

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

24-28 February 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Day 2

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

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

(Pre-meeting already in progress)

>>MARILYN CADE: We do continue to have different challenges, I think. We also face a realistic issue, and that is that groups that are working in the way we are and with the standing that we have are really not in a position to modify the Tunis Agenda.

I think we can have a discussion about the role of stakeholders in the later section, but putting it into a stand-alone section, I think, is going to be a fairly protracted discussion and very difficult to reach agreement on.

I discern a range of views already even on the inclusion of that topic. My proposal would be to put that in square brackets.

I'll just go back to one other point. I want to be careful. I'm not proposing outright changes in the headings, but I'm going to make a plea. I understand Joy's comment that the headings should tell a story. But I think that the heading language must also be -- at this point, it must be neutral in its terminology as we have not yet determined what the recommendations are.

One example would be inferring that there is agreement to call for a new mechanism before we have actually reached agreement on recommendations. Institutionalizing or operationalizing enhanced

cooperation to me is a broad enough term that then recommendations could go under. And then if there is agreement, there will probably be a range of recommendations: Strengthening existing mechanisms, enhancing existing mechanisms. We will have undoubtedly further discussion about any new mechanisms. So I would call on us to be neutral in the choice of words for the heading so that we're not then having to revise the headings once we get into our discussions about recommendations. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Marilyn. Thank you for the need to have balanced items. That's very important so it doesn't give the wrong impression. Abstention should speak, rather than the title, in its entirety.

Now I recognize we have Mr. Esmat followed by Blackler.

>> BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. This is Baher Esmat with ICANN. Just wanted to support the view of removing Section 4 from this outline. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Now Ms. Blackler.

>> ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you and good morning. It is Ellen Blackler.

I wanted to support the idea Joy had talked about, which was to make sure we had a summary of the findings. We have talked a lot about both barriers and progress that have broad agreement. And I want to make sure that those are in the report to give context to recommendations, which I always like to bring us back to the work that we've done, which is the mapping. And that should really be the factual basis for the recommendations that we have going forward where we identify the gaps and then make a recommendation that would address a gap. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Now request the U.K.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want like to also add my thanks to others for your work in giving us this useful framework for us to start our discussions.

I wanted to just add my voice to some of the others in the room to say that I completely agree we want a concise and precise report that reflects areas of consensus as accurately as possible.

And to that end, I would echo what Joy had said about possibly taking 6, 7 and 8, for example, and pushing them into 5 so that we don't end up with a repetition. And I think we can do that in a way that captures all the various issues that have come up in the discussion, for example, Ellen's previous comment, by using a simple formula of situation, context, question, and answer so that we cover: This is what we discovered. This was the context in which we were discussing it. And these are the conclusions that we agreed on.

And that would then hopefully cover all the bases, have a concise report that is not confusing and is not duplicatory. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. We will soon be ending into borrowed time of the plenary. May I request colleagues to make a few quick interventions, and then I will try to sum up what I have understood and then what I intend to present to the larger group.

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would also thank you for providing us with this draft that we can start working from.

I would also add my voice to Mexico, Sweden, and others who have called for us to be as concise as possible but also to focus on areas of agreement which, I think, is important for sending out a clear message about the work of the group.

We would also support the recommendation, I believe Sweden made, about treating the five different clusters equally in the context of the document.

And, also, I think Joy had a very good recommendation in terms of collapsing the Section 6 and 7 in the draft and incorporating them into Section 5 for more conciseness and clarity. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Canada.

Parminder, please.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And good morning. Actually, my comments got covered by the last intervention. I think we have two parts of the report, one is introduction which has -- can you make the text larger, please? Yeah -- which has the methodology and broad approach. And I think we should flip it. Broad approach and scope-affect areas should come first and then the methodology.

4, I think we agree to remove.

And after that, all the recommendations, recommendations on operationalizing enhanced cooperation and all A to E but also 6, 7 and 8 are recommendations. And they should, therefore, be a single kind of a plate. So first the introduction with two subsets and then recommendations on operationalizing enhanced cooperation with A to E and then F, G, H, which will be 6, 7, 8. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Parminder.

Let me finish with the remaining speakers. We have U.S. followed by Sweden and then Iran. Thank you.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Well, let me compliment you on a productive morning. It seems to us that you are hitting your marks.

In terms of the broad areas of consensus, it seems that we're agreeing that the report should be concise. We are agreeing that we should advance to the reading audience, to the CSTD that there were particular agreements where we can identify them. They would be interested in that information.

And then I think, finally, the third thing that we're talking about this morning is informing the audience in a very even way, which is to say I think there's been some discussion just recently about treating -- I'll call it the clusters -- there must be a better word but I will go along with it -- the five clusters evenly.

We would support that, and we think that the suggestion of taking 6, 7 and 8 and reflecting it in 5 is a very good one. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, U.S.

Request Sweden now.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize for coming back again. It is simply because we didn't see 6, 7 and 8 before.

But I share the same -- make the same reflection as the U.K. and U.S. and others, that we should not think about 6, 7 and 8 in this way but keep them within -- within 5.

That goes also back to the argument that we made before about -- that it's one thing to talk about operationalization of enhanced cooperation. It is a different thing to talk about mechanisms for doing so. And we will see what this working group concludes on that matter.

If there is a need to have something after the 5, the recommendations, maybe we should have some more general category where we call it "conclusions" or "road ahead" or "further reflections" or something like that, something more general. And then we will see what will be the outcome of this -- of the drafting of the recommendations. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Now request Iran, the last speaker. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. I just echo what has been said by previous speakers. And I believe that Item 6, 7 and 8 already can be, I mean, included in 5. Therefore, we don't need to have it in the list of the items in the report. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. If I may just sum up, I think it's been very useful and very productive in terms of a broad swath of issues that were a 10 and to give some direction.

