

Fifth Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

29 – 31 January 2018

Geneva, Switzerland

DAY 2

DISCLAIMER: This transcript was elaborated in real time during the fifth meeting of the WGEC and therefore it may contain minor errors. The views presented here are the contributors' and do not necessarily reflect the views and position of the United Nations or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Fifth Meeting

Geneva, Switzerland

30 January 2018

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning, colleagues. I'd like to ask you to take your seats. We're going to start in two minutes.

So I'd like to welcome all of you to the second day of our fifth and last meeting. Yesterday we started to revisit the second draft I had circulated two days ago. We have gone through a first reading of some of the paragraphs, particularly the introductory paragraph. And we started to do recommendations. We have, of course, agreed that it is not final. Anything that has been said is subject to a final review in the context of the text as a whole.

Yesterday we were at the end of the day examining paragraph 2. I'm not sure we have exhausted discussion on paragraph 2.

What I'd like to suggest for -- as of now for your consideration, I would not like to start discussion on the procedural aspects of this moment, but just to leave for your consideration, is that, after we finish our first reading of the text -- and I hope we can do it by noon or early afternoon today -- I would suggest that the second reading would not take place in this same plenary format, that we could more into a more informal setting. I think that, if we try to have a second reading in this plenary format, we may get into the same kind of stalemate we have been facing. So I'd like to offer an opportunity for more interactive and direct discussion without, let's say, so many formalities involved in the plenary session. I think that might be useful for trying to bridge some differences in regard to how some things would fit into the text.

So I leave it for your consideration. Again, I'd like not to have any reaction now. Just think about it.

When we finish the first reading, I'll come back to that and consult you whether you want to proceed in the same format we have been doing or if we'd like to move into a more informal setting. So with this I'd like to then take it from where we left yesterday.

As I said, we were looking to paragraph 2. There were a number of comments in regard to paragraph 2, particularly in regard to the first two elements that are there. The issue regarding the right of states for -- in regard to public policy and the multistakeholder approach. I'm not sure we have exhausted discussion on the elements there. So I'd like to offer -- to request the secretariat. Yes, it is already there on the screen, the text. And I'd like to open the floor for any further comments in regard to the elements that are there.

I see no further requests for the floor. I assume that the other elements do not give rise to particular concerns. So I would -- yes, Parminder. I'm sorry. I think you raised your hand like I thought you were asking for the floor. No, it's okay. Thank you.

So let's move then to recommendation 3.

So recommendation 3 emphasizes that the process of further implementation of enhanced cooperation should take account of existing work and support existing international fora to consider how they can develop and improve and to reduce the potential for the duplication of efforts. This is something in a way that is in the introductory parts and reflects the discussion we have had in the group in previous rounds of discussion. So I'd like to seek your comments in that regard. Yes, Parminder. United States.

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

I'm happy with the paragraph. But I think duplication of efforts is just a negative statement of, you know, restraining effort. But, if a positive statement also is added -- and I'll read it out now -- "duplication of efforts, comma, while encouraging complementary efforts and work" or something like that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think secretariat has taken that on board.

Thank you. U.S.

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

So we just thought this paragraph, when you read it, it didn't -- it was kind of hard to read and didn't make sense in some ways. So we just had some small modifications for clarity.

The first is that after -- "should take account," we would add "and avoid duplication of." And then after "support," we would add "improvement of" and then delete everything after "to consider how."

And so to read the way it would read it would be, "The process of further implementation of enhanced cooperation should take account of and avoid duplication of existing work and support improvement of existing international fora," which we just think is the same concept but provides clarity. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Poland followed by Saudi Arabia, Richard Hill.

>>POLAND: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the floor.

I have the very same amendment as U.S. The paragraph is really very good. But I just want to suggest on the end of the sentence "which reduced the risk of -- for duplication of efforts."

