

Transcript Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

30 April-2 May 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.

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Thursday, 1 May 2014
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. I hope you had a very refreshing sleep, a nice evening, you enjoyed -- some of you might have enjoyed the soccer match yesterday.

I didn't sleep well. I kept waking up about the differences we have and the kind of pessimism I could sense in the room.

We had a very good start yesterday and I was hoping that we shall come up with recommendations.

As you know me, I'm still optimistic and I think we will come up with a lot of recommendations.

I could hear that there were some requests for expressing opinions, and I think there's nothing wrong about that so I encouraged the groups to formulate their opinions and I'm told that these opinions have been formulated.

But before going to hear these opinions, which I don't intend to have a discussion on but just to listen to them, so let me give you a small assessment of Day 1.

So once again, here you have the mandate that we are 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.

Well, I had a conversation with many of you, and if I look at the mandate, we have sought inputs from stakeholders, we had the questionnaire, we had made a compilation -- which was quite a good one -- and we have had some -- quite a lot of draft recommendations which have value. A lot of value.

So I think we have invested quite a lot of work, and I'm really glad to say that we have substantial results. We don't have the final result, of course, I know.

So we have the obligation to report to the CSTD.

Next, please.

And of course we had a long discussion about that as well, but first of all, let me get back to Day 1.

So yesterday we had the introductory remarks and the information about related events.

Then we started our discussions on the draft res- -- recommendations. Sorry. I'm already in the mood of the CSTD, so I'm -- so "resolutions" should read "recommendations." Sorry about that. In Group D.

And as I mentioned, we had some positive results.

We heard interventions suggesting modifications to proposed draft recommendations, but unfortunately, I don't know what happened in the afternoon after lunch break. There was no consensus and there was more divergence.

Next one.

So we had the proposal to express these diverging views in opinions, and the proposers said that eventually they should be included in the report of the working group.

In case the group decides to go along this line, there are two options which was identified. Either we are going to include these opinions in the body of the report, and this will be followed by recommendations; or Option 2, these opinions will be annexed to the report.

So even on that, there was a divergence in the room whether it is necessary to express different opinions.

There was a proposal also to reflect these divergent views in the chair's report.

So I'm just trying to assess what I experienced yesterday. Next one.

There was a request to ask legal advice about the report, Option 1, whether it will be a report from the group or can it be a report from the chair.

It is clear to me that in case of irreconcilable differences -- I took up the word from Mr. Reddy, who used it I think, in the second or third meeting and I wasn't happy but apparently his wisdom is worth paying attention to.

So in case of irreconcilable differences, naturally through the chair's report with the factual description of the meetings, the methodology, the process and the results.

What is the way forward I suggest to do?

As I indicated, I'm going to ask information about the legal status of the report.

I would like to have, after these introductory remarks, the draft opinions which you suggested to have and I approved to listen to that, and these opinions are for information only. I don't intend to have a discussion on the -- of the opinions because these are opinions.

After that, I suggest to follow the agreed agenda. That is, to continue the draft recommendations for Group D and E, followed by the report from the chair of the correspondence group and making some notes and remarks on the living document of Group B, which all of you have received, I believe, and you had ample time to look at that.

I admit it's not a simple and very easy document, but it's a very substantial work so I think we owe the respect to discuss it.

Next one.

Well, basically that's how I see it, and getting back to the way ahead, so after our meeting today and tomorrow, probably based on the results where we are and based on the legal advice that we get, I have to report to the CSTD anyway, and I will report in a way that I will outline the substantial results we have. And we have results.

As you may know, we have the questionnaire. We have the contributions of almost 70 contributors. We have the draft recommendations in the state they are. They are still a draft. We have the correspondence group work. So -- and on the other hand, we have our divergences. I understand that.

But we -- I want to encourage you to be positive and rely on the positive results we already have and rely on the work we have done.

So basically that's how I see it and it's up to the CSTD to decide how to move forward.

Okay. So that's how I see it.

Now, as I indicated, I would like to give the floor to spokespersons who would like to express their views.

I can see Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Now it works better. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman.

We think that it would be preferable to work on the idea of a chairman's report and that that chairman's report would reflect, in a factual and high-level manner, the discussions that have taken

place in this working group. And we think that it would be beneficial for everyone in the group if we could see a draft of such a report today -- maybe this afternoon -- so that we all feel comfortable with that report and that we also have sufficient time to consult with capitals or with other stakeholders, because tomorrow is the last day and if we haven't -- I'm just afraid that if we get to see such a report tomorrow, we might not have time to review it and to reach consensus or to feel comfortable with the description in such a report.

So we would really urge you, Chairman and the secretariat, to work on that and to provide us something maybe by today -- this afternoon that we could look at.

Regarding the idea of opinions, we had not worked on any opinion since we didn't understand that there was a -- that there was consensus in the group yesterday that that was the way that we were going to move forward, and we don't foresee that we would have any opportunity by today to conclude such an opinion either today. As you know, it's a public holiday as well in many of our countries, including ours, so that also makes it more difficult to get feedback, of course.

And then we also raised some procedural questions yesterday about the potential format for such -- such opinions, which would be very important to know if we were to draft such opinions.

And some of those issues that we raised were the scope of these opinions, where in the -- in the text that they would be reflected, and also if there will be a clear attribution to this specific opinions.

So those are important parameters that we think we need to have clarity on if we were to draft an opinion.

But our -- our preference would be for a chairman's report and that we could see that chairman's report already by today.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Per. The answer is yes, you will have the chairman's -- draft chairman's report by 3:00.

USA.

>>UNITED STATES: So thank you, Chair, and good morning, everyone.

I would just like to support the comments made by Sweden and thank you for your offer to share the chairman's report by 3:00 today. I think it will be very useful for us to review that, have time, particularly for those who have greater time difference challenges than we may have but ours are also significant, as you know. And then, you know, if we are going to be going to -- if we feel at that point that there needs to be an assessment of opinions, then I agree with the comments that Sweden made about how those would be represented in the report going forward.

Thank you, Chair.

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

Well, in my introductory remarks, I made reference to the options which was -- which I heard in the room. It's an oversight on my part that I didn't mention the attribution. Naturally, this is going to be -- should be included as well, if it's -- if it's the wish of the group.

Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone.

The participants representing the technical and academic communities support the views expressed by Sweden and the U.S. delegation. I think -- I think it would be a good way forward to have a chairman's report. We have been working on a draft opinion and would be happy to see that opinion, along with other opinions, annexed to that report.

We would need maybe a little bit more time to finalize it and send it to the secretariat.

Another useful addition in the annexes would definitely be, from our perspective, the work of the correspondence group which we would also like to see explicitly in the annexes of that chairman's report.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone.

Just a clarification. Do I then understand from the chairman's comment that since we are moving towards a chairman's report, there would be no recommendations of the working group, as such, to be submitted? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't want to prejudge. You know me. I'm always optimistic. Until 9:00 on Friday evening, I don't make any comment whether it will be the chairman's report or it will be all, whether it will be the group's report, will we have the recommendations or not.

But I'm still optimistic. So I still hope that we are going to have recommendations.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. Good morning.

The business community also supports the comments of Sweden, U.S., and Constance and the technical community.

We definitely want to make sure that the work of the correspondence group is included in that chairman's report. I think when we step back, that is one of the most significant achievements we've

made here is documenting all of those efforts that are underway, and we want that to be included, as well as what really is a lot of significant work on the recommendations from the previous meetings.

We do have those that were, you know, agreed to in part and need some review, but we did do -- make some progress there.

So -- and we also look forward to seeing that report, to give us enough time to consult with the rest of our business colleagues.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning to colleagues.

I think two or three points, Chair, for the sake of repetition. I think we made this point yesterday also.

I think a lot of work has been achieved in terms of outputs of this working group. Whether we want to look at the vast swath of information that's been collected, opinions that have been collected.

Number two, there's the correspondence group which has done its work of a kind which obviously also merits its consideration by the working group.

And number three, that we have had extensive discussions on five subtopics.

Now, at the end of it, as we have said earlier also, the challenges seem to be in Section A and B; and C, D, and E are those where we could perhaps agree upon certain recommendations.

So it is still our belief that we could have a working group presenting recommendations, clearly understanding that there are divergences of opinions on A and B, which you have also at some stage encouraged us to come up with possible options reflected as models.

So in which case, the parameters that would guide the models can be -- are already contained in what is required of -- from Section A and B. The questions are there, and then that could itself be a kind of -- a kind of framework on what the -- on the topic on which the opinions would be required to be placed in the text, if that is the sense -- if that is the final decision that the group wants to.

So just to re- -- recap, I think it is still the preference of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, that one, we could still work towards arriving at recommendations of the working group to the CSTD. We see that there is a lot of -- there's a good possibility of going in that direction.

In case that is not an option, well, I think then we will be guided by you. If it is the chair's report, then we have clearly expressed our view yesterday on what it could contain. Then it has to be discussed and (indiscernible) and see what can go into it and what cannot go into it.

So we can embark on that part if that is the determination in the room.

But as I said, it will be -- it will be -- this is the first model of its kind that in the United Nations we have a multistakeholder way of discussing issues, and we will consider it's a real pity that -- if we cannot come up with recommendations, and it will speak for itself in the future.

So we have to bear in mind this larger picture, rather than looking at it in a -- you know, in the initial stages.

We'll be guided by you, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Just on the last point, well, this is the second time it happens because we had the previous working group which was also multistakeholder working group, and those of you who were members of that group remember that we have gone through this same, quote-unquote, crisis when we thought that, "Well, it's over," and then we started afresh and we came up with a fairly good set of recommendations and a very good understanding, and I understand that many fora on Internet governance have taken up the recommendations and are urging for full implementation of these recommendations.

So this gives me real hope and this is the basis of my optimism that we have already done that and once we have done this, we can do it again.

Maybe we need eventually some more time, we make some consultations back home, but that's another issue.

Probably it will be during the CSTD we are going to discuss how to move forward in case we don't come up with -- this time with a set of recommendations, as we wish, but I'm still -- as I told you, until 9:00 on Friday evening, I'm optimistic.

Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, colleagues. While we share the views expressed by India, we're optimistic to come out with a working group report. I mean, we know what is the point of convergence and what is the point that you can't agree. It is for the case A and B can be solved by a number of models. C, D and E, we could reach consensus. And I think this is the fourth meeting. It is fair for us and for the reader to have something of substance so they can review something in the overall review. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would like to basically concur and have been sort of chatting with a group of the civil society participants here and very much appreciate your offer to put together a chairman's report for review today, certainly hoping that it emphasizes the places where way have been

able to find agreement. Want to point out that one of the natures of multistakeholder processes is that sometimes they do take time to work out. So very much appreciate a report that emphasizes the positives that we have achieved, perhaps the road that we have yet to go on and wanted to mention that should the attachment of separate opinions in an annex be the way the report goes in the meantime, the group of us that have been working together in civil society would have a draft opinion to offer. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and to everybody. Mr. Chairman, we are guided by the resolution which -- of the so many preamble part, as this is the typical U.N. resolution type, so many preambles and then a little bit on the operative part. Paragraph 20 talks about "and the working group should report." They are not talking the Chairman should report, working group should report. So it should be report of the working group but not Chairman's report. This is something that we have to take into account.

Yes, as our distinguished friends from India, Saudi Arabia mentioned, it is very probable that it needs some sort of consensus in sections that is easy -- or more easy to deal with, C, D and E. And like yesterday on the developing countries, we are about to have some consensus on how to deal with the matter of participation in terms of capacity-building, knowledge sharing, so on and so forth; so that could work out.

The areas we could not reach, we could not reach agreement. And as usual as a customary way, traditional way, different views could be expressed, different positions could be expressed in a fair and balanced manner. And that is something. And everything could be called the report of the group.

However, it should be mentioned that we are not in the position to support that annexing any report the work of the correspondence group because this is an input document. Never input documents are taken as an output. Input is input, and output is output. So we could not annex it.

So that information is on your Web site. If anyone wants to refer to them, they could refer to them, refer to the discussion at CSTD or General Assembly. But we are not in favor of annexing any output -- any result of the correspondence group because they are input to this meeting and we have not come to any agreement on that. So in summary, earlier we could reach agreement, unanimous or consensus, yes. Earlier we could not reach agreement. We will explain in two or three different ways in a fair and balanced manner. And the group having different positions will be requested to provide text. And then we should take that into account in the report. And the text should be -- from the length of the text, from the number of the paragraphs should be balanced in a way that we maintain our neutrality. Therefore, we are not in favor of the Chairman's views or a Chairman's report. It would be working group report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As I indicated, we are going to discuss the report of the correspondence group and we are going to discuss the results of the correspondence groups. So I think it is premature

to make any decision whether we are going to attach it or annex it to the report or not. And as I indicated, I'm going to circulate the draft of the Chair's report. You will have time to comment on it.

And probably after having read that, we can come back and find what modalities of expressing eventually opinions and what the annexes could contain.

Anyone else from the members? If not, Richard.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

Just about the drafting group, I am sure that our rapporteur will mention this, but I thought I would bring it up already. There were two substantive inputs for the correspondence group, at least two, two that I saw. One from myself and one from David Allen on behalf of a group of people which responded to the convener of the correspondence group who would call for identification of gaps. So I trust that those two documents would be presented to the working group just as last time the very useful document from Japan was presented to the working group.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. As far as I know the secretariat circulated this document among the working group members.

Anyone on these issues? Yes, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I will speak as the chairman of the correspondence group. With reference to the observation from Mr. Hill, you should also attach -- there was an email sent to the correspondence group after that substantive comments that were claimed pointing out some issues. So in order for completeness, there is further correspondence that should be attached, should the work go forward. Thank you.

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

>>NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to speak before anyone else. Well, good morning. And good morning, colleagues. I would like to certainly support what has been said in terms of those opinions that have been drafted because I know some work has been taken forward on drafting opinions, are attached in some way to the Chairman's report.

I'd also fully endorse that whatever is agreed, that the substantial work that has gone into the correspondence group's report needs to be recognized.

I mean, one understands it is an input document. And I bow to the greater knowledge of processes and procedures that other people have, especially Mr. Arasteh. But simply referencing a body of work like this on the Web site, I think, is somewhat -- is somewhat not acceptable in the fact that this work has been done under the auspices of this Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. And, therefore, this group will have a chance to look at that work later today, I understand. And certainly we would be very keen for that work to be highlighted as a substantial piece of work and as evidence that's been collected,

not total evidence. One can never claim to have encapsulated every single fact, every single nuance. And obviously necessary disclaimers would have to be used in terms of -- but certainly to reference that work in some way. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think at some stage, we should be -- we would like to know clearly the process we are embarking upon because I think at this point in time, naturally there is no clarity in the process. I think that we need to work on that.

And, thereafter, I think we will make substantive comments on various proposals that have been made like, for example, your initial proposal was that we look at a report of the working group with possibilities of reflecting the opinions as models plus recommendations on areas of convergence.

Now, if this is not -- this is not being considered now, then you wish us to make comments on the second set of proposals, we can start that process.

But at this point in time, it will be very useful to have guidance from you because, otherwise, we are talking of two sets of two distinctly different things. And the outcomes will be entirely different and thereby the procedures that this working group, subset of ECOSOC, CSTD subset, has to follow. Then we'll come to those points separately. So thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for asking this question. Naturally my initial proposal is valid. I expect to have the opinions from different groups and probably the way forward, to have them sent to the secretariat, and eventually circulate among the members.

And as I indicated, I would like to continue with the discussion of point D which we haven't touched upon in those recommendations, and point E.

I also indicated that we are going to circulate the draft Chair's report which can be upgraded to the working group report in case of agreement. And probably we have to -- after taking note of the opinions, we have to decide upon the modalities, where to put them and how to proceed.

Now, I can hear my voice is getting a bit harsh so I need a tea. Before my tea, I think Saudi would you like to take the floor? Is it okay after tea? I'm sorry about that, but I really need a tea.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back. I fear that I'm about to lose my voice, and it's not because of you, so I would like to ask you to take the floor as often as you can in order that I can save my voice.

So before I run out to have my tea, I promise you that you are going to have the draft of the report this afternoon, and I indicated that I would like to go through the remaining draft recommendations in Point

-- in Group D and go through the recommendations in Group E, and followed by the report of the correspondence group on questions of Group B.

So before we start discussing the Group D, I can see Saudi Arabia taking -- asking for the floor.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, my understanding that the report you will be distributing at 3:00, is it the working group report or the chairman's report?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: For the time being, it's a draft report. It's up to the group to decide what sort of report you'd like to have.

Basically, that's why I'm offering to you to have a look at that in order to, let me say, upgrade to the working group report, if you have agreement on the items which are included in the report, which is for the time being a factual description what has happened, and we tried to reflect the -- the opinions which occurred and the divergences as well in a very short way.

But it's really up to you how you decide.

At the same time, I would like to tell you that I'm asking the opinion, legal opinion, of ECOSOC about the status, legal status, of the report, whether it should be a chair's report or -- could it be a chair's report or it will be a report from the working group itself, even though I know that the resolution of the General Assembly speaks about working group report.

Do you still want to...

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. So the default report should be a working group report. If there is no consensus, we can downgrade it.

We should not start the other way around, to upgrade. The mandate was a working group report, so we would like to see the report you will distribute at 3:00 titled the working group report.

Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's going to be a draft anyway.

Okay. Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, colleagues.

Chair, just one clarification regarding the statements and the positions that we were supposed to make with like-minded countries.

(indiscernible) the colleague from Sweden proposed to have some kind of guidelines to elaborate these statements or these documents, because in my view, we can have 80 pages for -- maybe for the opinion

of Mexico, and some other countries or group of countries could have only one page. So it will be useful to have some guidelines in that, as the Swedish colleague mentioned before. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The guidelines are in the resolution of the U.N.

Probably we have to concentrate on the core issue as for the implementation of the Tunis Agenda -- I mean, the points related to enhanced cooperation, and on that, you can give a brief opinion which I would like you to have, at most, one, one and a half pages. Not more.

So probably just to summarize your views.

I suggest to proceed and I would like to go to draft Recommendation Number 5 in Group D, which was submitted by Mexico.

Please, Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yesterday when we were revising Recommendation Number 4, I intervened and I said that Mexico was willing to merge our recommendation into the big one that we were supposed to do with the group, and we still have that flexibility to work on that, if the group as it was the feeling yesterday, is willing to continue that exercise. Even if we agree on just one part, it will be okay for us to work on that, because having something that is agreed by the group is better than having nothing. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico. I fully agree with that, that having something than nothing is much better.

On this tone, can you give some introduction to this fifth recommendation?

I believe we haven't discussed it yet. Yeah?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Well, it's -- the first part, as you can see, in this recommendation, it's background information, and the recommendation itself could be from Paragraph 2.

And as I said yesterday, we have heard a lot of recommendations talking about capacity-building and in a way, all the -- some of the other recommendations were related to an environment that reduces gaps and facilitates greater involvement of governments or all the multistakeholders from developing countries into the discussions of Internet governance, so that's why we consider that we can work on some of the other ones because we see them reflected in our own recommendation.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria.

Any comments on this recommendation?

Iran.

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

Yes, I think the recommendation in essence is addressing the issue of participation in general in terms of capacity-building and other issues that we have discussed informally yesterday -- knowledge sharing, transfer of knowledge and know-how, and many other things -- so the essence -- I think the first paragraph is preamble and the essence of the basic recommendation is in the second paragraph, but perhaps it might be better we hear if you want to include that, we should include in a general aspect that was discussed, participation and capacity-building, addressing all of those things with subsections of financing or so on and so forth.

Nevertheless, we should perhaps not put saying that enhanced cooperation should focus. Enhanced cooperation should address, comma, inter alia, comma, capacity-building, participation.

So we have no problem with the essence and the thrust of the proposal, but need to -- a little bit of drafting and perhaps we should put in a general conclusions, or whatever, statement with respect to participations, but not as detailed as in Paragraph 1.

Paragraph 1 is introduction to arrive at the conclusion in Paragraph 2.

So it needs a little bit of work to be done. Yesterday was discussing, so we could continue to discuss that.

However, Chairman, let us make it quite clear, our understanding is that the participation, capacity-building, and all of these things are part of the issue, and the main issue is not this, so we should not limit it to this one.

The acceptance of this part as a part of the recommendation is under the understanding that Section A and B should be addressed in one way or the other. Either we have some output or if we don't have an output, we should say that we have no agreement and giving different positions.

And referencing this one as a main issue would be, to some extent, misleading because we don't want to limit the activities of enhanced cooperation to capacity-building and participation and so on and so forth.

We agree with the issue. It's important. But these are all addressed elsewhere. Capacity-building is brought out in many other areas, including some of the international organizations, and even we have an Action Line. Action Line C2 is capacity-building, expansion or infrastructure, broadband, and all of them. We have broadband commission.

So we have no topic, but they are discussed elsewhere. Remote participation, they are discussed. There is resolutions of a lot of international organizations from the highest level of those organizations to ask the Secretary-General of that organization to explore ways and means.

No problem to refer, but this is partially the issue. The main issue is not. So we should not forget the main issue and it would be misleading and undermining, downgrading the very purpose and objectives and goals of enhanced cooperation and we should be careful about that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

Probably all these ideas will be reflected in the report, and I would like to go back to your first remark when you offered some text for the second paragraph.

It will be extremely useful if you could repeat it and probably the secretariat can take note of that.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, I think our distinguished colleague from Australia yesterday here was (indiscernible) some text with respect to the participation, whether we talk about participation or talking about participation and capacity-building, adding some other elements like knowledge sharing, best practices sharing, know-how and transfer and so on and so forth, but if you want to say that, we should say that with respect to this enhanced cooperations need also, comma, inter alia, comma, address the issue of, and then start the remaining part: Capacity-building -- participation and capacity-building, and go to the subsections of that, knowledge sharing, best practices sharing, and the prerequisite of that, which is also remote participation facilities and also financial support for participation.

These are the things that yesterday was discussed, so I think we should combine that with the other text that we have because we don't need to repeat the text at different place.

Developing countries has one section and we should have addressed that in that area. But this text is part of that, so I leave it to the author or the people writing that.

But once again, if we refer to Section A and B, which is important, we should not downgrade or partially mention or limit the discussions to this one. Otherwise, it would be diversion of the issues.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, as mentioned by Iran, the language here is not owing the aim of enhanced cooperation as envisaged by Tunis Agenda.

We are happy to work to modify the language to focus on the developing countries, as mentioned by Iran, how to develop or improve capacity-building, enabling environments, so governments can on equal footing develop international public policy issues.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I think we should see it in context.

USA?

>>UNITED STATES: Chair, I just wanted to see if we could understand a little bit better sort of what we're doing at the moment.

I appreciate that we're moving on to Recommendation 5. I guess in essence where we left off yesterday. But what does that mean for the status of the discussions that were had yesterday, the submissions that were made after significant work, the notion that some of the combination of combining recommendations has sort of been underway?

So now that we're on 5 here, what does that mean for that work that we did yesterday?