If I can sum up one, one suggestion made was from the beginning introduction states, we could flip 2 and 3. Role of stakeholders, we will keep it in square brackets for the time being because there is still some thoughts about it to keep it or not.

And then we have 6, 7 and 8. There seems to be an understanding that we could remove the 3 and merge it into those. But out of this, what we could do is -- since there are two of them, the recommendations, that is, 6 and 7, which have in a sense relation with the mechanisms, they're covered under B, 5B, so we could perhaps remove 6 and 7.

On 8 which is relationship with IGF, Item 8, I didn't hear any views in the room that we need to keep this in this report.

Yeah, Marilyn, please go ahead.

>>MARILYN CADE: Actually, Chair, I would have spoken to that, but I didn't assume it would be controversial. I think we should examine that in discussion. I would like to see it stay in. I think, in fact, we may want to be thinking about -- I'm assuming that in our discussions, based on what I've seen in the recommendations, that there will be a number of organizations, that there will be a comment about the relationship to. But I would like to keep that.

I think it's also very important since in the Tunis Agenda, the Tunis Agenda talked about two processes or two -- it talked about the IGF in particular and it talked about the enhanced cooperation as a process.

So I would like to speak to keeping it in. If there are colleagues who raise questions, then at a minimum, I'd ask that we keep it in square brackets and come back to a discussion.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Marilyn. Let me hear the two colleagues from Saudi Arabia followed by Iran.

Okay, Iran first. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a suggestion to merge title 2 and 3 which both are talking about the approach and methodology. And second point, since -- I think we had some questions on IGF in the questionnaire and we referred -- we will refer to in the recommendations. Therefore, we don't need to -- as I said before, to highlight one issue out of all. Therefore, I still insist on deleting Number 8. Thank you.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just double-checked the questionnaire and I have a question on the relation of IGF. So we are now treating this section more than the other five. So I think deleting this will be (indiscernible) criteria also rejected last time. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Colleagues, thank you.

Now I would like to conclude after hearing this conversation, that we keep two items in square brackets. That's 4 and 8. We seem to have significantly compressed the table of contents, and we'll leave it to the Chair of the group to thereafter -- Chair of the working group to guide us further.

On these two issues, what I intend to do is perhaps have more discussion at some stage during the course of the day and see whether we would at least have consensus on the content. And then the next step will be to move towards a kind of -- what kind of broad element they need to go into some of those areas that are not relating to recommendations.

And before we conclude, the suggestion made by the distinguished colleague from Iran with regard to 2 and 3, which is to look at methodology approach and scope of areas, well, I think I have a certain personal preference in this. Why I want this to be distinct is because when you talk methodology, you are purely talking about the way in which we proceeded in various -- in the three meetings that we have undertaken.

Broad approach and scope of area is something we're looking at, perhaps commenting on the nature of tasks that have been assigned to the working group. And it's sort of how we went about handling it. So that way we would have achieved broadly what we call the approach we have taken and, thereafter, what methodology we adopted in achieving that particular objective.

I see Iran, again. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Still, it seems to me the same because when we are talking different methodologies followed by the working group, in different meetings, in fact, second item which is broad approach, we are talking about the whole process which include the three meetings.

Therefore, I think we are just detailing the broad approach in methodology. I still think both are the same but in detail.

And while I have the floor, if we are going to keep Number 8 in brackets, we prefer to see 6 and 7 to be in the list and to be in brackets. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Iran.

And then we will keep 6 and 7 also in brackets.

I have Jimson now. Thereafter, I will see to Sweden.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much. Good morning, colleagues.

I just noticed a pretty big gap perhaps that we do not have an executive summary. I think it would be necessary for us to have an executive summary, but the nature of the numbers is also useful. I mean perhaps. At least there should be an executive summary. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Sweden. Thank you, Jimson.

And Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Just a very brief comment. We would have a preference, as I said before, striking out 6 and 8. But if it would be an agreeable compromise, couldn't we have something in the end that we call summary or we call it conclusions or something like that instead of potentially -- then we can see what out of 6, 7 and 8 would be relevant to bring in.

I don't know what would be the view of Iran or Marilyn, for instance, that had a preference for keeping 8. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Also, if I can also bring in this situation that was made earlier that we could have something called "a way forward" which could perhaps reflect what we would like to do thereafter.

Okay. Now I have Joy coming. Thank you.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Chair, for your indulgence. Just to clarify a point I made earlier in relation to Number 4 on the role of stakeholders and being happy with it being deleted, it was, of course, predicated on the assumption that the substantive issue itself is dealt with properly in 5C, so maybe with that being -- remaining there as it is at this point.

And also to say we really like the idea of "a way forward" section. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Before I conclude, I think Chair has given enough signals. He is already in the chair, so I must cede to the Chair.

Before that, I have Saudi Arabia that wants to make an intervention. Thank you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the way forward would be taken (indiscernible). The way forward would be decided by UNGA, so we don't want to prejudge the way forward. Our job here is to develop recommendations, and they will do the way forward, UNGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So we don't -- I mean, I agree, I think Number 9. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Is Iran still wanting to speak?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Saudi Arabia, that we have to leave it to CSTD, ECOSOC and UNGA to decide on the way forward. We leave it to them to proceed, and we leave it to them to decide on that. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. I have the last speaker. Last, last speaker is Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: thank you, Chair. I have been very well trained by my diplomatic colleagues to note that when there is not yet agreement, square brackets reserves yet another opportunity to discuss. So perhaps we can just leave 9 in square brackets and come back and talk about it because I do agree that we are not making a final decision by any means. We are a working group that is providing input to CSTD that will then go into -- sorry, ECOSOC and it will then go.

I think we could consider having a discussion on if we make recommendations that call on improvements -- for improvements in existing organizations or other things, then we may want to make a comment on we are experts in this by this time, right, and we are making recommendations in an area.

