

Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

3-5 May 2017

Geneva, Switzerland

DAY 3

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Geneva, Switzerland

5 MAY 2017

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning, colleagues. I will -- I welcome you back to the meeting. I'd like to resume our work.

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Let me just recall what we have been doing.

We are at -- in the agenda item, we have agreed -- as we agreed at the beginning, we are revisiting and discussing individual recommendations.

We started by those who seemed to -- able and prone to lead to early consensus. I would say that in the course of our exercise, that goal certainly was not achieved but it was very helpful to listen to your exchange on the various recommendations that were on the table. I think this would be very helpful in assisting us -- myself, ourselves, any drafting team that will be put together -- trying to bring together all the ideas that were voiced. I think those -- that exchange was very helpful in that regard.

So this allowed us to cover part of the recommendations, I would say, a set, a subset of the recommendations. Now we are moving to -- still considering recommendations, we want to look into a subset that refers to institutional framework.

So we are still in the same exercise of considering the individual recommendations, but now we are moving from those that seem to be prone to consensus to those who refer to the institutional framework, which, as you may recall, from the beginning, many of you expressed for them -- for you to be the most important issue. And I would say even in the course of our discussion so far, it has become clear that unless we have some more clarity in the minds of people all those elements will fit together and refer to the institutional framework, some of the other part of the discussion may not be ready for consideration.

So I think it is just fair now that we move to that part of the discussion.

As I explained yesterday, we -- together with the secretariat, we have -- I have tried to identify, in each recommendation, the portions that referred to institutional framework. This was submitted to your consideration. We received, I think, a type of reaction or feedback with some clarification in that regard, but I think basically this -- the secretariat has already put on screen the document that we'll be examining.

We are looking at those parts that are highlighted in blue.

And as a methodology for discussion, I suggest we take the same approach that was followed when we were examining high-level principles. That we start considering the proposals that had more references in individual recommendations. So the one single recommendation that clearly emanated as having more support or more reference -- not -- I'll be careful about the word -- not more support but more references in individual recommendations was the one that referred to the creation of a U.N. body.

I am avoiding to say "support" because I know it's a very divisive and controversial issue. It's something that certainly will not be solved by this group, but I think it's fair that -- to listen to those proponents, to have some discussion on it. I think this will assist us in a later stage to understand and to have a better idea on how to reflect -- whether to reflect this in the report.

Again, at this point I'd like to indicate to the group my -- I think we have been talking a lot about what is the intention of this group.

I think having been in New York at the WSIS+ site and having seen at that level many -- some difficulties which were not solved, particularly this one referring to the U.N. body, I think it is in no one's mind that we will solve it here in group. The divisions remain, the controversies remain around some issues, so I think the group is not mandated to solve this. It would be unfair to request the group to solve this. It would be unfair to say if the group cannot solve it the group is a failure, because then the General Assembly failed because they could not solve it at that level.

So the group is not tasked with that. The group is tasked to develop recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation on the basis of the consensus that was achieved by the GA that something has been done, there has been some progress in that regard, even though the full, precise definition on enhanced cooperation has different interpretation, it was agreed by consensus by all member states that some progress has been taking place but still some work needs to be done.

So my interpretation of what we are doing here is that we are trying to identify areas through which the group can recommend when this issue would be revisited by the General Assembly to add some more elements for their consideration.

Wishfully, we can come to areas in which there are -- there is full consensus in the group, some concepts. Even if we wish to reaffirm and to highlight some portions that come from the WSIS outcome document and Tunis Agenda, I think it would be fair that we say from the perspective of enhanced cooperation, those particular elements are of particular importance, we wish to highlight and to articulate ideas and to articulate some -- around some notions like capacity building, technology transfer.

I think there are many, many things we could do by consensus. One of -- probably and certainly this will not be the case for the -- this issue around the U.N. body. This has been going on for -- for years and years. It would be, I think, unrealistic if we would think to solve it here.

But I think it is realistic for us to go into a very substantive discussion on this issue. I think this is something that is lacking.

I would like at this point of the discussion, when you go through the recommendations -- I don't think we need any more -- any kind of extensive and lengthy presentations on the historical background, on the philosophy of this exercise. I think we are all tired of this. We have been going through this many times. We don't need that anymore.

I'd like you to be very focused on your recommendations, on what is your intent, on what is the objective, and I want to have reactions on this.

I think it will be important for the group and I think at the expert level, it's something which we can do. It's not possible to do at the GA level, of course, because I think here we can talk to each other and really have some interaction on this and to have some more clarity on the thinking and the support and the objections any idea can have.

I think this is the contribution we can provide to this exercise to get some more refinement on those ideas, not try to solve everything. We know some things will not be solved but, rather, to bring some -- to shed some light on the issues and to identify areas in which consensus can be -- can be reached that's a basis for further work towards this.

I think this is basically what I -- I envision.

And again, when we are moving to that part of the discussion, we are not doing anything different from what we have been doing. We are listening to proponents on their recommendations. We want to listen to them. We want to give them the opportunity to make some introductory remarks in regard to their recommendation. Then we want to receive feedback. And then we will decide in a subsequent phase what we'll do about that, how we'll address it.

I don't want at this point also -- we are not thinking about the final outcome of this group. We are discussing the actual recommendation. We are -- on its merit, on its substance, and we leave it for another occasion, given today we have agreed that we'll look at the outline. So it's not the moment now to think on how we will process this, but rather, to have some substantive discussion on the topic at hand.

So with this and -- if I can -- with your indulgence, I would like to --

Yes. So before that, Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everybody. I would normally not take the mic the first time in a day. I would perhaps let a government member do it. But I'm forced to do it because unfortunately in my understanding the framing put by the chair -- and I, again, am very diffident to disagree with the chair, but I have to -- is not completely as per my understanding and I have been put to a lot of unease about it.

We have indulged with people who have different views for a long time.

There was the last meeting we indulged with issues which I really think -- and I think a lot of people think that talking about transparency for two hours is really of not much use as far as we have been asked to implement something. And "implementation" is an English word with a serious and clear meaning. It's not to give moral advice.

We did it in the last meeting. We did it for two days in this meeting. But repeatedly one part of the recommendations -- and I will have my description of what that part is, which is different from how the chair described them -- is being prefaced with so much of gloom or almost an uncertainty that we would not be able to do it. But here it has been added -- which I really object to, sorry to say that -- that it's not our job to sort that out. I don't think that it's not our job to do or sort out.

When General Assembly gives a task to a specialized group, General Assembly does 500 very important things. They tell you to go out and sort out and come back. They don't tell you: We didn't do anything so you don't do anything which we did not do. I do not agree that what they could not do and set up a working group to do is not that task of that working group of a specialized setup here like this not to do it.

So the Chair to say that it is not our job to sort this out is something completely needs reclarification of member's views on. I completely disagree. I have spent a lot of time of this, much of it unfunded. I think it's our job, one.

Second, I think the nature of this part I have repeatedly said is not to set up a body or not. For me, it is institutional framework's part. I have repeatedly said that even those who have different views should tell us what is their method of implementation. For me, this part is, therefore, all of them. I'm ready to listen to it. Perhaps agree to that. Perhaps the way they want the high-level characteristics to go to different institutions and come back and report may be acceptable to me. But we are not wanting to talk about the framework. We talk about transparency. We want to talk about people should be inclusive. That's not I think what we were mandated.

I followed this process since WSIS, including various submissions with Brazil and U.N. consultations and I have an idea about what enhanced cooperation is including. I know you have been at WSIS+10 negotiating that task. And, of course, you have an insider view of it. But as an outsider, I have a view.

I think the institutional framework is central. It is not just a body. There could be alternatives. But implementation works -- for me, implementation equals some kind of institutional design change, system, and that has to be described.

So I'm just closing it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, please. Can I maybe just interrupt you? I just --

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, okay.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: For me, this is all those things. People are open to be convinced of the other side. But unless we talk, we are not going to do anything. So all the systems is what we are moving to, and this remains the most important part and we should move to with a positive attitude towards it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, for helping us to move in that direction. I think you're right, and I -- it was not maybe wise on my part to preempt the outcome of this discussion and to say from the start there would be no consensus. I -- I did it because I haven't been in this kind of discussions for many years, not as many as you and others. But I think having been in New York and having seen not only the discussion but to know that those -- the positions of different parts of the discussion, they are -- they are not, let's say, decided upon by the delegates that are there. They reflect views of the world and political guidance that even people in New York could not overlook that. So I think it would be very hard for the group.

Again, I take your point. I should not preempt the outcome and say from the start there will be no consensus. Let's wait for the discussion. Let's do as we have been doing. Listen to the proponents. Have some substantive -- in a way, what I said, and I thank you for highlighting, was contradictory. I said we should listen to everyone and then we should decide, and I said there would be no consensus.

[Laughter]

So let's not jump to that conclusion as yet. Let's go to the discussion.

You have also rightly pointed out that the institutional framework discussion involves not only the creation of U.N. body but there are many other things. We also want to -- personally I would be very much interested that these discussions would not revolve only around the U.N. body but also the other ideas that are being put on the table, which we should also reflect.

When we finish this, this will cover a substantial part of these recommendations. There will be others that -- and then when we come to this, we will also have to see how we address those that have not been covered by those two, let's say, broad categories we are working on. So thank you. Thank you for this.

May I turn then to the Russian Federation and ask you to introduce introductory remarks in regard to Recommendation 49. And just reminding that now we are focusing explicitly the framework part of your proposal, that your proposal contains other parts. So I would invite you to comment on part 2, first the format, and also to part 6 to the extent they relate to the framework.

Russia, please, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to present our proposal. So when it comes to the format, it's very easy for us actually because it's so clearly stated in the para 69 and 71 of the Tunis Agenda that enhanced cooperation format should have two layers. And one layer is intergovernmental, and another is multistakeholder.

When it comes to the intergovernmental format, the main characteristic is that governments should be presented on equal footing between each other and there should be the kind of mechanism for consultation with other stakeholders.

When it comes to the format, we see different possibilities for this format. And we understand clearly that it's the main point of discussion whether it's an institutional body of framework or kind of mechanism or some kind of coordination mechanism.

However, we think that -- and we believe and see that there is a great wide understanding that intergovernmental format is needed. And we think it's important for us to state it in the recommendation of our working group.

Regarding U.N. agency, we think they should play a very important part in this format also because as we discuss already, that the scope of public policy issues pertaining to the Internet is quite wide. And it's not about, like somebody said yesterday, the discussion who's more important, ITU or ICANN. It's not about ITU and ICANN. It's much wider.

And ITU and other organizations, U.N. agency, UNESCO, UNGA -- sorry, UNCTAD involves -- WIPO, should play a big role in this, according to their competence, according to their mandate, because intellectual property rights is an important part in public policy. ECommerce taxation is also important, things should also be addressed, cybersecurity-s, information securities, ethics. UNESCO is also a part of this.

And we believe that this body or this mechanism should not take this role from these agencies but should also play a very important role to coordinate the activities and to make, you know, the essential part.

Regarding multistakeholder layer, we think we already have a number of forums, multistakeholder forums, IGF, WSIS forum, high-level political forums. So we think it's already the settled basement for this and part of the work is already done. But the intergovernmental format is needed.

Then we come to the recommendation. Can you scroll it?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: So when it comes to recommendation, how we see it, that this particular material -- we made it in a structured way -- should be included as an annex to the CSTD report, to -- you know, and to -- make it clear the position of some countries. For Russia, for example.

Then we think that UNGA should be -- should invite the -- should -- we -- to invite UNGA to consider reasonability to establishing U.N. separate body or framework or mechanism for intergovernmental format of continuation of enhanced cooperation in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

Then we think it's needed to invite relevant U.N. agencies -- intergovernmental, international and regional organizations -- responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to create and support environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles.

And also regarding this material, it has to be made an annex to recommend governments and other stakeholders to use this annex to make it to a report in the activities.

So this is actually the main idea.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia, and I thank you for presenting and commend you for being very precise in your intervention.

I would say that in regard to the recommendations for the purpose of examining the proposal related to the framework, we should focus on the second and third bullets because the other refers more to other reporting and how we address it. We are not discussing this now. We are just discussing the idea related to the framework, so we are -- I invite then colleagues to comment on the proposal by Russia.

And I will just also want to highlight that after we -- we have that discussion on recommendation from Russia, we will also listen to others who have made similar proposals. This, if you want already to be appraised, they are Parminder's proposal, 72; India, 75; Iran in 79, I think, or 77; then Cuba and Saudi Arabia.

So we want to give -- since this was the single-most referred to idea, I want to give some kind of equal timing for all, because there are different nuances and approaches and we think it's useful for the group to have some discussion on the elements that are contained in those proposals.

Of course I expect that some of your comments will maybe refer to all of the ideas as a whole, so depending on the way you frame your comments, we don't need to repeat them for each and every proposal but I invite now comments on the Russian recommendation.

I recognize the representative of the United Kingdom, followed by Japan and Richard Hill.

You have the floor, Paul.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone and thank you to Russia for presenting their proposal.

For now it's just a question of clarification because I'm not sure we have understood exactly the detail of the proposal.

Is Russia suggesting that there should be a new body which would, in some way, coordinate the work of existing U.N. agencies? Is that the suggestion?

And if so, I wonder if Russia could just say a little bit more about how that new body would manage the coordination process. Just to give us a little bit more detail of what the proposal is would be very helpful. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I suggest as we have been doing now, let's get the comments and then I'll turn back to you, Russia, for your comments.

So Japan, can I have your thoughts on this, followed by Richard Hill and Anriette?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. I also had some concern concerning the of use of this.

What is this establishing U.N. support body? What does that mean?

It's a point I see in this recommendation, second point to the recommendation, it says "U.N. support body/frameworks/mechanisms." Well, does that mean instead of establishing U.N. separate body, using the existing organizations and the -- to develop new mechanisms using this existing organization is also a possible option?

We can go along with this latter approach using the existing institution and developing maybe new mechanisms to continue enhanced cooperation, but we are not -- we don't support this separate -- establishing the new separate body simply because I don't think it's necessary. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard Hill, followed by Anriette.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. May I make a very short comment on Section 2? Not the recommendations. The previous section.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. It's very quick. It just seems to me that with some editorials, including putting some stuff in square brackets, that that could be something -- a candidate for consensus because it's just a description of what's going on. So I think with a little bit of massaging, that could be a candidate for consensus, at least to guide us in our work, and not necessarily something to appear in the report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can I just ask you maybe to elaborate a little more? How do you see it reflected on text?

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, clearly we don't agree on the U.N. separate body so that would have to be in square brackets, and otherwise, it's I think a fair description of what actually is going on today.

It then needs a little fine-tuning. So in the right-hand column, it would be role of nongovernment stakeholders, and then the bottom column which has two times equal footing, it has to be clear that the equal footing applies across the two columns and not within each column, but that's all minor.

This seems to me a pretty good description of what exists, except of course for the separate body, so that would have to be in square brackets.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for this clarification.

Anriette, followed by Cuba.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto.

I also have some questions, and -- but a few comments as well.

I found the two different layers of enhanced cooperation a helpful device. However, I would say that the role of nongovernmental stakeholders is presented in too limited and narrow a way. I think just consulting.

I think in the way that public policymaking has evolved, and with initiatives like the Open Government Partnership, I think it's more than just consulting. But I still find that quite a useful layer.

I also liked the other different layers of categories. I noted that human rights in cyberspace features under social and economic development. I don't see mention of the Human Rights Council, which, in fact, is probably the U.N. body that has made most Internet-related decisions. But -- so I do find it helpful.

What I'm not clear on is, to me what you present in that resolution actually demonstrates that there is a lot of, in the intergovernmental sector, Internet-related decisions being made. So I also don't really understand where the new body will come in and how it will function, because I think this actually demonstrates the scope, and as you said in your presentation, how wide the scope is, and how many institutions are dealing with Internet-related policy issues.

So my question, I suppose, is similar to the U.K.'s: What would a new body add when so much expertise and specialized expertise is developing inside the intergovernmental system?

So those are my primary questions.

But if you were to use your model, I would say aside -- I would put the human rights layer in addition to social and economic development, not as just included in social and economic development.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette.

We are not addressing at this point the topics. That will be covered. We are just addressing the framework. But thank you again for your comments.

Cuba, followed by the European Union.

Yes, please.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm taking the floor now because I believe that in the schedule, maybe I will not be able to present my proposal, and also the questions that are put in the table now are the same for my proposal, so I will rather answer it now.

Why --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, Juan. Please, I'd like you to stick to the comments in regard to the recommendation by Russia.

>>CUBA: I'm responding to questions. There have been questions in the -- in the floor why is needed a new thing and narrow and how -- so many, and I'm going to address that, because it also covers my response. I think it's appropriate not to wait till that moment.

That is right. That is right what Anriette said. In United Nations, we have 15 specialized agencies. The specialized agency topic covers important aspects of the -- of the world and society. We have the Food Agricultural Association, FAO, International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, International Labour Organization, et cetera, et cetera. We have 15. We have related organizations. We have five related organizations, for your -- that cover important issues, and many of them are also cross-cutting. They got migration. Migration is covered. Atomic Energy Agency. The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Some are more specialized than others. So it's -- World Trade Organization. Those are the related organizations. Part of the U.N. family.

We have 13 in the -- in the U.N. family, three funds and --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- (off microphone) something. I want to -- I'm telling you this because I want to have the same level --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Everyone will have three minutes, so you have three and you have to manage your time so you may wish to abridge.

>>CUBA: (off microphone) -- in the U.N., there's a lot of things, many cross-cutting, like for women and gender, because they have what they call coordinator mechanisms, they have all that. No? And even for some cross-cutting.

So -- but -- even we have for the sea, for the climate, whatever.

And we are experts here and we have been in all the forums that -- you remember the commissions and all that. We are all saying that Internet is the new platform that is so important for economy, commerce, society, human, inclusive education, and all that, and there's not a place, a single place, in which governments that does not have large resources can go and discuss the issues of this topic.

As you see, they will have to go to ITU, they will have to go to UNCTAD, if it's something that has to do with like .africa, they will have to go to WIPO, they will have to go to this and to that and to that, and that is really unbearable for the majority of the countries of the world.

We need a place, a sort of clearing place, and the U.N. has many examples of them doing it because they have coordination, they have working groups, they have -- I could follow -- I have the whole list, but the chairman don't want me to go to the whole list. I could give it -- give it to you later.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: (off microphone).

>>CUBA: Okay. And I could put the Web site there. It's a United Nations Web site, unsceb.org/directory. You have there the whole directory of United Nations with categories and all that, and you will see that there are many things that cover things what we want.

So we need a place in order to discuss, deliberate, at a high political level where ministers can go, even head of states if they want to, to deliver things related with Internet.

In the European Union, they do it, in their own council at the high political level, and discuss all these issues. But we need something globally for that, for deliberation of the policies, of international public policy pertaining to the Internet. That's what we're discussing here. To do that.

Of course that body will not replace what ITU is doing in the technical or in the -- in -- in the spectrum and all that. Of course it will not replace if it's something that has to do with intellectual property rights with what it's doing in WIPO. If it has to do with commerce, it doesn't replace what it's doing in World Trade Organization. But it should have institutional linkage, institutionalized linkage with those organizations. So if some concern -- some country present a concern relating for Internet -- intellectual property things related with the Internet that happen very often, then they present it in this body and in -- in a formalized way, and this body then can have this arrangement with WIPO and pass it to the formal WIPO discussion places. The -- the -- this gentleman from the -- from the developed country -- developing country doesn't have to follow all that. They only go to one. It's like a clearinghouse. One point. In Spanish, we call it -- (non-English word or phrase) -- only one place where you go. You don't have to go to many places to do this step. You go to only one place.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Could you kindly close?

>>CUBA: You do that and then it has -- of course to have that, this has to be not only a mechanism. This has to be a recognized entity. Maybe it doesn't need a building but it needs a secretariat and it needs an entity with a -- (non-English word or phrase) -- a person who has a juridical personality, to have this institutional arrangement with all those that you see that are going on.

And if we have this for -- we have -- we have this for many --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: -- new challenges of the world, HIV and --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I think it's clear --

>>CUBA: -- and we need it for that, and so this needs to be --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Juan --

>>CUBA: I'm ending now, I'm ending now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please --

>>CUBA: -- (off microphone) secretariat in order to carry out this coordination of things. That's why it's needed. We have it for so many things. For the seas. For outer space we have it. And we don't have an Internet -- and we have the experts that are saying in all fora that Internet is the most important thing in the last time. Who are the ones who should defend the existence of this fora? We are.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No. Thank you, Juan, and I apologize to you because I do not want to --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I wanted to have as much time --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think it was useful, but -- I think it was useful, but to be very candid, I think you do not need to give too many examples. When you say there are international bodies, you don't need to go into each of them because I want to give this fair opportunity for everyone to present ideas and to discuss to you and not only this subject and we'll not get there if we have --

I would really urge colleagues to try to stick to the time because this will allow us -- the meeting to flow in a way that we can cover all the topics.

So with this -- but I -- your ideas are very helpful. We take note of them, certainly. This would be very helpful for the debate.

I will turn to the European Union, and I also have India and ISOC, so let me --

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning everybody.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning. Thanks also to the Russian Federation for their proposal.

I think following the discussion we had also yesterday, there was an extensive debate also regarding the duplication of work. We would like to see, thus, following also what the colleague from Cuba said, exactly the added value of this body.

So if the Russian Federation could clarify in some very clear bullet points the added value. And also the role, because also from the intervention from Cuba, we want to know exactly the consultative role.

Is it a role of this body to try to pass information? Is it a role of -- so we have a little bit more -- we would like to have a little bit more clarity about the role of this body in order to comment further. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, E.U. Again, then we take on board those questions. They will be addressed by Russian Federation in due time.

I will collect the -- all the views and then I'll turn to Russia.

So following my list, I have India, followed by ISOC, Canada, and Nick and Saudi Arabia.

So India, you have the floor.

U.S. as well. So India, you have the floor.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request you if you could kindly scroll it to Recommendation 75 on the screen.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>INDIA: Okay. So we'll be making our intervention then. Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>ISOC: Thank you, Chair. My comment is into -- in regards to the recommendation about a new intergovernmental mechanism. ISOC's understanding of enhanced cooperation is about strengthening collaboration among all the stakeholders, and from our view, such a mechanism would be in quite stark contrast to our understanding of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, chair. Good morning all colleagues. Thank you to the Russian Federation for presenting their contribution. Like the U.K., like Anriette, Canada has questions with this. In our view when we decide to create a new U.N. body, we do so because there's a serious problem that needs to be addressed. H.I.V., people were dying. It needed immediate, urgent, and separate action from the broad, general work that the WHO was doing.

There is no other body dealing with oceans, I think, other than the convention and the secretariat. So those are very specific issues.

Now, we've heard, again, and again, especially since the SDGs came out that ICT are an underlying technology, that they will support so many of these SDGs, so many of the work that is taking place in all of these other U.N. fora.

So I fail to see what exactly is the problem that you are trying to solve by creating this agency or this framework or this mechanism.

If you're telling me we're trying to solve cybercrime, well, crime is an INTERPOL and UNODC issue, so we're duplicating the work. Really, I guess, that's the question: What is the problem that you would be trying to solve by creating this new body framework or mechanism? Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada, for this. We will later on have Russia respond.

I will give the floor now to Nick Ashton-Hart followed by Saudi Arabia, U.S., and Marilyn Cade.

Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. Good morning to all. Sort of a related question -- thank you to the Russian Federation for the proposal -- is if we imagined a world tomorrow where this process existed, I think we all know that there's a pretty substantial history of interagency co-opetition or competition where there is mandate overlap. And here it seems like there would be the certainty of some perceived overlap at least between the many agencies where the Internet is discussed as part of work on other areas.

Do you have an idea in your mind of -- if you convene this forum tomorrow, do you have an idea in your mind of what agenda subjects that you think decisions taken by it would uniquely seek to do? Or how it would relate to the work of perhaps the chief executives board as it tries to coordinate cross-cutting action across the different agencies, how it would relate to that function?

I mean, if it existed tomorrow, how would it work and what would it do that is extremely difficult to do otherwise? Which is sort of related to the Canadian question. I'm asking if you have sort of a practical idea in your mind of certain subject areas which it could tackle. Maybe if you could walk us through any of those, it would be easier for us to visualize it ourselves. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick. Again, we are taking note of this and handing it over to Russia, if you wish to tackle it in a moment.

I turn now to Saudi Arabia followed by the U.S. and Marilyn Cade and Parminder.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues. We thank our Russian delegates for their proposal.

I think we have so many issues to be looked at in this institutional framework. We have privacy issue, data protection issue, Internet security issues. We have so many issues. And we have -- this was circulated to us yesterday. It's full of major issues. Who will solve this? There is a place for us to come around and have an equal-footing discussion on development of Internet public policy issues to solve and to protect the user of the Internet, to protect the hospitals that are linked to Internet, schools that are linked to Internet, banks that are linked to Internet, governments that are linked to the Internet. We have so many issues need to be solved.

Ten years ago, Tunis Agenda was very clear that current mechanisms are not evolving. And after ten years, more than the current mechanisms, we have so much development with no involvement in the international level to deal with or to protect the users. So we have so many issues to be looked at by this institutional mechanisms recommended by Russia. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I'll turn now to U.S. followed by Marilyn Cade and Parminder.

U.S., you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues.

First off, I would like to thank Russia for the fact that they used a different format to present their idea. I think that sometimes it is useful to use matrices and graphics and to move away from the narrative structure that we often use. So I thank you for putting those ideas in a different format.

Questions regarding your proposal. So I'm hearing two different things. I'm hearing kind of a coordinator of agencies, a secretariat of agencies, but I'm also hearing that there are so many issues to solve that we need some kind of macro problem solving -- solver.

So I'm wondering, number one, what would be the core competencies of this particular agency. You mentioned the other agencies do have separate mandates and core competencies.

So, number one, what would the core competency be? And then, number two, how does this agency work with multistakeholders and what kind of process do you foresee for it? Thank you.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, colleagues. I, too, want to thank Russia for in particular both the substance that's elaborated but also the format. I found it helpful to be able to examine the substance there.