But now looks the same.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I see, basically, you propose to replace "opportunity for risk," you can add "an alternative risk." Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues. What we know from UNGA resolution and we know the current mechanism does not equally deal with the public policy issues. So we should not only focus on current. At the end of the sentence, I would add "This process also could envisage the creation of a suitable framework or mechanisms to implement enhanced cooperation." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I think we are rapidly moving backwards here. But that's okay. We'll wind up somewhere. I could have lived with the original paragraph. But, since people want to change it to put the focus on avoiding duplication, we have to mention the other problem, which are gaps. I think everybody here knows that I have a paper which is now about 40 minutes long where I identify which are not just my opinion of gaps but everybody, including some governments, identifies as gaps which is areas we're not having enough international public policy work.

So we can fix that by "to improve the potential for duplication of effort," after that "while also addressing existing gaps."

And you can say "and" and put what Parminder had. I'm fine with what Parminder had. "addressing gaps and encouraging," et cetera, et cetera. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. Yes, Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Actually, when we look at these particular recommendations, we think that it's -- there is some lack of logic inside. Because, when we tell about the duplication, it's not understandable clearly between whom duplication is -- we have the risk of having.

And our proposal is very simple. We think that recommendation number 7, which goes in the text, can be moved before this. Because it says actually about more or less the same situation. But then afterwards, we can address the issue of duplication. And then we think it will become more logical. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia. I must say, I share in the sentiment expressed by Richard because I think we are now going backwards or maybe if I can say in another way, we are -- when I proposed this, I was trying to -- each paragraph would send a specific message that should be taken on its own. What I see is that people are trying to link this with other parts of the discussion. So basically what we were saying here originally is that the process should take into account existing work and developing and avoid duplication. So it was very straightforward message. It's something that could apply different context in different circumstances. I think -- I'm not sure it could be -- it equals this text that is proposed in paragraph recommendation 7. I think that it was likely from a different angle. So I think for the moment we should leave it here. We have agreed to look at the text in its entirety in the

end, but I fear that we are starting to mix issues. And again, my intent when proposing was that each paragraph would send a message in its entirety. There would be a package or more cohesive issue, if you want, each paragraph to reflect on every aspect of the discussion to be very difficult. I suggest we move, but before that, Richard, you want to talk on that.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. I have great sympathy and empathy for the position you're in. As I said at the beginning, I was happy with the report basically the way it was. But, you know, you made an honest effort to come up with what you thought was a compromise everybody could live with, and what we're seeing is that's not the case. Now you're just seeing that at the micro level, but it will also happen at the bigger level as we move down I fear. I'm a pessimist, but you're an optimist. You're doing your job. But, you know, again, I don't really see that this is going to progress, but let's keep going.

I can't resist adding that one way to reduce duplication of efforts would be to avoid proposing to the WTO to discuss exactly the same things that were discussed in the ITU. Sorry, I can't resist.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everybody. We just wanted to support what you have just said. We think that each of these draft recommendation captures a different aspect of the discussions that we've had. We cannot put every concept in every recommendation. We have two days now to complete our work, and we could make small changes and edits and suggest different words to all of these recommendations, and maybe we could even make some improvements in that way. But it doesn't really take us forward at this stage. So I think before we start suggesting changes, different words here and there, we should all maybe just pause a little bit and just be sure that we are really making improvements and not just extending the process. We were happy with the text you drafted for recommendation 3. We think it captured the points that was made in our discussion, and we agree with you that we think we now need to move forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Let's then move to paragraph 4. Recommendation 4. Recommendation 4, here I tried also to, in the second draft, to respond to calls that were made that in the previous draft I had three different paragraphs starting with the same line, "Institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policies should" do this, do that, so I put it in one single paragraph. The first item, the first engage in mutual consultation and engagement, thereby sharing knowledge to mutual benefit and taking advantage of successful approaches in regard to procedural and participation interventions, best practices and lessons learned. The second bullet refers to encourage and facilitate the full participation of all stakeholders when considering international Internet-related public policy issues. And finally, the last bullet would make a call for institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policies to reach out proactively to all stakeholders in an informative and easily understandable way when considering international Internet-related public policy. Particular attention should be dedicated to the involvement of those potentially impacted by the results as well as those responsible for or necessary to their implementation. So also in regard to the language, I took on board some recommendations, suggestions I thought were particularly useful. So the paragraph is then -- I'd like to have your comments in that regard. Maybe to have a more organized