So the way forward could address how we think that implementation could best be, with all understanding we are only making suggestions. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Thank you, Marilyn. And "way forward" stays but in brackets.

With this, I would like to just conclude. I think I have -- is U.K. wanting to speak? Please go ahead.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I just wanted to kind of agree with that, that the square brackets usually means we have an opportunity to come back. And I wonder whether some of the debate we've had this morning about whether, 6, 7 and 8 should be absorbed into 5, is 9 appropriate at this time, I wonder

whether in the work of the plenary we might actually find our conclusions giving us a steer about where these various headings should go.

I wonder if it is, therefore, worth putting in a kind of pin and saying "right, that's where we are right now, we will come back to it in a couple days' time and see if there are actually a different way to look at this based on the discussions we've had."

But that's entirely up to us, Chairman. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you very much. I think you have raised -- made a very pertinent point. I think we are now trying to -- sort of roping in the dark, trying to ride an elephant with some saying from the tail, some are saying from the trunk. I think we really need to find the elephant first and then come back to this content table at some stage. So I think that particular exercise I think we need to focus on.

At this stage, I would like to stop. And thankfully, since we are in the plenary almost, that means most of the colleagues who have been participating in our discussion are now going to continue.

Chair, with your permission, just to say that you have heard us, there are some areas of convergence, large convergence, and there are some areas where we need to work a little further.

I think we would perhaps at some stage during the day or sometime tomorrow morning on a similar pattern come back and with better appreciation of discussions of today, we can perhaps clean this table of contents.

For the time being, I would like to leave as it stands since there are differences of opinion on some of the areas -- some of the titles, subtitles, regarding the retention or not.

With this, I thank you everyone for your very, very constructive and very productive participation.

[Plenary Session begins.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, good morning. I would like to thank you all, especially Mr. Reddy, to lead this meeting which I think was a very fruitful one and very good introductory meeting to today's events.

I promise you that I will give you an assessment of the first day. I will do that. However, I think you have been working very hard for 1 1/2 hours, so actually you may like to have a small break, a 10-minute break, or else if there's no one who would like to have this break, we may continue.

So it's up to you.

I am ready if you are ready.

Break. Okay. So can we resume in 10 minutes?

Okay. But 10 minutes sharp. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning and welcome back. Yesterday I promised you that I'm going to give an assessment of each day at the beginning of our sessions, so I'm trying to make a summary of what has happened yesterday and this morning.

Next slide, please.

So as usual, I would like to recall our mandate about the establishment of the working group on enhanced cooperation to examine the mandate of WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation through seeking, compiling and reviewing inputs from all member states and all other stakeholders, and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate, with the obligation to report to the CSTD in 2014, and this is a UNGA solution which has been reiterated last year.

So yesterday, we agreed on the agenda and the procedural questions.

We kind of agreed on the time management.

And we also agreed that the report of the -- this group will be one document with a descriptive part and background information and naturally, of course, including the recommendations.

And we have also agreed to form an ad hoc group to guide me and the group on the structure of the report.

Next one.

Yesterday, we have also listened to a report from the chair of the correspondence group on public policy issues and possible mechanisms.

I have to recall that the group identified issues which were based on responses to the questionnaire which was prepared by this group.

The correspondence group also worked according to the terms of reference which was determined by this group.

So I take the opportunity again to thank the chair and the co-chair for their excellent work, and all those who contributed.

I proposed yesterday to discuss the five groups identified during our second meeting, which were the groups of responses, to discuss these in smaller groups and provide the draft recommendations, and I also proposed -- and I think you accepted that -- that we discuss the results of these breakout groups in plenary.

Next one, please. Yeah. Thank you.

So the way forward. I understand you had a very fruitful meeting this morning about the structure of the report, and I believe we received -- the secretariat and myself -- some instructions on the way

forward, and probably we can start working on the draft report, with the understanding that you will -- you would like to have another meeting to finalize the structure itself. But having said that, probably there are some elements already in the proposed structure which can be used by me and by the secretariat.

As for today, I suggest to have two breakout groups discussing the rolling document, discussing the issues which have been included in the rolling document, and I take the opportunity to inform you that submissions have been included in the rolling document containing draft recommendations, and I think copies are available -- right? -- on the table and I would like to suggest that as of now, we are going to have the rolling document as a Google Doc and the link to the Google Doc will be sent to you by the secretariat.

In case you have difficulties, please let the secretariat know about that and you will receive it by e-mail, in case you need it.

I think as of now, I would suggest to go paperless. We are going to have access to -- all of us to the document. For those even though it means a problem, please just make a note to the secretariat and they will take care of that.

So getting back to the two breakout groups, I suggest to have Group 1 to discuss recommendations on questions and responses in Group A, and I would suggest the convener to be the delegate of Peru.

As for Group 2 -- and I'm talking about the rolling document -- I suggest to discuss the responses in Group B, and as convener, I would recommend the delegate from Mexico.

I hope that these two breakout groups can work separately. I believe we have only this room available. There is no extra room. So please try and organize yourself in a way that you can attend one or the other group in this room. Try not to disturb each other. And I recommend to start the work right now.

And I would like to have the plenary discussion just to have a kind of report where you are, how you are proceeding, by 3:00 this afternoon. I would like to have the convener to give me some short report where we are, and based on this report, we shall decide how to proceed further.

Next one.

I also suggest to have -- one back. Yeah.

I propose and I hope we believe finalize the responses and draft recommendations for Group A by tomorrow morning and we can start working on the two other groups. That is, Groups C and D. I suggest a similar arrangement. That is, we are going to discuss it also in small groups. And at the same time, I hope to start working or continue working on the draft report.

And as I told you, all these documents will be made available on the Google Docs.

Next one.

If we work very diligently and efficiently, probably on Thursday we can start working on recommendations for Group E and we can discuss it at the plenary, and by Thursday evening we will have only one thing left for Friday. That is, finalizing the report, and it means that we will have a discussion on the complete report, including all the recommendations.

