governmental, I intend in the meetings to offer the floor in the order they will request the floor.

I think the beauty of working in a multistakeholder format that was approved for this particular group is that it will allow for very transparent and fluid discussions. I will not make a difference between different stakeholders in the mechanics of the group.

In regards to observers, there are some issues that I'd like to further review with the secretariat. But as was stated by Peter, the ECOSOC rules apply to non-governmental entities. All member states are invited to come as observers and will have a limitation of time in the discussion of topics. I have no difficulty to offer the floor to observers, be them from governments or non-governmental. I think at some point we will have to abide by the time and that might limit the floor for those observers. And I think this is not, let's say, something that I would do happily but probably if we want to be efficient in our work, we'll have to be at a certain point.

I would think that on the basis of the previous experience, it would be maybe not productive to break into a smaller group. My -- also, this is my personal view I would like to share with you. I think part of the difficulties we faced in the previous edition of the group was that some discussions took place without the full membership present. And I think that led to some misunderstandings and shortcomings that couldn't be curtailed later on because of lack of time. So I would favor a process in which even if we go slower, baby step, for example, but we have some outcomes that could be in the end owned by all of us that would not be subject to further challenge by anyone. And then also I think in terms of the process because I think it would be a good contribution from this group if we have some -- not be the overambitious outcome that was proposed but if we some outcome on the basis of which we can build later on, in principle, I'm ambitious about this. But let's be realistic.

I think one -- maybe the major issue should be discussed in the afternoon is, as I said before, to set the stage for our second meeting in January. I would like to anticipate in regard to the day because there are a few of you mentioned the dates. And we'll hear from the secretariat as well on this. There is a limitation in regard to the time the secretariat would need to finalize the documents for CSTD after we close. So I think there would be some deadlines that should pass by 16th January most that would allow them very limited amount of time to complete their work.

Personally, I would favor that the meeting should start later than that. Coming from Latin America country in which the big summer vacations are the ones that we focus -- as you in the north focus July and August, we focus December and January. So for most of us, it would be an effort to come here by mid January. I think this is something we will hear later from the secretariat later that might be unavoidable to start by 16th of January. But this is also something we would like to discuss.

For this meeting be it on the 16th or else, my impression is that we must have clarity at the end of the meeting what will be the working documents, working papers that we want to have before us. As I stated before, there are a number of documents coming from the first edition of this working group that we could rely upon. Some of them are totally, let's say, uncontroversial that were fully developed by the group. Some were later on developed by smaller groups. And we had the recommendations that are -- that came as a conference room paper that does not have a status, that is not owned by the group.

My personal suggestion to you -- and I leave this for you to think over lunch -- is I think one single document is, was, in a way tried to summarize and document the situation which is the mapping of international Internet public policy issues. This document is dated 17 April, 2015, that delineates on the basis of clusters of issues, some issues, some topics that could be further investigated. Those clusters, as you may recall, are infrastructure and standardization, security which would address cybersecurity,

human rights, legal cluster, economic development, social, cultural clusters. All those are the clusters that were encompassed in this document. And it is a very, I think, comprehensive paper. I fully -- I'm fully aware that this document is not a consensus document. So I'm not proposing to be owned by the group; but maybe you could have it as a working document, one upon which in between now and the January meeting could be further improved on the basis of submissions by you and by other participants.

I think maybe part of our task if we take this document as one starting point would be to reflect on how to inject in this document the notions and the agreements that are encompassed by SDG because it's not something that was addressed by this document.

I would in principle see the SDGs as some cross-cutting theme that would underline the whole document. But maybe there would be some reason to have some separate section on how to also take into account SDGs as something that came as a novelty after this document. This would be my proposal.

I think it would also be very useful if we could have some documents of principles that would guide us through. So I'm not thinking of further trying to elaborate on the enhanced cooperation concept but maybe just to document some agreed principles that could apply to this as they could apply to other discussions, one that would give us some basis on which we can build.

I would say maybe there's some early harvest in that regard. I think there are some documents that maybe we can tap into and extract from principles and have them as some consensus basis on which our work could proceed.

I don't think this is preliminary requirement for the group, but it might assist us just to have some reference. As for NETmundial, we have the principles and then we have a roadmap with the proposals, some interventions. But then we have those principles as something that could guide us through with roles. So I would favor this. But I don't think we should lose too much time on this, not distract our work to do it. But if we can have this high-level principle document, someone that could be agreed on the basis, I think that might be helpful.

Another early harvest that maybe we could envision for this second meeting -- and I take the point made by Marilyn and others that maybe we should already start thinking about the report. And I heed the call to circulate also the recommendations that emanated from the last working group.

There are two sections in the document. There is a actually section of recommendations that were agreed upon. There are recommendations that were not agreed upon. There are statements. So maybe this section on recommendations that were, indeed, agreed upon, maybe that could be some early harvest for us.

If those things that were agreed to us two years ago are still valid and they could be endorsed, there could be some early harvest we would move to our report. So I would leave you with those ideas.

I think it's very important for us when we start in January to have before us some reference papers on which we can start. And then we can discuss -- we can decide those are the priority issues. For example, all of those eight clusters, we want to focus on one or two or three, but we have very broad information.

Those are my suggestions to make the mapping document, to update, to adjust it as we want to try to develop these principle documents but on the basis of our further work if this could be useful for us as a guiding document. And maybe look into the recommendations that were agreed upon and to see if they are still valid and they could be moved, let's say, to a more stable part of our report.

So with this, I wish you a good lunch. I think we could be back, if you can agree, by 2:00 p.m. And I think today we have a shorter -- maybe we should depart before 6:00. If we can start at 2:00 p.m., I think we can have a fruitful discussion also. Thank you very much. Look forward to see you at 2:00.

Sorry, just before you leave, I have been requested to resume at 2:30 because some participants need time for religious purposes. So we will be back here at 2:30. Thank you.

[Lunch break]

AFTERNOON SESSION

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, good afternoon, everyone. I suggest we could resume our work.

I intend to propose to you to have a more structured discussion in this afternoon's session.

I would like to suggest a slight change for the item in the agenda to start with I think maybe the easiest part, that is the proposed date for next meeting. We can have some views on that. I'd like to hear from the secretariat, and then we can, if needed, have some discussion, but I think this is something that would give us a very concrete scenario for -- in terms of the time you have in between now and the next session.

Secondly, I'd like to discuss the methods of work with you. As you recall, I proposed we should have only plenary meetings, not breakout groups, at least for the moment in between this meeting and the second meeting.

I'd like to confirm the mechanics following our meeting. Also in regard to observers, point of order. And I'd like to also very briefly reflect on a proposal I had made back in Budapest for having a co-chair or vice chair. And after that, I would suggest that we could take 7 and 8 together, review of work and documents related to enhanced cooperation and proposals for topics and format of next meeting, because I think it is important to -- maybe to see, in conjunction, those two items to appraise the documents we had before us and, at the same time, trying to anticipate what will be appropriate for us to work upon in the second meeting.

Before, then, turning to the secretariat to speak on the proposed date for the next meeting, I'd like to turn -- there were two people who had asked for the floor. I -- Either if you want to, Richard and Jovan, speak now or in the course of the discussion, I just take your -- Okay. Thank you.

So I turn to the secretariat for item 9, proposed date for the next meeting.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, Chair. I think this is -- Let me begin by saying the end date is the CSTD's 21st session, which is going to happen in May of 2018. So that's the end for our work here.

So as we said earlier, the report has to be -- the work has to finish because we have to do a lot of report writing and clearing and all that by January 2018. So this work has to finish for us to go to and report to the CSTD in May.

So I just, then, would like to put to you what Peter presented earlier. So we had the first meeting today, and the second meeting in January 2017 before the intersessional. And the proposed date for 8th -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry. The third. Third week -- third week of January. And back to back with the intersessional. And then we will have May. The third meeting could be the CSTD, on the site of the CSTD, in May 2017. 8th. 8th May.

And then of course as Peter proposed, we could have a fourth meeting in September-October 2017, and hoping that would be the -- you know, that would end the work successfully. And that will give us enough time to prepare the report to the CSTD at the 21st session.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. But one thing I'd like to focus now would be the meeting in January, because I understand from the (indiscernible) secretariat there are some requirements in regard to the possible dates that the meeting could take place.

Bear in mind, they need, on the part of the secretariat, to prepare the documentation for the CSTD.

So that's why I understand we have this, let's say, maximum possibility to hold it by the third week of January, which for some of us will be a very demanding time, but I don't know if you would like to elaborate on this because I think it's very important to have the timing from the perspective of the secretariat in order to confirm that decision.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: What we propose is to have the meeting as the proposal was. I think you proposed earlier and also Peter mentioned the 16th, 17th January, so with the intersessional. Because it gives us basically one week to finish all our documentation to see if (indiscernible). This will be a lot of work for essentially a small unit that we have, and it will be a lot of work for us to -- it's not just this report but all the reports from intersessional will have to be prepared for the CSTD.

So I think for us, it would be good to have this meeting 16-17 January.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see some flags.

Maybe -- There's just one thing that occurs to me right now. Do we need to report to the next CSTD? Does our meeting --

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: No.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- have to be tied to the intersessional? Maybe I'm just thinking aloud, but then I'll turn to other colleagues as well.

Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: You've read my mind or I've read yours. That was going to be my question. And also, when is the intersessional? What are the dates for the intersessional, actually?

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Intersessional is from 18 to 20 January. So we thought we would have this meeting 16 to 17, you know, before the intersessional. And that gives us time to prepare all the document to CSTD.

18 to 20, so Wednesday, Thursday, Friday.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I think the question is whether we can disassociate this meeting from intersessional. I -- I ask myself there is also some reason attached to the funding for participants. Maybe this is a reason why we want to have them together.

Could maybe this could shed some light? But I would like to listen to Pakistan and to U.K.

Pakistan, you have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the secretariat for the information.

As I had remarked in my earlier intervention that January is a little bit strange month. So my request was to put it towards the very end. Since I understand it's not possible due to various reasons for the secretariat, as mentioned by them, so my request is if we can it -- we can make it to either week after the week of 16 or a week before that.

So my request would be to make it on 9 or 10 January. If I understood correctly from the secretariat that we shouldn't take it after the week of 16-17.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and thank you also to the secretariat. We know how difficult it can be finding convenient dates for meetings.

We agree with Pakistan, actually, and we had thought that both our meeting and the intersessional meeting would be in the week beginning the 9th of January. I'm not sure why we thought. Perhaps because I think last year -- last year it was at that time. So we had kind of assumed it would be at the same time.

And there's a particular difficulty for us with the 16th because that's when CPT is meeting, the European group for the ITU is meeting in that week, and there are at least six Member States in this group who are also going to be at the CPT meeting, which is in Copenhagen in the week beginning the 16th.

So, again, if there is any flexibility to moving to the 9th of January, it would be much more convenient for us and for the other Member States of CPT.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: I don't have any problems with the dates, but I think having it back to back is an advantage for those delegations that travel.

So if 16-17 is not good, what about doing it right afterwards, 23-24? That means people who coming to CSTD, if they wish to participate, they can stay -- be bored in Geneva for one weekend and then participate on 23-24.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Peru.

>>PERU: Thank you, Chairman. We also understood that the support that come in from Mr. Major and now from the secretariat was is the idea of having back-to-back with the CSTD intersessional either before or after our meeting. So we would refer to that. If there a problem in having the meeting just before probably, we can do after that, in the week in between. We are flexible. We don't want to complicate. We very much support the idea of having back-to-back meetings.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I don't want to try to summarize here, but I think there is a need or a convenience to associate, to have both meetings back-to-back in regard to funding, in regard to (indiscernible) participation, travel for participants. And I sense from the secretariat that the week of the 16th would be the latest date in which after that they could prepare their documentation for the CSTD. So the dates 18 to 20th at this point would be the latest date for the intersessional.

However -- and I feel there might be some flexibility -- instead of having the second meeting of this working group on 16th and 17th to move it to 23 and 24, I think if that could be done, considering there would be no need to report to the CSTD, that would be a oral report by me or by the acting chair. I think that might reconcile the need for -- difficulty from not only -- I think not only my case but most people that would come from the (indiscernible) have a lot of difficulty being here on the 9th because that would be for us one week after Christmas and the big summer vacation. So that might be -- the 23rd would already be some kind of sacrifice but before that -- so if that could maybe be accepted. Before that, I turn to Marilyn Cade. And then Richard Hill.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. I have listened very carefully to comments. One I didn't understand at all, which was a comment by the U.K. that said there were six participants affected by CEPT. But I don't think there's six participants -- I'm just looking at the list of governments. I recognize that there are a lot of conflicts, but I also want suggest -- I also heard someone say some of us could just stay over for a weekend in Geneva.

But also that to suggest -- I also heard someone suggest that some of us could just stay over for a weekend in Geneva. I think there needs to be a real recognition that self-funded -- (indiscernible) and there are several of us, we just can't afford to hang around in Geneva for a weekend. And I welcome that commitment, I hope there's a commitment, to hold the meeting back-to-back with the intersessional so that the nongovernment stakeholders from outside of Geneva and government stakeholders from outside of Geneva and outside of Europe can plan to be not only at the two-day meeting but also, then, at the intersessional. Both of those I think are very linked.

If you're moving it to the next weekend in January, that sounds great, but please do make the meeting dates next to each other and try not to insert a weekend, an additional expensive day, in Geneva to those who are not local to Geneva. And that, I think, is both for government representatives from a country as well as for nongovernment representatives.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yeah, actually we could Marilyn's concern. The secretariat won't much appreciate it, but we could actually start on Saturday 21 or Sunday 22. The U.N. is able to work -- I know it's not good for the staff. Sorry about that.

The other thing I was going to say, chairman, since we don't have a constraint on the number of days, maybe we should do it three days. Maybe we could start on Sunday for three days or start on Saturday for three days or whatever. That addresses Marilyn's concern. Also, since this meeting is only one day, I think it's fair that the next meeting would be three days.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think it's probably difficult to accommodate everyone's needs. I think at this point there are a number of possibilities working around the week of 16th January and then the week immediately after that. I suggest unless there are any further interventions, we can come back to this at the end of our meeting and let us reflect a little bit and see how.

But I think there is the recognition of the need or the convenience to link both meetings. I'd like to invite all participants to exert their flexibility to the extent they can in order to try to accommodate. But let's move on and then we come back to this because I think this actually was the last item on the agenda. We got anticipated.

Richard, you want to speak on this?

[Overlapping speakers]

>> RICHARD HILL: -- for May, then the tentative date would be 15 and 16 of May. Is that correct? It would be two days prior to the annual meeting?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: CSTD is from 8, 8 to the 12th. So it's from Monday to Friday. Pakistan?

>>PAKISTAN: Ambassador, just briefly. I didn't give the reason why this particular week is also problematic for many of us who are in Geneva. In addition to the problem that was expressed by U.K. colleague on behalf of -- not formally on behalf of E.U., but -- so the reason is we have in that week the World Economic Forum in Davos. And most of the -- or rather many of the Geneva missions are very, very busy in handling almost all of the issues related to World Economic Forum where many head of government and head of state and other dignitaries come to attend that. Particularly that week would be off limit really so to say.

So I would request either we take it before or take it to the week after. I think 23rd, 24th would be quite reasonable. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We need five minutes here.

(Pause).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, colleagues. We have been also discussing with the secretariat in light of the need they have. And I'm very glad to announce that the secretariat is addressing the most flexibility they can, and they are restricting the time they will have to prepare to the bare minimum. But they

would be ready then to live with the idea that the intersessional would be held between 23rd and 25th January, leaving the two days for us, 26th and 27th. So we avoid the week of Davos. We avoid the beginning of the year. I think that would accommodate colleagues. I think we can at least have -- U.S, you want to intervene on that point?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Thank you, chair. Not so much on that point, but we can be flexible with the timing for January. We did just want to note, though, looking at the calendar, ITU Council this year begins on May 15th. And so that would cause some difficulty, I think, for many of us with the third meeting on the margins of the annual meeting. Thank you. So if we could do it before the annual meeting, that would work better. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So can I --

(Pause).

>> SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: With your permission, chair, could you please give us some time because we need to see whether there are other UNCTAD meetings happening because if there are intergovernmental meetings like (inaudible) board and development board or something, and then we will not be allowed to have other intergovernmental meetings taking place. If you give me some time, I'm asking my staff to check the dates and get back to us.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay, thank you. So we will come back on this.

In regard to the May meeting, I'm not sure we should discuss now. But since it has already come up and we have the firm dates of 8 to 12 for the CSTD meeting, I assume there will be in principle two possibilities. But I'm told the possibility of having the week after would be problematic for some. So I would like to suggest then to be held two or three days before, two or three days before, the week before. That would be 4 and 5 May.

Yes, Richard.

>> RICHARD HILL: I would suggest that we tentatively block 3, 4, and 5 and at the next meeting we decide whether to have two or three days.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you. Let's bracket this issue and come back to it by the end of the meeting. I would like then to invite you to consider Item -- Agenda Item 6, methods of work. And here I'd like to recall my proposal initially that I made before, that we should in principle stick to meetings in plenary. I would strongly suggest that all the work that has been done by this group is fully -- fully with all the members. I would suggest this for the sake of being able to -- even if we move slower but to come to a final outcome that can be accepted by all.

In regard to the mechanics of the meeting, I would, as the chair of the meeting, offer the floor to all those who request -- all members of the group independently of their stakeholder group in the order they request. I think this would be in accordance also with what was done in the first meeting, the first working group, working group 1.0.

And I recall that when we met in New York in drafting these, there was a general understanding that the rule -- the methods that we follow would be mostly or totally accepted by us.

In regard to observer, of course, all member states can -- any member state can participate as an observer and non-governmental entities that are accredited to ECOSOC could also participate. And they could also have access to the floor, time permitting.

I was asking in the break in regard to point of order, and maybe someone would like to touch on this. But we do not want to be too much tied to having formal rules not to have to explain we are doing this because of Rule 5 or 6. I think we are working in an ambience that this should be I think -- not in accordance with our general feelings. So I think with regard to point of order draft, we just make a regular one, just make sure you are not (inaudible) the regular line but something that was flagged to us there would be no difficulty. Again, 9, 10, those vary. Let's say -- flexible rules that we do not want to be too much tied to the formal aspects. And I think this is also what was done last time.

One last point here, it's not exactly method of work, but I'd like to come back to an idea that my delegation -- speaking as head of delegation made in the Budapest international meeting, that this working group could be, if all participants agreed, co-chaired by a non-governmental representative. I understand that would be an innovation in regards to what has been done before. But I think we are in an ambience that requires innovation, that has to respond to innovation. I think it would be a very good signal for -- even for the outside world, for the outside community, government and non-governmental to see on this table also a representative from non-governmental. Being in the capacity of co-chair, vice chair would be in your hands. I would like to, one, receive your views on this and, second, if there is an agreement, to receive nomination -- possible nomination, invite some process for this.

But, again, I'm just recalling an idea that is not new, that my delegation in support from others has expressed. And I would like to hear from you.

When we are discussing those issues associated to method of work, plenary, the mechanics, the role of observers, I'd like to add here also the possibility that we will resort, if needed, to conference calls, to some kind of intersessional work. Because if we are tied only to the three physical meetings, that might prove ineffective. And maybe there would be a need to make some quick decisions or to have some update on the progress of work. I think that is also a modality, a method that could be accepted as a possibility for our group. So I would invite comments on that point.

For the moment, I would just request not touch on the issue regarding the documents, that we'll discuss these later on as soon as we finish these discussion on method of work.

I have Cuba and Richard Hill and Marilyn Cade remote.

>>CUBA: Thank you for the proposal you have presented today regarding the Item 6 of the agenda. We understand that you as the chair are proposing members of the working group a certain group of proposers regarding the methods of work. So we would like, if possible, if you could include them in a document and circulate it to the members and also make a decision in the next session. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: I support your approach, Chairman, and since we have captioning, I think it will be fairly easy to produce a document that captures them, fortunately.

And in terms of if we have subgroups, then I suggest they would be open to all members of the group and to observers, just like the main group.

I support your idea that there could be some offline work through the mailing list and I support your idea of having a co-chair not necessarily from a government. On the other hand, then we probably -- for the civil society, if you want one of us, we'd have to find another person because I'm sure all of the civil society members want to be on the floor to express their views and defend their positions, and on the chair, that's a little bit awkward, so you couldn't do both. So we could explore that as an option.

And then I want to touch on the comment made previously by Cuba regarding who is allowed to be an observer.

As I understand it, it's not just ECOSOC. It's ECOSOC and WSIS with you. So it's a large group. It is any group that is accredited for either ECOSOC or WSIS. And personally, I think the secretariat is very well qualified to check the people who are on the list. So I suggest that we don't discuss this any more online, but if anybody has any doubts, I think they can go offline and check with the secretariat as to whether some organization really was on the list or not on the list, and so on.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I invite Marilyn Cade on remote to participate.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. And welcome back to the afternoon session for others. I welcome the opportunity to return myself remotely, and I want to appreciate the great sensitivity that all of you in the room, and also the secretariat, are conveying to make sure that we are fully engaged as remote participants.

Having said that, I look forward to seeing a calendar of various events from the secretariat. I've already made my comment about the importance of holding the meetings back to back, and I look forward to seeing how that is implemented, how the draft calendar reflects that.

I want to comment about a submission that I made. I am aware that your delegation and, Ambassador Fonseca, during the intersessional did suggest the idea of co-chair; however, I did not support that at that time, and I still have multiple questions about it.

At this point, I would prefer that we have a primary chair, that is yourself, and I will say that I think in methods of work that there is going great benefit to having sub working sessions, as we saw in our first working group where (indiscernible) and India each co-chaired a small event, a working session which turned out to be very important. We played it back to the full group.

Any subgroups or outlying work could be co-chaired by a government and a nongovernment stakeholder which will begin to ease us into the idea that we are innovating. I appreciate the idea of innovation, but at this point, I'm not sure how we would agree among ourselves, as nongovernment stakeholders, on which nongovernment stakeholder group is declared as a co-chair. I think that could be very time consuming, and perhaps even divisive.

I respect Richard's comment that if there were to be a co-chair, we would have to go through what the rules are, if it's someone from the group, someone not from the group. That seems very time consuming to me, so I'd prefer not to engage in that at this time, particularly because we have so much work to do.

On the other hand, let me go to methods of work. I really think that it's important for us to be able to support outlying -- sorry, off-meeting intersessional work, and there I think that it's perfectly appropriate to use chair with the support and advice of the secretariat to task small teams to help to advance the work and then report back into the fuller group. We've seen that work very effectively in this group, as I mentioned earlier, but also elsewhere.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn.

Are you done?

I think we lost Marilyn, maybe.

>>MARILYN CADE: No, no, no. Thank you, Chair. I was just closing.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for your comments. Very useful.

I will turn to the U.S.

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

Good afternoon, colleagues.

First, on the proposal regarding sub working group, we agree with you, Chair, that the sub working groups can potentially make the work more complicated, and although we do recognize that there are moments where having an ad hoc group or breaking into a coffee break and having a small group of people discuss isolated issues is a very -- is a very good working method and that you should use your discretion, we think it's a bit premature at this point to establish that we are definitely going into sub working groups. So we support the work occurring in plenary as much as possible.

On the question of co-chairs, we certainly welcome innovative approaches, to -- especially since this is such be a unique group, this Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, so if establishing a nongovernmental co-chair is something that the chair would like to do, and we're open to hearing other's views, that is something we are supportive of and are interested in hearing who might emerge as such a co-chair.

We do note that if a co-chair is selected from nongovernmental group, we do share the concern of our colleague Richard Hill regarding ensuring that we don't lose a voice of a stakeholder on the working group. So we should determine how to accommodate -- how do accommodate allowing their voice to be heard in their working group member capacity in addition to their co-chair capacity so that the stakeholder group's participation is not diminished by one.

So thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador.

On two points that we are discussing right now, to a large extent, my U.S. colleague has already mentioned and we support that there shouldn't be breakout sessions, subgroups, and things like this. Of course we can have -- during the course of our working, we can have informal corner meetings to informally see and test different issues. Otherwise, I don't think that we need to formalize it. And it's particularly a challenge for small delegations like us where most of the time there is only one -- one delegate. And of course it's very difficult for that person to be in the -- in two rooms at the same time.

On the second issue, I -- I don't think that we will be making our life easier by -- through co-chairs and other things. I think we shouldn't go into that. There are so many complexities as mentioned by Marilyn as well.

I think we need to keep it very simple. We have a chair. We might have a wise chair because we can understand maybe during the meetings you can -- you need to have some time off for any reason. So very -- on a very informal manner, maybe we can have something as a vice chair or someone who can work on your behalf. That person may be even from your own delegation. We are perfectly right -- comfortable with that.

So I think we indeed to make our life easier by not going into that direction. Keep it simple. You are chair. That is it. We just go into the work.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

I turn to ICC.

>>ICC: Thank you, Ambassador, for your proposal and for this innovation, as you have called it.

As in Budapest, I would like to reiterate support for this proposal and to -- and that we should consider a co-chair from the stakeholder community.

I'd like to suggest that as gender balance is not something we should consider in innovation, we might consider one of the very capable women among the nongovernmental stakeholder representatives. And again, we agree, Richard, it would be important to have a voice substitute in the place of that co-chair.

In light of the limited resources of the secretariat for the work of this group and the full charge of the chair's role, I think we should recognize that this could be helpful in extending the resources available to the -- to this work and to help us proceed with our goals.

And finally, I will also support the chair's remark about a preference for working in plenary as opposed to small groups, and several others have pointed out that this could have a propensity to be more challenging. So I would support that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, (saying name), for your comments.

I give the floor to Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to make two points. First, as far as setting subgroups, position subgroups, we oppose that. We oppose that idea because when we mix so many subgroups at the outset, it makes the discussion very complicated and maybe to make the discussion, we need to -- since we need to come to the conclusion, consensus, at the end of this working group, I suggest that our discussion should be as simple and -- simple and not dig into the details too much.

So I support the plenary setting as long as possible. And if there is some need, ad hoc group or lunchtime break ad hoc group is an option.

And the second point, as far as the nongovernmental co-chair, instead of calling it co-chair, I suggest to call it vice chair, because the chair, we already have the chairman, and if we're going to invite some nongovernmental person to support the chair, we can support that.

And there's two reason we can support that. One, since this working group is a very unique working group comprising both government party and nongovernment business person, civil society person, academia person, and so on, if we have a vice chair from the private sector, it really gives a signal that we are now really proceeding the discussion in the multistakeholder approach.

Second reason, maybe we might need some additional resources, and if that vice chair is coming from the business sector, maybe we can expect more extended resources. This is the current reason.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan, for those comments. It's a very pragmatic reason. I didn't think about it at the time, but I agree.

Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. Certainly I -- I'm very appreciative of the spirit in which you're making this offer, aside from anything else. Whatever happens, I think it's a great signal.

With respect to how to break up people or not break up people, I think we've just given you the job of chairing this group. We ought to trust you with having the good instincts of knowing if we need to split

into groups, we'll split into groups, and I think you'll suggest it and we'll probably all go along with it. But we should let you sort of guide us in this as things proceed.

And if it turns out that a vice chair is more acceptable than a co-chair or whatever, I think I certainly won't take it amiss if the nongovernmental side is a vice chair rather than a co-chair. I think the objective you're trying to put through is worthwhile, and whether it's structured in either way, and perhaps it's simpler because then a vice chair can be a regular participant until he or she is required. I certainly take the gender point. Until he or she is needed to do something, and I think everyone will know the difference.

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

I give the floor to the European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Chair.

As pointed out already, this is already quite a unique group since its multistakeholder, so in that sense we would be willing to explore a co-chair or a vice chair, however we want to call him or her, from the -- from nongovernmental parts, particularly since it's a proposal that's coming from you. So I think it will be helpful.

And we will also be willing to explore other methods of work and not stick to the meetings we have here.

And regarding breaking to other groups, we could support Pakistan and others that said that not too many of them, but yes.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: First question is about these session groups. We believe that, like other delegation, we support that session groups is not the good way of -- good method for this particular working group because we have quite balanced and small working group, and we need to discuss for -- with the full audience all the questions.

Of course if we need some format for smaller group, like ad hoc groups and drafting teams, then of course it's very useful and can be used. But the session should be for the whole group.

The second question regarding co-chair and vice chair, our position is quite -- quite close to the position which was verbalized by Pakistan. We also think that we need to simplify the method of the working group here because the subject we have here is quite complicated. So we need to simplify the methods. And co-chair position will not bring us simplicity in our work. It probably adds to the complexity.

So vice chair is a good position, so for us, we -- if it could be nongovernmental or governmental, it doesn't matter. Woman or man it, doesn't matter. It's more about who is more qualified for this position.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I will give the floor to Nigel Hickson, ICANN.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon.

I mean, just very briefly, I think this is a very, very positive discussion. Indeed, go along with your suggestions and what you said earlier regarding observers and members of the group as well, which I think was entirely sensible.

We would certainly support a co-chair or a vice chair. And I think we could take up the idea of a vice chair -- sorry. Yes, the idea of a vice chair, as Russia has indicated, has certainly some advantages. And I think that would show the innovative spirit of this -- of this group and CSTD in general as, indeed, Marilyn Cade has spoken before of the innovative nature of the discussions at CSTD.

Thank you very much.

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

I turn to Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair, and congratulations for assuming this important responsibility. You can count on the delegation of Mexico in order to construct and look forward, hopefully reaching agreement.

Regarding these two points that we are discussing now, first on the question of the co-chair, I do have the feeling that maybe for the moment will be better to -- to stick to the role of the chair. I don't feel that for the moment it's necessary to divide the work, because we are just about to start. So we are open to have that in mind, maybe in the future, depending on the developments. But maybe for the moment, we would prefer to keep with the chair guidance only.

As per the proposal to have different groups, we share the concern of some of the delegations regarding that some delegations don't have enough delegates that could cover, eventually, these different meetings.

I will think on the possibility to have, in the future, maybe figure (indiscernible) facilitators that could help you, but it doesn't exactly mean to divide the session in different ones. It's just a tool that could contribute to have a better understanding of the positions given by Member States. But for the moment, we think it's better to keep it just for your guidance, with your guidance.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for your comments.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, chair. Having heard the discussion on the chair issue, I suggest if you wish to enlarge the management team, then probably vice chair is better. But I don't think we can do one vice chair. So why not have a vice chair from each of the constituent groups? There's long tradition of doing that in various organizations. So we could have a vice chair from civil society, a vice chair from business, a vice chair from academia and a vice chair from intergovernmental organizations. And I think that we should be bold in terms of gender equality and say they must, must all four be women. I think we have plenty of qualified candidates. It's not a problem.

Then I want to bring up a very minor point. Marilyn Cade in her extremely good email, which I hope everybody has read, raised the point that in the past there has been some misunderstandings about the appropriate use of social media and so people should show some sensitivity. Since the meetings are Webcast, I think, or they should be, I think, publicly Webcast, I don't have a problem with people tweeting so and so said so and so.

On the other hand, I would request the understanding that we all that pictures should not be taken unless the person who has their picture taken agrees to have his or her picture taken. So I don't think we want to allow sort of auspicious picture taking in these meetings.

And then I want to come to another point made by Marilyn, which is really excellent. And the heading was online submissions and documents, use of online calls for comments and submissions. And I do think that we should do that. I don't think we should do -- Marilyn mentioned the ITU consultations. I don't think we should do them as formal as they're doing them where they make a topic and so on.

What I think we should do is have a separate portion of the Web site where we encourage people who are not accredited, just anybody, general public, to make comments on our documents which I hope are all going to be public. I hope all of our documents are going to be public. And then anybody in this group can look at those comments on that Web site and then bring them into the meeting or not.

So I would encourage that we're open not just in terms of publishing what we're doing but we also encourage comments from the general public on what we're doing which, of course, would be posted separately from the group's documents and make it clear that these are public comments and not group documents. Thank you, chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comment.