I do -- the question about duplication of work is also a question that I have. But I'd also like to understand -- and I think this is a particularly relevant question -- is how would the new agency be paid for? And how would the cost of the secretariat be paid for? What would the competencies of the secretariat resources be that are different from the resources that are available within the existing U.N. agencies? How would this agency be able to, for instance, address creating a solution to protecting children online that is different than the work that is already going on elsewhere? Maybe it's the -- it's like why -- what is the competency at this agency that is different from the competency that is at the existing agencies? And how would the authority to overrule decisions that are taken at the other U.N. agencies, how would that be worked out? Would it be through formal agreements? Would it be a requirement that the other agencies change their constitutions and conventions to allocate certain overrule authority to this agency?

I have a question also about is part of the problem that you're trying to address what I will call a lack of easy access to information, about what is going on in some of the agencies about a particular topic that it's difficult to understand the work unless you're there in person. So is part of the problem you are trying to address creating this one-stop shop about where information comes in? From other agencies, it's aggregated. And so to Juan's point that you don't individually participate, you just go to this one place.

I will now just make a comment about my experience --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: If you could refrain --

>>MARILYN CADE: -- that's directly relevant. And I will wrap up.

There have been instances where businesses have decided to create coordinating bodies and all business groups come there instead of interacting directly. And it's very, very often to lose -- easy to lose the smaller voices and the necessary access to information. So I'd like to just understand how this agency would make sure there's very broad dissemination of information that's different from what's going on right now.

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

I have a list that is growing continuously. I think it's probably by addressing this first recommendation, addressing this topic, we will cover a lot of ground later on. I think it's only fair to dedicate that much time to this. We have taken on board many issues that have been raised. They are taken note of. I will then try to summarize when I turn to Russia for comments.

And I think, if you wish, some of those topics, for example, I think will -- are not suited for a response right now, for example.

I think Marilyn has raised many issues, many important issues. But in regard to how this would be funded -- I think once the GA decides to do anything, there will be another problem-solving issue. It's not for us to try to solve it as of now. But many other points were important.

So I have on my list Parminder. I have Kenya. And I have Timea from ICC-BASIS.

So, Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I will try to briefly address the issue which Canada and Nick and others raised about what is the problem which is being solved. I will come to more details when I discuss my proposal.

But I think the background is 59 and 60 of Tunis Agenda. 60 says, "We further recognize there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms," 2005. We are 2017. So if in 2005 Tunis Agenda clearly said there are issues which are not adequately addressed, there are issues which are not adequately addressed even in

'17. Otherwise, people can tell us which issues were not adequately addressed in '07 and now they are addressed.

So this remains a part of the fact that only yesterday I received "Economist" edition whose cover story this time is regulating the digital economy. That's the cover story of "The Economist" who is not very pro-regulation, by the way. This is popular press getting the idea. But we sitting in the effects of a sophisticated policy space seem not to get that there is an issue of regulation of digital society in space. So that really is odd.

Apart from this fact, when people ask me what is to be done at all, I simply ask them that there's an OECD committee on digital economic -- digital economy policy. The committee on digital economy policy was set up a few years back, last four, five years. An earlier committee's name was changed. A new mandate was given. That does things -- it is one of the most rapidly changing calendar of all the OECD committees. Just go up and see the things and all those things need to be done.

There are 50 other OECD committees. Despite them, this committee was set up. There's on labor, education, everything, but this committee is doing work. If OECD in its wisdom -- within OECD thinks we need a committee on digital economy inside U.N., we also need a committee on digital society. It's very simple.

And I have got issues. They have all done (indiscernible) data flows, eCommerce, role of Internet intermediaries, big data, Internet of Things, label displacement modernation, online consumer protection. I don't have the time to go on.

And the last point is all countries have some kind of mechanism today, which is either I.T. or cyber or digital. And all these mechanisms are evolving. New ones are being set up. For the same reasons they need it, U.N. needs it.

So I think it's not really that much of a surprise that somebody is asking about this. This need was identified in 2005, and the number of issues have gone a few times more, maybe like geometric progression. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I have Kenya, Timea, and then I am closing the list and I am turning to Russia. We will have opportunity to address other issues later when we address the other recommendations. But for the moment, I have Kenya and Timea will be the last speakers on this before I turn to Russian Federation.

Kenya, please, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair. First, I take the floor to thank the Russian delegation for their proposal and the elaboration that has been given in that support by other delegations.

I want just to underscore the fact that I think this working group was established because there is a wisdom, there's a need, there is a cup to be filled. And that cup on enhanced cooperation on international public policy issue is what we have to make recommendations to address.

So I just was thinking those of us who feel actually a mechanism or some of the recommendations being met are not necessary, it defeats the logic of why we are here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. I'm sorry to interrupt, Kenya. I would like to focus on the recommendation from Russia. We are not discussing the overall framework for our discussion.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: The main point is I'm supporting the recommendation and emphasizing the fact that this committee is here to make recommendations that will improve the core business of improved cooperation on public policy issues.

We have said there are very many organizations, agencies dealing with Internet issues on different levels on their various competencies. We strongly believe that a mechanism that will coordinate all these efforts by various agencies and organizations is very important. And to sum up, we strongly support that recommendation for a mechanism. Whether it is intergovernmental or multistakeholder, I think the details of it can evolve with time. Thank you, Chair.

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

Last speaker on this before I turn to Russian Federation will be Timea Suto from ICC-BASIS. You have the floor.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. My comment relates to the questions that have been raised before. It is unclear for us how this new mechanism, this new body that we are talking about creating perhaps, how would this play into the array of venues and fora where enhanced cooperation is already being implemented in a way and how would this go about in addressing the issues that is different in manner than those bodies that are already addressing the issues we have been talking about.

So my question would just be we need clarification on that. And because of this reason, I don't see our supporting the creation of a new body at this moment.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Timea. And I thank all of you who made interventions.

As I turn to the Russian Federation -- sorry? I will not attempt to summarize all the points that were raised. But I -- some of them caught my attention. So I will maybe just make a call in highlighting some of the things I think are very important when you will look again to the proposal and try to further refine it in the light of some concerns, if you wish.

So there was an issue about the coordination. U.K. requested the clarification about the intention is for the body to coordinate or not. I think this is something that would be important if you could address it in your intervention.

Also, there was some questions about, I think, coming from the -- what is the added values or what are the roles especially in regard to the consultative role that is being addressed. And I think in general, also, what are the core competencies. I think the basic concern is how this new body framework of mechanism is proposed will relate to existing institutions. What would be its role in regard? Would it

seek to impose itself on those existing institutions, play some coordinating role? How it would operate in regard to the decisions that are taken in this new existing body in relation to decisions that are taken elsewhere? Organizations that have different governing bodies. I think there are that kind of concerns that was expressed.

If you wish to address this and others, of course, I may be lacking certain views -- have been lacking many, many important points. But I think those were the ones that caught my attention.

So I turn to Russia. Of course, any comments you may wish because maybe some of those comments are more food for thought than something that will require an immediate answer now. But to the extent you want to address them, you are most welcome to do it now. Please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, first regarding the problem that should be solved, I agree with Parminder. And actually its Resolution 7125, 56, that many cross-cutting international public policy issues require attention and have not been adequately addressed. That means that the problem exists. This is the first.

About what areas? Actually, if we scroll here, it's areas, it's about scope and focus area of enhanced cooperation. And actually it's a big table shows that there's a lot of areas and, as I said, cybersecurity and infrastructure and capacity building, a lot of areas.

So these areas should be addressed by a U.N. organization about the authority of U.N. organizations -- agencies.

It's according to their mandate. If ITU has mandate, ITU should address the issues according to the address -- its mandate. WIPO, other organizations, all they have mandates; so they should address these issues.

When it comes to the separate body, actually, it's a bit premature to say that Russia propose a separate U.N. body. Russia said that there is the need for format, intergovernmental format for enhanced cooperation. This is what actually our contribution says. And we do not propose the body. We propose U.N. General Assembly to think about what this format should look like and it's actually to the consideration that who will pay for this and how easy or complicated to make it because UNGA understand better what format can be arranged, either it's a separate body or it's kind of a commission under existing organization or agency or it's a group of experts, for example.

We have a lot of examples of how it can be addressed. It can be addressed but it's not our task to decide. I think it's UNGA to decide also about the question of money.

Regarding the function of this format, so we think that, well, first it's coordination. It's definitely -- taking the understanding of the number of agencies and the number of focus areas and scope which will be addressed, of course coordination is needed, consolidation and prioritization, so this is actually the main function of this format, what we see.

So regarding the consultative role, well, we think it's, well, good wording. If you don't like, you know, the word "consulting," please propose another. But we think that if we -- if you come to the Human Rights Council, for example, well, of course we are not against, you know, to put Human Rights Council into this actual table, of course, but if we come to the function, who is the responsible for human rights? It's governments responsible for the human rights, not other stakeholders. That's why, you know, the roles are different. So that is clear. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia. I think with this, I'd like to close discussion on this particular recommendation and move to 72 from Parminder.

I think, although we have spent a lot of time on this first one, as we go through the others that refer to the same subject, maybe I'd like to seek additional comments in regard to those that were made. We don't need to repeat what was said. It was already taken note of.

You want to take the floor before we move to -- yes, Richard, on a point of order.

>>RICHARD HILL: No, not a point of order, but --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry. It's not a point of order?

>>RICHARD HILL: No. No. When it's a point of order, I'm going like this. May I, even though it's not a point of order?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: If it's a point of order. Otherwise, I will turn to Parminder. I do not want to stop what we are doing at this point.

>>RICHARD HILL: Okay. Then I will make the point after Parminder's speech. No problem.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So Parminder, you have the floor to make introductory remarks in regard to your Proposal 72. I'd ask the secretariat to put that up.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I see it on the screen.

Okay. So it's a -- it's a single recommendation because they are connected points, but it's spread out, and therefore I think like the E.U., U.K., and U.S. proposals, it needs to be given different --

There are items that can be separately considered, so I think we also need to be able to see the first three separate, and other two and two separate, and that also would go to the time that would be required to introduce this proposal, which I don't want to take too much time.

So Russia did say that it's premature to say that they're asking for a new mechanism. It's not at all premature to say that I'm asking for it.

So here it's very clear that I think that a new mechanism or body is needed, equal to what WHO does for health and UNESCO for education, FAO for food and agriculture, and -- however, I may clarify this point and say that it's okay if we take a smaller step and make, as Russia was saying, some kind of

commission, committee, open working group, which is an entity which is a step in that direction which could be done but shouldn't be something in the opposite direction.

Why this is needed?

I did earlier speak about the need of it.

There is a Committee on Digital Economic Policy of OECD which does this work, and that's exactly --

I mean, for me, I just see it -- they are 35 members, and if you put 189 or whatever is the U.N. membership in, that's the body. And the proposal as we'll go down is actually modeled on that body. I'll come to that point.

The first point is about -- U.S. and others have raised -- this is Number 2 -- whether it's a coordination mechanism or it's a vertical mechanism.

Now, we keep on talking about future-proofing our suggestions or our recommendations. We live in a networked age. Internet is a meta issue. It connects to all other issues and the requirement is for a body which is able to do specialized work which is stand-alone but is also able to interact with all organizations on Internet-related aspects of health, of education, of labor, of development. We know that they are Internet-related aspects which go closely to the Tunis Agenda language of Internet-related public policies.

So it interacts with all these organizations in terms of the Internet-related aspects of the core issues in their domain, and independently does things like artificial intelligence, big data, Internet intermediaries, platform governance. There are hundreds, all of them huge, on which E.U. has been, for example, working a lot. They're stand-alone work things.

None of them are technical in the sense that ITU does technical standards or ICANN does technical standards, but again, it will have relationship also with ICANN and ITU to be able to coordinate the complex entity that Internet is and the complex manner in which Internet is interacting with all sectors of the society.

So its purpose would be that it will keep abreast of global Internet-related issues, undertake discussions, develop Internet norms and public policies, seek appropriate harmonization of national level policies and, where necessary, facilitate required treaties, conventions, and agreements.

Now, people do kind of start wondering as if it is not understood in the U.N. system what is public policy function. It is very well understood. Thank UNESCO, thank UNO, WITO. They're not making treaties daily. The last time UNESCO made a treaty was long back. They are doing many complex works which together constitute public policymaking at U.N. level.

So this is not an invention of either Tunis Agenda or other proposals. They do norms building. They give guidelines. They help individual nations. They just discuss and add perspectives. They publish reports, all in a neutral manner and not in a manner which is dominated by the interests of one set of

countries as most Internet governance outputs today are. So that's what UNESCO does. The public policymaking is a huge complex, very well understood in the U.N. system. Neither it is treaty making but nor it is mere discussion. It's a whole set of things in between and that's all which this organization would do.

It specifically requires a unit which is able to do research, policy analysis, and policy advice, especially from a developing country standpoint as UNCTAD does on trade, because this is a very fast-moving area. All of you keep on talking about capacity building, but I mean, these words don't add up, if you actually talk about what and how about it. And the what and how about it is it is a U.N. agency which produces outputs on artificial intelligence, flow of data, IoT, how it changes business and all that.

So we need a hugely resourced institution with a research and analysis wing along with it.

And now the question I think from ICC was -- or the U.S. or perhaps both was how -- where is the U.S.? - about what is the nature of multistakeholder engagement with this new institution.

The model which I have suggested is a cut-and-paste from OECD's Committee on Digital Economy Policy which has three advisory groups -- technical advisory group, civil society advisory group and business advisory group -- which meets, looks at drafts, gives recommendations, so it's a very developed system of work which -- practices which are done in OECD.

My proposal is just cut and paste it on the new institution and that's done.

Now, one very interesting thing -- I would request the attention of the room -- is that OECD calls OECD's Digital Economy Policy Committee as a multistakeholder body. It is an intergovernmental council with stakeholder groups which are advisory groups. However, when India made a proposal on committee on Internet-related policies which was exactly the same model, the whole world says it is a multilateral body.

So I think we need to be a little bit more consistent on it. If this design is multistakeholder inside OECD, this design is multistakeholder inside U.N. as well. We just need to clarify things on that. How would that same design become multilateral because a set of developing countries have been added to it?

So my suggestion, therefore, is to just take that model of stakeholder engagement and cut and paste it on this new body.

And then just quickly two small points.

One is that this would have an organic relationship with the IGF. In that sense, this would be even more multistakeholder than the OECD's committee on digital economic policy, which does not have an equivalent body, so there will be an organic relationship with the IGF, which is the primary arena for stakeholder participation in Internet public policy development, which was the intention of the Tunis Agenda and also the subsequent GA resolutions which have talked about it as a distinct but complementary process.

And lastly, though it would not get into coordination and management of critical Internet resources, which is Paragraph 70 of Tunis Agenda -- no, some other paragraph, but it says that it has to develop globally applicable principles on public policy related to it, so it will be hands-off, just develop larger global public policy principles for technical management both for ITU and ICANN and take reports and does not enter into technical management.

Thank you so much, sir.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for those introductory remarks. I have allowed you enough time to do it in respect for the fact there are different aspects of your proposal that are of interest for us to hear some more elaboration, although in practice it was one single proposal. But I'm trying just to be fair to give enough opportunity for the real substance of recommendations to be sorted out, and I thank you for being -- to stick to what was on the text, even if it needed some more time for your elaboration.

I'd like to suggest to you -- we are on the last day of our meeting. I would suggest that -- with your indulgence, that we could skip the coffee break because I think we are having -- we have planned for a 15-minute coffee break and we are taking half an hour, so that will leave us with one hour to discuss in the morning.

So if you could agree, we could skip and continue because I think we are having a kind of fluid conversation. I'd like not to break the momentum for that. I will -- but I have a list of speakers.

Would anyone like to speak to that or that would agreed by the group we could move on?

Yeah. I don't see no one making any significant movement in that regard so I thank you for that. I have on my list a few speakers for this proposal.

I have -- and I apologize if I'm not following exactly the order you have signaled. I have Richard Hill, I have Switzerland, U.K., Anriette, and Nick Ashton-Hart. Australia. Yes, Australia as well. Yes, please.

Richard, you can go.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. Actually, I learned a lot from Parminder's introduction, and in particular, I've taken the trouble to go look up this OECD digital committee and it's -- Committee on Digital Economic Policy and its terms of reference, and I think that actually does answer some of the very valid questions that were asked earlier about what would such a new beast do at the international level.

Basically, the point is to avoid duplication by checking that two different agencies are not doing the same thing and also filling gaps -- if there's a gap, then tell somebody to go off and do it -- and also address cross-cutting issues.

The terms of reference of the OECD thing are quite long. I'll just read one little bit.

"The committee shall, in particular, develop and promote the coherent policy and regulatory frame-" -- "regulatory," wow, the "R" word -- "coherent policy and regulatory framework which supports competition, investment, and innovation across digital economy in particular." Then I won't go into "in

particular," but it's the stuff that we all know is important -- how to get access, you know, broadband, and strengthening trust -- and then it cooperates with other committees and does all sorts of interesting things, but basically it's kind of a coordination thing.

So I think that answers some of the questions.

So I have a question for people who know this beast better than I do. I don't know it at all, actually. I just discovered it.

If it's a good thing to do it at the OECD level, why is it not a good thing to do at the international level? Or maybe it's a bad thing to do at the OECD level and then it should be eliminated in the sake of -- for the sake of efficiency.

I am an OECD taxpayer, so it does concern me.

And then the other question I have is, I -- I -- there used to be something somewhat along these lines at the level of the European Union, some sort of coordination mechanism to discuss Internet governance issues that were cross-cutting, and again, in an attempt to avoid duplication and handle cross-cutting issues and so on.

So maybe -- and there might be in other regional groups also. So maybe people who have knowledge of those institutions, mechanisms, committees, whatever they are, could not at this meeting, obviously, but come back and give us a bit more information and that could guide our work to know what's actually going on elsewhere.

Because I believe the point Parminder makes is very valid.

We know that there's a need to coordinate things and have a coordinated framework and we don't want one organization going off and doing something and another one doing something else. How do we coordinate that work in order to avoid duplication and make sure there's no gaps and make sure that, as the OECD rightly puts it, there's a coherent framework?

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. I turn now to Switzerland, followed by U.K. and Anriette.

Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much for giving me the floor and thanks a lot to Parminder for explaining his proposal.

I guess that we may face similar questions to -- to those we have been discussing before regarding the Russian proposal.

Questions like how do we ensure that there is no duplication of the mandates of other organizations.

My thought is every -- or almost all aspects of public policy and of life have now a digital edge, so it's natural that many organizations, many agencies develop digital expertise, sometimes with new functions, sometimes with new departments, sometimes with new strategies.

So if this is happening in other agencies or in the processes with, let's say, traditional mandates or off-line mandates, what would be really the -- the added value of this new mechanism or of this new body? So I -- I think we would need more clarity on that.

It seems that the -- one of the aspects would be that clearinghouse function or this coordination role.

Also, identifying emerging topics. And maybe this reminds me -- and it's kind of funny that your proposal is Number 72 -- Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda where we talk about the mandate of the IGF.

Maybe there are also some kinds of aspects that are already covered there and we should know more exactly what would be the difference.

Of course it seems that one of the differences is this more intergovernmental way of working, but if you look into the Tunis Agenda, about the Paragraph 72 and the following ones, there is also room for being flexible and of innovating therein.

And lastly, I'm a bit curious about what you mean with maintaining an organic relationship with the IGF. It sounds very nice, very constructive, but how do you imagine that, really, in the real life? Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jorge, for raising those points. We are taking note of comments and in due time, I turn it over to Parminder.

Let's hear now -- U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Parminder for presenting the proposal. As we understand it, this is not simply a proposal for a coordination body. This is a new body which will develop international norms and public policies which will seek appropriate harmonization of national policies, which will facilitate treaties, conventions, and agreements. And to us, having listened to it, it sounds simply like a plan than duplication as Switzerland has suggested.

And we would ask, are we then -- if we set up this body, are we going to tell UNICEF that they must stop work on child online protection guidelines for industry? Will we tell the ITU they must no longer discuss over-the-top services? Will we tell UNESCO they shouldn't do work on digital literacy and multilingualism? Are we saying WIPO should no longer discuss online copyrights or the Human Rights Council should no longer discuss online privacy? Because if not, the only thing this proposal will achieve is a new organization, yet another one, yet more secretariats, perhaps yet another building, yet more meetings for us all to attend and more confusion about who is responsible for what.

If the proposal is to genuinely tell other U.N. bodies they should stop the work they are doing on Internet-related issues because it's going to move into this new body, then I can understand the logic

that we don't want duplication. But if we're not going to do that, from what we can see in this proposal, it is simply creating more organizations, more meetings, more secretariat, more cost, and more confusion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., for your comments. I have on my list Anriette followed by Nick and Australia.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. And thank you, Parminder.

I will just briefly respond with the chair's indulgence to Richard's question. My organization is involved in the OECD structure as part of the civil society mechanism.

Firstly, the mandate is actually not cross-cutting. It deals with broadband and telecom, which in the U.N. system is dealt with by the ITU. Internet economy, which in the U.N. system is dealt by UNCTAD -- there was a eCommerce week not so long ago. And UNCTAD has done extensive work on the suite of public policies that are needed to create enabling environments.

And then it also deals with consumer policy, the OECD Internet economy section, and the digital environment. It does look at Internet governance processes. And it also looks at -- sorry, digital governments. So very much -- that's very specific, or eGovernment. So it actually doesn't deal with a broad range of emerging, cross-cutting issues.

So just to jump to your proposal, I think I identify with a lot of what you are saying, Parminder. I think for myself and my organization, strengthening developing country participation in ICT and Internet policies is what we have been doing since 2000.

We just don't think this is going to achieve that particular objective. We are also not opposed to regulation; and we think there's a need for more discussion about regulation in some aspects of data protection, for example. We think the trend of integration of digital matters in all areas of policy in a specialized sense is an irreversible trend. It's not a trend we can go back to.

And our fear is, in fact, that by creating this additional body, you are not only are going to achieve duplication, you are going to increase the burden on developing countries. And you are not going to give them more influence because the real decisions will still be made in more specialized institutions. You are not going to transform the power structure whereby the powerful entities and the powerful governments have more of a -- where the footing is unequal, in other words.

I think you are much more likely to achieve a much more equal footing amongst governments by focusing, improving existing decision-making processes, making them more inclusive and strengthening developing country participation in them.

So I think to some extent, we have seen that in the UNDP, for example, 10, 20 years ago, the United Nations Development Program was a very powerful, significant entity. But as development decisions

have also become more siloed and sectorialized, UNDP is no longer possibly as influential. It's still very valuable as a place for bringing people together and sharing information. I definitely think there's a need for that.

But because your text is so specifically wanting to empower this mechanism with a policy-making role, we think it actually won't achieve its objective and it's just not feasible actually.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments.

I have on my list -- I will read the full list and then -- I have Nick Ashton-Hart. I have Australia, followed by Jovan, Carlos Afonso, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Marilyn Cade. And after that, I'm closing debate and I'm reverting to Parminder for his comments in regard to -- and Russian Federation. Inviting Russian Federation now. I don't see any other flags, so those will be the speakers for this. And then we will turn to Parminder.

Nick, you can go on.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. And thanks to Parminder for his proposal and his impassioned advocacy of it.

When you were speaking, I was reminded of the meeting I had with the then-current Indian permanent representative about three, four years ago discussing, I think, the IPSA proposals that were made in which he was saying we need one place to talk about this. We figured it's been talked -- Internet has been talked about in 36 places.

I said, Well, Your Excellency, if I thought that that would mean there was only one place to go to, I would probably be for it, too, because then I wouldn't have to go to the 36 places. I said, But I'm afraid you will just get one more place and there will be 37. And he laughed and he said, You may be right but keep an open mind.

[Laughter]

I'm really struck by that problem, is if -- if we really believed that the different agencies would no longer deal with the Internet as a policy subject, probably many people would be in favor of it because it really would mean we would have far less meetings to attend. But I think we know that's just not going to happen because it wouldn't even be a good idea to talk about technical assistance, something I know something about because I help deliver it in trade and development.

The expertise for that is in this house amongst other places. Because it's in so many other places, the international institutions created eTrade For All, which is 20 different intergovernmental institutions creating a portal where developing countries can see all the technical assistance that's available across everything related to digital trade and development. And more are joining every day precisely to make it easier for developing countries to find what resources are available to them and to create the possibility for synergies between them.

So to the extent that you want to actually increase technical assistance, that you want to actually increase developing countries' capacities to use technology for social and economic development, there's certainly a case to be made that the amount of technical assistance that's needed far outstrips the current supply.

But creating a political forum to discuss that, how is that going to have a unique value-add to create more of what we need? Or is it just going to create one more place that people have to go to advocate for what they want or what they believe they want? Because that's what we have now, is we have all the specialized agencies discussing the Internet within their mandate.

And overlap is inevitable, A, because the institutions feel that they have a unique value-add because of their mandate or because they feel a need to be relevant by discussing the Internet or because the member states are making proposals at different institutions precisely because they can't even be aware of all the places the Internet is being discussed by their own colleagues at other times and in other places.

And so is there a need to create -- is there an argument for a way to expose all of the places where different discussions on different subjects are taking place for everyone to be better able to understand what conversation is taking place, where and how to impact it? I believe that's true for some time. But that doesn't require a political forum to create. That requires an administrative forum or information sources or the like.

And I would suggest to members, this has been tackled in other public policy areas before. One of the most well-known is the humanitarian aid delivery system, where in 1992 a coordination process was created, not a political process, a coordination process between U.N. and non-U.N. humanitarian aid delivery agencies, a consolidated aid appeal process to avoid duplication in funding for the same things in the same disaster, and information stores so that everyone involved in aid delivery, funding, or consumption could see what was going on by whom and where.

Notably what was not created was a political function. That was retained by the General Assembly. The only agency that was created was purely for logistical support across all the U.N. family. And that's the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

So, if your objective is better coordination, more information about what is going on, I suspect there are many people who could see value in that. If the objective is purely another political discussion, I suspect that's going to be a hard sell because there's only so many people to go around.

And might I remind you that the average delegation size in Geneva is five in total for the general missions. That doesn't leave a lot of time -- for those of you in general missions, you will know this. You have to cover a whole lot of things. Adding more is probably not the friendliest thing that you can ask for people who have to already cover so much. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick.

I will turn now to Australia followed by Jovan, Carlos Afonso.

You have the floor.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to speak, and thank you to those who have presented proposals this morning. I found it very interesting discussion this morning. I found the presentations very insightful and as I did the transcript from yesterday. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to be here.

