

**Transcript Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced
Cooperation**

24-28 February 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Day 4

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

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

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. We are going to start in one minute.

Good morning.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So good morning again. I'm pleased you made it and you look fresh and determined to have a very fruitful day today. At least as fruitful as we had yesterday. So as usual I just put up the mandate to remind us what we have to do, and I'm glad that we -- up to now, we respected the mandate and I'm convinced that we are going to respect the mandate today and tomorrow.

Well, first of all, I would like to thank Mr. Reddy. I forgot to thank him yesterday for his efforts on the structure of the report. I just want to recall that I gave a proposal for the final structure of the report and it seems to me that you accepted that we are going to have the simplest structure as we can.

We had discussions in plenary mode yesterday. We decided to continue our work in the plenary mode rather than in breakout groups, and I would say we had a very fruitful discussion on two groups, Group A and Group B, and I was pleased to see that we had made some progress. And I was also able to note that there are significant differences of opinions, and I told you that I intend to reflect these differences in the report.

Just to give you some idea how I intend to do the report, as agreed we are going to have an introductory part, a part about the methods we have been using, and then we go to the bulk of the material that is the recommendations.

For each topic, we are going to list the agreed recommendations, followed by the topics which we didn't have agreement on, reflecting in a short way the opinions of the two sides.

So in discussion on -- in Group B, I think we had a -- I would qualify it as a moderate success. As you know, I'm always positive, so even if you have one recommendation which we agreed on, it's already a success.

But I hope that we are going to have some more in this Group B. I received from the U.S., at 1:45 in the morning, the consolidated text.

No, I'm really appreciative of your hard work. I really appreciate that. While I was watching TV and enjoying myself, you were working very hard.

So that is one of the set of recommendations we agreed to revisit, and we agreed, I think, another two in Group B to revisit I think later this day, today.

So as I mentioned, there are differences of opinions which will be reflected.

So for today, what I suggest to do, we -- yesterday when we stopped on your requests because you couldn't have more, we stopped before discussing groups C, D, and E, so I -- oh, it's a mistake here.

We are not going to discuss them in small groups. We are going to have everything in plenary.

And I hope that we can proceed much faster and we can finish it relatively early and we can get back to the outstanding issues, if any, in Group A, and naturally we are going to discuss the recommendations or draft recommendations we mentioned to be revisited.

So all the documents will be made available on Google Docs.

And last but not least, I hope that we will be able to have a final draft for the report which will be circulated by the end of the day.

My best hope is that we are going to include all the recommendations we have agreed on and we try to reflect also the topics in this document where we didn't have agreement on, with the diverging opinions.

Yesterday, I had some requests to treat those issues where we have no agreement on in a way that -- let me say in this way -- like-minded delegations would formulate some short descriptions of their opinion. I would like to have it in a -- to be very concise and very short. I would suggest to have it on one page.

That would mean, if you calculate correctly, five main topics, two pages each. It would mean 10 pages. I think this is excessive, so I would like to have, for each topic, each topic where we have no agreement on, three, four, five lines each. Not more.

So basically, that's how I see it now. Tomorrow, I would like to go through the final document -- that is, the report, including all the recommendations -- and fix the editorial changes we have agreed that we are going to go through.

There were some language problems, I believe.

So we will have plenty of things to do today and tomorrow, but to my best hope, the -- we will be able to complete our work by tomorrow at 6:00.

So our responsibility, as I mentioned yesterday, we should give the recommendations which should be meaningful, concise, and implementable, and I found one other aspect. They should be useful.

So we may come out with very general recommendations and everybody would agree to that, but are they useful? I don't know.

So probably we should also consider that our task is to be useful.

And of course, once again, we are accountable, and we are accountable not only to our constituencies but we are accountable to the whole community of the Internet.

So I believe that in this spirit, we can start our work and we start, as I told you, with topics in Group C, and I would like to ask the secretariat to load it.

You all have the document. It's on the screen. You feel comfortable with that? Size is okay? You can see it?

Right. So I can see recommendations from Jimson. Jimson, would you like to introduce these ones?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Distinguished chair, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I would like to say, first and foremost, that we from the developing economies, least developed economies, we are indeed very, very appreciative of governments that consider it is very imperative that business should be on the table discussing mechanisms and topics on Internet public policy issues moving forward.

The Internet developments are very beneficial to the development of the economies of the developing nations.

Having said it, I will say that we need to continue this dialogue and debate and constructive engagement, that I will suggest that it might be necessary that the mandates of the United Nations Commission for Science and Technology for Development be enhanced to coordinate international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in a collaborative multistakeholder framework that include all the stakeholders that are already engaged in this process. So that is the spirit behind that, the first statement.

And the second one, I have discovered that there is a grave depth of awareness, awareness level in my economies, in our economies in the developing nations, in the least developed nations that is very, very low concerning policy frameworks, implications and the dynamics, so that is why this is recommended:

"That international institutions already addressing Internet public policy issues pertaining to the Internet strengthen their awareness and capacity building programs, particularly in the developing and least developed nations across all sectors including government."

Prior to our meeting here today, or this week, I know how much engagement I initiated with some African countries and how much many are not really so aware. So what we are doing today is important.

So even within government, there's need for more awareness. Within the private sector, more awareness. Civil society, technical and academic communities, more awareness, and all communities. So that is the whole background and the idea behind the two recommendations.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson.

I open the floor --

Before I do that, I just want to make a small remark that usually we tend to forget that the stakeholders include also international organizations, and it is also explicit -- in the mandate of the CSTD, it is explicitly stated that in the WSIS follow-up process, the international organizations are to report to the CSTD about the activities, their activities on these issues.

So with this remark, I would open the floor -- open the discussion. Anyone who would like to comment on that?

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to thank my business colleague, Mr. Olufuye, for this comment and I think that I've found the discussion that I've been able to have with him and with others from the developing countries, from stakeholders, very interesting, and I thought I might just elaborate for a minute about it may be difficult for us to be changing the mandate of an organization. We might be able to modify this to call for strengthening the focus on these issues within the present work of the CSTD.

The STI work that CSD -- sorry. The STI work, the focus on science and technology for innovation work, is already -- those reports, I think, are already a place that could be built on, and within the -- the work, both the intersessional and the full week of the meeting of the CSTD, a recommendation that the specific inclusion of these topics, I think, might be another way to approach this without specifically calling for changing the mandate.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Very useful.

Parminder?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, Saudi. I'm sorry. I haven't seen you. I'm sorry.

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

I would like to thank our distinguished delegate, Jimson, for his recommendation but as we know, the CSTD has a limited membership and cannot provide a forum for all government on equal footing to come and discuss public policy issues.

And on the other hand, the Tunis Agenda only refers to government on equal footing, not all stakeholders on equal footing. This is on the first recommendation.

The second recommendation, as we said yesterday, there is no current international mechanism addressing Internet public policy issues. It only addresses technical issues.

So I mean these recommendation, I don't know how we're going to implement them if we -- if we say there is a current international mechanism which we don't see any.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Good morning, everybody.

Thank you, Jim, for your suggestions.

The first thing I would like to ask for a clarification is what exactly is the work we are referring to here?

Now, enhanced cooperation, the relevant sections are very clear that we are talking about public policymaking, public policy development. We are not talking about public policy discussions.

So first thing, we need -- I mean I think we need to go step by step and clarify where we are, because there is still a lot of confusion on the area on which we are working, and our understanding is that it's a public policy issue development and making, and the roles are also given in Section 35 about it.

Now, if the issue and desire is that all stakeholders on an equal footing would participate in public policymaking, I have my strong views about it but I would simply refer to the process that this kind of thing would need to be agreed to by the highest organ of the United Nations and special assembly should be called and then it should be ratified that there is a new form of public policymaking at the global level, and then the Parliaments of the countries -- and I know in India -- would also have some views on it, and probably -- not "probably" -- definitely they will face constitutional challenges.

I am not sure exactly what is being asked for here. Are you really asking that private sector should sit on an equal footing with governments and make public policies?

Now, if that is what it is, I would like a clarification, and obviously what then is needed to be done what I described.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Just a reflection on the remark from Saudi Arabia.

Yes, I agree that CSTD has a limited membership. However, CSTD is open to all member states, and even the drafting exercise is being followed by all member states who wish to participate and they can participate on an equal footing with the members.

Just to mention one example, in 2011 or 2010 the drafting group was chaired by Egypt, who is not a member of the CSTD, and ECOSOC rules do allow that.

Having said that, Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues.

We would like to thank Jimson for this very valuable contribution.

As for the first recommendation, we would also caution against giving a new or expanded mandate to the -- or calling for, rather, a new or expanded mandate for the CSTD, so we would have problems with that recommendation. However, the second recommendation, we think that's a very valid one. Awareness, we know that awareness about these issues is low in some countries. We definitely also know that there is a need for capacity-building programs related to international public policy issues. So if we can utilize existing institutions within their mandates and within their field of expertise to enhance cooperation in this way, we would certainly welcome that. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. And a very good morning to everyone in the room. With regard to the first draft recommendation from Jimson, thank you, Jimson, for giving us recommendations, which is important.

With regard to the first one, there are two fundamental issues in this. If we see the origin of CSTD coming -- existing as a focal point to look at implementation of various Tunis Agenda-related decisions, so to say, particularly within the U.N. system so far, I think through the 2006 ECOSOC resolution, CSTD was given that mandate. We are all familiar with that.

However, I think there is a limited mandate that CSTD has is relating to kind of -- it is kind of a -- it is not a clearinghouse; it is just a point at which everyone within the U.N. system has been mandated to sort of present what other actions that they have taken in implementing the previous -- the Tunis Agenda-related decisions.

Now, from that point, it is not very clear -- Parminder, are we talking about -- is it policy making? Is it discussion on Internet public policy issues? Because when we say "enhanced coordinate public policy issues" I mean, from the language point, the clarity is not there. One option is enhanced to continue -- to continue its discussion on implementation of -- because CSTD on its own cannot really be able to undertake anything unless it comes from U.N. General Assembly.

Now, giving mandate to CSTD, I think while -- as a starting point, a point can be made. But unless there is a determination that we want to call upon the U.N. General Assembly, it will be -- it will not make an impact on the ground. That's point one.

And, secondly, other serious difficulty we have is on "equal footing." I think it needs to be -- it is not clear to us, what is the definition of "equal footing" in this context because it's not so much aversion to this fact. I think "equal footing" can be at various levels of policy preparation. But at the end of it, the policy making is the realm of governments. I think it has to be very clear because if it is not the case, then accountability is an issue. Will all of the sectors be accountable for their decisions? I'm afraid. And if not, there are no mechanisms how to make accountable other participants in these particular forums.

Now, without understanding -- rather, having clarity on those dimensions, it is not just making decisions but when a decision is implemented, if something has to be, let's say, addressed, followed which is negative, accountability is addressed on as of now governments because they in their own way through their national legislations, legislatures, they arrive at these policies and then implement them and be able to take the sort of success and failure.

So from this limited point of view, "equal footing" is not clear to us unless someone in the room can clearly explain.

Thirdly, I have a very fundamental question to ask. When you talk of "multistakeholder framework," I raised this on the very first day of the last meeting also, that we do not have a definition of "multistakeholderism" and we are not willing to go down the path of defining it. Either initiating the principles, what does it involve?

I have heard in the room colleagues saying it means also decision-making. I think that then we are crossing a particular threshold which some colleagues have also mentioned in the room that we have democratic institutions where they are representatives of the people who have been elected who go into parliaments and make decisions.

And thereby -- but in that process of making decisions, there are obviously wide range of consultations at various levels. So this particular dimension is important. It is, again, versus -- democracy versus multistakeholderism.

We also heard someone saying that multistakeholderism is another form of democracy. Well, I'm afraid. I mean, if the path of decision-making is involved in the multistakeholder process, then I think we need to understand this better.

Otherwise, we would be talking of concepts which are not very clear and putting them all equal (indiscernible) again up to what point in arriving at the decision and making a decision.

So, Chair, I think from this point of view, I think the language here needs to be carefully worded if you are willing to accommodate some changes, we can start working on the language. But as it exists, India cannot support this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. Very useful comments and very enlightening. I just retained one word which is the clearinghouse. Probably it is a very good idea to be (indiscernible) on this notion. You have made comments, I think, on the first recommendations. To my mind, it wouldn't fly.

If I'm not mistaken, you haven't commented in detail the second one. Would you like to do that or let's leave it for a later time?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. On this, there is a slight issue if what international institutions are we talking about here? Are we to ask the member states to direct the international institutions? Are we calling on the international -- let's say -- I mean, we need to know what are the international institutions. I mean, there is a challenge here. And when we make this, are we saying intergovernmental institutions? And that's not the case, I think. When we say "international institutions," we can support what we call the import of this paragraph relating to awareness raising, capacity-building. And they are very key issues.

But if international institutions were to do this, are they going to put in money to do this? I'm afraid. I mean, we need know who are "they" and how "they" will do it, sir. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You mentioned again a magic word, "money." Thank you.

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: (Speaker off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Phil, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I think the point that Mr. Reddy was making with regards to the role of governments in an international environment is a valid one and one to bear in mind. I get very concerned when we talk about governments on an equal footing, discussing public policy issues.

Having see that extend to decision-making, I think it's right that nobody would disagree that governments have a role within their own national sovereign environment.

My country, if I don't like my government, I can try and vote them out. Other people may support the government, et cetera. So be it. But I get very nervous when we sort of extend that national sovereign right into international discussions. I think that should be something we be wary of going forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Hold it for a second. I think U.S. asked for the floor first.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone. I won't comment on the first one since I think many people have already done so. So I will just focus on the second for a moment.

I think that our read of the intent of this was a very positive one with regard to awareness -- awareness and capacity-building programs, many of which already exist in some international institutions or international organizations.

We just would also want to include others that may have a capacity-building program as well. So we would support it with a slight edit that would say, "organizations addressing international public policy issues pertaining to Internet should strengthen." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you repeat it?

>>UNITED STATES: Sure, sorry. It was not at transcription speed.

I would suggest replacing "that international institutions," strike that, and just start with "organizations," which I think has a fairly neutral and not prescriptive message. I would also strike "already addressing" -- "already" and then leave "addressing." And to make it recommendation-like text, I added the word "should" before "strengthen."

Second line, middle. There you go. "Should."

For your consideration. Thank you.

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

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. And thank you, Jimson, for the proposal. Mr. Chairman, most of what I wanted to say is captured by the other various speakers.

I wanted to refer our colleagues in the room to the different articles in Tunis Agenda on the matter. We have to be careful about the public policy issues. It had been repeated several times. I don't like to refer to it directly, but it is 35A. It is clear in the Tunis Agenda. And I don't think that the governments are in a position, please -- talking on behalf of my government -- to give up its sovereign rights which is public policy issues. And I don't think it is negotiable at this time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Just let me ask you about your views on the -- I mean, your remarks pertain to the first? Or to the second or both?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is on both, in fact, because we don't believe that public policy issues is going to be addressed by the international organizations which would be intergovernmental. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Much of what I was going to say has been offered by others. But, fortunately, some colleagues have presented arguments that I think maybe I can offer a slightly different interpretation in response.

I myself would suggest that based on both the comments, that the first -- number one be put completely in square brackets and we focus just on two. And I think that's the general what I'm hearing, and it is where I'm focusing.

I spent some time on some Web sites last night and the night before of some of the intergovernmental organizations. And I'm struck by the -- in the past five years, the growth of a new approach that is merging in all of them, including the ITU, UNESCO, UNDP, even WTO and WIPO where they're developing partnerships in order to engage in capacity-building and awareness to strengthen the ability of developing country citizens and organizations to fully participate at a regional level and an international level.

So I'm seeing that this is a beginning trend already. And, in fact, most of the work is focused on strengthening the ability to fully participate, which is how I read the second paragraph, not so much about developing new public policy -- new international public policy but about strengthening awareness and capacity-building to participate.

I cast my mind back to the reason that we're even talking about enhanced cooperation, and I think that that must be very much on the minds of all of us to bring a broader participation from all nations of the world into these discussions.

So I'd like to urge that we look positively at this and work on making smaller improvements.

I like the improvements that the U.S. made. I would make only one other word change and that is in the next-to-last line where the word "across" is used. I would prefer we use the word "inclusive of all sectors." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Just a couple of comments and a suggestion. Just in relation to the points that have been raised by Mr. Reddy and one or two others on this issue of sovereignty and the question of public policy making, I think particularly at the global level in relation to global public policy issues, it is really critical for civil society to be on an equal footing with other stakeholders in ways in which they can't be and which are constrained in domestic or international

settings where frequently civil society participates as citizens of domestic law-making processes in ways which are completely different from the processes for forming norms and forming standards at an international level, particularly in relation to Internet public policy issues where civil society is and needs to be on an equal footing. And there are a range of ways in which they're seen, not only in relation to the Internet but in relation to issues for marginalized and vulnerable groups including disabled people, children, women, migrants, refugees and others. So I think it is important to separate conceptually those issues when we look at this.

And, also, that -- I would be extremely surprised if all the government stakeholders had a shared definition of what democratic government means. And I think it wouldn't be helpful to our discussions to go down the path of defining that.

In relation to these particular recommendations, I really like the emphasis on awareness and capacity-building in relation to developing and least developed countries. I think that's excellent. And I know that we have another set of recommendations related to that. I just want to make sure that this concept here isn't lost in the next where we deal with those.

And it seems to me also that we might want to shape a recommendation around the Internet as a cross-cutting issue for a range of institutions and organizations that might be -- whose mandate might catch on Internet public policy issues.

And I'm happy to assist with framing a recommendation around referring to the cross-cutting nature of issues pertaining to the Internet, if that would be helpful.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Just a comment on Number 2. We fail to see how Draft Recommendation Number 2 could be considered to in any way interfere with national sovereignty.

"Organizations" is a pretty general term and could cover different kinds of international organizations, and -- as well as regional, and if we're looking at the ILO, for instance, as just one example, I think that's an excellent example of where we have different stakeholders participating on equal footing dealing with public policy issues, being governments, being employees, being employers, but that's just one example. And some of us here are very active in that organization.

So -- but just to the point, we find it very difficult to see how that can be -- how Recommendation Number 2 could be considered to be an interference with, in any way, national sovereignty.

And it's also about the -- maybe the word "addressing" here.

Addressing something doesn't necessarily mean that you are, let's say, voting on legislation or taking in that the -- someone in the government is taking an executive -- making an executive order or something like that.

It's much broader than that. So -- yeah. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Mr. Chairman, sorry to take the floor again but I thought simply to give two suggestions in this Paragraph 2.

While, as I said, we agree with this -- we like this paragraph, we need to fix some -- a couple of things, in our opinion.

I mean, we thank Marilyn for bringing in this inclusiveness, inclusive of all sectors. That's something we can very firmly support.

At the beginning of this paragraph, with regard to organizations, I think the examples that have been cited to far, they're all intergovernmental organizations. That is based out of the United Nations. That is UNICEF. That is UNDP, et cetera. If we can capture that particular part of the discussion into this paragraph.

In which case can we say that "intergovernmental organizations, comma, inter alia, in the United Nations," which means we are not restricting -- there could be intergovernmental organizations which are at a regional level. In fact, I think there are quite a number of programs.

So if I may -- yeah. That's it. "Intergovernmental organizations, inter alia, in the United Nations addressing."

Because again, in a big sensitive U.N. fora, any recommendation that's going up would find greater acceptability in terms of rather -- I mean, they'll be able to pronounce on this recommendation very easily, which would mean one of the U.N. systems at a higher level, either, say, ECOSOC or even General Assembly can give effect.

I think you have earlier said that we should be actionable, so actionability can come, if it is within the U.N. system, as and when they decide those organizations within the U.N. who are already doing work, they can be given greater flexibility to work on these areas.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So if no one else is asking for the floor, let me summarize.

I believe there was no support for Recommendation Number 1. There was no support at all.

For Recommendation 2, I can see considerable support, and with the last fixes I would like to ask you if it's acceptable.

Ellen, and then United States.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I'm sorry, but I'm going to suggest that we change "inter alia" into "among other things," which I just looked up is exactly what it means. It might be better to use English rather than Latin. And I apologize for having to look up what it meant.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen, I fully agree with you. However, we should follow the U.N. practice and the U.N. is a very pretentious organization. It uses "inter alia."

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: We're trying to be more, you know, of the people here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably this is a question to be addressed to the General Assembly.

United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Just referring back to my previous comments, I think that the value of awareness and capacity building programs are that they are -- that they are provided by many, and not just intergovernmental organizations.

Certainly they can be provided by intergovernmental organizations, but I think capacity building occurs in many other stakeholder entities as well, and it's very valuable, and dare I say it's often in partnership.

So I would -- with government -- either intergovernmental organizations or governments.

So I really would like to say that I would prefer to go back to a neutral -- more neutral stance and say "organizations."

And perhaps one fix that might help with the consternation that some may have with it is, say -- I'll read it and then, Claudia, I'll give it to you and transcription, but "all organizations strengthen their awareness and capacity building programs related to international Internet public policy issues."

Perhaps that would help it be palatable.

Claudia, do you want me to repeat?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>UNITED STATES: So start with "organizations," and then "all organizations," and then cut until "strengthen."

This is an editorial -- offered as an editorial help, but open to --

Okay. "Strengthen," and then after "programs," "related to international Internet public policy issues."

So you've -- we've moved the subject.

Perhaps that might help. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I had a similar issue as the United States with restricting this just to intergovernmental organizations involved with the U.N. and would like to endorse the rewrite that was just offered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So as it stands, "All organizations should strengthen their awareness and capacity building programs related to international Internet public policy issues, particularly in developing and least developed countries, inclusive of all sectors, including government, private sector organizations, civil society, technical and academic communities." That's how it stands now.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

Just a quick suggestion. Toward the end of the paragraph, it's saying "all sectors." Should we be saying "all stakeholders, including government"...

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As it stands, which is very neutral and serves a good purpose, is it acceptable?

As I said yesterday, it doesn't harm. On the contrary, it is useful.

I can see no objection. I can see an objection.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes. Saudi Arabia?

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

I mean, we are here to make a recommendation how to fully implement enhanced cooperation. We don't see, I mean, capacity building and awareness -- we know it is a very important issue, but does this implement enhanced cooperation as 69? I don't think so. So I mean this is a fundamental issue to us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran?

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

I doubt if this paragraph belonging to this part. Maybe we can locate it in the Part D, if I'm correct, on developing countries, first.

Second, I prefer to have "intergovernmental organizations."

And the third point, it's not clear to me whose ever strengthening their awareness. It means that organizations' awareness or the countries' awareness?

It's "strengthening their awareness and capacity building program." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you propose some text?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I don't think there is necessary there.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with Iran that it most probably belongs in the category of -- under development issues.

We disagree with Saudi Arabia that this doesn't have anything to do with enhanced cooperation. For us, this is part of the very core of enhanced cooperation.

A suggestion to try to answer to Iran's question about the text. Maybe what we are after here is awareness raising programs because that's -- so you would have "their awareness raising and capacity building programs" or if it should be even maybe clearer, you would add "programs" two times also after "awareness raising."

But I think "awareness raising efforts and capacity building programs," maybe that's -- that would work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

With the proposal from Iran to put it in the -- in the topics related to developing countries, and with these changes --

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had another proposal. To keep "intergovernmental organizations."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I suggest to have it as "organizations, including"? Is it acceptable?