So basically, that is the way I see it now. It may be different tomorrow. I hope we can stick to this schedule I have recommended to you, and I'm ready to take your questions.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the assessment report.

I'm seeking two points of clarifications.

When in your remarks you referred to the final report which is -- which will be in two parts, one background information and the other part will be descriptive, did you mean the descriptive the recommendations or you mean something else? I would like to hear about that.

And the second one is the basis for the discussion in two small groups will be the rolling document which has been delivered by the secretariat yesterday or we have new documents? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for your question. Probably I wasn't clear in my introductory remarks. I'm talking about one document. The document will be structured according to your recommendations, what you have decided in your ad hoc group, and I kind of anticipated -- or wrongly anticipated some of the outcomes of the ad hoc group, so the wording isn't correct. It will be following your structure.

As for the input document, as I mentioned, I mostly want you to discuss the rolling document as-is, which has been updated and which is available on the table.

As for the results of the correspondence groups -- group, I would like you also to take note of the correspondence -- the results of the correspondence group, in case there are parts which easily lend themselves to be included as recommendations. I encourage you to do that.

In case you think it's premature or too much information or it needs to be worked further, I think you should also note this remark and probably we will find a way forward how to use this extremely valuable information.

Anyone else?

United States.

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

Well, it's a lot of work but we support your path forward.

Just a couple of questions for you. How will we schedule the continuation of our work on the report we're talking about?

And let me also thank Mr. Reddy for his leadership on this, as we're in plenary.

Will we continue that at 9:00 tomorrow or how shall we proceed?

At this time, we are working on the structure of the report, but as I hear this morning, I take it that the assignment is to complete the report for review on Friday, if possible, so that we will have the ability to read it, see it, agree to it before leaving.

If you could just give us your thoughts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this question.

Yes, indeed, when I heard the last part of your ad hoc meeting this morning, I had the understanding that you would like to finalize the structure eventually today or tomorrow morning, so I would actually suggest to you to have a meeting at -- if it's convenient for you, at half past 2:00 in this room, or if it's more convenient -- the sooner is better. Let's face it.

I mean, even though we have four days, we have a lot of work to do, and so if you can come to some kind of conclusion about the structure of the report by today -- and I think after lunch it's an excellent time -- I would say that you may stay after 6:00 in this room. The room will be available up to 9:00.

I believe for -- if you have less time, you are more efficient.

So I'm just asking you if half past 2:00 would be a suitable time for you to convene the -- or continue your deliberations.

Yes, Mr. Reddy.

>>B.N. REDDY: A very good morning, Chair. Thank you for guiding us further on finalization of the structure of the report.

Two suggestions I have. One, if we could meet, let's say, after 6:00 p.m. today so that we would have better perspective of what we are talking about in the room, because possibly you might be convening the plenary in the later part of the day, allowing the two groups, two smaller groups, to have some preliminary discussions and report to the larger group.

From that perspective, I think we would be better placed to have this meeting at 6:00 p.m., for which I'm -- the room is ready and if there is consensus that we can do this meeting. That's number one.

Number two, which is in my national capacity, I'd like to just seek one more clarification.

In the Group B, when the discussion does take place, it is -- based on what I've heard from you, Chair, and a clarification that was subsequently received, is that while preparing the recommendations for Group B, you would like the colleagues to draw upon the correspondence group's work, which means that would give enough indication on how we formulate our recommendations, so these two will go as an integral part. These are not two separate and good, whole ideas of the correspondence group giving

these recommendations. I would say compilation plus formulating in a manner that -- which is easily understood and also clearly presented.

Is that -- at the time of preparing our recommendations, we would use that particular wealth of information and just present it in a very organized manner.

Can I take this as an understanding, so that it makes the Group B's job -- the small group in Group B would be much better placed, rather than having a separate discussion on the recommendations of -- on CG's work in a separate platform.

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

As for convening your ad hoc group after 6:00, I feel comfortable with that. It's up to the group to react if it's acceptable to have. Probably you'd like to limit your meeting in time for one hour, at most.

As for your second question, yes, it is desirable to take on board the information we have from the correspondence group because we said, it's extremely rich and points out a lot of existing mechanisms and gaps as well. So it probably would be a good idea. My fear is, however, that -- and I encourage you to take it on board. Naturally, I do.

However, I would caution to the fact that probably you may find it somehow uneven and you would -- actually may say that it needs further consideration. I naturally do not want to discuss it separately, so that's -- your assessment is absolutely correct. I want it to be an integral part of our deliberations.

I can see United States, Sweden, Marilyn.

So U.S.; after, Sweden; then Marilyn.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. We're happy to follow Mr. Reddy's lead and look forward to working with him 6:00, and we accept, too, your I think sensible observation that this is a process that will -- the defining of the structure will be informed by the discussions that we have.

As we are attempting to finish our work by the end of the week, do we hear from you that we should also attempt to -- I'll call it "fill out the narrative" -- to the extent that we can, so that the report is as robust as possible for the consideration of delegates by the end of the week?

Obviously, we're not going to be able to -- we can't go any further than the meeting goes and agrees, but we should -- I see that you're nodding, so that we should go as far as we can. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So yes, I was nodding.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden and then Marilyn.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just a question regarding the -- you know, the work we are just about to start.

I think the colleagues have also mentioned earlier today and yesterday that the submitted proposed draft recommendations take various forms. Some of them have a lot of text. Some of them are very, very short. Some of them include statements or -- or background descriptions or motivations for the recommendations. Others do not.

So my question would be: Are the breakout groups going to discuss and work and draft only the recommendations themselves or also background or motivation for these recommendations? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this question. Probably I should have shared with you my ideas about how these two groups should work.

I would recommend for these groups to separate the recommendations from statements and concentrate on the recommendations.