But as I -- as one of those general mission staff members who Nick has just referred to reflect on what I've heard, one of my roles as a bureaucrat is to stand in front of my minister from time to time and sell an idea. And I'm not clear yet what the idea is that I would need to sell to my minister or my prime minister. If I'm given my two minutes in the sun, what is the issue? What are we trying to solve? What would be the objective? What are the innovative solutions you've looked for? Because certainly I know there would be zero appetite in my minister's office for more political solutions.

What there is appetite for are those innovative solutions. We're talking about GAVI. We're talking about a specific issue that was identified and an innovative, not political, solution that was identified.

Slavery at the moment, there is a really interesting multistakeholder process going along at the moment to address the issue of modern slavery. And it is not requiring a new U.N. body agency process anything. What it's involved is multistakeholder business, civil society, governments, everyone coming together and saying, We can only fix this if we get together. But they have an objective. They know what their objective is. Everybody is coming together. Naturally it's a very fluid, very loose process; but everyone is working towards it because they have an idea what they are working towards.

And if I have to take this back as one of those general mission members and sell this to my government, I still can't quite grasp what it is. But what would be our objective? What is it that we're trying to solve? And what are the innovative solutions that we have considered besides this one, but besides sort of -- that will help us achieve that objective? So I'll be interested to hear more of those kind of specific solution-focused contributions, if possible, this morning. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your clarification. This is also taken note of. We will revert to Parminder, if you wish to touch on this and any other points, after we hear all the other interventions.

Now I will turn to Jovan followed by Carlos Afonso and Iran.

Jovan, you have the floor.

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Last evening when I returned home and look at "The Economist" Web site, I thought that "The Economist" was hacked and that is fake news when I read their coverage on data and regulation. It was really surprising. I have been following "The Economist" for the last 20 years.

It is at the same time not surprising because we are realizing that there are sort of needs to actively participate in shaping digital future including the question of regulation.

Then I had a look at the transcript of the last hour of our session. And then I had sort of a concern and worry. We spend a lot of time together. We have really bright people around the table. And I was worried about the notion that we may not be able to produce some sort of forward-looking consensus solution.

While I appreciate the importance of the speakers in the last hour indicating that reality is there are different views, that's why I really would like to encourage all of us, and it is my really personal wish, to put all the possible effort that we can create something in order to fill the gap which is really identified.

Now, a few speakers indicated that the life is -- we're discovering (indiscernible) -- life is becoming digital. Many sectors of the life are basically moving digital, and this is nothing new. It is clearly reflected in the work of international organizations in Geneva.

Now, eHealth is becoming increasingly health. ILO is discussing the future of work and digital work in their celebration of the hundred years of the ILO. We can go through almost all organizations, and it's clear that digital is becoming an underlying topic.

Therefore, we will have less and less uncovered the aspects of the digital development. They will be covered from human rights, economic, WTO, and other organizations. We have also principle that international law applies to the Internet.

Now, on that side, I'm a bit skeptical that there will be a space for specific Internet-related policy issues or policy making. What is coming clearly in our work in the Geneva Internet Platform is that many missions -- and, by the way, I just took the statistics.

Nick, there are 40 missions with three staff members, three diplomats. Then the average is moved because of the few big missions in Geneva.

It would be a huge, huge challenge to cover the cross-cutting aspect of all of these developments. They need more information. Missions need -- including international organizations because simply speaking, if you discuss privacy and human rights, it has an impact on, let's say, digital trade or security, which is discussed by UNGA.

There is a need for a lot of information sharing. There is a need for capacity building uncovering the issues in their cross-cutting nature. There are probably some sort of consensus solution, hopefully advanced compromised solution, could be reached around that element of finding the place where the information could be shared, where the capacity could be increased, where the missions and national governments and international organizations could be assisted not to duplicate their work and enhance them and support them to cover digital issues in a proper way. There are specific digital issues. I mean, health issues in WHO, and let's say labor issues in ILO.

Therefore, there is probably some space where I would say with collective wisdom and experience and creativity we could create something useful and forward -- forward-looking which will enable the future growth of the Internet, which want to reduce the choices, while at the same time addressing the clear

public policy concerns and the worries that are expressed now all over the world, including, as I indicated, in yesterday's coverage by "The Economist." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jovan.

May I comment? I found your comments very helpful. I would not at this point say I would agree with everything you said, but I think one very important thing is that this debate is beyond just identifying support, opposition to any particular recommendation, is helping us collectively to identify what are the real issues you want to address and try to think collectively on how to best address it. So there are recommendations in regard to how this can be done. This is what we are seeing.

But I think we are getting some -- and I must say I'm very glad to see not -- it's not often that we have that kind of intellectual debate that we can see pros and against and in a very straightforward manner that can help us better to understand where each other is coming from. And maybe with that we can collectively at the end -- not now, but at the end of this exercise be able to come up with something.

So I'd like to note your comments and thank you for this.

I will turn to Carlos Afonso, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Marilyn Cade, Russian Federation, and then we are coming back to Parminder for his comments in regard to what was said.

Carlos Afonso, you have the floor.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Thank you, Chair. So we are now at the real meat of the discussion. We have basically two proposals with variations. One is the platform link or embedded in the IGF, and the other is the creation of this new body.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Only Parminder -- Yes.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: the proposal of the creation of new body by Parminder and others, I wonder if we could with all the discussion we had -- and I won't repeat here -- what several people said -- and we know that the digital issue is already part of the day-to-day activity of all the U.N. organizations. We know that.

I wonder if we did a survey with the U.N. organizations asking them what they think about creating this new body. I wonder what the reactions would be. Like, when was the last time the U.N. created a new body of any kind? We are short of funds, and they want to create yet another body? What issues do they want to discuss that we don't discuss already? Why don't we discuss them here? This organization is going to create policies, establish conventions, if not, again, discuss the issues here, straight issues. We, UNCTAD, or WTO are discussing this right now.

These problems of data protection, of right to privacy, OHCHR, and several other organizations of the UNGA are discussing these issues.

So would this -- so the idea is that should -- should perhaps we do the survey, you know? If we -- before we approve, I think, a proposal like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Carlos Afonso.

Now I give the floor to Iran followed by Saudi Arabia, Marilyn Cade, and Russian Federation.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me start -- let me reference to your remark in the beginning of this morning that you have pointed out that we are here, just gathering the recommendation and we are not able and we are not going to resolve all the problems. That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

But I think finally we should go to the establishment of the new body and new mechanism that enhanced cooperation enable to implement the commitment and recommendations that we are here discussing together.

Mr. Chairman, from more than ten years ago, in the context of the Tunis Agenda, we are discussing about the enhanced cooperation. We have established the previous enhanced cooperation, and it didn't work.

I believe that current enhanced cooperation will not work if we could not think about the other final result.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we need a new body, a new mechanism. That whatever reflected in the Tunis Agenda, that preparation of the government to cooperate together and also the implementation of the recommendation that we are discussing at current enhanced cooperation.

We should also focus on the -- on some elements that is very important in enhanced cooperation, such as capacity building, transfer of technology, sharing knowledge, and so that.

So I believe that the Parminder suggestion is constructive for us, and we should think about it and we should seriously consider it. And I believe also that the Russia Federation -- Russian Federation format also in line of the establishment of a new mechanism and new bodies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we discuss about the recommendation right here, but we should think about what happens or what happened that we are delivering to the CSTD and CSTD delivering other recommendation to (indiscernible) and General Assembly and after that, so what?

So we should think about seriously about establishment of the new body and new mechanism that could able in the future to -- to realize and to realize our commitment that we have discussed here.

Thank you.

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

I will now turn to Saudi Arabia followed by Marilyn Cade.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman, and we thank Parminder for his constructive evidence-based recommendation.

Speaking of the OECD resolution, we have heard so many question about the coordination mechanisms and how we would do coordination. And in that working group, the OECD working group, they say the committee shall maintain closed working relationship (indiscernible) development budget within the OECD to ensure complementary effort and effective use of resources, and so on.

So we have an example of an effective coordination here. We have the Human Rights Council. They do issues of ICTs. Do we shut them down and say, no, ITU is doing ICT? No. They complement each other.

So they have resolution on Internet and ICT from their perspective as they have their own resolution from their perspective. So we cannot see there is a duplication and that's why we don't need this body to be established.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments and for your sticking to time and for being very precise in your comments.

I turn to Marilyn Cade followed by Russian Federation, and I am adding also India who has request for the floor. And if -- with your indulgence, this will be the final speaker on this before we turn to Parminder. I ask those who have made their inputs to put their plates down so it can be clear for everyone.

So, Marilyn, you have the floor.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. And I do want to thank Parminder for the particularly well-organized, I think, recommendation that you made.

I appreciate the fact that Anriette said pretty much what I would have said about the OECD committee, and I will say I've worked for many, many years, including through the present -- the advisory committee processes, and I think there was -- I don't really think that is the model that would deliver what were you looking for.

It's not a secret that I'm not a fan of new organizations and new mechanisms. So I'm not going to go into that because I have a specific area that exists in your proposal that I do find intriguing, and I saw elements of it in Russia's proposal as well. And that is this concept of the need to have a way to keep better abreast of the studies and the work that is going on in the existing bodies that is specifically relevant to developing countries.

I also was intrigued by Nick's comments. I do think that the idea of a portal -- and so my question to you is regardless of the fact that I don't support the full proposal, there's this element in it that I'd ask you to think about for the future. Would the form of an observatory that is really targeted towards the needs of developing countries around areas of knowledge sources, resources, technical support

resources, that is put together with an eye to the needs of developing countries around Internet governance issues and also enhancement of their engagement in the work that is going on, would that be of a particular value? Because that particular element in your recommendation I did find very useful.

I do think that a lot of that work is going on here at UNCTAD and should be going on more at CSTD, but I think the question of where the work would be done is different.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. I would like to thank Parminder, first of all, for his constructive proposal, and we see a lot of formalities -- similarities with our proposal, also, with some nuances. And what we can see, that he tried to address the certain points from the Tunis Agenda and the certain points from the WSIS review. And it looks like a very constructive proposal.

And I would like to say that for those who do not like the idea of a new body or any kind of body, but then I would like this delegation to propose some alternatives. Because from our point of view, saying that we don't need nothing coming to the issue of intergovernmental format of enhanced cooperation is not a constructive approach. And to say that we don't have any problem in this area, it means basically that we ignore that consensus documents like WSIS+10, like Tunis Agenda, like ten years' review WSIS process resolution, and basically our mandate also.

So I think it's not constructive. If somebody do not want a separate body, then please propose alternative.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lulia. I will now turn to India and then to Parminder for remarks.

India, you have the floor.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would also like to align ourselves, you know, the basic principles which have been highlighted in this proposal given by Parminder that we definitely need a body or a forum or a mechanism. We can always finalize the nomenclature of that framework, but definitely there is a need.

So the proposal put in by Russia has a lot of merit. We also support what Iran has said as well as Saudi Arabia, that there is a need to have -- and in fact, our recommendation which is in recommendation 75 also talks about the same thing.

Now, some people are saying we don't need any new body. This is just adding a new secretariat. Definitely there is a need to have a new secretariat or a new organizational structure because Internet is all pervasive. It is -- you know, whether it's UNICEF or FAO, everywhere, everything has been used.

Everybody is using the Internet. It does not mean there is no need to have a centralized mechanism where there is coordination between all these organizations. So that is what we would like to, you know, support. And I think it's better for us to ask openly how many of us are happy with the status quo, that there is no need to do anything new.

Let's see how many of them -- And then they should be one who should be defending their view rather than us who are going for something which is more futuristic. It is the need of future, you know. You cannot -- It's only a matter of time. You can -- You can slow it down, delay it. Ultimately you will need a place where all these discussions which are taking place in other places needs to be synthesized.

You have produced, you know, a synthesis report after getting recommendation from all of us. Similarly, the same work has done through a mechanism which will keep an eye on what's happening all over the world. What is the debate going on, where the debate should go forward to. I don't see, you know -- So I would like to listen from those who defend that currently everything is going fine. We don't need. And we shut down this meeting and happily go back home. But we are not convinced by that. We think there is need of a mechanism. And in fact we have also said the same thing in our proposal. We can always, you know, make a consensus on the final outcome, but the basic idea is we are in the same direction on this.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India, for your comments. And certainly one of the things I'm doing with my team and the secretariat is capturing all the views and trying to, at the appropriate time, to come forward to you with some synthesis of this.

For the moment I should, just before turning to Parminder, is say from the perspective of the Chair, there are really some kind of two different perspective on this, very clearly. I wouldn't say, maybe to be fair to those who oppose the U.N. body that they -- I haven't had the feeling that they feel there is no problem, there are no issues to be addressed. I think all of us recognize there are issues to be addressed. They are important topics to be discussed that will and that are in continuous change that will need to be addressed anyway.

I think the basic difference is whether this should be done relying on the existing organizations, existing processes that address these already from their perspective, by strengthening those, by trying to look into ways to overcome some of the difficulties we have identified here regarding participation of developing countries, capacity building, and so on and so forth, or whether do we need something in addition to that. I think basically, this is a difference. Maybe I'm not -- I leave, of course, for (indiscernible) to be explicit for other things, but I feel basically it's not recognition of any difficulty but, rather, how to deal with it. And I think I'm very happy about this discussion going on. I don't think we have all the elements to make some guidance on this. But I think this is helping us collectively to, on the basis of all the debate that has been going on for so long but also on the basis, I think, that have been said here, I think we are getting some (indiscernible). Because I think once all of us are convinced of the content, of the substance of what we want, maybe it would be easier to identify how we want to get there. And I think this has been helpful in that regard.

But with this, I would like to turn to Parminder for his comments.

Any -- any -- I do not want to summarize at this point because I think there are so many elements that were submitted to you. I -- I wouldn't expect that you -- if you wish, you could address all of them, but, of course, I think again, it's more like food for thought, for further refinement of these proposals that, again, is not -- with some nuances, has many areas of convergence with what others have also proposed.

So I turn to you, and after that I'd suggest we move to the other recommendations coming from (indiscernible).

You have the floor, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. As you observed, there are some common questions, and I'll try to go over them quickly.

The first point I think many people are talking, but mostly has been what is the need of the body and what are the issues going to be sorted out or solved. And, therefore, I don't know, go back again to Tunis Agenda 60 which clearly says there are issues not adequately addressed in 2005. We are 2017.

The whole Internet data revolution has been taken place between '05 and '17. Social media revolution, artificial intelligence revolution which is going on now has all taken place in this period, and we identified that there are public-policy issues not adequately addressed in '05. Now we are in '17.

Much lesser set of issues have lead to creation if not of a new body but new committees and groups in the U.N. Much less a set of issues. And this is a much larger and much more important set of issues. That's the first -- first question. And Carlos said, though it comes later, but it aligns with many other people, when was a new U.N. body created last. And again, as I'm agreed, that we could do halfway things as a committee or an open working group, but even to answer that rhetorical question, by rhetoric, when was last, it seems like Internet stock societies.

I mean, even (indiscernible) recognizes the evolutionary nature of changes. He recognizes that every sector, the nature of doing business, the governance, everything has changed. It's compared with the industrial revolution. So we think we need to have a proportionate look at the measure of the change and have a response.

So just talking about finances and where would -- which seats, which room they will sit is not the level at which we are talking.

So the duplication was another issue and there were people asking should ILO then stop talking about what they're talking, or I'll come to other examples.

And that, I think, is one of the most really complex issues, I think. I wouldn't go too much into it, but that issue requires a lengthy discussion.

But the maturation of the Internet issue and the networked nature in which issues are, in the new age, to be sorted out. I don't think ILO will stop talking about how labor is being displaced by machines, how artificial intelligence is creating richer discrimination in employment decisions. These things are happening and they will be dealing with it. But it's not adequately understood by ILO how artificial intelligence operates, what are the means of regulating artificial intelligence, how algorithmic decisions take place because these things are common. Same algorithmic decision-making also influences fake news, which influences health-related decisions. So these are common things -- I know you guys read newspapers daily. These are common things which ILO is not equipped to talk about. If somebody is going to be telling about how regulation of artificial intelligence is actually possible -- which is a big problem because artificial intelligence, even the person who makes artificial intelligence doesn't know how it takes decisions. So we have not figured out where does the regulatory layer come in. ILO cannot do it because they are all common issues. Data flow is common issue. Data as an economic resource is a common issue. So ILO would do these issues, but you need an agency which talks about such complex issues and right now the architecture of those issues which relates to -- define power relationships, social justice, everything is being formed, and if you don't do it now, by fault we know who then controls it.

These are the political decisions to be taken.

And people have talked about ILO, that it's a technical body. No, it's not a technical body. Somebody said a merely political body. No, it's not a merely political body. It's a highly political body. Because if you look at projections, some countries have only 65% of the jobs in -- I -- look at the things with dread and don't -- try not to accept them but they're already authoritative, how much labor displacement is taking place. People like Stephen Hawking and Bill Gates have said the things. Who is going to talk about them? And it's not a labor issue. Somebody said UNICEF should just stop talking about online child -- child pornography or whatever. Child protection. Sorry. Child protection. No, they won't stop. They would look at -- because they understand child best. But they don't understand platforms best. They don't understand even if we decide what should be done, how platforms actually operate globally and how they can be regulated. They don't understand. So they can't do their job unless somebody is going to be telling them how platforms work, what is the nature of platform governance on which E.U. recently had a very extensive public consultation. Platform governance is not which ILO is going to do.

These are big issues.

Internet intermediaries, data flows, IoTs, algorithmic decision-making, these issues are being -- they're not technical issues that I'm talking about. It's not ITU and ICANN. The social aspects of these issues is a common thing and these issues -- one agency which has expertise and takes political decisions on how artificial intelligence can be regulated under guidelines, then percolate both to other agencies and downwards to the national governments.

Same with UNESCO and at Human Rights Council talking about online privacy. The problem with online privacy is being dealt without talking about data as an economic resource, and that's where privacy discussions actually fail because everybody thinks privacy is good but they don't see that data is an

economic resource and people don't buy the privacy issues because they are getting value out of the digital activities they're doing because it's an economic resource. It's a social resource. So unless you talk of data as an economic resource, which no agency right now talks about, you cannot do a privacy discussion, and therefore Human Rights Council.

And I can give examples across all agencies that they can't do it. They're going to feel very, very paralyzed unless there is an agency which is able to take political decisions on guidelines, perspective-making, norms-making, and if needed, hard laws in this Internet era. And as I said earlier, in all national governments, there is development towards convergence on cyber things, and the same applies here.

Anriette said about CDEP. It's not true. CDEP also duplicates the work of another OECD committee on trade, on consumer, on all other -- there are 70 committees or 50 committees, I don't know the number. All those committees exist. Saudi Arabia and Richard read out parts of the mandate of that committee which is coordinating and harmonizing them, and so it's not true that --

That is a different context. As I've earlier said, I'm really cut and paste the whole mandate, the whole structure of OECD committee into the U.N. and call it the instrument we want.

Whatever. If it's good, it's good. If it's not good -- either way. So it really is not true that -- it does not duplicate work, and it also develops policies. In its mandate, it will do policy development work and it's not just a discussion space.

I'm giving examples. I know. Elections are going to be taken over the manner in which information flows and psychological behaviors are being mapped by big platforms and they feed information to them. These are huge issues. One of you countries are going to come back within a few years and insist that UNGA should meet next week because their elections have been tampered with, and we need, therefore, an anchorage within the U.N. system which can facilitate this kind of work. Come 2018 --

This is the only body in the U.N. system which has a converged mandate. It's got a meta mandate to tell us what other bodies should do.

Come 2018, this body is gone and there's no place where -- which countries can leverage to come up with the kind of problems, whether labor displacement or election -- captures which they are facing. I mean, I was shocked to hear that Adidas in 30 years for the first time took back manufacturing from developing countries back to Germany. Software is being developed to do the same thing for the garment business, which means so much for India for --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Parminder, I don't want to cut you but I'd like maybe you would be more objective and avoid giving many examples.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: People have clearly said -- and that was the main argument -- that ILO is able to look into it, and if I don't counter it, that argument stays, so that's -- there's no other way I could do other than giving an example because --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yeah. No, I heard it, sir. Yeah, that's fine.

So -- so I mean -- so I mean, these are -- these are momentous changes. I come from a political civil society. There is a loss of employment taking place. Garment industry would disappear in two years because robots are taking the jobs back to the developed countries. It's not a small thing. It's not just talking about transparency in the air. This is important. For me, this issue belongs to this committee. And that -- and that is true in all areas.

Just quickly to make -- create issues being dealt, economic is embedded within the society and not the other way around. The society issues, digital society issues, are a larger set and the economic issues are not only issues which are being dealt by perhaps WTO and UNCTAD. They should carry on doing it.

As Iulia said, what we are trying to solve, I think there is -- a lot of my responses went to it. Zero appetite for political solutions. I try to answer that also.

I'm going to close down because I'm just seeing what has not been duplicated.

Jovan talked about, again, information sharing, capacity building, but I think you need a political body because we often talk about data is everything. If data is everything, then somebody needs to be doing something about data. Similarly, platforms are everywhere.

Carlos' issues, I've addressed, but Carlos did talk about a platform embedded in the IGF.

I would again want to hear that proposal in a clear manner, and the sooner it comes up, we should be able to comment on it more.

Marilyn Cade said OECD committee is a model that will not deliver. I'm ready to take that model. I don't see -- she has not elaborated, so I can't answer these issues.

Observatory is a good thing. Observatory is a good thing. I would take it. In my proposal, it is embedded into the ecosystem but even on a stand-alone basis, it is a good thing but that's not enhanced cooperation. It should be a part of the enhanced cooperation structure.

Russia is right, again. Please give alternative proposals, because things -- we can go back and say we came and said that everybody should be transparent. There could be alternative proposals. These are our concerns. So the concerns could not completely be met, I understand, but if there are other ways to meet them, we want to listen to that.

And high-level characteristics does not meet our concerns. The discussions we had yesterday that there should be that all stakeholders are encouraged to share their views is not meeting the concerns at all. They are serious concerns and we need a serious thing which actually changes something on the ground.

That's about it, Chair. Thanks so much, and I'm sorry I took so long but there were just too many complex questions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Parminder. I thank you for your remarks.

I would say it's a serious concern for everyone to make sure we are able to make recommendations that will improve the existing system, and I am -- I think it's my responsibility to try to set the stage for the discussion to happen in the best way, and I -- I think we have been moving in that regard.

Nick, do you want -- because I wanted to move to another item but --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: But if it is in relation to the proposal, Parminder's proposal, okay, I'll give you the floor. Otherwise, if it is something of procedural aspects, we will keep it -- we will discuss it later.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Please go ahead.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Just in relation to a couple of points, Parminder, the -- not to just be the devil's advocate, but you suggested --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, I think we -- yeah. I think we had the opportunity to discuss before. I would be hesitant to -- we will revisit the same issue, basically, when we -- my intention would be to move now to India's proposal that, I think, maybe we'll allow you to make the comments that you want to make now, because I want to thank Parminder for these presentations, all of you, and I'd like to turn to India, the representative of India, to address Recommendation 75 that basically refers to the same content that was already examined, so I -- my strong request is not for us to duplicate the discussion but to the extent you think that there are any new elements on those which you would like to bring to this discussion, please, you are free to do so now. I give you the floor for your introductory remarks.

And please, I see others want to have additional comments and, Nick, we are -- we want to hear from you, but maybe you can make that comment also now in relation to India, just to allow us to move a little bit forward, with your indulgence. Okay. Thank you. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually, I will not be saying new. I'll be repeating the same thing, but for the sake of the record of the meeting, I would like to make a small, you know, crisp intervention.

You know, the importance of a suitable forum, or you can call it a mechanism, has already been highlighted in our recommendation so we are not going into it.

The creation of a centralized body under the aegis of the U.N. which would essentially act as a forum for stakeholders to exchange consolidated views on ICTs would further the cause of enhanced cooperation. That's the -- that's our position. And such a forum or mechanism would provide stakeholders with a platform and would serve as a body which could potentially coordinate amongst all various other U.N. organizations which are talking about these issues. The task of successfully coordinating among various forums, the linkage of this objective is of tremendous importance, and only a centralized body under the aegis of U.N. can rise to this challenge.

This is what we feel.

And if such a framework is created, the process of enhanced cooperation is likely to become a little more simpler than what it is right now.

So -- so I would like to conclude with that, so these are a few points which we have made, and the basic crux of the support of the argument already is, we have been doing it the last -- so the same arguments goes in favor of it. If there are those who think that whatever we are saying is not possible, they are the ones who should give arguments why. That is what is important.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India. I thank you for the -- for the introduction of your recommendation.

As I have said, that relates to much of what we have been discussing until now, this morning, at this morning's session, so I would think in principle it would not be necessary to open the floor for comments unless anyone has some very specific additional comments in regard to what has been said. Otherwise, we -- I think it is in our best interests to keep moving and make -- give the same opportunity for others who have made similar proposals.

Cuba, Saudi Arabia have also touched. I want to give them the opportunity to introduce their recommendations and make any additional -- and if necessary, can have some comments. Otherwise, I think it would be a waste of time for us to go back on the same kinds of things that have already been said.

I see I have on my list Richard Hill and Pakistan.

Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, Nick had his flag up first so Nick wishes to speak, I will -- no? Okay.

Yeah, I think I just wanted to highlight something that came out of the very succinct and clear presentation from India.

You know, a number of people ask what is the problem you're trying to solve or what is the issue you're trying to address, and I think it's very clear, and I'll just read the way the OECD Digital Policy Committee phrases it.

"Develop and promote a coherent policy and regulatory framework which supports competition, investment, and innovation across the digital economy." Now, Anriette said that they don't really address that many issues so maybe they aren't doing that. Okay. But that's still their mandate. And I think that that mandate is needed.

Now, as Jovan pointed out, The Economist, which as far as I know is a staunch bastion of capitalism, has just pointed out that regulation of certain aspects of the data economy is necessary.

And I'll give you a specific example.

The European Union is about to -- well, the general data protection regulation, which is a new European law, is about to come into force. Some people think that that's going to have extra-territorial effects.

So which existing international body is going to address the need to regulate certain aspects of the digital economy and which international body is going to sort out the extra-territorial effects arising from the general data protection regulation? Those are just examples. Parminder gave lots of other examples.