I have Canada and then a remote participant, Jimson. So, Canada, you have the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. As this is the first time I take the floor, I will take the opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment. We're very happy.

And I recall in January this year when Brazil made this proposal for a co-chair for the working group and at the time being very impressed at the idea, thinking that this was -- this was going to be completely in

the spirit of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. And certainly Canada would like to support this idea.

In terms of process of appointing a co-chair, I think it could be done as easily as your nomination was this morning, somebody to make a nomination in this meeting this afternoon and then hopefully we could all endorse it. I think there are -- everybody among the working group participants would be qualified to do it. It's a question of whether or not people have time to do it. But this said, I think it could be a fairly easy process that could be decided today if we decided to go into this route. And co-chair, vice chair, one or the other for us is good.

As many others have mentioned, Canada would have a strong preference for plenary work. Indeed, sometimes we may need to have little breakout sessions but we don't think these need to be formalized with separate facilitators.

As well, on documents -- and I would like to go very much in line with what Richard has said and what Marilyn had pointed out in her submission, that, you know, the work of this working group needs to be extremely transparent. I think again that would be in the spirit of what we envisage as enhanced cooperation.

And so having, you know, all proposals that we have be posted on the Web site for all of us to see but for other observers outside the working group to see and to reflect upon, this will nourish our conversation and our reflection as we are preparing recommendations.

And our recommendations will be all the stronger if there are many people with many voices who have been able to contribute to them. So in terms of our -- of the working methods, this is where, Canada, I think we would like to go. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much for your comments. I have on my list ISOC, Constance, and then Iran and Cuba.

Constance, you have the floor.

>>ISOC: Thank you very much, Chair. Constance Bommelaer from the Internet Society. And like the others, I would like to support the idea put forward by Richard and another colleague of potentially having vice chairs to broaden the management group and support you. I think it would also be interesting in terms of acknowledging the commitment of the different stakeholder groups to the success of this working group.

With regards to working methodologies, I would echo others in supporting your proposal that in principle, the work happens in plenary sessions. We saw during the last CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation that for the difficult issues where debate is needed, it is precious to have everyone in the room. So I think in principle, it is -- it is good and important to stick to the plenary unless breakout sessions are needed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your suggestion. I have the following observation. First on the subgroup, Mr. Chairman, the subgroup is a good idea, and we could consider discussions of the items in the details. But in line of Pakistan, please consider, small delegations that they are not able to cover all the issues.

And second observation is on the co-chairs, Mr. Chairman, as some delegations mentioned, this group is unique and this is a combination of the member states including the developing and developed countries and the representative of the non-governmental and the business. So it is a difficult decision to make on the co-chairs. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

I give the floor to Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, chair. Well, actually I did not participate myself in the intersessional meeting this year. So I need to consult my capital on this proposal that you are presenting on having a co-chair. I realize there is no consensus in the room regarding your proposal. Also, as I propose in my previous statement, I request you as the chair circulate in writing maybe the outcome of this discussion on this item of the agenda, on the different proposed methods of work for the consideration. And then we can submit it to our capital, to consult our capital to make this decision maybe in the next session.

I would like to say that preliminary, my reaction to this idea of having a co-chair from the stakeholders or civil society, already for us, this working group represent a balanced participation from all sides. So we do not think -- me personally but I need to consult my capital. I do not think it is necessary to have a co-chair. We trust in your chairmanship. We will support your work.

For the method of work, it is crucial for my government to respect the practice -- the general practice of participation for NGOs with consultative status and the participation of stakeholders that were a part of the CSTD work because they participate in some process. So that should be very clear. If you make a writing communication to the members of the working group, this principle of the participation should be very clear in that understanding. That's a common understanding. This is not new. We don't need to discuss it today because it is a practice. The practice is that this working group, the membership, and the participation is for NGOs with consultative status in ECOSOC, the members that were already approved by ECOSOC and by the whole participants were approved by ECOSOC and also stakeholders that participate in some. That's not for discussion. That's a clear principle for the methods of work.

What we request in the morning was information from the secretariat that I hope the secretariat could circulate it, is this list -- I mean, we want the secretariat to circulate or at least to give it to the Cuban delegation, the list of these NGOs that have been participating in the work of the CSTD for us to have clarity from now on and into the future which are the NGOs with consultative status that have been participating in the CSTD work and also which are the stakeholders that have been participating in the CSTD work that also participate in the summit.

Another issue related to subgroups or the publication of documentation, the transparency of the work of the working group and so on, what I propose to the chair is not to lose so much time today. I propose

not to lose time that you as a chair send the communication at the end of this meeting when we finish today. You can send a letter to all of us to say, well -- or a summary, if you prefer to make a summary of the meeting of today, on the different items of the agenda of today and say, well, it was discussed the issue of the methods of work. It was proposed this and this and this.

And then for the next session, we could reconfirm what is our understanding of the methods of work because at least I need to consult this idea on the co-chair with my capital. So that's my comments for Item 6 on methods of work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

Just before moving to the next speaker -- this is the last speaker for the moment -- by a remote participant. Let me just make a few comments because I see some things being repeated.

First of all, yes, I intend after this meeting to send a letter, if you will, documenting some of the things we have said and confirming the proposed route for our work.

In regard to the methods of work, I just want to be clear that except for the part of the co-chair or vice chair, no innovation is being proposed. We are just trying to follow what has been done before. And we were mandated to do this by our colleagues in New York, too. Based on the experience of the working group to replicate that experience. So it's just, let's say, when we are discussing the method of work, we are just making sure that we are all on board with regard to how we want to proceed.

And I take the point that there is a very broad preference and recognition of the needs to work at least those sensitive and problematic issues in plenary. I have a very strong response from you that it is maybe even danger to have breakout groups to engage in issues that are controversial and require the full membership of the group. However, I also take the point that we should not close the door for the possibility in the course of our meeting to have some breakout groups, to investigate some particular aspect that then could be further digested by the wider group. So I think in -- in addition to what I said initially, I think that's a very important clarification, that we should not tie our hands with any specific but we have a clear preference to work all the important and problematic issues in plenary. I fully agree.

In regard to the mechanics, we have already engaged. I confirm my intention to offer the floor to all members of the working group in the order they require. And this also applies to remote participants. I should apologize to some remote participants because I'm still not used to look at you and look at the list of remote participants. But I think this will come in time. But the intention is to -- and observers time permitting. Also, there will be -- I think we are -- by doing so and in regard to the observer, I would like them, the secretariat, to add in response to what Cuba has been asking in regard to observer. I think the point raised by Cuba maybe could be -- the secretariat could make some general statement in that regard. But if you require some particular information, I think that should go directly to your delegation. I in principle don't see a need to circulate this to the full membership. But if there is a need on the outside, I think it is fair that you receive that information.

And I think the method of work seeks to ensure that we are acting in line with what was requested by us, that the working group will meet. That it will ensure the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders, take into account their diverse views and their expertise.

And in that right, I also support the idea of transparency for the work. I think it is important to ensure the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders that this will be done. I do not see a reason for not doing this. And I as the chair would certainly support that.

In regard to the idea of the co-chair, I feel very strongly that many of you think it's an innovation but it's not mature enough at the moment, the idea of the co-chair. It needs some further reflection on some aspects and some elements.

However, I have felt strong support for the idea of vice chair. I think this is a category that maybe will not -- I'm not sure if we will have time in this meeting to further reflect on that. But I'll invite us to have this on the back of our minds. And if you would entrust me to have some further consultations, we can maybe come up with something that would be acceptable to all of us. I think that would be a very good signal for our work, a very good beginning for the work, even if it is not taken in this meeting for the work. There is a very pragmatic reason as Japan has said.

I think we -- I think the important thing about this work is that people will own what we have been doing. And I think that by having a vice chair, I think that reinforces the idea of ownership also on the part of non-governmental stakeholders. I would be very comfortable with that, even though we are working in the context of the U.N. and the context of the CSTD, that we will refer to ECOSOC and to the General Assembly.

I think in the context of our group, we can have, let's say, some kind of innovative approach that would be in line with the overall -- that is not contradictory at all in our view to the overall spirit in which we have been working.

With those words, I turn to the secretariat for the issue regarding the observers and any other issue you may wish to discuss. Thank you.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, chair. With regard to the provisional list of participants you have. On the last page, on page 5, we have identified the other stakeholders, observers. And they are either ECOSOC accredited or WSIS accredited. And we have one person from the U.N. Women, so that's a U.N. agency. These people have been coming or these organizations have been coming to CSTD, and we are very careful in checking -- fact checking on this front. If the distinguished delegates of Cuba would like to have more information, definitely we will talk to you bilaterally and give you all the information you need. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, I have on my list remote participant Jimson Olufuye. You have the floor.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Welcome back from lunch. The chair has spoken really well trying to (inaudible) the views.

(inaudible) that ensure the vice chair is a good one (inaudible) multistakeholder and the ownership of (indiscernible).

So I'm full in support of the progress we have been making.

And with regard to working methods, I think the approach of the working group is good. Agree with the plenary. (inaudible).

Agree very much with what you have said. And also it will -- (inaudible) opportunity to the public as well -- (inaudible) -- request for public to give input to the tradition kind of the working group. (inaudible).

For the public to input as well as we (indiscernible).

The private sector, ICT and (indiscernible) together opportunity to also have (indiscernible). That would be a good idea.

(inaudible) the opportunity to also (indiscernible).

Thank you very much for listening.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I have Pakistan. You have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. Ambassador, I think we need to recognize that we have very little precious time, and we shouldn't go into the complexities of chair, co-chair, and other things.

Ours is a very small group. I think if we combine all of us, it will be very, very small percentage of UN membership, even if we only include Member States. So I really don't think we should go into all the complexities here.

We have one chair. I think that is enough.

As far as vice chair is concerned, it's only required when you are not around, and I don't think that we will come into that situation because our meetings would be for -- mostly for two days. Very short meetings as compared to other longer meetings.

So I don't think that we -- of course it's important from stakeholders' point of view, and it's already very broad-based working group in which stakeholders have their participation. We welcome their participation. They are participating on an equal footing, and I would have full faith on you and I think all the stakeholders have faith in you that you will take into account input coming from all of us. So I don't think that we -- we need to go into the detail. One chair is enough. Let's go into the work. And keep it simple.

So my request is that we need to prioritize issues substance-wise. And as far as matters of work is concerned, I think we need to be very clear on which are the things that we have an understanding on.

It's better we can have in writing, but if not, at least we have, in a quite -- maybe a little bit of formal way, I should say, you number them in one, two, three, four. Maybe not in this meeting, but next

meeting, and then we agree on, okay, this is our understanding based on your oral representation so that we do not have snags in our future work. This is just to facilitate the work.

So we need to really concentrate on the substance now.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

I think the last speaker on this will be Cuba.

>>CUBA: I'm sorry to intervene once again. I am in page 5 of the list of the participants. When it says all the stakeholder observers, I need to have clarity from the secretariat.

For example, we already have, as a member of this working group, in the page 3 we have other stakeholder members of the working group, and then we have a representative from the ICC BASIS in this meeting. Physical presence and is a member, ICC BASIS. And I'm sorry to take the example of ICC. It's not a problem we have with ICC, whatever. But it's already a member, ICC BASIS, of this working group.

And then in page 5 of this same document, as other stakeholder observers, then we have one, two, three persons that are observers through ICC BASIS.

So there -- I want to have clarity. If somebody can clarify to me. There is a group of entities that have been registered as observers, but clarify that they are participating through ICC BASIS.

So my question is that from one entity, do we have more than one person participating in the group? Can, for example, be the same amount of Member States? I don't know. For example, can we have five people from Nigeria, five people from Cuba, ten people from any country to be observers? Like it happen with the stakeholders. Could this list be limited, you know, indefinite? It could be anybody?

We need to have clarity on that criteria. Are we going to follow that criteria in the future? Is this been a practice in the previous working group? I was not part of the previous working group so I cannot know how did you work in the period.

I want to have, you know, a balanced representation from each side. And if we are equal, we should be equal. If there is a possibility of having three or four representatives from one NGO or from one any entity, can we have it also governments?

I need to have clarity on this.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'll give the floor to Richard and to ICC and then to the secretariat.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I think I understand now the concern and the confusion. So let's take Member States first, which is easier.

I think it's clearly understood that Member States can show up with as many people as they like in their delegation, and any individual who raises the flag of the Member State would be considered to be speaking for the Member State and be recognized. This is well established practice and, in fact, here some states do have more than one person, and I think that's perfectly correct and, in fact, desirable.

Then the question arises for the organizations that are not states. And it's true that it wasn't entirely clear if the nominee was the organization -- for example, ICC BASIS -- or the person; that is, Richard Hill. And as I said, I think that we're not here as individuals. We're here to represent groups. But the point is well taken. Perhaps we could extend, in the spirit of treating everybody equally, as you have said repeatedly and as Cuba suggested, simply apply the same method. And so if ICC BASIS wants to show up with five people, that's fine, they'll show up with five people, and the same with any other organization. If ISOC or ICANN want to show up with more than one person, that's fine, within the constraints of the room, obviously. At some point you may have to say, look, you can only get two people in the room. But in practice, I don't think this is going to be a problem, because I agree, it is a bit strange to have ICC BASIS as a full member and then also as an observer. That's a little bit confusing. So I think that we could accept that organizations who are full members can show up with delegations of more than one person if that's acceptable.

I'm not intending to bring anybody else. Don't worry. It doesn't apply to my organization. One of me is more than enough, I think.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I turn to Peter Major. I think it's important to hear from him the rationale for this.

I'd like just to comment, and I do not want to anticipate Peter, but I think, to my understanding, there are some, in Internet governance, like ICC BASIS and ISOC that are kind of omnibus organizations that are coalition -- (indiscernible) coalition of many different institutions. I think not they would deserve, let's say, some kind of different status in regard to the others, but I think we are trying to have some flexibility to accommodate different situations.

But, Peter, I'm sorry, just I should turn to you directly.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have already congratulated you, haven't I? By the way, it's very strange to speak from this point.

[Laughter]

In my introductory remarks, I've just outlined the process of selecting the members of this group. And probably I haven't made it clear that the selection was a quite lengthy process with long coordination in the stakeholder group, including governmental stakeholder group.

By the way, in the CSTD, we have five regions, and in the five regions we had this process as well. So not all CSTD members are members of the group. They have selected themselves the countries who would represent the group itself, or the country will be part of the -- of the working group.

For the nongovernmental stakeholders, we had the coordination process, which is also very lengthy one. And I asked certain persons in the nongovernmental stakeholder groups to coordinate this process. And the feedback was quite positive. I think there was agreement for the persons to -- to come to the working group. And I think they do represent the stakeholder group itself.

Now, as for the observers, if there's a coincidence of having observers from a particular organization which has delegated a member to the working group, well, that is a coincidence. But we don't have a rule to limit the number of observers who have otherwise the actual invitation to the WSIS or the ECOSOC.

In case there's some concern, probably this concern should be raised at the CSTD or even at ECOSOC. But I think this group is not mandated to question the way we are dealing with the observers.

On the same idea, probably as for the vice chair, I have heard some statements that eventually it would be a good idea to have vice chair and, instead, to nominate someone from the same stakeholder group to replace eventually. I don't think this is appropriate. We have had the working group set up, and it has been noted by the CSTD and it has been noted also by ECOSOC. So I don't think we can deviate as far as numbers are concerned for the members.

So we have agreed to have 43 members, and I think we have to stick to that.

I have no problem concerning vice chairs, but we have to also keep in mind that we have governmental stakeholder and stakeholder groups who would also -- could come with the idea of nominating vice chair. And the same applies to the nongovernmental stakeholder groups. So probably if you are thinking about nominating vice chairs, you should also take this into account.

So, well, briefly, I'm ready to answer any questions concerning the process of the selection which has been taking place and which has been approved by CSTD and ECOSOC. And in case you have some uncertainty, I'm ready to answer here or offline.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I see Cuba raising flag. Are you --

>>CUBA: Yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- satisfied with the whole explanation?

>>CUBA: Actually, I'm not. Let me be very clear. We approve the composition of this work group formally by ECOSOC. The ten members of the working group, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, India, da-da-da.