As for the statements or the background information or the procedural issues, probably they will be also reflected -- well, not "probably." They will be reflected in the report itself and you will have opportunity to discuss it in the report itself. But the bulk of the work, I believe, are the recommendations.

So as a method, I would suggest you separate -- you agree what you should consider recommendations from the rolling document; what you think are not recommendations, they are rather statements; and start working on the recommendations.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I was merely seeking clarification. You provided that clarification earlier. So I'm fine. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Anyone else? As an observer, EU.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving me the floor. I just had two questions on logistics. Earlier you mentioned going to paperless which is, of course, a very good policy. But in this very instance, I have a slight concern as an observer. If the papers are available on the Web site of UNCTAD, of course, there's no problem. But if they are not, then observers don't get the papers we discuss during the meeting and it makes it very difficult for us to follow the discussions. So I would beg your indulgence if those are papers which are not available on the Web site, to have paper copies at least for observers to be able to follow. That was the first point.

And the second point concerns the two breakout groups. I think it would be much better if it were possible to allow for an extra room, to have each group in a room. I think it would be extremely difficult to work in the same room.

I don't know if there is a possibility that the secretariat could look into that. I know there are some rooms often available behind the big room over there. I'm sure we can arrange something. I think it would facilitate greatly our work if we can work separately. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for your questions. As for the paperless issue, I will consider your request. And as for the rooms, I will give the floor to the secretariat.

>>ANNE MIROUX: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just to let you know, we inquired about the possibility of having a second room already when we booked this one. And at the time, a second room was not available. So we will try, and it will be, basically, on an ad hoc basis. We will try for this afternoon. But I have a strong feeling that no room will be available. As I said, we did inquire in anticipation of the breaking groups. So we will try on a daily basis. And if by any chance, there is a room available, we will make it known to the group. But as I said, unfortunately, the chances are relatively small.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Anne, for this clarification. I'm not really sure that we are happy. But we have to do with that.

Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I wanted to come back to a substantive issue that came up this morning when the group was discussing the structure of the report.

Avri Doria correctly reminded us that the roles of the stakeholders in the multistakeholder model was not agreed by the working group on Internet governance. They made a proposal.

But there is something in the Tunis Agenda that was agreed which defines at least roughly the roles of the various stakeholders. That particular definition was consensus, but it was a consensus of people who adopted the Tunis Agenda; that is, the member states, the heads of state.

Some people were uncomfortable with that split of roles then and are increasingly uncomfortable. So there is an issue as to whether or not this group should address that at all, what are the roles of the stakeholders and, if so, whether you want to try to find consensus or simply note that there is some divergence of views on this issue.

As far as I know -- but I may be wrong, but as far as I know, I don't think any government has expressed any dissatisfaction with what's in the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard.

Now, if no one else is asking for the floor, I would suggest you split into two groups unfortunately in this room. I would suggest you have group A on the right-hand side, to the left-hand side, whatever, to this side of the room; and group B on the other side. Try to keep your voice low not to disturb to each other. I know it is extremely uncomfortable. But I really count on your cooperation, enhanced cooperation, if I may say so.

And I think you will work until lunchtime, that is until 1:00 and I encourage you to come back early from lunch and continue until 3:00. And I will be extremely interested in the interim report of the conveners by 3:00.

Thank you.

(Working in breakout groups.)

[Lunch]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I just want to say welcome to the afternoon session. We are going to start the session in five minutes' time. It seems to me that the other group is about to finish its work, so hopefully they will be in the room at quarter past. So thank you for your patience.

[Break]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Can I just ask a question. Is the other working group still going? Is that why we're waiting to begin or what's happening?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That was exactly what I said about 10 minutes ago, that they promised me to come in in five minutes, so...

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Well, can I take this opportunity to -- (off microphone) --

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Welcome to the afternoon session. In the morning we have created two breakout groups to deal with questions in Group A and Group B.

Group 1 was convened by the representative of Peru, Group B by the representative of Mexico.

I gave the following instructions to carry out the work: I would like to see the statements separated from the draft recommendations.

That was my aim, and I understand that this work is well underway.

So at this time, I would like to have a short plenary and have some report from the conveners of the group, and then I give the floor to the members of the group to give comments.

After that, I would like to draw some conclusions and decide on the follow-up of this work.

So I would like to ask the convener of Group 1 -- that is, the questions concerning Group A -- to give a short report on the work carried out.

Thank you.

>>PERU: We basically tried to separate the paragraphs between a list of recommendations and a list of statements.

At the beginning of our work, we debated a bit on the content of these statements or recommendations, and undoubtedly there are still positions that we must find a way to meet anew, extreme positions that we must find a way to mix.

Afterwards, after lunch, we change our methodology and we simply identified the statements from the recommendations and we have written on the side of the paper, of the document, all the times that the authors of these paragraphs have offered to rephrase in order to make them recommendations where they are statements or to make them more inclusive. No? That's the idea.

We need a lot of time for that work. There are a lot of paragraphs that need rephrasing.

Also, because we had a little technical problem, unfortunately, there was recommendations but that was not taken into account at the very end of the meeting before lunch, but we have corrected that already and I believe we would be getting the document for printing. No?

That would be all.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, the idea is that we receive something from you in electronic form and which will be shared as a Google Doc, as indicated previously. In case you need paper copies, probably the secretaries will make that available, but I prefer to have it as a Google Doc.

>>PERU: We have it as a Google document, yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Okay.

>>PERU: So now, what we would have to -- we have to settle here is, apart from the fact of the content in itself of each paragraph, we would have to settle an opportunity for us to meet again and to rephrase what needs to be rephrased.

And also, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you that some of the people that participated in this effort are very loyal to you because they wouldn't want me to do anything different than you, and they told me so. So I just wanted you to know that you are a very important fellow here and they're very loyal to you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, as I always say, I'm not really important but it is important what we are doing, and I'm aware that you all know that.