discussion we should take one by one. So I'd like to invite you -- your comments first in regard to little letter a. Can that be agreed with the present formulation? I see no requests. Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues. I have no comment on that. Just I have a question and more clarification on wording of the mutual consultation. We are talking about international cooperation. Could you please describe what does it mean, mutual consultation? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: The concept behind that is that institutions and processes should be consulting among themselves. I think the word "mutual" emphasizes the need that it goes in both directions. I'm not sure. Maybe there is a best way to state that, but I think that's the -- the intent, at least as I saw it. There consultation benefit both sides so that that's -- I agree with you, maybe not being a native English speaker, maybe there is a best way to convey the same idea if that idea is accepted by everyone.

So I suggest that as we revisit the full text, maybe there can be any suggest to include the language retaining the same concept. And I leave it to that. And I thank you for raising that point. I think it may add clarity if we say it in a different and more straightforward way. Jimson, can you help us out? Thank you.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, distinguished Chair. Good morning, everyone. Well, I just want to propose maybe a word could possibly be substitute, engaging reciprocal consultation. Reciprocal. So mutual is okay by me, but reciprocal could be another consideration. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, that is an alternative. I really would like to resort to -- to people who -- maybe to take on board this and to have a look at it later. But I have on my list Russian Federation followed by Nigel. Russian?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Actually, we are revisiting this para and sorry for making, you know, one step further. We would say that we consider para 4 and together with 5 and 6 as, you know, the paras with the lack of balance and which does not address the mandate of the working group and the main discussion. And when it comes to these particular points, we see that it's actually do not reflect the view and our understanding of the Tunis Agenda that public policy should be done by governments in consultation with all stakeholders and it -- this particular approach does not reflect the para 68 of Tunis Agenda and 69 also. We don't see anything regarding the rule of the government here, about the government on equal footing between their role and responsibility in international public policy issues related to Internet, and we think that we need to add balance in the text and put the proposal which was in our contribution. And if we decide to balance it with -- in our opinion probably we can find the balance in the whole text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

Sorry. Just take our contribution and take 2 bis, 2 bis. And inside the text we can find the balance probably and let's discuss this point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Russian Federation. May I just make a comment in that regard. As I said, when preparing this text, I tried to take into account all the issues expressed by members and observers of the group. It is critical clear to the chair and I think everyone that they are different views. And, as you have expressed in regard to how and whether there is a need or not for institutional mechanism. This is understood. There are different views. However, we're working the context of follow-up of WSIS+10 outcome document which states that there are ongoing efforts and there needs to be further implemented.

So even if you consider there is a need for new mechanisms, your point is very well expressed. There is a situation that has already recognized their existing institution process. And then we are not defining which are those institution processes. But, as you said, they're ongoing work in ITU, UNESCO and many other intergovernmental fora.

So, when we say institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public view or not, you are not in contradiction with your position. You're just stating that, for those institutional processes that are dealing with international Internet-related policy, they should do this. They should consult among themselves to benefit mutually reciprocally from their best practice and so on and so forth.

So I don't see a contradiction. Again, if we want to balance each paragraph and say in each paragraph, let's say, the overarching vision, it might get very difficult.

We can, of course, insert your proposal here. Certainly, I think that would import into this paragraph a discussion that does not belong here. Here we're saying very straightforward for institution and processes. We are not saying they even exist in our future institutions and processes dealing with should do this, because that would be beneficial to the process.

That was the intent when I proposed that. And I think this is in line with -- this is not in contradiction with anyone's positions, either yours or others. Of course, I'm just saying this in order to explain the purpose of this paragraph.