Iran?

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

What are the other organizations? It's not clear to me.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Regional. International organizations. Capacity building organizations.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes, Chair.

I'm just going to throw out a couple of examples and ask for clarification.

So for instance, the African Union, CITELE, I think those are both regional organizations. Undoubtedly there are more that address other regions.

I don't -- but the African Union is obviously a government-to-government organization. We wouldn't want to exclude such organizations, I don't think.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Just perhaps to offer some other examples, the Internet Engineering Task Force is another international organization that may be relevant here. Country code top-level domain managers who are responsible for public policy issues in relation to ccTLD management and administration, some of which involve governments as stakeholders on an equal footing, some of which are governments themselves. And of course I would refer back to the correspondence working group's work which identified a range of international organizations, some of which were intergovernmental, some of which were not.

So those are by way of example.

Another option, Mr. Chair, just in relation to this recommendation, I have no objection as the recommendation which falls within a section related to the roles of stakeholders highlights that intergovernmental organizations which are one stakeholder has this particular role. I say don't do that as exclusive to the roles of other stakeholders who might -- sorry, of other stakeholders' roles who also do the same thing.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

Finland?

>>FINLAND: Thank you, Chair.

Just to add to what Joy just said, it would be unfair, in our opinion, to exclude other organizations such as the regional Internet registries who actually do a lot of capacity building work through intergovernmental organizations by funding the work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Finland. Carlos?

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Yes, Chairman. Just completing the -- what Finland said, the regional Internet registries are examples of multistakeholder organizations in which there is full participation of several sectors in decision-making, and they have in their respective regions strong programs of capacity building regarding their field of activity.

For instance, the transition to IPv6, the support they give in training, in awareness raising, et cetera, for this organization is fundamental. So just to give you a -- to complement the example.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Baher?

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. Also adding to the list of technical and other organizations that do a lot of programs on capacity-building and awareness in addition to the RIRs, of course, Internet Society, the regional IGFs, we have a lot of activities going on in Africa and Middle East through the regional IGFs on capacity-building and awareness. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any members asking for the floor? U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and colleagues. I wanted to take the floor to suggest some alternative text which may, I hope, add to clarity but retain the desire in this paragraph to support capacity-building.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Go ahead.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: The U.K. would prefer to keep all organizations, although including "international organizations" is not unacceptable, though I worry about us ending up listing all of them. That's a debate we don't need to have right now.

But "should strengthen their programs to increase the capability of stakeholders in developing countries to participate in discussion around international Internet public policy issues."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you repeat?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Sure. So "all organizations should strengthen their programs to increase the capability of stakeholders in developing countries to participate in discussion around -- "the capability of all stakeholders in developing countries," sorry. "In developing countries to participate in discussions around international Internet public policy issues."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If it is about discussion, honestly, we have the IGF. So calling for discussion, more discussion, I mean, we have the IGF to develop public policy issues. We are here to make a recommendation on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation to enable governments. This is very clear to us, that discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Reddy mentioned an extremely important word today, money. To participate in the IGF has its limitations. International organizations have the capability of providing scholarships, supporting developing countries to come to meetings, to come to raising awareness programs. So that's where I see the basic difference. And I think this may be a very useful recommendation, if not the most useful.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Chair, thank you very much. Again, sorry to take the floor on this subject. But I think there are three dimensions that we are talking about here. One is awareness raising, capacity-building, and discussions, enable greater participation in discussions.

I think the key, if you are seeing it from the perspective of this developing and least developed countries, I think -- I mean, we're not denying that the role of greater participation in discussions is important. I mean, that role remains.

Where I think the key also is in terms of capacity-building, if you are looking at that dimension, I think the alternative given by our distinguished colleague from U.K., I think this dimension is missing. So I would request them to reconsider to bring in this capacity-building in their paragraph. Without which I think we can continue to discuss like we're discussing awareness raising. It will get improved but not really on the ground something they could physically do. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to support the contribution from the U.K. We think it's quite concrete, and we know that it is an issue that developing countries sometimes have problems, difficulties, in all these organizations and meetings and processes that are going on. So we would fully support it. And it's a recommendation in its own right, I think. So maybe it could be a standard recommendation, not prejudging what would happen with Number 2. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

My dear friends, we have started our meeting at half past 9:00. We have managed to go through two draft recommendations. It's half past 10:00. You have anticipated to travel home, I think, on Friday evening or Saturday, most of you.

We have a full day, full night today and eventually tomorrow. So if we go at this speed, probably we may manage but we have to work overnight.

Would you like to work overnight?

I can't see nodding. I don't know why.

So I really encourage you to be very specific, and I would like to encourage you to try to get close to a consensus, especially on issues which may be useful and which bear some fruit for our work.

So I could feel some kind of preference at least from most of the countries, most of the members for this second draft recommendation with the condition that it would be moved eventually to some other section.

So having said that, I would like you to reconsider your position and I would like you to agree on this recommendation.

Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Chair, sorry, I'm a little lost here. Are we talking about Recommendation 2 or about the alternative text or both? I mean, I'm just not clear.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably you're not the only one.

[Laughter]

Probably I will ask the secretariat to try and clean it or to have an alternative text. Is it agreeable that we take the alternative text? India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think the only dimension which is missing in 2 is relating to participation in discussion. So we can add these three words in the paragraph. It should read better, which means "should strengthen the programs to enhance participation in discussions," comma -- not "enhanced" but "enhance," comma, and then we fix the linguistic things. We will leave it to the distinguished colleague from U.K. if they agree with this kind of suggestion, to enhance participation in discussions, increase awareness raising. Because I think the other two things are equally important, capacity-building, as I said earlier. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I have a try to read it out how I understand it: All organizations including intergovernmental organizations should strengthen their programs to enhance participation in discussions, increase awareness-raising efforts and capacity-building programs related to international Internet public policy issues particularly in the developing and least developed countries and all stakeholders including government, private sector organization, civil society, technical and academic communities. That's how it reads.

The reason I'm not proposing to have a coffee break now and have some thought about it because we have an enormous amount of work ahead of us.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Chair, perhaps while you are reading, you seem to have looked at inclusive of all sectors. The word "inclusiveness" was important earlier. If you wish in including -- otherwise, it don't read well.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

So two things. One thing I have heard proposals to move it to other sections. I don't have a problem with that.

Second thing, we will come back to that in the final reading to fix the wording or whatever mistakes you may find on English language mistakes.

So having said that, is it acceptable? Thank you.

(speaker off microphone) -- recommendation. I think it had -- we had a consensus that we don't support it. I didn't hear any support for the first one, so I'm afraid we have to drop it.

Okay. I turn to Russia for the next recommendation. Do you want to add something to it or stand on its own? Yulia?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, this is our proposal. We can discuss it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The one question I have on it is "encourages members" and if that was encourages a multistakeholder discussion to further clarify the role of each stakeholder, okay, and especially governments. But I think the role of each stakeholder, multistakeholder mechanisms, it would be something that I certainly would be happy to see included. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have a question myself, when you are saying "encourages members," in capital, I can see -- you mean member states of the United Nations or members of this group or members of the CSTD?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: For clarification, we decided the members of this group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Of this group?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are giving us extra tasks?

[Laughter]

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yulia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We see this particular part was not clarified.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I knew it would come back. I knew it. I have given you enough tasks to do so it is coming back. All right.

So we are talking about the members of this group. Oh, my goodness.

ITU?

>>ITU: Thank you, Chairman. I know we are discussing about members of the group for the next recommendation, but I have one comment for the previous recommendation. If you allow me, then can I?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>ITU: So, generally, I do agree the recommendation and that ITU as an organization has big sectors in development and that we put our all effort to support -- at this point from developing and least developed countries. But as you may know, like many organizations, especially U.N. organizations, has budget constraint, budget limitations.

Although we want to support all the strength and effort to encourage the participation from the developing countries but we have to consider our budget limitation.

So I would like to suggest that maybe end of sentence, maybe we could put "as appropriate" so we try our effort but within our budget limitation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think inter alia we can put it in as appropriate. These are always the magic words which we put in. I don't think it hurts, but I suggest you come back with it when we go for the second reading of the finalizing. I wouldn't like to open this up again.

So, members, we have a recommendation in front of us, giving us some extra work. So...

Who would like to clarify the role of each stakeholder? Marilyn, I can see you.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I raised my card before the clarification was offered. I do think that this is -- I think I would second Avri, that it is a worthwhile discussion. But I don't know that we actually have enough time to take this up, although I really welcome the idea that it would be, I think, a learning exchange for all of us if we could do it, if we have time to do it.

So I like the sentiment behind it, but I feel -- I find myself challenged. I don't want to lose it. I would say if we could park it for right now, maybe, and put it in square brackets so not completely dismiss it but come back and talk about the objective behind it which I think is actually a very worthwhile objective to try to broaden the understanding. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think I fully agree with the idea. It is a great idea. However, if you think about the follow-up, are we going to do it now? Then why don't we write it down. If we are not going to do it now, when are we going to do it and who are we?

I mean, once we finished our work, I don't think we have any mandate to continue our discussion.

Yes, Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: As I remember, this question was right in WSIS. And, actually, in WSIS, this was discussed that our group is actually the best platform to discuss this particular issue. And if we

haven't discussed and haven't come to any -- well, any meaning for that and even do not understand who will discuss it and when it will be discussed, I think it's a lack of understanding.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I fully agree with that. And if you like to have a half an hour session on that, I'm ready to consecrate half an hour to the discussion, eventually even more. Joy and Sweden.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would also like to speak to this useful recommendation. I think it is a discussion we need to have. I'm wondering whether it is a discussion -- whether it is a recommendation that could relate to further work beyond the life of or the mandate of this committee because I'm on this working group. I'm not entirely sure.

It raises for me the question of recommendations for future work as opposed to recommendations for work within this week. And I wonder if an amendment to that effect might be useful.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Sweden, then Japan.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think this is also an interesting contribution. We would like to thank the Russian Federation for it. A couple of comments. First of all, I think we had to avoid too much of a top-down approach when we're talking about the role of different stakeholders. So it would probably be very difficult for this group at this stage to clarify the role of each and every stakeholder, although we have representation from different stakeholder groups.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

Sweden. Then Japan.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We think this is also a very interesting contribution and we would like to thank the Russian Federation for it.

A couple of comments.

First of all, I think it's -- we have to avoid too much of a top-down approach when we're talking about the role of -- of different stakeholders.

So it would probably be very difficult for, let's say, this group at this stage to clarify the role of each and every stakeholder.

Although we have representation from different stakeholder groups, it would be difficult to -- for this group at this stage to clarify the role of each and every stakeholder.

So that goes also to the -- to the issue of members and how this -- how this is worded at present.

We also have to keep in mind that the role of stakeholders might also change over time and we -- our position is that the logic stands, it's up to stakeholders themselves to define their role in the Internet governance system. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think this proposal is very useful and helpful, and our proposal, Japanese proposal, Number 2, maybe (indiscernible) similar, so I think some -- I don't know now, but I'd like to amend this sentence to -- merging this sentence and our sentence. Is it okay?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. So you're referring to your proposal Number 2 and you would like to modify it?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and thanks for taking time out for discussing this important issue. I would love to. It's one of my favorite issues right now, and --

So one thing, everybody here seems to agree that it's a very difficult issue, so I think we should perhaps recommend that a special U.N. meeting is called to discuss the role of stakeholders in global public policymaking.

It is at that kind of level.

So my recommendation is that we seek a U.N. meeting on a global discussion on clarifying the role of stakeholders in public policymaking.

Meanwhile, utilizing the time that we have now, I think Phil clarified that there is a clear agreement that within the nations, the role of public policy role is with the governments, with consultations and all that, and that is not challenged.

Which I'm very happy to hear, because I have seen actors who do the same challenges inside national spaces.

I was at the -- in the IGF MAG meeting recently where it was openly said that we -- what we say has to be equally represented as governments, say, in whatever is public policy. So it's good that we recognize that within nations, we do not have a challenge to the role of governments in policymaking.

However, it seemed that there was a suggestion that the global level is different, and that's a very important thing to discuss.

I would like to note: What is the formulation at the global level for public policymaking? We know that whether it is WTO, WIPO, National Security Council -- I mean U.N. Security Council, public policies are made and enforced in a certain manner, and there seems to now be an alternative which is being used to be described in a -- that should not be top-down manner.

So I think we would like to hear what is that new model at the global level of public policymaking.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would also like to mention that when we get to the recommendations that were put in under my name and a group, we also made some that are similar and fit in very well with the recommendation that was made by Japan and the sort of further work notion of the one made by Russia, and would like to suggest that really we do have a work item that we can recommend for further work.

And while I know we're not talking about the IGF anymore at this point, it's something that I would like us to consider that as a first place for the wide-ranging open discussion.

We have found in the past years that the roles of stakeholders not only vary over time, they vary in context, they vary in different phases of different projects, and that it really -- and even the constitution of which stakeholder groups are appropriate and applicable to a particular problem varies over time.

And so you go from periods where you have two stakeholder groups, governmentals and nongovernmentals, and then you go to other periods where you may have a myriad of six or seven clearly defined stakeholder groups, and so that it is a complex multidimensional issue that really does require further broad discussion.

And dumping this on the IGF or recommending that the IGF be a place to pick up and perhaps make recommendations back to various places seems to me an approach that we can look at.

But as I say, several of the recommendations that I offer after Japan fit into this same topic area.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Chris?

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

Good morning, everybody.

Once again, I find myself in a state of confusion. It seems to be a permanent state for me.

[Laughter]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree that I think that a discussion on the roles of stakeholders is something that could take place in the IGF. It is a U.N.-endorsed body and it's the perfect place to do it. However, I'm not sure I understand -- and I'm seeking some clarification here. "Encourages members to further clarify the role of each stakeholder." I can understand that.

"And especially governments." I can understand that.

"In multistakeholder implementation mechanisms." I'm not sure that I actually understand what that means.

So I'm unclear what we would be discussing and I was wondering if perhaps a little clarity could be provided, but I want to stress that I think the concept of, as Avri said, dumping it or suggesting to the IGF that they should bring it up is a very valuable one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chris.

I'm sorry about your confusion.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Well, I really didn't take the microphone just to explain that after all, Chris is from Australia, and so we all have to help him with his permanent state of confusion.

[Laughter]

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>MARILYN CADE: You're welcome.

I actually took the floor to make a different comment, and that is, I'm struck by the similarity of the concept that's inherent in the Russian contribution, reflected in the contribution from Japan, reflected I think also, as Avri said, in a group contribution, and so I would like to think that perhaps we could take the concept and park it in this "good idea, may even deserve to be suggested for future work," but I'm also cognizant that we're not going to have time to debate a lot or discuss a lot in terms of our time limitations today.

But I would just -- wanted to note the similarity, I think, of the concept with some of the other submissions that have been made, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Very constructive.

Let me suggest the following: We have three similar proposals, draft proposals. I would like to encourage the proponents to sit down together during lunchtime and come up with a kind of unified proposal and let's discuss it further.

I'm sorry. I know that you want to take the floor, all of you, and you are extremely enthusiastic and I appreciate it, but let's -- let's discuss it after lunch in the spirit of unifying the proposals.

So I would like to ask Russia, Japan, and -- it came from Joy? The third one?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh. Avri. I'm sorry.

So I would like to ask you. And we are in good hands and I'm sure that we are going to have a proposal which will be accepted by the group.

India, do you still want to take the floor?

>>INDIA: Chair, if you permit, I'll just take a minute only.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>INDIA: Or two, maximum.

Just quick, since you allowed us to deliver a brainstorm on this multistakeholder process, or multistakeholder approach, I think you know we recognize that there have been some debates, discussions, on this issue, and recently the European Commission's document, which was a communication very early in the month, I think has really also dealt with this -- on this subject.

I think it's useful to see if those elements of it also can become part of the process of our discussion, not necessarily that we arrive at any conclusions.

One is relating to -- it talks about how the multistakeholder process in relation to Internet policies must fulfill beyond their consistency with fundamental rights and they talk about transparency, inclusiveness and balance and accountability.

In this connection, I think they're also talking about development of multistakeholder guidelines and talking about sound multistakeholder process which is genuine.

So I think these are the other dimensions. I think at some stage also they need to come into the larger debate.

Quite apart from a recognition that any such effort should not affect the ability of the public authorities, deriving their powers and legitimacy from democratic processes, to fulfill their public policy responsibilities.

I think -- I think there is a recognition -- I know that this is also, I understand, a document for discussion in a certain fora, but since we're also drawing upon various experiences in our own effort to find some perhaps some concrete answers, I just leave this thought in the room but I'm not hoping -- I mean I'm not seeking any discussion on this.

We -- we like to go by your guidance on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

It's very useful.

I'm not sure I -- if I can see a representative from the E.U. here. It would be useful if some E.U. representation would be also in this kind of small group, just to bring in these ideas, which I find extremely interesting.

Sweden -- or Japan, you wanted to take the floor? Sweden? Jimson. Jimson, sorry.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair, colleagues.

Well, I do not have any problem with the recommendation of the chair. I support your chair advisory on moving forward on this proposal.

Well, I just want to respond, if I may, to the comment of my brother, Parminder.

Really, we appreciate our government and the sovereignty of nation is not in doubt, as Phil rightly pointed out, but in their wisdom, a number of them -- at least I know my country when it comes to, for example, public policy -- some public policy issues on the Internet like, for example, the ccTLD has been fully delegated to a multistakeholder body wherein the private sector is playing a very critical role and the government just followed through and (indiscernible) with the interest of the public and it served them well, so they are very happy.

But just to be able to say that in some sectors, yes, the -- when the government (indiscernible) of giving the opportunities to participate to fully, you know, place (indiscernible) in real decision-making (indiscernible) for all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson.

Sweden, and after that, I would like to have a coffee.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We just wanted to take this opportunity to very briefly explain something related to this paper from the European Commission that has been referred to a number of times during this meeting, and it's just to say that it's a paper from the European Commission. It's under internal discussion within the European Union and it does not reflect the common position of the European Union and its member states. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Okay. I suggest to have a 15 -- and I stress it -- 15 minutes. So I expect you to be back in 20 minutes' time.

[Laughter]

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you take your seats, please? I would like to resume in one minute.

Thank you. Welcome back. Welcome back. I would like to resume where we stopped before the coffee break. We have created -- or we have asked the proponents for the role of the stakeholders to come together and come up with a unified proposal, meaning that I asked the Russian Federation, Japan, Avri and those who are interested to come together.

I'm turning to Japan for the next set of recommendations, which was submitted by Japan. Would you like us to discuss it now, or would you like us to wait until the results of your consultations? Japan, please.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan originally proposed four proposals. The second one we will match this proposal to Russian proposal and Ms. Avri's proposal.

So I would like to explain the first one and third one and the fourth one.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay, go ahead, please.

>>JAPAN: Japan -- with regard to the first one, we considered that we should cover and (indiscernible) all stakeholders when we discussed the role of stakeholders, not only government.

And concerning the third one, with regard to the role of governments, Japan believes that all governments should encourage various stakeholders participate and cooperate to collect and reflect the opinions and to utilize their knowledge, experience and technology in order to address the Internet-related public policy issues.

With regard to the fourth one, on the other hand, concerning the role of stakeholders, Japan thinks that they should participate in the discussion and express their opinion in order to resolve issues with their knowledge, experience and technology cooperating with governments.

So we think the cooperation among all stakeholders is very useful and important to address the Internet-related public policy issues. So government should take appropriate actions to enhance the participation of all stakeholders for decision-making and conduct the necessary policy to deal with Internet-related public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan, for the clarifications and the explanations. Now I open the floor for discussion. Would anyone like to comment on proposals from Japan? We are talking about proposal 1, 2 -- 1, 3 and 4.

Is my assessment that you agree on that and we can move forward? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding 1, I think my intervention on the previous recommendation will cover this as there is no existing institution addressing public policy issues, which is -- they address now only technical matters.

Number 3, with regard to the role of governments, all governments should increase their transparency of the process of their decision-making. I mean, up until now, government is unable to participate in the Internet governance in order to develop public policy issues. So how we ask our government to increase their transparency, I think there is some missing point in here. First, it is enable government to perform their role, then we would ask them to increase their transparency. Thank you -- if there is lack in transparency. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Would you like to provide the modifications you think would be appropriate?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, I think our recommendation is in this direction. So when we go to our recommendation, we can see. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Can I propose then to come together with Japan to have a kind of common -- is it acceptable to Japan? We are talking about point 3. Yes, Iran, I can see you.

Japan, is it acceptable to sit down with Saudi Arabia and come up with a kind of joint proposal?

>>JAPAN: Yes, yes, it is acceptable for us.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

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

Mr. Chairman, to me it seems that Number 1 and 3 are a statement in recommendation. And Number 4, it seems at the moment, this recommendation is doing by some entities at the international level. So I don't see any fruit in having that one because -- or maybe to say "continue" because at the moment we have the other stakeholder -- I mean, all the stakeholders participating in discussions. And I don't want to refer because many times it's been referred to. Therefore, maybe it would be changes or -- I mean, consolidated work with Saudi Arabia, we can have a better paragraph on the matter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's exactly my idea, that eventually I'm expecting to have a kind of joint proposal which will be acceptable to all of us.

Just a quick one, would you like to work on Number 4 as well and Number 1? Japan, you will have a lot of work to do during lunchtime.

>>JAPAN: We accept other members who would like to cooperate with us. I will come.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay, thank you.

Can I conclude on that that we come back on that and we are going to listen to the results of your consultations and joint proposals?

I suggest we move further. We have a draft recommendation submitted by Avri. Would you like to give me some explanation? Thank you.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, quite quickly. First one is a recommendation that fits into the discussion we've already discussed having later. And the rest of them are really statements that support that first statement. So perhaps Joy might want to comment on the last of the bullets. But really other than the first one, I believe most of them are statements that we'd like to see reflected in the report but they're not recommendations.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. We take note of that, that you suggest to convert them to statements rather than recommendations.

>>AVRI DORIA: I confirm that Joy heard what I said and as one of the main contributors of this also supports my having said so.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, the first one is something you will discuss in a smaller group and all the rest are to be considered statements.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. I think the last bullet point is intended as a recommendation, so I'm happy to work on prefacing it so that it is characterized as one, appreciating the point that we're now working with Richard to make sure that they're framed as recommendations.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, just for clarification, has your comment been captured by the secretariat? So that was the one you referred to?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That is correct, okay.

Can we discuss it now? Because for statements, I don't believe we are going to discuss it at that point.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Please, please.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So can I have some --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Some wording? I think we could have the first sentence remain as it is and then add after the word "human rights" at the end of it, "and should." And then I would delete the rest down to the colon.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And the rest stays as is? Okay. I can see India, Iran. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just two quick comments on the current proposal. I think it is important to bear in mind when you talk about international human rights law, it is always useful to prescribe to those countries which are parties to those laws. I think not every country is a party to all international human rights law, and I'm sure everyone in the room agrees to this.

And then responsibilities need not be special but they are responsibilities. So perhaps instead of doing this, you could say that governments have responsibilities. You can delete the word "special", under international human rights law, to which they are parties, and bearers of duties to respect, et cetera." And toward the end, end of the line, you could say "relating to Internet."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Excuse me. Yeah.