Thank you for the effort, and I think after the plenary, we will break up again to continue our work, and I really congratulate you for the effort you have made up to now, and I expect some fine result by the end of this day on this group of questions.

Now I turn to Group B. Victoria, please.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Following your mandate, we -- our group was very loyal to you. We just split the document into the recommendations and the background statements.

We have a document that is highlighted where you can see the work that was done this morning. I don't know if it's good. I would like to put it on the screen or to share it with all the colleagues.

And we believe that that was the mandate, and as you can see, the part highlighted in yellow is the recommendations, and the part that was highlighted in blue is the background document, so -- the background statement.

So that's the work that we report to you, Mr. Chairman. We didn't get into the discussion of substantive content of any of the recommendations of the document.

And we included the last couple of recommendations that were submitted this morning, and that's all what we have to report, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria. Very efficient, it seems to me. Thank you for the effort.

Let me reiterate: We are not going after a moving target, so as of now, I don't really want to have new recommendations. That's Point 1. Because there's no way we can finish our work by having submissions on Friday evening.

Second of all, naturally I will open the floor for any comments on the work which has been carried out right now, but my comments are the following.

What I expect from you this afternoon is to -- from Group B and Group A as well -- to agree on draft recommendations where you can agree. Come to agreement to as many recommendations as you can.

In case you cannot come to agreement, then please indicate that there is a difference of opinion, and that's it.

We don't have to achieve at any price some compromise. I'm all for compromises, mind you, but in case you see that we cannot proceed, I don't want to risk a global result because of that.

So please try and get agreement on as many issues as you can, and in case you think you cannot, just indicate it to me and then we will bring it back to the plenary and we try to come to an agreement on these issues, and that is the point -- that is the way we are going to proceed.

And if at the end of the meeting we still have unresolved issues, we shall put it in the report. It's as simple as that.

But I hope we don't have that. So it's my sincere hope that we are not going to have that, but I really want you to proceed with your work and to come to some -- to agreement on as many recommendations as we can.

Now, having said that, I can see that Marilyn asks for the floor. Then after, Avri and Joy.

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I am reminded to share very briefly with colleagues the experience that some of us had in the early days of the preparation process for the Internet Governance Forum where Nitin Desai, the former Deputy Secretary-General of the U.N., was our advisor to the special -- to the Secretary-General, and he kept reminding us to continue to work toward understanding and commonality, no matter how far away we may have started from each other in the beginning.

So I welcome your urging that.

But I took the floor to ask a point of clarification, Chair.

In several instances, I -- what I'm seeing is that the originators of recommendations and others are consolidating existing recommendations or reforming them into recommendations, and I don't think those are new but those are efforts to reach agreement, and I just wanted to seek that.

The second point was that I noted that a recommendation submitted by Nigeria at the end of the last meeting was not included in the online, so that -- that too -- also would not be a new recommendation. Although it was not in the original printout of the rolling document, it was submitted at the last meeting.

And then I think there was also a recommendation embedded in the responses to a questionnaire, and I'm not sure -- I wouldn't have considered that a new recommendation.

So I was just seeking clarification on those three points.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

As for the submission from Nigeria, I'm told that it has been included in the rolling document. Probably it wasn't put at the right place. It may be at the end of the rolling document.

As for the submissions to the questionnaire to be considered as recommendations, I have made it clear that there was ample time to reformulate and probably we have to set a line.

I'm really sorry, I know that they are extremely valuable submissions and extremely valuable contributions and they will be included in the report as annexes.

So they have been included, I believe, in the summary, in my summary, which was prepared for the last meeting, and I believe this will be also included in the -- as an annex to our report.

Avri, you wanted to take the floor.

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

And I totally understand why you would want to draw a line, but I'm not quite sure I understand drawing a line that hadn't existed before.

So if people had reformulated their recommendation that had been contained in the previous material before coming into this afternoon meeting where the line was drawn, I would ask you to reconsider allowing anything before this meeting as within your line, as opposed to on the other side of the line.

I also wanted to go back to Marilyn's question. Perhaps put slightly differently, is: Some recommendations that are being offered at this point that look new are really compromises that they're hoping that various people with a difference -- at the moment, with a difference of recommendation, can accept.

So if that could be achieved in one of these groups, or at least put forward, I'm wondering whether there is any latitude for that kind of activity.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

As you asked me, I will consider it. I'm not sure "reconsider," but I will consider.

As for your second statement, I just want to repeat what I said that -- in the groups, in the breakout groups. Probably you have to identify what you have already done -- that is, statements and recommendations -- and refine the recommendations in a way which are agreeable to you on a consensual basis and those which are not.

So that is the exercise. It's simple. I think that's what you have to do.

Joy. After, Saudi Arabia.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Sorry. Joy after Saudi Arabia, or Joy, stop, after Saudi Arabia.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Just clarifying that. I don't want to interfere with my colleagues from Saudi Arabia.

[Laughter]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Just to pick up this point and not to belabor it unnecessarily -- and I appreciate the difficulty of your job, Mr. Chair -- but I really do think it is important, particularly from a civil society perspective, to be able to bring forward into this really critical part of our meeting and discussions and negotiations those recommendations which are not new but which have been formed getting us to this point and which may, as Avri has suggested, assist some parties who are currently at different points on the spectrum of views in coming together on points of consensus.

And there hasn't been previously a deadline called on the rolling document, and I appreciate that, you know, hindsight's a good thing, and they might have been put forward earlier, had the deadline been called, but we really would just want to emphasize and plea for your reconsideration, at least in relation to the document which, you know, has been shared with you in any event, if it would assist our discussions.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm not really sure that I understood you correctly.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I'm particularly referring to the -- to the recommendation from Anja Kovacs, the specific recommendation that relates to Group B and issues in front of Group B.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

During our last meeting in November, I have indicated that I want to have submissions as draft recommendations. It was made clear. So this is nothing new. We have started -- during the meeting itself, we have started submitting recommendations. And I also urged you to submit recommendations.