We also approve formally the other stakeholder members of the working group by the ECOSOC formal approval, representatives from the business community, all of those that are there. Representatives of civil society. They're entities. They're entities.

Representative from the technical community and academia, representative from the intergovernmental and international organization. That is what has been approved formally. Four page.

Member State observers, like any procedure of any meeting of the United Nations, any Member State, any mission here could request to be inscribed as an observer. A Member State of the United Nation can request to be an observer in any meeting.

Now, page 5, page 5, other stakeholder observers. I'm not sure that we have approved this formally to have other stakeholder observers. I have not seen any decision of ECOSOC establishing what is the criteria and the procedure we are going to set for other stakeholder observers to be inscribed as observers coming from the stakeholder side or civil society or United Nations agencies, and so on.

But, for example, UN Women, there is here a representative from UN Women. Of course, any United Nations agency, entity, can be observer on any process. In fact, in fact, the composition, in page 3, from representative of intergovernmental and international organization, is not enough. You know, there is no Latin American commission, there's no African commission. There is UN, intergovernmental entities. And I will say that in the official session of the commission on the status -- Commission on Science and Technology this year, that we wanted to have a balance. But it's okay. At the moment, we approve it, it was not included.

But there is a representative from the European Union. There is UNESCO. There is -- I mean, there is a mix that we have. You inherit that. It's great. But really, to have a very inclusive representation from all of the UN system and regional -- regions in general, it is okay to have as observers. We can have the African Union, we can have a Latin American commission, we can have the UN Women. It's okay.

My concern is there is like we are having in this paper today more representative of other stakeholders, there could be interest in joining the working group, and we have not set a criteria on how we are going to manage.

If there is any organization that requests the working group to participate, to be a remote participant or to come to (indiscernible), how we are going to proceed on that? We don't have a procedure. And I think we should have a procedure.

For example, if we decide that a stakeholder that already is a member, like we are having today -- that is ICC BASIS -- if they want to incorporate and inscribe other members, okay, but we need to decide on that.

I'm not opposing. I'm not saying we are opposed, but we should, as a member, as a member of the working group, we should have a procedure. We should have a communication, a formal communication from the secretariat that this and this and this entity are requesting to be observers in the working group. Maybe not in the case of a UN agency or a Latin American commission that is within

the UN system, but stakeholders that are outside the UN, or maybe they did not participate previously in the Summit, but they were born two years ago and they want to participate in this process.

So we need to know. What I'm talking is not opposing. What I'm talking about is the procedure for us to be informed and to decide if we set the participation of those stakeholders that are observers to have really transparency in our procedure. Because today, we have page 5, but I don't know if within the month there will be other observer entities or stakeholders that would like to join the working group.

That's my point. That's my point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

I think you have raised important points, but to my understanding, at least, those have already been addressed before. For example, in regard, you mention the need to balance the representation of government representatives, the other stakeholders. If I look into the lists of the last meeting -- for example, the case of Iran, I have four members; Japan, four; Brazil, two. So there is no limit for Member States to bring to this meeting any number of representative. This is not being restricted at all. But all those members will appear under the category of state members of the working group. They do not appear in any other page because they all belong to the same delegation. They will be here.

And I think I can sympathize with the tremendous effort that Peter engaged in putting this together, because in the case of governments, I remember initially there was a call for -- to try to ensure the balance of gender. But in the case of governments, we know it's difficult. It cannot impose on a government to indicate that.

And so the -- it only appears a number of the countries, and the countries are able to bring in any representative, and they'll be recognized as such.

In the case of business communities, civil society and technical community differently, and I stand to be corrected by Peter, it picked up individual persons. And by doing this, tried to strike the right balance between gender, between -- I don't know, geographic. So those are individuals that belong to such and such institution, but they are participate in this group on their personal capacity in the presentation of that group. And this brings us in that category, in those categories, business, civil society, and technical community. Since they are there in their own capacity, the institution they represent can ask for accreditation as observers in other capacity. And I heard from the chair of the CSTD, I'm not familiar with the rules, that there is no rule to impede that. And it would not be up to this group to decide on that rule since there is a rule that only rec 6 could be imposed, for example, by CSTD. I stand to be corrected.

So I think you're raising a point, and this possibility that, indeed, is taking place is something that cannot be addressed by us. That is allowed by the rule as far as both observers that appear on page 5 and that list below could grow of course, but under the condition that anyone put on this list will be -- belong to an institution accredited to the (indiscernible), to ECOSOC or WSIS. That is the basis because we have a rule. We have a procedure for that.

But again, we -- And the secretariat is tasked to make sure that all the names put on page 5 abide to these rules.

So I'm not too sure whether we should prolong this because I think those points have been adequately addressed. I -- If there is any other comment -- and Cuba, please -- I am in your hands. But I think we are -- I think we need to move to the agenda item that we first did, documentation for next meeting. We have roughly one hour left. I would beg your indulgence, unless there is a very important point, not to prolong on this.

But, Cuba, please, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I think we could have an understanding although I feel that the issue of all the stakeholders, observers has not been decided formally at all. Because as I could recall the decision of the ECOSOC is regarding the composition of this working group, not on the issue of observers from the stakeholders. I would like to know, for example, in the case of ICC-BASIS if the representatives that are listed in this page, that it seemed belonged to other entities. If those entities are members of the ICC-BASIS because the issue is the following. One person from one entity maybe is a member of a group or coalition of one entity that is already a member. It seemed very strange one. but there was some representative from the stakeholder that says that they represent a coalition, no, a coalition or a group of entities.

So I suppose that the person that are observer belonged to that coalition. What I'm trying to say is that we will not agree given the accreditation to an entity do not formally belong to the NGO with consultative status formally or the stakeholder that has been participating in the summit. Sometimes these kind of things happen. You go to an U.N. meeting and there is a person that's not formally accredited through that entity to have the consultative status. What we want is to avoid any registration that is not, you know respecting the status of what we decide who are the entities with the possibility of participating in these meetings. That's what I would like to be very clear. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list of these topics, ITC had requested the floor. Would you still like to comment on this? And then Russia and Richard.

So ITC.

>> ITC: Thank you, chair. Just to help clarify perhaps some of the confusion regarding ICC's consultative status and the way it works for our membership, we are very vigilant. And we have had a case in the past where somebody has registered as ICC-BASIS but was no longer a member but that is not happening. We coordinate very well with the secretariat to make sure that if somebody registers as a member of ICC-BASIS to be an observer in this process and many of the other U.N. processes that we participate in, that ICC is aware and is conferred -- and confirmed that person is a member. So it's not possible under that configuration that somebody would be on the list that is not a member.

The other thing I will remind people is that ICC is an organization that represents 6 1/2 million companies across 130 countries. So the idea that we could have other people from our membership that would want to be here and participate as observers and perhaps be in a place where they could

contribute ideas and thoughts to our representative would be -- I think as reasonable as stated for other government delegations to have a fuller representation. So thank you for letting me respond to that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. I think we have quite valid discussion. And, of course, some delegations have the questions and we need to understand how it should work. And for us it is also not so clear how we should proceed. And it looks like right now the level -- the rights of the members of working group and observers are quite same and what the difference of this and we think that this should be clarified. And what we propose is to ask secretariat for rules of procedures which should be applied for our working groups which can give us the understanding, that's the level of rights is available for members of the working group and what is for observers. It depends on the number of participants but it also should go to the number of speakers because it's different things that you can participate. But to speak as a speaker, it could be a number of, you know, participants, speaker participants. So this is the proposal to the secretariat to clarify rules of procedure. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I found that both the explanation from Peter Major and yourself were clear. I do agree with Russia, though, it would be nice to have that in writing. And, again, you have it in the transcripts which shouldn't be too difficult to turn that into a little document.

I didn't want to raise it as a point of order, chair, but I second your call to end this discussion now. If people are not satisfied, we can always reopen it later. But I think we should move on to other issues now.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Peru.

>>PERU: Thank you, Chairman. I actually wanted to raise another issue. I have no intention -- do you want me to refer or should I --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Does it refer to methods of work or other agenda item?

>>PERU: Actually it refers to something you mentioned before on issues that I believe there is agreement in the room. You made a few minutes ago a very interesting summary of what has been discussed and I would like to recall that so we can move that. In that, there is agreement in the room in the idea of having a plenary format instead of having small subgroups. However, there's also flexibility in the needs to have breakouts to consider necessarily to your prerogative.

There is also full agreement in giving floor to all the participants on equal footing. And then probably I would suggest also to have a report at the end of this meeting that can be circulated among the members. Yes, it's a summary, a factual summary, of what has been discussed and who has attended the meeting and which topics have been discussed. If there is agreement, that's good. And if there's not,

we can reflect the divergence of views. I assure that many have expressed we have to move forward. We cannot continue to debate endless. There is a need to reach certain agreement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to the last speaker on this. That would be Marilyn Cade. After that, I will ask the secretariat to introduce Agenda Item 7 that is review of working documents related to enhanced cooperation. I think this really does relate to the discussion of what are the documents we want to have as reference documents for our January meeting.

Marilyn, you have the last word.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, chair. Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm going to say that very generally that I think that perhaps there has been some confusion because when some observers have spoken, perhaps they didn't identify themselves in the observer capacity. I don't want to object to their being recognized, chair. But I want to respect the questions that have been raised by my colleagues from the other governments. And I welcome the explanation that you and Peter provided. And I do think it would be helpful to have it in writing.

But I also think that when someone speaks, if they're not an official member of the working group, if they could just say that they are speaking as an observer, that might also really be helpful to address any concerns and alleviate the concerns.

In our preliminary days, I look forward to our next meeting when instead of having eight observers, we will have 20 or 50 and many, many other people remotely. And it will be a very important opportunity for us to address as members of the working group so that we can listen to observers, not only those in the room but those who also may have contributed remotely or are attending remotely.

I look forward to further addressing this with you and advice from Peter. And I think we can move on as Peru and you have suggested.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. And then just before moving to the next agenda item, I think in regard to the participation of members of the working group and observers, my -- this is my feeling that, basically, we do not want to restrict the ability to speak. Of course, preference is given to the members of the working group. And I think at some time -- at some point in time, as we move to more substantive discussions, we'll have to be a little more rigid than we have been in this meeting because I think to make efficient use of our time and to allow the members of the group to interact and to come to some agreement, we will have possibly to limit a little bit the participation of observers.

But I didn't feel the need to do it at this particular meeting. And I think the spirit is to allow as much participation as possible, time allowing. So I -- I don't think it would be so much good for us to be tied to very rigid rules but working in an ambience -- of course, taking in time constraints. I think we can navigate around this in the most way possible.

So I recognize ICT and then I will turn to the secretariat. ICT will be the last speaker and then the secretariat will introduce agenda Item Number 7.

>> ISOC: Chair, I think it was ISOC and not ITC. Very quickly because I know you want to move on. During the previous CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation and also the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF, I just wanted to share -- because I had the privilege of participating in both of those working groups that observers were welcomed to participate. Simply the chair then gave the priority to members of the working group, formal members, and then he would turn to observers. And this way everybody knew de facto who WAS a full member and who was an observer. And I would note that things worked out quite smoothly and in a constructive fashion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I strive to do, likewise.

I turn to the secretariat.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, chair. Agenda item 7, review of work and documents related to enhanced cooperation. So I just would -- I think in Peter's presentation, he kind of outlined the processes that went into the last working group and in outcomes of the last working group. So it produced several documents including the report of the chair of the first WGEC. And they are all on this Web site. We have created a Web space for this working group, and here we have made available all this work that was done before. Plus, you can see there documents on the analyses of the response to the questionnaire on public policy issues. And then there's the draft recommendations and also the mapping exercise called the mapping of international public policy issues. And they're all here. And, also, the chair's -- the report of the chair of the first working group. So that's what I would like to mention. And please note the Web site. Thank you, chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think to my view it is very important that when we meet in January that we have in front of us -- we have this wealth of documents that have been produced in the previous edition of this working group. And they reflect maybe different degrees of consensus among participants on the issues that are dealt with in which document.

However, in the light of all the discussion we have in the morning -- and I had a very strong message from you that we want to take on board the work that has been done before, but we also want to make sure that anything that we take from the previous experience is updated, is adjusted to new developments, that takes on board things that have taken place since then. And I can fully endorse that.

Therefore -- and also we have somewhat limited time frame in between now and January if we want to make sure -- we cannot engage in a lengthy process for consultation, then request for comment.

Maybe my proposal for you as a way to try to reconcile those different needs and perspectives would be to take as working documents, as our reference documents, the documents on mapping of international Internet public policy issues. It is E/CN.16/2015/PRP2. I would ask the secretariat if that document could be posted on the screen so everyone can be sure which one I'm referring to.

To my understanding, these documents represent an attempt and I want to be very clear about the fact that it was an attempt that was not endorsed by the full plenary but an attempt to reflect and to present in a systematized way, in an organized way most of the ideas that were presented. I am full aware that

many portions of this document need to be updated, for example, with regards to the IANA transition with regard to SDG who have had another addition since then.

But my proposal would not to start from scratch, that maybe this could be a starting point to have on the table as a reference document for January.

I think that would allow us -- and I recall that Japan in initial presentation suggested that the second meeting could select those issues we want to focus on and then start working towards preparing the report.

I think in order to do it in an efficient way in January, we need to have before us a document that we spell out the issues, what are the areas of work. On that basis, we can make a decision to prioritize or not to prioritize. But on that list will have a scenario on which we can work.

Of course, that would need between now and January this document would need to be updated, would need to incorporate comments, input from us, and possibly from other participants.

But I think that that might be the best -- among all the documents that are before us, maybe this one to my view at least is one that could allow us to have that piece of document on which we could further elaborate. It doesn't mean that we are endorsing everything that is there. It doesn't mean that all the issues there would be addressed. It's just, let's say, an attempt to come to January with some reference document that could help us move along.

I also recall that I mentioned in the morning session the idea that in between now and January, if we can work around some high-principle document, that could also serve as a tool as we move along our exercise that would provide us with some general guidance on some principles of what it means to gather our work.

I would recall in that regard the drafting -- it has been mentioned enhanced cooperation is addressed not only in paragraph 69 and 71 but also in paragraph 70 of the Tunis Agenda.

And paragraph 70 says using relevant international organizations, such cooperation should include the development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination management of critical Internet resources. Of course, this here is framed in a very specific context. It refers to a context of the critical resources.

But I think the idea behind this is that having principles could help us. I think -- I'm not trying to use that paragraph to justify the idea for the documents on principle.

I think the spirit of the paragraph indicates that it's good to have principles on which we can work. I think this is an idea we could support if it is possible in parallel to the updating of the document on mapping, also to work around some principle points that could also help us through.

And again, and on the basis of what some of you have said, maybe you can have some early harvest, even for January, on the basis of recommendations that came from the previous group that were agreed

upon at that time, that are in a document that part of the document was agreed, part of the document was not agreed.

So maybe if we can revisit this in January and make sure that those things that we agreed upon as too valid, that could be some kind of early harvest, already some basis, some initial, very -- a seed for the report that we need to prepare by the end of our work.

So I would like to seek your views on those ideas. And again, the intent is to have before us in January some pieces of document that will allow us in a more systematic way, in a more pragmatic way, moving maybe away from rhetorical aspect but to try to focus on some areas of work, I think that might assist us in the course of next year's work.

So I would like to invite your comments and suggestions.

I see Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. A small comment. At this stage I agree that this is the most important document which is on the screen right now which we should take forward from the last WGIG. But it also appears to me that this area moves so fast that there has been -- and I can often think of a few very important issues which have happened after that time. It's been a year and a quarter.

I just remember two or three weeks back, the head of Ford Motor said that if somebody would have told me five years back that Ford is going to be into mass production of artificial intelligent driverless cars in three, four years, I would have thought it was a loony comment.

And so if -- if -- like artificial intelligence itself is a huge area, and I often take this bet with anyone whom I argue with, whether there are important public-policy issues related to the Internet or not. I say that, okay, let's take any international newspaper that we find. The next one, pick up and you would see at least one issue in it which actually touches a very core Internet public-policy issue.