>>INDIA: To which they are parties. Comma. At the end of the sentence, "human rights relating to Internet," full stop.

And then perhaps this is just a matter of detail, I think, in the sense that we can list many things here, I don't see the need in our group to go down to that detail because if there is a recognition to which they are parties, then that becomes a responsibility, then they ought to be fulfilling those responsibilities.

And I think I leave it at that with the submission that 1 to 6 are -- not to differ from some of them, but we are going to the part of listing a number of areas which we think that at this point in time, we have the time -- neither the luxury of time, I would say, to go down and analyze each of them and come up with some suggestions on this. So I will request if we can leave the chapeau very general statement and then move from there. Thank you.

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

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While echoing what just has been says by previous speaker, Mr. Chairman, I think we are going beyond the -- even what we have in the Human Rights Council, Mr. Chairman. Here we are talking about Internet, not human rights issues. Therefore, we have to leave it to the Human Rights Council to decide on that because that's a specialized agency.

And I don't think the related organs or bodies on Internet can have -- or can recommend something which is beyond even the existing human rights documents or treaties. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think we're moving away from our mandate. Our mandate is to focus on Tunis Agenda, not to bring in new language and responsibility to governments. Government responsibilities are very clear in the Tunis Agenda. Let's just stick to the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we support this recommendation as originally drafted. We think that it has -- it is an attempt to give some direction to the role of governments as one of stakeholders dealing with these issues and the implementation of the Tunis Agenda as well as the implementation of the enhanced cooperation.

We have a slight problem with the amendment proposed by India because international human rights law consists of both customary law as well as treaty law as well as sovereign law. Therefore, we think the addition to which they are parties does confuse that slightly. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Anyone else on this issue? Russia?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: If we would like to make an attempt to freeze the responsibilities of government, we cannot limit it to human rights only because government is also responsible for economical development of the countries and to the interests of the national -- national interest of the countries and so on.

So it means that we need to make it complete.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Do you have text to suggest?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, I will come with text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I am making a reference, again, to the WCIT we had in 2012 which was supposed to come up with an international treaty in the preamble which we had a statement about human rights. Right here we are not writing a treaty. We are just giving recommendations.

Anyone else from the members?

Okay. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to take the opportunity to add my support to the earlier statement of my Swedish colleague. We would support this recommendation in its original format.

I think to have responsibilities under international human rights law makes it clear. It is sort of implicit how that applies.

And we believe that this is very important text and definitely has a place in this document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Australia. I'm sorry.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Sorry. I was just going to, if it's helpful, just welcome this amendment from India in relation to the words "and promote human rights relating to the Internet." I thought that -- at least in respect to that, I thought that was a helpful addition.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any comments from members? Australia now.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

Just adding a voice of support for Sweden's intervention. This is something we can support and think would be important to include in the recommendations, and I just wanted to voice a note of surprise

about some of the opposition to this, given some of the debate that we've had underway in the MPP in which some member states of this body very strongly argued about the relevance of human rights to Internet issues.

Also to flag that, you know, these sorts of issues are not early into the Tunis Agenda, and are, in fact, included in many of the documents relating to it. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. I would just like to add our voice to those who are supporting this recommendation as it's now worded. We think this is something that's important to be included and should not be controversial and is certainly part of the whole WSIS package. I think that's -- that's very clear, if you look at the totality of all the WSIS -- the various WSIS instruments and other discussions we've been having about the WSIS process, as our Australian colleague has indicated.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Canada.

I'm turning to Russia. When do you think you can have the text you think should be added?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah. During the lunchtime, I will provide.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I can see India asking for...

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

If you have expressed an interest to discuss this paragraph, we're ready for that. At least I'm -- I can give some suggestions on (i), (ii), (iii) or whatever subitems.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>INDIA: I mean, we want to know your intention. If you want to proceed in the direction of actually having to discuss each of these lines, then I have suggestions to make.

If not, our suggestion was to leave it as general as it could get without going into the details.

But if that is the preference in the hall -- in the room, I think we'll be very happy to make suggestions from our side on subitems of this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Please, Mr. Reddy, go ahead.

>>INDIA: Chair, with regard to (i), can we please add "consult widely and be participative in the development of global" -- rather, "international Internet public policy issues"?

"Internet public policy issues."

"As well as" --

You can leave it at that, I think.

"Local Internet policy." But it's not very clear, though. We're saying -- we're talking of national Internet policies, but that is -- I don't think we like to suggest the word "national." It might give a sense of fragmentation of Internet, which I'm sure no one wants in this room to happen.

We are talking of national policies on Internet or -- I think we need to just make sure that these three words are reflecting the intent which we want to convey.

But I leave it to the authors of this text to reflect on that.

And then second one is "faithfully represent the diversity of civil society views." I think that will capture the sense of it.

The later part seems to be infructuous because the very fact that "faithfully represent," that means you --

[Scribes lost audio]

>>INDIA: -- I guess that's already -- it's happening in many countries. That's not a problem.

The next -- looking at the -- the last one I'll go down to, which is "take steps to ensure that businesses meet human rights standards," now here we need to be a little more explicit about reference to the U.N. guidance on human rights in business.

I must admit here that this is work in progress in the Human Rights Council. India is one of the core group members of this -- the forum for business and human rights. It's work in progress. If you want to give in a very general manner, we would not mind having specific reference, so saying for example you could say that, "comma, inter alia, in line with" -- "comma, inter alia" -- so say, for example, "in line with" -- or "in accordance with the U.N. guidelines on human rights in business." I think I'll leave it at this, Chair, for the time being.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I ask you to just go through -- I mean just to read through that? Have your remarks been captured correctly?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think as I mentioned, Paragraph (iii), Subparagraph (iii), and (v) perhaps need to be rephrased.

As I said, leave it in a more -- what do we call it? -- nonconfrontational language, which can encourage governments to do more in that direction.

So I have no language at this stage, but will come back to you on this.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

As it states, is it more acceptable?

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Chair.

Were you asking me whether -- about the rewording or because I had my flag up?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You say whatever you want to.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. I was just curious because it -- there had been a question right before my name.

Basically, one of the things I wanted to point out -- and it comes up frequently in these discussions where when certain human rights principles or other principles are put on the table, that we hear the notion that, "But of course no one wants the Internet to fragment."

And while no one wants to see any nation shut itself off from the global Internet, we have to acknowledge the ability of any country to do so if it feels that it needs to within the constraints of human rights as applied globally.

And I find myself very uncomfortable with the notion of fragmentation or the desire to avoid fragmentation being used as a method to sort of minimize global adherence to human rights and to asserting those principles.

And I mean I also assert my faith that any fragmentation we ever see in the Internet will be something that is temporary and that would be healed in time.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Now, to my previous question, anyone who would like to take the floor?

Do we have agreement on that?

United States.

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

Chairman, we're disposed to look at this very favorably. As we said yesterday, we're checking with capital on the language and now the specific language, and we hope to come back to you as quickly as we can. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I expect to have a night session.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I apologize to colleagues for having to get closer to the screen. I seem to be having contact problems.

But -- contact problems.

But my comment was going to be: This is another one of those very worthwhile submissions that has a lot of different points in it, but there's also a significant amount of complexity in the bullets, and some of the bullets seem to be -- some of the -- sorry, not bullets. Sorry. The numbered small Roman numbers seem to be general and be focused on international activity, and others may be more focused on national activity.

I think I would be more predisposed to think about keeping what is now shown on the screen as the first bullet and to edit it slightly.

And one comment I would make is that in fact I think it's a statement, and I also -- I -- there's a phrase in the bullet on the paper version I have that I don't think is reflected up there, and that just could be my poor eyesight this morning, but in the paper it says they also have the responsibility to protect and promote the public interest.

Human rights -- the recognition of human rights is certainly one very, very important area. I think also the public interest responsibility that governments have which includes consumer -- which is -- I'm not equating them here but I think it's also worth noting that that concept was also in the previous submission and is a very worthwhile concept.

So in summary, the chapeau with some small changes and as a statement, I would be very favorably disposed to.

The complexity of the small -- the smaller Roman numbered items I can't see as fitting into a single recommendation, and some of them, as I said before, I think are not -- would have to have a long debate to figure out whether they're national or they're international or they're international and regional. So I would prefer to go with a simpler approach as a statement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Anyone from the members?

Iran.

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

We have no problem with the chapeau, but for the rest, I need to consult with my capital. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So I think we shall leave it at that. I appreciate that you need some time to consult with your capital. I can see Joy. Then if no one else from the group would like to take the floor, I give the floor afterwards to Richard.

Joy, please.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thanks, everyone, for those helpful comments.

I can hear some useful suggestions for how to strengthen and tighten this, and certainly happy to work on that over the lunch break, and particularly picking up the points from our colleague from Iran.

If it's helpful and it would inch us towards consensus, I'm certainly happy to reflect on removing parts of the subparagraphs and having an agreed chapeau, but that presumes that there is the ability to get some consensus on the chapeau.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Okay. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Yeah, yesterday we had a discussion on a different recommendation which I think is related to this, so I don't know if you want to look at them together or not, on human rights, and the point was made that it should be a recommendation and not a statement, and I think that's because it's not exactly clear what is going to happen with the statements.

So the main output of this group is recommendations and then I think important things like human rights should indeed appear as recommendations.

And from my point of view, the observation made by Sweden about you don't need "to which they are parties" is correct, because that's understood. You have responsibilities under international human rights law. Everybody has those under customary law, and then you may have additional ones from the treaties to which you are parties, but you don't need to say that. That, I think, is understood.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard.

Your comment is really valuable in the sense that in fact we try to come up with a report which should be as concise as possible in order that readers can read it.

Moreover, readers will -- will read it. At least I hope that they will.

Anyone else on this issue?

I understand that there are delegations who would like to have consultation with their capital. I respect that. I understand that the proponent would like to work further on this issue. I understand that there are proposals to have it as a recommendation. And I understand as well that it should be a statement.

So probably we are going to capture on the screen all these and we will come back sometime, considering that offices in Washington will open, I think, in two, three hours from now, so probably after lunch we can come back to that.

Okay. Thank you.

Let's move down.

We have a joint proposal from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and the U.K., and I can identify Per.

Can you give us some clarification about it? Or explanation, rather?

>>PER LINNAR: Thank you, Chairman.

I think there has been a call for defining the role of governments in various fora, not at least here in Geneva. There was a discussion that we had in the WTPF. We have had it in various working groups in the ITU. We have had it in the WSIS MPP process. We have seen it in the CSTD, and so on.

And I think this draft recommendation should be seen as an attempt to give some direction to the answer to that question without -- without limiting the role of governance to only what is in here, because I think that is a very important part of this recommendation, "should include but not be limited to," but we tried to, I think, find some areas where we thought that it might be possible to reach a consensus.

Yeah. I think I -- I'll stop there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I open the floor on this recommendation, draft recommendation.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. First, I would like to thank, Brazil, Mexico, Sweden and United Kingdom for their draft recommendation. We see it a good attempt to enable government to perform further responsibilities. But we see one of the responsibilities agreed in WSIS as not mentioned in here. So if we can include the development of international public policy issues in this recommendation, I mean, we can agree. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I turn to the proponents. Is it agreeable to include this? Brazil? Where is Victoria?

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Now, I can only speak on behalf of the Swedish delegation. For us, this is probably something in addition that we would have to think over and consult with the capital about.

We definitely see governments -- that government has a role in the development of international public policy but is not the only stakeholder that plays a role in that as we see it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Can I encourage -- oh, Brazil, please.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, likewise, we would like first to ask the secretariat to add the suggested text and put it in brackets. And I think we then should have some time to evaluate it, come back.

(Scribes lost audio).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: -- after lunch and eventually have a discussion with Saudi Arabia before getting back with a final result to me. Thank you.

U.S., you would like to be part of it?

>>UNITED STATES: I have a question.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. As we have been discussing the role of stakeholders, generally -- well, in a broader sense, perhaps, in the context of this grouping and the previous -- can we -- I just wanted to ask a question about how this might relate to the work being done on the role of stakeholders generally, that we're -- that we referred to the earlier recommendation and the small group that might be working on role of stakeholders.

As you may recall, when we drafted the questionnaire months and months ago, it seems like now, we wanted to be sure to include a discussion of the role of governments but also a discussion of the role of all stakeholders. So I just wonder how those two efforts might relate. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are asking me or asking the proponents?

>>UNITED STATES: I suppose I pose the question for the room because --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right, okay.

>>UNITED STATES: The Chairman, the proponents and perhaps a small group. I'm not sure, but thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, who would like to answer? Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have to be careful in drafting the recommendations. In some parts when we are talking about the rights and powers of the governments, it should be shared with the other stakeholders. But when we are talking about the commitments, it is only on governments. So there is inconsistency between this approach. Therefore, we have to be very careful. We ask governments to share their rights and powers; but when we are talking commitments, we are asking only them to be responsible and transparent and accountable. So how come it's possible? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Constance?

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. I would support the initial text proposed. I think it's an interesting proposal.

I would suggest tweaking the very last part of this long sentence where it seems to foster a robust global Internet infrastructure. I would propose it be changed into "to support multistakeholder processes and partnerships and support enabling environments for a robust global Internet infrastructure."

I'm concerned that the initial draft gives the impression that the role is exclusively for governments, while we know that the development of the global Internet infrastructure is multistakeholder by nature.

And just to finish, I'm not very comfortable with the inclusion proposed by the distinguished delegate from Saudi Arabia as it gives, again, the impression that it excludes other stakeholders from a specific role in the context of this recommendation. So I would -- I would suggest taking out "the development of international public policy" at the very beginning of the draft recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance.

Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Well, I quite support the text as it was originally but it remains quite welcome. And in that regard, may I suggest if Iran could join the group that is Saudi Arabia and Brazil, Mexico, Sweden to rephrase or tidy up the wording. But if (indiscernible), it is okay. I like the whole idea. We could just require perhaps that the governments, yes, we know governments has sovereign rights and they have some roles to play in the multistakeholder environment. So the spirit is well understood. So if they could come up with a final text, we could look at it with this spirit, it's okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I like the original intent with the edits that Constance from ISOC added. But I'm going to suggest an idea here. I think the original intent was narrower in scope and purpose than would be the scope and purpose if Saudi's addition is made.

Right now, it's not directly addressing the development of public policy. It really, I think, is intended to address something else.

With Constance's edits in particular, if it would be possible to consider keeping the scope and purpose of this initial recommendation with Constance's reordering changes, then I think I understand and appreciate Saudi's point that when we -- I'm not suggesting I support it. I understand it and appreciate it.

[Laughter]

That the -- they're very different views about the development of international public policy. If we could keep recommendation and have it focused on the enabling environment, whereas is heavily about

the implementation. And the implementation of the enabling environment or Internet infrastructure is heavily, in all countries, involving the private sector, NGOs, academia.

So my plea is sort of if we keep the original scope, perhaps we can keep the recommendation.

And then we can live to discuss another day or later this afternoon the point the esteemed colleague from Saudi Arabia made. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

I can identify Parminder and India.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I think this proposed recommendation is very promising because it talks clearly about things which have been under discussion for a long time.

Though, I would like to keep the development of international public policy because that's the area we are talking about. And public policy and legal framework has close relationship. They're very connected kind of concepts. And to be clear, that we are talking about public policy issues.

I also agree with some suggestions that here it says we should talk about what is the role of other stakeholders because in (indiscernible), yes, different stakeholders have different roles in different parts but that doesn't really add to anything unless we are specific. And we are here specific about certain things which we have proposed role of the governments for.

So I would like to add another part to the next recommendation about the roles. And I will speak slowly, if possible, that could be typed in. Next recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Excuse me, Parminder. Can you hold it for a second? Is it a modification of this recommendation or amendment of this recommendation, or is it a new recommendation?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Actually, I can say we can carry on. I'm saying the role of those non-government stakeholders should be to -- it carries on from what has been written. It is connected to that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Let's give it a try.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Okay. "All non-government stakeholders should participate fully in processes for international public policy development by bringing in views from all sectors of the society, providing expertise, and seeking full transparency and accountability. Formal processes for this should be set up." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Can we go back to the original text? I think the referencing of international public policy is important in this. The following suggestions I have to make, one, in the second line, the

word "ensure" can be replaced with "develop," "develop a fair and consistent legal framework for international public policy issues, in" -- and then you can delete the word "that," "in a transparent, accountable, and equitable manner and then protect human rights online." Yeah, that's right. I think that would make it a very firm recommendation, which is ensuring -- I think it is not necessarily very specific. It is not actionable. Instead, we could talk about developing a legal framework for these issues which eventually protect human rights online, I think. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we would like to thank everyone for contributing to the discussion. We are not comfortable with the changes just proposed by India because we think it changes the very nature of what we tried to capture by this recommendation. So we would not be in a position to agree to that.

At the same -- along the same lines, we also have some difficulties with the addition suggested by Parminder because it relates to the proposal made by Saudi Arabia about the development of international public policy.

And this is not an area where governments have a monopoly, in our opinion. And, therefore, we do not think that the addition by Parminder fully reflects the spirit of the multistakeholder model and we could, therefore, not agree to that addition. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

My suggestion is I would like to come back to the original status -- that is, after Saudi Arabia suggested the addition -- and I have heard the reaction from different proponents to go back to capital and consult on the proposals, and I would like to encourage the proponents and Saudi Arabia to sit together and anyone who is interested may participate in this discussion, and come back after lunch with a consolidated text which is acceptable.

I can sense a wish for consensus and there is a trend for consensus.

We are not far from that, so please do your best and come back after lunch with that.

Saudi Arabia.

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

I think the amendments proposed by India are good, so I would appeal we include them in the consultation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it's up to India. If you would like to participate in the discussion during lunchtime, I encourage you to do so, and probably you are more than welcome.

So I would like to stop the discussion on this issue now and we are coming back to that.

If, Richard, you'd like to contribute more on that which you think would be extremely useful --

>>RICHARD HILL: Just to try, Chairman.

I think I understood the comment from Sweden regarding the proposal by Parminder which is the second paragraph there.

Perhaps that could be addressed -- just a question -- by dropping the "nongovernments." So simply saying "all stakeholders should participate fully in processes," et cetera, et cetera.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So I propose to go further.

Next one, please.

Okay. I would like to ask Saudi Arabia to introduce the proposal.

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

Well, in C1 is a recommendation regarding the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, including governments, and implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation as defined in the Tunis Agenda.

So a platform for global public policy and oversight is the responsibility of intergovernmental organizations, where all governments on equal footing can come and develop such policies.

The development of the process, as we know it, is (indiscernible) and vital step so it is the responsibility of government.

The final agreement is the responsibility of government.

Implementation of these international public policies is the responsibility of all stakeholders.

And in C3, I mean how enhanced cooperation will enable others to perform their roles and responsibilities. You can see the private sector will do the research and the development of technologies, consultative contribution to the drafting of national laws, promoting capacity building.

Civil society, awareness training, promoting various public interest, articulating perspectives on marginalized people, engaging in the policy process.

International organizations will do the development of technical standards and related policies, but also conform to international public policies.

The technical community and academia will interact with all stakeholder groups in areas of stability, security, functioning, and evolution of the Internet.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

We have quite a lot of interesting proposals here. I open the floor for discussion.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

This is certainly a significant amount of words and interesting concepts, but I find myself not in agreement with specific suggestions about directing things to a single specialized agency of the United Nations, so I would have difficulty with targeting a particular U.N. agency, particularly one that has a well-defined constitution and convention and, therefore, a particular focus and scope.

I also have already spoken on the difficulty that I have of agreeing to creating a mechanism, and I -- so I guess now I'll extend that to enhancing an existing mechanism to take on responsibilities that are not already a part of their acknowledged areas.

So those are concerns I have initially.

I also will make a very quick comment about the development of public policy in my own country. I worked for state government for 10 years and was heavily involved -- so I was a government employee for 10 years. I was heavily involved in the development of laws at a state level, and we had a requirement to have active involvement of our citizens at all levels, including even -- although not in the vote that our parliamentarians took, the meetings were open, there were hearings, there were submissions, experts testified. It was a very heavily interactive engagement. By no means was the government setting itself up to exclude the participation of citizens.

And I see that heavily involved in -- at the state level in the United States and many other countries and nations, and also at the federal level.

So I'm cautious about exclusionary statements that don't take into account the engagement governments already undertake in involving citizens in being experts in deliberations and even submitting draft language, which is something that is done in many countries. I would like to study this further and see if it's perhaps possible to find certain segments of it that might -- might be -- there might be an ability to come back to, to see if there are some recommendations in it that relate to capacity building that could be supported.

Finally, I'll just say that Saudi Arabia has done an interesting straw proposal that defines the roles of other sectors, and I am sure that colleagues from those other sectors, while embracing certain things here, might have expanded ideas of the contribution that stakeholders can make.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Just on this last remark you've made about the Saudis' proposal on the role of the stakeholders, it is my feeling that it would very well fit into the discussions we had before about the joint proposal from Russia, from Japan, and Avri.

Would you like to have it included in their deliberations and would you like to be part of this, or you maintain your proposal as a separate one?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm asking you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I'm sorry. I was not following, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So Marilyn made a remark about -- a variable remark about your proposal concerning the stakeholders and we have had a discussion about it before, I think, coffee break, and we decided to set up a kind of ad hoc group based on the proposal from Russia, from Japan, and from Avri also on this topic.

My question is whether you'd like to have it included in this joint proposal or you'd like to maintain your proposal separately. In case you would like to be included in a kind of joint proposal, would you like to join the group? I would very much encourage you to do that.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. I would prefer to make it separate, but I will join them in the discussion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

Anyone else from the members on Saudi Arabia's proposals?

Can I take it that there is a consensus on that?

Peru?

>>PERU: I tend to agree with Marilyn overall. I find that there are a lot of ideas that are quite - - I find that there are quite a few ideas in these paragraphs that are very interesting, although I also think that it is not only inconvenient at this point but also premature to suggest a role in public policy with the ITU.

I would go back to an idea that was mentioned yesterday as to the need of using the capabilities of the institutions that we know now and perhaps suggesting better ways of having these institutions evolve.

I don't know if I'm making myself clear or not.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. It's great. I mean absolutely clear. Thank you.

>>PERU: Okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: For clarification from Saudi Arabia, when referring to the ITU, are you referring to the ITU council working group on international public policy issues?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: The ITU as an entire body, not as the council working group, sir.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So taking the recommendations as a group, because I think they're conceptually or they're conceived, if you like, as a conceptual whole, though I understand they're separate. Just a comment on that.

Firstly, I think that the recommendations refer to the role of stakeholders as defined in the Tunis Agenda, and it must be remembered that the Tunis Agenda was not an agenda which civil society was involved in agreeing to, so it's something which governments have agreed to, and I think that it's quite clear that the role of civil society, as defined in the Tunis Agenda, is completely inadequate. It fails to even capture otherwise agreed definitions of civil society and the role of civil society elsewhere in the United Nations. For example, the United Nations secretary, Ban Ki-Moon, has issued a number of documents about civil society and its role.

So I think I welcome the opportunity from the Saudi proposal to look again at the Tunis Agenda and the definition of civil society, which, as I said, is inadequate, and we would welcome that.

And it's useful to see, for example, governments wanting civil society to have a role in promotion of local language content, but of course it's actually civil society which is creating much of local (indiscernible) content and leading public policy initiatives in that area.