So we need to develop and promote a coherent policy and regulatory framework at the international level which supports competition, investment, and innovation across the digital economy.

Now, if some colleagues think that this is actually being done at the international level, then I'd like to smoke what they're smoking. Or, maybe -- or, maybe they think that TISA is going to sort it out. Because from the leaked documents -- and they're leaked so I don't know if they're authentic. From the leaked documents that I've seen from TISA, they are trying to do exactly that.

The problem is that that process is not transparent, the process is not inclusive, and, in my opinion -- and it's not just mine, lots of people -- the outcome will have disastrous consequences for 99.9% of the world's citizens. We're not talking about the 1%. We're talking about the 0.1% that is going to benefit from the type of stuff that they're trying to do in TISA.

So, yeah, we don't need a new agency if you're willing to let secret negotiations in TISA screw the entire world.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. Actually, we agree with you that if comments have already been made on specific issues, we would not go into that, and in our case, actually much of what Parminder and other colleagues have said, we agree.

We also thank India for the proposal, and this also goes in line with our proposal.

I just want to touch on one issue. By looking at the -- at the language, and as Richard said, that we can reformulate it in terms of getting most of -- the most out of it, but there are two very quoted terms that have been used, "transparent" and "democratic." I think these are the two terms that we have -- we discussed during high-level characteristics, but then we reminded everyone that these terms are of -- these are hollow terms if we do not use them in their proper context, and here is the context: That we need to have a deliberative body where we can discuss these issues. And as Richard said, that -- and this has been going on for a while. It's not The Economist said it yesterday and we would embrace it, but there needs to be an organization, a body, an entity for regulating data, so -- so we really support the proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have an additional speaker on this, which is the U.K.

May I just make one comment, because in many of your interventions, I saw that there was a small I would say cleavage between some who argue that Tunis Agenda calls -- Tunis Agenda calls and indicates issues, some issues have not been adequately addressed, and I think in a number of interventions there were some kinds of requests for clarification.

Now, I'm not asking for some response now but maybe to give some more clarity of what is the meaning of that expression today, not 12 years ago, because I think from what I hear, there is a perception that maybe some of the issues that were not adequately addressed then may have found some way of -- or could either be addressed in some other format. I think that that expression that has been mentioned, and it's clear it's part of our mandate, I think there was some kind of request for clarification what exactly that it means today, and then how would be the best way to address it.

I'm just leaving it as food for thought for future intervention on this.

I have then the U.K. and Anriette, and after that, with your indulgence, I would close the list on this particular recommendation from India and we move to recommendations coming from Iran that are basically referred to the same content. I just want to anticipate at that moment I will ask Iran to introduce and if he has any additional remarks -- not now, in due time -- and we open discussion just in case there are any additional comments to be made.

But please, U.K. followed by Anriette.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

We just wanted to comment on the idea raised by India of coordination.

One of the things we -- we appreciated about the Russian proposal was that it reminded us how many U.N. bodies there are already playing roles in this area. And India talks about coordination. And we think it's important to consider this issue in the contents -- in the context of the U.N. system, because we have a series of U.N. agencies which have their own mandates, and those mandates are decided by the members of those bodies. So when we talk about coordination, I'm not clear, are we suggesting that a new body or mechanism would in some way override the mandates of those bodies or override the membership? Because that would be a very fundamental change to the way in which the U.N. system works.

So we're just asking this question and asking that when we propose ideas like this, we think about it in a broader context of what we're suggesting.

We have at the moment the chief executive's (indiscernible). I think an earlier colleague mentioned that, if that plays a role. We have also the U.N. group on the information society, which is another example of U.N. agencies coming together to cooperate with one another for the common good. So there are some examples of this kind of coordination. But we do need to think carefully about the broader implications on the U.N. system as a whole of suggesting something which could potentially in some way override the existing mandates of -- of U.N. agencies, because that a very major and fundamental change that we would be suggesting.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. Certainly we do not want to suggest anything that would go against the U.N. culture. I think all of us, particularly those coming from governments, are very much aware of the need that this would be filtered by colleagues that are working, of course, with that context.

Thank you for your comments.

Anriette followed by Cuba.

Anriette, please, you have the floor.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. Thank you, India, for the proposal. What I like about it is that it captures what we feel is a gap, which is this deliberation space.

We also appreciate that you -- that you refer here to stakeholders. So I certainly read India's sentiment here as seeing this as an inclusive process. And I think my question to you and possibly to Parminder as well is in the India proposal, policy-making is not mentioned explicitly as a role of this body, although in section 7, you do say there's a need to create a new institutional mechanism to enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibility in international policy issues.

So, actually, my question to India but also to -- and we can reflect on that later, is do you feel it needs to be the same body? Is the deliberation -- the space where this deliberation, and for governments in particular but in an inclusive way with other stakeholders involved, can that or do you want that to be the same body, then, that does the policy-making or develops the policy guidelines as in the OECD?

So just maybe we can reflect on that later. Because in your proposal you're not actually explicit about that. Parminder, your proposal, you are very explicit that it would be the same body that does the deliberation and the policy-making.

So just some elaboration at some point would be useful on that, whether that's one space or possibly more than one.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. Thank you for this request for clarification.

I'll turn to India after we exhaust the list. I was not thinking at this stage of coming back to Parminder. I think Parminder's proposal was very explicit. He mentioned in one U.N. body, and he -- if you wish, I could even offer the floor before India, but I would like to go then to Cuba and to India for final remarks in regard to comments that were made.

Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you for India and before Parminder, before Russia, for all these contributions. But I ask for the floor. I wanted to talk to this later during my proposal, but to take advantage because what the delegate from the UK mentioned, I think it's essential, that is essential also that was mentioned by the representative of Switzerland and also by Nick, what he mentioned, all the

diversity of places where this is addressed and carried out. And of course this -- this is not a problem but it's real what he says, that they are not going to lose their mandate, they are not going to change because of that. And -- And he ask if whether this happen in the U.N. system, and the answer is yes. We have history of this in the United Nations. As a matter of fact, when you have the own catalog of United Nations bodies that they catalog, agencies and related bodies and commissions, you know which is the larger group? What they call in the United Nations language Interagency Coordination Mechanisms. There are 29.

What Nick mentioned, the gover- (indiscernible) platform that was created in 2006 is one of these. The most well-known is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is one of these Interagency Coordination Mechanisms it's because to coordinate policy-making, is what they say, that has been done elsewhere. So this is part of U.N. culture. I have the list here. Of course I can give it. I can also mention, because somebody ask when bodies have been made in the U.N. Even in 2012, we have the (indiscernible) for the post 2015 U.N. development agenda which was created in the 2012. Also, there's the Inter-Registry Network for Use Development because use development is very cross-cutting. That has to do with iLaw, it has to do with UNICEF, it has to do with anything. And so history shows that this is happening.

Maybe the way to do it in Internet, we will have to think about that because Anriette raised a very interesting point. Because there's several task that this -- that need to be done. I'm not going to say now if it's going to be a body or a committee, whatever, but it needs to be done.

Certainly because what -- especially what was said by Nick and the delegate from Switzerland and the U.K., there's a lot of coordination to be done, because as you very aptly said you need to know, even for the agencies themselves, maybe they are duplicating things because they don't know what other agency is doing, because that is one of the reasons for this interagency coordination mechanism that's created in the U.N. So this will be useful for the agencies, so we will not be put in something they will not like. That's useful for them, even to avoid existing duplication. That is it.

But it's also, as Anriette and the India proposal said, there's also a need for deliberation and high-level policy deliberation. That's why when we get to my proposal, I will have something about that to say about that, but that's another task to be carried out.

And finally, I -- I will mention that the duplication -- and this -- this discussion is being carried elsewhere. I'm going to participate or I'm following because Cuba is participating on a group of governmental expert of the first commission related with cybersecurity or security of ICT in the context of Internet and security. You know, it's very long name. Long name. It's called GGE in short. And I can tell you -- the deliberations there are closed, of course, but I can tell you, I'm not going to violate much secret, that there's a discussion going on there of proper fora to keep the conversation going, because they have more or less the same situation we have here. Let me finish with this, because as you know, the WSIS decided that the follow-up of the WSIS is done on the CSTD, and that's why each year we have this in the yearly commission. This year we'll have. But the CSTD has done an excellent job there, but I think

that the -- it's been surpassed now because CSTD is only 40 countries, no? More or less. 40 countries. And a lot of countries want that to be in a more open space.

The same happen in the GGE. There's the -- or the GGE has to be convened. It's not a permanent mechanism, so there's a lot of countries who want some permanent place --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Could you please come to a close.

>>CUBA: -- For cybersecurity. That's it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: What I'm just saying, that this is nothing new --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: -- Distinguished delegate from the U.K. This has happened in the United Nation system before and it's happening right now, and it will continue to happen because you imagine things will come, not only in cybersecurity, artificial intelligence. Internet of things, you know the light bulb --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>CUBA: -- has been on the Internet.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, I should say I think the (indiscernible) that was raised by the U.K., I do not want to -- was slightly different from the end we are looking at. I think you all expressed concern about how this coordination role would be performed in relation to the mandate. So I think that was rather not a question of the kind of interagency mechanism that exists in UNOG or the (indiscernible). I think, if I interpret, he was concerned about how that coordination role, particularly if we want to give some kind of guidance to other bodies that have governing -- different government, how that would be done in relation to existing mandate. I think that's -- And this was addressed to India. I'm turning to India, if he wish to (indiscernible) at the appropriate moment.

So I will have a last speaker on this. (Indiscernible), if I turn to you (indiscernible), that is Nick, if you wish to take the floor, and then I turn immediately to India. And I do not want to prolong discussion now on this topic. (Indiscernible). We'll have opportunity. Juan, we'll will come to your proposal if we have -- if I have the help of everyone to keep the meeting going. So I will give you ample opportunity to speak on your proposal.

Nick, please.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Yeah, it just strikes me, Chairman, that there are sort of three different aspects to these proposals. There's an aspect that is a political-level deliberation on various subjects. There is an aspect that is better coordination of execution by existing bodies. And then there is an aspect of better informing decision-makers and agencies of what is going on in relation to the Internet throughout

international policy development, and it -- without prejudice to the following proposal, it might be interesting to look at those three objective outcomes in order to come -- because I think we might come to some elements of those three or all three or some of the three that would be -- would be possible to have some consensus around as a way forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this was very helpful.

May I turn to India for your comments.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I'll go one by one, the questions which have been raised directed to us.

Number one was the concern about whether this coordination which we are proposing will override the existing mandate of. The question doesn't arise, actually, but you already have answered it. Why will it override it? The idea is to help these other organizations, not to, you know, prejudice their work which they are already doing. Because what we foresee is that what will it do, actually, review and assess, assess the progress which has made at international regional level on the implementation of various action lines which has been proposed. That's one of the jobs. The second is to share best practices. You know, to basically -- what are the effective processes being followed at some -- by some countries, some regions which can, you know -- there has to be a platform where it can be shared. Where, you know, this will help us have an informed discussion on various issues.

So basically this is a platform to promote dialogue, coordination. These are some of the basic elements and three of the elements have been very clearly, you know, mentioned in this. And we can build on this proposal based on this.

As far as whether it would be one space or multiple spaces, well, we can -- we have to start with one -- one space, but as the work of that body will increase, we're likely to have subsets in coming times, more specialized. Suppose there is deliberation only on artificial intelligence in a small sub-body. That's what happened, for example, in World Intellectual Property Organization. There is a committee on copyrights, there is one on patents, one on design, trademark, and so on. Similarly in WHO, and so on.

So this is a beginning. You never know. The first cell has to be created. Then it's up to them to multiply how many times.

This is all. Thank you. I don't know if I've missed any point.

So these are the two main points which have been addressed to us.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India.

I think at this point I'd like just to take some time with you to plan for the rest of the day because we are fast approaching lunchtime.

We had agreed to defer the discussion on the outline document, and I think this was the right decision for us to do at that point in time, if I may say so. And we have decided to start this discussion on framework-related recommendations. I would say we have spent a substantial amount of time, but -- until now, but I think we have maybe touched on the most -- let's say the issues that deserve the most attention on our part so I don't think it was a waste of time. And as I look at the other recommendations that I have identified that cover more or less the same content, and this is recommendation 76 from Iran, 77 also from Iran the second part. Maybe the secretary can show is on the screen. Then we go to 79 from Cuba, 80 from Cuba that develops also the idea of the U.N. body but also the idea of the UNJ so we are parking the UNJ for not -- it will not be touched on it now. Then we have Saudi -- sorry. I'm saying the numbers. 79 and 80 from Cuba. And then we have 82 from Saudi Arabia, coupled with uncategorized 6 from Saudi Arabia that also addresses the same topic in B2 part.

>> Chairman?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, let me complete. No, no; let me finalize. I will -- as soon as -- No, no, as soon as I finish, I'll give you the floor. You haven't heard what I have to say. Please, I just ask you to wait.

So my question to you is whether we could try, as we come back from lunch, to try to exhaust discussion on this. I think we can cover. Even though we have a number of resolutions, but they are addressing basically the same topics.

There will be additional elements, additional. Of course I give each proponent the opportunity to introduce its recommendation, to add any comments. We can open debate if it is the case, but of course we don't want to replicate discussions. I think we could do it very rapidly.

And then I suggest that after that, if you wish, we could move, then, to the outline, but not past the afternoon session discussing our plan because I think that will break a kind of momentum we are building in regard to covering work for many of you, this has been said from the beginning, is the main, core issue for this meeting. So I would like to give a go at trying to cover it. I think we can do it. It will not take too much time because we do not want to repeat things. Of course opportunity will be given time especially for proponents to do it, but I'd like to take your reactions in that regard.

>> Point of order.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, I have Cuba and I have Richard Hill. I think both of you have points of order.

>>CUBA: Chairman, because from your intervention, I have a point of order. I ask for my right to present my proposal in full, not to park the second part of my proposal. It's part of the mechanism.

So I ask, please, ask. It's not so lengthy like others, it's even shorter. So I ask not to park the second part for whatever. It's part of the proposal. So when I prepare -- present the proposal, it will be with point one and point two.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. Unfortunately, I'll have to rule against that because we have said, as a kind of methodology for this meeting, we are looking to one issue. After we exhaust one issue, look to the other. Otherwise we --

>>CUBA: I'm sorry to have to explain to you because this should be evident, but it was mentioned even by Anriette in the discussion here that the part of the political space for -- is part of the mechanism. So you cannot see it separately.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So --

>>CUBA: Part of the proposal. The proposal is on a mechanism, and it has part one and part two.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I made myself a proposal but I'm not married to it. I will follow the sentiment of plenary. If there is support for that idea that when you present your proposal. I just would like to draw the attention that by doing what we have been doing, we have jumped over many other proposals. I don't want to be unfair to those who are waiting for the opportunity to comment. But if the plenary wishes to allow exceptionally that opportunity to elaborate on something that is not under discussion now, I would be more than happy to do so.

Richard, and then I have Saudi Arabia and Nick.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, to that point, I understand that what Juan is saying is that the part that you have excluded in his opinion is part of the first part of his proposal. So he does not understand the split. So he's not suggesting to change your rule. He's not agreeing with your specific implementation. And I think we should defer to him. If he thinks that the second part is an integral part of his proposal, then he should be allowed to present it.

But I wanted to say something else.

Yes, I think that to continue this discussion after lunch is appropriate, provided that we fix a definite time to come to the -- because I do not want to leave this room without having discussed that. So let's say 1700, at the latest. At the latest, we will tackle the idea of the report at 1700.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And I think I -- I can follow your interpretation and maybe even apologize to Juan. I think now I can better understand what you meant. Maybe it's part of -- it's one single -- okay, okay. So we are -- from your perspective, we are not --

Yeah. Because when I was going through this exercise with the secretariat, we thought of it as two separate things, but if you interpret these and it is supported by others, I will be more than glad to do it.

In regard to the afternoon session, the way to organize it, I thank you, Richard, for this proposal. You were the one that originally proposed that we should discuss the outline, so I think if you are in agreement to that, I assume that there would be no strong objections if we followed that path, and I think it would be helpful for us to continue a little bit on that. Wishfully, in a very rapid way.

Could I turn to Saudi Arabia? Do -- do you have any addition on that or are you glad with those arrangements? Thank you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Well, I just want to highlight that every proponent has the right to present their recommendation as a whole. We have listened yesterday to everyone's proposal with good intention, so when it comes to our proposal, I mean, we should present it as a whole. Not sections that are relevant to an institution. Because it's really related paragraphs that will lead to the institutional mechanism.

So I would ask you to -- when it comes to my turn, I will present my proposal in a very short way but I will touch upon the relevant areas that lead us to the recommendation to an institutional mechanism. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I -- well, I certainly do not want to impose anything on the group, but I would like to recall it's not a rule written in stone but it is the kind of procedure we have been taking from the start.

Russia was the first proponent to comment, and they agreed to encapsulate the part that refers to the framework.

So maybe one way out is when you address your proposal, to the extent you see these are related to the framework, you are free to do so, but please, we are not at this point in time opening discussion on other elements because that would not lead us to a productive discussion as we are having for the moment.

I count on your flexibility and your consistent goodwill you've been displaying over the years on that topic.

So thank you. With this, I'd like to -- I think we are going for an early lunch. We are two minutes ahead of our schedule but I don't think it would be much useful to start the discussion now on other agenda items and other recommendations, so I wish you a good lunch and look forward to seeing you back here at 3:00. Thank you.

[Lunch]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd like to call the meeting to order. As this is our last session, this afternoon session, I'd like to move as fast as we can. I would like to, in the order we are following now, offer the floor for the representative of Iran for introductory remarks of Recommendation 76 and, I would say 77, the second part, as shown on the screen. Both texts relate to the establishment of -- the first text relates to the establishment of a mechanism which would be conducive to the implementation and the second part is more precise, calling for the establishment of an intergovernmental mechanism to regulate and coordinate the relations of governments.

I -- as I have said before, also in relation to the recommendation proposed by India and that we have discussed, I think many or most of the aspects related to this proposal have already been discussed, but nonetheless, I'd like to first give the floor to Iran for introductory remarks and then open the floor for comments, but again urging colleagues to restrict yourselves, please, to comments that do not repeat, not replicate discussions we have had so far. This is taken on board and have been duly taken note of and will be the object of deliberations we'll have on that later on.

So with this, I'll turn to Iran.

You have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned, we have already discussed about these recommendations -- some recommendations from some delegates, as you mentioned that. Just for avoiding duplicating discussion, I just refer my remarks to this morning on Parminder's proposal on new mechanism and I don't want to repeat again it.

Just for more explanation on Recommendation 76 and the second part of Recommendation 77, I believe that they are the same line, so just I want to -- more explanation on the first part of the Recommendation 77.

It's referring to 70 article of Tunis Agenda and I believe that we need -- in the line time, we need the guideline and we should seriously consider the principle on public policy issues. And for the Recommendation 78, I believe that we have discussed yesterday afternoon.

I thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran, and thank you for being very straight to the point you want to make, in addition to the discussion we have had so far. Are there any additional issues in relation to what has been said so far in regard specifically to those two proposals?

I see Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I actually wanted to go back to something, but it's in this context chairman. It's not out of context. Something that Australia said which I thought was very refreshing in bringing us back to earth.

We have to be able to explain this proposal to decision-makers. She took the case of, well, what am I going to tell my minister.

Now, suppose that you're in a country which doesn't have a digital policy. Then I think it's pretty easy to say -- understand why you'd go to the minister and say, "We need additional policy," these days. And if you doubt that, you need to go read various articles like the one The Economist just published. But, you see, at the international level we don't have that. We don't have a coherent international digital policy.

So I think that's really what's being asked for. And that comes out clearly in the second one there, "an intergovernmental mechanism to regulate and coordinate the relations of governments." That's basically saying to come up with a policy.

And I think that falls into enhanced cooperation because enhanced cooperation was to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out the roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

So, you know, a lot of the things we're discussing are international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, and to the extent that governments don't have a mechanism to cooperate at the international level to come up with a coherent policy, I think that makes sense to create a mechanism.

And again, I like the way that the OECD phrased it, "develop and promote a coherent policy and regulatory framework which supports competition, investment, and innovation across the digital economy." Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. May I -- I see no other flags.

May I invite the representative from Cuba, Juan, please, to make introductory remarks to your recommendation. I see both 79 and 80 were proposed by you, so please be free to introduce your remarks. Thank you.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I will be very brief because all this has been discussed previously.

Recommendation 79 actually was a recommendation to the group, not for putting in. It's sort of the -- the reasons or the rationale for having a proposal of the mechanism that follows.

And I tried to do this -- this -- how do you call? -- these reasons for that in terms of the Tunis Agenda. That is the reference to the paragraph. So I take this from Paragraph 68, Paragraph 69, Paragraph 70.

And then a very important thing that is in the Tunis Agenda -- as I told day before yesterday, I am always amazed of the rich content of the Tunis Agenda -- that such a mechanism should not replace any existing organization but rather be a coordination mechanism that call upon the organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles. That is from Paragraph 70.

And, well, I -- of course I suggest that this mechanism should be an intergovernmental mechanism based in the United Nations and with formal links with other stakeholder organizations.

And then Recommendation 80 is the actual recommendation for the group and it's in the creation of such a mechanism.

In Point 1, I mentioned three different -- I'm not going to get into the detail here -- three different possible variants.

One possible of a new body or new international organization.

The Option B is creation of a permanent and open group with a specialized support structure in the United Nations secretariat. Here I want to stress that whatever mechanism is created, even if it's a light one here, for instance, on CSTD or whatever, it needs a specialized secretariat to do the coordinating work because it's a lot of work, because, as Nick has said before, as some other representatives have said, that this is going on in many other bodies. It needs work to be done so it needs a permanent secretariat.

I don't want to get into the details. I also mentioned the possibility of having this mechanism as an adjunct to the IGF, as was mentioned by somebody else. I also don't go into the details of where to have this mechanism but I've been -- somebody has told me that Geneva could be a good place because many of the other organizations that it needs to coordinate with are based in Geneva, so maybe it will be in Geneva.

On the other hand, the political emphasis, it's more New York-based, so that is why as a complement for the mechanism, I am proposing that in every year, general debate of the General Assembly of the United Nations to have one day devoted to these Internet or cyber issues or whatever name you want to give it, and I suggest there the agenda item where it could be as an existing agenda item and I make that.

Of course what is the advantage of this? This is a complementary proposal with the mechanism in the sense that it could also stand alone. Maybe -- maybe some delegates here in the room won't like to have a new mechanism but maybe they will like to have a day in General Assembly that could be for this purpose. I don't know. I leave it open to you how to do it. But the thing -- the good thing of this is that it may serve to balance what was said, I think, by Nick and Anriette that there's three jobs, a job of coordinating, you know, a job of having -- disseminating information. That can be done by this mechanism with the secretariat. But there's another part of policy dialogue, of high-level policy dialogue that could be done in the General Assembly in this day. Of course with the process of presented resolutions, this and that. I'll leave it at that.

I believe what it was said before, that this mechanism could have any form, even from a very light thing like a working group with a -- with its secretariat, or even to use some existing organization. I don't know. Maybe it can be the ITU and the UNCTAD or in some other organization here, WIPO, whoever wants to receive this group. And the functions -- I think that Nick mentioned three functions in a very articulate way, three functions of that. Of course it will be a new thing. Its functions could evolve, and with collective work it can do.

And gentlemen, I really want to finish this intervention because in the last day, to please ask for apologies because sometimes my ways are not very diplomatic but I'm -- I'm asking for your apology and also to thank you for being such an excellent group of experts, and to tell you that I think that diplomacy works in both ways.

Some of us here may have mandates from our capitals in this and that position, but I think in the other way, this is a group of experts, so we have a duty to, from this collective expertise, also make suggestions to our capital in future paths.

I think that for me, it's very clear that Internet issues need some sort of debate within the U.N. family, as so many issues, important issues of the contemporary world.

I'm sure that it will be a matter of time before that becomes really a mainstream idea.

And I think this group of experts can be, in a very collective and recent way, help in that trend.

The way that is done, if it's a new body because it have budgeting, if it's in another place, that could be sort out later. But I think that we, as expert more than anybody, realize that the importance of this topic deserves to be treated in a -- how do you say? In an official way and with method and substance in the United Nations.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan, for your remarks. I think they are very helpful. I must commend you for this. And I think I must apologize myself to you, because my -- as I see the way you are presenting, I must acknowledge that it is -- has much more far-reaching and -- implications and emphasis I didn't detect initially. So I think it's completely in line to see your proposal in full. And I apologize for, in the previous debate, not having recognized that.

As I open for debate, colleagues, I'd like to propose the following, that we -- if you wish, of course you are free to do differently, but if maybe we can have discussion on the separate elements of the proposal because they refer to different ideas. Maybe we should have focused discussion on one and then move to the other.

In relation to proposal, I'd say number 1a, I think that refers very much to what has already been discussed. I don't see a need to have more discussion on that, unless, of course, you wish.

I'd like to, by opening the floor, if I can priority (indiscernible) comments in regard to 1b, the creation of a permanent and open working group with a specialized support structure in the United Nations Secretariat.

So it is a proposal from the chair, just try to organize a little bit the discussion to avoid going back and forth when we discuss the issues, but you -- if you want to take that approach.

I have on my list United Kingdom. You have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon, everybody. And first of all, I think we should say I can't see any reason for our colleague from Cuba to apologize at all. He's been extremely constructive throughout all our discussion and I personally have appreciated his help and advice, particularly yesterday when we were talking about some of the U.K. proposals. And we very much appreciate that constructive and diplomatic approach.

But just a question, really, to understand this proposal better. And it applies to 1b, but it also applies to other parts of the proposal. And that's about where are the stakeholders in this proposal, exactly?

Paragraph 71 says that the process towards enhanced cooperation shall involve all stakeholders, but I'm finding it difficult to understand where stakeholders fit into this. It looks to us like a closed intergovernmental arrangement, whichever option you look at, which excludes stakeholders. So I'd just like to hear a little bit more from Cuba about how they see stakeholders engaging and contributing in this recommendation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. as we have been doing, we'll revert to Cuba at the end of the comments we are receiving now.

I have on my list Nick Ashton-Hart and Anriette.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone, and Paul, as usual, as put it very well in respect to his comments about Juan and his very welcome contributions here.