And I cannot start, of course, to engage into a discussion from the point of view. But I think that that discussion does not belong here in this paragraph.

But, if you insist, we will, of course, insert your proposal and revisit it later.

I have Saudi Arabia followed by yourself again. Saudi.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We share the views expressed by Russia. We need to find ways and means to enable government. So, if this recommendation speaks about institution and processes should engage in consultation, this is fine. But we need to capture that. Those institutions and processes should be made available the environment where government can come and develop Internet public policy.

Of course, as it was said by Russia in consultation with the stakeholder. So this element is important to be captured when the institution and processes dealing with this issue should have both stakeholder and an area or environment where member states can develop international public policy issues. So this is the balance we look in this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just request to -- and I'll do the same with Russia. And I think Yulia is already prepared for it. Are you proposing some specific amendments to accommodate your idea that we have some language we could propose or -- yeah? Can you -- or are you just following -- yeah. You are supporting Russia. Okay. Russian Federation followed by Richard Hill, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Yeah, we agree with you, Chair, that it's a complicated task. And, of course, we need to hear ourselves and to hear all the views and together try to find the balanced way. However, we have the mandate. And we have 68 -- 69 in our mandate. And we need to address it. And we believe that in 2015 in the WSIS+10 resolution it was a clear understanding that there are some problems. And it's in the text of the resolution there was some diverse views on this particular issue. And we really think that we don't need to avoid the role of the government. And we need to address this point. Otherwise, it's not the reflection of the Tunis Agenda, and it's not the reflection of our mandate. At least in certain other text by contribution. And, by the way, it was not only Russian proposal before that. There is the part of the number of states proposals. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have the text.

Yes. Where do you -- because we are discussing literally. Do you want to put it in an alternative to A or where should it go to this?

So it would be 2 bis or -- just for clarity, to see how it would fit in the text. 3 bis. So I think that should precede the discussion we are having. Okay. Okay. I see. I see.

Okay. It will be inserted in the text and for the second reading.

I just like from the start to draw attention that in here, we are doing something we had -- I had indicated it was not my intent to do. And I don't think that would lead to any outcome in the group to adopt the "some said this and some said that" approach. I think this was -- in that introductory part, we're trying to avoid that. And in the recommendation certainly this would not meet the agreement of everyone. But I take the point it is -- you're insisting in that position. We are taking it on board. And we'll have to revert to that.

I really feel the need for a more informal setting discussion. Otherwise, I think we're getting around the same issues every time we discuss even minor issues. I would not think that the topic we're discussing would prompt that discussion.

Richard Hill followed by U.K. and Nigel. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. Well, since you mentioned the process issue, I'll just make a couple comments based on my experience. It's often a good idea to start with at least less contentious issues, as you did,

and then move up to the contentious issues. But sometimes that doesn't work. And I think we're seeing this here.

People are keen to get down to the contentious issue, and they're just bringing it in up front because they're frustrated by not getting two contentious issues. So maybe we should skip further down. But anyway, let's follow this process.

I honestly think that, unless people agree to have some sort of version of they said this, they said that, not necessarily in that format. But I suggest that you simply have a paragraph where you have a section rather where you have non-agreed recommendations. And anybody can put in what they want. Unless you do that, I don't think we'll agree a report.

But I do have a positive suggestion now. If you scroll back up to the original text -- no. So down, sorry. To your original text. I was hoping that the comments from Russian Federation and Saudi could be accommodated if in B, where you have "the full participation of all stakeholders" you add "In their respective roles and responsibilities," which in my opinion fully covers the point made that governments have public policy roles and responsibilities, blah, blah. So maybe that would be a solution, but I'm not optimistic.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K. followed by Nigel and Jimson. U.K. No? European Union. Oh, I'm sorry. So Nigel followed by Jimson and European Union.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, others. I was getting confused who I was.