So we would like to see much more of a focus in the recommendations from this group on looking afresh and looking again at the roles of stakeholders in the Tunis Agenda.

So that's my first point.

I think the second one, in relation to the recommendation for implementing enhanced cooperation relating to governments, is that -- in C2 is that while it's, of course, entirely up to any stakeholder group, including governments, to organize themselves as they see fit, when it comes to international public policy, issues relating to the Internet, these must take place amongst stakeholders -- amongst all stakeholders on an equal footing, not only governments, and therefore we'd want to see -- and I'd be happy to help with wording to that effect in the redrafting of these recommendations, should they proceed.

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to join the commenters before me in observing that this is a very rich and thorough proposal, so it takes a lot of digesting.

But one thing that strikes us is that it refers to the -- it's not explicitly to a new institution or a new body. It does refer to a new mandate for an existing one, which to our understanding was something we reached yesterday as sort of a -- an under- -- a mutual understanding and a -- perhaps a healthy point of understanding where we have agreed to disagree.

And so I'm wondering how this -- the full aspect of these proposals will be reflected in that regard.

As Saudi Arabia and others might work together on the stakeholder component of it, we certainly welcome that work, although I still have an outstanding question about how any definitions we come up with and recommendations we come up with here relate to the small group effort to possibly define some further work, so I have some caution and pause with regard to this -- this particular set. Thank you.

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

I just want to recall our earlier discussion this morning when we had a proposal to enable the CSTD to discuss public policy issues and we agreed that it's not in the remit of this group to enlarge a mandate of an international organization or part of it.

I think we may like to leave it to the plenipotentiary conference of the ITU to define or redefine its mandate, but I don't really believe that we have the capability of doing it here.

Having said that, I can identify Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would just like to echo what was said by Peru about the importance of trying to utilize existing -- existing bodies and mechanisms within their existing mandates in the best possible way, and we are not in a position to support any new mechanism or any expanded mandate given to the ITU or any other organization in this regard.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Any members of the group?

If not, I give the floor to Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would support the view taken by Sweden and some others that it's certainly a very detailed and comprehensive proposal, but I think that the approach taken by Sweden in the previous recommendation we were looking at a while ago is a better one in the sense that we -- we were discussing early in this meeting that we need to focus on areas where we're in agreement and not in disagreement, and I think in terms of establishing a new platform or mechanism, as is stated in this proposal, that's clearly an area where we're not in agreement and so we -- we would join those who would not be in favor of this particular recommendation and the whole of this recommendation.

I think the other approach of looking at maybe more modest areas that we have in common is better.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Canada.

Anyone from the members or member states?

In case no -- Nigel?

>> ICANN: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman, good morning. Or is it afternoon? I just wanted to comment on this in relation to the overall context of the discussion we're having because I think it's very refreshing that we're able to debate a proposal like this, a proposal that doesn't rely on references to the Tunis Agenda, a proposal in text that doesn't rely on necessarily any other attributable reference and puts the language fairly clearly.

Now, I absolutely take the point in terms of this group accepting such language as if we would perhaps, it would be inappropriate to give other bodies mandates. Obviously, that's one factor.

But I think the importance of this is to -- is the debate which some of the theories sort of invoke in terms of what are the public policy responsibility for governments and other institutions. And I think I would reflect on comments made by Marilyn and others in this respect, that already from a factual situation, in many governments, public policy decisions are derived through more than just government officials. They're derived through members of the academic community, members of the technical community, whatever. And it has got nothing to do with the Internet. It has got nothing to do with ICT. These are decisions that are made in settings which do not just involve governments.

It is the same in the European Union, in some of the secondary legislation that the European Union adopts. It is made in the context where there is more than just governments in the room.

So I think we have to reflect on that, and we have to reflect on as we go forward the way that the Internet -- we're talking about Internet public policy here, but we also have to reflect on the way that the Internet itself irrespective of the public policy considerations of it is affecting how legislation, regulation, policies derive at the government level. I think a discussion has to be taken at some point. Of course, we are in your hands of how and when that is done. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I think several people have made the same point I would like to make. Although it doesn't say so in the chapeau, it is clear here that we are talking about international public policy relating to the Internet.

Now, the Internet is a very broad term, which I think in our discussion encompasses as we've already talked about intellectual property rights, human rights, and so on. And it is clear that will be on the mandate of the ITU.

So I would support those who said that there should be no specific mention here of the ITU because different intergovernmental organizations have mandates to deal with different aspects. For example, the Human Rights Council looks at the human rights aspects. WIPO looks at the intellectual property aspects and so on and so forth. If that were to help, perhaps one could consider simply deleting that we specifically suggest that this be ITU, with the understanding, of course, that certain aspects are within the remit of the ITU. Radio frequencies is one which is not controversial. Everybody agrees the ITU does radio frequencies, which have an impact on the Internet.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard, of reminding us of the upcoming WRC15 which, in fact, will have a significant impact on the mobile telecommunications and specifically on the mobile Internet by freeing again frequencies.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps some of this discussion, which I am going to also to contribute to, is becoming repetitive and perhaps infructuous. Still, I think the role of stakeholders is a very important thing to talk about.

I heard Marilyn and then Nigel respectively talk about how U.S. policy making is taking place and perhaps in Europe and other places. And I'm happy to provide the best of the best practices and put it out on a paper and sign that. And mention was made that everyone was in the room. And we have all agreed that everybody has to be in the room, ask questions, make drafts, seek responses, ask why the draft was not accepted. But that's not the question. Everybody agrees to those rules for all stakeholders.

The question is final policy authority. Policy authority is the word used in Section 35. These terms have clear, clear meaning in all policies of the world, in political signs. They are known what they are. Delegated authority, like Jim said about ccTLD, is different from policy authority. Delegated authority can be passed on to any structure. That's the prerogative of the policymakers. But policy authority is a specific thing. And we are talking in Tunis Agenda enhanced cooperation about policy authority for international public policies and whether other stakeholders have an equal role in decision-making. That's the point we are talking about.

Anybody who wants to give a best practice of where actually non-governmental people sign on, vote for this kind of a thing, I'm very happy to listen and incorporate in our discussion.

It's now not going to -- will be very helpful in the present text but I just wanted to contribute the point as I understand that we are talking about public policy authority, not delegated authority. We are talking did decision-making and role of other stakeholders in that particular point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I would welcome all discussions on this issue. Right now, I would like to come back and concentrate on the proposals in front of us. And I would like to take it one by one.

Can we have a final text with the remarks which have been announced concerning the ITU?

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It is just a point of clarification. I was recalling that yesterday - I can't remember what time because -- I think it was late in the day -- there was a similar recommendation related to the ITU about which there was no consensus. And so I'm just wondering -- I'm thinking ahead because I know there are a number of recommendations coming up in the rest of the cluster of the recommendations that we have that make the same recommendation.

I'm just wondering how we deal with that in relation to when we previously agreed there is no consensus. Just please, I think some guidance on that from the group is needed. Otherwise, I fear that we will be reflecting back multiple of the same recommendations tomorrow when we come to the final set. So just how we deal with that fact would be helpful.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, thank you for your question. We are going to take the same approach. If we have consensus on the recommendation, then we shall finalize it as a recommendation. In case we don't have consensus, we're going to reflect it in the report, the topic itself, the possible description, short description, of the opinions about it.

But, first, I have to know in which -- let me put it this way -- which category we are in. Is it the consensus or is it not a consensus? So I have heard concrete suggestions not to be specific about ITU. And I have also heard suggestions saying that there's no agreement in spite of the fact that the topic itself is extremely important.

So I'm turning to you about your feeling of a consensus or about the possibility of modifying the text in order to achieve some consensus.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. Perhaps I wasn't clear earlier. While the sentence on the ITU is one aspect of difficulty for us, it is really the whole chunk of C1 here and perhaps others that give us some difficulty for related reasons, you know, particularly with regard to responsibility of governments and sort of explicitly and exclusively, even in the authority as Parminder mentioned earlier.

So my view based on the comments in the room so far is that we do not have consensus on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So anyone else? Do we agree that we don't agree? So I'm afraid we have to note that there was no consensus on C1.

Let's go to C2.

I assume this is a word by word from the Tunis Agenda. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. May I ask -- I'm a little confused by the "is provided in recommendation B2." So should we actually be looking at a different place in the document to find more detail? Or are we just looking at these three lines?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you give us some clarification, Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, the recommendation for implementing enhanced cooperation enabling governments is what we provided in B2. So we are in the section regarding roles and responsibilities of stakeholders. So the government would perform the roles as we said in B2.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you for that clarification. I believe B2 was rejected as lack of consensus. Can I verify at that? Or was not accepted due to lack of consensus? Working on my diplomatic language training.

Can I verify that?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So you have it on the screen, B2?

>>MARILYN CADE: And it says "no consensus," right?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Can you go back to C2? Can I conclude that in recommendation B2 which is referred to, since we don't have consensus, we don't have a consensus on C2?

Let me repeat the topics which have been dealt with, and we have no consensus on but will be reflected in the report with the proper opinion: C3.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. For anyone who didn't live through the four years of the World Summit on the Information Society who may be reading this transcript from the four corners of the world, WGIG refers to the six-month working group that -- multistakeholder working group that worked together on an equal footing that did put forward a fairly interesting report with four different examples of ways to work together across multistakeholders in the Internet governance area.

I just wanted to mention that as a footnote almost because sometimes in terminology is a little vague.

In no way can I see how this is a recommendation. I can't make it into a recommendation. It says that it is a recommendation on how enhanced cooperation can enable stakeholders other than governments. It might be a statement. It is noting -- it should be noted that the WGIG report gives a fairly comprehensive assessment, et cetera, et cetera. That might be a statement, I would posit. But I'm not sure how I could see this could be a representation.

And then I will just add one other caution. I think we've talked before about the roles of stakeholders and we have a group that's going to be talking more about that at lunchtime.

This is some examples of the role of various stakeholders. But as I said earlier in my comments, stakeholders probably want to be able to self-define their participation. So if we wanted to make it a statement, maybe we could talk more about it. But I'm having difficulty turning it into an active recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. You said a very important word, lunch break.

But before we do that, I would like to ask you, Saudi Arabia, that you agree that you would participate in the discussion on this issue. And I'm really happy to note that you nodded.

So I suggest to leave it after the discussion, and let's go to C4 and I want to finish all the submissions.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: C4 could be an example of how the various roles by stakeholders be implemented. So, I mean, we can consider it as an example recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You're suggesting that this should also be included in your discussions? Thank you.

C5.

Personally, I think this is a very rich text. Probably it needs eventually to be modified to qualify to be a recommendation. That is as a first glance at the proposal.

Sweden, then United States.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We are in agreement with your assessment. We do not consider this to be -- have the form of a recommendation but rather a form of a statement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. We also agree with you on the assessment that it's written in statement language rather than a recommendation. But we also note that it is premised on the need for a suitable intergovernmental mechanism which brings us back to our agree-to-disagree point.

Even if it were to be revised -- either utilized as a statement or revised for more recommendation-like text, we would still note that we believe there is no consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. It is an observation, not a recommendation. But if we go to the last paragraph, which is the substance where Article 35, 36 breaks down the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder, our mandate is to implement enhanced cooperation has contained in the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Anyone else on this issue? Sorry, on this proposal.

I heard two interventions suggesting no consensus or alternates to be a statement.

Can I conclude that we have no consensus?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the last paragraph "regarding national capacity" could be a recommendation. I agree with the first part could be considered a statement. But that paragraph "regarding national capacities," we can have it as a recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this remark.

I would like to have your opinion about the "regarding national capacities" paragraph. Could we convert it to a recommendation? I know that you are hungry. I understand that. I really appreciate it. Just give me two more minutes and let's be positive.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Just to facilitate the silence here, I think we would have to see any text before we make that judgment. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: But you see it.

>>UNITED STATES: As is, I think that -- if you want my reaction on this text, I'm happy to provide it. But I'm not sure --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. The message is clear. You need lunch. Okay. So I think we stop here. I suggest we come back at 3:00. You have a lot of work to do. And I expect you will do it.

I need the language on this last one to be a real recommendation to be discussed. I can sense some possibility for that. And you know me, I want to have as many recommendations as we can have.

So, please, be back by 3:00 with very positive results in order that we can continue our work. We have the following things in the afternoon. We have to finish group C. We start and finish group D. We start and finish group E.

I have already given my theater ticket to a friend.

[Laughter]

So you don't have to worry about me. Okay?

So bon appetit and see you back at 3:00.

(Lunch break)

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. I can see that small groups are still working on recommendations. I advise them to take their time because for me, this is the most important, so we may start a little bit later and I was about to give you my concluding remarks, but probably it's too early.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So can I have this group stay in five minutes here and we can start in five minutes?

India? Iran? Parminder? Yes?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 minutes, I think, is enough for us to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: 10 minutes.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Welcome back to our meeting. I'm pleased to announce that we have very, very diligent members of this group who have been working over the lunch break and even after the lunch break, so we have a common proposal from the Russian Federation, Japan and Avri, as I requested them, and I offer it to you to go through.

Just on this point, I am reminded by the secretariat that the Google Docs is updated after each session so if you go to the Google Docs, probably it won't always reflect the real status at any time.

It will reflect the real status only after our session. That is, before lunchtime and probably after the evening session.

So I would like you to keep that in mind, and now I -- because I will read out what I can see on the screen.

"Recommends further multistakeholder discussion to clarify and to clearly recognize each other's roles and responsibilities, which may depend on the issue, process or task at hand, in multistakeholder process with special regard to enhanced cooperation."

This is the common proposal from Russia, Japan and Avri Doria.

So I open the floor, possibly with your comments of approval.

Do you need bigger font?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just a minor thing, I believe there's an apostrophe which is missing. "Each others'."

No. After -- after the "S." Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm seeking a point of clarification on the last proposal. "Multistakeholder processes," how many multistakeholder processes we have, and where they working? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see Chris escaping. He was the one who was behind the processes.

I would turn to the proponents. Yuliya, Japan, or Avri, can any one of you give me clarification?

>>AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So indeed, there are -- I think it could be either way. "In the multistakeholder process with special regard to enhanced cooperation" would be one way of putting it, and then we're talking about the multistakeholder process as a general notion that is applied in many organizational entities, et cetera.

Or, we could be specific and just sort of say we recognize that there are many variants of the multistakeholder process. We have one here in this meeting. You know, the IGF has one. They're -- they're multiplying, with great gratitude from many of us, and so therefore we really could be talking about the modalities in general in "multistakeholder processes."

I don't know that there's a need to explicitly enumerate all the possible processes, but I know I'm personally -- you know, if we -- we could talk in general about "the multistakeholder process" or we can talk in, you know, a non-explicit generality of "multistakeholder processes," knowing that there are several and they do vary, and so this is -- would be taking into account that there is not a one-size-fits-all multistakeholder process but, indeed, they come in multiple varieties.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. With this explanation, it is getting even more confused.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, I'm sorry about this judgment. No, no, I didn't mean it. Please take the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are completely right.

I have another comment also in this paragraph. I think "recognition" needs maybe other -- other kind of maybe process than only discussion. Clarifying is okay. In discussion you can clarify. But I don't think that recognition can be done during discussion. Therefore, I doubt about, you know, the -- to recognize this in the proper place. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues.

Just to -- I know it is a very delicate balance that has been arrived at very carefully by Japan, Russia, and of course Avri.

Therefore, minor suggestions, if that could be accommodated, which is instead of using the world "multistakeholder discussion" can we say "discussion among relevant" -- or "discussion among all stakeholders," so that eventually you are looking at a multistakeholder process towards the end.

So it does not take away the -- anything. We will not be repeating the same word, because the intention is discussion among the stakeholders.

And the second one is relating to the question that was raised by our colleague from Iran regarding multistakeholder processes.

If -- if you wish to give more clarity into this with regard "enhanced cooperation, comma, IGF is another process, comma," I mean we can leave it at that. That you would have given some examples of where the -- which -- what processes we are referring to if that is agreeable in the room. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I'm confused now with this recommendation. I mean it's a further discussion among stakeholders to clarify the roles and responsibilities.

Is it the same roles and responsibilities in Tunis Agenda or new roles and responsibilities? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I feel the confusion growing, but we are here to clarify things so I turn again to proponents and I'm sure they are very capable of solving these problems.

Yuliya?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, if it's the confusion in the audience, I then refer to the question which we already created on the platform of consensus, and it's Question Number 5 where there is roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation. So we can put like that. And I believe that if we already reach the consensus regarding this wording, we can reach it now also.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you repeat in dictation speed?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And the rest of the paragraph remains as-is?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: The rest, we don't need it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Avri. I know. No?

>>AVRI DORIA: I'd have to say that I wouldn't be comfortable with that and would no longer be able to consider it a common proposal of -- that included me, and therefore would need to sort of discuss further.

I acknowledge the question that is the question that has been one that we've kind of been sort of circling the drain on for a very, very long time in this whole enhanced cooperation Internet governance multistakeholder process is the whole discussion about stakeholder roles. Stakeholder roles -- if we go back to the proposal that I still have in front of us, if this is, you know, not possible, then, you know, the questions are, yes, there's been a declaration by governments of a set of stakeholders that governments unilaterally -- or uni-stakeholder-wise, perhaps, since it's not lateral between stakeholders, it's uni-stakeholder method -- defined a set of stakeholder roles for other than themselves and defined a specific role for themselves that perhaps other stakeholders have not recognized.

And thus, you know, in terms of the main task that we've been given of how do we move enhanced cooperation first, this was actually put in a very careful general sense to sort of not get specific about looking at that definition of roles and refer -- and, you know, let's not reopen the old issues but let's move forward and sort of say "It's been a while. Stakeholder roles have evolved. And it really is a general principle that I hope we can evolve to accept that, you know, stakeholders actually have to have a role in defining their own definition of their roles and responsibilities and we have to recognize that."

So the general language that was there was meant to make that possible without offending the past, without reopening the past, and yet accepting that if we're going to get anywhere in the future, we need to look at roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Personally, I felt comfortable with the original common proposal. I would really indulge you to reconsider your positions and revert back to the original one, eventually, with minor changes, which seems to be a very good way forward to a consensus.

I can see Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think you said what I wanted to say. This was a carefully drafted compromise text that we were willing to go along with, and now with all the proposed changes, it becomes much more difficult. We think that there are a couple of important aspects captured in this recommendation.

For example, the recognition of each other's role, that's a matter of respect for the role of different stakeholders, which is an important concept which was captured in the original wording.

And then we would also support what was said by Avri just now about the importance of recognizing that the roles may be different, depending on the issue and the process and over time.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think this is a time to remind us again that we are a working group writing recommendations. We are not writing a treaty. We are just writing recommendations. And as

recommendations are not mandatory, even though they are coming from a U.N. body, they are just recommendations which will go to the CSTD, from the CSTD to the ECOSOC, and finally to the -- taken into account in the WSIS+10 review.

So we try and contribute to this process and to try to improve something.

So with this in mind, let me ask you the following question: Does it harm? I don't think so.

Switzerland?

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I think we can also support this text as it stands because we are also convinced that the roles -- as time moves on, the roles evolve.

If you look at the years before the WSIS, we had also in this country the telecom landscape was owned by the government. The liberalization had just taken place. Now it's normal for everyone that some public services are provided by private companies under surveillance of a national regulator, which is sometimes also independent of the government.

So these things evolve, the roles evolve, and we think that this formulation, we could maybe find a nicer word here or there to make it more look beautiful -- look more beautiful, but in terms of substance, we think this is a very appropriate formulation for what we're trying to capture. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Switzerland. I would be very careful with the word "surveillance."

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I just wanted to support your and Sweden's and Switzerland's remark that I think this is -- I like this formulation better than where we kind of wandered off to. I think this could work.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. After Avri's explanation, I think we can go along with this. I mean as long as -- I mean the way it is read with little changes in the language, it's fine, but we can live with this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, we have difficulties with the language in this recommendation. This may imply changing of Tunis Agenda, so we have difficulties. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I have some explanation why it changes the Tunis Agenda?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, I mean "recognizing each other's roles and responsibilities which may depend on the issue or process." I mean the Tunis Agenda is very clear. 35 is the roles and all issues and

processes, so I don't imagine in one process this is the role and in the other we have another role, so this is against Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to keep the original expression of this recommendation because we take account of Ms. Avri's consideration, the Russian Federation's proposal. And I think the technology has developed so -- (indiscernible) has changed, so maybe the role of stakeholder will be changed continuously.

So we have to continue to discuss the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders. So I think this recommendation may be reasonable. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But I think Sweden was -- Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I have no problem to accept this paragraph, but I still have a problem with recognition to clearly recognize each other's roles and responsibilities because I think legal-wise, it is not correct in a discussion as I mentioned before in my previous remarks.

Discussion will not result in recognition of the responsibilities and roles of different stakeholders.

Maybe we can clarify but cannot recognize or decide, in fact, on the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Before I give the floor to Sweden, can I have a clarification on the word "recognize." Is it used in a legal term, or acknowledge -- it is not clear to me. I need clarification from English-speaking colleagues. I know that we are all English-speaking, but native.

>>AVRI DORIA: While I apologize in that I'm only an American speaker, not an English speaker --

[Laughter]

-- I do think there is a difference between a legal recognition and just the social recognition. And this is really talking about a stakeholder group recognizing each other. If after this whole process was finished there was further recommendations to make it somehow more, that would be a different issue.

This is really a process issue that when you work with someone and you are multistakeholders, you need to basically have a recognition of each other's opposition. And at the moment, that is something we just do not have. We're constantly saying, "Well, but I think my role is this, but, no, I think your role is that."

This is really just a general social process, that in a multistakeholder process for it to work, the stakeholders have to recognize each other and it doesn't involve a legal process. So we're not saying to

legally recognize each other's roles but basically the notion of respect, respectfully recognizing each other's roles.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay, respect. Respect is not bad. Another American speaker -- not U.S., not U.S. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: I'm not sure I'm actually even an American speaker. I think I speak Missourian.

I actually wanted to -- I listened to Avri's explanation. We're writing language in an environment where sometimes definitions of terms do get their assumptions about that a term means one thing legally, et cetera.

I think what the intent here is that we want to improve the understanding and recognition of each other's roles. I don't think we can call for a written exchange of documents. That's not the intent at all, right?

We're just trying to improve the understanding and recognition of each other's roles and responsibilities.

I don't envision this turning into a formal document that I have to carry with me with my Tunis Agenda.

But if this is about discussions which then improve how we're able to collaborate, that's the goal we're trying to achieve. So I would propose a slight modification to improve understanding and recognition of each other's roles.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So, I can see Sweden. I could see Iran. I could see India. India, I really count on you because you have the real English.

[Laughter]

>>INDIA: (Speaker off microphone.)

Thank you, Chair. I'm extremely sorry to disappoint you on this because I don't think we are qualified in that bracket. We write what is called Indian-English these days.