So if the secretariat can come up with a small addendum on a couple of issues which have been very important, generally agreed that these are important issues over the last one year, that would be useful to add to that gap analysis.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S., and then Japan.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you very much for the proposal.

I think that we can all agree, and as some of the conversation that we had earlier in the day, that having something concrete to go through would be a helpful way forward.

We do think, however, that using the mapping exercise as a basis for discussion perhaps brings us into a -- brings us into a realm that would actually inadvertently make our work a little bit more difficult

because, from the outset of the work, we would be negotiating a text, and a very long text at that, which potentially -- which potentially might not be the best way to start and to bring this conversation forward.

With that in mind -- And, also, I worry about giving the secretariat a lot of work to do in advance, because if everyone submits, for example, track changes in the document about things they want to add or if we're asking the secretariat to pull together principles too far in advance, I think that we're really maybe pre- -- prejudging what this group may want to come out with; especially, as many noted, since this is a new working group with a lot of new expertise.

So we did consider -- you did make this proposal before lunch and we did have some time to discuss it very briefly in that time period, and a few of us from WEOG thought that a consensus was emerging this morning around a couple different topics. And so we came up with three questions that we would like to propose for the group to consider that these questions could perhaps be a guide for the next meeting as well as the topics for written inputs into the meeting. That -- That way, we are able to -- That way we are able to prepare in the way that you're speaking of, but also not necessarily work from an existing document.

So -- And we can copy and paste these questions into the chat, perhaps, but I'll just read them aloud now for discussion.

So the first question would be -- And again, this was meant to be based on the inputs of the group from this morning, so if there's something that we missed, of course we welcome that discussion.

So the first question would be taking into consideration the work of the previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, what kind of recommendation should we consider?

The second question is how can enhanced cooperation support sustainable development? Particularly since that was such a topic that many expressed support for.

And then the third is what are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? And we felt that that question gets to the concept of principles and others.

And so we think this could potentially set us up to have three different tracks to talk about at the second meeting and contribute to the solicitation of some rich inputs. And so we put that forward on behalf of those that we coordinated with during the lunch break for the group's consideration.

Thank you.

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

Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. As for your proposal for setting the work, the procedure, way we should go for the January meeting, we can agree that we should fully take into consideration the work of the previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

But also, at the same time, I also have some concern concerning the -- to start a discussion base, because that's really based on this mapping, this metrics, complicated metrics, and also many potential recommendations that was discussed at the last working group, and not agreed at the plenary level.

I agree, these recommendations were not approved because the content are controversial. And when we discuss that again here, maybe it will become another messy discussion and coming to -- that brings us nowhere.

Instead of just following -- following the previous mapping, my recommendation is I would like to go along with the U.S. proposal. That was -- that was just proposed, (indiscernible) proposed.

So I understand what was presented by the U.S. is maybe we should take into consideration the work of the previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, but it's not exactly the only input. Maybe it is maybe one of the input. And while considering and studying these documents, maybe we should invite all the -- all the members working group should present the secretariat by the end -- by the end of maybe this year some written comment concerning what kind of recommendations should we discuss here proposed by the U.S. as a first question.

And I -- something also I agree with the second question that was proposed by U.S. Second question is so how can enhanced cooperation support sustainable development? After hearing this morning's session, I heard many members talked about we should consider the relationship between the 2030 SDG goals and the work we are now doing now.

So this is a new approach, and it's a new issue that didn't exist two years ago. So maybe we should take into consideration this insight. How can enhanced cooperation support SDG?

And U.S. also presented a third question that is what can -- what are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? This question was raised by the U.K. this morning. The U.K. said that maybe as a start point for discussion, we should have some consensus concerning what kind of situation is enhanced cooperations. But -- And maybe without that common understanding, we can't -- the discussion can't go anywhere.

And I also heard intervention from (saying name) saying that maybe this is -- (indiscernible) should be discussed in parallel with other important questions.

So we can also go along with this third question raised by U.S. Maybe we should also, as a written input, mention about what are the characteristics of enhanced cooperation.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan. And just before moving to the other speakers, I take advantage of my position as chair just to speak a little bit on the proposal a little more.

I think this document on mapping of international Internet public-policy issues, I fully -- I'm fully aware that there are areas of the document that are highly controversial. But I think, I'm totally convinced that there is a very important part of the document that maybe would not be controversial (indiscernible)

refer to diagnosis of the explanation of what are the issues to be addressed by enhanced cooperation. I think if we could maybe agree that at least part of the document that refers to diagnosis, to the mapping, to the picture of what has taken place can be accepted, then we can bracket the areas in which there are recommendation.

I -- I see the document, that typically each section has a part of the text that refers to areas of ambiguity, unresolved issues, and possible gaps. I understand that anything under this is subject to controversy. So this would be, let's say, completely bracketed. But part of the document just explains what are the issues, just states what are the -- some of -- And I think I would be pained if we could -- if we would just take it out, completely off the table, because to achieve this, to come to this point, the previous working group worked months, received over 1,000 contributions, worked on that, refined that.

And of course, this final document has the positives, the diagnosis, the picture, but also some positives propositive (phonetic). So maybe if we could take the positives, the diagnosis, that will assist us in identify the issues, and in our meeting to come up to a point in which we can select what we want to address. I think that that might be helpful.

And I completely agree with Japan. I think the second question proposed by the U.S. is very much in line with something I said before; that any attempt to update documents that came from the previous working group should have a section that would try to make the link with the sustainable development goals and the 2030 agenda, which is something new and overarching efforts on the part of the international community. So I think that would be very much helpful.

And the third question, what are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation, also refer to that part of the discussion we have had, and you have rightly spelled out whether we should have that (indiscernible), try to come to some declarations or statement of (indiscernible) that should run in parallel. I think that refers -- It relates to the first question, what kind of recommendation mandate from the first. I think here we bring on board all the controversies. I don't see an added (indiscernible) in regard to the report itself. I may be wrong, but those are just initial comments. I would like to turn to other colleagues.

I have Richard Hill, Mr. Yokozawa, and Marilyn Cade on remote participation.

So Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chair. Actually, I agree with what the U.S. suggested and what Japan suggested, which I thought was very similar to what the U.S. said.

My view is that, much as the U.S. said, the mapping document is certainly an important element of our work to be considered, but I wouldn't use it as a basis, and certainly not at this stage try to red-line, to improve it. Maybe we'll come to that later, but it's much too early to say that. So that's simply an element to be considered.

I would like to see the simple proposals from the U.S. up on the screen here so we could actually wordsmith them.

As I heard them, I'm okay in principle. The second one, I think I'd like to enlarge it because as we said earlier, certainly the SDGs are important but we shouldn't, like, exclude other things. So I was thinking maybe the second one -- I don't see the text. Ah, yeah. How can enhanced cooperation support -- Yes. So I would edit that as how can enhanced cooperation support further development of the Internet for all. Further development of the Internet --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Put it in brackets.

>>RICHARD HILL: If you could put it in red marks, that would be better, so you keep the original and then we see possible revisions.

No. Go back to the original.

So further development of the Internet for all.

No. Further....

Okay. Comma, including, in particular, the sustainable development goals. So I'm not excluding the sustainable development goals. In fact, I'm highlighting them but I want to make it more general.

And could we see the first one?

Yeah, I'm okay with all three with that edit, assuming that other colleagues agree with the edit.

And I think it's understood these are not restrictive. So these are encouragements for us to contribute along those lines, but of course any member is free to contribute anything they wish. Then the group may say we don't want to look at it. That's a different problem. But from a procedural point of view, there's no restriction on the contributions. They will all be posted; they will all be on the agenda. And then the group can always say, well, we don't want to discuss this one now; we want to discuss it later.

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

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you, Chair. I am representing the Japanese business association, and I have experience to join the previous work of the mapping exercise in the WGEC 1. And my understanding is the proposed documents to review as homework as shown on the screen was a summarized version, and we should take -- go into the base -- the document base -- the database version of this mapping exercise as the spontaneous group as shown.

So I just wanted to highlight that the -- yes, I echo the U.S. and Japan, the intervention here, that the -- we should run from the previous work with. Not the ingredient of the study but the how we can do that. So how we could (indiscernible) that, so -- or maybe some -- we need some good resource to do this again. But just keep in mind.

And the other thing we might highlight is regarding the -- how we can propose the homework like we have just seen in the sentence, red-lined in the sentence.

And just bear in mind that the previous work of the mapping was mainly for the as-is based study, so -- and the -- on the contrary, the (indiscernible), there were several goal and SDG, the to-be mapping.

So this is something a little bit different to the -- maybe the methodology could be a little bit different.

So maybe to summarize, my comment is these two other documents are very good to just (indiscernible) how we have made this document -- made this information, but the part that we need to cultivate or to develop, what the idea, the methodology to feed the WGEC 2.0 that is a little bit different from the -- our work.

So keep in this mind and we can take into account the old documents.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. We're taking now Marilyn Cade, remote.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I think this is a really important discussion, and I say that because I probably need to take either the blame or the credit for suggesting originally that we undertake the mapping exercise.

I think we learned a lot from that, and I was very impressed by the work that we did.

I want to now say how important I think it is that we treat that as our background document. As others have said, we do not lose it. We also don't spend time on trying to make major changes to it.

I'm going to suggest that a side suggested change to Richard's edit because I think we need to take into account the importance of achieving the SGDs by 2030 very explicitly in the work we do on enhanced cooperation.

So my only suggestion on -- I make two suggestions. One, I would move that U.S. government suggestion of number 3, what are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation, I would make that the first topic. And then I would suggest a small change. I hope Richard will treat this as a formal -- a friendly amendment. On item 2, I would say how can enhanced cooperation support further development of the Internet for all and advance achieving of the SDGs by 2030. It's just a small change, but I think it recognizes two different issues related to why enhanced cooperation is important.

Every government in this meeting and every stakeholder in this meeting is very aware that we have not achieved broad affordable access for all citizens in their own countries, for all citizens of the world. So I think it's really important that we look at enhanced cooperation and say what are we doing and how are we making a difference?

I think that's why we're here and why we've all agreed to spend so many hours together. And I really welcome the U.S. government's suggestions with just a few edits.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Next on my list is Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, chair. Much as I support the chair's proposal that the document of public policy gap analysis is important, I'll take forward the proposal of the U.S., supported by Japan and others.

But before that, I would like to go back to into why did we go into public policy gap analysis. We always knew that enhanced cooperation is a mechanism for mandate. The mandate is to figure out 69 of Tunis Agenda says that there is a need for enhanced cooperation to enable governments on equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. And it was always about what kind of mechanism or process would allow them to fulfill that role. So enhanced cooperation is a mechanism-focused mandate.

However, the question then was: Is there any need for any such process and mechanism which takes us into a discussion: What kind of public policies are important and whether they're already been taken care or not. And that, as Marilyn said, that she suggested, and perhaps others who supported, doing analysis, first of all, to find out whether we do need a new mechanism or new kind of process at all or not. So we stepped back to look at what kind of public policy issues are not addressed or not being addressed adequately. And we did this big exercise.

Now, this exercise is very important for us to give insight into the fact that there are some issues on this debate. But it presented some kind of -- it is not important to actually, you know, agree on what are the issues and what is a strength. The importance of the issue goes back to whether there are some important issues that are not being addressed for which we need some sort of process or mechanism. The mandate was always to figure out, if so, what kind of mechanism or process it would be.

So in that sense, the public policy gap analysis, which is also an analysis of gaps in the institutional mechanisms associated with the public policy gap analysis remains important as a document to look at whenever we would reach this point and we would reach this point again and again that issues are being taken care of everywhere appropriately. So then we have to go back to the analysis document and show, no, there are important issues which are not being taken care of.

Having said that, that document, therefore, should be on the table as an important document. But I'm agreeable to go by the three points which you had listed.

And Marilyn anticipated the main point which I wanted to say which was to move three to one which was something which U.K. also suggested in the morning that we have to do at least some discussion on what is it that we are trying to do here, what kind of -- what is that we look at when we say "enhanced cooperation."

And the current point one is what Russia opened their -- the comment in the morning was that we need to at this stage starting a long process and massage what kind of recommendations and what is the outcome we are going to produce among our different minds. What is it that we associate is the kind of thing we would finally come out with? And work backwards from. That's point one now which should become point two.

Three should be one. And one should be two. And as I said in the morning, I do think the point on SDGs is very important, but it's obviously secondary to the larger structural issues which are society-wide which would be covered by the new one and two. And the SDG point should be the third subsidiary point as a subset of these points.

And I think that kind of discussion should be important but keep the public policy gap analysis paper on the table as an important reference because we would be stuck again and again to the point that are there any issues, what kind of issues are we talking about, what kind of analysis -- what kind of institutional gaps are in this thing and we would have to go back to that paper for that purpose. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Point of order for Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry, chairman. But Marilyn made a suggestion. And it should be on the screen. We should treat everybody equally. So I would like to see regarding point two, she also suggested the order. I'm less than thrilled about that. But she had actual text which was different for point two. If secretariat doesn't have it, Marilyn can dictate it again.

You're right. I'm sorry. I apologize.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Before moving to the next speakers on the basis, I'm prepared to propose that we change the order of paragraphs for colleagues to consider. So three would become one. Yeah, I think that's the right order right now. And we keep paragraph three, the alternative language. I think that might reflect better the feeling of the room on how those three questions should be -- U.S., you as a proponent, would you like to comment on that?

>>UNITED STATES: Sure. We're very flexible, I think, in the order. We also just wanted to make one other point of clarification about the proposal. It seems that some have interpreted the proposal to mean that we are trying to take the mapping exercise completely off the table, and that was not our intention.

Rather, the question that was formerly the first question but now is the second question, it's what we meant when we said "taking into consideration the work of the previous." We included the exercise as part of that question. And so we didn't intend to take it off the table completely. It would be considered as part of that second question for others to consider, to consider as part of -- in their answers. Just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have Mexico next on my list and then Russian Federation. Mexico, please.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, chair. As a proposal to work on the document of the mapping, we could be flexible and we could support this. We believe this is a concrete document including clusters of issues of interest for member states.

Having in mind the concerns regarding the update of the document that is required, we suggest maybe the possibility to choose the relevant elements or issues and work on them. And maybe we could start working on drafting a list of issues to focus the work of this working group.

We are of the view that having (inaudible) 2030 ODS is important and could contribute to our work as these will establish a general and comprehensive framework for action that has already been agreed by all U.N. member states.

We believe that the working group could identify the relevant elements of the 2030 ODS to enrich, guide, and focus the debates of the group.

Regarding the Internet governance on principles, our preference is to work on already-agreed documents as the WSIS+10 outcome and, of course, the 2030 agenda, having in mind we see some interrelation between both documents. Thank you, chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Actually, thank you. Parminder, you said actually what we wanted to say before. That there are some points -- all points are important. And sustainable development goal is a very important issue. However, it's a very broad issue and has a lot of aspects. In order to be successful, we in the working group, we have to be more focused to decide on what's in our mandate because we need to consider what should be must-do things and what are good-to-have things. And based on that, we need to make some prioritization. And what is actually included into the mandate should be in our must-do things. And that's why we think that either -- SDG is important, but it should have lower priority and will come to the list if we are successful in major stuff.

And, also, before we go to what is must-do list is Tunis Agenda 99 -- 69, sorry, 70, 71. That's why we propose such cooperation, how can enhanced cooperation support the development of global applicable principles on public policy issues. This is actually from Item 70 of Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I had this point before questions and any other topic related that is there for your consideration. Next on my list are Nick and Anriette remote. Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thanks very much. In brief, I would say I think what is now point one, I regrettably agree with you, chairman, that this is a recipe for us finding what we disagree about rather than what we agree about. Whereas, Item 2 to me seems like a recipe for coming up with at least some core elements about which we actually agree.

And with respect to the priority of the SDGs, I'm quite sure, especially given the scope of the SDGs, that looking at the mandate of this group through the lens of what delivers development is not only possible but really there is no other purpose to public policy than the benefit of people. There is no purpose to cooperation between governments other than the benefit of people. We're not here to cooperate for the sake of cooperation. Governments don't exist for the sake of existing. They exist to serve the people.