My question was sort of similar to that, is -- is b intended to be an international organization, intergovernmental, per se, or is it meant perhaps to be broader? Perhaps with an intergovernmental part, perhaps with a non-intergovernmental part. Or how is b) particularly different than a)?

Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Actually, I don't have much to add but to just really thank Juan and Cuba for this input. In fact, the idea of the variant c) in recommendation 80, which is establishment of a mechanism inside the Internet Governance Forum, was inspirational to us, in fact, and we tried to work with that. But I echo the questions.

It's also not entirely clear to me. I know that you're looking at deliberation and also at policy-making, but is that in the same -- is it sequential, in the same space, or in two different platforms that inform? And then I echo the other questions about stakeholder (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see also Parminder. You have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

First a point of clarification. Are we only discussing b here?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I propose to go section by section, but the issues addressed by both U.K. and Nick I think refer to all the three -- all elements of the proposal and yet referred to 1c. So I don't want to be rigid about what I said. You can, if you wish, comment on the proposal as a whole. It was just for the sake of organizing a little bit. But I think it's going well that way. You can go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Of course a) has been discussed extensively and has been proposed, including by us, and that's what we think not only we want to go, I think that's where we will finally go as the Internet takes control of everything.

However, talking now of b), as also I said earlier that, yes, we can look at those first few steps towards what would be a) finally, but I don't have to bring that in. So it's possible to do some kind of committee or open working group with a specialized support structure in the United Nations Secretariat as long as it has enough support in the secretariat. So that, we welcome that particular possibility as well.

And again asking or adding to the question which U.K. said, whether -- and verifying with Cuba whether we can add a multistakeholder participation process around b), whether that could then make it a more well-bodied proposal.

Quickly coming to c), I am again open to Chair wanting the c) to be discussed separately. Should I comment on c) now or should I take it later? I'm open because if people are focusing on b), I think we should focus on b) and then go to c).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: As you wish. I was expecting -- yes, you will come back, because I was expecting some reactions in regard to b because I think this is of somewhat different nature in regard to what we have been discussing so far. But I understand it may be a prerequisite for many to comment on this would be to have so clarification from Cuba what would be the role of other stakeholders. So just as -- and I see Anriette has put down, so maybe I turn to Cuba for that clarification because that might help others to react to your proposal.

Thank you.

>>CUBA: Thank you for the excellent question, you know. You know that when your presentation is (indiscernible) or something like that and you don't have time, you sometimes arrange with some colleague in the floor to ask special question. We call that in Spanish pala, a shovel. And so this didn't happen here, but the question are so good that it seems like it was prepared. Because of course this is the perfect question to explain because it's one of the key concerns of everybody.

I think that our mandate is very clear. We are under the terms of reference of Tunis Agenda. So the answer for this is paragraph 68, second part of paragraph 68 in Tunis Agenda. We also recognize the need for development of public-policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders.

So this mechanism, whatever -- in whatever form it takes, it should put in place a mechanism for consultation with all stakeholders.

The way as it goes and the way that is implemented, of course it will depend on the persons, the interest of rest of stakeholders. You know that with the rest of the stakeholders, there's always a problem. A problem or -- not a problem. A characteristic that is different from government. In governments, you have regional groups, you have already an organization to reach out to -- to government through representative. The representation of the rest of the stakeholders, sometimes it's more diffuse, it's more numerous. Private sector sometimes organize better and more concentrated.

Civil societies don't have one overarching organization, there have to be several, so that will set the way, the practical way of doing this will have to be found -- found along the way as has always been through IGF, through WSIS process.

So I repeat, this is to be done like is in Tunis Agenda in paragraph 68, the need for development of public-policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders.

And what was the other -- I think that was the main question. No? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I follow then the list of speakers. I see the Parminder has -- yes, I have you down. I have Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. As for this proposal from Cuba, first I'd like to appreciate the flexibility that is shown here because the previous proposer concerning this institutional mechanism is suggesting a new body, U.N. body, but I think this proposal is showing more flexibility. Instead of a creation of a new organization in the United Nations, but to me, it's the creation of a working group. I see it as a separation of some mechanism in IGF and I think this kind of -- this is something we can think -- we can think -- find some compromise on it.

Well, having said that, I have a question as for (c).

IGF is a totally multistakeholder fora for the deliberation of the political policy issues. Are you -- in Cuba -- to the proposer, are you suggesting that we should have some distinct separate fora only for the intergovernmental participation?

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, as we do not have any other requests for the floor, I would go -- ah. So maybe we listen to the U.S. and then I revert to Cuba.

U.S., please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Cuba for this proposal but also for the insights that you've had throughout the week or the last couple days. It's been very helpful.

So also some thoughts about your proposal.

The -- how does (b) relate to (a)? And I know we're only supposed to be talking about (b), but there -- I don't know if that's an "either/or" or an "and." "Either"? And --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>UNITED STATES: "Or." Okay. So it's an "or."

And, you know, the devil's also in the detail in all of these in terms of how -- what are their working methods and what's their terms of reference, and one of the things that I wonder about is one of the themes that we've heard today is that there needs to be like a coordinator of coordinators, a

coordinator of U.N. bodies and all the different issues that go through, and, you know, I wonder how other U.N. organizations will react to that type of a structure, especially since many of these U.N. organizations are mature organizations, and to what extent it would actually be feasible at the end of the day. Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CUBA: Well, I have two questions. One question first from Japan is about how this could be done in the IGF.

Of course. Maybe we're a little bit ahead of ourselves because maybe the details could be worked afterwards by everybody, but my view -- and that's why I put IGF in the third place. It's not that I don't give merit to the IGF. On the contrary, I'm a big fan of the IGF.

I put it there because I have some concerns because if it sits in the IGF, it has to be, as you said, a separate track in the IGF to be governments in consultation with the rest. And IGF has such a freshness and such a diversity, that maybe to put it an intergovernmental track inside of the IGF, I don't know, I still -- it could be a possibility, but as I put it there, I put it in the last possibility. That will have to be discussed among all of us. But that was the reason, because it has to be a different track because it's a different process. It's very differing from what the IGF is going, and the way the IGF has its merit and its working.

So that's the thing.

And the questions from the U.S., it's very important. It's very important. And -- because it is -- it's -- the details are the essence of this.

First, to say that I put those three, (a), (b), and (c) as examples of different ways, that mechanism. It could be more. As I said, it could be already in an existing organization like ITU or WIPO or whatever. That's another option. Or maybe somebody here can think of another option. That's open. That was only put there as examples of variation.

And to answer your question how this relates with other organizations, Angel -- (Speaking in a non-English language.)

I asked permission to Angel, because he's an old friend from UNCTAD, that, you know, UNCTAD is doing excellent work in eCommerce and digital trade for many years. My first time I came to Geneva was in 1999 when Bruno Lanvin was heading the eCommerce in UNCTAD, so I'm very aware of that. And he came to me and said, "What you're proposing will take this work out for UNCTAD?"

And I said, "On the contrary, on the contrary, this will help to facilitate this."

And by my side was the Spanish from private sector, Lorenzo. He already left. He had to take a plane.

And I turned to Lorenzo and said, "Lorenzo, did you know that in UNCTAD, they are doing this excellent work on eTrade?"

He said, "No, I didn't."

And I am going over to the IGF, and even members from MAG that have their meetings here, if you ask if they know what UNCTAD is doing in digital trade and eTrade, I'm sure that 99% will not know.

So I feel -- I think that it's the other way around. This kind of mechanism could help to mainstream what is already being done in this sector in some other agencies regarding Internet and online things. I think that that -- and of course you're very right, madam, that the devil is in the details. As the other questions that were asked, that will -- of the stakeholder participation, this will have to be arranged, have to be done.

I mention here there's 29 interagency coordination mechanisms. I never participated in any of them but there's already 29 interagency coordination mechanisms in United Nations which we could ask from them best practice, what has worked well, what has worked bad, and from that experience try to nurture a proposal.

But of course it's a proposal that needs the work and the input of all of you. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba, Juan, for giving those additional details. I have on my list a few -- some other participants who requested the floor, Parminder, followed by U.K., and Jovan. Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Once again, I would like to give a chance to anyone who is speaking about (b) before I speak for (c) because people have been speaking about the Internet Governance Form one, but I want the discussion on (b), which is very distinct, to be finished and I can come back later. I don't know now. The chair can check whether they want to speak on (b) and I can come after them. But I would like to speak on 2(c).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. So we will be coming to you specifically in regard to 2(c).

May I turn to the U.K. for your comments.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. My comment was on (c) also.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So let me just ask: Would anyone at this point like to comment specifically on (b), 1(b)? So we take comments for 1(b).

Because I think it's important for Cuba and for the group to know if that idea of creation of this permanent working group with a specialized support structure in the United Nations -- this is the first time we're discussing here at this particular meeting.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. If this has -- someone would like to comment specifically on this, I think we should -- and I would strongly support that we have a focused discussion on this.

I see Marilyn Cade is asking for the floor, but Switzerland would like to comment on this as well because you were before in the line so I go directly to Marilyn Cade then.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. My comments and questions are specifically related to (b). I might have other questions about the other, but in the create -- the question is more the creation of a permanent and open working group with a specialized support structure in the United Nations secretariat.

An open working group to me sounds like that means the attendance is open to everyone, but that it -- when you say "permanent," that also means that it has an unlimited time span associated with it, and most of the work that is related to WSIS follow-up is done on a -- sort of a timely basis of reports on once a year and maybe authorized for a five-year period or something like that. So I just wanted to better understand what that thinking was.

And then secondly, there are a number of places that have secretariats -- UNCTAD, the CSTD, others. When you say the U.N. -- the United Nations secretariat, are you being specific about the kinds of characteristics that would be needed? And perhaps you could just say more about that so it would be possible to understand if there are existing resources that could be applied. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So in case there is no one else who would like to come in specifically (b) and I see it's not the case, I turn then to Cuba for -- to clarify.

>>CUBA: My goodness, another excellent question, and I -- I reiterate, we are not coordinating this beforehand. This is --

First, I have to be --

Well, the secretariat, I will leave it to the end.

What is meant by "open and permanent." That is a normal way of describing these groups because there are groups in United Nations that are not open to all member states. What I'm talking here, all member states. Like, for instance, CSTD. CSTD, because it's elective group. There are many. The GGE, famous GGE, now is 25 countries as well. And the "permanent" is the difference. CSTD is permanent. It's established. Each year it has a session, it has an intersessional, it's permanent. But for instance, GGE is not a permanent group. It has to be convened. It was convened so far five times since 2000- something.

It may not be convened next year. It depends.

So when -- when I'm saying that it's open, I mean it's open to all member states, and when I say that -- and in this case, remember that it says that it's in consultation with all stakeholders, so it will be open to the representatives of the stakeholders in the proper way that it will have to be arranged, through the ECOSOC or whatever, you know, in a proper way, okay? That is the openness.

And the "permanent" is in order that not have to be convened time by time, so it has, for instance, a period of maybe 10 years or something like that that it's permanent.

And about the secretariat, Marilyn, I have to be honest. When I was writing there, I was thinking of the U.N. secretariat from New York because I was thinking around -- along some other working group that exists there, but after having conversation with some others, and even with yourself, that told that maybe Geneva is a better place because -- for the coordination with the rest of the agencies, now when I mention "secretariat" I mentioned -- I say that the secretariat could come from UNCTAD, from whatever, but I underline here the need that that working group needs a permanent secretariat because it's not -- it's not an event-based thing. It's a thing that -- which should have a methodology of working all year in which member states could -- or the rest of the stakeholders, because it's a consultation, they can submit requests, consultation, whatever, and the secretariat will have to parse that. If some has to do with intellectual property, then it -- this group will have of course already some sort of mechanisms and liaison with those other organisms. And for that, you need a secretariat.

And for whatever meetings they have, if they have it one time a year or two times a year. But it needs a permanent secretariat for logistics and for all that thing. That is the idea of mentioning the secretariat there. I -- I don't know if this answered your question. Okay. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I -- I think we could consider 1(b) covered unless there are any other comments here.

Yes, I turn to, yes, Peter Major.

Yes, please, you have the floor.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, Juan, for your presentation and calling our attention to the CSTD.

So you have rightly mentioned the CSTD has a limited membership, which is true, but it's an open commission. That is, all member states of the U.N. can participate in the discussions. They can participate in the drafting of the resolutions as well. And to my best knowledge, we never voted.

So having said that, I would like to call your attention also to the fact that CSTD is mandated to the follow-up of the World Summit on Information Society, and if I am not mistaken, enhanced cooperation is part of it.

So I'll let you read the mandate of the CSTD and I really encourage you to go through the activities of the CSTD.

And it has been mentioned earlier, emerging issues are being discussed in the CSTD, and for the record we are going to have the annual meeting next week and you are kindly invited to participate.

And to show you how open the whole thing is, everyone whether WSIS or ECOSOC accreditation, can participate irrespective of whether they're a member state or nongovernmental representative.

So basically these are the remarks I wanted to make. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Peter.

Juan, if you wish to make an additional comment, but I don't think we need to discuss this now --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- because I think the concept that you are proposing is something that is understood. I think the details about how CSTD and other bodies -- I think is not relevant to the discussion right now.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please, yes, please, go ahead.

>>CUBA: Yes. Peter, I agree, of course, and CSTD has been doing that. I mentioned that before. But -- so this group could be part -- not part -- adjunct to CSTD, because I don't think that CSTD, right now, that it has different priority things. It's this.

CSTD is not this coordinating group because this coordinating group should be specific for this task, with the secretariat for that task. It may be -- I don't know how strained the CSTD secretariat is. I think it's a little bit strained. So it will need to be reinforced but this group could be placed here. As a matter of fact, the secretariat of CSTD is given by UNCTAD, so in a way, it could be in UNCTAD, another thing that UNCTAD shelters besides CSTD.

But I don't think that CSTD, per se now is this group and I don't think that CSTD could be this group. It has to be something adjunct to it. I'm not very clear. Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. So now with this, I would suggest we turn to 1(c), which refers to the establishment of intergovernmental mechanism -- ah. Timea. Yeah, before that, Timea Suto, please, go ahead.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. I'll be brief. I'm listening to these comments on coordination mechanism and a question pops to my mind regarding that there are a number of other entities that are not within the U.N. remit, such as -- they're not U.N. agencies, such as the GCCS, the G20, Council of Europe, APAC, and other organizations that are active in this space, and I was just wondering how would this coordination mechanism add a layer that would -- according to this coordination mechanism, it would be a partial layer. How would that add value and reduce complexity regarding all the other organizations that fall outside the U.N. remit?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'll turn to Cuba but I think the kind of discussion we are having here, we are looking at this issue from the angle of the international -- say the global nature of things. So we understand there are regional aspects, national aspects, even subnational aspects but we are -- we are --

from the perspective of what we are doing, I think we are looking at the global dimension of it. If Cuba wants to comment, but -- yeah, yeah.

>>CUBA: Timea, of course. If we're talking about coordination, it's not only with the U.N. agencies. There's some other organizations not from the U.N. that are major players in this. I'm thinking about ICANN, for instance.

This group should do some coordination with ICANN.

So -- and it will do some coordination, as the chairman said, with the global organization, with the global reach, that are pertinent and relevant.

If it's not relevant, maybe not, but it's a relevant organization that has done work.

Even research centers. It was said here that one of the things that is needed is to do some prospective thing of new emerging issues and whatever, so this group could also coordinate with universities, research centers, think-tanks, in order to do all the work.

I really feel like whatever you keep thinking of this, that there's a lot of things to be done so -- and the need to specialize with a group of persons that could do all the coordination, that could do all the preparation throughout in a permanent basis, I think that it's worthwhile to give a try.

But certainly other non-U.N. organization will be part of the coordination.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Could we then move to 1c. Just for -- and I have a list of speakers, I understand, on this particular topic. I'll read them out. Parminder, the U.K., Jovan, Switzerland, Timea.

Just before initiating -- yes, I'm taking out Timea.

Just before, I'd like also to recall that this, we have also a different recommendation specifically addressed to this coming from Anriette. We expect to be able to discuss it later on. But just, Anriette, if you want at some point to intervene. Not discuss your, but maybe some elements you may think during the discussion are also helpful for the discussion.

Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I must say that we know that we have to innovate and go beyond our existing positions, and something new would come out if we do it with sincerity.

So I'm not completely opposed to any -- any kind of suggestion which does enable governments, in consultation with all stakeholders, to develop public-policy related to the Internet as long as that particular objective can be addressed in full (indiscernible).

So we're looking to what can be done to include relationship with Internet Governance Forum, though of course it will stretch actually (indiscernible) the language of Tunis Agenda because both Internet

Governance Forum clearly says all stakeholders meet on an equal footing. So it is difficult to pull out nonequal footing mechanisms within it. It also clearly says as a policy developing and the job of enhanced cooperation is nearly under brackets or under coordination development of public policy which is related to the Internet.

But we can look around how these things could be very close to each other, and I always think I -- I'm -- I work in participatory democracy processes. We are -- Participatory democracy processes together contribute to evolve public-policy making. So that's a general concept.

The second part of it, the problem is that I was a part of the working group on improvements to the IGF, and I notice there are some very -- very unhappy, from my viewpoint, suggestions. India made a very strong proposal to make Internet Governance Forum very strong. I also made it. But there were people who said, including those who were coordinating the process, that Internet Governance Forum is only a project of the U.N., and U.N. not only would not fund but cannot fund the IGF. There were even clarifications sought from the New York office. I think that's a problem. It shouldn't have been like that. It's wrong interpretation, but they brought clarifications that it's a project and the U.N. cannot fund it. So, therefore, positively, we were left with a privately funded IGF. And now there's going to be a very interesting innovation where intergovernmental public-policy making systems would be placed within privately funded systems. I think we are taking the ICANN model too seriously. Also, would the MAG, which is multistakeholder, be in super intendance of anything which is intergovernmental mechanism and then you are basically lower than a system where (indiscernible) along with others decide things. I think this is inversion of democracy in a major way. Basic principles of not only U.N. but democratic systems are up-ended. However, I go back to the original point. We are open to a very close association of these two things. But the background has to be kept in mind.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, I think we could have a constructive conversation about the IGF and about how it plays its role. And we could talk about how the IGF needs to reach out, particularly to stakeholders in developing countries, how the IGF plays its role in sharing information, and how governments engage in the IGF. And that conversation is happening. It's happening at the IGF. It's happening in the MAG.

I fear, however, that some colleagues would quickly tell us that the IGF has got nothing to do with enhanced cooperation, and that, from our point of view, is a missed opportunity. Because for us, the IGF really does have a very important role. And actually what we are talking about today is in the mandate of the IGF. It's in paragraph 72 of Tunis. The mandate of the IGF is to facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet. Its mandate is to interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations. This is what the IGF was set up to do. This is what we're talking about. And my fear is that the proposal from Cuba is simply to say we should exclude stakeholders from parts of the IGF. And for us, I'm afraid that's not a positive way forward.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We'll turn to Cuba after we hear all interventions on this.

I have then Jovan, followed by Switzerland.

Jovan.

>>JOVAN KURBALIJA: Thank you. Congratulations, Juan, for, as always, creative and significant input with a specific style which has marked the IGF since IG processes in the first meeting of the WGIG in 2004.

I'll comment on this possibility of linking the -- this to the IGF, and there are few reasons why it could be not only possible but also beneficial and desired, because of the, first, IGF is dynamic space. It is multistakeholder space. It gets legitimacy, which I think is one of the concerns in this process by the U.N. It's part -- it was established by the WSIS. Members of the MAG are nominated by the Secretary-General. Therefore, it is (indiscernible) to the multilateral -- multilateral process. It is a place where we have a relatively successful dealing with silos. And we have been hearing examples about silos in -- about information about UNCTAD events, and I can tell you this is my almost daily experience of dealing with silos, and there are bad and good news. Bad news is that silos are here to stay. We simply have limited time, limited number of hours per day, and we socialize in the groups where we feel comfortable. And it's very human. Therefore, silos are -- shouldn't be necessarily dismantled.

What should be done, and I think IGF can help, is to create some sort of boundary spanners. People and the institutions and the forums that will deal with the silos problems.

Now, in the comments, we had one of the issues was equal footing and the question that it could be relatively potentially damaging for the IGF to introduce a new type of form of interaction. Intergovernmental. And I'm fully aware of that, following the IGF since the WGIG, since the IGF came into motion, it should be handled with necessary care because there is a risk that atmosphere and dynamics could be threatened. But possible solution where we want -- we wouldn't just introduce one track which could be exclusive intergovernmental track is to also introduce in the IGF other governmental tracks. Therefore, we can have one day where business sector will be meeting and addressing very (indiscernible), civil society, technical community and academia, and governments. Within their own way of doing things and within their own support, which Juan mentioned be the secretariat -- secretariat and other issues.

Therefore, even formally we can stretch a bit the understanding of equal footing because everybody will have equal opportunity. That could be a limited part of the exercise, maybe one day or enhanced zero day. And then we would move into the -- what we have been experiencing, the high level real multistakeholder interaction during the IGF itself.

This is just -- just part of brainstorming how we can do it, and what is the -- not the major aim but this solution could help strengthen the IGF.

We did research on IGF demography, and it is clear that we don't have some participation from governments. And the facts are clear on that side.

By introducing this track, we can also strengthen the governments participation in the main IGF after that, let's say, stakeholder track where each stakeholder will be basically focusing on their group, and then they move to the traditional multistakeholder format of the IGF as we have been doing since 2006.

This could be a possible -- a possible solution where we can tick all boxes: Equal footing, keeping multistakeholder approach, and within the space which has legitimacy given by the WSIS and the U.N. secretariat.

Thank you.

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

I have on my list Switzerland followed by Parminder and ISOC.

Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Benedicto. And thank you to Juan for this proposal and for the explanations he has given before.

Regarding the point c), I could associate with a lot of what has been said by Jovan just before, so I won't repeat what has been said. It's always important to look not only at how the IGF is now or how it was five years ago or ten years ago when it started, but also the potential that is in its mandate under the Tunis Agenda and the flexibilities. At least myself as a trained lawyer, I see a lot of room for creative and innovative solutions that keep with the spirit of the IGF.

But we're talking here about one possible form of how this mechanism could be presented or could be agreed, and I see a lot of value of looking for this form under the IGF. But, still, I just wanted to point out that we would need some more clarity on what is the function we are really implementing with this, because it is described in very general terms. But I don't know if this discussion is already over or we can discuss about this. I seek clarification from the chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm -- you're thinking explicitly whether we should also incorporate in the discussion about the function roles? I prefer to take your question and leave it for Juan to respond the way he thinks appropriate because I do not want to expend too much and open other avenues for discussion here, but I will give him the opportunity to address your concerns when I refer to him after hearing all the other comments.

Thank you.

I will now turn to Parminder and to ISOC.

Let me just make one comment before, because I -- I may be wrong, but I see that -- kind of how we framed the discussion to be that those would be, let's say, alternative ways of dealing with this. At least

from my perspective, it seems that some of those options would not be excluding itself of others. That we could have, for example, b) and c). Or I don't see why if you have one working group linked to some kind of secretariat, we could not have also something at the IGF. So I'd like just to propose you to think that it's not either/or. I think it could be one plus the other. If -- Again, if these could be taken up by the group.

So Parminder followed by ISOC.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'm obliged that the delegate of Switzerland spoke about functions. We have a mandate. Our mandate is about enhanced cooperation, which has a function which is clearly defined in Tunis Agenda, which is development of public policies related to the Internet. That's the function.

We can change anything about the process, a system, a mechanism, a body, but we can't change the function. You work backwards from a function. The function is fixed. We can't negotiate the function. We may say that that function is not to be fulfilled, that function is being fulfilled elsewhere, but we can't change the function. And that's basic to the discussion which we are having.

The function -- And if there is, and it seems to have been introduced at various points, confusion on what is the meaning of development of public policies in the U.N. system, I think we can have a two-day workshop on it. I am pretty clear about, and veterans of U.N. should be clear, what's the meaning of development of public policies in the U.N. system. There is a clear meaning which has got history.

Now, in that sense -- now, and Jovan is excited about that idea which is good, is about making IGF dialogue more efficient. You can do it in separate and come back. But Tunis Agenda in its wisdom separated two functions, one of development of public-policy making and other of policy dialogue which should feed into, of course, the policy development.

Now, making a dialogue more effective, and that also goes to Anriette's proposal, is a useful thing to pursue. It's not our mandate. It was the mandate of the earlier working group. We could still talk about it. Our mandate is development of public-policy principles.

So anybody who gives an innovation, which I'm ready to hear even within IGF, has to tell me how that process would then develop public-policy principles related to Internet. Let's make this as our yardstick. Let there be innovative proposals, but they should fit. Therefore, in this manner, these public-policy principles can be developed in (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Last on my list is ISOC, and then I am reverting to Cuba.

ISOC, you have the floor.

>>ISOC: Thank you, Chair. I have two brief comments. The first one is to second what the U.K. was mentioning, that a lot of the things that we have been discussing today is already mentioned in the

mandate of the IGF. And, you know, when we're talking about issues of knowledge sharing or I think it was India that expressed in their recommendation around converging views on issues, that's where we see the IGF playing an important role.

And, secondly, when we're discussing these type of recommendations related to the IGF, I think if we're considering mechanisms within the IGF, I think first of all it should be something that should be discussed with the MAG of how do you strengthen participation of certain stakeholders groups. But also, if we're talking about recommendations related to the IGF, and especially in light of recommendations of new bodies and mechanisms, there seems to be kind of a will to fund new things, I think it should be considered how we can strengthen the funding of the IGF so we can really make full use of the mandate of the IGF.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. With this, I will invite Juan to make his comments on that.

>>CUBA: Again, thank you for such good interventions. I think the last one on Paul's has some point in context, so I will begin from there.

Of course when I put this in the proposal I was thinking that those as examples. And I put this as c) because, although I like the IGF -- by the way, I am member of MAG, so I know the process that is going. I have been for three years member of MAG, and (indiscernible) now, that's how I met with the IGF and fall in love with him. But I recognize that this has challenge, not only for the IGF but for -- for this group, because I am -- as I told you before, this is a group that needs hard work, needs a secretariat.

As you know, the MAG is strained. It will need a revolution in order for the MAG to assume these functions or -- not the MAG. The IGF secretariat that is only two or three persons. They don't have the capacity to do. This they will have to do (indiscernible).

There's another problem related to that that was mentioned. Funding. IGF is funded by some private funders or different kind of funders, government, whatever, for the function that is already there.