Chair, I think if there is a conflict of understanding this, can we talk of some guidelines which -- multistakeholder guidelines which in their discussions not only clarify and develop multistakeholder guidelines about each other's roles and responsibilities. I mean, that's one way of looking at it. I don't want to complicate this discussion now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think we have got stuck on the word "recognize." Am I right? So if we can have -- I have heard "respect." With all my respect to you, would it fly with "respect"? Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think Marilyn's proposal -- I mean, the first one, is okay to me. And I'm comfortable with to replace "understanding" with "clearly recognized." Yeah, "clearly recognized" to be replaced by "understanding." I think that will work." "Clarify and understanding each other's roles." Yeah, thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What we have on the screen, is it okay? I would really like to ask you to be positive.

Can I have the approval of the room on that? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Maybe if we said roles and responsibilities with regards to enhanced cooperation, so strike everything --

[Laughter]

I'm not sure, but... I think laughing is a consensus, though.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I think it is already something. It means we are having a great time. I have a slight suspicion that other members of the group wouldn't be very happy if we don't have the text which has been stricken out.

I still feel that we are very close. I still think that the joint proposal from Russia, Japan, and Avri Doria is a good one. And it would really -- it will be really something which we can use and we can implement.

So I really ask you to approve with some modifications.

I'm turning to you, Saudi Arabia. Do you need some more time to get back to capital and have some discussion?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Mr. Chairman, my concern is, I mean, we feel that this recommendation is rewriting the roles and responsibilities in the Tunis Agenda which we don't agree. So, I mean, if you want to give us some time to consult capital, I mean, I can consult them. But... This is our initial views of this recommendation. It is rewriting the roles and responsibilities of the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I really ask you to consult the capital. In my view, it is not a rewriting. And I believe this view is shared by many, that it is not a rewriting. It is our understanding in 2014, ten years, almost ten years after Tunis.

So I would put a "revisit" after the recommendation and I move forward. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Are we including the deletion there?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, I just wondered.

And on the discussion to "clarify and understand" as suggested, that almost works for me and if that can get the consensus of the room, I guess I could become comfortable with it. I might have preferred substituting "recognized" with "acknowledge" and adding that, perhaps, to the litany of the three words.

But as I say, if I can get consensus of the room as written now, I can live with "understanding," though it makes me a little edgy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, that was my feeling as well, that the word "understanding" has no bearing on the Tunis Agenda as for rewriting it. We just want to understand.

Okay. But as we have discussed, I asked Saudi Arabia to get back to us. And let's move forward.

We have a common proposal from Japan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran: Governments in developing international public policies pertaining to the Internet are encouraged to make various stakeholders participate and cooperate to reflect their opinions and to utilize their knowledge, experience and technology for the implementation of enhanced cooperation, as appropriate, in their respective roles and responsibilities. Wow.

Chris?

>> CHRIS DISSPAIN: Without commenting on the rest of the words, if I could just make the point that the word "make" in the second line carries an implication of force. It might be better replaced with another word. But I may have some other comments later.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me ask you at this relatively late stage of our meeting, in case you have some problems with language, please do affirm it straight away, language. "Invited to encourage" or "encourage to invite"?

>> "Encourage to enable." "Encourage to enable."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, I will make you cooperate with us.

[Laughter]

Jokes aside, we think that this recommendation, first of all, of course, we would like to thank Japan and Saudi Arabia and Iran for drafting it. However, we feel that it doesn't strike the right balance between the different stakeholders in the making or development of international public policies since it only talks about other stakeholders' participation and cooperation. And we think that's too weak for us. We would not be in a position to agree to this text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Avri? You didn't want to, okay.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think it is a very well-prepared draft for consideration by Japan, of course, and supported by Saudi Arabia and Iran.

The advantage we see in this paragraph is to clearly reflect the desire to develop these policies in a collaborative and participative manner. That's number one.

And, also, giving emphasis that there are different stakeholders with certain specific knowledge and experience and with technology who can participate in their respective roles. I think it captures well a

sense of what we call enhanced cooperation with the right dosage of multistakeholderism. So we can fully support this paragraph. Thank you.

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

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. I have a suggestion, just a slight change in the text. I can read it in dictation speed.

"In developing international public policies pertaining to the Internet, all stakeholders, including governments, are encouraged to participate and cooperate to reflect the question" -- to the end of the sentence. And I'm not native English, by the way.

[Laughter]

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Prior to that very useful intervention, my comments would have been different, but I do want to follow my colleagues by supporting the comments of Sweden to say that the original text doesn't have the balance it needs but I really appreciate the very quick wordsmithing of our friend from ICANN to achieve that balance, I think, so we are looking at it with a different eye at the moment and think that should be up for discussion. Thank you. With a positive bent. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Not even in the brackets?

>>BAHER ESMAT: Well, it is in the brackets but I can still -- my proposal was to start the text with "in developing," not with "governments."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

>> Perhaps, Baher, would you read it again?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Okay. India, please?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think with this amendment, then this is something which we all know and we don't need to recommend this and it's already in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I have a question, what I usually ask. Does it harm?

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

Sorry to take the floor again, but it doesn't add value, so I think there are times -- if you make this as a recommendation, you also had given us a benchmark of looking at how do we implement.

Now, the point is, if you are stating an obvious which is rather elaborated in 30-odd paragraphs in the Tunis Agenda, then why do we write this paragraph in the first instance? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I ask the proponents about their opinion.

>>JAPAN: This is a refocus on the government in this paragraph, refocus on the role of government in this paragraph.

I think all stakeholders has each roles but there -- with regard to this paragraph, we focus on the government, and I think government -- if government develop the policy, government should involve all stakeholders to consider (indiscernible) making decision for policy and implement policy, so this is -- only focus on government.

But I think we should have the recommendation for other stakeholders, but just this sentence focus on - - this recommendation focus on the government. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any additional remark from Iran or Saudi Arabia?

Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I mean India said what we want to say. I mean there is no -- with the amendment, there is nothing new in this recommendation from the Tunis Agenda, so there is no need.

I mean it seems there is no consensus on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I would imagine you would say the same thing, Jafar.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I can see your face.

So to me it's clear either we don't take it or we reword back to a recommendation which addresses governments.

With all my respect to Baher, your modification was not a slight rewording. It is a basic change.

So I would like you to consider the original proposal in view of amending in a way which would be acceptable to all and which brings value.

I think that would be an excellent opportunity to show your real will of cooperation.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I have an idea that maybe works. I would suggest adding, after the word "in," so it would be "governments in their activities in the development of," and then take out "developing."

So it would read "Governments in their activities in the development of international public policies pertaining to the Internet" -- I've lost the thread of where we are -- "should enable." Yeah, I guess.

I think it says they should enable various stakeholders to participate. Still a mouthful.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Jafar.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you, Ellen, for your proposal but I prefer to keep the original language. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I think -- I mean all proposed amendments should also be removed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I think this discussion is also reflective of our agree-to-disagree situation on whether or not we really put a heavy focus on government and reflecting on Sweden's earlier comment about the imbalance.

I also think that if there is a feeling that the stakeholder approach is already reflected in the Tunis Agenda and makes no change, then I'm not sure the original -- the original formulation does either.

So I suppose what you're hearing is a lack of consensus in the room, and I would posit we might move on from this one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I ask you if you agree that we don't agree.

I tried it. I tried it hard.

Okay. No consensus.

Next one.

Okay. Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a point of clarification. What will be the -- I mean what we are going to do with those paragraphs which there is no agreement? Do we delete them or we keep them in the records of the meeting?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for the question.

I think we have to reflect the richness of our deliberations, and especially -- well, not of our deliberations. This is a secondary question. But the material we have been dealing with. And I believe we have to reflect all draft recommendations in a form that for future reading it can be revisited.

Having said that, I think this is an opportunity again to tell you how I envisage the report itself.

So as -- in the agreed format, what I proposed yesterday, in the chapter on the recommendations, which will be the essence of our work, I would have the list of recommendations by the main groups -- that is, A, B, C, D, and E -- and each recommendation which has been approved will be followed by the recommendations which we didn't have consensus on and I would like to reflect the opinions in an annex to the report.

I hope this is acceptable.

And the reason I'm suggesting this approach, I don't really want to have a very bulky report in itself.

As you may know, the report will go to the CSTD, and judging from the structure and the members of the CSTD, we have to make sure that the message will get through, and those who are interested who are real professionals will go to the annexes and will have the opportunity to see the different opinions, which by the way, I asked you to write as we have agreed yesterday, the, quote-unquote, similar-minded people would sit down and write the opinions on the different issues on which we didn't have consensus on.

Basically, that's how I see things, so to answer your questions, yes, it will be reflected.

U.S.?

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

You know, my inclination at the moment is to say, you know, "Chairman, we trust you. We trust you." So that if you are able to simply reflect the facts of agreement and disagreement, that would be sufficient for our purposes. If any readers of the report are deeply interested to read the background, they should be invited to read the comments that were submitted to this meeting.

But it would seem to us, Chairman, to expedite the work if, for no other reason -- and because we think it's probably unnecessary -- we would simply look to you to reflect, as you will faithfully, as I say, what was agreed and what was not. Thank you.

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

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

With that, Mr. Chairman, therefore, I would like to see the previous paragraphs with all proposals, because I see that the original text has been deleted and it still showed as inside the -- inserted in the paragraph. Therefore, if we are going to keep, we have to keep all proposals. Otherwise, to keep the original one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm afraid I -- I didn't get clearly what you suggested.

Well, let me -- let me put that in a different way.

I will reflect the original proposals without modifications ones we had no consensus on, because I don't see the reason to insert text which we ourselves cannot retrace anymore.

So it would be even more confusing for someone who is outside of this meeting.

So I would like to retain the original proposals and indicate that there was no consensus.

Is it okay? Yes, Iran?

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

If -- may I ask the secretariat to roll up to the previous paragraph? Then in that case, I can -- yes.

No, that's not the one. No.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You're referring to --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yeah. To this one. So it's not the original one, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Then if we are going to keep the original one, we would like to see it now to be original, because it's not the original one. We have some amendments in. Yeah, just to -- not to confuse, I mean, the secretariat in a later stage to -- yeah. Thank you. That's all.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I would assure you that in the reading of the report, which I intend to do tomorrow -- the original intention was from 10:00, but probably it will be a bit later -- we will have the opportunity to go through and identify eventual mistakes or errors, and as you indicated, we are going to have the originals.

There will be no changes to any originals where we didn't have a consensus.

Anyone else on this issue? Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We just wanted to echo what was said previously by the United States that we have full trust in you in reflecting in the report, in a brief and a balanced and fair manner, what were the different areas of disagreement, and we do not see the need for us writing different sort of statements explaining our positions.

And we also support your idea about having an annex with -- with the submitted recommendations in their original form, together with of course the work of the correspondence group, the result of the work of the correspondence group, as well as the answers to the -- to the questionnaire, as well as the records of the meeting, because all that can be very rich and useful material for us to use in the future.

I realize that's quite a lot of pages, a substantial amount of material, and if that makes the report too long, then maybe we should put it on the Web page and just provide a -- provide a link. That's also another solution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

As for your last comment about the bulkiness of the report and having too many annexes, well, as you may all know, the available documents are on the Web site. This is an open Web site. Everybody can read it. And hopefully the members of the CSTD will do that.

It will be a bit frightening for them to go through. We are approaching hundreds of pages now. So -- but I trust their wisdom and knowledge and their diligence, that they will go through all the documents.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chairman. Just to recap our understanding so far since a few interventions, a few clarifications on this matter, the understanding has been that, one, you would encourage -- you use the work "like-minded members" in this group to see if they want to give an opinion in which case that would be reflected apart from a number of consensus-based paragraphs that we would have arrived at under each of the five pages. We believe that would be the right approach so that the fundamental differences that exist, I think, are well-known and it would be in fairness of everything that the opinions which are there are reflected in their own words and those opinions can be sort of submitted to you which will be reflected on a non-negotiable basis so those views remain on record.

It comes to various proposals that have been given on which we have had detailed discussion and we have really worked hard to see whether we could have some consensus. And those proposals, in my view -- in our view, it is not necessary because if you provide for these crisp opinions of -- let's say, on some of those very critical and difficult non-convergable areas of our work, we would have perhaps captured a sense of this group's intention. One, wherever we agreed, we would list them. Wherever we did not agree, not in large number, but where there are fundamental differences and those are irreconcilable and fundamental differences, we acknowledge in the room and that is the reason we don't have consensus on many, many paragraphs.

So the best way to move forward, we really appreciate your initiative to capture those opinions in their own words and present to you for inclusion in the main body of the report. I think that would perhaps set -- keep everyone on even keel because we are not making any judgment on what is written in that particular portion. And you would be qualifying exclusively that there are opinions of some members of the working group. That way you will have -- I mean, that would have given all of us the benefit of seeing at the end of the five-day meeting, yes, we have agreements but there are issues, there are opinions, and they are reflected in the report. I think that would be perhaps, in our view, also the right way to do. And we will have done justice to everyone, I think, who felt on those two, three fundamentally -- fundamental issues on which there are fundamental differences. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

I think this is the point when all chairmen would say that "I am in your hands." I have no preference, should it be opinion, should it be of like-minded people in the annex, should it be a short description coming from me. I really appreciate the trust you showed to me.

The only thing I don't like is the word "irreconcilable." There is no such thing. At some point in time, we come to agreement. It may not be here. It may not be this time, but we will come to an agreement because we are bound to come to an agreement. We have one Internet. We live in one world. We have to tolerate each other. And we have to cooperate, and we're going to do that.

So, the other thing which is a practical issue, if we opt for giving recommendations which hadn't had consensus on, the opinion variant, it is clear to me that we do not have the time right now, even if there are like-minded people in the room, you don't have the time. And I'm open to that as well, that you may provide me your opinion at a later time.

But what I really want to do is to have the report out with the approved recommendations and with the links to existing documents which have already been posted on the Web site.

And we have to provide that for the next CSTD meeting. As for the opinions, probably it is up to you how you think they can be formed.

I can see Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We do not think it would be very wise to include in the main body of the report, let's say, explanations of a position or statements on positions because it's important that the report is coherent and readable, also fairly brief, I think, because otherwise we will lose sight of what is actually -- what is actually important. And what is important is -- the most important part is where do we have consensus.

We also think that it's -- it would be against the spirit of this working group to focus our efforts here on developing statements in a non-consensus manner because we think that the working method in this working group is by consensus and we have one important task and that is to make recommendations. Nowhere in the mandate given from the General Assembly does it say that we should develop statements or some kind of position paper or something like that.

So we strongly -- we would strongly urge the working group to focus on its mandate which is to develop recommendations by consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I think we should at this point decide the process because we are just before the last day of our meeting and have a common picture of how we're going to do it, even if it takes some time. So my comments would pertain to the process.

And I think the Chair referred to a bulky report, and I do not see any such danger right now of us having a bulky report of agreed text at all. I haven't seen much text which has common agreement till now.

And I also would remind the group that some text which could possibly move towards agreement was also contingent on the fact that the main task of the group is addressed. And we are able to agree on some recommendations to suggest how to fulfill the Tunis mandate for enhanced cooperation.

And the complementary aspects are subject to the main primary task of what is defined as "enhanced cooperation."

Given that situation, I think it would be good if we take the precedent of the WGIG report where by consensus there were more than one models, whereby at least the subsequent stages of consideration by ECOSOC, U.N. Assembly and the general community, they at least know that this is something which happened. There were these two views on which they can build.

I agree with the Chair that finally everything is reconcilable. But then you have to take steps to reconcile. If there are 20 views in the room and they can converge toward two views, that is a big step because that tells how to go ahead at other times to converge those views as well.

But if we go back with a very loose report where every paragraph is structured around some controversies, and nobody reads a pattern in those controversies, then we have not added anything at all.

At times, we should recognize that we are failing to do that. This group in four days has failed to make those steps forward. And if we do not recognize that we failed, then we would never recognize how to improve. It would be wrong to keep on saying that we are succeeding when we are not succeeding. And those recognitions are also important.

And I think the best bet at present is one could see there was a vertical division on many areas. And at least two coherent sets of views can be captured on two positions, one page each, along with them some comment of agreed things.

To me that appears the best possible report which would be a positive contribution which is implementable, usable, et cetera, from this working group. Otherwise, I'm beginning -- I'm sorry -- to be a little pessimistic about the outcomes. Sorry to say that, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'm struck by, I think perhaps, an asset or resource that we have that we haven't acknowledged in terms of how we make information available to support the report, however deep the report itself is. And that is that we have transcripts of our meetings. We have the Chair's summary at the beginning of each meeting. I'm not suggesting those things go in the -- our

report, but I do think we must use the online history, library so to speak, that we have prepared and that we will also want to make it a bit easier to find the things that relate.

And so perhaps we'll want to put a special list together with links on it which has all of the backup information. That could be the transcripts, the agendas for the day, a variety of other things.

I now -- and I really want to suggest that we take that into account as we then think about the level of detail that has to go into the rest of the report.

I really -- I understand the concerns expressed by other participants that you've all worked hard to get a recommendation here. And even if it has found no favor in the sense of consensus, it is still an expression of a concern or an interest. I think it's a little more -- I agree with some of what you said, Parminder. But I'm a little more optimistic. I see sort of maybe three groupings of recommendations as opposed to just two. And I think we have made progress in some areas of improving or getting closer to language that might over time be accepted in some of the recommendations that have not yet been accepted.

I'm a little interested in what the purpose of detailed explanations are, about -- that would be written by different groups about recommendations that did not find consensus. It is all there in the transcripts, thorough, rich debate; balanced debate -- by "balanced" I mean recognition of all who raised their hands, whether they are participants in the group or they are observers.

So I'm a little bit challenged by the necessity of having these almost what would be called opinions that are developed.

And I remain open to understanding the benefit of that unless it's, as we say, to provide more color to the reader. But I would think there has to be a word limit in that case, Chair, which is often customary to do, something beyond the number of characters in a tweet but perhaps no more than a page so then the reference could be made back to the transcript for the richer detail.

I think I've already spoken earlier about the importance of also capturing and acknowledging some of the rest of the work that we've done. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Good of you to remind you of the transcripts which are valuable documents as well which reflect our discussions and opinions as well.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I apologize for contributing to this sinkhole that we seem to be falling into on process. I very much agree with the notion of the transcripts are, indeed, the detail. The transcripts include all of us reading out our original text and discussing it. And so as long as those remain in a place that can be gotten by people, the full richness will remain.

I very much favor the original suggestions of a short and sweet report that lists the few points that we manage to find our way to consensus on with an appendix that the Chair and secretariat have written

explaining that there was, indeed, a breadth of opinion on many issues. And then we have thousands upon thousands of words that contribute to those who want to research the greater substance of what we've done.

So that would be my recommendation and leave it at that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Lest for the transcripts, you will be sure that they will be kept in a safe place. It will be on the Web.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. We would start with a reflection that the report certainly is not Marilyn's report, it is not Mexico's report, it is not Sweden's report, it is not Mr. Reddy's report. It is a reflection of what happened in this meeting after a week of work.

So it would seem to us, Mr. Chairman, that we would do great injustice not to report on our progress certainly but not pour into the report all the arguments that were made through the week. That's not what the CSTD is looking for. And I don't think, as I say, it honors the work that we've done.

The news here, the story to be told, is that we had these debates and these debates resulted in certain agreements and no agreements in other areas.

Chairman, if we were to just simply turn in transcripts and write up arguments, there would have been no reason to meet to talk, to debate, and to stay late.

So, Chairman, we do urge you and with full faith in you to put together a Chairman's report that does justice to the meeting by reflecting back factually where we were able to agree and, as I say, where we were not able to agree.

Send the reader to transcripts. Send the reader anywhere the reader wants to go to find information, okay? In particular, I think it was a very good decision to make mention of the correspondence group.

Well, Chairman, I'm becoming enthusiastic. I hope I have made my point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You have. Especially sending the reader...

[Laughter]

Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of points. I just wanted to add my voice in favor of reminding us all that we made recommendations and those should form the main part of the report.

I just wanted to make one point about the -- about putting in text that isn't agreed. If I heard you correctly, what you were suggesting is that the text of a proposal recommendation that was put forward

by a member of this group or a group of members of this group would be put in -- that didn't reach consensus would be put into the document.

I wonder if that perhaps isn't slightly challenging by putting it in and saying it doesn't reach consensus, doesn't actually reflect the fact that there may have been suggested amendments that didn't meet with approval and so on.

I'm just wondering whether that's what one would normally do in these circumstances, and I don't know and whether there is, in fact, a problem with simply providing the original text that isn't agreed rather than the text plus any suggested amendments that couldn't be agreed order to provide a true picture of the discussion and debate. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, in that case, we probably should fall back to the transcripts.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Because there was reference made to the mandate given to this working group, and maybe I would just again going through paragraph 20 of the last year's resolution, they have called: The CSTD chair has been requested to submit the report and the report from here, this working group, will make the report. I understand it is not the Chair's report but the working group's report. So that is, I think, clear to me at least.

And the other thing, as it has to be a factual representation of what happened in this working group. The report from this working group should be a factual representation. So in case, we are able to arrive at consensus on certain number of recommendations, that is good. We have to aspire for that. We have to strive for that, whatever we can do.

But in case there are divergence of opinions or views that exist, that is a factual representation. It should be reflected accurately that there are divergence of opinions on certain issues on which maybe if given one or two paragraphs, whatever our limit, could be given. Something like that, I have seen in other organizations also. Sometimes some report of the Chair is prepared like that.

Some feel this -- some others feel this. Maybe a few limited words or something you can do that. And then it will be an accurate reflection of the discussion taking place in this house.

So that is what I wanted to submit. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Russia?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We support this point of view also because if we see the broad alternative understanding of the point, it should be reflected in the report of the working group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My delegation express at the very beginning of this meeting that we wanted to -- or we have a hope to have a good report, concise-oriented, and stressing on the agreements without leaving apart obviously those (a) which we do not agree because it's obvious that some positions cannot find consensus, but just to say that at this hour, it was our wish to have this report stressing on the what we have achieved already.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm really feeling for you at the moment. I'm feeling --

[Laughter]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- feeling for the weight of the responsibility of your task, and I also want to express faith and confidence in you and acknowledge that you do have the responsibility of preparing the report of our deliberations and our work. Not just for this meeting, but in fact, for the entire -- entire year, nearly, that we have been working.

And so I think I'd suggest at this point that the working group -- that this report is now the working group's report doesn't represent the -- faithfully the basis upon which we've been working and entrusting you with this process, and I would like to make sure that we conclude the process by making sure that the final report on our deliberations does reflect the fact that you are our chair and we trust and have faith in you preparing the report for us, and I feel that very strongly.

So that's my first point.

My second point is that I've been very concerned in the last few hours to hear sort of a repetition that there seem to be only two views on particular points and that there are -- there are two positions on particular points.

In fact, it's been quite clear for a vast array of recommendations we have before us that there are multiple divergent views on a range of points.

There are two sets of views that are quite strongly held and often repeated by certain participants, but that does not make them the only views on the table nor, indeed, the most meritorious views on issues. There are many that are worthy of debate and movement.

So I would want to ensure that the -- any report on the working of the group reflects a picture of nuance and breadth and not only the ends of the spectrum of the views that have been presented. That's my second point.

My third point is I think it's a mistake and I would urge extreme caution in appending all the recommendations that -- in their original form to the report.

I think that simply rewards those who did not strive for consensus and I think that is an unfortunate mistake to make.

I think there has been a considerable amount of discussion in good faith on points for -- striving for consensus and that should be rewarded, rather than the opposite.