So probably it must have been clear to most of us. I'm really sorry if it wasn't clear to some of the participants, and I really regret, but I'm afraid we really have to be strict on that.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question for clarification.

How would we deal with a recommendation that is out of the scope of this working group? I mean, we have a mandate here to complement enhanced cooperation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, probably during the meeting, I think we are going to proceed in this direction.

USA?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman.

Not to belabor this point, but I guess I'm still not clear on what we're accepting and what we're not or what we're considering a new recommendation and what's not.

I ask specifically in regards to the work of Group A where, having gone through the recommendations, our able chairperson named some "statements" and some "recommendations," and the authors of text that were deemed to be statements requested the opportunity to rewrite them, rephrase them as recommendations.

I'm wondering, are those considered new recommendations?

You'd almost undergo a full-sale rewrite so I'm wondering how you would differentiate between a rewritten statement that's now a recommendation and perhaps a recommendation that has been

submitted as a proposed compromise text or something that was -- missed this deadline that we've now been made aware of. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, what I said that what you should do in these groups are still valid and I expect if you have some doubts, you would come back to the plenary and we may discuss it and we shall decide on the issues, if they are to be considered new ones or they are to be considered as statements. I'm -- I don't really know the details of what you're referring to. I probably will be much clearer about it by the end of the day.

So I really recommend you to move forward in this direction and get some kind of almost final text in front of me.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Yeah. I guess I will add my confusion to what appears to me to be a sudden deadline.

I was not aware that there was a deadline. I think I was aware that there was a need for a deadline but not that we had set one, and I think we -- it will -- I understand the need to work efficiently, but to date, we actually haven't made so much progress that it wouldn't be hard to catch up with new recommendations in terms of putting them into blue or yellow, as we did in our group, and I think it will undermine our work in the long run if there's reports after the meeting that we cut off debate without a clear deadline ahead of time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think I set a deadline as today morning. I have made it clear. I have made it clear to both groups. So probably it didn't -- this wasn't conveyed in a proper way, then. But I really would like you to consider the deadline as of today morning.

Peru?

>>PERU: Mr. Chairman, I believe that in light of the fact that there are some proposals that seems (indiscernible), everything we do to make that situation better is something that we should accept. If there are recommendations that can get us closer, why not? If there are possibilities of rephrasing statements or recommendations that will lead us to find a common ground, why not? Anything that can be brought up on that direction, I believe it should be accepted. Obviously, you can not propose a new recommendation to something that is simply written. Those are two different things. But if both of them or any of them drive us to find a common ground in a plenary where finding a common ground is very difficult, I think it's worth the effort.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Did I get you right, that you're suggesting to extend the deadline as of this afternoon?

>>PERU: What I believe, Mr. Chair, is that we're going to have an open meeting and we can decide if this new statement or our recommendation are elements that are helping us to find a common ground because maybe they are not. If they are not and they come late, why should we make the effort to accept them? But if they are helping us to find a common ground, why not?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Yes? Go ahead.

>> Mr. Chair, I'll be direct and just make this request, that we consider receiving some of these recommendations that came at lunchtime. As you have rightly put it, that it may not have been clear when you put the deadline. And because of that -- because of lack of that clarity, I know there was a recommendation that came and I would kindly request that you accept the recommendations that came before lunchtime.

>> (Speaker off microphone.).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So my question is the following: In case we think that our work will proceed more smoothly by setting the deadline as of lunchtime or at 3:00 this afternoon and that is the real final deadline, do you think that we can go ahead with that? So I just want to ask your approval for that? Is it acceptable? U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. We're thinking through how we could be helpful. So here's our best effort. It seems to us that the Peruvian chair might have a point which is to say that there has to be some intuitive understanding of when we're coming up with an entirely, I'll call it, de novo proposal, something no one has ever seen, we have never dealt with it before, we've never tried to weave it into anything we're doing, and the deadline has passed. To the extent that it's possible, perhaps, to listen to the voices that are coming in on a particular issue which is more or less well-known to this audience, it doesn't strike us as a bad thing, an offensive thing, to allow that discussion to occur.

So just to summarize, Chairman, I wonder if it would be helpful, as I say, to say the following, if it is completely new material that everyone in the room knows it's new material, then it's new material. And, you know, at some point, we have to decide that we can only -- in time we can only deal with these proposals and so forth.

But if it's possible to, as I say, to listen and to bring the points to bear in a discussion, we would support that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So I ask you, is it acceptable that we set the deadline at 3:00 in the afternoon today? Everything which arrived up to this time frame is acceptable? And we don't accept anything more after 3:00. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, I mean, we can agree with you. But the point of clarification, one of the (indiscernible) recommendations was consider it as a statement and we offered that we would rewrite it to be as a recommendation. How would we deal with our -- is it fine?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay.

>> Thank you, Chair. In group A, we read aloud and then after that, we reread -- we took it back. We consider there is a type of contribution that should be allowed, and I suggest it is allowed for the group

which would be some compromised suggestions or something like that because at this stage, there is very little room for compromise with these type of recommendations we have in some places.

So if some group of actors gathered themselves and they want to have and they can have a text that would be a compromise or an intention of compromise, this could be accepted, if the rest was as suggested.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think two things I want to say. One, we want to support your approach of having to give a deadline on having proposals which are available for discussion. But, however, there's one small issue, which is during the process of discussions and as we start preparing the recommendations, it is quite possible that the delegations who had given the recommendations not necessarily this moment but in the previous example, the CG table had and then we had a questionnaire which was circulated in the past.

I would like to take the point from our distinguished colleague from U.S. has mentioned. There has been some contributions in the past but which have not been articulated. I think this could be the time they would like to articulate that particular aspect.