Also, I believe I understood that -- from Mexico that this -- some -- that's the process question.

More substantively, I believe I understand from Mexico that they were willing to work with the group working on very similar recommendations in these, so I appreciate that. I also just want to -- you may recall that the U.S. submitted a similarly intended recommendation on the participation of developing countries that was discussed at our last meeting, so I believe that we would -- we would propose being in the discussion on that combination as well.

So I guess a process question and a substantive point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As for the process, I just asked the secretariat if he received any contribution from the drafting -- small drafting groups. I am told that it's only from Avri we received something.

I turn to Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: We kind of came to a place where we couldn't agree even on the text that we had been discussing, because of the -- there was some definite agreement coalescing about the need to enhance meaningful participation, but the way to do that and to -- and the fora in which we might wish that participation to be carried out were not points of agreement, and so we really didn't have a substantive text.

However, I understand that there has been some work being done separately on some sort of text that we might possibly discuss at some point in a drafting group, perhaps in the margins, and come back to you, but I don't have anything that we -- that I could consider agreed text to provide to you, I'm afraid.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia.

I still encourage the self-organizing capacity of this group to get together and come to some agreement on discussions you had yesterday and submit this text to the secretariat and to the group itself, in order we can discuss it.

I mean, U.S., you can understand that we can't discuss something we don't have. We can discuss whatever we have.

You'd like to respond, U.S.? No.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Just to say that on this specific draft recommendation, we think this goes to the very heart of enhanced cooperation and we thank Mexico for drafting it and we could support it without linking it to any other recommendations or issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The related members come together and set up the informal group and discussed the recommendation on Group D, but we haven't reached consensus.

But I have prepared the draft recommendation taking account of the results of yesterday's discussions, so I'd like to introduce my proposal to related members and consult with them and invite their comment and their advices, so I would like to continue to discuss on this with informal group, if it would be acceptable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: To me, every initiative which is serving the progress is acceptable, of course.

I would like to ask you to share with the secretariat, if any, written contributions you have in order that we can make it public.

Yes, naturally I encourage you to continue your endeavors.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. In general, among many points, a point on capacity-building is always welcomed. But I'm not able to understand the key grounds or principles behind this point. It says in the start that a "key element of enhanced cooperation is a lack of understanding of the context and local issues." Whose understanding of context and local issues is being questioned here is not very clear because I think developing countries really do understand local issues because of the progress to those issues.

And then it says next that "since the number of Internet users is low, their effort is on network infrastructure and broadband, local content creation," probably, therefore, meaning that they have an underdeveloped sense of the larger public policy issues which are global related to the Internet.

And if I see the contributions, it is the developing countries who have contributed the maximum number of what they consider as global public policy issues. And it is the developing countries who have

been insistent to say that there are global public policy issues which remain unresolved, more than even the developed countries.

So to point to their lack of understanding that there are sufficient global public policy issues beyond network infrastructure and content creation remains unclear to me.

And also then, therefore, we should focus on their capacity-building so that now they have come up with maybe 70 issues, then they'll come up with 200 issues. The point is what is happening about those issues.

And I don't think, therefore, we can say that problem of enhanced cooperation is linked to lack of understanding among developing countries about real public policy issues, which to me it may not be the intention of those who framed this paragraph. But it comes out like that to me, and that would in my view be problematic. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. Frankly speaking, I very much prefer the approach of Iran when they offered text. So we are very short of time, and I would like you to offer text. I mean, if you don't see something is clear, then probably you would like to offer some text to make it clear or eventually you ask the question what is meant by that. But I think you have asked the question.

So, Victoria, you might like to answer to this question, what is meant by lack of understanding -- and what was the other thing -- context and local issues.

>>MEXICO: Excuse me, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I didn't have my mic on. I'm sorry. So there was a question about understanding of context and local issues, what is meant by that exactly. That is the second line of your proposal.

>> MEXICO: Chair, on the statement before our recommendation, we are clear that we have different ways and every country has a different understanding what they believe. It has been said a lot about it in this group. Even for one single definition, we can understand it in one way and maybe my colleagues in Guatemala that are next to Mexico can understand IN a different way whether we speak the same language. So that's basically intended to weather this issue of differences. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I support you, that we should not discuss that paragraph of the Mexican proposal. This is the argument to come to the second paragraph. And the heart of the matter on their proposal is second paragraph, saying that, therefore, in view of the above, in light of the fore(inaudible), therefore, enhanced cooperation, and so on and so forth.

I suggest if you agree -- and I think you have agreed implicitly -- that we have one topic and that topic is developing countries' involvement or participation and so on and so forth.

We should continue having or drafting a paragraph addressing that issue in an appropriate manner starting from participation or involvement, going to capacity-building, and other and so on and so forth;

and that is, of course, sufficient. And we should not label it whether this is heart of the matter or not heart of the matter. It is a different view. And whether it is the only issue or not only, focusing or not focusing, let's be a little bit pragmatic and practical.

So the group, whoever you have designated, continue. I'm sure we could have some paragraph. There is no general disagreement on that. We could add that one, but not in a separate issue. It is one general topic, developing countries' participation and involvement in enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. That's exactly what I thought, but I would like to ask you to continue your work during lunch break to come up with some text on that because I can see and I can feel that we can come to some agreement on that and without labeling. And I think this is a very good remark, that we don't label. We don't think that one thing is more important than the other. I mean, we just -- just go ahead and try to do our job.

Yes?

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I hope you have not asked me to do that. I think Australia was doing that. And also their English is the least corrupted English language in the world. So perhaps she should continue to that in a better language than Persian English and also Slingish. But I'm happy to contribute and participate and to help. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I do not intend to include or exclude anyone. And, most importantly, I don't make any judgment about English language. So to me, one thing is important, to understand and to be understood and the rest is minor detail.

Mexico, please.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I've heard that my Japanese colleague, she has some -- already some work been done. So it will be very useful if we can work on that because she already took the time and the effort to draft something. So it will be good to have it, through you, if she can share it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Have you sent it to the secretariat?

>> No.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>JAPAN: Australia has prepared some document yesterday. So I would like to merge her proposal into my proposal and discuss. And I would like to send to the secretariat. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm proposing when we receive it, we shall discuss it. It should probably be kind of finalized as a draft.

Okay. So I can see some room for this recommendation. And as I indicated, I would like you to work on this and the natural related issues.

Now, if you don't have any objection to that, I would like to go to group E.

So this is the group on barriers, on participation. And I can see the first draft recommendation is by Russia Federation.

Julia, you want to comment on that?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, here you can see two recommendations. And, actually, they're linked to different problems. One problem is related to the oversight function which is now related to only one country and even we have some positive intention. However, this work is not agreed as done and this was done actually -- this recommendation was produced in December last year. However, I think it's still valid and has the purpose of discussion.

And another recommendation is about the procedures in the multistakeholder processes because we still believe that there is the need for improvement of multistakeholder processes because the model is not perfect. And it has the minimum participation of governments, and governments are actually the guards for human rights and also the key player in economy development of the country and also the key player in preventing some illegal actions to their citizens and it is also very important for legitimacy and effectiveness of the model. So this is about that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Russia, for this introduction.

Any comments? Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would support the Russian recommendation, especially as it touches upon the sense of enhanced cooperation.

Regarding the second recommendation, I mean, the second line, if we can put emphasis through multistakeholder process. We know every stakeholder has responsibilities. So to be clear, where every stakeholder can lead in different aspects of Internet governance.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Excuse me, where do you want to put it? In the second paragraph?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: The second paragraph we can work with Russia to improve the language a bit. So after "through," "through participation of different stakeholders within their respective roles and responsibilities." Something like this. I think the language needs to be improved.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. And welcoming the opportunity to say good morning, almost good afternoon. I think -- and let me focus first on the second paragraph. I think if we were to be consistent with our effort yesterday, we might change the beginning use of the word "members" and just strike "members" and start out by saying, "encourage the development of innovative procedures and mechanisms" since the recommendation will go to more than the CSTD members.

I want to thank Saudi Arabia for their addition, and I will look further at that paragraph to see if I have any other comments.

I want to go to the first paragraph. I think by the use of the words "further internationalization of the oversight management," although there has been the announcement of a process to move forward on the internationalization, that I agree with Russia that that doesn't mean that the further internationalization should not be referenced in our report but I would raise a question about the last parenthetical phrase which reads now "represented by their government's participation on an equal footing."

The management and coordination of critical Internet resources is heavily a technical set of activities, at least highly dependent upon technical expertise and technical coordination and activities. And in that vein, I would not be able to accept that only governments should be participating. So I would propose to try to work with others to modify that paragraph in a way that could be more inclusive of the participation also of other stakeholders. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is there any specific text you can offer? Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. I think at this point I would just have to ask to put the last phrase in square brackets with the offer to work with others to come back with replacement optional -- to replace the text to be discussed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Just a question to Russia, do you have in mind the day-to-day operations, or do you have in mind the oversight?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, oversight is oversight as it is now related to one government. So this is the function which is related to one government. That's why it is reflected to the citizens of all countries, represented by their governments because to improve the asymmetric status of the -- well, which is reflected right now.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So my understanding is that you are referring to the oversight or, to put it a more politically correct way, stewardship.

Okay. Thank you.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. On the first paragraph, we think this paragraph seems to be drafted in a way that may be more of a resolution text where you note something. It is not clearly drafted maybe as a recommendation.

Also, we note that this is an ongoing process. And I don't know if it's beneficial if this group gets into the details of this particular issue since it's -- it has been announced that there should be a reform on

internationalization. And that's an ongoing process that maybe we should instead await the outcome of that reform process before we start to comment in such detail on that issue.

On the second paragraph, we think that we agree with the proposal to change "members" to "all stakeholders." So maybe that could be reflected on the screen, "encourages all stakeholders" as an alternative. And maybe instead of "procedures and mechanisms," we could have something more general like "methods" as an alternative. That goes also then in the second part of the sentence where, again, it's referred to "processes, procedures, and mechanisms." Maybe we could have "methods" or -- well, maybe "processes" only is another alternative that we could work on.

And then regarding the addition made by Saudi Arabia, we do not see added value here. So we would like to see that square bracketed about the different stakeholders within the respective roles and responsibilities. We think that we do not have to go down to such a level of detail here.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. This recommendation has two parts. One part talking in the first paragraph. I think we should try to understand the sensitivity of the matter, terms -- using of the terms like "oversight" which has a sensitivity among many people, should be carefully taken into account.

And also the events that currently started from -- at least partially for this issue, on 14th March is another issue that should be taken into account. Perhaps this recommendation was drafted before that time. And ongoing activities, whether we will be successful in future to internationalize or not. But that is the hope. I don't think that is my age. Maybe my son, grandson's age, that one.

Nevertheless, we have to modify the paragraph 1 to address it in a different way in the term of internationalizations and of the management of the resources and so on and so forth. And, also, it is difficult to say that equally among citizens, first of all, I don't see how you implement equally among citizens or people that you go to every single person in the country and they equally have a role in the management of that resource. That should be in the drafting and so on and so forth.

Paragraph 2 is okay, innovations. We have to see that. But I don't think that we should introduce in square brackets. We should just take the proposal made. We have to develop that.

Innovative or innovation is something that is now referred everywhere, so nobody is against that.

Emerging issues is something that's valid. We are talking today. Who knows what happens tomorrow. The world is progressing. So we should address that issue of innovation.

Paragraph 2 could be easily redrafted. Paragraph 1 could be carefully redrafted, if we want to retain that or if we just want to limit it to internationalization of the Internet governance.

But, perhaps, here we are not talking of Internet governance here. We are talking of enhanced cooperation for the issue of the public policy issues. So we should limit ourselves to that one. We are not dealing with Internet governance at this meeting. We are dealing with the part of that which relates to our activities. So perhaps we need some sort of -- I think maybe Marilyn will be candidate to do that? Because the first one that opens their mouth is a victim to start the drafting. That is the rules of the games.

[Laughter]

She may be a candidate to redraft that. No doubt it will take all points into account. Otherwise, we could not (indiscernible).

Thank you.

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

From your intervention, it has become clear why we are using "globalization" rather than "internationalization" because it's so difficult to pronounce.

On a more serious tone, I could hear Marilyn's name as a candidate to help in redrafting.

Are you volunteering?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I would welcome Mr. Arasteh as my co-drafter.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I really count on you.

Avri?

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

On the first one, I had the appearance that -- or the impression that that was really more of a statement. I liked the suggestion made somewhere along the discussion of "further internationalization" or "globalization" -- whichever word people wanted to use -- "of the stewardship of critical Internet resources," as that's being worked, but I don't know if that's being reflected there.

And I would suggest -- although I'm not volunteering to be part of the drafting group -- "which ensures equality amongst all stakeholders," since that is what we have been talking about here.

In the second, I appreciate the bracketing of the "within their respective roles and responsibilities" since that's language that's being developed and suffered over in A and D and it is language in which we do have some disparity in viewpoint.

I think also, though, that you would need to include -- either include "participation of different stakeholders" within that bracketing or remove "stakeholder process" because "through participation of stakeholder" -- "of different stakeholders in multiple stakeholder process" gets a little redundant.

And the word "only" there at the end, I -- of that phrase, I don't understand.

So thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Did I hear you correctly that you do not want to be part of this redrafting, which is --

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I offered all that I had to offer at this point so was not volunteering to do further word-crafting on this one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right. Okay. Thank you, Avri. At least it gives some hope, and I think we may come to some recommendation of that.

I'm turning to Yuliya. Do you agree that you come together with Marilyn and Mr. Arasteh to have text which can be included as a recommendation?

>> (off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Thank you.

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

Can we see all amendments between square brackets? So the Saudi, Sweden, Marilyn?

All amendments to be between square brackets, not only the Saudi amendments?

Then "Encourages," I would like to insert "governments." So between square bracket, "governments to develop." To keep "to develop," so --

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes. Naturally it's my mistake. I didn't call the attention of the secretariat to put them in square brackets, but probably as of now, we are going to do that.

USA?

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

The United States would like to thank Russia for both of these contributions.

Quite simply, we generally supported the second text as originally submitted from Russia. I think some of the modifications, some of them were positive, some of them less so, but I think that will be -- that will be resolved.

As for the first one, I would agree with previous speakers that this is obviously a very important issue and one that is -- has been greatly influenced by recent announcements and there's obviously an ongoing process that will change this entire context, so I think we need to be very careful on the timeliness and relevance of this recommendation, if it is to remain a part of this group.

A couple of points and some concerns, perhaps.

I do believe and agree with others that "globalization" is a more appropriate word than "internationalization" in the coordination and management of resources. It's not just the purview of governments and nations but stakeholders from across the globe, so I think "globalization" is the correct term."

Share similar concerns as others with "oversight management." I think "stewardship" or "coordination" is more appropriate.

Just generally did not understand -- Chairman, perhaps through you we could seek clarification on the term "in the direction of the environment." I was just confused on the meaning of those words in this context.

And then finally, very importantly -- and appreciate the square-bracketed text on the "represented by governments, participation on an equal footing."

Obviously governments do have a role to play and they are on equal footing, but that's only one way by which stakeholders are represented. They have opportunities to be represented on their own terms through the technical community, through corporations, et cetera, so I don't think that that's an accurate way to describe that situation.

Thank you.

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

Can I ask you, as well, to participate in this smaller group?

Thank you.

And I hope to have some results by the end of the lunch break.

Iran, please.

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

I'm sure that we come to some sort of output which covers the points.

With respect to whether we put "internationalization" or "globalization," we would have some output, and sometimes if we have difficulty to opt for any of the two, we put both of them with a slash, oblique between the two, and leave it to the readers to take it the way that you want.

And the first paragraph is not only limited to the transfer of the stewardship of IANA to international community and so on and so forth. It's a little bit going beyond that. So we come to some sort of that.

And with respect to the government in the second paragraph, or others, this is my personal view, professionalism. I don't think innovation is only limited to governments. Innovation is limited to those who have something to contribute. So we should not limit it just to the particular sector. We should be more broad and be more open.

So we try to find something which covers the point and avoiding this difficulty of the square bracket and so on.

With respect to the "within the role and responsibilities," we will open the discussion in the different -- in the little group to see what we can do about that.

So I'm sure that we come to some sort of --

But we could not at this stage indicate where we put these -- whether to put it under the barriers or put it elsewhere. Let's agree on the text and then where we put it we decide later on.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I believe an observer wanted to take the floor? Yeah?

>> Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was very pleased this morning because I heard a lot of good -- good stuff about the roles of governments.

My personal viewpoint is that today, we have too much interventions of the governments in private affairs because the Internet is, for me, firstly a private affair. It's not a government affair.

So if I could avoid to have government -- government playing the field of civil societies, it would be very nice. We don't want to have governments playing -- controlling business development, because at the end of the day who is developing Internet? This is private business and this is civil society.

So my viewpoint is that government role should be restricted to -- to of course defense of the human rights, defense of the privacies, but as I feel that we are more talking about investment in infrastructure, in capacity-building around the Internet, I think it should be better to avoid those government interventions because today we are at -- when there is an innovation, government is first to come to play and to give the rules, so Internet cannot develop easily.

We have a lot of examples in the world where government is more -- more a barrier than an incentive to the development of the Internet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Nigel?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

Just very briefly, and of course others are experts on this, but I think it would -- you know, for the sake of the -- if you like, the wider public and the credibility of our recommendations, whatever text is finally agreed -- and no doubt the working group will come up with something appropriate -- I think it needs to recognize that something is taking place.

So one can of course note the importance of a lot of things, but also I think one note -- one should perhaps welcome that a process is underway in some sense.

One can say that the global --

[Scribes have lost audio]

>> -- backed by the U.S. government, and in fact, they set some preconditions and they will decide at the end whether or not the transition takes place. Now, not only is that not equal footing for all states, it's not even equal footing for all people of the world.

I'm not a U.S. citizen. I don't have any way to influence what the U.S. decides to do or not to do with respect to that, and I find that troublesome.

The process for discussing the IANA transition is completely open and I'm one of many people participating in that, but the preconditions were not open and the final decision is not open, and I think that you have to recognize that some people are not comfortable with that.

And so there are two points of view on that. Some people think that's fine and some people think that's not fine.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard.

Well, once again, I would like to turn to the voluntary drafting group, the small one, and I encourage you to come up with some results. I have very promising statements from you.

Iran, you want to...

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

I suggest that we do not mention anything about the decisions or announcements of the NTIA with respect to the transfer of the stewardship. We should just talk about the globalization or internationalization of the management of the critical resources and so on and so forth.

As Richard said and I told in the other meeting, I don't want to refer to any meeting that these are the conditions, and I asked the questions at the meeting that if these conditions are not satisfied by USA, they say, "No, I don't transfer at all. I continue to 2017, if not 2019." So we don't refer to that. It's better not to create a problem for ourselves. Let us be general and that's a general issue and not to -- and in any case, it is not the duty of this meeting to welcome or not welcome or to approve or not approve the unknown.

Let us be neutral and let us be objective. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Basically, that was exactly the reason I said that eventually "taking note" would be a quite neutral expression, but I leave it up to you.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think we do consider these references in these two paragraphs very important.

In the spirit of having to consider those original texts and amendments, we would suggest to note the keeping-in-brackets approach, rather than deletions in the text.

So from that perspective, if the word "internationalization" is just bracketed rather than being deleted, and I think the rest of it is -- it's okay.

Thereafter, we can come back on the final version as we go on.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I suggest we go to Number 2. It's a recommendation submitted by Japan.

Can you comment on that?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In order to reduce the barriers and the strains on participation in enhanced cooperation, Japan proposed two recommendations, two proposals or recommendations, and the first one is to share information on meetings and activities contributing to enhanced cooperation, and the second one is to encourage international organizations to promote remote participation, provide information -- information on discussion, and to invite comments from all stakeholders.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan. Any comments?

Iran.

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

This recommendation, part of it is addressed elsewhere under the participation, capacity-building and so on and so forth.

The other part about captioning and so on, we don't want to be advocator for that one, captioning or supporting or not supporting, but we should also mention this one in the elements relating to the participations remotely, saying "using all possible and available ways and means such as captioning" and so on and so forth.

It should be there.

I don't think we should have a new or separate text here. Let's just concentrate everything in one single area, and that is participation or involvement -- according to my distinguished friend, involvement of the developing countries and so on and so forth, and address that "such as" as a suggestion.

We don't want to talk about captioning. It is going on already. Leave it to that. We don't want here this meeting to have any recommendation to international organizations. It's not our duty. They know their job better. I think everybody, they're doing this captioning. There are somebody pushing for that, and that is that, so I don't think that we could do more than that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

I turn to Japan. Do you agree that this will be included in the discussion you have on other issues and will be part of it?

>>JAPAN: I think we have to make a concise recommendation, so we can accept Iran's proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think the proposal made by Japan is a very useful one because eventually when we are capturing various challenges in participation and efforts that need to be made to enhance participation of representatives from developing countries, I think these recommendations will go a long way.

And again, as I said in the beginning, we can -- once we such recommendations at different places, we can bring them along the lines we have very likely suggested and come up with a text which can read together rather than in bits and pieces.

So we support this content. And placement, we can look at it.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

I also join others in supporting the Japanese proposal, but I have only one question, Mr. Chairman.

If we are talking about barriers for participation and enhanced cooperation, then I'm hesitating whether it belongs here and also in the other one, because the previous section speaks about the participation of developing countries, but as my country has also benefited and strengthened participation through the use of I.T. technology, then I don't know if this is the combination in order to attack barriers for participation. So I'm not really clear how can we distinguish these two things, because the other is

oriented to developing countries. Probably this is broader, but this still maybe can be somehow the same issue.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria.

I believe India's remark was very pertinent. Let's agree on the substance, and I think it is very useful and then we can discuss where to put it.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I thought you had given this paragraph also to Australia to include in the participation, capacity-building with the very careful attention that we should not intervene in the procedures of any organization or any arrangement in the world, whether they put or made available the minutes of conference to the public or whether they call for public for the comments. I don't think that is correct. We cannot do that.

I don't want to go to particular organizations or particular treaties. But each treaty has its own rules and procedures, how to treat that. We could not get -- And this group is not entitled to modify any treaty to say make available the minutes for public comments. I don't think that.

How plenipotentiary conference, ITU, should make these minutes available for available for public comments, the minutes is a result of discussion. And it is agreed at each meeting. That is all.

And there is paragraph -- Article 19 and 24 of the convention of the ITU says the procedure. So we could not talk about it. It is far reaching, and we should be very, very careful. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see Australia asking for the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I guess my response to those comments would be that this paragraph is premised with "encourages," so it is not making this compulsory. It is just saying we think this is a good idea. And international organizations can decide within their rules of procedure and their constitutions whether to apply it. But I understand the concerns my Iranian colleague has voiced.