Those who have wanted to follow our work and participate in this process have been fully able to do so. All of our work is on line. It has been since last year. The transcripts are available. And I think it would be unhelpful to -- to clutter the report on our work material which is freely available on line to anybody who wants to go. In fact, to people who can listen on line now.

So I would also urge a clean, concise, sharp report which highlights those one or two areas of consensus, expresses the disappointment in the lack of progress in gaining more consensus, but does not rehearse material which has been well rehearsed already in our discussions and which -- and the questions submitted to the questionnaire and the work of the correspondence working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. I am really honored.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

Just wish to clarify how you're going to handle, in your either short report, your long report containing some, none, or all of the above recommendations, the output of the correspondence group.

That, in itself, ran to 97 pages and had some raw data that I think that the meeting found useful.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

I intend to annex to the report the work of the correspondence group, and naturally I will have it made available on the Web which is available right now, but I really insist that this be made available for a long, long time. Alongside that, all the contributions we received as a working group. So all the material will be made available for consultation. And naturally, all the transcripts will be made available for consultation.

And I think we are extremely lucky to have all these transcripts which reflect what has happened during the meetings.

I have Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to support the discussions that have been had, those comments so far with regards to the compilation of the reports, in that firstly, we're all very deeply appreciative of your leadership and the work and the very difficult task that you have, and I think to start having this discussion at this time is most appropriate because we can read the tea leaves, as it were, jointly as a group.

We thank you for your patience and for your resolute belief that we can find consensus. And we have tried. God knows we have tried.

I apologize for my absence from the meeting for some period due to an emergency, but I want to just remind the group of the mandate in terms of the words that have been given, which says, "to examine the mandate of WSIS regarding EC through seeking, compiling, and reviewing inputs from all member states and all other stakeholders to make recommendations."

In that sense, the report, Mr. Chairman, must include what you have sought, what has been provided, and the compilation of the arguments whether it is by way of the mapping exercise or the other documents.

We leave it in your good hands to decide whether you want to include them as an annexure or in the report, but I think it's important that those who will read the report, since this is going to be submitted to the chair of the CSTD and, in turn, to the UNGA, should have the benefits of the arguments that were had, the presentations that were made, the attempts that were made to reconcile our views, so that whenever this issue is visited next by whichever group or committee or subgroup, they have the benefit of having the full information of what this hard-working body tried to achieve, and to your vision of giving it five days to find consensus, even though we were battling you, I know, for three days, four days at the last meeting.

So I think this entire exercise needs to be compiled in and should be available to whoever would look at this report or will re-examine the issue ever, especially in view of the written content in the mandate that has been given.

We trust your judgment for what you wish to include, but I think we should avoid -- we should accurately represent the positions but avoid just contentious sets of recommendations as a listing because that will not sort of provide everything that we need.

The transcripts, instead, will give a lot of information and insight into what occurred.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. I think when I suggested to have a five-day meeting, I -- I underestimated the time.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Naturally, it was a good decision not to stick to a three- or four-day meetings, but five seemed to me enough, but anyway, one makes mistakes.

Mexico and Saudi Arabia and I can see -- yes, I can see you and Iran, and after this, I would like to close the procedural discussions and would like to revert back to the bulk of the work you want to avoid, I know, but we have to work on the remaining parts of the recommendations.

I know this is extremely important to find out, but I can hear from you that you have -- I have your trust.

So if I have your trust, then I can provide the report in an appropriate format to reflect all your concerns and, naturally, most of all, the results.

Okay. So having said that, Mexico. Saudi Arabia. Parminder you asked for the floor. Iran.

No? Mexico, you don't ask for the floor? That was a quick one. That was a quick one.

Saudi Arabia?

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

As we discussed yesterday and the day before yesterday, back in Section A and B we don't have consensus. There is two views. We agreed that both of the views will be, I mean, expressed equally. Every like-minded group will, I mean, put their views into the subject. This was the agreement.

I mean, other than this, the whole process from first meeting until the final report is developed can be put in a background report attached to the working group final report. We would like to see the working group final report as concise as possible, and areas we didn't have consensus, it is very clear that there is two options. The two options would be expressed very clearly in a balanced manner. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Commenting on the limited point that Joy made and which I repeated about giving no special privilege to two views which may be polar views, and that was never the intention. The intention was that there are a lot of views. We seem to be failing to come to one view, which looks to me very clear, even if we have another day, and then what can we as a group do.

And I thought it was a useful contribution if we could say that can we have two kinds of views, and within that, these convergences are sought at Step 1, and that would be a contribution and not take the two poles apart, the two poles and then put them in the sheet. There is a fact that we recognize, a view which says existing mechanisms have to be strengthened, and there is a view that says a new kind of mechanism is needed, and I mean there are two kinds of views and people on two sides then should converge and be able to say that this is something we can come up with, which I understand helps the process go forward. We did it more than 10 years back at WGIG. The fact that we are not even able to do even that now after 10 years is not a very good commentary on where the global consensus on

governing the Internet is going, but yes, my point was not to take the polar views but to at least have consensus and concretizations around two and then we can help them take forward in a later point of time.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran?

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

Mr. Chairman, we also have confidence in you.

Mr. Chairman, we don't -- we don't think it's proper to send whatever we discussed here to the CSTD with a -- I mean through a bulky report because we believe that it will take us nowhere.

Mr. Chairman, in this way, we -- we have to be very clear and brief. To send whatever we experienced here will send the wrong message to the CSTD. Then we are going to have the same experience in CSTD, the same discussions, and again nowhere.

I think we have to be very clear what we are going to send to CSTD.

I totally agree with Indian delegation and with your initial proposal to send differences of opinion on subjects which there is no consensus on, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this remark, Iran, and I take it very seriously, as being the vice chair of the CSTD and possibly being very much involved in drafting the resolution on WSIS follow-up.

So it seems to me that there is work to be done, and irrespective of whatever I want, I have to do this work at some -- either now or some later stage.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I think we should have a little bit more of an optimistic outlook. We have actually managed to agree to quite a few recommendations, I think. Three or four.

I remember --

[Laughter]

>>SWEDEN: Yeah. No. Well, I mean I remember actually E.U. chairman saying at our first meeting that if we have one recommendation, it's a success --

[Laughter]

>>SWEDEN: -- at the end of the meeting. I mean maybe we should keep that in mind and keep expectations within reasonable sort of levels, because we have a couple of recommendations. I think we're on -- on the road to success, at least, even if we are not really there yet.

So that's the first point.

The second point is that we do not have two opinions. I think we have probably 35, maybe? Because I think -- so we have -- on some of the views, and I think if we were to go down the path where we should have statements or negotiated statements or negotiated sort of positions, then we have to start now.

So then probably we would have to start to get together maybe some -- we could start with some European colleagues. We can book a room somewhere in this -- in this building and start to build consensus around our view on some of the issues, and then we could maybe go around and talk to some others where -- that have similar views to us and -- so that's one way we could spend our time.

Or we could try to spend our time fulfilling our mandate, which is actually to work by consensus, the whole group, to develop consensus recommendations.

Our preference would be for the second -- for the second way of working. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, I will give the floor to India. Naturally, my preference would be also the second option, and as I heard from most of you, I have your confidence and so I really thank you for that and having said that, please just give me what -- a little more time to come out with some solution the way I would really do the report, and I hope it will be a report which will be of satisfaction to the whole group.

But the main thing for us here and now is to concentrate on the bulk of the work. I have to repeat that. We may write the best report ever, which would reflect all the nuances of the opinions, and at the end of the day, people would say "Who cares?"

If we can come up with really good recommendations, and even if we come up with a few, that will be the real result, and it will be a very promising result. So please, I really indulge you to -- to concentrate on this work and leave the rest a bit later.

India, and after that, I will give the floor to observers.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for giving me the floor again on this subject.

I mean, I just thought it could be useful to -- since we are on this subject of how do we report on these deliberations.

There were opinions expressed that earlier we would have some of this low-hanging fruits, we'll just pluck them and think that that is the result and thereby we present some recommendations where we all agree, and then perhaps not reflect the vast diverse views that have come in which you have earlier encouraged everyone to see if they -- that can be coalesced into finite groups, and I think -- in our view, I think there are two sets of major views in the room on some of those issues.

So I think if such a reflection is not there, I think we will have very -- it will be very challenging for us, at least for my delegation, to have a report which has recommendations which actually mean perhaps the lowest possible denominator, which I think will be -- I mean -- I mean people are looking outside. They're going to -- it would be a reflector on our work and I don't think India can be party to such an effort where we come up with recommendations which have -- perhaps barely touching on the problem, rather than making any serious attempt to reflect the vast opinions that are there in this room.

But again, brevity, again. As I said, you are -- I mean, again, we are very confident you will find a solution to this and I'm sure no one in the room will have a problem in reflecting opinions and I'm sure there is a very democratic way of doing things. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As has been indicated many times, in the mandate, we were to collect inputs from all stakeholders from member states. We were to review these inputs.

We were to give recommendations based on this input. We have done a lot of work. So there's substance and very serious substance we can report on. So I don't share with you the opinion that our work is being regarded as useless.

On the contrary, I think it's extremely useful because we have reached out to a large community who have concerns about these issues we are discussing. And we have -- to my belief, this is the first time we have collected so much information.

So to my mind, it is even the richness of the information which may prevent us to come to some real conclusion in this -- such a short time.

I can see at least ten doctoral theses in the material we have. So probably people out there who will look into the material we have will find it extremely useful in its present form irrespective what format we are going to give to the report. So for them, the original material may be even more useful than the recommendations we are going to give. But this is my opinion.

Okay. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I totally agree with you, that a tremendous work has been done. And it will be useful but not as a part of the report.

As we agreed before, they can be presented on the -- there could be the online access to those -- what we have, not as part of the report to the CSTD. That's the issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I really want to assure you that I don't intend to have annexes of 100 pages or 200 pages. Probably we shall give the link, and the link will be available. So that is my intent. In case there is a request for a paper copy during the CSTD meeting, paper copies will be made available, but on request.

Now, I would like to close the debate on that. Before I close, I will give the floor to the observers. I could identify Australia and the European Union. Do not hesitate to take the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: I won't. My EU colleague has very kindly let me speak. She has had her flag up for quite a significant amount of time ahead of me. But thank you.

Look, I have the sense that we have come completely full circle four days later and many conversations later. We're back where we began which, was a discussion of the report and what it will contain where I believed -- and I think people spoke out quite strongly across the membership of this group -- that the report should be about and should reflect what we can agree on. It should be included if we have consensus on it and not if we don't.

I really feel that any sort of annex that includes long statements of what, where one position is and where the other position is isn't really in accordance with this general agreement that I thought we had.

Let's focus on where we have consensus. Let's move forward and on those points, using the Australian method, as everyone is so fond of calling back to me, let's not include an annex that so starkly focuses on the disagreements.

I do think the conversations we've been having here are precisely the point. In fact, if there's an end in themselves, we need to have these conversations. And I think they have been very useful. And I think the meeting has not been a failure. I think we are getting -- we are getting somewhere, and let's focus on that.

I think in terms of reflecting some of the disagreements, the multiplicity of views on different issues, we should trust the Chair to do something that is short, that is sharp, maybe two sentences summarizing the vibe, the atmosphere in the room and the positions. But I agree with Iran wholeheartedly, this needs to be a short, sharp, concise report, and I think our Chair is well-able to deliver that for us.

So just to sum up, let's move to looking at the substantive issues and let's focus on areas where we have consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia. As for the atmosphere of the group, I'm in a very lucky position because I can qualify it good. It is a very good atmosphere we have. I mean, we have discussions. We are extremely cautious to each other, polite, and respect each other. And we are working together. We have differences of opinion but so what? I mean, that's human nature.

EU.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I raised my flag at quarter past 4:00 to take advantage of the observer slot. But since then we embarked on this discussion which is not what I wanted to address. So I'm really in your hands, Mr. Chair, whether I should make my statement now or later.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Hold it for a second. I would like to turn to Egypt who also raised his flag, and I wonder if he would like to contribute to this discussion we had right now or something else? Okay. Egypt, in that case, please go ahead. Then I will go back to you, EU.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very quickly, I think a report that would reflect exactly what happened, be that there is an agreement or disagreement, of course, we all trust you, Mr. Chairman. That's why we have you as a Chair. We all have been following your leadership.

But as India and others have mentioned, a report -- a fair report would really reflected what happened during the meeting. Otherwise, if we only reflect on the agreements on two, three, four paragraphs that means we had three, four, five meetings on three, four paragraphs. It does not reflect the amount of work that was discussed.

Especially as Iran was saying, this report will be put forward to the CSTD. And I'm really -- attending the CSTD last year, I'm fairly certain we had the same discussions. If we do not highlight that there was two or three opinions that were there, we really try to confine or help the CSTD in taking the things forward.

So I believe that what was mentioned by India, Iran, Saudi Arabia and others on having a more -- a broader report on reflecting what happened, there was agreement on specific issues, there was no consensus or disagreement on other issues, and reflecting as you mentioned previously there are two main points or two main views that are reflected in the room. Saying that does not mean that we have 150 pages on everything. But just to highlight as the Chair can summarize the two views or three views that were there in a very concise, short paragraphs, that really, I believe, will help the work of the CSTD moving forward. I thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Probably if I do that, I will make everybody equally unhappy.

Pakistan. On this issue?

>>PAKISTAN: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would like to support what has been already articulated by India, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. We think it is good that we have agreement on some topics, but brevity is fine. But at the same time, it is very important that we also have a record of differences of opinion on topics where the two sides diverge. And it is very important that these differences are highlighted and incorporated into the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Okay.

With this, I will try and close the debate on the issue. I have heard different approaches. The common denominator for me is that I have your trust. And I'm really happy about that.

EU.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I take it you would like for me to make my statement now? Okay.

So I just wanted, not directly related with what we just discussed, to make a point of clarification on behalf of the European Union regarding some of the discussions we've had on draft recommendations, in particular on the role of governments.

So the clarification I would like to offer relates to the communication on Internet policy and governance which was adopted by the European Commission on the 12th of February and is currently under the consideration of the E.U. member states and European Parliament.

This communication does not call for a stronger role for governments and public authorities. It states, inter alia, the following points: First, the multistakeholder model for the governance of the Internet is the best approach provided the model is based on clear, shared rules and that it ensures minimum standards of accountability, transparency, and inclusiveness of all stakeholders.

Second, there's a need to define but not necessarily strengthen the role of governments, public authorities, to make sure they are in a position to exercise their duties towards their citizens coherently, inter alia, with their obligations under human rights laws.

Third, this implies that it is well possible that in certain cases the role of governments, public authorities should be limited.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. We take note of this declaration. And I suggest to you to have a 15-minute coffee break. It will allow me to have a consultation with the secretariat on the report. And I would like to see you back after the 15-minute break -- well, by quarter to 6:00.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I'm really sorry to interrupt you in your enjoying your evening.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Before doing that, let's go to --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no. We have Nigeria or --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So ladies and gentlemen, before going to Group D, we have some recommendations in Group C. I can see a recommendation -- draft recommendation submitted by Mexico and there is one

draft recommendation submitted by Nigeria, and I'm told by the secretariat that there is a revised version from Avri and Joy of their recommendation, so I would like to ask Mexico to introduce the text which is on the screen. We are in Group C, Number 6.

In the meantime, I would like to remind all those who promised to me to come back to me with the opinion from the capital to do so, irrespective of the outcome.

I have to see clearly because this is all -- the last, but one day, and by tomorrow I would like to have all material be clear except for some minor editorial changes.

So Mexico, please, can you introduce the text? Or would you like me to read it out?

I'm losing my voice.

"The report of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations presented, submitted on August the 4th, 2005, gives an important approach to the definition of the role and responsibilities of key stakeholders as governments, private sector, civil society and even the academic and technical communities, as stated in Paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda. In this regard, the efforts of enhanced cooperation should aim at building an equal participatory environment, one that balances the participation and role of key stakeholders from the various sectors in Internet governance."

So you have a recommendation in front of you. I open the floor for discussions.

Please be brief. We have a very short time. I don't intend to have you here after 9:00.

Well, as a matter of fact, I am going to leave before 9:00, so there will be no chair.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You have to be aware of that. And by that time, I would like to go through all the recommendations.

So I open the floor. Be very brief and just first state whether you agree with the message of the recommendation, and in case you do, if you have any problems with the language of it or, just the contrary, you don't agree with the message of the recommendation but you have amendments or just you simply say no.

Okay. I would like to see the positive faces and positive hands.

Can I take that this is approved?

Oh. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: I certainly, Chair, wouldn't want to get in the way of approval of a recommendation and we do support this one.

One suggested edit that we hope would be a positive one would be replacing the word "balances" with "maximizes," but otherwise, it's something we would support and thank Mexico for their submission. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's the one. Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: "Maximizes."

Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, unfortunately, we cannot agree with this as the basis of the working -- the Secretary-General's report is not the Tunis Agenda which is clearly, on 69, enhanced cooperation is to enable governments, so unfortunately we cannot agree. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Anyone else asking for the floor?

Who is the technical community? You are observer. You will take the floor last.

Any member on this issue?

Well, yesterday at 7:00 you were more alert than now and it's only 6:00.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So what happened?

Okay. In that case, Nigel, you're lucky. You have the floor now.

>>ICANN: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I mean if it's been objected to, then I won't waste the committee's time. I --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, no, no. No. Just to make it clear that observers can take the floor after the members --

>>ICANN: No, I recognize that but I don't want to speak on this -- this particular text if it's not going to go forward. All I was going to say is that in the part that talks about enhanced cooperation, it should probably say "In this regards, the ongoing dialogue on enhanced cooperation should aim at building," to recognize that this is something that is taking place.

But if it's not going forward, then thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just to say that we support this recommendation with the -- as amended by the United States. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Maybe I have one question for the U.S. delegation when they the amendment "balances" to "maximizes." Maximizes whose role, like out of the five stakeholders identified in the WGIG report?

So actually the previous one was perhaps more understandable than this "maximizes."

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. We are on the details. I would like to have the substance.

Is it agreeable in the original format? Peru?

>>PERU: I would like to support the paragraph presented by Mexico, and I was wondering if the delegate of Saudi Arabia, if he -- if he would be willing to accept the paragraph if the -- if the mention to Paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda would be omitted. If it would be -- if it was only mentioned the Tunis Agenda and not the specific Paragraph 35. If omitting the Paragraph 35 would make it acceptable for them.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Any member would like to take the floor?

Saudi Arabia, would you like to reply?

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

The issue is not with Paragraph 35. The issue is "building an equal participatory environment."

So we know government will develop. Others will follow. So there is no equal -- equal between government only.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Can I conclude that there is no consensus on that?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Number 7.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: In front of me, I have the draft recommendation submitted by Nigeria: "That the ongoing inclusive, national, regional and international cooperation on Internet matters be sustained

among all stakeholders with governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic community actively playing their respective roles."

Okay. Any comments? Remarks? Observations?

United States. Then I can identify Sweden, Saudi Arabia. Please, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

We would like to thank Nigeria for their submission in this regard and it's very nice to hear from our developing country partners and applaud the approach here with regard to inclusive and -- inclusive cooperation that we think was reflected in the correspondence group work, as well as in the Tunis Agenda itself, with the identification of the stakeholders and their respective roles, so we welcome and support this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would also like to thank Nigeria for this very constructive recommendation and we fully support it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have a question on the ongoing international cooperation. Kind of distinguished colleague would you clarify this? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Nigeria, can you clarify the ongoing international cooperation?

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, enhanced cooperation is not a national issue but an international issue, so that is the issue that is on board and that is the cooperation between nations, and that is the aspect I am thinking about. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

I would point to the work of the correspondence group at this late hour and indicate in at least some of the broad issue areas that we were garnering information on, UNESCO indicated that they had been active in a number of the areas. Thank you.

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

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to offer to the house a word to replace. We've got "playing," "balancing," "maximizing" and we'll have to sort of keep going on with words.

Perhaps the word "optimizing" or "optimal" or "optimizing" captures the wholesome role and a lot of the stuff that we're saying. It's about balancing and yet it's about evolving and enhancing.

So if the house would agree to "optimizing," then we could use one word in several places to express what we are trying to.

Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, originally, I was an analyst and a programmer, and I was always told to optimize, optimizing a program, is the last step.

I -- if your optimism is in this sense that we are about to have the last step, then I'm ready to take the optimizing, and I can sense some kind of consensus on that.

Yes, Iran.

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

Mr. Chairman, if in reality that is happening, so what is the need for enhanced cooperation? I don't think so that. I -- I -- just looking for government's role in ongoing cooperation on Internet matters, can someone just tell me where it can happen? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran. Andres?

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: I guess the question that the distinguished --

Thank you, Chair. Sorry.

The question that the distinguished colleague of Iran is asking is, the answer for this question is -- would be the trap we are all here in, because we cannot keep the common ground because we can't understand that for some members of this group, the enhanced cooperation process has been ongoing for 10 years and is underway, for some members of this group it hasn't even started.

And for what I think would be a common ground that I guess we can reach in some -- in some -- if we open -- agree our positions, it would be to limitate in which -- until which extent it has been developed and which are the parts that are not been developed.

I guess obviously I have a personal opinion on that. It doesn't matter in this particular moment. But I guess personally that government's role have to be strengthened in enhanced cooperation. There has been enhanced cooperation with -- between -- among the stakeholders, but this is only one interpretation of enhanced cooperation. But strengthening the government's role in the multistakeholder ecosystem, in the multistakeholder model, at least that phrase would be the part where -- an ongoing process, that is, that for me at least it's underway but needs to be strengthened, and this would be, for me, the answer to the question.

But if it is impossible to understand that there is something going on and it has to be improved because we would never recognize that it -- that it -- there is actually something going on, so, yeah, okay, in that way it wouldn't be possible to approve any -- any of these contributions.

But okay, I hope to be -- if -- you asked for some answer. I tried to provide one. I guess I hope it is -- it is satisfactory.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres.

I just want to recall our mandate, which is stating -- I try and quote by heart -- to fully implement enhanced cooperation. So even the UNGA resolution talks about "fully implement," meaning that we are not at the very beginning.

So probably, if I understand correctly, that was your original idea, Nigeria, and I am personally very, very grateful for your submission and really appreciate, and I regard this as an example of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

Having said that, Marilyn, you asked for the floor?

>>MARILYN CADE: I did, Chair.

I think your -- your intervention may have begun to address what I was going to say.

Africa is the second most populated continent in the world, and I am aware of that because I was privileged to travel to Nigeria to a -- an ICT summit in July of this year and to hear some very interesting feedback from 12 or 13 African country representatives and from the private sector who were talking about the need to accelerate and bring -- bring into full participation and access many parts of their countries, and also other developing countries.

So I think if we take this in the spirit that I believe it was offered in, it's a very positive recommendation, but I think the -- I was going to suggest -- and "fully implement" may be the right approach. I was going to suggest a substitute for the word "sustained" as "optimized and enhanced," but I think "fully implement," Chair, may be a simpler improvement.

I also want to say how much I appreciate having recommendations that are coming forward to us that are thinking -- that are clearly thinking about more inclusive engagement throughout the world and welcome Nigeria's contribution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I would like to ask you to pay attention to the message we are sending out from here. To my mind, it will be a good message to take on board this recommendation where we are, I think, quite close to consensus. I so really indulge you in this direction to think about overall.