And so I -- I think that it's entirely possible to execute on the objectives of the working group. And to do that whilst looking at how those objectives meet the needs of people.

With respect to point four, this also seems to me while I'm sure fascinating and interesting another way to find the many things we don't agree about. So I would just say I think we should try and focus on the things which are likely to bring out points of common agreement rather than the things which are likely to bring out the opposite because, as we all know, the things that bring out points of disagreement then consume all of the time if you chase agreement. And that doesn't seem like the right place to start anyway. At least if we start with something that is more likely to bring agreement, we may then have some deliverables around which we can then say, okay, now let's tackle some of the more broad issues and see if we can make some progress on them. But we will certainly have something in advance of starting down that path. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you very much, Benedicto, and congratulations to you. I hope we don't make you (indiscernible), taking on this role.

And thank you to Peter and the secretariat for the work that's done to bring us to this point. And I'm sorry I can't be with you.

So just a few general comments. It's the first opportunity I've had to speak today.

I agree that we should use the work of the previous working group, but I would suggest that we use it as a reference and as a resource. I think it's also important that we make a fresh start with the working group.

And I prefer that we have vice chairs, or one or more. I do think it's a good practice and could be helpful to the chair.

And now to the approach. I like the idea of the WEOG proposal, but I would see it in the context of a staged approach, and I don't think that those plans as they're outlined need to be the sum of our work, but I think it's a good way of framing our first phase.

(Indiscernible) modifications, although I'm a little bit concerned. I kind of liked the open and general nature of how can enhanced cooperation support sustainable development. I think if we make it too narrow, it might not be a broad enough discussion. And it might be worth the reordering. But I would stick to the (indiscernible) three points for the first phase.

I think as a second phase to our work, I might build on Parminder's, suggestion, which is to look at specific topics -- sorry, I just almost put my camera on -- and I think that mapping on a specific topic, looking at where the gap is, looking at mechanisms to deal with that topic, would be a good way of concretizing our work after the first phase.

And you could (indiscernible) the proposed point 4 into the second phase. I wouldn't add it to the first phase.

In the final phase, (indiscernible) our recommendation, so that's really what I would suggest, that we (garbled audio).

I think a phased approach makes sense.

And then (garbled audio) is there any plan to consult, to invite (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: We can't hear you well. I think we lost your last sentences.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Should I repeat the last sentence?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, yes, please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Last sentence was a question. Whether, as a working group, there would be any engagement or consultation with the broader Internet governance community, with the (indiscernible) community and even more broader than that? And specifically the IGF in Mexico which is coming up. Are we planning to have any consultation, a forum or a meeting to use that opportunity to tell people about our work, but also to get some input? Or is that not part of the plan?

Just (indiscernible) to give consideration to how, as a working group, we interact and how we communicate our work and get input from the wider community.

And that was all. I hope you heard that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

No, absolutely. Thank you. Thank you, Anriette.

And maybe I'll just briefly touch on this. My intention was to have the sense of the room where -- what input and what kind of material we would like -- we would agree to prepare for next meeting in January. And on that basis, also decide upon a process for why the consultation.

For example, I think if we agree on a set of questions, it needs to be appropriate for -- allow also people outside of the room from the wider community to come and to bring input. So that would be further taken up by the group.

My concern is at this point, I think we are running out of time very quickly. Initially, we were planning for 5:30. I would suggest if we could extend until 6:00 p.m., which is, I think, the ordinary UN working time. I would like to have your indulgence in this. We have a number of speakers. I want to hear, and then we would like to propose -- to make a proposal, taking also into account any burden or any work would be requested from the secretariat. I think it would be very important in the light of the limited resources that are available for the group or nonexisting resources, I think it would be important that

anything that we assess which is necessary is commensurate with the part of secretariat to deliver for January.

But -- Yes, yes, please. I was asking, but please.

>>SHAMIKA SIRIMANNE: Thank you, Chair. On that account. Newly provisioned, to come and let you know that we are under tremendous resource constraints. Basically it is run by Dong, and I have basically borrowed staff from other parts of the division to do just this meeting.

On this account, I'd like to thank Switzerland, Finland, and U.S. that you provided funds for us earlier for the last working group.

And I think Switzerland and Finland also supported by having a person with us to carry on this work, and plus the -- plus the funds to bring consultants together. Because if we -- if the secretariat is given to do some substantive work, we need very good people who understand the matter working with us.

At the moment, we do not have this ability, but, however, if you -- if you intend to go through these three questions and you answer the three questions, I mean, of course we can compile these things and bring it to the -- bring it to the January meeting. I mean, we can put them on the Web, but this is unfortunately all we can do. We cannot synthesize. We cannot analyze. We cannot do any gap analysis based on this big report, this big mapping exercise. So please do understand our, you know, concerns. And in this regard it would be very good for you to also consider supporting this work and supporting the secretariat to carry on with this extremely important work.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Pakistan, Richard Hill, Cuba, Iran, U.K., and Marilyn Cade remote, and Parminder. And I'm closing the list after that. So Parminder will be the last speaker. And then I'll make some comments and a proposal on our way forward, and we'll take it from there.

So first I'll call Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador. I just need clarity here. Are we negotiating this document that is on the screen? Because I'm really confused because there was a proposal, very good proposal, from the U.S., and then there were some counter-proposal and things were added up to it.

Currently, where does it stand? It's not clear to me.

If this is the case, that maybe we already moving in a direction where we can synthesize many of the elements for our future consideration. If this is the case, then probably we will also have a few proposals which are at the very base of our work. And one is mentioned by Russian Federation, and I think it's important, but I think even more important is the one which is mentioned in para 69 of the Tunis Agenda. And I don't know, maybe we can just have it as it is or in a language that is more suitable for our document here which is apparently being negotiated or being filled up, but it's like on the need for enhanced cooperation, how -- We can word it differently. How enhanced cooperation enable

governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public-policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

And of course we can continue with the rest of the paragraph as it stands in Tunis Agenda.

And of course we then have the few modalities that are mentioned, 71.

So my basic concern remains the same, what we are doing with this document. But if the intention -- and I think it's welcome thing that we are already moving in something where we can see how to -- to move different elements in different direction. And of course we will base our future work on those issues.

If this is the presumption, then probably we need to look at in a more concrete way.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. And just to reply to your question, my understanding is that the items proposed by the U.S. had very -- from what I heard, very broad acceptance. So in a way, there was an attempt to refine the language, basically what is proposed for now, which then is question one. It will not change. In regard to three, there was some change, but it does not change the meaning or the spirit of the question.

And then Russian Federation proposed another question, now you're proposing.

So I don't -- I wouldn't -- I would be (indiscernible) in a negotiating mood, but we are trying to collect ideas that would serve our meeting in January to have answers to those questions. And to my understanding, (indiscernible) have been working on very consensus base, so why -- I haven't seen anyone objecting to any of these elements, so that's why I'm entertaining these, for the moment, could be taken up for consultation and for the basis of our work in January.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: First, a minor editorial point. I think Pakistan pointed out that their text is 69, I think you said. So it should be reflected there, Tunis Agenda 69.

With respect to 2, I fully support the reformulation from Marilyn. So if nobody objects, you can, in fact, delete the brackets in the end, including "in particular," which was my suggestion. So I like it the way Marilyn had it.

To Nick's point, one and obviously four and five will open discussions where it may be difficult to find consensus. That may or may not be true, but the point is we already agreed that to the extent we don't find consensus, we'll capture differing views, so that will not block our work.

At some point, Chairman, you'll say, look, obviously there are different points of view here, let's capture them and move on. So I don't have a problem with that.

So I'm supporting, again, U.S.'s proposal one, two and three.

Four and five appear to me to simply be embedded in one, because as soon as you say enhanced cooperation, you're going to refer back to the Tunis Agenda and then you're going to find that language.

So I would suggest that if we want to keep those, and I would suggest we do keep them because they are useful references, simply copy/paste four and five at the back of one. So one becomes that sentence, and then the two other sentences with the reference to Tunis Agenda. That would be my suggestion. Otherwise, you can leave them there. That's fine for me to leave them as they are. And I think we can work on all of this in parallel. Obviously, we're not going to finish it in one meeting, but I think we'll get a very good overview of what are the key things to look at if we start with these three main things.

And, no, I wouldn't suggest that we put these out at this stage on the website for public comment, et cetera, but I am suggesting that all of our inputs as members to these -- to these topics and any other topic be on the public website, and then also we create a space for public comments so people can react to what we're putting up as members.

That was my proposal.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

I think one point we may wish to consider when we request input from outside people, outside of the group, you mentioned the idea that they should comment on our comments, but maybe they should comment on the questions themselves, not on our (indiscernible).

Cuba, please.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Well, to be brief, we support the proposals made by different delegations. We believe question four and five as they are coming from the original mandate of this current working group and the previous one should be at the top of the page.

We also would like to insert another question, maybe at the end, related -- well, I will read it: How enhanced cooperation can ensure a safe and secure Internet.

Thank you. Again, we support the different proposals that have been made.

Just one clarification. We would like to begin the discussion from the perspective of Tunis Agenda, and then we move forward on the discussion of the advancement or the achievement of SDGs. We would prefer not to frame the question only on the implementation of this other fora. Of course we support it, and we are fully committed with the agenda.

Just take into account that we are talking on SDGs and the agenda 2030, is the whole issue.

So those are our comments.

Thank you.

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

I would only suggest maybe at this point in the light of the time restriction that we should not be too much concerned with the order of the questions. Let's just make sure we have on board all the points that are relevant, and then you -- if time allows, we can have a discussion. Otherwise, I'd like to request your authorization to allow the secretariat to put together. And anyway, we can make sure to say that there is no hierarchy between the questions. Those are inputs that the group find available.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one of the important issues that we have discussed in the previous sessions and also it's reflected in the resolution 70/125 and also in the Tunisia -- Tunisia Agenda, is the digital divide. And just my question is that this item -- these four items that are suggested by the delegation, six right now, six items, which of them is cover this input on issue? Because without the bridging the digital divide, how could we support the SDGs to operationalize the implementation of the SDGs?

If it's offered; if not, I suggest to add another item to the suggestion that how the working group is considering bridging digital divides.

And another thing, we had challenges and also opportunities in the previous discussions in the Commission and also in the working group. I think we should also consider these challenges and the opportunities for other discussions in the future to -- for reflecting in the finalized report.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon.

We support this approach. We think it's useful to have a small number of questions as a simple guide for our next meeting. That's all we're discussing here, I think. Of course it's open to all members of the group to respond as they wish, and it's open to any member of the group to bring any issue that they wish to this group, but we think it's helpful to have a kind of guide for the next meeting.

And the three questions that were originally proposed we think genuinely reflect the discussion that we had this morning, from listening to the different views. We thought those three questions broadly reflected the points that were made.

We are a bit worried now, however, if we are going to keep adding lots and lots of new questions going into more detail. We think there's a danger here we're going to start negotiating lots of questions. I could come up with a list of five or six questions that the U.K. would like to see here, but others may not

agree with us. So we think perhaps we shouldn't start writing lots and lots of questions, but maybe just take the three broad questions that were first suggested as a guide for our next meeting.

We do take the point made by Russia that we need to bear in mind the mandate that we have from Tunis, that we would like to suggest one amendment to question two. That we would say: Taking into consideration the work of the previous WGEC and the mandate in the Tunis Agenda, comma.

We think that captures the whole of the mandate in the Tunis Agenda. We don't need to start picking out individual paragraphs. It's quite right we should be reminded of that, but let's not pick out individual paragraphs. And let's not try to create a shopping list here where we all throw in our favorite issues, because we could be here for a very long time doing that.

We would suggest we don't need four, five, six or seven. If members of the group want to talk about those things, it's covered under the second question, which is a very broad question for any member here to come forward with suggestions for what we need to consider. Any -- Any suggestion for what kind of recommendations can come under question two. So we would suggest, given the time of day, we just stick with the first questions, one, two, and three, with that amendment to take account of Russia's point on the Tunis Agenda.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA:

Thank you, U.K. And I think we have some alternative on how to deal with this particular issue.

At this point, I would suggest that we should consult with the proponents of the questions to see if they would see their consent appropriately with your amendment. If this is the case, we can quickly get rid of four and five. Otherwise, I would suggest those should be retained.

I think at this point, we do not have a huge number of questions. I think it is quite manageable, but I agree with you. If we can have even a smaller step of three or four, that would help us.

So I would turn to Russian Federation, actually also you've got the floor, and then that proposed question number four, and then back on the proposed question number five to see if you agree that your concerns are already taken on board.

So Russian Federation first, and then Pakistan.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We have the comments regarding U.K. statement regarding the mandate because mandate for these working groups is not related to the Tunis Agenda. It's related to UNGA resolution 70/125, Item 65. And actually there is the chapter on enhanced cooperation, Item 64 and 65. So 64 is actually the strict -- how to say -- relation of the item of enhanced cooperation to Tunis Agenda included into 69, 70, 71. That's why I we think we need to focus on this because it's included into the resolution. And Item 65 is related to the mandate of the working group. Just we need to correct it. Mandate in the Tunis Agenda does not correlate with reality.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Actually, I DO agree with the colleague from the U.K. that we should not go into those issues which are not directly related to enhanced cooperation. And, of course, this is something that needs further deliberations because that was what we were discussing in the morning, what is enhanced cooperation and what areas does it cover and things like this.

But I think the proposal that was made by Pakistan earlier on is something that no one would say is not included in that. So taking intervention from U.K., we can rephrase it, even in para two.

So maybe if you are -- sorry, I couldn't name you. Maybe, secretariat, if you can write it in a different para, we can say taking into consideration the work of previous WGEC, Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, what kind of recommendation should we consider, what kind of recommendation should we consider, and then we include very shortly these two basic elements from 69 and 70, that is, to enable governments. And then maybe we can -- we can remove different nuances that are there, like, on day-to-day technical operation matters and things that are mentioned in 69. But we can say as you already envisaged, we can say to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. This is one thing.

And in 70, that is how such cooperation should include -- maybe we can take them in two bullets then, one para but then again two bullets, short bullets, the one that is in para 70 of Tunis Agenda as proposed by Russian Federation.

So from my side, we can do it this way as well. We need not have a separate para. But this is important element actually. This is what is enhanced cooperation -- what enhanced cooperation is about. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. I'm really not sure where we stand at this point. I would maybe suggest that we could revert to the previous wording. I think those were -- I think even if there is some overlap or some repetition but to the extent that it is aligned with the language -- I don't see -- I'm concerned about the time we have to conclude this.

I would be (inaudible) if we could not at the end of the meeting, we could not agree on a set of questions we want to propose.

So I'll hear other comments about my suggestions. My preference would be to refer to the five questions we had before (indiscernible). This was the suggestion of the U.K. And then I think what made sense but would be a long discussion I don't think we have time for at this meeting.

I would suggest that, but I would listen first to the speakers on my list: Marilyn Cade, Parminder, the U.S., Nigel, Russia, Jimson. And I think we should close the list at this point.

So Marilyn Cade, first, remote participation. No? I hear she may have left us.

So, Parminder, please, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, chair. Can you please move the document to its top.

The issue is the first two, right now we were trying to make categories of how we would do our work. But now increasingly we have got into doing our work. The first two were really about just roughly charting out the areas in which we can go and that would have been non-controversial because they are just topics. What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? And then that was a subject of discussion rather than elaboration in this document.

And, second, what kind of recommendations we can consider. We were kind of distributing our work in these channels.

Now, what had happened -- that actually comes from the problem with question three which was original that it added a very specific element of sustainable development to these general directions. And because in my view -- because of that, then there are other additions which are very specific.

Not to mix the issue of isn't everything then of public's benefit, development is not synonymous with people's benefit. Development is a historically situated set of conditions and processes which is a subset of public welfare. And the public welfare or public benefit is much larger. There's no doubt all public policies are supposed to only address public welfare. But development policies do not exhaust public policies. So that is a subset. My organization works only for development, and I thought I should make that clear while we insist development takes priority but we also know the structural conditions of legal frameworks, democracy, working markets, all this frame what development can be.