I think this paragraph is important. I think it addresses something that we focused on yesterday. And that is how different institutions multilateral, multistakeholder institutions that are engaged in Internet public policy should hit -- should adhere to certain standards, as was discussed. I think these three tiers, A, B, and C are entirely appropriate. We would have two just really editorial remarks in terms of the English. And the first on the first line of A) "sharing knowledge for mutual benefit" rather than "to mutual benefit" is better. So replacing "to" with "for." And, yeah, that's all. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, distinguished chair and colleagues.

First and foremost, I'd like to make a correction on the earlier amendment I proposed. It's just reciprocal. Not reciprocal -- just said reciprocal as to be considered. So just reciprocal. Then, secondly, the point Russian Federation is making is quite valid. And, as Richard mentioned, maybe it could be so integrated to B, considering all stakeholders in their respective roles. Or we could craft out maybe D of that. We have now to C. We could add a D with explaining that.

I think B also captures what the Russian Federation is talking about.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Good morning to all colleagues. Just briefly we'd like to support the Chair's approach. We see your effort there. We're currently discussing the recommendation. We see your point that each of what is there has a purpose of its own. And we cannot include every single consideration in its point. Otherwise, I'm afraid each point will end up being a separate report in itself. So we should just continue with your approach if we are to get a report in in the next two days. Sooner or later we'll get to the contentious issues at the end of this discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for this. One thing that I'd like to suggest -- and I think it might help us out. I think, when considering each paragraph -- and I want to say it to Russian Federation and others who have made very strong points about their views. I think, when considering each and every paragraph, it is fair that we consider that anything that is stated in the paragraph in the view of the Russian Federation and others, that should be seen in the context of this wider discussion.

Because I think that might avoid us to discuss every time we go into one paragraph with a message to revisit the full discussion. So it is understood there is, let's say, some kind of reservation in regard to the balance. Because we understand that, from your perspective, that anything that is there should be balanced in regard to that overarching view. If that could be accepted -- because I'd like to avoid a situation in which, when discussing each and every paragraph, the same discussion will come up again.

But your proposed amendment is there. It will stay for a second reading. And in that context, I invite further comments I have on my list. Anriette. Iran, do you want to take the floor again on this point? And then Cuba. But first Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I also want to express my support for your approach.

And I think we shouldn't undermine the consensus that we did reach by trying to insert the consensus that we did not reach into the paragraphs on which there actually were more or less consensus such as this one.

So just my response to Richard. I'd prefer not to include paragraph 35 in full text. I think as a working group we need to both honor the Tunis Agenda, honor the 2015 General Assembly resolution, but also reflect that we are grounded in the present reality.

And I think that Internet public policy making has evolved. And also the reading from civil society, many in civil society are -- basically, there's many diverse views -- is that the roles and responsibilities defined in paragraph 35 are -- provide guidance. They're not exclusive.

So civil society stance has always been that, while governments have a right to make Internet-related public policy, it's not an exclusive right. And it's not a right that other stakeholders do not also have to be actively involved in that. So I feel that the existing text that the Chair put in the report strikes, for me, a perfect balance between reflecting what is in the Tunis Agenda but also reflecting that our thinking and our practice on Internet public policy has evolved.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Iran followed by Cuba and Lea Kaspar. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Chair, just I have a comment on bullet B.

Mr. Chair, I believe that the Tunis Agenda should be reflected on the recommendations. According to the Tunis Agenda, the governments have a main role in international Internet public policy. So we should not water down the role of the government. Because, when we say the full participation, we should emphasize on the government. Because we have a developing countries, especially the LDCs that they need financial support to -- full participation in the meetings. So I suggest that after the full participation of governments as well as other stakeholders.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I should also maybe clarify that when I proposed that, to encourage the full participation of all stakeholders, in my view, that didn't imply that we were replacing the particular role of government in regard to enhanced cooperation. Because paragraph 69 said enhanced cooperation is to enable governments on an equal footing to do this and to do that.