The other thing I would say is I agree with Mexico's comments that elements of this definitely have application to our discussion in participation in the context of development, but some of them could equally apply to developed countries. They could apply to other stakeholders. And so there are parts of this that I think if you remove this wholesale, you lose elements of this that could be useful under this particular topic heading, A, rather than the previous one. Thank you for your comments.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Along the same lines as Australia, just the opinion Australia just expressed, we had to look at the language here. It says "encourage." It doesn't sort of give any firm

direction to international organizations. It encourages international organizations to look into this. And we think that's an important message.

And we also agree with Australia that this is -- the intent here is to deal with barriers, not only for developing countries but also for stakeholders also in developed countries. So we think that it's probably at its right place right now. And we thank Japan for drafting it. And we support it. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize to come back again. There is no difficulty with some part of this, captioning and so on and so forth. There is need of clarification when we talk about "implement language support." Are we talking of 2,000 languages in the world? U.N. is six languages. Sometimes, if paid by some people, seven and eight languages. When we talk of "languages," it is very broad.

And then if you want to address this issue, we should separate the element of captioning, separate the element of remote participation from the release of the minutes and so on and so forth, and to encourage internationalization organizations to consider where appropriate, take into account their rules of procedures and putting in that clarification. Without that, I'm sorry, it is very difficult. We are part of one government, and we cannot go in other parts of the international organizations like others and say something which is against those treaties. We have signed that treaty, and we have to respect the treaty. So that is the situation.

But I have no problem to just consider within the framework of the rules and procedures as appropriate and then have something about the minutes released and so on and so forth. Captioning we have no problem. Captioning, that is good. This is working. This is sort of disability of the people. It helps people like me that do not very well understand English by listening. And regarding the captioning, they could immediately take it. It is good.

We have to be very, very careful. We would not support open language in that paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

I certainly understand the language you requested to put in, that is to consider as appropriate. And I leave it to the group to discuss it and to consider it, of course.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Section, I think it's E, and the related question in the questionnaire is 12 -- 11, 12, 13, 16. If we go back to the questionnaire and read the question, it is totally something different than the proposed language in here. Our question was very precise on how to remove barriers and implementing enhanced cooperation.

If I read what barriers remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance, how can these barriers best be overcome? What actions are needed to promote further participation of all marginalized people in the global information society? How can enhanced cooperation add these key issues toward global, social, and economic development? And then the last one is 16: What are the key issues to be addressed to promote the affordability of the Internet?

We should capture these elements in drafting such recommendations under this section. And I see this recommendation as Japan shows its flexibility. It goes under the other section, not under the barriers. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

We have agreed that eventually we should consider the substance of the recommendation and we should make -- we should find appropriate space for it after we have agreed on the text.

Are there any members of the group that would like to take the floor? If not -- yes, ITU.

>>ITU: Thank you, Chairman. Actually, I have a question to Japan. At least the conference materials and minutes, could Japan define what "conference" means, including all the meetings or, like, forums or working group-level discussions? What is the limit or range of conference materials and minutes? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I'm sure Japan can answer that. Please. Go ahead.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We considered the level of conference as the big conference and many people are interested in such kind of conference. So I think -- I think the working group with very small conferences, it is not subject to this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm sure when you go back to some drafting group, you will clarify this issue.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I was reflecting on this myself and thinking about the importance of the availability, you know, for instance, our own information. We took a decision in our second meeting to have transcripts and to make remote participation available.

So perhaps when they go -- when the group goes into the drafting group, it would be possible to consider within the limits of existing budget and to the greatest extent practical if there are concerns about the scope or the cost of making this effort.

But I do also want to note that -- to promote the availability and awareness of the work of the international organizations and the intergovernmental organizations.

Access to material is a key part of what helps to broaden the understanding of the organization's purpose and work itself. So I would hope that we could keep the spirit of what Japan has proposed, even if we have to propose some limiting phrases. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I'm also convinced that we're going to keep the spirit of the text and with the eventual limitations.

Any members of the group on this issue? If not, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I must apologize to Iran, but I cannot agree with his initial statement on these matters. Actually, here I would support the Sweden, Australia, and what Marilyn Cade just said. This group is about enhanced cooperation. So it seems perfectly appropriate to make recommendations on how institutions should work, even if we don't exactly agree on what is enhanced cooperation. I think we can agree on some elements.

Transparency is an important one. Here I would say you should encourage all organizations, not just the international ones.

But I would add after "concerned, where it says "concerned to promote," I would add "concerned, to be fully transparent," and et cetera. I'm not a member so perhaps I don't think you want to take that on board, but perhaps others would see that.

And Mr. Arasteh mentioned the ITU plenipot. In fact, they are now Webcast. They are open. But it is true, I have to admit that the ITU is less transparent than the U.N. agencies.

WIPO is now making all of the input documents available and the drafts produced by the secretariat for negotiation with all the square brackets. So anybody can follow that remotely. And, personally, I think all organizations should do that. And the ITU should be called on to become more transparent.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. We listen to you, but I think we are not going to discuss specific organizations here. So we leave it to specific organizations to speak for themselves and to decide on their policies how they're going to handle the issues.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Let us not confer this meeting to criticize a particular organization whether it is transparent or not transparent. It is not up to us. And it would not be fair that criticizing a particular organization, that organization works according -- in accordance with the rules of procedures and criteria mentioned how to do that. So I don't think that.

But we -- we are part of the government, and we have to have consistencies in all areas. We should not say something here which is contrary. We should be very, very careful. We should not talk about fully transparent. I don't understand what that means, "fully transparent."

So we should limit ourselves to captioning and remote participation. And if we talk about the availability of the document, it should be within the terms of reference and within the rules of procedures as appropriate. And Mr. Hill is wrong, that one document we had to go to the council of the ITU to get the permission to make it available. And they sent one of the documents -- two of the

documents out of five. So I don't think we could. I know some people want to have total transparency and total, deregulation. But we are not yet here.

Until the convention constitution of those organizations is changed, we should not, Chairman. Please kindly do not go to that sort of detail. Talk about something which helps the people. Captioning, yes. Remote participation, yes. And other things, rules of procedures as appropriate. So we would not be in a position to criticize any organizations or to say something which is inconsistent with the rules of procedures or those treaties that we are signatories of that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

After Richard's intervention, I said almost the same thing. And I don't intend to carry on with the debate on these issues because it seems to me that we are agreeing on the essence and the spirit of the Japanese contribution. So I would like to encourage you to get back to the small drafting group and agree on the text itself in a way which is acceptable to all of us. I think it has merits. It has great merits. And it has been recognized. So I really would like you to go back after lunch and finish with the other issues.

ITU, still want to take the floor?

>>ITU: Thank you, Chairman. No, actually, you suggested a group, exactly what I wanted to comment. So I will just leave it like that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: (Off microphone).

So we are at Number 3. Okay. I didn't have my mic on.

So can you introduce it, Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With your indulgence, I would like to point out something that with regard to 1, I did not want to waste the group's time by repeating myself. But if I could beg the Chair's indulgence, I would like at some point just to point out later all the places where I'd asked for bracketing and changes that somehow slipped the notice of the editing. So if I could later, I'd like to do that. Thank you.

Okay. So with this one, basically, we're basically talking about reinforcing the multistakeholder approach and encouraging all stakeholders to engage more in, to work with existing organizations, and to explore ways in which stakeholder engagement can be enhanced, including... and then go through a set of bullets.

First one, bottom-up strategies. And here we are explaining bottom-up strategies, "which use local expertise and focus on telecommunications and Internet infrastructure, enabling policies and incentives for private sector and education for all; reduce the cost for Internet access in developing countries; capacity-building for marginalized groups to access online spaces, public information, and essential services in a safe and inclusive way; work with marginalized communities to develop local content in

their own language, that meet their needs and tell their stories; capacity-building and campaigns for Internet users to understand the barriers to participation by marginalized groups in the information society, including online threats and discrimination; facilitate participation of marginalized groups in Internet Governance Forums by ensuring their issues are on the agendas of those forums; measuring the inclusion of women in Internet governance spaces and taking concrete action if the results indicated unequal participation; and encourages the establishment of regional and national multistakeholder forums and processes for dealing with Internet governance and Internet policy issues, and ensuring that those include marginalized voices."

Basically, it is a set of points, a set of actual actions, that we believe are all possible and doable and implementable. So hopefully this can find favor with the other members of the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Probably you might have had a secret contact with the Internet Governance Forum secretariat because he just entered the room when you were reading out. Okay. Thank you.

Any comments on E? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, the language can be improved or enhanced to meet the mandate. If we can add the issue of interconnection cost to the first recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you specify where you want to put it?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: A new bullet, interconnection cost.

And then regarding the second recommendation, "encouraging the establishment of regional and national forums," this is implicitly IGF. So I don't see this in particular in this working group who proposed reading this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Which bullet do you want to square bracket?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: "Encourages the establishment of regional and national," the whole paragraph.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I think there's a lot of merit in the numerous bullet points that are here. But I would like to suggest that some of them are very much about -- might fit under the participation work that is going on. I don't think -- I would propose a different approach not to remove the square brackets that were just proposed but to suggest that there are some additional recommendations elsewhere that are very similar to that last bullet point and perhaps those could all be taken together. So let me make a comment about whether national and regional multistakeholder fora always equal the IGF initiatives. In fact, I don't think they do.

I act as the chief catalyst to the IGF USA by no means is that the only place, the only multistakeholder fora where discussion about Internet public policy takes place. There are many, many other fora where discussion about international policy issues and Internet governance are discussed.

I think the intent in the last bullet -- I'm not channeling the civil society or trying to over-interpret. But I believe the discussion about the importance of national and regional fora and processes can be productively taken up. I would say in C, there are a couple of other references to similar events or activities.

So I'd like us to perhaps take all those up together and not to discount valuable contributions until we've fully explored the intent that's behind them and the problem that the recommendation may be trying to solve.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Iran?

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

I, in fact, don't know where we could put various elements of these recommendations.

They are talking of capacity-building. We have discussed capacity-building under the topic of developing countries.

We are talking of marginalized, whether we should address that there.

But some issues are quite difficult.

What is "bottom-up strategies"? It is just words. It has not been implemented.

In one of the organizations dealing with the Internet, ICANN, the issue of bottom-up approach was discussed in the council of the CC and GSO, and it was clearly mentioned that it is not implementable. There is no bottom-up approach. You cannot start from the bottom, people around, and start putting their ideas together and send it to the upper level, send it to the upper level.

This is something good in words but how you implement that? Bottom-up strategies which use local expertise and focus on telecommunication and Internet infrastructure is all good words but not implementable.

I don't know whether reduction of the cost of Internet access should be here or should be elsewhere.

And there are many other issues.

Participation. Again, talk about participation is good. Why not we put it under the participation that we have discussed before?

Measuring the inclusion of women in Internet governance. Very good. But to whom is this addressed? Who measures that? Governments? Private sector? Civil society? Individuals? Users?

"Measure." How measured? What criteria for measurement?

And then it says "taking course of action if the results indicate unequal participation."

How you could come up if there's unequal participation?

If there is no participation, you could not create the participation.

So we are in favor of the topic, but how to implement that.

So I don't think that elements of this could be implemented, so we have to pick up some of this, put it elsewhere, and some others, to see what we can do.

Some of them are totally unimplementable.

The issue of bottom-up process is still under discussions and the ways and means and modality how to implement that should be addressed. We have not addressed that.

Could distinguished person who wrote this paragraph give me one example of bottom-up approach, where it has been implemented?

Fortunately, I'm following all meetings. Give me one example that bottom-up approach has been implemented, and if yes, how. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

I can see a lot of flags but there was a direct question to Avri.

Avri, please.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I'll answer that one and if I can, make some other points, if I may. Certainly.

The IETF is certainly one place. The Internet Engineering Task Force is certainly one place. And while those of us in ICANN someone -- sometimes complain about the degree to which the bottom-up policy is being implemented, it definitely has been. It is ongoing. It is most definitely implementable.

I would argue that each of these items is, indeed, implementable, and we've seen approaches towards implementing them throughout the years.

The last comment I wanted to make is, we had discussed earlier -- this was during our previous meeting -- that the IGF was, indeed, designated as one of the places within which enhanced cooperation could take place.

We went through a very long discussion and got to that point.

So therefore, I think that the mention of the IGF type of multistakeholder forums and such is indeed that kind of thing, is indeed in keeping with the notion that one takes a much broader approach towards

bringing enhanced cooperation to developing populations, developing countries and marginalized groups.

Mentioning marginalized groups is important because even within developing countries and even developed countries, there are marginalized groups that we don't reach out to and therefore feel it's very important.

I must confess I am not the distinguished person that wrote this. That is Joy. I am really trying to convey some of the wisdom that she would convey, had she been here.

Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I think since we are on this topic of barriers that remain for all stakeholders to fully participant, we'd like to see it in two dimensions.

One dimension which is relevant but which could be effectively addressed under A and B, which is for the sake of saying it, I would say that for the governments that we believe that there is no mechanism to participate effectively in the global Internet governance.

That is something that is -- will be addressed, we hope, separately.

Having said that, the second one is -- that is at the international level, and they're obviously -- I mean, importance has to be given to the national level, how all stakeholders within the national, let's say, context should find ways and means of participating effectively in the -- Internet governance-related.

I think in that con- -- if you're looking at it from that context, we see a lot of merit in many of the recommendations which are contained in this paragraph, because eventually -- well, each of us in our own respective roles, governments and all other stakeholders, at the national level have to do their bit for enhanced participation of people at large, and for which I think these recommendations -- which of course I don't want to go on all of them. Some of -- one or two we have some concerns, but otherwise, in its spirit, we can support this kind of language, which can come up again, as I said under those recommendations which we would like to make for -- as a value addition to this process.

And this would be -- I think that's the main objective of our working group, to see those recommendations which may look to be very general in nature, but I think they might have certain appeal.

Let me go back to the last point, which is: Again, we would like to see this in its entire context. It cannot be said that since we agree on these paragraphs, we go back and say, "Okay, we will say only this, and we'll not talk about the rest." I think it has to be seen in the entire context.

If we have that flexibility in moving forward, I think we can find a number of recommendations, positive ones, going into the report that we are planning to envisage.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, we would like to thank the proponents of these -- or these proponents, rather, of these very important recommendations, and we agree with India that the spirit here -- although maybe we need to work with the language on some of them, but we think that the spirit of these recommendations is something that we should all be able to go along with.

Regarding the issue of bottom-up, maybe we can contrast bottom-up with top-down. Top-down, what does that mean? Maybe top-down could mean that the big boss makes all the decisions and then he asks other people to implement them.

I think maybe that -- that to some extent, our distinguished colleague from Iran gave already a definition of "bottom-up," how we can work, how we can invite relevant expertise to discuss problems and issues and form policy in that manner and then move on from there and take it up to relevant decision-makers, for instance. That's something that -- that's a method that we often apply, at least, when the Swedish government is creating public policy. And I think we have also seen bottom-up -- successful bottom-up approaches at the international level, I think while discussing issues related to Internet governance and the Information Society.

I think just two examples that comes to my mind is the very successful NETmundial conference held last week in Brazil where all stakeholders were invited at an early stage to participate with proposals to that conference.

We also have the MPP process coordinated by the ITU on the WSIS+10, just to give two examples.

But we think that it has value to highlight here the importance of bottom-up strategies because by using local expertise, we would make more informed decisions on policy.

Also, on the second bullet here, on encouraging establishment of regional and national multistakeholder forums, we think that it's not only about the IGF.

Just to give one example, in May this year, the Stockholm Internet Forum will be held and where the Swedish government makes special efforts to include marginalized voices by financing participation for a large number of civil society and industry representatives from developing countries, with a special focus on least-developed countries.

So that's just one example of something that we have a very good experience of, and I think that it's not directly related to the IGF.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I also wanted to support this recommendation and particularly take note of the fourth bullet that talks about efforts to develop local content.

That was one of the questions that we asked in the questionnaire and we got some important feedback on that and was also part of the mapping, so I would like to make sure we include that, going forward.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Carlos?

>>CARLOS AFONSO: I am trying to understand why Saudi Arabia wants to exclude that last paragraph.

We have excellent examples of processes leading to the IGF in terms of regional organizations like the EuroDIG in Europe, national and regional IGFs happening in Africa, in Asia, and in South -- in Latin America, and in North America, et cetera.

These are spaces where we not only share our understanding of Internet governance in general and the scope and objectives of the IGF in particular, but also we have the opportunity to build proposals to bring to the IGF in a way in which many of the participants in these regional and national preparatory IGFs cannot go and be present in some way in the IGF discussions.

And this is a way of conveying their opinions and their views to the IGF.

So the importance of viewing the IGF as a process and not just the one-time event every year is -- cannot be left aside.

And I think this is -- has to be encouraged, so I agree with the way it was -- it is proposed.

So I would like to ask from Saudi Arabia the reason why they want to bracket that paragraph.

And secondly, I would like that they develop what they mean by "interconnexion costs" because there is the expression there but not the phrase explaining exactly what should be the recommendation regarding it.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos. I'm sure Saudi Arabia will answer you, but before that, I have a long list.

Baher?

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman.

I'd like to join others in supporting many of the points under this recommendation.

I realize that we're here discussing barriers to participation, and while barriers would inevitably be more -- I mean, barriers in developing countries would inevitably be more challenging than in developed countries, I don't think they are limited to developing countries.

So I can understand that some of the points about marginalized groups could fit more under the previous point we discussed in the morning about developing countries. I still see merit in including other points here.

Particularly, I would like to support Marilyn and others with regard to the last bullet.

This is not about the IGF. This is not about developing countries either.

This is about regional and national multistakeholder fora that are necessary for all stakeholders to be able to participate actively and effectively in international and global fora.

I've seen -- I mean, I've been working in the Arab world, in the Middle East and countries including Iran, (indiscernible) Pakistan, and we've seen that lack of availability of such fora at regional and national level has had an impact on participation from these countries in global fora.

So I think this is very important and we need to keep it.

Again, I agree with the intervention made by India earlier about the context, so I mean, whether we include it here or include it in some other context, that's fine as long as we do not lose it.

On the point about bottom-up and what does the term exactly mean, I mean, to me it's very simple and it's very clear. It's the opposite to top-down without any further explanation.

And I think -- I'm not sure whether we want to delve into a discussion about examples, and I also realize that at some point we -- the group said that we shouldn't discuss specific organizations or specific fora, but again, as Avri mentioned some examples, I could add more.

ICANN is definitely a multistakeholder bottom-up organization. The processes within ICANN, the policy development processes within ICANN, are bottom-up.

There have always been discussions and there will continue to be discussions at ICANN about improving those processes because the ICANN community believes that any policy development processes -- there is always room for improvement in any policy development process.

One specific example that was very relevant at the time to many countries in this room was the internationalized domain names, IDNs.

ICANN did not decide to implement IDNs. It was the global community around the world that called upon the technical community to develop standards to implement IDNs and called upon ICANN to develop policies to implement IDNs.

It was the community of the Asia-Pacific top-level domains who met in Dubai in 2007 or 2008 and recommended a fast-track process within ICANN to expedite the process of implementing IDNs.

The result of that is simply more than 30 countries have delegated or have received their delegated top-level domains in different languages and scripts.

I could go longer with examples, but I'll stop there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher.

I take your intervention that you just gave as an example of a company. We are not going to single out any organization in this discussion.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Briefly, just I thank the proponents of the recommendation. We see lots of merit in that. And briefly, I would like to refer to the bottom-up strategy.

And for Mexico, it's very interesting because we see here lots of what we do, and one of the examples that comes to my mind is the indigenous people and it, for us, is extremely important to have them on board, and the policy of Mexico towards these communities is very important and we take them on board and we include them and it will be very good to have them in a broad perspective in all these forums that they are already in there, but it will be very, very interesting to have these kind of recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Russia?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, essentially quite a big recommendation, I would say, and it has a lot of redundancy inside of it, and I believe that it's a lot of policy things inside of these long recommendations.

However, it's not all of them really address the enhanced cooperation, which is the area of our working group, and not all of them reflect the barriers in the implementation of enhanced cooperation.

I think the text now, how it is, doesn't reflect the fair understanding of the barriers of implementation of enhanced cooperation. However, it reflects a lot of policy things but, you know, it's -- local context on the national level of course is important but it's not really addressing the barriers of implementing of enhanced cooperation from our point of view.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: On this issue, can you offer some text or can you offer some modification to the proposal?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, it -- you're supposed to make another working group or what?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. I mean, right now in here.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Uh-huh. Well, I need to think about.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Take your time.

Iran?

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

I think that you will ask me do I have any suggestions to make.

Yes.

As I mentioned, there's a lot of things here. Some of them should be elsewhere.

Capacity-building, and so on and so forth. Participations. Costs.

But they need to be reworded.

Let's take Paragraph 1. The bottom-up approach as such, we are not against bottom-up approach strategies but we should desire that in a multistakeholder approach, one of the points or key point is a bottom-up approach, and then we should not limit that bottom-up approach to the private sector.

It goes saying that "enabling policies, incentives for the private sector and education." Bottom-up approach is everybody: private sector, civil society, technical community, users and so on and so forth. So there's limitation, so need to be reworded.

"Starting that in a multistakeholder approach," a bottom-up procedural approach is a key element or is an important element which calls for the views and incentives from all participants, all stakeholders in that process, and so on and so forth. That is -- we have to reword that. Then --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Kavouss, Kavouss, you are doing it now so let's capture what you're saying.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Oh, you are doing. Okay.

I think it is better you create another group. We can't do it in this part. It's difficult to convert this meeting to a drafting group. Let's take the ideas is there, the captioning, and then --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: -- somebody sit down -- not Mr. Arasteh, someone else, sit down and prefer that we -- because I'm involved in two groups already so I cannot divide myself in three.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: So that is that.

So this is the first paragraph that you have to do.

Cost of Internet? Yes, you could put it somewhere. I don't know where we have to put.

Capacity-building should go to the area we discuss capacity-building and participations.

Marginalized communities also should be mentioned there with specific situations.

Again, talking of the Internet users understand the barriers to participation, marginalized, they are repetitions for the others.

Facility for participation again is there.

And the measuring, I have difficult how we put that. Who should make that measuring? What is the criteria for measuring? And where we put that one.

So as Russia mentioned, good elements but need to be restructured, distributed among different areas, and put the elements.

But I'm not against the bottom-up approach. It's good, but we should be worked out. And IETF is one and is not all examples, and what ICANN they're doing, yes, one example internationalized domain names, yes, but not others.

I don't see any area that ICANN has worked on the bottom-up approach that they are taking. It's coming from the board and from the discussions in the board and that's all, and some -- something like that, so it is not really a bottom-up approach, but you could put that in a general sense.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Thank you. As I indicated, we don't really want to have debate on ICANN.

Russia, you want to take the floor? Okay.

There was a -- there were two questions for Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The second bullet speaks about reducing the cost of Internet access in developing countries. We see that there is an issue of Internet cost, interconnection cost. We know that developing countries is paying for the full Internet circuits. There is absence of an appropriate, effective global Internet mechanism to resolve such issues.