Having said that, Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I deeply appreciate Nigeria's proposal, excellent proposal. And I fully agree to this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So after this discussion, can I ask you if it's approval to have this recommendation? Saudi Arabia, Iran, then Russia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: As mentioned by me and about my colleague from Iran, we have to disagree with this recommendation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. No, thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Russia?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: As we discussed before that even discussion is needed regarding the respective roles of each stakeholder in the multistakeholder processes toward enhanced cooperation, I cannot see and cannot support how it will -- the message that the role is not established and understood and how this can be an advantage.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. In that case, we have no consensus.

Let's go further.

A recommendation by Sweden: Stakeholders themselves should be allowed to define their role in the international Internet ecosystem.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks to our colleague from Sweden for this contribution. But according to the Tunis Agenda, which is our mandate, the roles are defined and giving all the stakeholders -- I mean, to define their roles and responsibilities, this is against Tunis Agenda. So we cannot agree. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Frankly I'm a bit confused. I just heard a minute ago from Russia that these roles aren't defined. So I may be a newcomer.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just to briefly try to explain the rationale behind this recommendation. We would like to avoid a situation where we have too much of a top-down approach when we are talking about the role of stakeholders, that, let's say, governments get together and decide all the roles of the different stakeholders.

We think that it's rather those stakeholders that are directly involved in the different areas related to enhanced cooperation that often are in the best position to define what are their roles.

So that's our thinking behind this draft. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, we thank Sweden for this input and support it for several reasons but most important amongst them that the reading of the Tunis Agenda, Section 35A, shows that the government has a role of public authority for Internet-related public policy issues, is a sovereign right of states. They have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues. But in reality, they do a lot more. They provide infrastructure in several countries, or have for a while. They provide technical support. They also engage with several bodies and coordinate issues.

So I think if you read B which is the role of the private sector, it doesn't speak about anything on infrastructure, while that is a huge part of what Section 3 to 28 of the Tunis Agenda are about. It is time that we should allow the shareholders to define their role because they are doing a lot more; and, therefore, it would be appropriate for them to accurately represent what they're doing.

And the way it's currently defined is queued in favor of a stakeholder, leaving it blocked for several others who can do and extract a lot more if the definition was appropriately represented by them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. When you were referring to "shareholders," you meant "stakeholders"?

[Laughter]

>>VIRAT BHATIA: It is the business community, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have no doubt about it.

[Laughter]

Thank you.

Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Actually, we have some problems with this proposal because we think it doesn't really make sense because if you look at, for instance, at efforts to combat hate speech or to fight piracy, whatever, if the ISPs decide that they are now the police and they decide what is hate speech or not or they decided they have no role in this at all, I think it doesn't make sense that we let every stakeholder himself define its role.

But I would rather go in the direction that Avri and some others have pointed out earlier today that we have to mutually agree all stakeholders together on the role of each stakeholder in each issue. And if we, for instance, agree that we are fighting piracy, the basic definition should come from governments. But in the implementation, private sector has a role -- or the private sector has a role of advising

government what is feasible or not or what is appropriate or not. Are we fighting hate speech, or whatever.

Then it is up to all stakeholders through the whole society to, basically, say which stakeholder is best to have which role and which responsibility. We think that would make a lot more sense. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Switzerland. Very useful. It would have been more useful if you could have provided us with some text to make it usable.

Yes, Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to join my colleagues to really appreciate Sweden for this recommendation and also to align with what Virat said because using my economy -- my nation's economy in Nigeria as a case in point, at first, like when it comes to telecom, is the government willing to provide the electricity with government alone? In the government's wisdom said, Well, like private sector, can you make it better? And so the role of the private sector has changed overnight in these key areas of national life.

So with regard to telecom, private sector do more than we agree when we signed the contract because it is, like, we are getting results with you. That's why you say the (indiscernible).

So I think it is very appropriate because we are in kind of a dynamic environment. So let's take what business can see and say this is what one can do, and at least let's start from there.

The distinguished delegates from Russia is very much interested in the rules which we also I really like. We need for that to come up. But let those bear in name. I'm Jimson Olufuye. You cannot tell me the history of the name Jimson Olufuye (indiscernible).

So I have to really articulate the story. It is not left for you to say, okay, history does not meet up to the expectation of the general society. That is the way I look at it. And this is a very good recommendation, and I think it will add value to us moving forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. One of these days I would like to hear your story.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much, Chair. I actually would also thank and appreciate Sweden's contribution of this and also to appreciate Switzerland's reference to the common proposal that's been forwarded.

I actually think that they are complementary in that stakeholders themselves do define their role. Their responsibilities and such come out from the interaction of their roles and the various issues, processes, and stages of various processes that we're in. But, indeed, the self-identity of a stakeholder group is, indeed, something that that stakeholder group defines.

So I actually don't see this as in contradiction to what we've offered, but I do see it as complementary. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps I would not have commented, but I was motivated after the excellent remarks Switzerland made which I thought I should simply come up and congratulate him for having said what he said.

And I'm a bit surprised and dismayed about the dissolution of politics in governments which seems to be taking place.

I think we should remind ourselves we are talking about Internet governance. We are not talking about social, cultural expressions, how we live in our neighborhoods. This is specific context in which the text is being made. It is governance of the Internet.

And, therefore, how much interested I am in listening to stories about the second names, that's not what's being talked about. Governance is a sector of an important institution of society.

And to say that everybody would define their roles and do what they wish to do is -- the problem is I can't understand it, basically. So thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Virat again. "Shareholder."

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr., Chairman, thank you for the reminder of the Freudian slip. I agree to be embarrassed for the rest of the conference.

[Laughter]

I might as well take time off and I will be in the corner, if anybody has eggs, tomatoes.

[Laughter]

Mr. Chairman, I think the point made by Switzerland is a very important point. I think it is not a point that can be taken lightly. I think it must be debated and discussed for a few minutes. And I would like to offer the house a practical example to see how this has changed.

I read to you, with your permission, from the Indian Telegraph Act of 1885, which is the law. And it is all about Internet governance because it relates to access which is the big fat elephant in Internet governance.

And it says, There are four privileges and powers of government for the exclusive privilege with respect to telegraphs, not even telecom. And the power to grant licenses within the central government shall have exclusive privilege of establishing, maintaining and working of telegraphs.

It would be unimaginable in 1885 that by 1995, 110 years later, the biggest provider of infrastructure would be the private sector. In fact, 90% of it. I'm sure this is -- I'm just giving you an example, but I'm always able to sustain this across laws and policies in vast majority of the countries, if not all.

So the point I'm trying to make here is not about the business should get into the rules of the government, as Parminder has pointed out very accurately. But we must realize that what was true in 1885 was not in 1995 and what is true in 2005 is not true in 2014 or going forward.

And the fact that this is changing must be reflected and should be a matter of discussion and dialogue. I would only say that any party that attempts to abuse this offer to display their role will be checked by others. I don't believe this will be -- you cannot come into something and say which is -- become something that is completely unacceptable. So I think there would be some debate and discussion around it. But the opportunity to define what you do should be put on the table by the stakeholders who are involved as we rapidly change the environment. This access piece is just a case in point which is very much Internet governance, which is very much law and is one of the 199 countries in the system. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat.

Just one question, is the law still in force?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Sorry?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The Telegraph Act?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: The law is actually in force, has had a few amendments and works actually quite well because it has the exceptions to give licenses. And private sector has been given licenses under the exceptions that had been imagined by the British, it seems, in 1885.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And we still have telegraphs?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: We sent our last telegraph message on the 15th of June, 2013, and we finished telegraphs forever and put it to sleep.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: But the law is still in force?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: The law is in force.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Very good. I'm relieved.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I don't want to get into an argument, but I think it is an important work we have to figure out who plays what role in public policy making. And I have heard this contention again and again that since more private sector is now involved in telecommunication, that increases its role in terms of public policy making, which is something which I do not understand.

Trade is almost entirely done by private sector. That does not mean that trade is governed by the private sector. It is governed by the governing bodies which are public policy-making legitimate bodies.

Intellectual property is almost entirely held by private bodies. That's the meaning of property. The governance is by the governments. And this logic, it used to be used in U.K. when democracy had started that because we owned the land, therefore, I need to have power -- voting power in the parliament.

So this logic that if a larger part of the productive system is with private sector, the governments would have public policy roles where private sector absolutely makes no sense, as. I said, in trade, in IP, agriculture, all our private activities does not have any implication, therefore, that the public policy-making should have an equal role in the private sector. That logic does not apply in my understanding. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden, and then I would like to stop the debate about that and would like to get back to Switzerland because I'm sure that you have the solution for all problems.

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we realize that this recommendation as it's worded now might be slightly provocative for some, and I think we have provoked a very interesting debate here. Unfortunately, we don't have that much for those more philosophical discussions today and tomorrow, this week, I guess.

Just to say we agree with Switzerland that if this draft recommendation should be adopted, we would probably need to work on the language and it is not our intention to advocate for anarchy. So you would maybe like to add something like "within existing frameworks" or something like that after "ecosystem" in order to make it a little bit -- to read a little bit better.

What we wanted to reflect with this recommendation is just that, as I think also was pointed out by various speakers before me, that roles change over time and they are continuously developing, and that's very important for us to keep in mind when we're discussing these issues.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

I can feel the urge from Thomas that he'd like to take the floor and give us the text.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you for giving me the floor which I asked so desperately for.

Unfortunately, I'm working on about five things in parallel here so my resource is limited but I think again Avri has said something intelligent, and I thank Sweden for bringing this up because it indeed was a very fruitful discussion.

Of course every stakeholder has a self-perception of its role but that might even differ within stakeholders. To go back to my example before, I think the content industry has a different perception of the role of private sector with regard to copyright protection than the ISPs have, and so on and so forth. So I think -- and Avri I think is -- she might be the best to make a formulation. Every stakeholder has the right to have its own perception of its role but in the end it's the whole community, the whole society, that decides or that should get a common shared understanding of all of the stakeholders' roles in the individual issues. I think somebody would just need to bring this down to paper. I hope that helps. Thank you. And sorry for not having provided the final solution.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Even that was very useful, I believe.

So Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would never put myself up as providing a final solution.

[Laughter]

>>AVRI DORIA: However -- however, what I would like to say is --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are not referring to the end (indiscernible).

[Laughter]

>>AVRI DORIA: What I would -- Thank you. What I would like to say is perhaps, then it could be amended to "should be allowed to participate in defining their role," and that may be a way through this to be able to keep this very important sentiment, I believe, in the document without running into some of the -- the problems and issues that we've run into, so I'd like to suggest that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

With this amendment, the text as it stands, "should be allowed to participate in defining their role in the international Internet ecosystem within existing frameworks," is it acceptable?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: It would be acceptable if you add the view in Tunis Agenda, but now, no. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Why is it in conflict with Tunis Agenda?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Because you are now implementing fully enhanced cooperation as per Tunis Agenda, which Paragraph 35 state the roles in Internet governance. Any amendment should be -- within the overall process would be taken on best by the General Assembly. There I mean we can discuss different roles and responsibilities. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Anyone else on this?

Avri, you would like to take the floor again?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I conclude that there was no consensus on that.

I'm really sorry, I thought we were quite close.

Do we have any outstanding issues in Point D?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, I understand that there is a proposal, a revised proposal, from Avri and Joy?

Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just a question, Mr. Chairman.

Did I miss something or have we managed to get through the whole of Section C without agreeing a single recommendation? I'm fairly sure I'm right, but I --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So we currently have a group -- role of stakeholders with no recommendations at all. Or do we have one?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. One. Good. Super. Jolly good.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran, please.

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

The paragraph we agreed, is it the one -- should we move to the -- I mean part of -- I mean to that part which is on developing countries or --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Based on the remarks I had about the Tunis Agenda, it is clear that as it has been defined, we are comfortable with this definition, so that is the message I have.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Not all of us.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think there was -- we were working on one recommendation which was the joint recommendations submitted by Brazil, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. I don't think we had finished that discussion. I don't know if you would like to continue that now or at a later stage, maybe.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Was it in Section C or B?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: C? Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So first, I would take Avri and Joy, because they had a similar issue, working on something, and then I would take yours.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So just to clarify the work that's been done on this recommendation, it's been submitted in an alternative on the basis that there was some discussion from members that seemed to indicate more, rather than less --

[Scribes lost audio]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- which also takes into account requests for amendments in relation to tenor of the language and specific areas of confusion. So represented in this burst of offering alternatives which might make some of the consensus of the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just a question. Is the first paragraph intended to be a recommendation because it doesn't seem to be recommending anything? It is a recognizing statement rather than a recommendation.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I missed it, sorry.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I was asking is the first paragraph supposed to be a recommendation because it is not written as is a recognizing statement.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: It is the chapeau. So all I'm doing is reflecting back to the chapeau that they indicated they had agreed on.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It doesn't look like a recommendation to me. It looks like it might part of a paragraph that leads to a recommendation but it itself is not a recommendation, I don't think.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think you have a problem that you have text here which is Recommendation 1. That is your problem. And you have after that Recommendation 2. That might be an editorial change. You

had the intention, I believe, to have text which is like a chapeau which we almost fully agreed on. I'm not sure which one is the case. And the recommendation text is recognizing their responsibilities and so on and so forth. Am I right?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: No. The idea was to propose a short recommendation, Recommendation 1, which seemed to have more -- seemed to have less disagreement than the full version of the recommendation which occurs in what's now Recommendation 2. So Recommendation 2 includes the chapeau with the specific subnumbered paragraphs referring to those steps which member states are encouraged to take.

In the event that participants -- or members are inclined not to agree and go to that level of detail, which was one of the concerns raised in the issue discussion, the alternative recommendation, the short version is offered in its place.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So if that case, I think we deal with the short version first. And I read it out: Recognizing that member states have responsibilities under international human rights law to respect, protect, and promote human rights relating to the Internet and to protect and promote the public interest.

I think it reflects the discussions we had earlier, and I have a recollection that we agreed on a similar language.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just a reminder that we had indicated that we would have to check with capital and get back to you. And we have done that and can provide some what I hope is correcting -- well, is --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Amending.

>>UNITED STATES: -- edits in the spirit of getting to consensus but with legal review.

[Laughter]

If we're working with just the first shortened recommendation at the moment, we would replace "responsibilities" with "obligations," "under applicable," which I think looks like it was there before, "to respect and protect human rights." Yeah, "to respect and protect human rights," period.

For a revision of the next sentence, "they should also act in the public interest."

Since our edits were set for the original draft, I would have to check that. But, sure, keep "relating to the Internet" now and then period, "they should also act in the public interest."

If there are discussions on the bullet point at any point, we do have some input on that as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So we have modified text. I would first go to the proponents.

>>UNITED STATES: Just to correct for the secretariat, "to respect and protect" and delete "promote." We are not against promoting. We are just taking our legal guidance. They should also act in the public interest, yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So --

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So to proponents, with this modification, is it acceptable to you?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes, Mr. Chair. And happy, of course, for the discussion to continue.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I turn to the floor. Members? Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, proponents, and the amendments made by the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, I remember at the beginning of our meeting, you said we have to concentrate on those recommendations which -- in fact, a recommendation not "which" -- when I see this paragraph, I don't think it is a recommendation. It is what is going on in the human rights body, and I see no value added. You may ask: What is the harm? Like the other cases. The harm is we are increasing the volume -- the bulk of the report. I see no value added in having this, although I have no problem to have this paragraph, Mr. Chairman. But I see no value added in that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. That's already a positive approach.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We do not think that it is human rights bodies or organizations that we respect and protect human rights but in the real world. That's our first comment.

Second comment is that we support the amendments made by the United States. However, we wonder whether or not it shouldn't be just "states" because why limit it to "member states," and in such case, which member states? Otherwise, we fully endorse this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any other views?

I would like to call your attention to issues of child on-line protection, hate speech, religious speech, which may be offensive, as for the value of this recommendation.

And I would like to ask you again, try and think in your own capacity and think about the role you are going to play or you are playing now and the way you can contribute.

Is it agreeable in its present form?

Iran.

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

I don't think it's necessary to repeat myself again that I see no value added in that paragraph. All states are very well aware of their commitments and responsibilities and I don't think it's necessary to repeat it everywhere.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I ask you if you are ready to accept this as a recommendation.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

As we said before, the human rights issue is covered in Tunis Agenda. We work under Tunis Agenda. Human rights are protected. So there is no need to repeat again and again and again. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I heard no counterargument except its redundancy with respect to Tunis Agenda.

Can I suggest with that to accept it?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I know it's redundant, but to -- our report won't be bulky anymore. It won't be bulky. Unfortunately.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm not going to comment about the redundancy or its usefulness because we have earlier also expressed our view that maybe we were okay with this -- actually the chapeau part, but I just wanted to draw the attention of this house towards the fundamental challenge that you are seeing about, because you raise those problems of child on-line and hate speech, religious speech, whatever.

So actually we are really challenged with those problems and we wanted to have some discussion in this body on addressing those challenges to have governments' obligation and responsibility, how it could be fulfilled, how they can undertake that responsibility or obligation to handle those issues.

So of course giving a slogan or something that it should be in the public interest is okay, but we are then bypassing the real problem.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

It's really up to us what we bring on board and if it hasn't been brought on board, so there is nothing I can do about it.

So if up to now no one has touched upon these problems, at least there was a fair trial -- try to get something about it. That was my understanding. That's how I see things.

So I strongly encourage you to at least -- at least approve this recommendation in order to move forward in some later stage.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I'm just carrying on to explain what India is saying.

I agree with this thing on the screen at present and that's fine with me. But what is said is -- and since Chair said that nothing has been laid out regarding what India spoke, what has been laid out is a platform for governments to take up issues which are new, which did not exist, and unless you form some laws and some frameworks, there's no remedies possible, and that has to be well done, which is a different platform. The human rights system is a great system. It provides remedies against some existing platforms. But there are new kind of issues which have to be evaluated, analyzed, and legal frameworks developed for them, whether it is digital data protection and crime on Internet, but also social justice issues.

So we -- the need for a platform is the main set of Section B which has been put there, so I was just clarifying that it's not true that it has not been got to the report. Section B is about mechanisms for addressing those new issues, and if there's a mechanism, hosts of them can be addressed. We don't have to list 1, 2, 3, because there are hundreds of new issues with regard to the Internet. So that has been put on board, I'm just clarifying. And human rights mechanism as a remedy measure is absolutely great, should be a form of (indiscernible), but also we need to move forward about issues which have not been sorted out yet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I would like to conclude on that. I didn't have any strong objections and I can see Egypt, I can see Phil, but I really want to conclude on that and would like to move forward because it's 7:00 in the evening, we can be here until 9:00, and we have a relatively short day tomorrow. I understand that some of you would like to take a flight, even though I have very good connections with the Geneva airport. I am sure you can all pass my connections as well.

So I strongly urge you to approve this recommendation as-is.

Iran.

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

Sorry, we cannot accept it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. In that case, no consensus. We move forward.

I closed the debate on that.

Phil, you still want to take the floor? Okay.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair, and I'm sorry to push but I would point out that there is quite a lot of detail in the correspondence group activity with regard to child on-line protection whereby INTERPOL, UNODC, UNESCO, UNICEF, U.N. committee on the Rights of The Child, et cetera, are cited as organs that would be possible areas for investigation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As I mentioned, all the contributions of the correspondence group will be made available on the working group Web site and I'm sure that CSTD members will have the opportunity to read that.

Okay. Let's move forward.

I imagine that it's needless to go into the detailed recommendation after the short one failed.

So I understand that there was a draft recommendation from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, and we have some modifications to the original one.

>>SWEDEN: Mr. Chairman, maybe we could address the -- and provide some explanation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>SWEDEN: I don't see our Brazilian colleague in the room, so I'll go ahead.

So we have tried to rework the original submission and we have tried to take into consideration the additional proposal made by Saudi Arabia about the importance of addressing international public policies.

I think we would all apologize because we didn't have time to consult bilaterally with Saudi Arabia about this because we were working together and we had also to consult our capitals. But this is our best effort to try to offer a reworked text on the role of -- of the government. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So we have a new -- or amended, rather -- amended recommendation from the smaller group. I turn to you whether the message itself is acceptable.

Anyone from the groups? Members of the group?

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I'm interested, of course, in what other people have to say, but I think it captures a lot of the things that we've been circling around in several of the discussions around the important role of governments in establishing legal frameworks, so I think it looks quite good.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan, then Saudi Arabia.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to support this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Can we see the previous proposal with our amendment?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Increase the size, the font size.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: And where is the new one?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia, take your time and while you are thinking, I give the floor to Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the Swedish colleague, too, for this proposal.

Just a point of clarification. In the third line, "consistent legislative framework," consistent with what? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden, can you clarify?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I don't know if our colleague from the United Kingdom is here, because I think in terms of these terms, sometimes it could be helpful to have a native speaker, but our understanding is that it should be internally consistent.

But maybe the U.K. would like to add something to that. Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: No. I think my Swedish colleague sums it up as in "not self-contradictory," thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Is the picture clear? You are getting more confused?

Yes, Iran.

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

Still I'm looking for the other side. The legislative framework should be consistent with some -- some other legislations. What are the other legislation? This is one case.

And the other one, Mr. Chairman, "fair" is fair to whom? When we are talking to say "fair," fair is something else, in my view, to the others. It's very vague. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, we don't interpret it that way. It should be that -- it should be sufficiently clear that you have -- you wouldn't have, let's say, one law saying one thing and another law saying something that is contradictory to that.

That's our understanding. That's consistent. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India?

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Just a quick amendment I want to suggest at the beginning of the paragraph, which should say that -- otherwise it will be a few miles behind the Tunis Agenda -- "Governments have a sovereign role in addressing international public policies." So I think that if you could capture this idea, thereafter we can write whatever we like, I think. We have no problem with the rest of it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen? Wait. Sorry, I think it hasn't been captured correctly.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you very much, Chair. The word "should" should not be there. Delete the word "should." I think that's the suggestion. "Governments have a sovereign role in addressing international public policies," Et cetera, et cetera, thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And you don't care about the rest? That's what I heard.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Wow. So my original comment, I'll make that first. I was going to suggest as a possible compromise that the phrase "a fair and consistent" be removed. And I would also suggest to change "legislative" to "legal" so that it would read "empowering Internet users and ensuring a legal framework that is transparent, accountable, equitable and ensures respect." So I guess I will make that proposal.

It now reads to me with the new edits -- once we remove "should," it seems like it is no longer a recommendation. So I will also say that, and I will end there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see Phil, then Avri.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Just seeking clarification, the Tunis Agenda actually refers to Internet-related public policy issues as the sovereign right of states. Is there a difference between states and governments? And does it matter?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good catch. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Chair. I admit that this looks like it's totally turned the recommendation on its head. We were talking before about the role of non-governmentals, and now we've basically taken the statement and enforced it as a statement about governments and sovereignty. No one is questioning government sovereignty within their own states.

Even when you look at 35A, you notice that there's two sentences. One of them mentions the sovereignty of the governments in public policy, and the second one says "and they also have roles and responsibilities in international Internet public policy."

And so we've been confounding those two sentences all along here. And here it seems like we're actually trying to reinforce a government notion -- a notion of government sovereignty over international public policy on the Internet which is a place where they have a role and responsibility, but they do not exercise sovereignty over the Internet public policy.