So it was a message in that process the full participation should be encouraged. And we think this is in line with the Tunis Agenda that says that Internet governance in general and enhanced cooperation being a subset of Internet governance should also follow the same criteria, should allow the full involvement of all stakeholders. And of course, we see that it would be in their respective roles and responsibilities because we don't -- I think the concern raised by Anriette is quite fair about when we, at least -- and maybe resorting to our national position, when we say international in their respective roles and responsibilities we are not thinking exactly of the wording of 35 -- paragraph 35. Rather we are making a statement that there are differences that should be there. We are not particularly attached to that language of 35, although it is, of course, agreed language.

So again, just to make the clarification that by proposing B it was very clear to the chair, at least, that we would not, let's say, taking away from governments, we are not changing the language coming from -- that is in paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda. But I -- this is just for clarification in regard to what I have done. I have on my list Cuba followed by Lea and Richard Hill. Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to all. I came this morning with a firm will not to intervene in order to give you time to work and go on, but this point and the discussion and the points that was said by Anriette and by you now brings me to tell this to all of you. We are going back all the time to the Tunis Agenda because that's the only high-level document that has been agreed by head of states on this matter. I agree with Anriette that since Tunis some things have changed, and we had some attempts to modernize those concepts. For instance, in NETmundial in Sao Paulo in '14 in which these roles and responsibilities were trying to be -- I think the word was in a creative way. But we didn't get to because it was not the forum for that.

I think that this illustrates that we need some sort of mechanism, multilateral and with the participation of the rest of stakeholders, to further this discussion in a way that we can update all these things. But

we have not had that yet. We still have Tunis and WSIS+10, that it only are just little things. But not this topic of roles and responsibility.

So having said that, I think that we're stuck. Whenever we're talking about stakeholders here, we have to put within the roles and responsibilities. And that, as you very aptly said, that does not mean that we are stuck in the past. But it's a discussion that we need. I think that this really illustrates that we need to have a conversation not among us because I -- and I realize that here are many people that has very good ideas that reflects the reality of today. But certainly, gentlemen, not even myself, we don't have the level, the power to really create the basis of a worldwide accepted platform on this. We have not the level. I don't know how to say it in English. We don't have this mandated capacity. We don't have it. Because we are only, I don't know, expert or middle -- well, with all respect to all of us here.

So this illustrate that we need to have this conversation. Otherwise ten years from now, we will still have the same discussion of role responsibility of paragraph 35a of Tunis that everybody knows has to be updated. As you said, recognizing there are differences, but maybe that needs to be updated. And we need some multilateral, some global high-level place to further this discussion. Maybe to begin in General Assembly and then how to get into that. We need to update all of that. This really illustrates that we need something. We cannot keep hiding our neck in the sand like ostriches. That's the word, "ostriches." Pretending that nothing's happening around us. We need that. And I'm with you. I think that here, this document, we should not begin, as you said, changing this and that and trying to reinterpret it and to move Tunis Agenda in the -- in the direction that everybody wants. Because otherwise, we're not getting anywhere.

I will try not to intervene again because this is my philosophy surrounding this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this. I recall actually when we were negotiating the WSIS+10 document there were some proposals to revisit the language of paragraph 35, although there was no traction for that and actually there was a sense that it would be like opening up Pandora's box, that the language there was crafted in some way that reflected some kind of balance and there was no real intent to make the effort necessary for that. So maybe, as you said, that was a missed opportunity. We do not have the authority to revisit the Tunis language. That's sure. Even if we understand some areas would need to be updated. So with that said -- and I repeat, my delegation always refers to the full participation of stakeholders in their respective roles and responsibilities. We are not saying here exactly that they would be restricted to that language, 35a, but we think it's an important statement to make sure that we are -- and this is consistent, we think, with the overall Tunis Agenda. But again, maybe -- I said in the beginning, let's try to be -- have some very straightforward focused discussion on the text. I'd like to invite you to do that. I have on my list, Lea followed by Richard Hill and I have a few other requests for the floor. Lea, please. Go ahead.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Lea Kaspar speaking. I have a comment on 4a, and it's a textual edit. At the moment if you read it, it reads a bit odd in English and it says "engage" and "engagement" and there's twice I think "mutual benefit" and "mutual consultation." If I may suggest alternative language here to -- if the secretariat would help, I would suggest deleting the text up