So when we speak about reducing the cost, we should, I mean, put emphasis on the interconnection costs. There should be mechanisms to make sure that cost is reduced in a way that would not affect developing countries.

On the other hand, why we put brackets at the second recommendation? We know that the WSIS outcomes related to Internet governance, there is two outputs. One is enhanced cooperation where governments will develop international public policy issues. And we have IGF, that discussion would happen over there.

We are here in a group to fully implement enhanced cooperation, not in a group to put recommendations how to improve Internet governance. This happened three years ago, and you chaired that group. We developed such recommendations.

So our focus here should be on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation, how governments can develop international policies. Thank you.

And I'm sorry. Regarding the bottom-up policies, again, as Mr. Arasteh mentioned, what is the bottom-up? I looked at the Tunis Agenda. There is no bottom-up wording. There is no bottom-up definition.

I don't want to speak about ICANN. I spoke yesterday. I mean, there is no such bottom-up framework in the world even. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. It's true that the working group has the mandate to look into the issues in enhanced cooperation. However, we haven't been told that we can't take reality into account.

Any member that would like to take the floor? I've not -- I have two observers.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Again, I need to apologize to Iran on this issue. I would fully support what Avri Doria said in her first intervention. The language that I see there on the substance is from what I can tell consistent with numerous U.N. resolutions that deal with related issues. And, indeed, I am convinced that bottom-up strategies are good and they work. A number of examples were mentioned.

I would add ISO, the International Standards Organization and even ITU itself. In ITU, every single output document is based on inputs from the membership. So that's an example of bottom-up.

Sweden said, okay, we can contrast bottom-up with top-down, which is true. Didn't give an example. So I cannot resist giving my favorite example, which is at this time PPP and TIPP, both of which are being conducted in secret, not just from the public but from parliaments which I find shocking. These are treaties in case people don't know.

According to leaks, it is clear that Internet governance issues are part of those discussions. And I think this is an extremely undesirable way to do business.

That's not to say that top-down should not be used as times. In Switzerland, the top is the Swiss people. As people, they are the sovereigns. And every now and then we do make a decision and it overrides everything that has come from the government and consultations and so on and so forth. And I think that sometimes top-down is appropriate. But in general, one should start with bottom-up as is stated there. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. I have no doubt about the upcoming votes on grouping, what your vote will be.

Yes? Take the floor.

>> GEORGES RADJOU: Yeah. I can understand -- this is my real first meeting on drafting a recommendation, so I can understand how it is difficult to have a consensus and the barriers. Most of the time you can't remove barriers because this is in beliefs. It is about religion. It is about culture. It is very difficult. Anyway, we have to compromise.

From my personal work experience, because I'm working mainly with poor people, vulnerable people. So there has been a good talk about people in this room, about defending the causes of the majority of the population of the world, which are the 2, 3, 4, 5 billions of poor people on the planet who don't have access to water, electricity, and technologies. So I was just trying to understand them.

My viewpoint is we always are thinking about the top-down approaches which is the board who is taking the decision for the majority of us. And the (indiscernible) solution does not work.

There are enough studies in the world about very clever people, more clever than me, who have described the failures of technology and transfer of technology in the world. So it is an ongoing process. So I would like to point out there is now a new party, a new change about more sharing -- risk-sharing societies, whereas as a people would need help who are taking the future in their own hands.

And so a strategy of bottom-up or top-down approach is just the strategy. Sometimes it works. Sometimes it doesn't work so I won't focus.

(Inaudible) thing about empowering people because ideally what we want to do, we want to grow countries. We want to make more -- we want to remove poverty. We want to make people sufficient or interdependent. It would be much more intense to (indiscernible) which empowers people.

We need to empower populations. We need to empower poor people because this is an untapped market. This is where growth is.

So governments should make regulations to enforce the suspect -- the weak point of our society. And businesses can make the intermediaries and the link between the population and the governments. Governments should look after the health of people. Governments should look after the education of people. Governments should look after the defense of the country but not about the investment of the private businesses.

For example, I will give some example, but I won't be too focused. The power of poor people and people, you know, (inaudible) is very strong. It is a tool. Sometimes you just use -- my teams two years ago in 2012 there was a war in Mali. Mali was a conflict area.

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

>> GEORGES RADJOU: Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you conclude?

>> GEORGES RADJOU: Thank you. So I trust (off microphone) empowerment than top-down approach. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, from this discussion, I have a very positive feeling. I could hear relative support or considerable support, but I didn't have any substantial objection to the text itself and to the set of recommendations. I heard that the spirit is okay. I heard that wording should be rephrased eventually and where we should put it, it is also up to discussion.

So I'm turning to Avri who at this time I think is volunteering to do some redrafting. But I would like to encourage members of the group to participate in this redrafting because we have to bring on board all concerns and all our contributions for recommendation. So I don't intend to open the discussion on the following item.

Before we break for lunch, Australia. You probably want to brief us about the upcoming meeting for your drafting?

>>AUSTRALIA: Chair, you have read my mind. I just wanted to flag if anyone is interested in participating in a short discussion with Japan and Australia about a revised text that Japan has very kindly prepared, we propose meeting here at 2:30 p.m. to have a look at that. So I would encourage who is interested to come along. And, hopefully, we can find some common ground.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia.

I apologize to Phil because I promised him that we shall have him after 12:00 but the discussions took longer. I understand you have some other engagement at the beginning of the afternoon. So I expect you will be available after 4:00? And I hope to hear from you after 4:00. And by that time, I hope to finish with the remaining issues in group A -- E, sorry.

Yes, Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I'll endeavor to be here for 4:00 but rest assured, you will hear from me.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So I think we have plenty of things to do during the lunch break. And I hope you will be very diligent. And it is not too overwhelming to do all these jobs, but that is what we are here for. And I can sense a very positive spirit now. I'm really glad.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a procedural question, are we following the agenda? Because we are now a half day behind the agenda. So when will we start the second day on the agenda? After lunch tomorrow? Today? Evening?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for reminding me of reminding you to bring some food with you because we are going to have a long afternoon, early evening, late evening session. So I really intend to do the bulk of the work today, and I'm really sorry to say that.

But I had also flagged yesterday that eventually we might have some late sessions up to 9:00 we are allowed to be here. And I think if there's no serious objection to that, that we can do that.

So don't forget to bring some food, even though I think the vending machines are available. But it is up to you.

So, in the afternoon, I would like to continue with E. As I mentioned, we are trying to circulate the report, the draft report, to you for your information. I hope to continue with the report from the correspondence group and then we can attack other issues as they come.

Thank you.

[Break]

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Thursday, 1 May 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Afternoon Session

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Can you take your seats, please.

I would like to start in two minutes.

Is it okay? Two, three -- how many minutes do you need? Good afternoon. Welcome back to the meeting. I'm really happy that I could see so many small groups working very diligently.

I'm very grateful to you for that and I'm really grateful for the results you achieved. I'm getting more and more optimistic.

So as we broke up for lunch, we left the Group E recommendation, draft recommendations. And we stopped at recommendation number 4, which is a draft recommendation from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and U.K.

I would like to ask the proponents of this recommendation to introduce, please. Either Brazil or Mexico, Sweden, whoever.

You are being very polite.

>>SWEDEN: Okay. Thank you, Chairman. So I think it reads, then, members should increase efforts to empower stakeholders to participate through capacity-building, including, but not limited to training programs, awareness raising, best practice sharing.

I think the recommendation is pretty straightforward. It's about empowering stakeholders to participate in a meaningful way. We have been discussing that also yesterday, the fact that in order to be able to participate in a meaningful way, it's important for stakeholders to have the knowledge of both the substance and the processes related to Internet governance and some of the tools that we can utilize in order to achieve this are listed in this recommendation.

We had a discussion yesterday also about the word "members." And I think it's as relevant to this recommendation, and therefore maybe it would be better to talk again about all stakeholders to make it -- to direct this recommendation to the broader community.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Iran.

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

I think I understood that this is empowering for everybody, and then the same issue is for the developing country, whether we are addressing separately or we are addressing together. That is no problem.

But in the developing countries area, we are not limited to just these three areas. Although we have mentioned, including but not limited, training programs, awareness-raising, and we have many other issues over there. We have talking of the capacity-building mentioned here, knowledge, literacy -- sorry, literacy improvement is not here, enabling environment is not here. Practice sharing is here. Transfer of know-how is not here. Turning program is here. Awareness-raising.

So if you want to limit to that, at least you have to see -- see also recommendation cross references developing countries. Because they should be connected.

If you want to maintain this, this is for everybody. You have developing countries separately. But we have to cross-reference that here. See also recommendation if you agree at the end. That's it.

But it is limited here, because there are many other elements that could be added. But the sentence including, but not limited include that point, if you cross reference to other recommendations. It is harmless.

>> (Off mic.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for mentioning the cross referencing. I should have told you at the very beginning how I --

I should have told you at the very beginning how I intend to have this session. We are going to continue with the remaining issues in Group E, then we are going back to the drafting groups, the results of the drafting groups. And after that, I would like to with the correspondence group and the report of the correspondence group. And as I promised, the report.

So -- and in the remaining time, we are going to discuss other outstanding issues in Group A, B, and C. That is the short program for today.

So I can see Mexico taking -- would like to take the floor on this issue.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

I can speak for my delegation, but I'm sure that I can also imagine that will be probably the position of my coproponents, that Iran's recommendation is -- suggestion is quite good and we can improve the language in this recommendation with some of the issues that he raised here.

This is just a sample of a few areas what we can -- we see that we can improve. But it's obviously very welcome, his suggestion, and as well, the cross reference to participation of developing countries.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: I can only echo what Mexico has said. I think the suggestions (saying name) proposed are excellent additions, and I'm sure that the group will want to take them on board.

And I find this recommendation quite -- quite positive.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Iran, you want to take the floor again?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman.

As you know, there are (indiscernible) involved in all of this wording. So perhaps in order to have a -- let us say a standard format, we don't need to mention at the beginning, "Members should." We start that, "Increase" or "to increase efforts." Because if we start "members should," in other words, we have to have something. So just put the square bracket, we could delete it at the end to make it say how we start our recommendations. We start with an entity or we start with the actions. So it is editorial. It is not important. But editorially, we should do it outside the -- offline, whether start with "to increase efforts to empower, "Or we say, "Members should." Otherwise, in other recommendations, we start with something, "members should," "stakeholders should." So this is a format issue, editorial.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

As it stands, probably it needs some more editing.

Saudi Arabia.

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

We see the barriers more than empowering stakeholder to participate in capacity-building. I mean, there is no place for enhanced cooperation where those stakeholders can participate. So this is an issue.

The other issue regarding to the agenda I have seen the view and discussion of proposal for topic A, then we will go to the correspondence group, then we will go to B. So I wonder why we changed the order now to the correspondence group, then A and B.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, concerning the first remark, can you specify what you want to add or what modification you'd like to --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: No, my comment was this was dealing with one part of barriers. So this is a small side of the barriers. When you go to our recommendation, it will show the other.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Any other comment on this recommendation?

As for the follow-up for finalizing, because it seems to me that there is a fair amount of consensus that this can be included in the recommendations. Is Sweden, Mexico, Brazil willing to work on that?

For the cross reference, which was mentioned by Iran, I expect that it is cross reference to some text we are going to discuss.

Okay.

So probably let's leave it at that and continue with the next one.

Next one is a draft recommendation submitted by Saudi Arabia.

Can you introduce it.

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

As I just explained, one of the barriers we see for government, that there is no mechanisms or framework where they can come together on equal footing to develop international public policy issues. So in order to overcome this barrier, establishing under the United Nations will help developing countries and developed countries to come on equal footing to fully implement enhanced cooperation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Any comments on this recommendation, which is, I think, quite a substantial one?

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: You thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't need to make a lengthy intervention. I think this goes back to the main sticking point we've had in the entire duration of this meeting. The U.S. is not in a position to support a new U.N. body on Internet public policy.

Thank you.

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

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think we've had sufficient discussion during the -- many of our meetings. This particular dimension we can effectively address, since we have said earlier also through that particular (indiscernible) contained in model. And it could even come under the categories A and B.

So with that understanding, some elements of this can be shifted to that particular portion, provided we have certain clarity that that is the way we are going. Otherwise, then we'll have to start reflecting on the language, which we leave it to you whether you want us to discuss it in this format or perhaps allow us the flexibility to reflect it as a model, with some -- which some group of members can join and voluntarily submit for the consideration of the group.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. You rightly pointed out that this is the kind of crucial issue which should be or eventually may be included in the opinions. So I strongly support your approach. And I encourage those members who share this opinion to come together and work on that to include in this opinion. And eventually, if you think that some elements can be put into the recommendations and can enjoy consensus, then probably this will be -- this should be factored out.

So that's how I view it.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I welcome the suggestion that has just been made.

First of all, I'd like to note that I think that there is a phrase in this recommendation which we all share, and that is that we want to find ways to address the key issues that advance global, social, and economic growth and development. But we have -- as noted by India, we have very divergent views as to how to do it. As one of the business representatives, although business can find merit in new initiatives and talk further about new initiatives with enhancements and strengthening of existing entities, I could not suggest that we could find support for a new body.

But I do want to note the -- what I consider the commonality of concern about addressing issues that are barriers to global, social, and economic growth and development. And I hope in that spirit, when we work on the rest of our recommendations, that we will also be able to put forward other recommendations that we can find consensus on.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Any members? Member on this issue?

Observers?

Do we have remote?

No?

Can I take the proposal from India, and I encourage you to incorporate this recommendation into the opinion to move forward. Thank you.

Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: But with the understanding that it will have models under A and B, and recommendation under C, D, and E, pending the agreement on A and B? This is to be the understanding we create now, not tomorrow. Are we all agreeing on this?

It is better to take a decision now on this approach. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As for taking the decision right now, I would suggest to -- you take it up in one hour's time, when we are going to discuss the draft which has been circulated among members. And probably -- it has been sent out?

So it has been sent out to members.

But I would like you to concentrate -- well, if you didn't receive it, it doesn't -- it -- it will be re-sent. But please do concentrate now on what we are doing, because we have too many issues at the same time in parallel.

So I tried to channel and try to finish with this, E, and then get back to track. And I take up your remark about the agenda. Frankly speaking, I was surprised myself to see that I skipped A. And it was -- in fact, my intention was to treat issues which we haven't treated before. And that was -- that was on my mind, that we should treat B, because we haven't dealt with B at any of our meetings.

So on E -- can we go down to the next one?

We are almost there.

So I can see a draft recommendation from Mexico. Can I have the introduction, please.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This recommendation is addressed to some of the mechanisms, some to the local, national, and regional level, the other is international.

The first part, I see that it's in line with what we were discussing this morning regarding establishment of regional, national multistakeholder forums, which I can work with the group on this first part of our recommendation.

The second part is related to what we think could be a recommendation to strengthen participation, to strengthen at the same time international agencies and have a larger role in cooperation and promoting enhanced cooperation in public policy. So this is what we are presenting to the group.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria.

Any comment on this recommendation?

Yes, Iran.

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

Not this specific comment, but why we give some privilege to international agencies? What are international agencies? There is no definition for international agencies.

Anything more than one country is international, because between two nations. There are thousands of agencies, international agencies should be given a larger role. We have tried to talk of equal footing earlier. We talk of preference in some other area. We should be consistent and we should be neutral. Perhaps we should try to modify the language or not refer to this, and provide the flexibility to create an environment that facilitates -- who put flexibility or inflexibility that we want to give further flexibility. We should address properly what we are dealing with.

For the first part, we have no problem, (indiscernible) and with understanding, not full understanding, with understanding of such context from various stakeholders.

But after that, second paragraph, we need to see why, what is he talking about? Facilitating a -- a better development of information society. These words -- is it necessary, this second paragraph? What message we are giving in second paragraph? Encouraging cooperation and understanding. We don't need to encourage cooperation. We have encourage in the first paragraph, international cooperation. Why establish international cooperation -- so I question, why do we need second paragraph at all?

This is our comments.

Because the message is not clear, and we don't want to give any purpose to any particular more than I don't know what are the international agencies. There are many agencies, including those that we wanted in brackets, I should say, government agencies.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Mexico for this recommendation. We have a question, what are these international cooperation mechanisms in mind, (indiscernible) quickly, adequate local and regional circumstances. Can we ask Mexico this question, what did they have in mind? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Of course you can. And I'm sure Mexico would be just happy to answer.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's what I was explaining in the introduction of this recommendation. It's along the line of the previous suggestion of Avri Doria gave us this morning and it's related to understand the (indiscernible) local differences. And I was talking this morning that it's not the same certain issues for me that probably to my neighbors in the south, I was pointing to the case of Guatemala, for example. That's along that line, to have this understanding of different circumstances and situations and environments.

And the second part probably is I see that international agencies is not an adequate term and it was meant to be mechanisms, processes related to Internet governance, and I see that probably the meaning was not one and it was not reflected what it should have been, but that's what we're trying to convey to the group, that these two issues, one to local and regional circumstances is very important for us and the second one is that already something has been done and we have to strengthen all their -- the activities and all mechanisms we already have. And we've been talking all the morning about those that have differences with us. It's difficult to mention all of them, but we can -- we can work on that and we are flexible enough to redraft this or to accommodate where we see place in some of the other accommodations. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria. With this explanation do you agree that Mexico is -- should I give Mexico a second chance to redraft or to accommodate the observations from other stakeholders? Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Don't know whether the coffee break is a 10 minute or 50 minutes but if you take it about 30 minutes we could sit down with Mexico to see to what extent we could accommodate the thrust of that. Currently the statement is a recommendation. We should try to say endeavor or minimize the -- what -- talking of the minimizing barriers with respect to the local and so on. We should put it in term of recommendation and not statement, and paragraph two I don't think the issue of the multistakeholder process this existed in other recommendation, you will see that. So put it in abeyance. Perhaps we should do something. Maybe after we receive the others, we should listen to the others, maybe we have covered the point. But we are ready to discuss in a 30 minutes coffee break with Brazil -- with Mexico. Sorry, Mexico. Mexico. Both of them are all friends. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As for the agenda, one thing is for sure we are going to have coffee break. Not now but we are going to have coffee break. So I can guarantee you I am not going to mess this up. So I think we have come to the end of the first reading of recommendations in group E. I think it's very promising. And now I would like to turn to the small groups who submitted some modifications or edits to recommendations in group D and E. Who would like to take first the floor to introduce the new text if we have it on the screen? You can start with Japan. I'm sorry. Australia, you wanted to take the floor?

>>AUSTRALIA: Just to introduce this, if you are ready to move on to what's on the screen. Okay. So a small group met at the tail end of the lunch break. We had a look at some text that Japan had very kindly provided in an attempt to combine a number of contributions on the topic of participation on capacity building, and this is what we came up with. Not everybody, obviously, was able to be in the smaller group but we felt we had some really good momentum going and very constructive changes, and I'm quite pleased to present the text and I hope that we have an equally constructive conversation about what's on the screen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia, for this introduction. Can I take it that in the small group you came to a consensus? Thank you. I'm turning to the members of the working group. Do you have any comments? Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman, we were part of that group and I just for completeness, I would suggest that in second line of the second part after via we say comma, inter alia, comma, training and education. So we do not limit to that. So that is just editorial, it is not so critical. Thank you.

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

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. If we can add after "some developing countries within their respective roles and responsibilities" -- up, up, up, first paragraph. And then in the second paragraph "in particular, development of international Internet public policy." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I'm asking you if there are any changes. We still have the consensus? I hope so. Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank Australia, Japan, and Iran for working on this text. I think that the proposal made by Iran was helpful and we think also that the addition proposed by Saudi Arabia on "development of" is something that maybe makes the text clearer. However, we question whether or not there is a need to include this other addition as proposed by Saudi Arabia "within their respective roles and responsibilities." Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Once again, we would like -- we also would like to thank our colleagues from Australia, Japan, Iran, and others who joined to develop this formulation. We have two comments to make.

In the first paragraph at some stage I think we're referring to the financial and technical support. We are presuming that we will at some stage work at a separate paragraph to deal with that particular dimension because it is easy to invoke it but unless we specify, not necessarily pin down but certainly mention possible sources for financial and technical support for realization of this particular paragraph, because as many colleagues in the room have said in the past that they should be actionable. When we talk about actionability of this and financial and technical support damages are not there, this might look half full (indiscernible) and the other half is not.

And the second part of the paragraph -- second paragraph, I think it would be useful to qualify that three things that we're trying to do, capacity building, best practices, and creating an enabling environment, et cetera, we are leading to that different -- to contribute to global Internet governance. I think that -- it only contributes to three things, as we see it. Improves accessibility, improves availability, and affordability of information services. It is not so much that they would -- I mean, if we -- if you look at it from the point of view of this in turn contributing to global Internet governance, well, that could be one interpretation. So the qualified I would like to suggest, if it is possible, after the word "contribute to," contribute in the third line, end of the third line, third line, "contribute to accessibility, availability, and affordability of information services." You could then put -- we can see how these two can be linked. This particular dimension adding to global Internet governance. Because what we are talking about in the earlier part of the paragraph is -- I mean, by way of giving education, training, you know, where there's way of making them participate, I think these are the three aspects we are trying to address. I'll come back to it, Chair, with regard to how we can link this with the idea of global Internet governance. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India, for that. Well, one remark, accessibility in this context might mean accessibility for disabled people. Access means a slightly different thing. Accessibility usually coined as accessibility for disabled people, but I'll leave it to you. Australia would like to take the floor.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry to jump in. I know it's out of tone. But just as by way of background, we were focused in this paragraph on participation and meaningful participation and how

to facilitate that. Just by way of explanation as to why -- and I can totally see where my Indian colleague is coming on this, but our intent here was to focus on participation. So we could work to add these other things or we might want to think about a separate paragraph about accessibility, availability, and affordability to information services, which is a subtly different point to what we were trying to achieve here. But similar language may apply in pursuing that objective as well, so maybe we could talk about how we could use this sort of language in a way that our Iranian colleague was talking about as kind of a standard thing -- language that we have agreed on, if it's amenable to the group, and then maybe look at a different paragraph or we could work on how we could add this in. But it's a subtly different point to the one we were working on previously, just by way of background.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you. Trying to reconcile the two things I can very much understand what the delegate from Australia is trying to say. And I think it is about participation in Internet governance, including development of international Internet public policy issues. So either we stop there, or if we insist in giving examples of public policy issues, which seem to be of greatest interest to developing countries, and see to ensuring affordable access and enhancing use of Internet by all and then we can add other possibilities and accessibility, availability, and affordability of information services in the end as kind of public policy issues which are being highlighted and not there. Because there I agree that it's unclear whether the contribution is for making the services available or participation in Internet governance and Internet public policies. And if this is being done I would also like to add accessibility, availability, affordability, and localization of information services and then bring it to the end of the sentence which I hope would solve the problem with structure. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank, Parminder. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we agree with our distinguished colleague from India, but perhaps we should alleviate the situation by after "environment" in the second line, introduce a round bracket and for the time being delete (indiscernible) change, for the time being, delete "via inter alia training and education," close round bracket after education, close round bracket, in order to, and then the square bracket in the fourth line, you take it from there, you put it at the end of the last line, then we say "not limited to ensuring" and put "accessibility, availability, and affordability" and then -- "and enhancing use of the Internet." So please take that portion, yeah, and after "ensuring," you introduce that portion, you have taken because affordability is already there, okay, so information, "ensuring accessibility, availability, and affordability, localization of information service," I don't -- you really -- you don't -- you put it elsewhere. And "enhancing use of the -- "with the view to enhance the use of the Internet by all." "With a view to enhance." This "localization of information" I think we have to either delete it or put it elsewhere. So now I think the sentence covers, because as our distinguished colleague from India mentioned, the building capacity is not only training, it's inter alia training and education. Then the second -- so in particular "development of international," I don't think you need to -- leave the round bracket -- the square bracket. "Development of" proposal is okay without the square bracket. I think it is nothing wrong with that. And then availability. The only thing remains to the last portion availability, I think to "localization of information services," you take it out

from there and then leave the sentence. "Ensuring accessibility, availability, and affordability," delete -- change "affordable access to" and then delete also that one and delete "and with a view" or "with a view," doesn't matter, "with a view" to "enhancing use of the Internet by all." And then this localization, you put it maybe here. The one you have deleted something about localization of -- can you -- okay. Maybe you put and or something, "and localization of information services." So this is the -- let us say a rough editing. We have to align that. So I think the point of colleagues are covered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: United States Peter, I can't.