So, yes, sustainable development is a smaller subset of public policies. And, therefore, when we put that kind of question on, people will talk about security. People will talk about other important issues. And that's why we have started to discuss our important perceptions of what should be the characteristics and outcomes of enhanced cooperation.

So I think one and two are the general directions in which we work. But I'm still happy to go by a list which I think the chair prefers at this point. But I thought I should point to this being the cause of confusion on the screen right now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Could we -- I think we are really having some confusion on the screen. Can we get rid of this language in paragraph three in blue. Thank you.

Next on my list is Nigel from ICANN.

>>ICANN: Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be quite brief, as I know you are trying to wrap up this.

Just a few points. I mean, first of all, we are really going into substance here which is -- which is good in one sense. But perhaps there might be people remote or in other areas, members of this working group that didn't think we would be going into such detail and we would have contributions to make. I suspect you understand that as well. And we might want to reflect on some of this.

I think having three questions is about right. And obviously we have to frame them, and I think what Parminder was saying was very useful in this respect and what other people have said earlier. We need to frame them in a sense that they're understandable to encompass the mandate that we've been given. And I think a link to the sustainable development agenda is quite opportune in this relationship.

On the mapping exercise, I think that -- and appreciating the resources of the secretariat, it certainly shouldn't be there -- their sort of responsibility or something they have to do. But at the end of the day, we had a piece of work that was tremendously useful. If we look at that piece of work -- and I'm as guilty as others perhaps of not looking at it recently -- if something leaps out at us and we say, That gap has been filled by X or Y, then surely we should bring that to the attention of this group because that's another element in this jigsaw as Parminder and others were sort of articulating earlier.

And, finally, to pick up Anriette's excellent suggestion of these -- articulating some of this at the IGF, I'm not quite sure how we do it but we can give some thought to it. Because I think this work is so important that it might be that -- well, I'm sure that others will have good ideas. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel.

Next on my list is Jimson Olufuye, remote.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: I very much would like... (silence).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think we -- No, no, we can hear you. Well? I will --

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: (inaudible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: And then we will come back to you.

I will turn to Mr. Hill. And we try to fix the question regarding the system.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, chair. I think I had too much Scotch last night because having consistently supported the U.S, now I'm even going to support the United Kingdom and, of course, also my colleague Parminder. I think if we put two in the right language, then we don't need four, five, six, et cetera. And I do agree with the edits suggested by Russia. So I would say two would read, if the U.K. agrees, of course, taking into consideration the work of the previous WGEC and the Tunis Agenda, so simply "and the Tunis Agenda," what kind of recommendations should we consider?

And then automatically people can pick and choose their favorite bits of the Tunis Agenda. And as others and you yourself, chairman, have pointed out, I think we don't want to do that here because everybody has their favorite bits of the Tunis Agenda and then we get into a negotiation. And I have been in many of those negotiations which in the end, the solution was refer to the whole thing because nobody could agree to a favorite one bit over another bit. It was a balanced document, a careful negotiation, and just refer to the whole thing.

And as you pointed out, chair, if we try to copy/paste bits of the Tunis Agenda, we enter into a whole renegotiation, especially if we only take some parts of some things, et cetera. So I'm assuming I have understood the U.K.'s intent. And if so, I think that if we do that, we're off the hook and we can stop with one, two and three.

Thank you, Mr. chairman.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, chair. I think we are, again, pretty flexible on the language, but I did want to clarify one point. I think that part of the impetus it sounds like for the proposals particularly in four, five, and six, and the desire to include the reference to the Tunis Agenda, which we don't object to, it seems that there might be a little bit of a misunderstanding about what these questions -- the intent behind the questions. We -- we're putting forward -- we put forward these questions, again, just to scope the next meeting. It's not meant to -- it's not meant to serve as the roadmap for the rest of the working group. It's just for this next meeting.

Paragraph 69 through 71 are the entire mandate of the group. That is what we're going to be spending the next year plus talking about. And so to us, these other questions are fundamental questions that we will be getting to. But we think that by trying to focus on everything at the next meeting, we're afraid that in the end we'll come up with nothing.

And so the reason why -- because I think that the third question about sustainable development is actually causing more confusion than we intended. The intent was not to have -- only talk about enhanced cooperation in the context of sustainable development but rather we think sustainable development is one issue that we may be able to find some common agreements about, some areas of cooperation that do enhance sustainable development that we can then pick out and apply to other public policy issues that this group is tasked to discuss.

And so that was -- that was the reason for that particular proposal. But it's not to say that we'll never get to any of these other questions down the road.

With that said, we can support the proposal by -- that Richard Hill just made regarding the reference to the Tunis Agenda if that's more acceptable to our colleagues from Russia and Pakistan, for example. But we do think that adding -- we don't support questions 4 through 7 at this point because, again, we think that we will get there, but we think that we may be inadvertently re-creating the questionnaire from last time or other sorts of things by bringing everything into the next meeting. So our preference would be to stick with the three questions, you know, with the amendments and then trying to again just move forward for this next meeting. And then at the next meeting, discussing how we might be able to address some of these broader issues. Thank you.

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

Belarus will be the last speaker on this, and then I will make a comment.

>> BELARUS: Thank you so much, chair. Good evening -- good afternoon, everyone. I have a small proposal regarding para two as looks like right now. In my opinion, it is still too broad and it doesn't reflect fully what has meant in para 4-7. So I think we should put it like -- in para 69, 70 of the Tunis Agenda, to put in para two. Just underline which paras are important in the discussion in this working group. Question number two.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Thank you.

We need to break between 6:00 and 6:15 in case we need to extend in order to record the meeting. But just before --

(Background noise).

-- I think one of the difficulties around this exercise -- (background noise) -- and we have been through it many, many times, is that sometimes we get stuck in some kind of discussions that we know will not be solved easily.

And the discussion will be endless. (background noise). Sometimes I think less is more. And since we are looking for input, we are not here negotiating the outcome. We are not negotiating anything. We are just trying to elicit some inputs for our further work.

My proposal would be the following: That we should take question number one as it is: What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation? It would be very broad. It would be an umbrella for many comments.

In regard to the second question, I would suggest that we take into consideration the work of the previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation and the Tunis Agenda. What kind of recommendation should we consider? I think by doing this, we are not getting rid of the concern expressed in paragraphs four and five. We are allowing room for any comments with regard to those steps. But I would be very reluctant to engage in selection of paragraphs. We did this in WSIS+10. We had one week meeting October, one week meeting November, and one and a half meeting in December. So we will not do it in five or ten minutes here.

And the third question I would suggest that we should say: How can enhanced cooperation support further development of the Internet for all and advance achieving SDGs by 2030?

I think this, when we refer to support further development of the Internet for all, the notion that was brought by Iran is already there. The digital divide is there because we are -- the development and the linking to the SDGs, I think that was part of your question. For me, it provides room for (indiscernible) regard to that. I would be very comfortable as representative of a developing country to see any concerns represented there.

And question number six I think proposed by Cuba, I think it is already there when we refer to -- to the third -- to the three questions in conjunction, because the issue around cybersecurity, security, is one of

the issues that is also stated in the Internet; that is in enhanced cooperation in Tunis Agenda. So we are not losing sight of this.

So this would be my proposal that we take those three questions. Those -- And again, sometimes I think less is more. If we can agree to that, at least we have conditions to ask for inputs that will help us through, and we'll have something more concrete, in addition to the documents we have -- in addition to the documents we have coming from the first Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

I'm making those comments because I felt a strong support for the proposal by the U.S., and I take on board the comments that the intention is not to lose anything that was done before. But again, I think some of those documents, maybe we could also have on the table when we meet in January. I'm really convinced that the work that was behind the report on mapping, at least the controversial part is not something we should lose sight. I'm also convinced we should not lose sight of the recommendations that have been agreed before. We should have a look at them and, as Japan said, we're not going to start negotiating things that were not agreed. But those that were agreed I think should also be on the table on January when we meet again.

So this is my suggestion for you for an overall set of things that could be -- have a prioritized focus in January.

I think your views -- We can continue -- in case we continue, we should make a break -- or we can have agreement.

I have Iran and I have Pakistan.

Iran? Or Pakistan?

Who requested floor? Please.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Ambassador. In the spirit of moving forward, and in the spirit of being in Friday evening, I think we need to clear it.

My proposal would be -- since there is a proposal from the U.K. and you have already proposed something, and taking also a cue from our colleague from Belarus, maybe we can do one thing as follows. We keep question number one as it is. Para 2, we insert paragraphs 69 to 71 of Tunis Agenda.

So before "Tunis Agenda," we refer to these three paras which are the basis of all whole work and then we delete all the rest of paras starting from 3 to 7. This is my proposal.

Because what I think, if all of the issues that are -- I can repeat. I can repeat.

So para -- Para one should be there as it is. Para two, everything as it is, but just before "Tunis Agenda," you refer paragraphs -- as per paragraphs 69 to 71, so it is clear we are talking about very specifically on these paragraphs of Tunis Agenda.

And then we delete all other paras from three to seven. Because if we are saying that the rest of the things are somehow being covered in these two questions, I think this would also be covered that if we have to -- if we were to have any discussion on SDGs, we can have it in the elements in the question number one.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I was going to ask you why delete three? Because I think three was the idea we were trying to reflect that we need to -- in a way, try to reflect in our work that SDG is something new, something that is framing or you are work. It is something that was not there automatically before.

You don't agree. Okay.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Sorry. Sorry.

Thank you for your suggestion.

I support, Mr. Chairman, your suggestion, but I think digital divide is important issue, and we have -- we have discussed in the previous sessions, in the Commission and also in the working group, and also is reflected in the resolution in the Tunis Agenda.

We cannot disregard this issue in our negotiation in the framework of the working group.

As we discuss this issue, how we could consider the implementation of SGD, and how we could consider the divide, the digital divide between and within the countries.

I think if at this stage the member of the group has no readiness to discuss about this suggestion, we could consider as a suggestion for the next meeting, but not delete the suggestion at this. If you are going to re-open again the topics in the next meeting, okay, there's no problem. But the deletion of the suggestion I think I cannot, you know, go along with the group, because I believe that this is a very important issue that we have discussed in the past.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I couldn't agree more with you that it is an important issue. Being national from Brazil, I would never take out the digital divide discussion outside the table. But as I read question number three, how can enhanced cooperation support further development of the Internet for all and advance achieving of the SDG, I'm convinced that the concern is there, is encompassed there. And this is in line with your first intervention in which you asked was there input there. And my personal opinion is that it is there.

I think at this point, I would -- I see we are losing people, so I'm concerned about -- I think we were asked by our technical support to make a quick stop. I think they can resume by 6:15, which will be five

minutes. So I suggest to make this very short break and we'll try to finalize as we go. To come back by 6:15 for those who can.

Thank you.

(Brief break)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would suggest we resume.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, this is Marilyn. I would like to make a comment before we begin.

(Conversations off microphone)

>>MARILYN CADE: Actually, Chair, my comment --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd like to suggest that we could look into some way out of the discussion we have had. I had some discussions with some of you, unfortunately not all of you, and I apologize for that, but I think there is some emerging way forward I'd like to test with the wider group to see if that could address our concern.

So the proposal is the following there will be -- Yes, please. I need to see the question. The actual -- Yes.

So question number one would read: What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation?

So that would be one of the questions we'll be asking for inputs.

The second question would be: Taking into consideration the work of the previous Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation and the Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraph 69 to 71, what kind of recommendations should we consider?

In the previous Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraphs 69 to 71. And then we delete. What kind of recommendation should we consider?

There, in regard to question number three, there was -- there is very firm, strong objection to include this question. And the question there to be submitted, and I think for the sake of transparency, there is a concern that this would deviate in a way our main task. But on the other hand, what is being proposed, and this is for your consideration, that, first of all, that nothing would impede comments in regard to SDGs when asked or other outside participants would comment on questions one and two. And in my summary of this meeting, I would be explicit and mention that that link was, indeed, one of the issues that we're discussing of emphasis in this meeting. And also I would add the issue regarding the bridging of the digital divide in that context.

So number -- question number three would be deleted.

Number four is already addressed in number two. Number five as well.

Number six would also be deleted, with the understanding this is already encompassed up. And number seven.

So we would stipulate those two questions as those that are agreed by consensus by the group. And those ideas, including those contained in question six proposed by Cuba and, as I said before, will be part of my summary and I'll be explicit. It is a document that will simply -- it will not have the same (indiscernible) as those two questions that will be submitted for and the answers to which will constitute the basis of our work. But this is what have emerged from those discussions, and I submit for your consideration.

If that is the case, then the secretariat will make sure it will be posted.

And I'd like to also be educated on how -- because I understand there is part of the site that will be restricted to participants of the group and part of the site will be -- if you could maybe explain a little bit how it will operate in practice in regard to those two questions. That will be part of the input to be considering in January.

>> So if I understand it correctly, the intention is to post this on the Internet and invite inputs -- Is it from everyone in the world or just members of the work group? Because knowing that would help us --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. We are seeking input from the wider community, but I understood there would be separate tracks to deal with the input coming from the members and input coming from outside. Just to make sure the secretariat will provide that separation of --

>> Yeah. I think we can do that, yeah.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: And I understand from Rita that maybe there will be resources that allow members to interact or -- Yes, please, on the basis of (indiscernible).

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. So my proposal is that all of the submissions from the -- of the members to the group would also be public. So we have two websites, both of which are fully publicly accessible. One, we have all the public comments. One you have the public comments from us. And then we have our mailing lists. And I have no problem if the mailing list is made public but I also have no problem if the mailing list is not paid public. Either way, I would prefer the mailing list be public, but that's not essential as far as I'm concerned. What is essential is the submissions to the group be public.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Kenya.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, at least you have summarized the questions into two main ones, but just a very short inquiry. Maybe my understanding might be wrong on number one. What would we be referring to when we say "high-level characteristics"? What is a high-level aspect of that part of the question?

Are we just talking of what are characteristics of enhanced cooperation or are we talking of separating the specific level and high level? What would it be? Just for my benefit, maybe.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I turn to the proponent and those who have supported it.

I didn't intervene at the time, but maybe it should be better if what are the high-level principles that should guide enhanced cooperation. But I defer to the proponent and supporters.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the question. I think we spent so much time thinking about the rest of the questions that we didn't necessarily have a very full conversation about the first one.

The idea behind saying "high-level characteristics" is to note that -- you know, we didn't want to get into too many details about this. We thought that perhaps there were some characteristics that could be identified that were -- that, you know -- that were not -- that didn't necessarily get into the weeds of every single way that enhanced cooperation could be applied, but, rather, there were certain characteristics of enhanced cooperation that could be identified.

We prefer the term -- I think that we're flexible about high level, but we prefer the term "characteristics" over "principles" because we do think those mean different things.

But I do think, you know, we're a little worried about opening it up again at this hour, given, you know, we are trying to get out of here. And so our plea to the group would really just be to stick with the EC, what the inputs are, and if there's need to refine for the following meeting, let's do that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have remote participation Juan Fernandez from Cuba. I will give you the floor. Juan, please.

>>JUAN FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Can you hear me well, Benedicto?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>JUAN FERNANDEZ: Do you have audio? Do you hear me well?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, yes. Go on.

>>JUAN FERNANDEZ: Congratulations for being selected the chair. Greetings to all my colleagues. I'm sorry not to be there physically, but I have been following the discussions.

I want to say that I agree with you when you tried to go to specifics in order to try to advance the discussions because we fear the possibility of going full circle back to 2005 and beginning with what Tunis Agenda said about enhanced cooperation. I think that in some time this group will have to go to specifics of what public policies we're talking about in which we need to enhance the cooperation.

I think somebody made those proposals through the way. And I think that beyond what is written in the Tunis Agenda in these ten years, the technology has advanced and some topics have emerged.

I can refer with all the colleagues to paragraph 19 of the last two years' assessment in the progress made in implementation on follow-up of the World Summit on Information Society, which was the draft resolution of the CSTD. In paragraph 19, there's some emerging topics that have been reflected there.