I'm not sure that if we introduce an intergovernmental track in the IGF, maybe some of the funders will no longer be so interested to fund. That's a challenge that we'll have to do there. Because to answer the ISOC, it's not that the current IGF with the mandate is capable of this task because as was said by Parminder, this task is to develop public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders. That is very clear, the task.

And to put that task in the IGF, I am worried about the IGF because it creates, as Jovan said different tracks. I think that we begin doing the formalization of IGF that -- what I like from the IGF is the informal dialogue and openness that encourages people that have never been in an embassy or in a U.N. to go and talk and if we begin putting in all this -- that is why -- although that's a possibility, it's better to have it in the IGF than not to have it at all, because if we don't have it at all, it will be not to fulfill our mandate.

And another challenge of the IGF, I mentioned the secretariat, I mentioned the funding, I mentioned that the IGF, we're putting an intergovernmental process in the IGF.

The IGF has their meetings in many places of the world that are not U.N. sites. That's a problem for -- in intergovernmental processes that sometimes -- I'm not very keen about that, but I've been told that intergovernmental processes have to be in what is called U.N. sites. That is, Geneva, New York, Vienna, Rome, Nairobi, Santiago de Chile. Those are the U.N. sites that are suitable for intergovernmental processes. Of course maybe I'm wrong about that. So I think that IGF, it's a possibility. I mention it in my proposal. It's a possibility, but it's one that I reluctantly put it there, such as a last resort.

I am more inclined to -- to take in Peter's suggestion of doing something here in UNCTAD. I am not shy of saying that I'm a very fan of UNCTAD. I told you that the first connection with the U.N. system was through UNCTAD. I would love if UNCTAD could grab us and -- this group.

And of course the idea that the chairman said that this does not preclude that if this is done here, this group, one of the entities that it will need to coordinate with will be the IGF, so this will have some relationship with the IGF, maybe some workshops or whatever, without tweaking the IGF, but some collaboration with the IGF. Some of the results of this group could be presented it there, be informed in one way or another to strengthen, move -- take more government representatives to the IGF in order for them to see the other informal side of the coin, and so I think it could be a win/win situation if we do it well. Thank you.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CUBA: I'm sorry. Function. The function. It was answered by Parminder.

It's development of public policy in consultation with the rest of the stakeholders. But that process, sorry, is not just drafting documents. What we're going to do here in CSTD next week is public policymaking. It's different priority things, not only in the following of the World Summit, it's also some about sustainable food supply and all that policy, and that involves, if you come here next week, you will see that UNCTAD and CSTD has prepared always a panel of experts that have done research throughout the year, so public policymaking includes have research, receive surveys, ideas, different perspectives to see -- we have a saying -- you know, the peasants in Cuba, called (non-English word or phrase), you know the peasants, they say to kill a (non-English word or phrase), a snake with a machete, you don't throw the machete where the snake is because the snake will go. You have to foresee where the snake is going and then take the machete. We have to do the same with public policy. We have to figure out where the snake is going to throw the machete. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan, for your comments and we will listen to a remote participant from Mexico. You can go ahead, sir.

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

I have some thoughts on 1(c) proposal regarding the IGF. In my opinion, the IGF offers the right incentives for governmental participation. Governments can propose an Open Forum, a Day Zero

activity or also they can participate in several workshops and activities carried out during the IGF meetings, even during the preparatory process, since the MAG meetings are open. Perhaps we could focus on make recommendations on how to strengthen the governmental participation in the IGF processes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think we have had a good discussion on this. I would, of course, not prevent any comments from being made but I want to keep moving and I just recall we have a very interesting proposal also coming from Anriette that looks from a different angle and I personally would be very much interested that we have time to go through it.

So I would suggest that, yes, just after Jimson, that we move to -- oh, I'm sorry, I'm taking Jimson, and yes, then the Part 2 of Cuba and then we move to 82, and that's what exactly I was going to say.

Jimson, please, you have the floor.

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

Chair, I'm just wondering when I will have an opportunity to maybe present my recommendation that is somewhat in tandem with what we have been discussing.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Exactly. As you can see, I'm a bit anxious to keep moving because I'd like to exhaust discussion on these kind of U.N. body framework and I would like to revert to discussion and to have some feedback on proposals made by you, by Anriette, by others in the room that refer to somewhat different -- India, for example, in regard to the proposal that GAC should report to CSTD.

That -- I think we need also that kind of feedback from -- on those proposals as well. That's why we -- but I think I'd like to suggest we should exhaust this after we discuss, I hope briefly, Proposal Number 2 from Cuba. We'll move to those that were proposed by Saudi Arabia. I will -- by the way, Saudi Arabia, that will give you all the time you need to -- for the introduction of your recommendation that addresses, I think, exactly this, so it -- it will be just okay for you.

And after that, we'll discuss the other --

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry.

-- the other recommendations, including your own. So it's just a matter of making sure we don't waste time in unnecessary duplication of discussion.

So let me with this invite -- so we are -- still -- we are still on 80, and now Part 2 that refers to the idea that there should be, in the General Assembly -- in the General Assembly -- yes.

Yeah, I think now it's on the screen.

-- on a yearly basis it would be added to agenda item, ICT for development, so there will be a heading on promotional and sustainable economic growth and sustainable development.

So I think you have already made an introduction of that proposal, Juan. I'd look for reaction on the part of the plenary.

So we are now focusing on 80, Part 2.

Are there any comments?

So can I assume it is accepted that we can add it as a recommendation?

By the way, I think the inclusion of items in the General Assembly usually follows a proceeding in which an interested group of countries come together and they propose to the secretary-general, so we are, in a way, just proposing that that should be done by member states, that we should -- I think that's the regular way to include some agenda item at -- so we are just suggesting that that could be -- should be done in order to have, let's say, an institutional home for discussion on a yearly basis of those issues.

So that -- could that motion, with the necessary editorial changes, be accepted as something we could agree could be done.

U.K.?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm not sure that we are at the stage yet of actually agreeing what our recommendations will be now. I think it would be helpful to have a bit more time to consider this properly. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. That's fair. I take it very positively. And we'll certainly come back to this.

So with this, then, may I suggest that we move to Recommendation 82 proposed by Saudi Arabia.

Actually, 82 was included in the first round of contributions that were sent to the January meeting, and later on Saudi Arabia expanded this in what is now appearing as uncategorized Proposal Number 6, so -- but I turn to Saudi Arabia to guide us through your proposal.

Please, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I think I'll start with the additional recommendation, so to cover our submission in a general manner.

So at Section A, we have done a review of the implementation of Tunis Agenda. We have gone through the relevant articles. And to see how much further implementation is done -- or how much further implementation we need to do according to UNGA in order to implement enhanced cooperation.

As it's clear at the first -- at the first of -- at the beginning of Page 22, there is no enhanced cooperation mechanisms nor global applicable principles on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. That's why we concluded that Tunis Agenda mandate related to enhanced cooperation, the development part is not yet implemented.

Then we go to Section B, which is recommendation related to international policy issues and possible mechanisms, so we have listed a number of issues, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. For example, security, safety, continuity, sustainability, robustness of the Internet, combating cybercrime, issues pertaining to the use or misuse of the Internet, respect for privacy and protection of personal information and data and protection of children, as well as multilingualism, international connectivity. Then we have development of access to the Internet and capacity building.

So looking at these issues, we need a mechanism that will enable everyone according to their roles and responsibilities. Our view is we need an intergovernmental body under the U.N. umbrella to do this, and we should have a balanced representation by region, developed, developing countries, for the committees that enter that body and for the chair and vice chair of that -- this body.

Then once we have that body, it will be very clear the relationship between the two distant tracks, enhanced cooperation and IGF.

Once we have enhanced cooperation body where the development of international public policy issue is happening, we will see the full cycle of Internet governance where we have IGF as a venue of discussion, all the stakeholders will come on equal footing. That enhanced cooperation body might sponsor discussion sessions in IGF in order to capture the full range of views by stakeholders and send it back to the enhanced cooperation body to assist in the development of international public policy issues.

Then after 2C, in Section C, we have recommendations related to the role of stakeholders. I mean, this was considered by the -- Paragraph 35 in the WGEC report, so we have certain -- or modified some of the roles and responsibilities for private sector. They would do the research and development of technologies, for example. Civil society would do awareness raising and capacity building. They would promote various public interest objectives. International organization would do the development of technical standards. And the technical community and academia will do the interaction with and all within stakeholder groups.

So we will see really how those stakeholders come together to help in the development of international public policy issues by government.

This, in general, Mr. Chairman. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia, for your introductory remarks. I think your input developed and elaborates on many aspects of what has been discussed here. I think it provides some additional thoughts on how those -- that mechanism could be implemented so I look for the plenary and I ask you whether there are any comments in addition to those that are already made in relation to some similar proposals that should be made in that part of the conversation.

Yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Well, thank you for this proposal. There is -- there's a lot in it and so it's a little difficult to unpack it, but one of the things that we haven't discussed that's in this that I would say I

would be very concerned about is the discussion of some of the technical -- technical standards, some of the technical issues here.

There are -- and, you know, without going into detail here, because I know we're getting short on time, but I'm afraid there might be some overlap and duplication with other -- other organizations that are wide-ranging, such as international standards bodies, but also just a range of organizations that handle these issues, and this is a very extensive list.

So let me just stop with the duplication and overlap theme. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see Anriette and Canada -- followed by Canada.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto, and thank you, Saudi Arabia, for this.

I actually value any proposal that makes me read the Tunis Agenda again.

Just very briefly, I think -- I think that the Tunis Agenda actually does not at any point recommend one mechanism. It uses the term "mechanisms," plural, and I think that's really, for me, the most important point at this point, really.

I -- I appreciate the effort and the thinking that's gone into this, and the analysis of the challenges.

I think what -- what I find difficult to visualize as being effective is the notion of one single mechanism being the solution.

I really appreciated Jovan's points earlier about silos. I think that is a reality that we need to recognize.

So nothing more at this point, and just that point around the -- for us, the infeasibility of one single mechanism as the mechanism, and also we do not read that as the recommendation of the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I -- I have Canada, followed by Japan and Parminder.

Canada?

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you to Saudi Arabia for presenting their proposal in this way. As has been said by the two previous speakers, Canada would also have reservations with this proposal, and I think that probably more than any of the other recommendations on this topic that we've had today, what strikes me is the fact that we're, in fact, not starting from the same position. I mean, if I heard Saudi correctly, he's saying that, you know, the Tunis Agenda is not being implemented, there is no international public policy that is actually being made, and when we have EC, then IPP will happen.

But that is absolutely not Canada's starting point. Canada feels that we are making international public policy related to the Internet in a multitude of fora.

We agree that it's not perfect. One of the main things that we see is that not all relevant participants are at the table. Many of the developing countries never show up to these meetings. And I wish we could hear their voices more because they have something to contribute to the discussion, whether they're government or they're civil society.

So obviously when we're starting from two such different positions to begin with, it will be very difficult for us to come to an agreement on the creation of a new body.

Now, there's a section where -- where there's a list of all of the activities that could -- you know, that need enhanced cooperation, and it is correct they need enhanced cooperation, but all of these activities are already being discussed in a wide variety of fora, and the proposal here to create another one will just add another place where we're throwing money, not everybody is coming, and we're not making effective decisions.

So it would be very difficult for Canada to be able to agree on this. And I didn't come in on many of the proposals that we spoke after the first one, but I think that that's -- that's probably where the divide is, is that we see that international public policy is being developed, slowly but surely, and there is enhanced cooperation taking place. It is not completely effective, but the solution to those problems is not a new single body. It is something else. It has to do with capacity building, it has to do with education, it has to do with funding people to actually travel to just be able to attend the meeting, and that's -- that's a very different issue and I think there are solutions to the first one. This creation of a new body is not going to help in that respect.

So with all due respect to Saudi Arabia, I appreciate the effort and I think it's -- it's -- you did a lot of work to come to this but we would not be able to support it, ultimately. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. Well, I think I should reaffirm. I had already said that at some point of the meeting. I think the starting point from all of us is the language coming from WSIS+10. So at the WSIS+10 high-level UNJ meeting, the language coming from there says that some progress has been made, and we need to provide recommendation how to further implement. So any recommendation we make cannot be framed, I think, that we are initiating something that the general Assembly has said has already -- some progress has been made. We cannot change that. It should be framed in the way to say that we are seeking ways to further implement. So all the proposals I have in here, in spite of anything anyone can say, can only be framed in that way. Any proposal is aimed at seeking to further implement. I think this is a starting point for all of us. I would, as the chair, say I would not accept any language different from this. If we -- We have to be guided by -- by the mandate we have by what has been decided at the very high level. We are not changing that.

So I'd like to say that, from that perspective, all of us should be on the same page in regard to what we are doing here. We are seeking ways to further implement and not to start something that G.A. has recognized is already in progress.

I have Japan followed by Parminder, Marilyn Cade, Cuba, and I see observer, Phil, you also come to comment when I give you the floor.

So, Japan, please, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. I have a question concerning the Saudi Arabian proposal. If I see this b2, the proposal part concerning the institutional mechanism, it says enable enhanced cooperation via intergovernmental body under the U.N. umbrella funded by the U.N. And the ITU would be appropriate hosting agent for this body. And I understand this party is kind of unique because the previous proposal is setting up a new body under the U.N. umbrella. But my reading of this proposal is maybe this proposal is setting up, it's adding another function to the ITU. This is my reading.

So my question is to the gentleman colleague is, actually, ITU is an intergovernmental entity, and they are discussing many of the Internet-related issues. ITU Council working group, the one with (indiscernible) is Internet-related issues, public-policy issues. So what kind of additional function are you thinking about when you propose this? Something need to be changed concerning the ITU function?

I want to suggest some amendment to the ITU constitution or convention in the next plenipot.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan. As we have been doing, we are taking note of all the questions and we'll refer to Saudi Arabia for comments on that.

Next on my list is Parminder followed by Marilyn Cade.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Three quick points. First of all, we support Saudi Arabia's very detailed proposal, and it does address many of the issues which have been raised for some other proposals, where are the stakeholders, and Saudi Arabia explained in detail where the stakeholders are. And also I remember somebody asked me the question of the organic relationship with IGF, which I forgot to respond, but Saudi Arabia again gave great details about how that relationship would be done. So I support that, first of all.

Second, in response to Anriette, I wanted to correct a notion that -- which has been said that mechanisms are mentioned and a process is the not mentioned. Obviously, Tunis Agenda is not very clear what has to be done; otherwise, we would not be sitting here. However, there are enough places where it says a process and other process mechanisms. 61 says there is a need to initiate and reinforce as appropriate a transparent democratic -- transparent, democratic, multilateral process with participation of government, and so on. This process could envisage creation of a suitable framework or mechanisms. So I'm just saying it says both. It doesn't preclude one thinking from other thinking.

Canada's statement then followed by the Chair about our starting-point issue is, yes. No, I mean, if somebody pushes people to say is there no public policy being made anywhere, and that's what happened, I know, at WSIS10, you would in the most gentlemanly manner at one point have to agree, yes, there is something happening which now should not be used to take away from what was the original intention. People would agree if you keep on pushing somebody, how can you say zero? You

know, you can always put to a person this is zero for public-policy making or zero cooperation been happening. The people accept it. You are making that case. Okay. But that doesn't take away from the function.

How -- Now, Chair said that Chair would not accept anything other than what is in WSIS language. In that sense, I would request Chair also not to accept many other things which are coming in which are not per Tunis Agenda enhanced cooperation mandate. And at that time, and we had objected, there was a view that anything that anybody wants to say is on, and we wanted to put a test of relevance to our mandate. Yesterday was a big discussion on test of importance as relevance to mandate. And people were speaking, no, that test of relevance is not on. Now the test of relevance is on. And I agree, there should be a test of relevance, and the test of relevance should be uniformly applied. Yes, we agreed it is said further implement. The word "implement" is there. Implement cannot be done by model language. Implement is always a mechanism with an output. There is no implementation without a system and an output.

So we need to create an implementation system. And also it says enhanced cooperation as defined in Tunis Agenda with the function. Only a thing which can develop public-policy -- public-policy issues should be discussed and nothing else as the test of relevance on further implement has been applied.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Just for clarity, what I said -- what I meant is that we can have discussion and not -- I think we should not try to get into much by asking everyone to be so precise about everything that's been said. What I said is from the perspective of -- I'm looking at the end game of this, that will be to prepare some kind of report, that I will not accept including in the report anything that contradicts what is in the WSIS+10.

So people can say what they say, but when it comes to the report, I think we must be very clear that if something is in contradiction to this, then I -- maybe I don't want to give because it might seem something subjective.

But if it's just an overall statement? Do we want to follow-up on this?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: A quick comment. I do agree that discussions are often the context of something else, so that cannot (indiscernible). I also meant when we finally make a report, we need to put the test of relevance of what is our mandate.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade followed by Cuba and Phil.

Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for this very detailed and also very thoroughly organized presentation, recommendation.

There is -- I will say that I have significant concern about the duplication of work that is embodied, particular -- in this particular list of -- of issues, but I also have a concern about the idea since we all agreed when we looked at our own gap analysis that we could identify some work, but we also identified that there is work still needed in various areas. And we saw that there is work going on in content, in multilingualism, and in other areas in UNESCO. We also saw that there is work going on in protecting children online, in UNICEF and other places.

So I mention that to say that the various U.N. agencies clearly do have work going on, all of them, and I have a particular concern about the idea of elevating a single U.N. specialized agency which has a CSTD that I buy every time the plenipot meets and any updates are made and read it. Assuming that it is possible to change the constitution and convention of the ITU and to significantly expand its mandate is a very challenging question. And I know not everybody here is an expert on the ITU, but some people here are.

So let me raise that as an area of concern about picking a single ITU -- a single agency and elevating them over others.

The second is, again, I see a lot of duplication, but I also see some reference to activities that are in the day-to-day technical coordination area, such as the administration of the root zone files and system, and the further enhancements on the rollout of IPv6.

The third thing I would say in this area is standards are not only developed in the telecommunications area by the ITU. Standards that are relevant are developed in IEEE, they're developed in many other places, and they are developed in multi -- in entities where there is participation by a very diverse number of people. So I am concerned about this idea, again, of everything being put under a single -- into a single place.

And then finally, I would just say that I did see in this recommendation identification of some areas that I think we would want to continue to discuss in our recommendations to say I don't think we need a new mechanism but I do think we need improvements in some places, and I think there are some ideas in this paper -- in this recommendation that could be pulled out and considered as still needing further examination of how they could be addressed even if I don't think it's in a new mechanism.

Thank you, Chair.

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

I will now turn to Cuba, followed by Phil.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. And I -- please, your previous intervention about the terms of reference of this work of this group that is the document from WSIS+10 in 2015 and also, of course, the Tunis Agenda that is part of that mandate, it's very relevant.

Like Anriette, I always go back to Tunis Agenda. I have read it many times. Even before I had a laptop, I always worked with this booklet that was published by the ITU. It had already been worn out.

And so please allow me to clarify, because I think there's some misunderstandings here. And also the intervention of the distinguished colleague of Canada, I think it throws into much confusion as well.

It is mentioned, as Anriette says, there are several mechanisms for Internet governance process. Several.

As you know, we had -- in the WGIG we created a definition of Internet governance. And in a nutshell, internet governance is everything that shapes the Internet and how it's used. So if a company puts to sale a new phone, that's Internet governance. If an NGO creates a new way of collective access, that's Internet governance. If a government puts this regulation. Everything that shapes the Internet and the way it's used. So it's a lot of processes. And in Tunis Agenda they recognize that in paragraph 56.

But in paragraph 60, and now we're going to our mandate of this group, because we are not taking everything, in paragraph 60, they say we further recognize that there are many cross-cutting international public-policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms, in plural. And that is where then comes 68 that I mentioned; that is, we also recognize the need for development of public-policy by governments in consultation with other stakeholders.

So the distinguished colleague of Canada when she mentioned that policies, international public policies mentioned in everywhere, I think that's not precise.

Maybe Internet governance. It made many where, but international public policies for the Internet, I don't know if many -- some are made in these organization for a specific topics, but there are some topics that are not covered as is here. For instance, it's like World Health Organization. A lot of countries and places all are fighting for health, to improve the health, but the global policies, the global policy have to be agreed someplace, and that place is the World Health Organization.

So what we need is some way -- I'm not going to call it mechanism. I'm not going to call it body, because maybe this is satan. This is like -- I don't know what the word. "Regulations," no? (Indiscernible) the word that they unspeakable. That's like in Harry Potter. What's the name, I don't know, that you cannot mention. The unspeakable. But we need an unspeakable thing to develop public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders. We need that. Where to put it? We are the expert. Our countries have sent us here because we're the experts in this field. We are the one that have to come back to the government and say, well, this is a thing that is in the Tunis Agenda. It was agreed by heads of states. Not us; not my ministers. By my head of state was agreed this and we have to solve this. For many years. That's the mandate we have from General Assembly. So we have to say what is the need? The need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can you please conclude?

>>CUBA: -- stakeholder. And we have to do it. Where? That's our job.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I'm -- Yes, Phil, please. You have the floor, followed by Pakistan and Iran. And I see -- is it ISOC or ICANN who is requesting the floor? ICANN. Yes. So you will be the last speaker on this and then I will revert to Saudi Arabia for comments.

Phil, please.

>>PHILIP RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon. I'll be brief. I thank the colleague from Saudi for the paper and the proposal, but just want to say, associate ourselves with the comments from Canada who were very eloquent in making the points that we would have made had we taken the floor. But we can't beat such eloquence, so thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much for this, for the short (indiscernible). Thank you.

Can we -- I recognize Pakistan followed by Iran.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. I will also try to be brief because as recommended by -- as suggested by Richard, I think we should have some time for report, and we still have a few recommendations to consider.

So in very shortly, we support Saudi delegation for the -- for their very useful proposal.

Just one comment. They have suggested that ITU could be an appropriate or -- organization for the proposed body, and there have been some comments in the room on -- around this.

We see that this is just a suggestion, just a proposal. And as we discussed previously, that we can look at other fora, other organizations that are relevant for it and which can host.

Japanese member asked whether it would require modification, any amendment in the ITU constitution or its law-making authority. We don't think that this is required because what is really required for us to do is to have a place where major Internet issues are discussed, and we don't think that ITU has this mandate to do it because although it is dealing with technical issues, but it's not doing those -- around those issues which are mentioned in Tunis, those related to principles and public-policy issues.

So it's just a suggestion, and certainly similar proposals are also open for any relevant organization to be considered for this.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan.

Again, we are taking notes about comments and I'm sure also Saudi Arabia, I will revert to you for comments in that regard.

So Iran followed by ICANN will be the last speakers on this before I revert to Saudi Arabia.

Iran, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I'm very brief.

During today and yesterday, at least five countries and stakeholders raised the similar recommendation. So it seems that this is interesting of at least some of the part of member of the group, and I think the plenary should seriously consider this proposal.

Nobody wants to isolate the ITU, but as we know, that the enhanced cooperation has raised, in the Tunis Agenda from 10 years ago, and up to now during this times, unfortunately ITU couldn't materialize these issues, and so we are here discussing about these issues and we seriously feel that we need a new mechanism, a new body for implementation of the recommendation of enhanced cooperation for enabling the countries to carry out their commitment. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran, for your comments. I'll turn now to Nigel Hickson for your comments.

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

First of all, apologies for being absent and therefore -- not that people have missed me any at all, but just that I might have missed -- I might have dismissed some significant dialogue, which I'm sure I have.

I mean, just really three brief points, I think.

First of all, to thank Saudi Arabia for the clarity of this proposal because I think it's important that we understand where we are, so to speak.

The second point is that we start from the -- from the point of the WSIS+10 review process. It was a review process which we were very pleased to be part of. Professor Minkin -- ah, he is here -- and the tremendous work he did in terms of facilitating such an intelligent document coming out of the ITU process for that. And within that work, the recognition that however imperfect it might be, however gradual or glacial it might be -- and I don't think "glacial" is a good word in this context, but anyway -- enhanced cooperation is taking place. I mean, that was it. It is taking place as much as oxygen is around, as much as other things are taking place. Not perfect. World peace is perhaps not taking place exactly how we want it but taking place in some areas.

And therefore let's build on that. And I understand that some of the proposals being put forward to enhance the ability of stakeholders and governments in particular to take part in Internet public policy debates and issues and dialogues was something that has been referred to earlier today in other people's proposals, and perhaps we'll have the chance again at these meetings to discuss those

proposals by Anriette and by Jimson and others. And this dialogue is -- is taking place perhaps not perfectly.

And as we recognized when we debated in the NETmundial conference and what came out of that, that there was a crucial need for a platform in which to have dialogue on these Internet public policy issues that weren't being addressed.

As Nick says, many are being addressed, but perhaps some aren't.

In ICANN, we play just a small role in our public policy development through 170 countries in the Government Advisory Committee as I noted before, and I'll finish there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel.

So now I will revert to Saudi Arabia and request, please, sir, to comment on any of the comments that were made, please. The floor is yours.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I have written everything and I will respond to the topics by colleagues.

So on issues of internal organization and the development of standards, that's why we've said "international organization." It's not only intergovernmental organization who will develop the standards. We know ITU develop, ISO develop, IEEE develop, so it's a collaborative role, but there development would be confined to the international policy that was developed by the body.

On the issue of Tunis Agenda, I think Cuba and Parminder really answered this, for the sake of time.

Then going to the ITU as one possible institution to host enhanced cooperation. This is possible because it's the U.N. specialized agency for ICT. It could be one of the candidates. We knew that ITU took a leading role in the WSIS which resulted in Internet governance and they have the expertise in this area, so it's not the ultimate or the only place, but it could be considered one of the -- one of the places to have enhanced cooperation.

Then on the -- the gap analysis, some work on some public policies being developed, I'm really not aware of any public policy being developed where all government on equal footings are gathered and make development. We've seen that gap analysis document and we could not identify anyplace that an Internet public policy was developed on equal footing by governments. So if there is, I would be happy to know where that place and such development is happening.

Then on the issue of some progress has been made, yeah, we agree that some progress has been made toward the process of starting or operationalizing enhanced cooperation. Some consultation was done in 2010 or 2012. We have attended the previous working group. So there was process and work initiatives. ITU established their council working group on Internet. But no development. When we go to that council working group and try to develop a policy, this policy is being plucked because we didn't have a mandate or there is no policy to be developed. So where should we go?