And so I really see we've taken a -- what I thought was actually an agreeable recommendation, turned it on its head, and made it into something that I can't support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you. The Tunis Agenda, somebody already said it, refers to the sovereign right of states which is not the same as the sovereign right or the sovereign role of governments. In this country where we live, the sovereign is the people and the government makes proposals for laws and so on. And if the people don't like it, they say no or they say yes, if they like it. So the sovereign in my country is not the government. The government is a servant, and the sovereign is the people, at least in my country. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So where are we now? It seems to me that we are coming to a complete consensus of not agreeing to the text we have in front of us. It is all right. It is something. It is more than we achieved yesterday. Yesterday we agreed that we didn't agree. Here we agree that all of us don't agree with this text.

So...

I need wisdom. I need wisdom from my friends.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. I don't think I have ever said anything wise.

[Laughter]

And I'm not going to do it now either most probably but just to say that we have problems with the amendment as proposed by India for the reasons explained by Switzerland and others. And we think we were really on our way to achieve some meaningful compromise here. I think we have heard support from different stakeholders in different regions.

But we are not in a position to accept the amendment as proposed by India unfortunately. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Okay. If "sovereign" is removed and we say "governments have the role of," I don't know whether that works, "the role of" instead of "in."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. If there's no qualifiers, then I think that's something we can go along. Qualifying the role, we can (indiscernible) sovereign or if you are looking at the role of addressing international public policy issues -- no need to type it in, sorry. No need to type anything, yet. There is no qualifiers. I think we can go along with that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Switzerland?

>>SWITZERLAND: Maybe for the sake of a compromise, we could look for something like "a key role" or even "a leading role" which it doesn't mean the only role, whether that would lead us to the next level of consensus. But "sovereign" is definitely the wrong word for us.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Yes. Trying to avoid a sticky wicket. I would suggest perhaps rather than "leading," "key," "the governments have a key role." It should read "governments have a key role." It is not that they have the only role. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.K. as proponent of the proposal.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would just like to thank everyone for trying to work with us. We worked very hard over the lunch to try and come up with the text that would was a compromise among all of our positions and seek consensus.

I can certainly support Mr. Rushton's addition, but I would have to revert to "legislative" rather than "legal." That's the only other change I would make. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's definitely a challenge probably for us in this environment and in this late hour to make the real difference between "legal" and "legislative." We will go along with what you proposed. Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: With the aim to complicate the whole thing, I hope it will settle it. Not every framework is a legal or legislative framework. There may be also regulatory frameworks, might be --

[Laughter]

Okay. I withdraw. I withdraw.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. That was a good try.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Given that there is quite a lot of good conversation about the wording throughout the text here, I just wanted to add something that I hope will be positive for everyone.

Perhaps if we could start the text with "in implementing enhanced cooperation." Thank you. And I leave the rest for those in discussion on it. Thank you.

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

So as I see it now, we have some text like "In implementing enhanced cooperation, governments have a key role of addressing international public policies, empowering Internet users, and ensuring legislative framework that is transparent, accountable, equitable and ensures respect for human rights online, fosters a robust Internet infrastructure, and supports multistakeholder processes and partnerships." So that's what we have right now.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I'm still uncomfortable with the fact that we turned it on its head from a "all stakeholders" to "governments." And I don't understand what a "key role" means. I understand that they have a role and such, but I really don't understand -- it is like saying they really, really have a role. And it doesn't really add anything. They have a role, yes.

And, in fact, government and all stakeholders -- you know, in implementing enhanced cooperation, governments and all stakeholders have a role in all of this. And beyond that, I just -- I don't see why we want to single out governments in this particular statement.

I understand why we wanted to add them when it started out "other stakeholders," "non-governmental stakeholders have a role." But to turn it on its head and remove non-governmental stakeholders and make it only about governmental stakeholders is that -- I do like the fact that we got into a discussion of the multiple roles of governments to regulate, to legislate, to whatever. But I do think that it really has to remain about government and along with other stakeholders, et cetera. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India, I need your wisdom.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think at times when we get into wrangles, wisdom seems to be somewhere in a distant place. So we are trying to gather our senses to see whether we can find some common ground on this paragraph.

The way it is framed on framework, to remove the word "legal," I think it is not very clear. Either we -- are we talking about global framework, or are we talking about national framework? Because it seems to have implications at both levels. It might be useful to as well state it, "ensuring global as well as national frameworks that are transparent, equitable and ensures respect for human rights online," et cetera, et cetera. "Global/national frameworks that are." Because since we are talking in the realm of international public policy, we might as well state that they have responsibilities, if there are any, that they apply to both global as well as national levels. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I thought by now you can hear me without the mic.

So I can see no flags from the members, so I ask Canada to take the floor.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair.

In terms of describing the roles of government, I'm wondering, since we seem to have some disagreement about using phrases like "important" or "key," if we can go back to the Tunis Agenda and use the phrase that's used there, which is that they have rights and responsibilities. That seems like a -- it follows the Tunis Agenda and is -- and is, I think, more or less a neutral expression.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If we have "the principal role" instead of "the key role." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.K.?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much.

I would certainly be happy to accept Canada's suggestion. I'm less happy with "principal."

But, once again, the language in the middle might be tripping us up a little bit.

We had a long discussion about it at lunchtime and "legislative framework" was the compromise language that we came up with, and so I would prefer to stick with that, please, rather than "global as well as national frameworks."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran?

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

"The principal role." Not "a."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So, "In implementing enhanced cooperation, governments have rights and responsibilities or the principal or the key role of addressing international public policies, empowering Internet users and ensuring legislative or legal, global as well as national frameworks that are" -- or "is transparent, accountable, equitable," and so on and so forth, so the last three -- 2 1/2 lines is okay.

I can see no major conflict in the message of the text. I can see some issues in the wording.

Can I propose that we come back in the second reading.

Yes, Iran.

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

If I remember right, the Indian delegation accepted the paragraph without the qualification at the end, if I'm right. The qualification -- without the qualification. Thank you.

>>INDIA: Do I have the permission, Chair?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think initial preference was "with the sovereign." I've heard the arguments so we're willing to look at without the qualifier because then we would have perhaps, one way or the other, prejudiced what kind of role it is. If that is where we are having consensus, we can go along with that. But if you are adding a qualifier, then I mean of the three, I'm willing to withdraw my "sovereign" phrase out of this. I heard the serious concerns or sentiments expressed in the room again.

So in which case, then you could look at the phrase either "principal," but I believe we would prefer without any qualifier. The sentence makes some reasonable sense to all of us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So may I suggest that we delete "principal," we delete "a key," we delete the "important" before?

Okay. So "In implementing enhanced cooperation, governments have a role of addressing international public policies, empowering Internet users and ensuring" -- "legislative" or "legal"?

Governments have legislative frameworks or the country has legislative framework or the Parliament has legislative framework or --

I'm not clear about that.

But it's my confusion. I don't really want to disturb you with that.

"Global as well as national frameworks that are transparent" --

Okay. We are getting there.

Yes, Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I think I have a clarification. Is it reading now "In implementing enhanced cooperation governments have the role of addressing international public policies"?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's how it reads.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Okay. I think I'm not really comfortable with "the role."

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I guess I liked "key" better or we could take it out and say --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I don't know. I -- we've come full circle but I'm not real comfortable with it saying "the role."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I originally raised my flag to ask for, at the appropriate point, the key -- the clean version of what you were going to propose for a second reading, but I see there's still conversation going on about the wording, so I'll reserve --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: But you can help me. Anyone can help me.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm totally confused now. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't know if I'll help, but I would replace the word "the" with "a," because they definitely do have "a" role.

And then when you get down to the "legislative" versus "legal," as far as I know, not all states have a legislature or a Parliament. They all do things differently. So try and define by what method they fulfill their role I think is an infinite morass, and to just admit that it is a role for ensuring, you know, transparent, accountable, equitable, et cetera, then I think it works, and then it's something that, you know, it states what is the case.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

I believe it is very helpful to me. I'm not sure it's helpful to others, but I -- I sincerely hope.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We are not comfortable with "the role" either. "A role," "a important role" or "the key role" or "the main role," maybe, but not -- or "the essential role."

[Laughter]

>>SWEDEN: But not "the role," for the reason we -- that we -- so --

And we have a preference also for "legislative framework" because that was something that we had discussed extensively and we have some sensitivities there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just a remark to comment on Avri's intervention.

She pointed out rightly that it is not necessarily true for every country to have a legislative framework, so we have to be clear what we want to say.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The notion of adding words, I would be uncomfortable with "the essential." I would be comfortable with "a" or "an essential role." I'd even be comfortable with "a really essential role."

[Laughter]

>>AVRI DORIA: But "the essential role" -- anytime it is indicating that they are the only one with the role is where I find myself having objection.

But "a really, really very essential role" would be fine.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me remind you that it's half past 7:00. I know that we are having a great time --

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: -- and I mean it. I'm enjoying it. And I would enjoy it up to midnight with you but I'm told that I can't be -- I mean we can't be here after 9:00, so that will be the end of the story for today, and we want to have something on the table and this is very close to it.

We are discussing one or two words. We are not discussing substance.

So I really advise you to approve it, with the condition that we are going through a second reading tomorrow and we fix the missing parts, what we don't think we can agree on.

Is it agreeable, with this comment?

Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As we have said earlier, we would like to keep the words "civil rights" as it is stated in Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 35, Item 1(b), "Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states."

So this is what -- how it reads in Tunis Agenda. If we have these words in Tunis Agenda, I don't know why shouldn't we have it here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And please forgive me for repeating, but the sovereign right of states is within the sovereign state. The sovereign right of states is not defined in the second sentence which says they have rights and responsibilities or roles and responsibilities in international Internet policy. Those are two very distinct thoughts. So certainly no one's questioning the sovereign right within the sovereign state. It's the sovereign right in the international Internet public policy that is the key substantive point here, and that is not defined in the Tunis Agenda.

There are two sentences in 35(a). They have different meanings and we can't continue to confound them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

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

I agree to a -- I have no problem to read it again and improve the language, but subject to having all proposals from the room, like "the principal," "the key role," and all these together, then it will help us in -- come up with maybe better language when we are going to work on it.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So probably if we sleep on that, it will give us good advice. Eventually some call to capital as well.

So let's note it approved on the condition of improving in second reading.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: As we've done before, I'd like to request that we say "revisit," as opposed to "approved."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. "Revisit." It's my mistake. I suggested the "revisit." I should have suggested in the first place "approved."

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Anyway. Okay. Probably next time.

I think with that, we have finished --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no. No, no. No, no. We go to Section D.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I just have an organizational question. I want to -- can we make sure before we leave that we leave time to maybe just briefly review the ones that are to be revisited tomorrow, because I think I may have lost a little track.

Not review them in substance. Just get a look at them?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Very useful. You are not the only one.

Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. Go to the top and let's see what we have.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

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

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Am I right, you want to see everything from A, B, and --

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Just the ones that we considered on the revisit list, or agreed to, if there is such a thing.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I give you five minutes' break because the secretariat needs five minutes to clean up the document which will be considered tomorrow. So five minutes' break.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have news for you without qualifying whether it is bad news or good news. We can start working.

I'm also told that by 9:00, we have to leave the room. I know that you are sorry for that. You would like to stay until 10:00 or 11:00 or 12:00, but life is very rough here.

So there was a request before we broke for five minutes a half an hour ago to have kind of a clean idea - or clear idea where we are, what to go through again, what to revisit, and what did we skip because unfortunately it seems to me we might have skipped some items.

So what you have on the screen -- and you will be sent again -- is kind of a clean version of the recommendations which haven't been discussed at all or haven't been discussed -- have been discussed only partially. And there are in this list also recommendations that we have approved, and you have the recommendations where we agreed to revisit.

So I'm told by the secretariat that in Group A -- and I would like to ask you -- especially the proponents to comment, if that is the case. So that was the draft recommendations submitted by Japan which was, according to this, unfinished.

I can see a recommendation by Sweden which is in square brackets.

Go down.

There was a group of recommendations, I think, by Avri and Chris and Joy. And I think one part was not discussed.

We go down -- it is marked as pending.

There was a set of recommendations from Saudi Arabia, the status of which is not clear to me. So I retained it.

Same applies to Parminder's recommendation.

And if you go down, there is a recommendation from Mexico with no indication. And we have a recommendation from U.S., first part pending, second part agreed.

We have a set of recommendations submitted by Joy which are revised but apparently we haven't had a chance to look at them.

We have Recommendation 18 and then if you go down to revisit. And we have a recommendation which has been agreed.

We have a submission from the U.S. combining IGF recommendations which we didn't discuss.

>> UNITED STATES: Just to clarify, there are two there. And one was originally in A and one was originally in B. But in our group we decided not to determine where to place them so you can leave them both there for now, I guess.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Chair, there were a series of recommendations put by me in part B and I don't see them there. I see all the ones which were having no consensus. I'm not very sure what process has been followed. I would like to be clarified on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Did I get you right, that your recommendations haven't been treated or haven't been discussed or we had no consensus? I'm not sure what you are saying.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Sorry, Chair, if I did not make myself clear. I said that there are many recommendations on the screen which were seen and marked as no consensus and so was the recommendations which I made in Section B, but I don't see them on the screen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The intent for us was to remove those ones which had "no consensus" remark at the end and then probably we might have misplaced some so we would very much appreciate your help to clean this further.

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Am I being asked to resubmit those ones?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Where we had no consensus on?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: No, Chair. I'm still not clear. There are lots on the top on which we did not have consensus. I mean, practically everything on the screen. Perhaps there are two or three where I can see there was -- previously not possible consensus, but 80% of the screen are things which had no consensus here. That's how I see it, Saudi Arabia, but also Group B submitted by Joy, all of them.

And I don't see the distinction between those ones and the ones which I presented.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So as I explained to you, our intent was to get -- to separate those ones which we had no consensus on, not to have them on the list. Eventually we might have made some mistake in doing so. So that's why I'm asking your help to say, no, this shouldn't be on the list because we didn't have consensus.

Basically, what I want to have recommendations which we agreed on and recommendations we have to revisit, eventually recommendations which have been reverted, rephrased, and it should be also rediscussed. But I don't really want to open up discussions on recommendations on which we didn't have consensus on. That is the idea.

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Chair, I'm perhaps making -- being too insistent on that. The ones I see now, I mean, I can change my recommendations by a sentence or two. But I thought the ones which were -- I remember the rapid rolling and reading of those documents and those things were being brought back. Many of those things which are on the screen had no consensus. I can resubmit them in a slightly changed manner. But the ones right now I see, though, I agree with many of those there, but I don't see the consistency in the consideration to those. So I would just request the ones which I had submitted still be considered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I repeat, I am ready to take your help in identifying those recommendations which we are sharing on the screen which we didn't have consensus and I'm ready to remove them. That is the only thing I can offer, to remove those ones that didn't have consensus. I don't intend to discuss those ones again. So if you find -- if anyone in the room can find recommendations or draft recommendations where we didn't have consensus and they are still on the list, please just notify me or the secretariat about it.

Yes, Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to help Parminder, this cluster of recommendations here was one that was worked on late yesterday in which the Chair asked us to rework and submit in light of the comments that were made on them.

So this is one which was pending, the conclusion of discussion on it. It is not one -- what's happened is that the revised versions have been resubmitted, but there hasn't been subsequent discussions to determine whether there is consensus or not.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right. I agree.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I'm ready to submit a revised version of the ones I submitted earlier.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder, let me have discussion between the two of us to avoid confusion.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with your approach. Maybe we should start from the top of the document and go through them one by one to see if there are any ones there we don't have any chance of getting consensus. We can delete them. This is the time, I guess. We cannot rediscuss three, four times things that we have no chance of reaching any consensus on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Practically we are going to do that. But the bottom line is that eventually -- and I repeat eventually, we might have made a mistake not putting the remark after the discussion that we haven't reached consensus. And that is the basis of this misunderstanding. So I also suggest to go back to the top and revisit very quickly. And I am in your hands to say, no, we didn't have consensus on that one. It shouldn't be on the list.

So, scroll down a bit.

We have here the Japanese submission, a remark "unfinished." I have no idea what it means. Frankly, I have no clue what it means.

Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: I have two sets of notes on the Japanese proposal. So I would just ask colleagues, one of them says that we have now a new simplified version of the resolution. And that's what we have there, right?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Recommendation, you mean?

>>MARILYN CADE: Yeah, yes, sorry, yes. Sorry.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's what we have on the screen, I believe.

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say this proposal is the common proposal of Japan and Iran. So please amend.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: With the collaboration, okay. It is a proposal from Japan with some help, some generous help. Okay.

And we were close to concluding on that, I believe.

The status of the next one?

>> (Speaker off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm talking about Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. The status of this one was we thought that it had much in common with the Japanese one and we just wanted to -- since we had not finished the text of the Japanese one, we wanted to provide it just as a reference point for maybe potentially improving the language of the Japanese one, if necessary. The only thing that I think we could say is that if there would be a value of starting the Japanese recommendation by saying that the Tunis Agenda should be implemented and then follow on by the Japanese text. Otherwise, I think that we can withdraw our text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The third one, we have the remark of "pending." Probably at that time we didn't use the word "revisit." So, well, if you have the "pending," it comes to me to revisit. I don't really want to go into substantial discussion now.

Go to Number 4.

Following a set of recommendations -- Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. There was no consensus on this one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Mr. Chairman, we left with one day -- I mean we did one reading on most of the sections except two sections.

When we came to the substance, there is no consensus, and we went around and around on the subject where is consensus. So I didn't know how our report would recommend for the implementing enhanced cooperation. We cannot accept a report including a number of recommendations, very general recommendations. I mean, we did not come here to write very general recommendations on implementing enhanced cooperation. Let's be frank.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for offering us your remarks but now we are trying a technical thing, so I would like so I would like to have your cooperation on that.

Iran?

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

So what was the decision on the first three paragraphs? We leave them at the moment or...

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: The first two, maybe.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Go up.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes. What is the decision on these two? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, there was a discussion on the Japanese proposal which I was informed came with your kind cooperation, as there was a discussion close to approval, and we left as a reminder of the Swedish proposal which in spirit was close to the original Japanese, and Sweden said that in case we discuss the Japanese and we arrive to some result, he is going to withdraw.

We haven't discussed it because we said that the Japanese encompasses whatever is.

Yes?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your explanation. Therefore, it's not agreed yet.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Okay. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Revisit.

I ask Parminder, in his recollection, what was the status of your recommendation?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: No. I mean it's certainly not agreed or close to that, but I'm not sure --

Okay. Like the one which is the Number 2 up there, what is the status? It's not that I'm insisting that any of them were agreed and now they're disappearing. I'm not clear about -- I mean, I would ask the chair what was the status, why this is there and some other parts are not there.

I must say that I'm not sure. That's all.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think I made it clear that there was some technical problem where we didn't put down the final decision of the group.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: If you are asking me what I remember was the status of this, then it was seen by people and passed on and it was obviously not agreed to.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So we didn't have consensus. Thank you.

The same question to Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Well, Chair, regarding the proposal, I don't recall no consensus but no agreement either.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So no consensus. Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Was it for revisit?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So the recommendation submitted by U.S. has a clear indication that the second part agreed, first part pending, meaning probably to revisit.

Iran?

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

I think for the previous paragraph there is no consensus. Why revisit?

I have a problem with that. Therefore, there is no consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So no consensus.

Okay. In Group B, we have a set of recommendations which we asked Joy to reformulate and I think that was the result and we haven't had a chance to discuss it. Yes, Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just in the spirit of cooperation, I did just check the transcript on the question of consensus, and the -- it seems that there was a decision to -- a request to reconsider and re- -- offer revised recommendations in relation to Recommendation 1 and 3 here, but that there was no consensus on Recommendation 2 --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- if that can be recorded.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

For 1 and 2, revisit -- 1 and -- 1, 3, and 4.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Yes. 1, 3, and 4. But for Recommendation 2, there was no consensus.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran.

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

There was a paragraph, I saw that it is mentioned "revisited" without any comments under. Can we see that again before...

Yes. Which part it means that -- I mean "second part agreed." Which part is the second part?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably the second sentence.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can we go further?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yeah. Go ahead.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

So we are there at the IGF recommendations which we should discuss. U.S. submitted consolidated IGF recommendations, or two.

Go down.

And we are already at Group C.

So we had one recommendation we agreed to move, I think, to another section. Probably the section on development.

Yes, Iran.

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

May I ask the secretariat to be a little slower? It's very fast. Because I couldn't get the previous paragraph, what is --

Yeah. So what is the decision on these two paragraphs?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.S. was asked -- or U.S. offered that recommendations on -- related to the IGF will be consolidated into a more concise recommendation which we didn't have a chance to discuss, so we are --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: So we need to put some -- some word at the end to know what we are going to do later on.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Very useful.

Okay. India?

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Can we go back, too, Chair, to the recommendations on IGF, please?

I think we'll have a difficulty in accepting this proposal because this is a working group on enhanced cooperation and I don't think we are prepared to make a recommendation to extend IGF in this platform.

I mean, we have no difficulty in extending IGF's mandate. There's no difficulty. But in this particular working group, making a recommendation on IGF extension, well, I think that's -- perhaps it's not the place to look at it.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

I'm not prepared to have a discussion on it now. We had a general comment but we haven't discussed it at length in the new form, so we shall discuss it tomorrow and you may have the arguments, and on the basis of which we can take some decision.

Go down.

So we have a common proposal from Russia, Japan, and Avri, with the remark to revisit.

Go down.

We had a common proposal from Japan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran. No consensus.

And I'm sure you will clean the document.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Slower. Slower. It's too fast for me, I think.

Okay. So we had a set of recommendations submitted by Avri, and I think you have worked on it and came up with something new.

Yes, Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. I mean, those are basically pending deletion, depending upon what happens with the revisited/reworked one.

I have a -- you know, but -- so they're pending -- they're pending drop, depending on what happens with the revisited statement.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I believe they will be deleted anyway.

>>AVRI DORIA: I'm sure they won't get consensus, but yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, no. I don't mean that. I don't mean that.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The bottom line is, we are going to discuss your modified --

>>AVRI DORIA: Right. Okay. Fine. Yeah. Whatever. Right.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I mean we are not going to discuss the original.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And be optimistic, please.

[Laughter]

>>AVRI DORIA: That was optimism.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It sounded as a wishful thinking, but anyway. Okay. So we are going to --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Go up. Stop. It's up. No, no, no. Just one -- one or two lines. Okay.

So that was a common recommendation from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and U.K. We discussed it this afternoon, I believe.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And we agreed to revisit it. Okay.

We were very productive today. Oh, my, friends.

I skipped my theater, so as a compensation, tomorrow I expect you will approve a lot of recommendations. I expect you to work very well on the chair's report and accept it. And I wish you a very good evening and hope to see you here tomorrow. I would like to start at 10:00 because I need some time to sit down with the secretariat and to have some clean documents for your consideration, and tomorrow we are going at a very great speed.

India has the last word.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I don't intend to delay the proceedings any further, but just one fundamental clarification is to make it - I want to be clear about next steps, which is, this will be a report of the working group that will be going to the CSTD. That's our understanding. So when you are saying "the chair's summary," I just want to be clear we're talking about the summary of these recommendations that will be presented to the group tomorrow to further discuss.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: There will be nothing sent to the CSTD until it's agreed to. Thank you.