One of those topics is cybersecurity. I think it's no secret that cybersecurity has emerged as one of the most topics that are of most concern and it has to be addressed. But I'm happy with this agreement if the specifics will be further down the line of the work of the group.

But I repeat, we need to go into specifics. Otherwise, the result of this group will be very vague as it was the predecessor. Thank you, chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. Next on my list is Richard Hill, and then I have two remote participants, Marilyn Cade, and then Jimson Olufuye and then the U.K.

So, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: I support the intervention from the U.S. I think "characteristics" is the right word in this context.

And to the question from Kenya, what do we mean by "high level," I think that's up to each of us. So we will be making submissions and others will be making submissions and everybody has their own idea of high level and then we'll look at that as a group and say, Yes, we agree that was high level or, no, we don't think that was high level. If we don't think it's high level, we're not throwing it out. We're just pushing it off to what Juan just referred to, some detailed discussion which will take place later on. So I'm comfortable with that. That's not excluding inputs. We're not going to rule something out because we say it's not high level. We will just look at it and then decide what to do with it. Thank you, chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. It's Marilyn Cade speaking.

I'm going to make a comment about how important the work we're doing is to another aspect that I'm engaged in. And I'm looking across this group and many of the people in this group are also engaged in this additional work. And it is the work of the national and regional IGFs.

I see that we have the secretariat, Chengetai, here. I'm not asking him to speak. I'm speaking differently because I'm one of the five business representatives.

(Feedback).

I think that we need to be more concrete, and I think we're getting close to being concrete. Personally, one, two -- I would like to see three questions because I think that will allow all of us to advance responses into the work we're doing.

The final comment I'm going to make is I mainly want to welcome you, Benedicto, as chair of this working group to participate in the IGF 2016. I think it would be fantastic -- some others made reference to this -- (silence).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think we lost just as she was inviting. Marilyn, I intend to be in Guadalajara for sure. I intend to be there as host country but now maybe in an additional capacity as well.

I have another remote participant on the list. It is Mr. Jimson Olufuye. And then I have the U.K.

(distorted audio)

I think it's not available either. Yeah, yeah, please, go ahead.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Would it be possible to send your comments by email so we could have for the plenary. We apologize for that.

U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, chair.

We wanted quickly to agree with Richard as he agreed with us earlier. We return the favor. When we talk about what do we mean by "high level," it's an open question and any member can respond however they want and we'll discuss that at our next meeting.

We just wanted to say very briefly that we are sorry that we don't have a reference to the sustainable development agenda anymore. But we do understand the reasons for that. There are logical reasons behind it. We just hope that everyone in the group really gives some thoughts to the connections with sustainable development when they're looking at these questions and making contributions because it's such an important agenda. But for now, we can support the consensus way forward that you've outlined. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think that there will be an additional item, but I don't think we would deal with it efficiently at this time to talk about the topics and format for the next meeting. I think this is something that in light of the decision we made, we will take it from there. I would like just to summarize that then those two questions will be posted for comment, both from us and from the wider community, all interested stakeholders. I thank you for that.

On the other hand, I would with your indulgence just insist a little bit in regard to some pieces of document that we should also have on the table when we resume our work in January.

So I would like to just to consult with you whether you could entrust me to try to organize some documents that, of course, would be submitted to the group and they could immediately be dismissed if you don't like them. But I think that some part of the work that was done before should be highlighted in order to make our work more efficient.

I refer to the recommendations that were agreed. I refer to parts of the factual information that was compiled and is still valid that do not have any recommendations or any personal assessments. It is just factual information.

I would -- I know there's a lack of resources from the secretariat even to engage in any amount of document. But I would like just to consult with you whether this could be acceptable that on my own responsibility, I could try to work with entities under my personal guidance just to make sure we have some more concrete -- I'm very much concerned.

We have a collection of documents that amount to thousands and thousands of pages. This is not efficient. When we were working in NETmundial, for example, we had -- we hired consultants there to prepare a document upon which we could work. It was a 50-page, 40-page document. Otherwise, it is not feasible because -- especially because probably there will be some discussion on every topic that will be there. So if you are comfortable with this, I would like to anticipate my intention to come up for the next meeting also some piece of document. I want to make sure that there will be an effort to invite any controversial issue, this is something we should discuss. But all factual information that might be relevant.

I think in the light of the fact that our last meeting was finalized two years ago, there are many developments, many things that have happened. I think if we do not -- when we meet, do not have these pictures of things, our work would not be too much efficient. So I think we should work on the basis of the reporting. But I think we should also have some set of documents that should help us and organize.

I see Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I fully agree, chairman. And I would go further. I don't think you even have to ask our permission. In my view, you as chairman, are always enabled to put forward proposals that will advance the work of the group. Of course, if you get it wrong and we complain, then you'll know about it. But having worked with you personally for a very long time, I know that you know very well what the red lines are and you will produce something that we might want to massage or something but we're not going to say: Where did you get that from? Just go ahead in my view.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Just a short addition to what Richard said, I think it's very important that, first of all, we have the previous work on the table which is mentioned and also whatever, as the chair has said, is brought to the group about what has happened.

And I think in this regard, even members could be free to submit submissions of what they think has happened in the last year and a half which they think is important. And the small one, two pages can be given as something which is input to you and then you can collect them and bring to the group apart from what you already are maybe planning to do. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If there are no further interventions on this, I would like just to inform you that -- yes, I see you, U.S. (inaudible).

>>MARILYN CADE: (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The secretariat has confirmed that the dates of our next meeting would be the 23 to 27 January.

>> MARILYN CADE: Chair?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Probably we would start with the intersessional meeting and then we would get to our second working group meeting. So it would be -- the week of the 23rd of January is confirmed.

>> MARILYN CADE: Chair?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I hear someone calling me. But I give short to U.S. and then to Marilyn Cade.

>> MARILYN CADE: No.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No?

>> MARILYN CADE: I disagree, chair. I'm asked for an intervention to ask for a previous contribution before you went to the U.S. government. And so I would ask you to respect remote participation, if you don't mind.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, absolutely, Marilyn. As I said before, my intention is to (indiscernible) the point of order at the request of (indiscernible) in the order (indiscernible).

As I said before, I should apologize to you. But this was not intent. This was simply information that I received after.

With apologies, go ahead.

>>MARILYN CADE: I fully except that, chair. I think you have done an excellent job to respect the interventions from the remote participants. I wanted to just take a sec because what you need to deal with now is very important, but I want to also to take a sec, just a minute. (indiscernible)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Go ahead.

>>MARILYN CADE: Those of us who are remote are very dependent on the timing of when we get recognized. I would just like to reference that because I submitted a couple of contributions, not only for myself but I'm not the most important person here.

If we can't -- the secretariat has done a fantastic job, but I -- I'm kind of thinking you haven't really considered all of the remote participations. If I might just ask us to, without changing anything you proposed, add in additional comments remotely, those would just augment what we had as a semi-agreement. But it recognizes the remote participants. If you don't mind, chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I apologize, Marilyn. Can I -- can I ask you, what exactly do you expect from us?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I saw two points. And I noticed both of those times -- it's Marilyn Cade speaking because I don't want to ignore remote participants to know who is speaking. I am about one of five business representatives speaking in my individual capacity.

I think there is agreement to two questions, but I want to leave it open. I think (inaudible) a third question. I wanted to comment the openness I have to a possible third question while recognizing that we need to respect the previous work we've done.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Marilyn, can you hear me? Hello?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, these are not changes to your suggestion. I think it just leaves it open to other ideas while we do open consultation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, one thing that I indicated when I spelled out those two questions of those who had full consensus of the room -- and this is the rule we are trying to follow, of course, all of us -- was those two questions would be put for consultation. But in my report, I would summarize and include the other items that have emerged in the discussion as very important points that were considered by some as priority. But let's say those are the issues including paragraph number three, which I think is the one you are referring to, could not meet that, let's say, agreed rule of consensus among the group.

I don't know if that satisfies your request. I'm not clear about -- because I don't think (inaudible) we could reopen discussion on this third question.

[Multiple speakers]

I don't know if this satisfies your question. I'm not clear about -- because I don't think at this stage we can re-open discussion on this third question. I think it is beyond --

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you.

Chair, I am not trying to open the discussion. I'm just suggesting it may be important to have some open discussion later.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, absolutely.

And just to make clear that when you made your suggestion including that suggestion, it was fully taken on board in due time. But later on, in the light of further discussion, this was stricken, but not your personal amendment but let's say the full paragraph. But just to make sure your particular proposal was taken on in due time.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I fully appreciate that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Yes, U.S., please, would you take the floor. Please.

>>UNITED STATES: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

We -- Just going back to the proposal regarding the documents, as we said before, we were very supportive of bringing in some of the old work into the new. And I think that the -- the CSTD secretariat's call for documents in that regard was a helpful contribution, and we hope to see those in the next.

But we did want to just express that while we're very sympathetic with your desire to work off of the basis of a document, and we completely understand why, we think that it's very -- it's very important for us to strike a balance between the work of the old group and our task as a new group. And while there are certainly aspects of the mapping exercise that will be helpful for this group, as you've mentioned, it's our expectation that through the second question here, members of the working group and as well as others will bring that in in their -- in their own capacity.

So we're a little hesitant about you, perhaps, bringing those in as the chair, as the chair of the group for this first meeting. We think we may get there as the work of the working group progresses, but we really would urge to see what the inputs are before we judge that the mapping exercise is really the right way to approach the group.

So we do think that, you know, these questions really do prepare a way forward. We agree with what the U.K. said regarding really encouraging focus on sustainable development in people's inputs, but we do want to be cautious that we're not inadvertently prejudging the outcome of that meeting.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I would fully share the sentiment. The intent was not to guide but not to lose important elements that otherwise might be not exact. Because my concern is that in regard to those two questions, and the secretariat was explicit about that, there will be no possibility to prepare a summary document and a knowledge document. We'll have, for example, 30 or 40 pieces of contribution, a compilation of those, and we'll have to work on that.

That's why initially my -- and of course this was overruled by the plenary -- was to have one document, let's say even imperfect but one on which we could maybe work around, delete, insert, but try to update on the basis, even on the basis of those questions. But that would allow us to have one single piece of...

So one thing that I -- I'll try to do, and I would like to really make sure that there be no -- it will not come as a surprise, the document that will be submitted as the working paper for the meeting, but just -- I want to make sure we have one document that will in a way summarize important developments that have taken place. And this will be a reference for the group.

And rightly, I think the decision is that the main inputs will be those coming from the two questions. This is, I think, perfectly understood.

Pakistan, you have the floor.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. I -- And you already addressed this issue, but maybe I -- let me come to your defense on this issue, because you -- you presented this proposal and submit it to the working group and ask whether it is acceptable. And after you -- you felt that perhaps you can go along, then -- then we have had this it feeling that, okay, we can -- we can accept this proposal.

But I think it's very important that we have a contribution from remote participants, but it's quite natural that there are some obstacles in which that participation could, of course, not be -- could not be equal to the physical participation. But of course whatever secretariat and the working group as a whole could do should be doing that.

Actually, I took the floor to, Ambassador, request you to -- what are we now planning for -- for almost four months? What we have before January meeting? What we are expected to do?

These are the two questions, we understand.

I also understand there will be report from your side.

I'm sorry if you -- if I interjected you before you wanted to make your intervention on this, but just on my side, if clarification could be made.

And then if there would be any draft or something, compilation of views or something. Maybe. I'm not sure. But you can give us some direction on where we -- we go from here.

And, of course, in January meeting, the main question actually is that we do have this email system and remote participation -- shouldn't say remote participation, but, rather, a network system in which we can communicate with each other. Whether we will go for that in terms of sharing ideas or -- of course that will be informal. And whatever decision has to be taken will be taken in the physical meeting that is next meeting in January.

So I'm toying with different ideas just to seek clarification on where we would go from here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you for asking this. I -- Well, we have agreed that the starting point will be the two questions that are being submitted for -- with a request for inputs from us and from the community. So I think at this moment, to think of anything beyond that would be premature.

I would strongly suggest that through the mailing list we can anticipate some question, some proposals. Maybe we can have some fruitful exchange.

I would strongly favor that in the light of the discussion that might emerge that we could convene a conference call to discuss -- There's always a challenge because of the differing time zones. It's not the ideal way of -- but maybe that could be of help to us.

But beyond that, I don't see much that we could do to advance the work for January beyond doing that.

Of course we have -- we can tap into the existing documents, include the previous documents. We can engage in our effort to attract funding, to enhance participation from other stakeholders, but as far as the substantive work is concerned, I think we should respect the decision to send out the questions and wait for the inputs as the prerequisite for further work.

But again, I would strongly encourage that through the mailing list. And in that sense, I agree with you, maybe it should not be open at this point. It should be a mailing list in which all of us would have trust to exchange ideas, even some ideas that are bold and innovative that maybe should be kept among us for a moment. There's no lack of transparency, but maybe we can be even more audacious when we are working that kind of ambience. So I would strongly encourage that, but beyond this, I'm -- I'm not sure.

One thing which should be revised, we should establish a deadline for receiving the inputs. I would say we would like to allow sufficient amount of time. In the case of some institutions, some individuals, sometimes is required to go through -- especially if the answers will be prepared in -- taking into account all the information that has been amassed.

So we are in the beginning of October. Maybe we should allow at least two months for this consultation. That would be my initial proposal. But I -- Maybe the secretariat, on the basis of your previous experience in dealing with that, would you like to suggest? Or Peter. We have the best resource in the room, Peter.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chair.

I would suggest the end of November, which would give some time to -- at least to compile the responses, which I assume will only include simple compilation, no analysis, no (indiscernible), but simply to make it available to the larger public.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you.

Any other interventions?

On this note, secretariat, any announcements?

Yes, the secretariat is reminding me that for an (indiscernible), for the sake of clarity in regard to our next meeting, the next meeting will take place on the 26th and 27th of January. The first three days of this week will be dedicated to the intersessional panel, taking into account that after that, immediately the secretariat start to prepare the report on the panel. So that's the reason why we are moving our meeting to the end of the week, not the beginning as was initially envisaged.

And with this, we'd like to thank the secretariat that will have very limited time to finalize the work for CSTD. And we will also reconcile the need to have these meetings back to back, and this will be helpful to those people who are funded and for general participants.

Oh, yes, I'd like also to thank ICANN for the captioning of this meeting. And that's it. I thank you very much.

And -- Oh, yes, Richard and Pakistan.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. Very important point, chairman. I'm sure I speak for all the members of the group and all the observers when I thank you personally for your work and the secretariat for their support, including technical people, some of whom are not here and who have certainly helped us very much. So please accept our thanks, Chairman.

[Applause]

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you. Of course thanking you and the entire team but I have a substantive question. I'm not sure whether we already have some kind of an understanding, but maybe I have missed it.

We did discuss (indiscernible) thing but I am not sure whether we have come to any understanding on whether we need to do something on mapping exercise? Would there be any separate questionnaire or nothing? Because we did discuss it, but probably we didn't come to any conclusion. So that's my question.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, my understanding that, yes, indeed, we have discussed the issue. I think there is general acknowledgment of the issue of the document that were produced by -- in that regard, both the report and the addendum.

They are part of the legacy that is coming from the first Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation 1.0. But there was no decision on how to proceed in that regard.

So I think there is an understanding that the document is there as a resource you can tap into, but there was no decision that we should proceed on the basis of this or even if that was the right approach to do it.

One thing that I propose, and that would be on my own responsibility, to try to, let's say, clean the document from those portions that are more controversial. Just maybe try to stick with the factual areas, which will allow us to have, let's say, a very broad view.

Actually, I don't know if that is feasible but this is something I would like to try to occupy my time between now and the January meeting. Because I think it would be very useful if we can have one-piece document that could at least give us a picture of what has taken place.

But as a group, the plenary has not taken any decision in that regard. This is something I would like to maybe offer as a resource that would be accepted or not, together with maybe just one piece or two pages just recalling those recommendations that were hit upon in the previous version. I think those might be useful resources for the group.

But for the moment being, there was no decision to elevate the status of those documents in relation to the others.

So thank you very much. Look forward to seeing you in January.

Thank you.

[Applause]