So I think I -- I have covered everything. If there is anything, I'm happy to intervene again for colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I'd say that in principle, with this, we have covered those recommendations that are in that specific part of the creation of new mechanism or body, framework. We are -- at this point I think -- I recall one suggestion that was made as part of the meeting that we should -- as we have done, as we have decided to do and we will summarize this when we report to you the outcomes of our discussions.

In regards to, for example, capacity building, we thought it would be a good idea maybe to ask all those who had similar opinions to come together and try to come to a unified text that could wishfully make it to our report, not as a unified recommendation but as a kind of scenario. So this is something that maybe after having exhausted discussion on those set of recommendation -- particular recommendations, before moving to other recommendations, and I would be -- before we discuss the outline document, I will make a proposal in that regard.

But I would just check with colleagues whether at this point it would be like, say, a fair conclusion of the debate that we need to have some more debate among participants that have similar ideas and try to come together to one unified proposal and come back to us to see in -- in which appropriate form it should -- whether it should report -- be reflected and in which form.

Would that be acceptable for us as trying to provide a way forward in regard to that part of the discussion?

I see both Nick and Richard Hill and Parminder.

Nick, please.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, certainly I'd be friendly to that proposal. One thing that it strikes me that might be useful is perhaps we could prevail on the secretariat -- I checked with Dong earlier to see if this would be seen friendly -- to take all of the proposal related to institutional development and perhaps produce a grid in which it is easy to see proposals for a political forum for decisions, a political forum for discussion, an informational service, the various aspects of the various proposals that you can see, simply to try and look at the different elements of the proposals.

It might then be easy to discuss like -- or elements of proposals which have a similar character together, and their relative merits, because I detect in the room that there is wider interest in some of those options than in some others, and so it might be possible to at least agree on some things before -- even if we don't get to a complete agreement on some others, and then it would be easier to characterize those others. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nick.

I think maybe one problem with requesting the secretariat to do it right -- out right now is that we would be, in a way, not taking into account everything that was said in plenary, and I have the feeling that many of the proponents or all of them will want to revisit their -- the text they have provided, in light of the exchanges.

I think the beauty of this kind of discussion is that it provides fresh air in regard -- for example, I was very happy because I see the flexibility of -- I mean, I saw, for example, Cuba criticizing his own proposal in regard to the IGF, for example, so I'm not sure if Cuba will retain it as it was initially phrased. I think Juan would certainly want to reflect and come back. So I think it's not the right moment to request the secretariat to do it because I think we need some more massaging on the part of those who have proposed and -- where they could do it individually or they could do it together. I think the approach we have taken in regard, for example, to the capacity building cluster was to request those who had similar to come together, but I'm in your hands. I look for your guidance on this.

So I have Richard Hill followed by Cuba and Parminder.

Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I support both of your proposed ways forward here, the first one and the second one that you've stated in response to Nick. I think you're perfectly correct.

Just regarding your first suggestion, so if I understood correctly, you've identified two areas where different people who made separate proposals could kind of try to coalesce them. One, if I understood you correctly, was the capacity building and the second one was the institutional mechanism. Perhaps you could -- after the meeting, obviously -- identify some additional areas when you're looking through the summary of the discussions where it looks like several proposals could be brought together.

I think there were other areas. Yeah. So if you could then come back and say, "Here's some areas where we would welcome some combined proposals that reflect the discussions," that would be helpful.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. This is helpful. Yes, I mentioned capacity building from the top of my mind but we have to see the notes we have taken. Possibly other issues will also emerge.

Cuba?

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman, because I'm a little bit lost. Your intention is today to finalize with a draft of the structure or what is your intention today?

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No. Today we are in -- we are following this agenda item. We are discussing the recommendations.

I think when, the first part of our meeting, we discuss recommendations, we came up with some proposals on the way forward, either to request proponents to come forward with new text or to propose some mergers. We have done this before.

In regard to that part of the discussion which refers to the institutional framework basically, specifically the creation of a new U.N. body, I'm not -- it's not my intent to come out of this meeting with a perfect draft. I'm just thinking when we'll be revisiting this issue, we may wish to have one unified text -- that was my proposal -- coming from the proponents.

But it's not -- it's something to assist us. This was a first reading, so when we come back to it again -- and we also discussed how this will maybe fall into the outline document we want to prepare -- I'm just proposing as a way forward that since we have five or six texts, that we try to unify, if possible, if you think it's a good idea.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Now I understand. So you're saying "if possible," and I just want to bring the attention to the case where it's not possible, and as I said, I think it was yesterday morning, there's a precedent of the working group of Internet governance report in which it was a consensus, the whole document was a consensus, the report, but in one chapter where there was some disagreement in models, very similar like here, because it was institutional model, in that chapter, they said, "Well, the group did not come to a single recommendation. There are these views and these views and these views." I think that way can we always be able to have a report. And I'm with you, you convinced me, that we will try to exhaust all possibility of getting to a consensus.

So I am very happy that after my presentation I think that a lot of people are beginning to think in the -- in that possibility with -- with another interest.

As I said, I think that these have to go and have to mature, also consultations in capital, but I think that we could get to a good finalization of our work in our next meeting.

And also, I will ask you to take in -- that into consideration, taking into consideration that we need to have the final report by the end of this year or, at most, the beginning of next year, to do a backward planning of what do we have to achieve in the next meeting, when it's going to be, and what the milestones should be, in order to ensure that we get in time to the end of our work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

If I get it right, what chair is saying is possible and what Cuba is saying is not possible refers to the same thing of consolidations, but I'll come to later and that -- that possibility is what I think we should move towards.

As -- and still, I do agree that we should bring things closer together and see what we can agree. And as you will recognize, in the morning, I was most optimistic we should pull things together as much as is possible.

So if it's possible to get some institutional recommendations by consensus, we still are looking for it. It's not that we are not looking for that.

But as was said, I think we can move in stages. We had today a very good understanding of different kind of possibilities in the room, and to get together in the next stage, if we have clearer pictures of two or three sets of possibilities, that helps us go to the next step better to get consensus, and if we don't get consensus, to be able to say that both of these had a lot of people going for it and there are two advices which are parallel.

So I just request one thing, that we do at this stage start using the test of relevance to our mandate and whatever we propose should, in some way -- I'm not forcing it on you; I'm just suggesting it to you -- should be what can be said as something. First of all, it helps develop public policies by governments and can be considered as something which is implementing. Implementing is always a system with an outcome. So it should look like this is a process by which we can implement.

We need to give a process. The process could be evolution of existing organizations, but there needs to be a process, if not a new mechanism. So as long as we are doing that, we would be going forward, so I agree with the chair's general assessment in this regard. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you very much for your reaction to this. I think nothing is final. This is just to assist me when we finish the meeting to sit with the secretariat and to provide for you some proposals on the way forward, and of course we'll be guided by you in that regard.

But I think this was very helpful.

May I -- yes. United Kingdom?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: I'm sorry, Chair. We're having some difficulty following exactly what the suggestion is.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Uh-huh.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: When you say the secretariat providing something to us, what -- what do you mean? I'm sorry, I don't...

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No. I was just saying that we didn't have time, as we have gone through each of the recommendations, including the ones under this category of consensus-prone, to, at the end of each recommendation, just indicate whether we decided to ask for further refinement or for merger, so I just -- I was referring to that part of the work. That this is something we want just to show you this is our interpretation and if this fits your own interpretation, so in regard to recommendation, we ask the proponent to come forward.

I'm thinking of the kind of intersessional work we need to do in between now and the next meeting to make sure that we start next meeting with some more refined text.

I am not saying we are proposing anything new. We are just trying to reflect on paper the outcomes we had in the room. So it will not be something coming out of the proposal. It will just be a reflection of what took place in the room.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I understand why you are making the suggestions and I can see the reasons why it might help us, but it's asking a very, very difficult job of the secretariat to do that. They will have to make some very difficult judgments. Actually, we can all look at the transcripts of what was said and see what the outcome was. It's written down there.

From our point of view, we think we've had a really useful conversation over the last few days. This is actually the first time that we've discussed the recommendations, that we've really got in depth and had an exchange on views on our various recommendations, and we've learned a lot. We're still waiting to hear from Anriette and others and we would like to get on to that quickly, but it's the first time we've really had a proper substantive change exchange on the recommendations. It's clear there are some areas of consensus or very close to consensus, and we have a much better understanding of one another's views. And it seems to us now that having done that, the proponents of those recommendations need some time to reflect -- as Cuba says, to consult capitals, perhaps, as well -- and then to develop our proposals in order to try to achieve that consensus. And some proponents may decide to get together and merge their proposals if that's something that they think is appropriate and helpful. Others will want to look at the transcripts. And certainly the U.K. will look at the comments that were made on our proposals and we'll make changes to try to make sure that they reflect the view of the group. We think really it's for the proponents, then, to reflect and do that work. And we will be cautious about imposing a very, very difficult task on the secretariat at this stage.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Oh, I think I may not have expressed it well, but I think the kind of work I wish to do was exactly just to map this but to leave to the proponents to do it. But we are not thinking different things. I think this is understood, and we intend, as we have done from the beginning, to be guided by what the proponent in the group wishes. Not, at this point, at least, to come forward with some attempt to reconcile language.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. What I understood your comment to be is entirely different from what Paul understood. So what I understood that you are proposing to do is to identify certain areas where it would be helpful for the proponents to modify the proposals or combine them, not actually the substance. So, for example, you mentioned capacity building, and another one would be the institutional mechanism. And obviously also it would be the (indiscernible) proposals when we go through the transcript. So I thought the chairman was simply proposing to identify certain areas where it would be useful for the proponents to modify their proposal, but not to suggest the actual modifications.

Is that a correct understanding, Chairman?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I don't see much difference in what (indiscernible) because at the end of the day, it will be up to those who made proposals to come forward with text. So either individually or with a merger.

I think in the course of the discussion, I think it was the kind of sentiment that in some cases it would make sense for people to come together, but as Cuba said, if possible, if they wish, it's something that we do not want to impose.

Yes, Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would tend to have to agree with the U.K. I also got lost by all the different explanations that were going on. But I just want to put on the record a few things that will be important for us. I think we've discussed a number of recommendations, and proponents have heard what they need to do with their recommendations. I do not see any real value added in having the secretariat reiterate that. So at this point, I would not task the secretariat to do anything in this respect.

We all have our homework to do. We've -- We've heard comments on our recommendations, and so let's all go home and let's start working on those.

I would support your proposal that the proponents on a new mechanism get together, because if they can't agree on a way forward amongst themselves, then, I mean, already, Canada, we're definitely not convinced, there's no way they're going to be able to convince us further. So I think if they cannot work together to even start thinking about something, then really it's clear that we will just not get anywhere, or that their proposals will not get anywhere.

So -- So that's two things.

The last thing is there are a lot of other recommendations that we've heard nothing about, and I'm really anxious to hear about those. So if we could just end the conversation here and start hearing new recommendations, I would be very pleased with this outcome at the moment.

Thank you.

>> Point of order.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I see -- I regret I made that observation but I do not want to engage that kind of discussion. I was just -- I was not -- I said, I think -- maybe I was misinterpreted but I was in the saying anything substantially different from what any of you have said. We have heard -- I'll give you the floor.

We have heard -- I'm using the Chair's prerogative but I will give you the point of order.

We have heard all of the comments, including those who have proposed the (indiscernible) framework interventions. It will -- Even in the course of discussion, some elements that were expressed led even the proponents themselves to reflect. So I think it is just fair that, as I said, those proponents will go

back and on the basis of what has said, try to formulate in a way that we can revisit this. I think it's completely understood. So it's not a matter of asking the secretariat to do it. I was thinking the secretariat would provide just a kind of mapping. Say for this recommendation, the proponent should do. For this recommendation, maybe to (indiscernible) with a merge. So it was not something -- It was just kind of a guide. But if you, as you have said, you don't need it because everybody has heard and everybody knows, it's okay. We are in your hands.

Cuba. Yes, please.

>>CUBA: Yes, a point of order, Chairman, because you are the one who should conduct this meeting through a normal courses because the previous speaker mentioned a group of "they." If "they." And I don't know what was mentioned if. You can clarify what they mean with "they" and also the way it was referred to "they," it was a little bit derogatory. So, please, I am really confused. I think this goes against the ambient that we are having here, especially today. So, please, can you clarify what is meant by "they."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I -- I should maybe request Canada, but I -- at least from my perspective, I didn't see something negative. Canada made clear those who had made proposals in regard to the framework should come together. They should come together. That's what I interpret. But, Canada, would you like?

I do not want to -- We are not in a.

>>CANADA: I refer to the gentlemen who were making proposals about a mechanism -- sorry, gentlemen and lady because we also have Iulia who made a recommendation in that direction. So those proponents who have proposed new mechanisms, there's lots of overlap. And you suggested it yourself, Chair, that perhaps it would help us if, together, they could come to an agreement. Yes, they could come to an agreement.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Saudi Arabia, do you want --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I think this is applicable to the recommendation on capacity building and other relevant (indiscernible). So other colleagues should go and try to format their recommendation in the context of enhanced cooperation so we can be convinced.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Chairman, I remind you that we had agreed to start discussion, so may I start that discussion now?

>> (Off microphone).

>>RICHARD HILL: No, we said 5:00. But if you want to go to 5:30, that's okay for me, also. We said 5:00 but we can go to 5:30.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate that we had agreed earlier today that perhaps at 5:00 we should start discussion on the report, but as I mentioned in my previous intervention, I am very concerned that we have not heard more recommendations.

So I -- Canada, personally, would be amenable of postponing the discussion on the report to our next meeting in order to really allow more people to present their recommendations because I believe this is what we're here to do.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I'm taking the order. Marilyn, Jimson, and Richard.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I -- Let me say plus one. Problem say I agree with Canada.

I think it's quite unfair to not hear the other recommendations. And I know that some of us have had many, many opportunities to give long -- longer comments. So can we please make sure we hear all of the recommendations. I'm happy to stay later if others are to work on the report, but I really must plead that we hear the other recommendations and we do it now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Jimson Olufuye.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, Canada and Marilyn Cade have expressed my opinion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard. Pakistan.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, chairman, unless people are willing to stay here all night you are not going to be able to hear many more recommendations because I believe there are something like 40 or 50 recommendations that have not been heard, including most of mine.

So, honestly, Chairman, what kind of a game are we playing here? We're not going to be able to hear more than two or three more recommendations, and we had agreed that we would discuss the report briefly at the present meeting.

We could have, in my opinion, discussed the report in the time that was taken to discuss whether we should discuss the report.

So since we had agreed that and since there is not unanimity to go away from that decision, because I insist that we discuss the report, and in fact Juan also raised the issue, Juan had already opened the issue of the report, Chairman, can we please just take five minutes to discuss the report. And I'm happy to put a time limit on it. We'll just take five minutes to discuss the report, and then we go back to the recommendations.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think that could be some kind of compromise. We make some kind of intermission to discuss, and then....

Anyway, in regard to the number of recommendations we have, what I'd like to propose to you at the time it comes to resume discussion on the recommendations, of course we'll not be able to discuss all of them, but I saw in the course of the meeting that some recommendations are related directly to issues that were discussed, and I refer explicitly to Anriette's recommendation in regard to the role, the intergovernmental platform in IGF. There was a discussion. I even invited her to join it, and I thought that she very elegantly deferred. So I think it would be just fair to allow to hear, because that's also part of something we discussed before.

And the same applies also to Jimson, because there was also discussion on CSTD, what could be done. And I also noticed that Jimson also refrained from engaging. He could have made his point but he refrained. So I think it would be fair to allow both of them to express and to have some discussion on those two proposals.

I think that would cover quite a lot of ground in regard to the institutional framework because there were -- we discussed those U.N. priority framework mechanism, (indiscernible), we discussed those, new IGF. I don't -- I'm not sure there would be too many concepts to discuss. Maybe there are a number of recommendation, including your own, of course, but I think we would have covered a lot of ground.

So I'll turn to Pakistan, and if the plenary is in agreement, I fully agree and I thank you for your flexibility to have a very short, concise discussion of no more than five, ten minutes and then we refer and give the floor to Anriette and Jimson too to talk on their recommendation.

If it takes us a little beyond time, would I pledge colleagues to consider just for the sake of finalize the discussion on (indiscernible) issues.

Pakistan.

>>PAKISTAN: Thank you, Chair. Very briefly to save the time. I fully agree with you that there are many recommendations, but the first is the one with which we can synthesize them. So in that regard, we also support the proposal made by Cuba that we should go for synthesis.

Of course, we also understand the comment made by Canada that we cannot put it to the secretariat. I mean, it's our job and we should be doing it, unless we direct them very clearly that this is something that we need. And otherwise, it's very difficult for the secretariat to do it.

With respect to the proposal by Richard, I think we should spend some time. But I would not be able to participate beyond 6:00 because I have very important commitments. So maybe five minutes beyond 6:00, but beyond that, it will not be possible.

And of course we should give time to everyone to present their recommendations. But as you also mentioned, that it's not possible because there are a number of recommendations and we cannot discuss them all here in this meeting.

Today's session was very fruitful. My thinking is that it should have been done quite earlier. Maybe in our last meeting in January, because this is what we'll essentially be doing. But we can continue with the recommendation. And after that, maybe for five, ten minutes, to report.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Should we then have this short discussion on the outline document?

Anriette, do you want to intervene on --

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I'm sorry about this, Benedicto. I think instead of a coffee break, we ended up having a "procedure get lost in a maze" break.

I think that just maybe there was a misunderstanding because my understanding was we were working on the highlighted text of recommendations with regard to arrangements. We skipped to the end of the document because Saudi Arabia had a recommendation in two places. But in that process of skipping, we actually skipped some highlighted recommendations from Jimson and myself, but also from ICANN, from the U.S.

So there's not a lot left in that highlighted document, but I think we did so well using it that it would be a pity to not see that process through.

And then just with regard to the role of the secretariat, I actually really value the chair's suggestion. I think the middle ground here would be for the secretariat to work with the transcript and annotate it and maybe by putting in numbers of recommendations where -- where they don't exist and just inserting some comments, and I -- I really do think that work from the secretariat in some capacity will facilitate the next step. And I support all the idea of synthesis and collaboration and joint proposals, but we do need the secretariat's help and I trust them to help in doing that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I hope this will not cause any more discussion but I think it is agreed it will up to proponents to come forward with some revised text. Anything that will come from myself, from -- might be -- should be seen as something that is aimed at helping this, and that can be considered by you or rejected by you or any -- so we don't need to agree to do anything. I mean, as we

have been doing throughout, maybe some tools or some information that may be helpful if you wish or not. This is something we are ready to do and we think it's just in line with the role we are doing here.

Richard, please, for your comments in regard to the outline document.

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

So I was thinking that the first part of the report would be just factual. The mandate of the group, the composition of the group, we met X times, and so on.

Then we would have a preambular part which I think would all be agreed text and I think we've already identified some elements which would go into that.

And then I'm being very optimistic. Then we'd have the recommendations that are fully agreed.

On the other hand, preparing for the unlikely event where there's not full consensus, then I think a number of people have already mentioned that the WGIG -- W-G-I-G -- approach is pretty good, and so then perhaps we could have two boxes. One box would be the recommendations of those who believe that we can further implement enhanced cooperation without any new institutional mechanisms and the second box would be the recommendation of those who think that a new mechanism or institution is needed in order to further implement enhanced cooperation.

So that -- that was kind of my thinking of the report. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard, for this. I -- I'd say it's maybe interesting to have in the back of our mind some kind of image of what will be the outcome of this group. However, I think it's way too early to anticipate that part had consensus, that part did not have consensus. As I have been told in regard to the intervention I made and as I started to say (indiscernible) we are working on that. So we are requesting colleagues who have made recommendations to come forward, to reflect on what everything was said, to try to incorporate and to revise accordingly, take into account views, so I wouldn't think at this point we --

I think as a general outline, probably that's the way it should look, but I think honestly we should not lose time because we would discuss the -- the last day of our lives and we still have to live a lot to get there. Let's live every day a day, and then by the time we get there, as we -- you say in English, let's get - - when we get to the bridge, we cross it. I don't think we should lose much more time at this point of our meeting. Especially since we are having some kind of momentum in discussion. But I thank you very much but I think it's good that maybe we can project the kind of thing we may wish to achieve.

Does anyone want to comment on this anyway?

I have Marilyn Cade, Parminder, and the Russian Federation.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, chair.

I'd like to suggest that -- and thank you, Richard, but I'm now going to say "but" in caps, flaming red.

I think that what we should do is take advantage of the fact we have an email list that has been set up and we need to think about doing a little bit of work on line.

So we have an idea from Richard. Rather than debating it, perhaps we could suggest -- and I know lots of other people are also going want to say, "No, I want to do it this way," "No, I want to do it that way," blah, blah, blah. But I think it's unfair -- I'm going to say it again. It's unfair to -- at least to the people who had highlighted text not to hear and discuss fairly what they had to say.

We can take up a discussion on line about different views about the organization of the report. And I feel very strongly about that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I would allow the chair to take the process point by Marilyn if a discussion on the format would continue.

I'm neutral. I also support if some documents, some points have to be referred to.

So are we discussing the format for the next five, 10 minutes? And then I'll comment.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think we already have kind of exhausted the time we allotted for this, so I will not, of course, prevent you from taking the floor, but I would kindly urge you not to prolong this because I think it's -- it's off of line of what we are doing. It's -- we are trying to anticipate -- it's too premature to start discussing, as of now.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Chair, I did not understand. What is premature?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The outline of the document, of the final document.

Russian Federation, followed by Japan.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Actually, we agree with Richard in general, with his proposal. However, we also would like to remind that we spent one day to discuss -- discussing high-level characteristics, so we think we need a special chapter about characteristics of enhanced cooperation, and we also think it's important to have a chapter about the scope and focus area of enhanced cooperation, and international organization involved into enhanced cooperation, and especially the format, and so this is the main point and recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. As for the structure of the report of our working group, I also agree with Russia in the point that maybe we need some part mentioning the high characteristics of enhanced cooperation. If we -- when we see the Tunis Agenda or the WSIS+10 resolutions, actually we really don't find any explanation concerning what is enhanced cooperation and ultimately we -- in the working group, we did that.

We analyzed that, we discussed that, and at least we made some consensus concerning the -- some points. So I think it is worthy to be noted in the report. Maybe after preambular, between the preambular part and the -- some recommendations, maybe we need some chapter for the high characteristics.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I really think we should not prolong this. It's useless. Please. I would strongly urge you to put your flags down. We are not discussing this here, please. We are losing out time.

We will get to that discussion later, but not -- not now. We are going back to the high-level characteristics, something I have circulated a document for your consideration. We are not -- we have not discussed it in this meeting. I think we should not discuss it now.

So thank you for your indulgence.

Please, as I have said, and thank you for in the course of discussion it was made clear that in regard to the highlighted text, we selected those that referred to the same subject. There are a number of texts that refer to other portions, so we should, of course, have the opportunity to look at all of them.

For the sake of using the time we have left for us today, my suggestion would be to take two particular that refer to discussions that we had in the room, so I think in a way that would help us to -- to have a better understanding and some more discussion on things that were already discussed.

Those refer to the recommendations coming from Anriette and also from Jimson. I'd like, then -- if I would follow the order exactly, I would offer the floor first to Jimson. It is Recommendation 83. And I'd like to then invite you to make introductory remarks and then for the plenary to comment on that. Please.

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

It has really been a pleasure to listen to all the comments. Very, very solid, useful comments and recommendations.

This recommendation, I -- in light of what I've heard, is more or less like -- maybe like a middle point. Kind of giving us a track of enhanced cooperation on its own and also not a new body, so to speak, but perhaps a new mechanism that enhances the current work prescription of this organization that I'm going to talk about.

So what I'm proposing is that the enhanced cooperation track could come up within the CSTD framework.

The CSTD is appropriately positioned because according to its mandate, I think the chair -- the vice chair of the CSTD had mentioned the mandate and I would just read it quickly. It says, "The commission was established to provide the General Assembly and ECOSOC with high-level advice on relevant issues

through analysis and appropriate policy recommendations or options in order to enable those organs to guide the future work of the United Nations, develop common policies, and agree on appropriate actions."

So I think this just puts in perspective what enhanced cooperation is to achieve, and I propose that it could be an annual meeting, maybe two days a day or two before the current CSTD framework meeting period, wherein we can bring in experts. We also -- already know that enhanced cooperation is already ongoing in some places. UNESCO or WIPO who have experts who could come in, brief all stakeholders, and after discussion, governments will discuss on equal footing, and then the stakeholder groups would also be there. I'd also be privileged, if my stakeholder group from AfICTA -- that is, developing countries ICT organizations -- give me the privilege to represent them as they have given me now. By the way, 27 African countries are in the AfICTA. That is the IC association of business.

So we'll be -- or I will have the opportunity or whoever represent will have opportunity to also be playing the equal role providing expert input from developing nations. And it would be at overhead extra cost, so to speak.

In terms of funding, we really appreciate all the organizations that are providing support to the secretariat. By the way, the CSTD secretariat is doing a fantastic job. We all know that.

So it could be that that could be enhanced a little.

And in the area of getting more experts to enhance, you know, to synthesize all the inputs that will come in on the discussion, and a good probability is that whatever policy that we conclude on can easily move through the United Nations process, to ECOSOC and then to UNGA.

So we have an existing framework in place, a U.N. organization whereby we also participate, the business community, the other communities can participate, and you can have experts come in, different ideas can come in, and it will not be as much overhead cost, so to speak.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson, for introducing your recommendation.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia, followed by Nick Ashton-Hart, and Parminder.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair, and we thank Jimson for his recommendation, but we have a question.

How would CSTD, with its current format and structure, would help the global -- all governments to develop policy?

As we know, there is no mandate given to CSTD in the development of public policy other than CSTD will do the yearly follow-up as a general cross-cutting follow-up to the WSIS outcomes. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We will take all the comments and then I'll revert to Jimson as we have been doing.

I have then Nick followed by Parminder and the U.K.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: I would just note for information briefly -- thank you, Jimson, for your proposal -- there is an annual forum on science and technology and technology for sustainable development every year in New York that is a multistakeholder forum that's part of the SDG follow-up process through the technology facilitation mechanism. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yeah. Thanks.