As we go through the final edition of the text, that means as they're trying to freeze the language, if there are recommendations which are made from the floor, not necessarily as (indiscernible) of full paragraphs, but let's say in the form of amendments to the text that is being discussed, I suppose that should be well within the remit of our oral discussions.

Would you approve of this? Then in which case, I think most of this discussion becomes quite academic because what proposal one is giving up to 3:00 p.m. or 4:00 p.m., it becomes quite not necessarily relevant because as we go along, as we go through the text which is on the screen and we freeze the language, some delegations may have an amendment. And then at that point in time, we bring in that amendment and see whether there is consensus being built on that or not. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Naturally amendments are in the game. What I really wanted to say, I don't really want to have completely new submissions in forms of proposals for recommendations. We have enough material, I believe. Even I think we have even oral statement that we have too much, so what we can grasp right now.

Naturally, everything which we had up to now should be considered naturally. We tried to downsize what we have because that's the way we can achieve some result. But as you said, especially in the U.N. environment, amendments are a kind of natural approaches. And I don't really want to have discussions on an academic level.

Having said that, I give the floor to Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I think your summary reflects what I was going to say. As you know, I have been following these discussions for ten years. I have to say I don't think I have seen

anything new in terms of ideas or spirit. We do have lots of language. But if there is new language that is approaching consensus and allowing people the chief consensus, then I think that it should be considered. And I believe India said that, Andres Piazza said that and U.S. said that. And I think you just said that, too, Chairman. The idea is not to come in with new things that would cause further divergence but to encourage new things that would cause convergence.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I just appear to you to make suggestions which result in convergence. Sweden, I think you will be the last one. And after that, I would like to encourage you to go back to the smaller groups and continue your work in the way I have outlined.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think most of what I wanted to say has already been said. But it strikes me that we are talking about areas where we might find consensus. Areas where it's difficult to find consensus, we might look for compromises and so on. And I totally agree what was said by India, that obviously when we start this process of discussing the recommendations, there must be room for amending recommendations for trying to find common ground and so on.

The problem that we are having right now is that we haven't started a discussion. We haven't discussed any recommendations. So we can guess that we -- that there are areas of consensus and we can guess qualified guesses also that there are areas that we do not have consensus.

But as you pointed out, Chairman, maybe it is time to actually have a first discussion on the recommendations to see where we are standing on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, everybody. Sorry for being late in making this statement. We know that we are in a very sized moment of this negotiation. From my personal perspective, we should take advantage of every opportunity in the possibilities of achieving consensus.

If we set very, very strict criteria for these moments, I think that we could -- would not be conducive to consensus. So I encourage you to be -- to follow degree of flexibility because we don't really know in which way we are going, if you are going towards divergence or convergence. Maybe you could be more flexible under your guidance in this negotiating process.

So I'm just having these ideas. And maybe we could leave the door open for some -- for some more additional thoughts on some solution in the future. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil.

I fear we have passed this stage, and I have agreed to be more inclusive and take on board all the recommendations which we received up to this afternoon and left the door open for amendments, in case it's needed, which is a natural thing. I leave the door open for amendments.

I really want to thank you for the efforts you have made up to now, and I encourage you to continue in the same way. As for the time management, I would like you to come back at 5:45. I would like to have a report from the conveners of the afternoon session, and I understand that we have agreed this morning about a meeting of the other group on the structure of the report as of 6:00 in this room.

So I wish you a very fruitful deliberation in the small groups.

Anything important which may influence the work of the small groups? Yes.

>> Just request the Chair to give a little more direction on what is expected from the groups. It happens at times that groups meet and then they really aren't sure and then the night is not well spent. Would you in brief tell us what the group is expected by you to accomplish?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think at the very beginning of this meeting, I indicated what I expect from you. I expected in the morning to separate the statements from the recommendations, number one. This afternoon, I expect you to go through the recommendations and come to consensus on as many as you can. In case you can't come to consensus on some of the recommendations, please do indicate those differences in opinion. That's what I expect from you. It is relatively simple.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, may I beg your indulgence to ask a quick question. I know we had previously discussed having a reconvening -- I'm looking for Mr. Reddy, a reconvening of the group to discuss structure. But I'm wondering if we could postpone that till we get past this next stage of work. I think we have a draft structure, but we're trying to figure out kind of where we are.

I think we all are realistic that we will be working late tomorrow night and we all have -- I wonder if we might beg your indulgence to postpone that to either tomorrow morning for 30 minutes or at another time, maybe at lunchtime, and let us work through other things. I think it would be a more efficient use of time. I am, again, looking for Mr. Reddy to ask him.

But if I might ask that as a possibility.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I think this is a very sensible proposal. I'm also turning to Mr. Reddy that eventually if you have your meeting at 9:00 as today in the very same way, probably we are not very far from that. I could see some square brackets in the structure. I could see this text in the square brackets which are included in some of the subpoints. So it wasn't very clear to me why these square brackets are there and the text in the square brackets, but probably you would clarify to me.

And I think we are not very far from the final structure. In fact, let me show you the view that we have already started that we have of the secretariat drafting the report itself, according to your instructions in the structure you have indicated. And we are hoping that you will come up with a final structure by tomorrow morning, and we can come up with a kind of first read of the draft report by tomorrow afternoon.

Is it agreeable to have your meeting at 9:00 tomorrow morning? I can see you nodding so that's okay.

Let me encourage you in that case to go in small groups in the same arrangements we had in the morning and you are welcome to work as long as 9:00 in the evening.

I believe both rooms are available up till 9:00. Make sure you know where the vending machines are for food and drink. And I wish you good luck. Thank you.

(Working in small groups.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just for clarification, we agreed not to have the meeting for the structure of the report. It means that we shall meet next time on the plenary tomorrow morning at 10:00. Just wanted to make it clear that I don't expect you to come back after your working group or breakout group meeting.

I expect to have the report from the structure group on the work of the group, and I want to have the report of the conveners of the two breakout groups.

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