Maybe I'm losing my hearing, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

Thank you. First of all, I participated in this drafting group. So I want to thank my colleagues from Iran certainly, Australia, Japan, and others, for their participation and assistance not only in the drafting group, but also now as we're considering it here. And thank Iran particularly for many of those clarifying edits that I think are very helpful.

I have -- I'd like to also support Sweden in their comment regarding the addition in the first paragraph with regard to "within their respective roles and responsibilities," because this -- I just want to remind the group that on Australia's point earlier, that this is really focused on participation and in -- growing participation in Internet governance. And so it seems overly restrictive in that use in that way.

Secondly, with some of the new edits here, I wonder if we could get clarification on the addition of localization of information services and what the intent there is with -- you know, in the discussion of accessibility, availability, and affordability, which are all, of course, very familiar to us and all laudable goals here. But I just wonder what the intent on localization of information services there, if we could get some clarification on that.

Thank you.

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

Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I have the same question on localization of information services. I'd like some clarification on that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I see there's a slight concern about -- in paragraph 1, "within their respective roles and responsibilities," and in the second paragraph, some concern about the new text "and localization of information services." Can we deal with the second one first, that is, localization of information services, what it means and how we can insert it into the text.

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Position in the text is fine with me, and trying to explain the intention or the meaning behind this term, is that -- I mean, that's how we see development, accessibility, availability, and affordability is never enough. The models have to be locally owned, locally contextualized, multilingualism, services which take into account local languages, local context, et cetera. That is always important, and not just availability and affordability. It's typical development language that you have localization as well, apart from availability and accessibility.

I can clarify further if there's a specific question.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: (Indiscernible) related to "within their respective roles and responsibilities," do you insist to have the text?

You do. Okay.

Avri.

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

I wanted to thank Sweden and the U.S. for their bringing up the issues within their respective roles and responsibilities.

In the normal case -- and we're putting that phrase in many places, even though at the beginning of the document, it is something that will have already been discussed, and the issues have been brought up many times, that this is an issue that many of the stakeholders in Internet governance and in all of these processes have a very large problem with. It's not only a limiting thing. Every time it's in there, it comes off as a very patronizing and limiting of saying, but some of you stakeholders do not have the ability to participate as the others. And it's seen that way by myself and by many others from civil society, from technical community, perhaps from business. I haven't asked them. But certainly I've asked in the others.

So I really am concerned, and especially, as was mentioned in this case, where we're talking about increased participation, but yet then we add in a phrase that limits that participation.

So in addition to being very, very troubled not only by its inclusion here, but by its continual insertion in just about every possible paragraph, I just really want to bring up that that is something that makes the effort that we're doing somewhat unpalatable, somewhat difficult to say, "Yes, you know, this is a document we would be able to support at the end of the day."

Going beyond that, if we're going to talk, "in order to enable" -- in the second paragraph, "to enable developing countries," I would request that we put, "in order to enable all stakeholders from developing countries," because we -- again, we're talking about increased participation, not trying to limit things.

So if we're going to have to put in limitations everywhere, we're also going to have to put in words to de- -- to, basically, eliminate those limitations.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

I think Iran, and U.S.

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

Let me share with you the difficulty we've had for similar, but not exactly the same, similar issue elsewhere.

In WSIS + 10, we had the discussions on the human rights. There was idea that some people, they wanted to put "human rights" in every and all paragraphs. Some other people say that it should be relevant to the paragraph, unsuited to the paragraph. What we did, we tried to mention it once somewhere, at the beginning or whatever, and tried to see this is a chapeau and we don't need to repeat it everywhere.

So perhaps the proposal of Saudi Arabia is quite relevant. We could not deny what is here, because this is something that set up a (indiscernible). So we could mention somewhere, maybe in the preamble or somewhere, that in addressing the issue of Internet or international Internet public policy issue, attention to be made, or it is worth to mention the paragraph, the content of paragraph 69 of the WSIS, which mentioned inter alia the role and responsibilities of whether you talk stakeholders or so on and so forth. So we have to mention that, something very important.

But in every paragraph, we should see if it is fitted, yes, we do that. If it is not fitted, and if it is agreed by everybody. I have no problem to put it here. And talking about this.

This is first point.

Second point, Chairman, I have difficulty with the location of information service. Because even with explanation, the meaning is not clear. We should not write for ourselves. We should write for the readers.

If the reader reads that one and asks, what is the location of information services, we should not ask somebody to go and explain them. It should be self-explanatory.

I suggest -- I think, not suggest, I think that the availability is almost embodied in the localization of information services. Perhaps we don't need to refer to that here, because it does not properly suit in this paragraph. It requires explanations, interpretations. It may add more confusion than solving any problems and may not contribute to the essence of recommendations.

So perhaps if distinguished colleagues agree, we may not refer to that, and put (indiscernible) after by all.

But the responsibilities, we are open. One way would be to put it once at the beginning of the paragraph in the preamble to cover all issues. And this is something very important. Or if you put in every paragraph. That is up to the colleagues. But I just wanted to, by way of suggestions, to say what we had in WSIS + 10 to resolve the issue. Otherwise, we have every paragraph discussions, reactions. And that is that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran, for your second suggestion is deleting the and localization of information services.

Is it agreeable, with the explanation we got from Iran that this is eventually not fully understood by all the readers? Maybe GPS users can be clear about it, but -- as far as localization. But I'm not really sure.

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I was just having a conversation on the side with the Australian delegate on the same issue. And we proposed that probably we can -- I think it's very important and I would like to impress on my colleagues here also that services need to be in the context of the -- I mean, I remember Mexico was talking about context, local context, and Guatemala being indiscernible) different from Mexico. And this is what is the issue of -- (indiscernible) Internet is information services, 80% of it. And we are talking about local context, local languages, local cultures and things being appropriate to that. And, therefore, it's not just availability on the tap of Internet and you put it on and the Internet flows, but what use people make of it, what relevance it has to their lives and how their lives can be improved by those services. And the idea here is the two parts: Adaptation, local adaptation and local innovation. If it doesn't make the sentence too long, I think these were the two things which we talked could further explicate the thing. But perhaps the sentence is already too long. So that's my submission, and I'll leave it to the group to decide.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

By suggesting what you suggested in your intervention sounds much better than "localization of information." Localization may be misleading, especially for French-speaking people.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: -- need to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You suggested to spell it out.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So probably even if it's longer, and if you insist to have it in, probably let's -- let's make it clear to the reader.

I can see a lot of flags. About ten minutes ago, we were almost close to accept the recommendation. But I can see Nigeria, Sweden, I think Victoria, Ellen, United States.

Okay. So we are getting there.

Saudi Arabia, yeah.

By the way, before I give the floor to Nigeria, there was a proposal from Iran, and I take up this proposal, to have chapeaus in front of the recommendations. Basically, that was the practice we followed in the previous working group. We had a set of recommendations which was preceded by a chapeau.

And as Iran pointed out very correctly, the chapeau can play the role of giving general information so, eventually, with the agreement of Saudi Arabia, if we take his idea and put it in a chapeau, let it be in front of the group of recommendations or let it be in the bulk of the -- of the report. Is it agreeable that we delete it from here?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, we agree, Mr. Chairman, but the language should not disagree with the chapeau. That's the important thing.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: (Inaudible), then Sweden, then Ellen, then United States, and Iran.

Nigeria, please.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yeah, with respect of the first paragraph submitted by the colleague from Australia, I understand the words she is saying, that is talking about the local ownership of Internet (indiscernible). But the aspect I want a little bit of clarification, we are not quite clear, based on the belief and understanding that we make recommendations that are achievable, is this issue that keeps on featuring, like it says, "including through financial and technical support." So the financial aspect of it, how is that achievable? And how -- probably if that is included in the recommendation, how do we go about making that an achievable issue?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigeria, for reminding us on the intervention of India, who brought up this issue, I think, just a couple of minutes ago. And with the idea behind that eventually we should have some recommendations about it and indicate how we think it should be implemented, which is quite a challenge.

So Mexico, Sweden, Ellen, United States, Iran, Saudi Arabia.

Mexico, please.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. Quick that we agree on having the chapeau, and then we can delete the -- in the first paragraph, the wording of -- within brackets.

And the second paragraph, we agree with to enable all stakeholders from developing countries. That's very important.

And the third question I wanted to say is that this localization that was proposed by Parminder, maybe we can rethink it in Mexico's proposals for section E, 'cause that's relevant for -- also for what we were trying to convey with our recommendation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, we would like to thank Mr. Arasteh for his excellent drafting work. We think that now the paragraph reads much better. And we also think that it's a good suggestion to try to refer to the relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda in a chapeau, and maybe to make it very clear in such a chapeau that nothing in this report or in these recommendations intend to contradict or overrule in any -- or change in any way the Tunis Agenda. Maybe that's language that would give comfort to us all, because that's not within the mandate of this group. We are here to clarify and to give recommendations on how to implement, but not how to change or rewrite or in any way contradict the Tunis Agenda. So we think that's also a very wise proposal, and we would be happy looking at text for that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I realize I'm coming behind a few interventions now, but, first of all, I'd like to thank Parminder for his explanation, which does provide some very good context for the intent of development of local content and local innovation, which, of course, we support and concur with you, Chair, that the use of the term "localization" is confusing and misleading. So we also thank you for that comment, but also, Mr. Arasteh for his very helpful drafting suggestions that are quite helpful for this purpose.

If -- There may be -- If this wording in here that -- "to achieve the local adaptation and innovation" is still in brackets, we'll take a look at it, but I definitely think that that's an improvement. And we can accommodate that here or in another recommendation, if that makes more sense, either for length or understandability.

In principle, I -- we would support an approach for chapeau language and support Sweden's suggestion that it would not reflect a way that does not contradict the Tunis Agenda. And I would just say or the spirit of recommendations that go particularly to expanding participation in some of the input that we

had received in these suggestions for increasing participation by developing countries and removing barriers, et cetera.

Thank you, Chair.

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

Let me ask all of you if you agree to remove the square brackets.

And we are almost done.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: My understanding my text goes after the text "all the stakeholders from developing." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I wanted to comment on this local adaptation question. I'm still not clear on this language. I'm particularly concerned about the use of the term "information services" here that has a particular legal meaning in the U.S. that I think would be confusing, so I would suggest we go talk about the Internet, I guess, if that's what we mean.

The other thought I had on this section is that if we look at the recommendation I think we reached agreement on that's right before this one we did right before lunch, number 3. It addresses the need for local resources and local content and local innovation, and it may be better placed there. So it may help if we look at both of those recommendations together. At any rate I think it needs further clarification as it's written right now.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, let's just read the paragraph thoroughly and with caution. The second part that starts "in particular," please kind listen. "In particular, development of international Internet public policy issues" forget about including and go to the "along local adaptations and innovation regarding information services" doesn't fit there. It doesn't fit there. So we should read the whole sentence after "in particular." I have no problem with local adaptations. You could put it elsewhere. But I have difficulty along -- this is not along. Maybe "with due regard" but not along. "with due regard to" and then after "local adaptation," then "regarding -- I don't understand "local adaptation regarding information service." It's still not very clear in this paragraph. So perhaps we should try to see whether it fits here or not. That is number one.

My second point is what the issue raised by Saudi Arabia. We have addressed in other recommendations local or national, regional Internet governance and so on and so forth consultations. Why in every paragraph people wants to have all the stakeholders everywhere? I don't think we need that. This is talking about developing countries and it is not up to us to say that -- Chairman, please kindly carefully read. When you say undertake is the most strongest term. Is more than shall.

Undertake. Can you -- can somebody recommend that in any developing country that all the stakeholders without any exceptions to participate with regard to undertaking of that or (indiscernible) to the environment situations or circumstances and so on and so forth. Chairman, I suggest that at least if the people want coffee, let's take this one adapted -- approved by us before coffee and we delete all stakeholders from, the square bracket to a square bracket I'm content, and put everything along the -- the part you mentioned after innovations and so on and so forth, adaptation. This -- that one doesn't fit here. We could look at that one along local adaptation and innovation regarding information service. Separate that, put it at end of somewhere and replace along "with due regard" and then we have to find other place for that, but not here. At least it doesn't fit in this paragraph. Maybe a separate paragraph. Attention also should be gone to the fact that (indiscernible) but not this paragraph. So I suggest that we try to finalize this paragraph, these two paragraphs and not everybody agrees and with the preamble that along the line what Sweden said but not so general. Expressly mentioning paragraph which refers to the roles and responsibilities with respect to the Internet -- international Internet public policy issues so we can come up with some sort of language we have in agreement. So that is my suggestion, Mr. Chairman. Please delete this portion along adaptation, so on and so forth, and put it elsewhere and change along "with due regard." Thank you. And that part after is deleted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Provided we are going to delete it, do you have any suggestion where we should put it? Not necessarily in this recommendation but probably in some recommendation? Is it agreeable? No, it's not agreeable. Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: I'm hoping I might have a very simple solution that could assist with this. So if we have including but not limited to -- the first thing we're saying is ensuring accessibility, availability, and affordability" and keep the comma. And the second thing we're saying "and fostering local adaptation and innovation regarding" and we may want to discuss information services because I believe there was a colleague in the room that raised some concerns about that term. But if you include fostering as opposed to "with due regard to" it may resolve some of the concerns that my Iranian colleague had, but I would be interested in hearing his views on that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia. You didn't use the Australian method. Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I think we're going in the right direction. I think if we could delete "regarding information services" it would say "with due regard to local adaptation and innovation," which may be adequate.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So "fostering" or "with due regard to." Any preference? No preference. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, local adaptation to what? To the market? Local adaptation to environment? Local adaptation to green grass? Local adaptation to what? We have to be careful. We have to have something. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Given that my I thought simple solution isn't a simple solution, I am now suggesting the Australian method. If we can't come to some kind of conclusion about this, and it seems to be a Parminder (indiscernible), but let's maybe work separately with Parminder to try to find some language that deals with this maybe in a separate paragraph. And I'm happy to work with him to find the right language, if that is amenable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia. Is it acceptable that we have a further paragraph to accommodate your suggestion?

>>PARMINDER: Yes, it is. I think this is not a major issue and with Australia and Iran we can try to sort it out and either remove it or change it in the next break, if that's acceptable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think our preference would be to go with a combination of the Australian and Iranian method, which is harvesting this now and then have coffee and then we can discuss the additional point on information services for -- in a separate paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: There's consensus as for the coffee. And so I propose -- you said 30 minutes? You need 30 minutes, Kavouss? To discuss outstanding issues? Okay, 30 minutes? We'll be back 10 past 5:00.

>> Please do. Australia should defend the Australian method. Thank you.

[break]

>> Chairman, Australia gave this chocolate to me as a small bribery that I agree with the paragraph. I give it to you as another type of bribery that you agree with this paragraph and transition of the stewardship of eating the chocolate. Thank you.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So it's really time for coffee. Are we agreed on that? Yes? Okay. Good. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. And thank you for your patience. I know that I've promised you after 12:00. Well, we are still after 12:00.

Yes.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Indeed, you did, Chair. You promised me after 12:00, and after 4:00. You just didn't tell me which day it was going to be on. That's all.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I still hope it will be today.

Saudi Arabia.

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

The original Mexican language included the word "establishing international cooperation mechanisms." This is -- was my point, to come and change the word "strengthen." The original language was "establishing." So I would insist on "establishing or developing international cooperation mechanisms."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Can I deviate from the speaking order?

Mexico, I can give you the order.

(Audio problem for scribe.)

(Dropped audio.)

>> -- deleting the word "international," that's one possibility, and then come down and say delete the two words "enhanced cooperation" there and say "in developing countries -- "in development of international public policy issues." Then we make it neutral where -- and then the context is not -- is to be spelled out, which cooperation mechanisms we're talk about. If you want to actually take the meat of this paragraph but if you see this in a compromise, which can make some -- many happy, I think this is perhaps one way of it and then we can have the word, whichever word you want to use should not affect the rest of the paragraph. Develop cooperation mechanisms or strengthen, I think in this case even using the word "develop" should not create a problem for colleagues in the room who believe that it would mean creating new mechanisms. Developing cooperation mechanisms and it is not said in the easy per se but more to do with international public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'll let you think about it. (indiscernible). Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The word "develop" is covering that something may exist, you developed that. Established means nothing exists, you start from zero. Develop does not necessarily mean it starts from zero. Something exists, you develop, further develop that and so on and so forth. That is the situation. So I just may help the people, you may put both of them, develop and -- sentence, you may put that develop. Establishing is quite difficult to accept from the Mexican proposal because you're saying that nothing exists. No one could say that there is no mechanism exists at all for any cooperation. There are something. Maybe it is not documented, maybe it is not official, but you could not say there is nothing at all. That is why the word is put there. You want to put "develop," develop also is covering something exists. You further develop that. Or maybe said development or further development or something like that in order to cover the point, not to say only a strengthening. Instead of strengthen put further development or development. But it is not establishing. "Establishing" means absolutely nothing.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank India for constructive contribution. And along the lines of what Iran just said, we would be able to go along with this if we would have "further develop," or maybe as an alternative, to have "develop existing cooperation mechanisms."

That would give us more comfort.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Any other comments?

We still have some scribe records.

Can I suggest you take the words "further develop existing cooperation mechanisms." Will that be acceptable?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I think after listening to Mr. Aristeh "further develop cooperation mechanisms" is acceptable without "existing."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it okay?

You can remove the scribe records.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Just a couple of grammatical points I think which may help the recommendation.

There's barriers in participation. I believe there's barriers to participation of developing countries in the development.

And then I guess my question is -- it's more of a question, but I don't know -- are policy issues developed or is policy developed?

And then it's probably -- either issue -- issues should either be plural or it should be dropped and it should be the development of international-related public policy. As constructed, it doesn't make sense.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's always frustrating to have someone -- it's always frustrating to have someone from a strong language background.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, I have no problem with "issue" to be deleted at the end.

But the question is that with the explanation that I have given, and one country which is economy number one in the world one day, ten years ago, they said that we are also developing country, because we develop every day. So don't take us as developed. We are developing.

Do we need "further" at the beginning? "Developed" means something existing. You develop that. We are not saying "establish." So do we need "further" just a question that -- in order for people to be happy, just as a suggestion.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. Let me reformulate your question.

Does it hurt to have the "further"? I don't believe it does.

Sweden, then Saudi Arabia.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Actually, I think that Saudi Arabia was before us.

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

We would keep the word "issues." So return "issues."

And, again, honestly, reading this recommendation is -- it is not very clear to me, to be honest "further develop cooperation" -- for me, at least, knowledge, it is not very clear to me. Maybe we do need more time to look at this until tomorrow.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden, do you want to take the floor? No, not really?

Saudi Arabia, when you're talking about more time, can I measure it in seconds?

I don't really want to rush you.

I want to emphasize that I think a comfortable time and effort has been invested and we have come to some kind of text or language which is acceptable and makes no harm.

Can I ask you to accept the text as is?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Mr. Chairman, let us be very clear. Accepting -- I mean, we did go with -- we do have flexibilities to accept such languages, with the understanding that our models will be reflected.

So I know we do have some recommendations under the barriers. It was not reflected, I mean, in its entirety, so I find it difficult for Saudi Arabia to go with such recommendation addressing one element of the barrier.

We can go along with this, but I need -- we need to look at the entire report, the entire set of recommendations. If this is the understanding, I will not stop the consensus.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As I mentioned to you and to other members of the group in the previous working group, we worked with the principle of drafting recommendations. And at the end, we had the report with the recommendations as one document. So it means that in case we accept everything. So that is the idea behind I would like to follow here as well.

But we will have the report in case there's an agreement on the whole report.

Having said that, is it acceptable like that?

Because we have to build up piece by piece. That's clear.

Iran.

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

Perhaps maybe we could provisionally agree to that to see the whole text, the other parts. Because now we're dealing with a piecemeal approach, we see the text one by one, but we have to see all of them to have a look to see to what extent. So maybe for the time being, in order to enable you to go to the two other drafting groups that they have prepared something and to maybe come back to that, provisionally, I go with that to see what are the others. Because they are repetitive in many areas. Maybe overlapping or maybe, as Saudi Arabia mentioned, this is the only text with barriers, maybe the other text, no. Where are the other text with barriers. Is it the only barriers to local adaptation or there are barriers? Or how we partition barriers with respect to participation?

Is there some something here? Yeah.

So let us do that, Chairman. Provisionally, I agree with that to come back to that to see whether we need to look at the whole barriers or not. Because now, all of the participation of developing countries or in the developing countries, whether they are seen as a barrier or not. But if it is the only text for barriers, we don't know yet. So let's take provisionally and go to the others and come back to that, if Mr. Rushton still could stay with us.

>> (Off mic.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India.

>>INDIA: Chair, I -- we agree with your approach that we are obviously agreeing at different places, and there are different ideas. So it's useful to go -- you follow this approach. Since there are these

issues, different types of concerns that colleagues have in the room, the standard format we do is "agreed ad referendum," a-d. That means we'll come back and look at it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So how do I do it? In square brackets?

Well, I think we have agreed on that, with the notion that we are going to discuss the other issues and come back.

Okay. So we have two other drafting groups, if I'm not mistaken.

Avri, you don't want to offer something for us?

>>AVRI DORIA: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, thank you, yes, we did. And I sent it. And I believe it's up on the screen. Is that the one?

Yes, that's the one.