Before I respond to Jimson, I have participated in some processes around the technology facilitation forum in New York which is a multistakeholder body. It does not pass the test of public policy development which is inherent to our mandate.

However, I find Jimson's proposal interesting.

Especially when he brought the mandate of CSTD as he read out, and I would like to share with him, which was policy development, and put that mandate on a possible meeting held under the CSTD rubric, but annexed to it, but with a function, as I saw from the way he read it earlier, high-level advice, development of public policies, and so on does make it an interesting proposition and actually comes somewhat close to many of the propositions where CSTD is the hosting body but -- but the -- as he said, the two-day meeting is outside the CSTD. I mean, I'm not agreeing to the proposal but I'm -- I'm trying to describe it as I see it.

In which case, as Jimson says, it has the mandate of development of public policy principles and giving high-level advice which gets communicated.

So as I see it, that governments on an equal footing would be able to bring emergent public-policy issues to this particular meeting which would have to be given a name which we can figure out, but that meeting is a permanent fixture next to the CSTD, outside its annual meeting, devoted exclusively to Internet-related public policies with the governments having a mandate to develop public policies. And of course there would be multistakeholder participation processes which we can take from CSTD or even further develop it.

That's how I understand it. I find it an interesting proposition.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for the presentation of this proposal. It's an interesting proposal, but I think from our point of view, it would be helpful to have some more detail so that we could see how it would add value to the forums that already exist. This sounds to us very similar if not the same as the IGF. This is what the IGF does at the moment.

Nick also mentioned the forum in New York, and of course also we have the WSIS forum which meets every year in places. So we already have three forums. We're not sure that adding a fourth forum would add value, but perhaps it needs a little bit more detail so that we could make an assessment of that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I know not everyone is as addicted to attending the CSTD at every possible opportunity as I am so I will take this opportunity to just reference something, and perhaps the secretariat or even Peter Major might make a comment about it. CSTD does something called Stip reviews that are requested by countries, and those reviews do look at specific areas of policy within a country and then come up with recommendations.

I read many of them, and I don't know perhaps if the secretariat would quickly want to mention that or Peter might. But I think it's helpful for those who aren't deeply embedded in the work of the CSTD to know that, in fact, the CSTD in the science and technology work does something that does result in what I would call analyzing the status of policy.

Again, this is at the request of the government, but in an organized way. And then it results in a Stip publication.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn.

I see Parminder raising the flag. Probably he will say that we are looking here from the sector of international public policy, not national issues that -- Let me turn to Japan and I will come back to you.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. My comment -- my first reading of this recommendation is it's quite interesting recommendation, but as pointed out by the previous speaker from the U.K., I also think -- I'm wondering what is the added value for this new forum? It says this forum is a the fora where all governments on equal footing can discuss public-policy issues, and also it says with the participation of the business community, (indiscernible) community, civil society, and academia.

It sounds like a mixture of the intergovernmental fora and the multistakeholder fora. So the text isn't so clear simply by reading this. So maybe other -- as U.K. suggested, more detailed information of this recommendation is appreciated.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I turn to Jimson for his comments in regard to observations that were made.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished Chair. And I would like to really appreciate all commented. In particular, distinguished delegate from Saudi Arabia asked a question, and when the Parminder spoke, he quite happy in responding to that question that what kind of -- with this new framework, will it handle international public-policy issue that concerns enhanced cooperation? Well, if I got it right, yes, very much, and it's in the mandate which I read earlier, and I will just quickly reemphasize that part of the mandate that says that the Commission will look at appropriate policy recommendation -- recommendations or options in order to enable those organs to guide the future work of the United Nations.

So develop common policies. That is the emphasis here. Develop common policies. So -- And that's a superset of Internet public policy. And agree on appropriate action.

So in the industry, the ICT industry, we already know that when we're talking about ICT policy we're also referring to Internet policy. So international ICT policy, that's also talking about international Internet policy. So it's quite encompassing.

Well, this is a track on its own because we are here to provide a means to discuss various aspect of international public-policy issue (indiscernible) on the Internet. So this could take its own track as case may be. As has been mentioned by the distinguished delegate from U.K. and Japan, we welcome more details on this, but this is basically a skeletal approach to tackling the issue of where we go next.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments on this. This is certainly something we wish to revisit on the basis of discussions that have taken place not only here, as I said before. This has been discussed in conjunction also with even the proposal that was made by Cuba, 1b. So there are some food for thought. We would -- I think as we have done in other case, encourage you to.

[Audio failure]

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: ...pre-, during WSIS, and post WSIS. And, therefore, we acknowledge that there is -- that many developing countries don't feel there is an easy space for them to come together -- I'm using the term "space," Juan, forgive me -- to talk with other governments. There are multiple opportunities for governments to come together and to work together on specific issues. But having a common space to have the type of cross-cutting, Internet-related public-policy dialogue that is referred to in the Tunis Agenda is actually quite difficult.

On the other hand, we do not think that a single policy-making space is feasible or desirable, and definitely not sustainable over the longer term.

So in that sense, I think we diverge with some of the other proposals. But we do believe that there is a need for -- for this opportunity for governments to discuss these issues in a broad, cross-cutting away

with one another with the full involvement of other stakeholders but still with the character of a conversation among governments. And that's the background to this.

We're very open to changes to this proposal and we welcome those who have already given us feedback. We want more and look forward to developing a modification.

I'll just highlight a few other characteristics.

So we do not see this as a policy-making space. We don't think it creates new institutions. We think it optimizes existing U.N.-based processes and institutions. We feel it won't duplicate work of any existing process.

How would it actually work? So theoretically there are different ways of coming at it but we see it as -- and I'll use a term I've heard some people use -- a track inside the Internet Governance Forum focused on governments and enabling governments to have these conversations with one another. We can use CSTD processes as one of MAG processes to give governments the opportunity to develop agenda items for -- for this dialogue. It's also possible for this dialogue to take place twice a year, once a year at CSTD, and I like Jimson's proposal, and once a year at the IGF.

I think why the IGF, however. I want to just emphasize that. I think, Juan, you did a really good job of outlining the value of the IGF, its legitimacy and the variety of stakeholders that participate in it. And I think with regard to the U.K.'s concern about changing the nature of the IGF, I think with -- there are risks, but I think at this point in time, there's a greater risk to the IGF of governments not participating sufficiently than the risk of governments becoming so predominant in the IGF that it will change the multistakeholder character of the IGF.

We also think, for those of you that are inside the IGF, that this could become an intersessional track. That this relationship with government identifying what their needs are, what are the topics they want to discuss could become an ongoing intersessional work area within the IGF.

I just want to look at some of the outputs and advantages. One of the strengths of the IGF in recent years is that it has become more outcome oriented, which was a recommendation of the working group on IGF improvements. They are very useful policy recommendations now in best practice forums. Some governments are using these, some are not. I think this opportunity of a dialogue with and among governments in the IGF is a way for governments to give critical feedback on those policy recommendations that are coming out of the IGF as well as benefit from them.

Let me not actually elaborate much more. I think you have all read this. Just to emphasize, we do not see this as a new institutional arrangement, and we really are very open to working with others in developing this and modifying it or working with certain components of it.

And maybe just the final comment here would -- that we see it as having the added advantage of strengthening the IGF and bringing more developing country participation into the IGF. We also think it's really very consistent with the WSIS+10 resolution, which is advising us to make progress in further establishing enhanced cooperation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette.

Just before opening the floor for comments, I see in the attempts that was made previously by Juan and now by Anriette some kind of attempt to link both process or to see ways in which both process (indiscernible) includes work as called for in every of the General Assembly meets and under the agenda item ICT for Development calls for the two process to pursue in two different tracks but in a way that can be mutually reinforcing. So I -- I see, without making any judgment on the proposal, but this attempt to try to give some concrete meaning to this.

And my additional comment is that maybe this should not be seen as something that would be the only game in town. That could be seen as -- and I think you have also said that could be maybe implemented in conjunction with something to be done under the CSTD or under other (indiscernible). So I think just for -- for the sake of bringing on board elements that were already in discussion, not other part, I'd like to highlight those two aspects by inviting you to comment on that proposal if you wish.

Nick, your plate is up. Do you wish to comment on this? Okay. Thank you.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

I should start from what you said in the end, that as long as it is not looked at as the only game in the town. So that actually gives me more hope than the rest of the articulation of the proposal, because if these are elements of a complex architecture, I'm happy to go, because my purpose is not to be fixated on a structure or a format, but it is on an outcome and a function, which I think is for global public interest.

So if it is an element of other things and some (indiscernible) some way in which it links IGF outputs to some other systems and that enables, you know, public-policy making, that's perfectly well done. But since this proposal has been put, in my view, by Anriette as an alternative to any new institutional mechanism, I'll go to my comments in that -- in that spirit apart from the fact that if it is a connecting element, I'm fine.

So first of all, when she says she doesn't see it as a policy-making space, that makes it not enhanced cooperation. So I think that disqualifies this from being an enhanced cooperation process, whatever else as it may be, and, as I said, as a connecting architectural element between IGF and an enhanced cooperation mechanism, I find value in this thing.

Actually, nowadays, for many years there is a day of intergovernmental discussions at the IGF, a day prior to the IGF. I'm not able to understand how this is different because right now governments actually have a day off discussions. I would like to hear how this discussion is different from the discussion they already do, intergovernmentally. It's between the governments.

Second, as we know, governments are not interested only in discussions. You don't come to a place where you discuss and nothing gets done because they have really a role given to them which quite

occupies them in most -- most of the time, which is to actually develop public policies. So they don't just come just for discussions. In any case, they are welcome to come to IGF and that's open, and now we have already given them a governmental day on the IGF as well.

Track inside the IGF for governments for public-policy making. Really, I don't understand the directions in which we are going that MAG would then supervise the environment within which governments will make policy. This MAG not only is multistakeholder and have corporate sitting on equal footing, it's also privately funded. This whole system is absolutely unacceptable for me for the U.N. public-policy making, and please try to consider this as a system of public-policy making in your countries. It is anti-democratic. It's not constitutional. There would be problems on the streets if you try to do it. And I don't agree, therefore, also for the U.N. to be doing public-policy making under a multistakeholder body which is privately funded. So these are the kind of problems I have with this.

I must repeat again, as an element of architecture where there is public-policy making connected, this proposal is good but not as an alternative to a forum where actually enhanced cooperation takes place.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I will turn to Carlos Afonso, followed by Saudi Arabia.

>> (Off microphone.)

>>CARLOS AFONSO: It's okay? Okay. Quickly, I think that the -- none of these two major proposals will go away just because one of the sides wants it.

I think that as Parminder said, we can think of an approach of trying to approximate both, in terms of what can be combined, and I would follow the suggestion by Marilyn Cade of this group trying to start intersessional work, and this would be an opportunity for these two major proposals to interact with each other and try to come up with a reasonable, say, joint or consolidated proposal for us. We don't need to wait until September/October to have this interaction again. It could be done through our mailing list, for instance, like we did -- we do in the MAG, like we did in the WGIG, right, and -- Juan. And this would save us a lot of discussions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Carlos Afonso.

I think this is very helpful. I was going to propose at some point that we should not refrain from using our -- even encourage you to use the list to the extent you think it might be helpful to advance any aspect. Of course anything that is done on the list has kind of an informal status that certainly should, therefore, be endorsed and submitted to plenary, but of course we -- I think it would be appropriate if we could make the best use as we can of these -- of those resources we have. Today, many meetings we do not -- for the work we do, most of us do not count exclusively on the potential meetings. We have the mailing list, we have videoconference as well, so we -- Web conferences, so there are a number of tools that can assist us. To the extent they can be helpful to us, we should not refrain from doing it, of course.

Saudi Arabia, followed by Cuba, I think. Yes. Saudi Arabia, please, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman, and we thank Anriette for her proposal.

However, we see the proposal as lacking a fundamental and essential element of enhanced cooperation, which is the policymaking development -- or the policy development process. As this element is -- and the solution itself is an output, we can consider their recommendation, but having this out from the solution or from the recommendation as a mechanism to implement UNGA mandates is something that is irrelevant in here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba, I think -- you wanted to say the same? Yes, please, if you wish.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I want to comment. Thank you, Anriette. Thank you, also, Jimson.

I think we have heard a lot of proposals for mechanisms with a level of detail that serves. I think they are very valuable, even including the one I made, to try -- for us to understand what we are we talking about. But I think that if we're going to put something in a report -- somebody said it, I think it was this morning -- we should be very general and let the U.N. itself select the proper place, the proper funding, the proper -- because now we can see we have two strands. One is IGF. That is from UNDESA. UNDESA is -- it's appropriate. UNDESA could do it in the IGF or something parallel because they are -- it's how they call -- the interface between global policies and the economic, social, and environment spheres and national action.

And its work is guided by the universal integrated and transformative 2030 agenda for sustainable development. So that is one possibility. The possibility of CSTD is through ECOSOC because CSTD is a subsidiary body from ECOSOC. So I think that's another, because also it's economic and social council. And so I think that that decision should be in the hands of United Nations itself, which place it's more appropriate, because in the end it will have to be funded, because funded -- funding is -- it's a real issue because as private funded organization for the development of public policy by governments, I think it's a little bit strange that the -- the donors -- I mentioned that already so I don't want to mention it again.

But I believe that all this is very interesting but in the end I think it's -- it will be a little ahead of ourselves if in the final report we put excess detail. If -- if we have a consensus, okay. If we don't have a consensus and we're going to give one proposal by -- one option of the group, they -- the group, they, that have the -- the proposed mechanism to mention, just that it's a mechanism in U.N. that it has to be permanent, that it has to be open, that it has to -- need to have a permanent secretariat so it needs some funding.

So I -- I believe that that's the way that we should do it because if we put more detail, it narrows the options for United Nations to consider. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I think you raise a point that may be interesting but I think from the perspective of this group and from what we have been doing -- and I think you have said that at the end of your intervention, if we are convinced that from the perspective of further enhancing -- further

implementing enhanced cooperation, that such and such way to do things would be beneficial and would address the function and the role, we should not refrain to do it if we are convinced.

So I think part of the discussion we're having now is whether such and such framework could serve best our interests. I think to the extent we can agree to something, even if this will be superseded by a decision based on financial availability, it's something that for the moment we must take on board. It's a concrete thing. We cannot ignore the reality and the financial situation of U.N. institutions, but I think this should maybe not be the guiding -- the main guiding element for us here.

So I'd like to turn for -- I do not see any further requests for the floor. I'd like to turn then to Anriette for final comments on that proposal.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto, and thanks very much, everyone, for the input.

Parminder, I'll respond to you. I think, well, on the policymaking role, I think we do have a different view on that and on whether -- and, in fact, Saudi Arabia's response as well.

Policy development and policymaking, in my view, is not the same thing. I definitely see this platform as part of the policy development process and, therefore, part of enhanced cooperation, and I think that's a very significant part of the policy development process.

Policymaking is, in fact, taking place in many institutions inside the U.N. system and outside, and what this mechanism would allow us to do is to reinforce that and -- and make it more transparent and create more access and information and availability of information about those processes.

I also think that this process or this -- this mechanism can help identify gaps, so if there's a cross-cutting Internet-related public policy issue that emerges that is not being addressed, that that's -- that's a role it can play as well in identifying that.

And I think the CSTD also has value to add there.

Parminder, how is it different from the existing high-level fora? How many have you been to?

You know, I think there -- so I think there are -- I've been to several as well. They are usually quite formal. They are not focused on a very specific topic. They are ceremonial. And they do not have preparation. In other words, there's no background documents, there's no background discussion and development of the agenda. Participant -- participants are there not based on their subject expertise or the area of -- of Internet public policy. They are working in international governments. They're usually just people that are coming to the IGF for some capacity.

So I think it's actually very, very different.

There's also no continuity. There's no intersessional outcome process from that.

You asked also about the MAG, would the MAG supervise if there was this track inside the IGF that focuses on governments. I would say no. It might facilitate. I definitely don't see it as playing a

supervisory role. In fact, I don't think the MAG actually supervises anything. It enables and facilitates and organizes the IGF.

I think, Saudi Arabia, yes, I think that -- I think I've addressed that with the difference between -- that I see between policy development, which is much broader than actual policymaking.

Policy development also requires capacity building, it requires access to information and resources.

And then Juan, I'm not exactly sure precise- -- I mean, you weren't really asking me a question so -- you were commenting, but I just want to respond with a comment based on our experience with New York versus Geneva.

We find that particularly African governments -- and if they are here, they can speak up -- that they have subject expertise in Geneva. They don't have it in New York. And that's one of the reasons why WSIS+10 was so hard for them to negotiate. They don't have channels between ministries, between the relevant ministries, like telecommunications and ICTs, between their New York missions in the way that they have with their Geneva missions. So anything that's New York based -- and I cannot speak for the rest of the world but I can speak for African governments in this capacity -- it's very hard for them in New York.

Geneva is different. They do have capacity here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette.

I think this brings us to the end of our meeting today and the end of our third meeting. I would like to say that I think personally that we have covered some ground. I fully concur with what Pakistan had said earlier, that we should have been doing this for -- from January, and you may have seen that I have tried to do it, but of course we -- we understand that sometimes it takes time for people to get their act together and to decide even on the methodology to be followed.

And I think we have made good use of our time in between yesterday and today trying to cover all those topics. Of course there are -- we have not come to a point in which we can clearly identify, "This is consensus, this is not." We have some strong indications in some regards, either we need some more work to be done, kind of editorial work, kind of merger work. I would certainly -- well, the main -- the main axis of work we have been developing in this, everything should come from you, everything should come from the WGEC members and observers input or discussion, so this is understood. We are preferenced and we will expect that proponents, on the basis of discussions, will revisit and come forward. But I would strongly encourage that we use the -- the mailing list and any other resource we can find to be helpful to the extent they can help advance discussions because we have -- we are now in May. We will be meeting again late September or early October -- maybe I should turn to the secretariat because the secretariat was looking to dates for our next meeting and I'm not sure if they have it now.

But in between now and then, certainly with the -- as much work we can do in trying to further refine the ideas and have formulations for our next meeting, that will be of very much assistance to us.

Of course there are a number of recommendations that have not been addressed by us. I couldn't say now how many, but probably something between 30 and 40% of those recommendations.

I also encourage that in this online discussion, maybe we can start to have some kind of feeling in that regard and maybe that can also assist us in organizing ourselves for the next meeting.

But I'd like to -- with this, to thank you. I'll turn to the secretariat for information in regard to the dates for next meeting, but let me, before that, just consult whether anyone wishes to make any final comments, statement, or -- in regard to what we've been doing in regard to --

Yes. Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: No. Chairman, I just wanted to thank you for your patience and the way you've guided us through this meeting as well as all of the colleagues who have all been extremely constructive, in my opinion, and helpful, and of course thank the secretariat who has been working very hard and very efficiently. Just want to make sure that goes on the record before you bang the gavel, Chairman.

And then if the --

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>RICHARD HILL: And for the dates, I had the week of October 2, but then the secretariat and I will perhaps clarify that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I don't see any -- please, Angel, could you provide some --

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ-SANZ: Unfortunately, the months of September and October are extremely busy in the Palais, including the trade and development board of INTA, our new intergovernmental government on the digital economy and eCommerce and many other meetings, and the only three days in that period where we have room availability are 25 to 27 September.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, we are not being given many options to select.

We -- Yes, I see some -- some requests for the floor. I see there may be some concern about those dates that are being proposed.

May I hear Saudi Arabia and Peter Major. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I don't have an issue with the date but you remember last time we had the idea of having more days at least to finalize the work. Three days, I think it's really very short period to discuss and maybe we need to evaluate, I'm not sure, but this is an idea, to have a full week.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I can work with the secretariat in that regard. It is the sentiment of the room that we need one full week.

One thing that I'd like to comment, that we can make sure that we are as efficient as we can in this intersessional period to -- And I think now we are probably in a better phase of work with regard to previous stages in which we lost -- last meeting we lost more than one day, half the meeting just discussing how we should work. I think now we are in kind of a momentum. So maybe three days might be enough if we also have some efficient intersessional work. But I can work with the secretariat and come back to you on this.

But before that, I have a few requests. Peter Major already was on the list, and then I have Nick, Richard, and Marilyn Cade.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chairman. I'd rather take the last word, if I may. I'll let Richard, Nick.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I think that you should take a little -- do some time planning. I lost track of how many recommendations were introduced and how many were not, and I think that, you know, you have to just multiply, for each of the remaining recommendations, you need three minutes to introduce. I won't take three minutes for each of mine, but, you know, just plan it that way. And then, I don't know, maybe five to ten minutes for discussion and multiply that out and see how many hours you have. That's just to introduce the recommendations. And then at the next meeting we will have to start seriously discussing the structure of the output report. So you should plan some time for that.

So if you just do that exercise, you'll see whether three days is enough or whether you need more. Or, you know, obviously I have no problem with evening sessions, but I understand the secretariat does and some of the participants might. So if you think we're going to do evening sessions, people should be told in advance so they can make their arrangements. Including people who live in Geneva, they might have to make arrangements for child care and things like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Nick.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you, Chair. I would just say briefly, a), I'm not in favor of spending a week. I think if we use our intersessional time well, if people get together who have similar proposals and try to come up with consolidated proposals and to do that enough in advance of the meeting that some discussion can take place online and the like, we don't need a week. I don't think it should take a week.

I know what the secretariat here has to do around that one brief period. The IEG is the next week. There really isn't a week, and it shouldn't take us that long, honestly. If we do work intersessionally in the next few months, it shouldn't take that long.

That's my view. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have several requests for the floor. So I refer to Marilyn Cade, U.K., Jimson. And with your indulgence, maybe we can have those as the last.

Yes, I see Marilyn, are you -- will you speak? Okay. Please. So Marilyn, Jimson and U.K.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thanks. I'm going to appeal to colleagues to recognize that for all of us, a week is actually -- it's just both physically not feasible given the fact we all do have other jobs and it's financially not feasible for those of us who self-fund to spend a lot of time in Geneva. This trip was incredibly expensive for all of us. If you travel to Geneva, you know this was a very expensive time. September is a more affordable time, but, really, all of us have other work we need to do. I really would appeal that we take advantage of intersessional opportunities. And I don't mean that you have to spend a lot of time on conference calls, but that we design work that can be responded to by emails, and then have perhaps a couple of Webinar sessions where we can work through tough issues.

I'm very happy to help volunteer with others on trying to come up with that, but the fact of the matter is if we spend a full week, then that means that most of us are not doing our day jobs for a full week. And I personally think all of you need to do your day job because I need to do mine.

Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn.

Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, thank you, Chair. I echo -- First and foremost, I do echo the sentiments of Richard and every one of us. Really, thank you very, very much because this has been quite productive and I'm very, very optimistic that we're getting something at the end.

I want to say that I want it plead with the secretariat, maybe they can get us a directory that include emails of everyone so that with that, we can notice that we may easily put our own intersessional work and work before we send it to the mailing list. And just say that.

Thank you.

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

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Just to add a voice to you to thank you for the job you and the secretariat are doing and to agree with those who have said it's really too much of a burden to ask people to spend a whole week here. We think that, actually, if people do their homework, including the U.K., and we genuinely reflect on the comments and views that have been expressed over the last three days and come prepared with approaches that we hope can win consensus, that's the best way forward. And that's the approach that we will be taking.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Peter, would you like to take the floor at this point for your comments?

>>PETER MAJOR: Well, as for the date, probably we may come to an agreement. I fully agree that it's a very, very challenging thing to come to Geneva for more than three days, and it's extremely expensive and probably we will have some kind of solution for that. One has been suggested to do some intersessional work. So I'm sure after this meeting that this is the way out.

And if I have the floor, I would like to thank all the participants, the members of the group, the observers, the remote participants for the delegation and the openness and the positive discussions. It's really very hopeful, especially the trust I could sense which has been excellent. It's really excellent to say the discussions really reflected some kind of mutual trust.

As I have indicated, next week we are going to have the 20th session of the CSTD, and on the second day of the Commission, we will have a panel discussion on the progress made in the implementation and follow-up to the WSIS outcome at the regional and international level. And in this discussion, the chair of the working group, Ambassador Fonseca Filho, is going to give a presentation about the progress we have made here in the WGEC.

And I'm really happy that you've carried forward some real progress and a very fruitful three days. So let me take this opportunity to thank you, Benedicto, for your able chairmanship.

And I propose once again a round of applause.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, colleagues. I am really honored. I thank Juan, Jimson, Paul, and Peter, and all of you. Very kind of you. I really should thank you for your contribution because this is collective work. My role here is just to keep the train going in a way that leads us to the desired outcome for all of us. And also I'd like to thank the secretariat and all those who have been in the backstage for making this meeting happen.

I just want, just before closing, to just reaffirm something that when I accepted this role, and some people came to me and said why are you doing this, it's kind of impossible job. Mission impossible, that kind of thing. But I do it because we really believe that we can achieve something here. This has been my personal belief, but also my -- the national position we are taking to those meetings. We think there is value in working a multistakeholder format, even if we are looking to something that has a very clear governmental, let's say, dimension, special dimension, but doing it in a multistakeholder fashion. I think it's very challenging, but I would say it is also very rewarding, because we are engaged in something new. We are working here in a format that can be a new paradigm for many things that have been done. Of course they are not doing it for the very first time, but we are doing such a relevant issue and such complex issue that I think that if we can achieve results, then that will be seen as useful for future endeavors.

I think it's important for me as the chair, of course, I put that on my curriculum if I can. If it fails, I will not put it on curriculum, of course. But I think it's important for all of us collectively. And it's important

for the U.N. It's important for the organizations that we demonstrate we can come together, we can identify areas of consensus, we can come to some suggestion of way forward. And even if we recognize honestly there is no consensus, that we are able to work out in a way that will not prevent progress. I am very concerned about that because I think changing the world rapidly, and what is the relevance of what we are doing here if we cannot provide some input that will -- we can engage in some kind of rhetorical debate and prepare a report and report to our capitals or to our organizations that we have made our points, but by the end of the day it will not be relevant if we do not put forward something that will be useful for the ecosystem. I've seen many of you making that comment, so it's not something coming only from me. It came from you as well.

So again, thank you very much. I think this was, indeed, very fruitful, very productive. I look forward for our next meeting and to the intersessional work we will be doing then, by then. And again, thank you very much. And with this, I call the meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

[Applause]