And, first of all, I want to thank -- it almost feels like being at an award show. But I want to thank certainly Iran, the United States, Saudi Arabia, all the observers, and everyone that came along to help us with this language. So, hopefully, -- Okay.

So we basically -- we basically -- and, hopefully, it is -- actually scans properly in English.

So reinforces the multistakeholder approach and encourages all stakeholders to engage more in, to work with existing organizations and to explore ways in which stakeholder engagement can be enhanced, including the following recommendations:

So the first, the development of national bottom-up strategies which use local expertise and focus on telecommunications and Internet infrastructure, enabling policies, incentives and education for all.

Second, reduce interconnection costs for developing countries, including reduction of the cost on Internet access for users in those countries.

Third, work with marginalized communities to develop local content in their own language that meets their needs in order to assist them in accessing online spaces, public information, and essential services in a safe and inclusive way, as well as raising general awareness of the online threats and the discrimination that these communities face by sharing their experiences.

Almost a runon sentence.

Include the issues of marginalized communities -- Okay. That's wrong. It's ensure. Sorry, that's my mistyping.

Ensure the issues of marginalized communities are on the agendas of Internet governance processes.

And, finally, to promote to the greatest extent possible the equal participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete action to achieve this goal.

And the last one remains as was. And it is still bracketed. And we actually did not discuss the unbracketing.

Or disbracketing.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I can see that there is no measurement for the last recommendation. You can't see it from the back. So can we have bigger font?

Please speak up if you can't see it.

Okay.

Take your time.

Okay. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks to the facilitators and the participants in this small group for --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Excuse me, Sweden.

Yes, Avri.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: This is better?

Okay. Yes, Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Okay. So thanks to Avri and Iran and U.S. and others that have drafted this, redrafted this text, we think it's a very valuable (indiscernible). We just have one issue, and it's regarding the last bullet point on this page "promote, to the greatest extent practicable, the equal participation of women" and then it continues. We do not see why we need to add this language on "to the extent practicable." The recommendation, in our view, would read much better if we would just have "promote the equal participation of women in Internet governance spaces and to take concrete actions to achieve this goal." That would be a much stronger and, in our view, better message to send on this very, very important topic of gender equality. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. I think it's very useful. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. It's a preference but exactly the same point as Sweden said was why I was -- I fully support it. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Any other comment from members? Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: I just wanted to chime in and voice my support with Sweden's last intervention. We very much support that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see Richard asking for the floor for about half an hour ago.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry, Chairman. No, I think it's just editorial and might be helpful. It was about the previous one. If you could scroll back. You have suggested --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just let --

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, go back to that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it acceptable like that? Yes, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. English language is a specific particular language. Sometimes definitive articles may have different meanings and so on and so forth. I remember in 2010 in one conference the United States says that why we need "the" before particular words. And the French language says that because in French we have difficulty to translate that, so do we need "the" before the multistakeholder? When you say "the" that means there's a specific approach. Still this approach is under the development if we look at that and do we need that one. And then, I apologize that what is "the enforce" is the correct term or we should have something else. That is one point. And don't be worried -- don't worry about this.

And then coming to the last paragraph, "promote," in fact, I also suggest that it's intractable. Does it mean that if the ladies are more than men we should delete a number of the ladies, say no you are not allowed because you are 60% and the men are 40%? We don't know. This is the source of human rights that no, you don't have the right. In many areas, just in telecommunication department in our country, ladies are more than men. Number of ladies are 64% of the total in (indiscernible). They occupied all the posts. So do we say no, no, you don't have rights, 50%. Why we -- "to the extent practicable" is looking into the conditions according to the case and so on and so forth. So you should not delete that possibility. And sometimes it is difficult to send this participation equally, equally. You don't find. What do you do? You say no. You reduce the number of men because there are five ladies, seven men so you reduce two of them by five, but two who's qualified doesn't go? Why -- why is it bothering to this practicable? Some people they can do it, they can do nothing to prevent them. Some of the people according to the case, the conditions. I don't think that this qualifications or qualifying sentence could bother. I think we should be very careful if you want any dinner at home to talk about this paragraph. Otherwise you will be punished, no dinner.

(Laughter)

Or no -- I don't know. Lunch. Not dinner only. No breakfast. We should be very careful. This is an area we should be careful of. This one and language, when we talk about language, because a quick -- agree with that, more comfortable "to the extent practicable." Not greatest. Take out greatest. "To the extent practicable." Just down to "to the extent practicable." I hope Saudi Arabia would agree with me, and say "to the extent practicable" and that is that. Maybe some different cases to this one. And one

idea also that the paragraph before that, "to ensure that the issues of marginalized are in the agendas" the word was to include, not ensure. We cannot ensure anything. Ensure is a very strong word. So we take -- "to include the issue of marginalized communities in the agenda of," I have no problem. But at first what we used was to include, but not to ensure. And these are the two things. And I just open to further discussions, but I suggest that Chairman you take "to the extent practicable" we do comma and delete and square bracket around that and go to the other paragraph to see. And the last paragraph which has a square bracket to -- what was the last one? You have something with -- yeah, this one. "Encourages the establishment of regional and national multistakeholder forums and processes of dealing with IG." What's IG? Internet governance? "And Internet policy issues and ensuring that these include marginalized" -- I think the sentence was better without this. Or maybe I was too tired. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. I hope we still have dinner after this discussion. I think the "promote" word just takes care of your concern. That's my feeling. So if we go to this last paragraph "promote," I think it does take care of your concern. And you don't -- and the ladies in the telecommunication department don't have to fear. And I believe as well -- and this is wishful thinking -- but I wish that would be the greatest concern, that women outnumber men, but I'm afraid that is not the case in general. I can see Sweden, Mexico, Ellen, Avri. And Australia.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think in 2014 it's not so easy to know who's cooking at home.

(Laughter)

It varies, I think.

[Applause]

But -- but I think you -- Chairman, you put it very well. I think that we are not after, let's say, quotation here or -- we are after promoting gender equality. Like you said, the word "promote" takes care of the concerns that you might have in specific cases, as was the case with the telecommunication ministry in Iran and so on. I don't think that's at all the intent by -- with this -- with this recommendation, to micromanage in any way specific institutions or companies or whatever it would be. It's more about promoting gender equality, and I think that's very clear from the context. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. And as you can see, we support the proposal to include the issues of marginalized communities. And as you can see I brought some resources from the human rights in order to post to the proposal of having this drafting to the extent possible because we don't even know how to translate that into Spanish. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I wanted to look at the third bullet. I feel like it lost some of its original meaning. To me it originally read like we were trying to encourage content creation in local languages.

And now it feels like we are limiting the kind of content creation that we would like to see. So I would like -- I have two thoughts about how to do that -- fix that. One might be to end the sentence after "needs" so it says "work of marginalized communities to develop local content in their own language that meets their needs." An alternative might be to say in order to -- actually I'm going to stop there. I think that's the best approach.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen, is that reflected on the screen, what you said?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Yes. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One question, what is the agendas of Internet governance processes? (indiscernible) now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Are you asking me? I turn to Avri. That was a question. Can you repeat your question, please?

>>AVRI DORIA: Can you please repeat your question?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia can you repeat the question?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. My question was, what is the agendas of Internet governance processes? Thank you.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Each of the Internet governance processes that I know of has an agenda of topics that are to be covered, and in this case we are suggesting that the topics related to marginalized peoples and such be included in the agendas of these various organizations. And that those suggestions take place as opposed to being out of scope.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is this okay?

>>AVRI DORIA: It was suggested to me by Marilyn just now that perhaps "work programs" would be a better terminology than "agendas." I know sometimes agendas is used as a negative word.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right.

>>AVRI DORIA: It wasn't meant as that. It's just that there is an agenda. We review the agenda at the beginning of every meeting.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think you were asking for the floor.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, I was also asking for the floor. Okay, I just didn't realize. Okay. In the first place, I understand the removal of "the." I believe an article is necessary. The multistakeholder approach is a general approach. It's not specifying any specific model, but one could just as easily say a multistakeholder approach, if one wants to not limit it to, you know, anything. But I do believe that we need an article there.

I'm concerned about -- and this is what I had gone over to speak about, I'm concerned about in the third bullet in terms of marginalized communities that meet their needs that there's a lot of specificity in the part that's been bracketed that I believe is important in terms of the accessing online spaces, public information, essential services, in a safe and inclusive way and as well as raising general awareness of the online threats and the discrimination that these communities face. You know, by sharing their -- so I'm concerned that a lot of the content is lost. I understand the well meaning of the needs and that those things are all needs, but I believe without specifying in this case perhaps those needs won't be immediately apparent. So I wanted to bring that up.

On the include, I think that is -- is a good correction for the discussion we had as it was -- as I was reading it, I had left out the word "to" whereas I thought I had actually put in the wrong word. So it was my mistake in the correcting of my reading, and then I'm very supportive of the notion of removing the phrase "to the greatest extent possible" but I would be very uncomfortable with including "to the extent possible" without "greatest." So if we were to go back to including what has been bracketed, I would wish to argue for including the word "greatest" as well. But I -- but I -- I'm perfectly happy with the removal of the phrase. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Chairman. Yes, having dinner has nothing to do with cooking. Even if you cook as a man, to have a dinner you have the permission of the lady, your boss. If you have a different approach that is different. But the main boss is there. Whether you admit it or not admit it, it is so. That is a joke. Don't take it serious.

Now, coming back to the situation, I -- I'm happy that the author of the recommendation agreed that -- to say "to include to the extent practicable" and I can assure my distinguished colleague from Mexico there are more than 40 places in the ITU that "to the extent practicable" has been properly translated in Spanish, French, Chinese, Russian, and other languages. So I can show her they are. Because I have -- I have done that many time, "to the extent practicable," as appropriate. So there is.

Now coming back to the beginning. Could we say "further explore" instead of "reinforce"? At the beginning, bullet one. Yeah. "Further explore." Because reinforcement has different connotation, different meanings and so on. Reinforcement of the law and so on, so have legal connotation. "Further explore." And then where it say -- in fact, want to say a multistakeholder or the multistakeholder, that is another case. So further goes to remove some of the discussions. And I don't think we need the accommodations at the end of the chapeau. Includes the following. Because the whole thing is a recommendation. You don't need to talk about recommendation again. So without the last paragraph we have not discussed that, so I am happy to discuss that if you want to discuss, encourage. I thought we talk of national multistakeholder forums or fora, no problem. But talk of regional, it may be more difficult. National is no problem. To promote, not to encourage. To promote, encourage, but no problem if national. If you talk of regional, I don't know whether we go beyond that or not. As we discuss that, the meeting was national. You leave it to the country, you promote -- you ask them, you encourage them to promote the -- in fact, every country start to do that, this national consultations. So

this is a multistakeholder forums in the terms of consultations with the public. So respond to do that. So that is my suggestion, that we (indiscernible). But the first one, we prefer to say to "further explore." Either the existing multistakeholder or multistakeholder approach but not to "reinforce." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Two quick comments.

In third bullet, we would prefer it written idea contained in the later part of the sentence. I think it will be too shortened. There are very important messages that are coming out in that later part.

And second one, I just realized that the Human Rights Council in -- one floor up has just been closed. If they had all been there, they would have come down trooping into this room to look at the bullet on the next page. They would have taken great offense to the characterization of this particular first bullet.

I think we will go home happy if you say, "promote greater participation of women." I think it will take away all other characterizations, "extent possible," "equal," and "equal." Because as it stands, it can be slightly objectionable by way -- if you're saying extent practicable, greatest extent practicable. I think we might just say promote greater participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete action. That will be an easy solution to this.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I have a new idea on the third bullet that will keep all of that language.

Perhaps after "needs," we say, "Including content" -- or maybe just "including." Let me just read it.

-- that meets their needs -- "Including content which will," and then take out "in order to."

And then keep the list. But then the list is not limiting. It's things we're calling out. But any content is included.

Is that better?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Can we go up -- yeah.

So this is a chapeau under a set of recommendations or a recommendation, including recommendations. Really, so if the recommendation is under the chapeau, so let us delete this chapeau. And you have this set of recommendations. It's confusing. A recommendation under a recommendation.

This is one.

The second one, again my question regarding the Internet governance agendas. My understanding of the Internet governance process says that it's two processes. One is enhanced cooperation, and the other is IGF. So it is not very clear to me what is meant by "Internet governance agendas." It is not very clear to me, either, I think to the reader.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Avri, would you like to reply?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On several things. First of all, on the "to further explore," I do believe that that's gone too far in the other direction. If "reinforces" is a difficult word, there -- you know, something intermediate would be "to promote." I mean, we talked about promoting. So that would be -- because "further exploration" could just be let's go look at it and do nothing.

Now, in terms of this, this is one recommendation that has multiple aspects to it, multiple parts. It's not one recommendation with several subordinate recommendations. It's one recommendation that has a set of content. And so therefore I really don't think it's very confusing. The top is not a chapeau. The top is the overall recommendation. The points are the specific -- the specifics of that recommendation so that it isn't just empty words. And I did have one -- I think the including content which will assist them in an improving edit. So I'm very grateful for that.

So was there one more question that I haven't answered?

>> Agenda.

>>AVRI DORIA: The agendas. As -- Thank you.

There -- that the agendas -- We've talked several times about -- and it's been a current through this, that part of where enhanced cooperation is done beyond the body that people talk about that has not received support is using the current Internet governance processes.

Now, we talked about changing the word "agendas" for -- you know, as Marilyn had recommended a different word, "into their work programs," so that the "agenda" word was not troubling. But the point is that we are using the existing Internet governance mechanisms in order to achieve these, so therefore I think it's appropriate to specify that those work programs would need to be specifically -- that you would need to specifically include these issues in their work programs for anything to happen on these issues.

So I'd like to argue for that notion staying in of, if we want to get something done concretely, we've got to include it in the work programs of existing Internet governance programs.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Next is Iran.

Yes, Iran.

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

With respect to the gender balance and gender issue, we would perhaps take both proposals, initial one and what was proposed by India, saying that to promote gender balance in terms of greater participation of women.

So we remain within the Tunis Agenda, gender balance is referred to, and then "in terms of greater participation" as proposed by India.

So perhaps that could resolve the issue of some colleagues, and they -- including "the extent practicable" is something that we should maintain.

Having chapeau or not having chapeau, it depends on whether you want to refer to multistakeholder or you don't want to refer to multistakeholder. If you delete the chapeau, we do not have any reference to multistakeholder. And if you start the recommendation itself, it could go. But if you want, you have to put something within the framework of multistakeholder approach and go to the following. So both versions are possible.

But start to further amend the chapeau, it would be very, very difficult now, because we are converting your meeting to a drafting group with the existing organizations and -- So one way would be "within the framework of multistakeholder approach." Please don't touch that. Copy that and put it underneath as an alternative, because if you touch that, it will be unreadable totally.

Okay. "Within the framework" -- Sorry. "Within the framework of multistakeholder approach, explore ways and means" -- "explore ways and means by which" or "in which stakeholders' engagement could be enhanced, taking into account of the following."

That is -- could be one chapeau as alternative. A little bit more simpler. So we have no problem to delete the chapeau. We have no problem to maintain the second alternative, or the alternative that is suggested.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Ellen.

No, you don't want to take the floor.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Again, I don't see the (indiscernible) bullet follow a rational and logical manner. I mean, issues have been put after each other. There is no link, to be honest. So I don't see it adding values to reader or to - to -- I mean, to achieve the mandate of our work. That speaks about the strategies and (indiscernible) connection (indiscernible).

I mean, it's so many ideas in one place. I'm not sure -- The wording is (indiscernible) is fine, but I would change the wording to read "stakeholder engagement could be improved, taking into account the following."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

On the gender paragraph, we have serious difficulties with the language that kind of relativized the promotion of greater participation of women, and with the aim of achieving a gender balance. So we cannot go along with the language of, "to the extent practicable."

However, the proposal made by India, if I understood it correctly, "to promote," and then "greater participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete actions to achieve this goal," that would be something that, as a compromise, I think we would be able to accept. But we would have serious difficulties with this -- with adding this language "to the extent practicable."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Richard.

>> Yes. First on this one, and then when you wish, I'll go back to the previous one.

India mentioned that there are Human Rights Council resolutions on this issue. That is correct. If you wish to take a language that is in Human Rights Council resolution 23.2, 23.2, then you would say something like, "Facilitate equal participation."

So, "Facilitate equal participation of women in Internet governance," blah, blah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I will come back to you.

Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

As an observer, it's obviously -- I'm not in a position to insist on replacements of words or phrases. But I would just like to put on the record that "ensuring gender balance" would be something we would be

interested in. But this seems to be "promote" is something we can all agree on. "Ensuring" for us would be better. But "promote" it seems is a word there's agreement on.

I would hope there might be a little bit of flexibility shown, given that it's "promote," not "ensure," to the removal of the term "to the greatest extent practicable," which seems to be not something that quite a few delegations in this room think should be there. And I'll leave it at that.

I think "facilitate equal participation of women" is an interesting way to go. I think "greater participation of women" is an interesting way to go. But I would just like to ask Iran if it could maybe show some flexibility in agreeing to remove "to the greatest extent practical," given the number of delegations here who find that something that they couldn't agree to. Just a request from an observer.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I believe Iran seems to be quite flexible, so --

And before I give you the floor, Mexico asked first.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. We were also discussing here what could be the best way, and we follow the line of what India proposed to "facilitate equal" is okay. But we would prefer what is used in the Human Rights Council, "facilitate effective participation." Maybe this can help to see the issue of what is -- probably "effective" is better.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, I think we are spending more time on issues that isn't the current mandate of our working group. Our current mandate is to fully implement enhanced cooperation, not to focus on gender. I mean, we respect women. We do (indiscernible) women to work in Internet governance. But you are spending more time on a side issue than the main issue.

Let us stop discussing this. Let us go to the main issue. Let us finalize it. Then we can go back to the side issues. We know it is important. It has been taken care of in Tunis Agenda and in the Human Rights Council. I'm sure we will find the language sometime today or tomorrow that will please everyone. But let us focus on the main issues, on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation.

We don't want to be -- to run out of time. Tomorrow is the last day. We do have a full report to review and agree on.

So up until now, we did not touch on any main element of enhanced cooperation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, and to my distinguished colleague from Australia. We have been demonstrating to be more flexible than anyone else in this room. So many proposals, so many consensus-building. So I don't think that we should be asked to be more flexible. But we have no problem to say "promote gender balance in terms of greater participation of women" -- that is -- as Saudi Arabia said, this is a side issue. So let's take that one and then go ahead and go to the chapeau whether the alternative we proposed is acceptable as a chapeau or you don't want any chapeau at all. So you put that one, alternative propose for chapeau or no chapeau at all.

But this one, "promote gender balance," it is WSIS and everywhere we are talking. Nobody against that. And say what term, in terms of greater participation. This is what India proposed. And we agree with that. If they withdraw that, we have no problem.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I realize that our impromptu applause earlier for a part of this issue did not reflect. Our actual position -
- Our actual point here is that for the participation of women, we cannot accept "to the extent practicable." So we would welcome other suggestions that do not prejudice the participation of women at all in Internet governance.

I'm a little bit confused as to the current version that we are discussing. But I just wanted to make sure to make that point.

Secondly, I just feel I need to make a placeholder comment that we -- to disavow the comment that we have not been discussing enhanced cooperation throughout this entire -- this recommendation, much less others throughout the day today. I strongly believe that we have. And, of course, that reflects some of the -- the divergent views that we have. But I do think that's a -- you know, something that we would placeholder for further discussion when we get to earlier pieces and should not hold up discussion about the participation that we are trying to get to in developing -- for developing countries and removing barriers that we are trying to achieve here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Liesyl.

I think you are not the only one who is a bit confused with what we have here. It's too rich. Probably it's time to simplify it and be a bit practical to have some clean text. Because I think, in principle, all of us do agree on the sense of the text, if I'm not mistaken.

I would respectfully turn to India to come up with the original proposal, because I can't find it anymore. So if you can revert to it or just find the appropriate words to make this bullet simplified.

>>INDIA: Mr. Chair, without any attributes, we can perhaps simply say that, "Promote greater participation of women." That's it.

And it's -- "greater participation of women." So which means if it is less, it will be more. If it is more, it will be more than more. So I think -- Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see some disagreement.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes. It really does look like we're going backwards. We used to have "facilitate equal and effective participation of women" from the Human Rights Council. We've had stronger language than that in Tunis Agenda. And now we're basically getting to the point where we just want to facilitate somewhat greater participation.

I would like, if anything, to facilitate equal and effective participation in women, which is using existing language and is, indeed, what we're talking about. We're talking about equal, and we're talking about effective.

So I would make a strong request that we return to the -- the language that has actually been promoted.

Also, in terms of the two initial statements, I hesitate to call them chapeaus, because I do not believe they are chapeaus. The first one does include content that has been eliminated, which is "to engage and work more with existing organizations and to explore ways in which it can be enhanced." So it's -- the alternate has taken out that whole notion of working within the existing organizations, all of them, to take this further.

So I do agree with Saudi Arabia in the extent I'm truly amazed at how much time we have spent talking about this. But I do agree with the United States that this is an integral part of our mandate and issues that we really do need to discuss and resolve.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Can you scroll down. Yes.

Can I suggest you have "promote equal participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete action to achieve this goal."

I think this is -- is this agreeable?

No dinner.

Yes, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, in many meetings around the world, we are dealing with gender balance. We are not talking of equal or unequal. Gender balance is gender balance. Plenipotentiary Congress of ITU, one of the organs talks of gender balance and many other areas. So we have no problem "to promote gender balance in terms of greater participation" and (indiscernible) to this paragraph, Chairman. To be determined, decisive, finish this paragraph, go to the chapeau. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So the final text will be, "Promote the gender balance in terms of greater participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete actions to achieve this goal."

Not happy?

Not happy? Can I send out the men from the room? And probably....

Is it close?

It's not even close?

Shall we use Richard's text?

I really want to have a concrete suggestion for that, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest Australia method, but for now, let us put our recommendation between bracket and let us go further.

It is one hour, 20 minutes. Can you imagine this?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We have been discussing this for one hour and 20 minutes?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, really?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: So let us put the whole thing between square brackets and let's move forward.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Having said that, I'm a bit astonished that we have done that. But I don't propose to have the Australian method, because I consider this is an important issue.

And I can see Italy asking for the floor.

>>ITALY: I am not a state representative. I am representative of NGO. And I will insist -- No, maybe insist or reflect on toward education, because Internet can be also a means of ineducation.

And before speaking about gender equality that obviously I agree, I think that females are less educated all around the world, especially in underdeveloped countries. And then before speaking about gender equality, speaking in Internet, we need to speak of gender equality in education, and that with this base, it's possible to go to gender equality in Internet.

Also, I will stress the word "safe." We would insist on safely things in Internet, because children are always in threats. Who can -- Because you are assuring services in a safe way. Who can assure safe way? Who?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Not on this issue. I wanted --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The other issue.

I turn to you. You want to take the floor on this issue?

>> Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. As we're looking for the right language on women's participation, I'd like to draw your attention to Human Rights Council resolution 12-17, specifically, paragraph 9, which calls on states to ensure full representation and full and equal participation of women in political, social, and economic decision-making.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Having heard all these, I still don't have the final text.

We have the sense of the final text, but we don't have the exact wording.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would strongly support the previous speaker. If it's agreed language by the Human Rights Council, why should we try to renegotiate that language here and come up with something that is maybe weaker than that? It would be very unfortunate, I think, and would seriously harm the legitimacy and the credibility of the outcome of this group. So we strongly support the previous experience on trying to use that language.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Iran.

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

I suggest we do not get into this matter of the hierarchy. Whatever we put in this recommendation does in no way alter, change, modify, strengthen, weaken the other resolutions. They are stable and they are having according to their status. So let us not go there.

I think the language that was proposed for more gender balance in terms of greater participation was something that it is more or less along the lines of that. And it was about to be agreed. If you want to put everything back, no problem. But at least clear this square bracket, small square bracket, as much as possible, if you want, everything is another issue. But now you have so many square brackets, so many things. Let's finish this one item, and that is gender balance. It is in all resolutions and everywhere. And it is recommendation weaker resolutions. If resolution is further that, it is already agreed, and we don't want to in turn and take the language of other resolutions.

Finish this paragraph, go to the chapeau to see what we need in the chapeau. There are so many things. And I think we have to be more straightforward and try to clear the text as much as possible, Chairman.

So, please, kindly try to delete those square brackets, edited lines, revision marks, and make the text quite clear and go to the part that we have not discussed. And that is the chapeau. Whether we need or we don't need the chapeau.

The inclusions of something that are rare but which is not correct, because at first we had, "To ensure." Now we have another verb, "To include." So the remaining part of that paragraph does not match with, "To include." So you have to go and grammatically correct that. And I think Saudi Arabia said it's sufficient to discuss this paragraph and then try to finish it and finish it as soon as possible within the next five, ten minutes.

We are approaching seven o'clock.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, I know.

And we are approaching this status when we shall agree by (indiscernible) because the chair feels a bit tired.

Would it be agreeable in the form that it is?

>>AVRI DORIA: At this point -- thank you, Mr. Chair. At this point there are so many brackets I don't know what to say. We're just talking about this one line "to promote gender balance in terms of greater" -- what? "Greater participation"?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>AVRI DORIA: I think it's unfortunate. I think it's unfortunate that we have to basically degrade language that is in the human rights statements to try and get something that can be agreed to in this --

and I definitely just think it's a sad state of affairs. I don't believe I can agree to it. I don't know that that matters, but I don't think that I can.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, of course it does matter. What is the alternative for you? "Facilitate equal" --

>>AVRI DORIA: "Promote gender balance in terms of equal and effective participation of women in Internet governance spaces."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. In this form is it acceptable?

>> (Off microphone)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen? Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I was just going to come in in support of Sweden's comments of previous -- in support of the observation made from the U.N. and actually the text is there, we should use it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Victoria.

>>MARIA VICTORIA ROMERO: Thank you, Chair. I just would like to support this previous. I think it was Avri who suggested the new wording, and if we cannot have the one that has been already approved in the Human Rights Council, this new proposal is actually very comfortable for us. And we think that includes India and Iran concerns. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it acceptable? The last proposal from Avri. As it stands. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chair, double emphasis, balance. What does it mean balance? Equal. How -- why doesn't equally? Promote balance with effective participation, and that is that. Gender balance is gender balance. We don't define that. Effective or ineffective and so on and so forth. In all resolutions talks of gender balance. And I think why we spend so much time on this.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think that was a wish from the floor to --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: We propose gender balance and general participation. Distinguished lady did not accept that one. And then we come back, gender balance with effective participation. That is that. Aligned with all resolutions within the entire U.N. system. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we could have -- we want a good and equal balance, that's my understanding of this. Not this skewed balance, for instance. So we think that although we had a preference for the proposal to import the language from the Human Rights Council resolution as referred to by the previous speaker, we can also live with the proposal made by Avri and supported by Mexico. So I think now that it's -- it adds value to emphasize here and clarify that it's in terms of equal and effective. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Talk to the members of the group. Is it acceptable at this time? Avri. You do not want to take the floor. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We think the proposal that was submitted by India and made here by Iran is much more suitable and we encourage that we finalize this recommendation and we go to other which is the heart of the -- of this work of this working group. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do think this is meaningful work. A possible compromise that was mentioned to me, since although having once been a chemistry major I know you can balance things when they're not equal, was -- and so therefore I did not see it as a duplication, however, promote gender balance in terms of meaningful and effective participation could possibly be an acceptable -- or hopefully be an acceptable compromise to those who think there's redundancy in balance and equality.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, good evening. I just wanted to reiterate our support for Avri and her efforts in trying to reach consensus. She's just shown the spirit of compromise on a very important issue of human rights and I think we should all reflect now at the late hour and appreciate her efforts in trying to put this proposal forward and try to reach agreement now on what she has just proposed "promote gender balance in terms of meaningful and effective participation of women in Internet governance spaces and take concrete action to achieve this goal." Avri should be commended for her effort and she deserves our support, and the U.S. does support her intervention efforts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Once again, I ask you if it's acceptable in this last form with the modification? Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we want to clear the text. If you talk about gender balance in terms of gender so you don't need to talk about it women again in the fourth line. Promote gender balance in terms of whether you say meaningful and effective participation, so on and so forth. We talk about gender balance and that is that. You don't talk two times about the same thing. I'm going to avoid the repetition.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I agree with Avri's interpretation that while you could have a distorted balance where it's not an equal balance or you can maybe find some other kind of balance, and we want to have equal balance. I think that's the objective. We -- as a compromise, we could most probably also live with a meaningful. But it is important that we leave here "participation of women" because that's the -- that's part of the essence that we're trying to capture here. It's not the meaningful and effective participation of men in Internet governance spaces because that is not perceived to be the problem, generally speaking at least. I mean, we -- but it's -- it's important to leave here women and it's not a duplication. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you. Also in this paragraph we see this period is that women could participate in a greater extent in Internet, so we consider it's important to keep women. In this paragraph we consider it's the intention of Iran in gender balance as well as the proposal of India and the proposal of other indeed and so we consider it the most agreed language that we can have in (indiscernible). Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So can I ask you if I can remove some text which you think not necessary? I think it's - it's cleaner now. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, let's go to the remaining part and we come back to see how much flexibility other people will show. They push whatever they want. Is it possible? We have to negotiate. Reflect -- flexibility everywhere. Let us take this one and --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: (indiscernible).

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: We give this one, we have to give another one, we have to give another one, and this is not fair to Chairman. Let us take this one, okay, provisionally, go to the remaining part. If we agree to the remaining part, we come back, I may give it that. It depends how much degree of flexibility of our distinguished colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So let's go forward for the upper part. Avri, you want to take the floor?

>>AVRI DORIA: I just wanted to ask a clarifying question. Has women's rights now become a bargaining chip for other issues here? I just wanted to understand what was -- what was being proposed?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't think it was meant in this way.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: He meant probably words.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I know him quite well. Australia. And Canada. Sorry, Canada first.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair. No, just to express our support for the wording proposed by Avri and to have both gender balance and effective -- meaningful and effective participation of women for the reasons. That I think our Swedish colleague gave, this is not in any way redundant. I think it's important to have this language in there, and I think our whole discussion we've had this evening has proven that it's important to have the language like that in there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: I think -- I feel a need to be very, very clear, before we proceed any further, about the importance of this issue which has been characterized by some delegations in this room as a side issue,

a minor issue, something that is somehow outside the scope of enhanced participation. Let me be clear, this is an important issue. Any system of Internet governance that does not include the full and meaningful participation of 50% of the population is a system that has failed. This is a barrier to full implementation of enhanced cooperation, and I think it's something that deserves a small sentence somewhere in here. And I just want to make that very clear on the record. And it's no surprise that I support Avri's language, given that I just said that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. You fortunately don't have to convince me. India.

>>INDIA: Chair, I think as we've tried to arrive at some language, I sincerely request colleagues not to characterize other opinions because here we're trying to -- I think everyone is working toward the same goal, is trying to see that -- (indiscernible) is merely trying to fix the language. I sincerely urge that colleagues not border on the part of characterizing a delegation's view as something which they're not actually saying. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I completely agree with that statement. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to be very clear, when we said this is a side issue in regard to the mandate, it is not a side issue to speak about gender equality. This is very important in terms of gender, so just to be very clear. My second question, how long do you think we would spend on this? I mean --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see there is great interest in this topic and a lot of misunderstanding. That's my view. Probably it's high time we stop discussing this paragraph and go up. If you agree with that, we leave the language as is, and in case there's a need we come back to it. And I apologize on behalf of anyone who (indiscernible). I don't doubt the good intention of everyone here. So Iran, let's go to the chapeau.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman, I request you please go to the remaining part and clear this as soon as possible. Now you're on the beginning. Start with that one. I suggest that we take alternative chapeau within the framework of multistakeholder approach, explore the ways and means in which a stakeholder engagement could be enhanced, not improved, taking into account all of the following, and that is that. So reduce the number of square brackets and delete the square bracket around "enhanced" and take it and suggest that as the Chair that you propose it to be accepted by the colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That is exactly my intention. Is there any opposition to accepting this text as the alternative text? (indiscernible)? Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Can you please say it again? I could not understand you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I suggested to accept the alternative text proposed by Iran.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay. This is in regard to the chapeau only or to the whole recommendation?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, I'm suggesting the -- this particular text. No, I'm not talking about the whole recommendation. We are going bullet by bullet. Can we delete the first sentence and take only the alternative text? I take it as agreement? To remove the word "alt." Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, you're not (indiscernible) the Chairman's count, one, two, three, yes or no.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, I know what meeting you're referring to.

(Laughter)

Board chairmen are different. That is not a judgment. There are just differences. And I have a particular respect for that chairman. So let's go down and try to clean the text. I can see no square brackets in bullet one, bullet two. I can see square brackets in bullet three. And probably it's my feeling that it's close to an editorial. Saudi Arabia, you want the floor?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have an issue with the first bullet since the (indiscernible) with the bottom-up strategies. Do we speak about barrier of developmental strategies, it isn't very clear to me, some of the recommendation and with each other concerns I think there's of Internet governance. I think it needs further work to redraft this recommendation to be more easy to understand for us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Did I get you right that you want to split this recommendation into more than one?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, I see the five white bullets are recommendation, and then (indiscernible). So they can be placed under groups C, D, and E, if they belong to (indiscernible), because everyone speak about something different than the one before. They don't follow a rational and logical manner to be, I mean, after each other. Every bullet is about something different than the bullet before.

Let's speak about development strategies. We know this is a mechanism for implementation. We do have now the agendas and process. And this is so many things in one recommendation. It needs to be simplified more so we can understand it.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I know how much sensitivity some communities, marginalized, we fully respect and wish to observe their rights, their demands, their needs, and so on and so forth. On the other hand, the paragraph seems, paragraph C, to be too long, and maybe we should shorten that, if possible.

We start to say "work with marginalized communities to develop local content in their own language" -- very good -- "that meets their needs."

And then starting at the beginning of the square bracket, that one we wish to suggest that we may not need that one until two lines after, starting "as well as." Instead of "as well as" we say "including raising general awareness of "so on and so forth.

So let's make it shorter. I don't think that we exclude anything. We have no need to go into too much detail. And so, okay, "Including raising general awareness." I think that covers the point that we discussed. And in the sense of Saudi Arabia, it wants to make it simpler. I think this is a very -- and I don't think that it loses any content of the -- or any perspective or thrust of the paragraph.

So that is what I suggest to make it shorter and go to the last bullet line -- bullet.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

I could hear Avri sighing.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To call it a sigh was to make it a lot more mellow than it was inside my head.

I do believe it loses content. Marginalized people have great difficulty in accessing online spaces at the moment. Public information is not being made available to them for essential services, and they don't have access in safe and inclusive ways.

So those are three needs that are rather important and that content would, indeed, be lost. It's -- I do not understand the concern with word content. I do understand the concern with getting the grammar correct. And I would basically appeal in terms of marginalized communities. I spent years working with them when I was still a developer. And those things are important. And they -- it would be a pity to see them removed. There is content there.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I can see some fatigue, and I can see that some people would like to have dinner. And I can see that some people are having dinner.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I wish BON appetite.

I'm afraid we have to break now, before the final round.

So I think if we have a 20, 25-minute dinner break, I suggest -- I suggested you to bring some food with you before we broke for lunch. And I -- yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, I suggest that we finish this one, and then we finish --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, but I --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I don't think that we -- we start, we are fresh to discuss this. And we lose the momentum.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Do we have momentum?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, we have momentum for this paragraph, yes!

If we don't want to do that, we are French --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I further agree with you. But --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Young people should -- should cope with us.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, I know, but --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: They should understand --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: -- do we have the momentum? That's what I'm --

(Multiple people speaking simultaneously.)

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: -- not you and me.

Let's go to this and finish it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can go without dinner right now, so no problem. If this is the wish of the room, we can continue finishing this and have dinner afterwards. In the meantime, I wish bon appetit to those who can't cope with that.

You heard the remark from Avri saying that we are losing content.

Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I support leaving that language in as well. Once we've got "including" I think we should keep the rest of that language. I understand the interest in being short and precise, but I don't think we need to lose meaning in order to have one line shorter in what is appearing not to be an overly long set of recommendations, frankly.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Before striking out, I think we had two square brackets. We had two square brackets. We had square brackets "including content which will." And the other one was "in order to."

So I'm waiting for your proposals how to move forward.

Yes, Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: My proposal would be to delete "in order to," keep all the other language that's currently crossed out.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, could we say, "Needs in order to assist them," and make it shorter that, but not go to all of those details? We have no problem if you have patience, you have time, and so on and so forth. But I think people kindly need, in particular the distinguished lady, show a degree of flexibility. Some people are too -- pressing too much. They want whatever they express to be included. They should also understand the other people's views.

"in order to assist them" in one or two other words, but not go into too much details of that, "Including but not limited to the raising general awareness," I have no problem saying, "Including, but not limited to, general awareness," which is still possible to do those details in future.

"In order to assist them." And that is it. "In accessing online space."

But not, "Public information, essential services." What is essential services? "In a safe and inclusive way," and so on and so forth. We are talking of safe, of the service, we are talking of security of the network here? This is not that one.

And inclusiveness I don't think that you should have.

I show to one of the distinguished delegates a request for inclusiveness, and it was rejected by a society I don't want to name. Somebody wanted to be included in the activity of the society. It was rejected. No, we have no means to include you. You are rejected.

How? How you can do that? You say something, "Including to meet their requirements," and then, "As well as raising the general" -- I would not go into too much detail. Access maybe, you have access to the online -- I don't know what is online spaces. Online service? What is "online spaces"? We are talking of cyberspace? We are talking of space communications? What is online space? Spaces I have difficulty. We are talking of rooms? We are talking of what? What is "spaces"?

So in order to assist them, and I request, distinguished lady, to -- after "assist them" to stay involved, "In online access" maybe, "As well as raising awareness." And I request colleagues to be a little bit more flexible and sometimes agree to our proposals, sometimes, but not always.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

Any comment on that?

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I keep dropping my placard.

I have been trying to be very flexible. I think I have sort of agreed to many changes here. So if I was the person who was being referred to as not at all flexible, I -- I'm trying. For example, we did change a meaningful top paragraph into a chapeau at the request. We've gone through many other changes at request.

I basically, though, do maintain that online access is not a trivial thing for marginalized people. Accessing online spaces is not at all trivial. There are many spaces. Many of those spaces are fraught with danger for marginalized people. There is violence and abuse against marginalized people online. So to say that "accessing essential services online in a safe and inclusive way" is something we cut is to basically say that our notion of cooperation, enhancing cooperation, Internet governance, includes allowing for marginalized people to be threatened and abused online.

And that seems to me something that I really can't afford to be reasonable about and really do need to insist that, you know, we have to consider the safety of marginalized people online, that that is as critical an issue as we can come up with in enhanced cooperation, in Internet governance, in any of those issues. And if we can't allow those marginalized people to be safe, it's truly a sad day for us.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Let me propose the following: Just let's go to the next bullet, and I will let you discuss it with Kavouss offline and then come back to the meeting. I don't really want to have a dialogue in the meeting, and probably it will be the best way -- I'm sure in two minutes you can sort this out if you talk to each other directly.

Yes, Kavouss?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, I could say something. I agree that safe access is important for marginalized. But safe access is important for everybody. Child, adults, everybody.

However, we should say that in order to assist them in safe online access, full stop, and go, as well as so on and so forth, as well as the awareness of that and (indiscernible). Okay, safe, and safety, that's all. But let us, Chairman, finish this before going to lunch or dinner or breakfast.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I know that you hope to have a large dinner, but it's not going to be a large one.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: "Safe online access" is close enough.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

It's acceptable.

Can we remove the square brackets and the text.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: You do have one word, "To assist them in a safe online" -- the "a" is superfluous in that sentence.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: No problem of that. I am dealing with the bullet after that, "To include," if you will allow me.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So this bullet is okay.

Let's go to the next one.

So to me, the question is whether "to include" or "to ensure." That's what I can see as square bracketed. And "work programs" or "agendas."

Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, two years ago, we had five meetings, and all of these very distinguished developed countries. Whenever we talk about to ensure, no, no, we cannot ensure anything. It's difficult to ensure and to guarantee. Therefore, I suggest that the, "Safe to include," not ensure -- to include the issue of marginalized community on the work program of -- not "agenda" -- "On the work program of." If you want to put "agenda," I don't know "work program" is more general -- "of the Internet governance process." It is not something that we really comfortable, but in the light of the time, that's something could work out.

So, "To include the issue of marginalized community." Take out "are." Okay. Delete -- "On the work program of Internet governance processes." If you want to put, "On the agenda," we have no problem. But we believe that "work program" is more general.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

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

I do have difficulties with the marginalized communities on Internet governance.

In Tunis Agenda, we said marginalized and their access and authorization of ICTs in a very general issue.

And Internet governance, this is something new to us. If this was the overall review, I can accept this language. This is something new to us.

So we cannot accept this recommendation in its wording as it stands now.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you be a bit more explicit for the reasons.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: If it is related to ICTs, we can go along. Linking this to Internet governance processes is something new.

Our mandate is -- should be taken from Tunis Agenda as UNGA resolution. We don't want to invent something new.

We do have difficulties, as we have difficulties on establishing mechanisms. We have difficulties on inventing wording that does not exist on Tunis Agenda. (Indiscernible) does not exist on Tunis Agenda.

Bottom-up, something like this. This is something we cannot accept, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You may have a point here. However, in 2008, the Convention of Rights of People with Disabilities has been accepted and has been ratified by more than 100 countries. And it has been signed by more than 155 countries. So I believe it's high time we bring in this issue. And I think your country has also signed the treaty.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Indeed, we signed.

My point was, if we are in the overall review process of the Tunis Agenda, I can accept such language. But now we do have a very specific mandate. We have spent now more than two hours on a side issue on our mandate, when it has come to our recommendation, we do have only five minutes, and we say there is no consensus, let's go. But on issues -- on side issues, we have spent now two hours. This isn't fair to us, Mr. Chairman.

We are near the end of the second day.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's what you hope.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: No, no. I just said, we'll finish by 9:00. So I don't think we'll finish by 12:00 and we'll come back tomorrow to discuss the (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. I take your point.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Let us be very clear on this.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I take your point.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri.

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

Just to build on the point that you made, that in the nearly ten years intervening from the time that WSIS completed, that the Tunis Agenda was written, and that Internet governance and enhanced cooperation were put on the table, the issues of marginalized communities have become a concern of Internet governance and of enhanced cooperation.

So in terms of our mandate of looking at how do we deal with the process of enhanced cooperation and Internet governance and as they're interrelated, it seems to me that this is essential.

I was asked before for flexibility and hopefully have shown it in the previous couple of points. I'd like to return the request and sort of request that that same flexibility in terms of that -- I totally agree, to use a certain slangism, that we have spent too long arguing over these terms. I do not think they are side issues. I think they are critical issues for the Internet and for Internet governance and enhanced cooperation. And so I'm hoping that we can include the issues of marginalized communities and the work programs of Internet governance processes.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

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

I think that the discussion has now become a little bit more critical.

We are talking of Internet governance process. Why we don't go to IGF? This should be proposal for IGF. We are not here dealing with Internet governance. We are dealing with public policy issues related to Internet. This is the mandate of this group.

And number two, because the people, they ask, when you say include issue of marginalized community, what are the issues? They might have many, many issues which has nothing to do with the Internet governance. Social issues.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I'm sorry to say that maybe political issues. Do we have to include all of them here?

So "issue" is a particular word with particular connotations.

If somebody asked that, okay, you agree with that. What is the issue of marginalized communities that you agreed to be included in the work of this? What answer do I give to my colleagues if they ask me? Says, you didn't understand, but you agreed with that? What is issues? Give me one example, what is the issues?

So why not, Chairman, if possible, we take it from here and people propose it in Istanbul in September? The agenda is open, and I think there would be evolution or revolutions after the Brazil meeting to reorganize, restructure the activities of the IGF. They asked the mandate of the IGF to be extended. They asked the financial support for IGF. They asked the extension of the IGF beyond 2015. All of these issues will be there.

Why we overload this innocent group with something which is difficult? If distinguished Avri asks me, I ask a question, give me two or three examples of the issues that I would have to include them in the IGF but not here? What are the issues? If I asked the question, I have to have an example. I don't have any examples.

So if it's one way -- if you take it out, put the square bracket, go to the last one to see what will happen. If we treat the last one, we come back to see, take it, put it in the IGF, and there is a possibility. Unless we giving what are the issues. And we are not dealing with Internet governance process here. We are dealing with the international Internet public-policy issues or international related public-policy issues. I forgot the term. So that is that.

So let us hear from that. This is not asking for flexibility. It is understanding. You have to understand what we agree and what we recommend.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

How can we say that an issue is a side issue or a secondary issue or a minor issue when so many stakeholders feel so strongly about it? I think we define, stakeholders together define what are the core issues of enhanced cooperation. And it's obvious in this room, I think, that many feel strongly about these issues. Hence, it's not a side issue; it's not a secondary issue; it's not a minor issue.

We think this is a very important paragraph, and we think it should be retained. And we think if there is a problem with the understanding of issues related to marginal communities and whether or not such issues relates in any way to Internet governance, maybe we can just solve that very easily by adding "relevant issues." Relevant issues for what we're discussing here. Because there might be many issues that are related to marginalized communities. What we are -- I thought what we are looking at here is issues that are relevant for the discussions here. I think that was -- I don't know if "relevant" is necessary, because I think anyone that would read this text in the context of -- in the overall context of this report and these recommendations would be able to understand that it's relevant issues. But if it would give comfort to some delegations, maybe we could add the word "relevant" there.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Just let me give you one example. Accessibility of government Web sites for visually impaired people is a public policy issue. To comply with standards. It is. We are talking about a large number of people who are affected and who should have equal rights.

So -- And these issues are being dealt with in the Internet Governance Forum.

I'm afraid for Istanbul it's too late. But you are right, if the recommendations of the working group -- the previous working group, are implemented, probably these issues will be enforced, because we have about four or five recommendations on these issues.

Avri.

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

In listening to the discussion, it would be possible to recast this if there's, you know, this worry that this is just relating to the Internet Governance Forum, to basically -- to include the issues of marginalized communities in the discussion of Internet public-policy issues or Internet public policy. You know, if we don't want to get so specific as to say, "In the Internet governance processes" or "the IGF," it's, "issues of marginalized communities in the discussion of Internet public policy," period.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Rae (phonetic).

>> Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring to the attention of this meeting that the issue of promoting gender equality to others in an all-inclusive society has actually been paid attention in documents such as the memorandum of understanding between the ITU and the UNDP and Uniform. There is also the outcomes of WSIS, the Geneva Declaration of Principles, the Geneva Plan of Action, the Tunis Commitment and Tunis Agenda, the Marrakech Plenipotentiary Conference, and then the Istanbul World Telecommunication Development Conference.

So it is not new. And, personally, I don't understand the resistance. And I just want to say, like Avri, can we be flexible, knowing that we are not proposing anything that is so new. We are just saying that we need to include this very important sentence.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

You don't want the floor, India. Okay.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you very much, chairman.

An outcome from the Internet governance is public-policy issues which is paragraph 35, 69, discussed different (indiscernible) of the government and the sovereignty and the rights and so on and so forth. The only thing is there is equal footing with respect to other governments, because previously or still today there is a legacy of -- for one single government. I think you make it worse, you come to that.

"Relevant" is good to have that one. Maybe at the end of that, you have "processes" comma, "as appropriate," you add that one as well. And then you see whether it is a public-policy issue or is it

(indiscernible). In discussion with distinguished Lady Avri was talk of Internet governance in general, but not public-policy issues. You make it worse.

So you bring it back to the Internet governance, and we see whether it is relevant or not. So I don't agree -- not don't agree. I have difficulty to revert to "Internet public-policy issue."

"Internet governance," (indiscernible), and "where appropriate and relevant," so we will see what we can do. And after that, you go to the last paragraph and to see what will happen, and we come back to see whether we could agree.

But I think it would be possible to say, "To include" -- I think, "Where appropriate" should go after the verb usually. In English, is like this, "To include, where appropriate" or "as appropriate the relevant issues of the marginalized communities in the work program of Internet governance." And then we will discuss it to see the recommendation, whether the CSTD will take that recommendation and decide to put it in the agenda of the IGF, or whether the general assembly of the IGF. I don't know. Somebody should take that one. That's at least -- it is more workable as it is now, than public-policy issue. Because that is paragraph 35 and 69, clear, and we have decided or we have decided to put that one in the chapeau of all these documents so we cannot have something in (indiscernible).

So let's take it as it is now, and between the "to include," comma, "as appropriate," comma, "the relevant issues of the marginalized countries on the work programs," and so on and so forth.

If you want to have better English, you say, "To include, as appropriate, on the work program of the Internet governance process the relevant issue of marginalized." This is better structure in English, shorter than this one. So I suggest, "To include, as appropriate, on the work program of Internet governance process the relevant issues of marginalized communities."

I think I was too fast. Sorry.

Rapid, rapid. Muy rapido.

"To include, as appropriate, on the work program of Internet governance process the relevant issue of marginalized community."

Thank you very much, muchas gracias.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

I would say shukran.

But as it stands, is it acceptable?

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

Yeah, it's close. I mean, "the" -- "as appropriate" are those words that are very similar to the "to the extent possible" words. I would prefer it without the "as appropriate," but I won't put us through another hour's discussion on those words. It's kind of a -- you know, it's kind of a, let's put the issue

down a little bit by saying we're not really sure that it's appropriate, so we'll add the, "as appropriate" words, whereas I think that, you know, the issues of the marginalized communities are, indeed, critical Internet public-policy issues that need to be dealt with in Internet governance. But I won't fight it.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Can we clean the text? Issues? That might be the old issue. The previous one. Sorry. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks to Mr. Arasteh for his -- for showing again his excellent drafting skills. We think that this text is an improvement, but we still think that it would be better without "as appropriate." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, 40 years international (indiscernible) shows me that equally happy or equally unhappy. This is equally unhappy. Let's take it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. As it stands, is it acceptable? I take the silence as approval. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: We see this outside of the mandate of our working group, honestly. This is outside the mandate of the working group. We cannot accept such recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are referring to this article of work?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Yes. I speak of Internet governance processes, enhanced cooperation and IGF. We are here to discuss enhanced cooperation. We spent now two hours or three hours. I say this, we stop the debate and we go further and let us come back to this tomorrow morning with fresh mind. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have nothing against coming back tomorrow with a fresh mind, but I would like to remind you as well that tomorrow with a fresh mind means that after 9:00 you will go through the draft report and you will have other issues to go through and tomorrow we are going to discuss it. So as I told you, I have nothing against -- and probably we can stop the discussion here on that issue and we can come back to that, but still I think there is one outstanding group which has submitted a draft, if I'm not mistaken. Yes? But right now I really suggest we have a break. Probably after two, two and a half hours probably we need some break. And we try and come back in 15 minutes' time. Is it okay? Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good evening. We have about 30 minutes to go. We have been told by security that it would be advisable if we left at 9:00 or before 9:00. So my intention is to leave before 9:00.

I just want to bring up one issue.

I understand that internal facilities are being used and they are being used in different fashion.

So I would like to call your attention that during a meeting, there are several ways of expressing ourselves which may lead to some misunderstanding, but probably it's within the context. Out of the context, it may be extremely harmful. So I would advise you not to tweet or send information about the meeting which are out of the context. And probably we should respect each other, we should improve the trust in each other. And I do have that trust in each and every one of you. And probably I would like to ask you to do the same.

I don't really want to go on on this issue. I would like to go on on substantial issues.

Iran, please.

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

We are starting at 9:00, and then we are continuing, now it's 8:00 in the evening, almost 11 hours, during the lunch break and coffee break, we have worked. So sometimes it may be necessary at the meeting in order to improve the morale of the meeting, in order to continue to establish more friendly atmosphere to go to some unserious matter, some jokes, so on and so forth. It should not be put on Twitter immediately. It is not appropriate. This is a meeting among friends and so on and so forth. Sometimes the people should avoid that. Otherwise, we should -- if we are so serious that we could not work, we would like to improve the morale. We would like to further enhance, enforce or foster the friendly atmosphere among the people having a dialogue from a professionalism point of view. So I think we should not interpret in a different way.

So we do not agree with this sort of the attitudes and this sort of the arrangement. And that should be taken out from whatever media, and that is that.

So we should limit discussions to whatever we have, even so that this should be understood. I mean, all meetings. Otherwise, in future, we don't agree to even have anything on the captioning, if the people, they misinterpret that.

The issue that we able to manage many of these things because of this good friendship and these good relations. So we should foster that, we should increase that.

So we would request those people who are responsible for these sort of activities to be cautious and not to include all these things. And whatever they have included, they should take it out.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I think the message has been clear. So I propose we go directly to our esteemed friend, Phil, who is keen to have his presentation.

Phil, this is the time.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You -- I'm sure you -- you just completely forgot about it.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Sorry, Chair. I was not paying attention.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, you lost all hope that you would at last present your report?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Yes, lost all hope.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are all keen to hear your report. And after that, we have some small discussion, and probably we break for this evening.

Please, go ahead.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

Good evening.

Give a verbal report on the activities of the correspondence group since our last meeting.

You will recall, Chair, sitting next door when my colleague and countryperson from the FCO suggested that the correspondence group continue to do some further work on identifying mechanisms. I think this was driven in part by the request to simplify the presentation of the information that we had.

I did have severe words with him afterwards. But that's another story.

So we continued the work as requested, Chair. And that was done on a voluntary basis. And at that point, I should say, we should recognize the efforts of Sam Dickinson and Lea Kaspar and the efforts of producing 34 pages of very thorough activities and 6,000 cells of information, and would bring that to your attention that that is only based on 19 responses. Had we had more responses, I'm sure it would have been a longer document.

The reason we undertook this activity, Chair, to simplify the presentation was because when we started the work of the correspondence group, we didn't proscribe how the information would be provided. We just said, "Give the information."

And as a consequence, when it was presented at the last meeting, I think everybody agreed that in the spreadsheet form, it was not easy to follow. There were differences of amount of information. And therefore it was requested, I think, by India, that the presentation style should be simplified. And Per's going to miss the best bit.

And so we undertook at the last meeting to try and complete the terms of reference as outlined in the December meeting.

Oh, he's back. Good.

And this started off by simplifying the presentation. And we took a conscious decision to use the same information across all the submissions that we'd had, across the 24, 26 broad areas of information.

I have to say, because we had taken the information in a free format form originally, putting this information into -- into a simplified format took longer than we had originally anticipated. And therefore at this time, I have to say the correspondence group did not complete its terms of reference. I will come back to that as I proceed through my discourse to you, Chair.

The other issue that impacted the ability to meet the terms of reference was the fact that you yourself, Chair, moved the meeting forward. So -- and they say a week is a long time in politics. Well, it's true when you're simplifying the presentation as well. And therefore we had a week less in order to do the work, to give the working group members two weeks to sit down and review, assess, comprehend, and be prepared to answer detailed questions on the spreadsheet.

Part of the examiners we undertook was to initially focus on one of the broad areas. We did that on area 6, which was child online protection. We sent that to the working group and said, "This is what we're doing. Is there any dissent, disapproval, or disagreement?"

And I'm pleased to say, Chair, that after a week, none was registered, and therefore, we proceeded to complete the activity.

And we submitted that for your and this group's approval on the 14th of April. And that is the spreadsheet that you see before you.

I said earlier, Chair, that that was an incomplete activity. And I think I -- I would propose, as chair of the correspondence group, three follow-on activities for you to consider. I think the -- the spreadsheet, the 17 -- 34 pages, if I double my path, that was created by Sam and Lea, I think that should be sent back to the correspondence group. They haven't had the opportunity to review it in detail. And therefore, I think it would be opportune to have those people that had submitted contributions to the correspondence group that we put into this format to make sure that the information that they have presented is accurately reflected with the additional columns that we've presented. It's not to get new information. It's not to change the information. It's purely a proposal to have correspondence group members verify what is being presented here. And I think that would be a useful activity.

The second proposal I'd make, Chair, is the need to take this work forward. I think the spreadsheet has proven to be a useful tool. And I think it is the basis for some good discussions to be had. It certainly is thrown up -- as somebody who did not contribute to the work of the correspondence group, as neither did Sam or Lea, we thought it more appropriate that we remain distant from the contributions. But it's certainly been a learning exercise that I didn't realize from 19 contributions that there was so much activity out there. And I've learned an awful lot, and I hope others have as well.

So in taking this forward to complete the terms of reference of the correspondence group, you could do that in two ways, Chair. One would be to do it on a voluntary basis. And the other would be to do it on a more formal, full-time activity, perhaps through the CSTD secretariat. My preference and advice to yourself and to the group would be to perhaps do it through the CSTD secretariat. I think doing it on a voluntary basis would be too onerous for any one person, given that they probably have a day job as well.

As I said, the terms of reference of the correspondence group have not been fulfilled. And that, then, comes to how we take this forward.

We have given you a more formal and simplified version of the text and how to view that. Such a document, with some minor modification, could be used to generate more input. One example I could foresee would be to make the document available to the IGF and ask people at the IGF to add their views to the document and build it out that way. You can imagine it going to other forums and to other activities to have more input.

I think if we are to take the activity forward and to do the gap analysis and to do an assessment, I think there needs to be clearly-defined criteria to assist in the analysis of that activity to analyze the gaps. I do not think it is a simple task that should be done. And it should be as well-defined and as clearly scoped as we can make it in quite detail, because I think any analysis needs to be as scientific as possible in order to be consistent, coherent, and as far as possible complete.

And as parts of that, Chair, there were two late submissions submitted to the correspondence group after the deadline of submitting it to this working group. And I would urge that those are used in the next stage of the activity to be part of revising the text and in the -- any gap analysis that's undertaken.

With that, Chair, I hopefully have not taken too much time, and I'm happy to answer questions.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. It was a great presentation. Thank you for that. And let me take the opportunity of thanking Lea and Sam for their activities and their voluntary work. And, in fact, I consider the result, the outcome of the correspondence group as a significant work. It's something we can build on and which we should be using, I believe.

Now, as for the proposal for the way forward, I fully agree that late submissions of value which have really good value should be included. That's point one.

And to continue, your option, I think, is a good option, that is, the work should be done on a scientific basis. It should be done on a full-time basis. And probably the secretariat could reflect on the ways forward how to handle this issue. Because I think this is a great amount of information which should be used.

So thank you again for all those who contributed. Thank you again for those who have taken part in the compilation of the document, in the simplification of the document.

I believe you have done a great job. Thank you again.

Now I open the floor for discussion. I intend to have the discussion for about five to ten minutes. And in the remaining five minutes, I'll like to outline how I imagine the day tomorrow, how we are going to proceed with our work.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, we would like to thank the correspondence group, and in particular, Phil, Lea, and Sam, for their tremendous efforts. And just to say, really, that it's a very impressive product that I think is an extremely valuable input to this -- to this group. And certainly we see value in continuing this work. And we would also support to task the secretariat to carry this work forward since I think that we should not further burden Phil and Lea and Sam to do this on a voluntary basis, because this is -- this is more than you can expect from anyone to do without -- without having this as more or less a full-time job, I think.

So just to express our deep appreciation. And we would encourage everyone to try to utilize this during our deliberations here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. I think on -- even my delegation wants to thank the correspondence group and the chair of the correspondence group for their extremely useful work in terms of -- in terms of moving to the core issues that we initially embarked on finding answers for. At the outset, we also want to believe that this is work in progress.

And number two, there have been also some useful contributions that have been given after the last date for submission of inputs. I think there is merit in considering those into this body of work that is going on and perhaps come up with certain more recommendations.

If we all reflect back from the time when we decided as a working group to constitute such a correspondence group, the key objective, as we understood, was that we would look at the existing mechanisms, if any, and identify the gaps, and thereafter look at possible recommendations that the working group can make.

Now, there is a small missing link which I thought it must be flagged in this discussion.

We have had the benefit of the correspondence group presenting their, let's say, recommendations. Even in the last meeting of the working group, we had the benefit of it. But as a working group, we have not made any serious attempt to deliberate on the output that has been produced.

I think that stands to be the case today also.

I think it is important that we are not yet able to make substantive -- I mean, rather, benefit substantially from the hard work that has gone into this, into this streamlined information that we have.

So, Chair, I think it would be very useful if we wish to acknowledge not just the work that the correspondence group has undertaken, but equally important is for this working group to benefit out of those recommendations and gap analysis which has been done, part of it. We see that there are certain gaps that have been identified, certain recommendations have been provided for. But I think as a working group, we need to deliberate and make our own recommendations as a working group. I

thought that was the original intention that the correspondence group would present certain observations. I think rightly, Phil observed that he initially would not like to be the adjudicator on this matter. He would be merely facilitating the work, for which we are very thankful to him and his team. So from that perspective, you might consider providing for a certain time to discuss the recommendations or observations that have been presented by the correspondence group.

And we also are in support of more work, if it requires -- that is the will of the group. We will not -- we would like to endorse that approach.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Probably, as you may know, it's -- if there's a wish to have the benefit of the work in forms of recommendation, or at least to have a deeper knowledge what is in this work and draw some conclusions, we can do it in the framework of this working group, provided we are mandated by the CSTD. And, naturally, if it's the wish of this group to go beyond the date we have been allocated, then probably this wish can be communicated to the CSTD, with a view of making use of this information, this bulk of information we have in front of us, which may be extremely beneficial for filling our mandate.

I fully agree that we didn't have time to discuss it, partially because we didn't have in the appropriate format. It was very difficult to handle it in that format. Although at that time, we already knew the value of this material.

So now we have it in the appropriate format. It's just the circumstances well, just aren't -- Probably when we started the work as a working group, we already knew the amount of work we had to do, but probably we underestimated it.

So that's really -- that's always what happens. But I fully agree that we should in some way move it forward and make use of what we have in the information.

U.S.A.

>>UNITED STATES: United States thank you, Chair.

I would like to echo and thank the distinguished delegate from India for his comments and observations on the work of the correspondence group as well as echo Sweden's as well.

We think that, really, the group -- the correspondence group, as well as Phil and Sam and Lea, deserve a great amount of credit for the work that they put in, because the -- the amount of input that came in from the questionnaires, on the one hand, and then the separate submissions, was quite substantial. So we really want to thank them for that effort.

You know, certainly the United States provided a response to the questionnaire, as well as a response into the correspondence group's request for information. And we thank those many others that did the same, because it has provided a very rich illustration of the amount of activity and cooperation that is

being undertaken to address the very issues that came out of the responses to the questionnaire that we took quite some effort to pull together in the first place at our very first meeting one year ago.

I think we would also echo the comments about the potential processes for next steps with regard to the correspondence group, the reflection of the input. I think there would be some value to some professionalization of the work going forward, not only because I think Phil and Sam and Lea have day jobs, but also because it could be undertaken in a dedicated and scientific way, as I think someone suggested, that would also be very, very useful, including additional information, as then brought forward, and moving it ahead into something else that maybe not only looks nice, as it does now, but also provides a real demonstration of things that, for example, can help with our recommendations going forward.

I'm recalling that we undertook the correspondence group effort as a parallel process to try to develop recommendations. And for its -- particularly for a test, that was very useful. But it may be also useful to consider it going forward to assist with the bolstering and proof point for recommendations that we would have coming forward.

So I echo the comments that have been made and once again thank everybody for their work on this and their input.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Liesyl.

Just wanted to mention two things. One is, we should talk about Joy, Joy Liddicoat, who is co-chair of the correspondence group, and about Marilyn who's initiated -- whose idea it was to have this exercise. I really appreciate it. And it's more than that, I give you the floor.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I remember the discussion that was going on when I think I said facts are our friends. I too want to really applaud the work that has been done by the correspondence group but also the work that was done by everybody who submitted comments, like Phil, and I tend to think -- perhaps unfairly so -- that I know a lot, but I obviously didn't know a lot of what turned out to be in our document and I would support the idea that if we could now take the stage of the gap analysis and use some professional resources to put together a draft of that particular section and then bring back to the working group a document that could be thoroughly discussed within the working group, we'll have the range of views on the gaps and on what to do going forward. But I think that is, in fact, what is necessary for us to fulfill our work as the working group.

I understand that we would need to have the support of the CSTD to complete the rest of that work. I think it would be important for us to do that. And I think we built up a fair amount of expertise within this body of the working group, that we should continue to take advantage of.

We're at an interesting time in the evolution of the Internet and the role that the Internet can play. There are billions of people who still can benefit from connectivity to the Internet and from access to information and to communications tools, and that makes Internet governance and enhanced

cooperation both very, very important activities that we all need to continue to devote our time and attention to.

So I would support the idea of our completing this work, but I also support the idea of adding in now, at this stage, some additional resources and then coming back to the working group for the thorough discussion. And Chair, I gather that if we have more meetings that I will have to be planning to provide more chocolate chip cookies for the closing days of the meeting.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. They tasted great. Now, let me adopt the motto which has been used during NETmundial, since we have about 7 minutes up to 9:00. Can you limit your intervention to 30 seconds? It was very useful in the NETmundial and it seemed to be -- it works fine. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: 30 seconds, Chair. Absolutely right. Should have recognized Joy. I will write her a letter of apology. Going forward, the delegate from India absolutely spot on. There are gaps and we need to work forward. In addition to the mechanisms and gaps that were provided, these I think you have to take -- bearing in mind that there was some pushback on the correspondence groups of that list so therefore it's worth going forward. And I would propose a small group, probably tomorrow lunchtime, to sit down and provide some guidance to CSTD as to some of the issues that we've learned from the correspondence group that could be used by CSTD in doing the professional. And that was 45 seconds. Apologies.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Brazil. Sao Paulo matters.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. At first we'd like to express our gratitude to the correspondence group for the work and for the efforts put into this document. And echoing previous speakers would like to support the continuation of this work along the lines that were voiced. We think that gap analysis is an important step that should take forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sadly when it comes to the substance we have only 30 seconds to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, no. You misunderstood me. Right now we have to leave at 9:00, but we will continue tomorrow.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay. So we understand -- okay. So we'll continue tomorrow discussing this and follow-up?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: If you have substantive observations, yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. There is gaps, I think, in here that are worth mentioning that will help us in writing the accommodation. I mean, at this state we can't develop this. I don't think so. We need more time to go over this, I mean in terms of correspondence group. The work has been done by the

distinguished delegates. It's fine up to now. Let us take it as a working group and work upon it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, very briefly, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of ICANN I'd just like to say thanks for letting me speak but also the correspondence group I think has done an amazing job. This analysis of what has taken place I think is just -- is just so important. And I think what it clearly shows is that, you know, whether there are gaps or not, I, too, think what India said was very helpful. It needs to be a living document because, you know, the situation is changing all the time. The Internet governance landscape is developing, as we all know. We live it every day. And therefore, what happens, the participation of governments, what happens in different fora is happening all the time. So it must be living, if it possibly can be. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel. With that, I close the interventions. What I want to say also in 30 seconds for tomorrow, homework. Go through the draft report, give me your observations. Second, we are going to discuss outstanding issues that we haven't discussed today because we stopped for dinner. Third, we are going to discuss points group A, group B, and we come to the drafting of the report. We will -- we will take our time to discuss points group A and group B. That's what I intend to do tomorrow, and be prepared to have your dinner with you tomorrow.

So I'm told by Secretariat that you will have the printouts on the table. So you will have the draft report printouts on the table. Upon leaving please do collect them.

I really want to congratulate you. I think today we were in very good spirits. We achieved quite a lot. I know that no -- not everyone is happy. I hope tomorrow we will have more people who will be happy. Thank you, and have a nice evening. I'm sorry. 9:00. You can't come? Sorry. We start tomorrow at 9:00. Whoever can come, please do come at 9:00. Those who can't make it, you will catch up. You will catch up. Saudi.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: So we'll discuss A and B tomorrow.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Everything on the agenda?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes. I promise you, we will do that. U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thanks, Chairman. To clarify, subjects A and B, would that be in the documents that you refer to as we had agreed to in coming back to or everything that had ever been submitted under those categories?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are going to discuss issues where we hope to have some agreement on.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay. So in document 1.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, we are going to discuss, I repeat, issues we think -- we hope to have agreements on. Including --

>> We will discuss A and B, everything in A and B, which is the understanding from the agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We will discuss it.

>> A and B. There's no limitation to discussion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We will discuss it.

>> Okay.