until the comma. Up until "sharing knowledge." So the text before, I'd delete that and replace it with "facilitate," so then the sentence and the bullet would read, "The policies should facilitate sharing knowledge for" and to proceed as we have it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I think that should come after "thereby," so you just insert there Lea "facilitate." I think that that's -- that reflects her proposal. Yes. Thank you. Thank you for that.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I think Anriette's comment really, you know, gets us to the heart of the issue and why it's so difficult to come to any agreed text. Just I want to remind everybody, in case you didn't remember, the Tunis Agenda was reaffirmed by the General Assembly in the WSIS+10 review. So it's not open for rediscussion.

Now, Anriette said that some parts of civil society think that it's okay that public policy is not made by corporations. That's probably true. It's certainly not true of my case. I believe that it's a democratic right that is a human right that I as a citizen am involved, indirectly, of course, but I'm involved in every single public policy decision that is made. And it is correct that more and more public policy decisions regarding the Internet are not made by governments. They're made by corporations, and I'll give a couple examples.

Now some people think that's fine. As everybody in this room I hope knows, at the beginning people thought that the Internet shouldn't be subject to law at all. It's the same as Barlow Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace. Most people think that that's a joke but some people still believe that. On the other hand, it's accepted that offline law applies online so more and more that is diminishing and the question is, what should governments do about the Internet and then what should they do at the national level and what should they do at the international level and that is the subject that has always been very difficult to find agreement on because some people think that okay, if we have to have government, at least it should be only one particular government or some particular group of governments and not other governments, and they have very good reasons for saying that. And other people don't agree, and that's what we've been going round and round and round in circles ever since.

Now, I'll give you some examples of public policy which did not used to be made by corporations but is now being made by corporations. One of them you know very well, Chairman. The question of whether the delegation of the gTLD .AMAZON should go to the private company Amazon or not. Some people don't think that's a public policy issue, some people do think it's a public policy issue. The GAC thought it was a public policy issue because it issued advice. In the end the decision is going to be made by a private company. And some people think that's fine and other people think it's not. And then I sent a joke out yesterday, Google pizza. I urge all of you to read it because it's actually not a joke. It's a reality. And that's another example. At present data protection policy, that namely how my personal data is or is not used, is being made by private companies. That's one of the gaps that I've identified in my paper. I don't think that's correct. I think that governments have to do that. European Union, to its credit with the data protection regulation and now the -- sorry, directive and now the general data protection regulation has addressed that and countries are doing that. But still, we have a gap at the international level. I don't know of any international organization that's working on harmonizing data protection.

That's an obvious gap, and we just can't hide it. And we keep going around in circles, but Chairman, I'm sorry, that's the real issue. Is this group willing to agree that there's some need for international discussion of some issues? Apparently not. Okay. So we have two solutions. Either we say some people think this is needed and some people don't. Anriette has just crafted some text she's sharing privately which would say that. Maybe we can incorporate that. If we can do that, maybe we can reach agreement. If people don't even want to recognize that reality in this report, then I'm sorry, Chairman, I don't think we're going to have a report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. And I -- two comments. I think we should try to avoid bringing here discussions that are taking place elsewhere because otherwise our discussion may be getting very complicated. I'd like to keep focused on the text we have before us. And while you have been making a point very clearly that you don't think we might get anywhere, but your point is taken. I think -- but we'll proceed until the end. I'd like to make the best effort we can to try to come to something. If by the end of the afternoon tomorrow we don't have that outcome, then we would look for a Plan B, but I'll not delete as of now.

May I invite then other participants who have requested the floor? I have Egypt followed by Peru and Russian Federation. Yes.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning to everyone. Mr. Chairman, I fully support your earlier comments that we need to be more particular in our approach today. We only have less than two days to resolve input. I don't think in this meeting and then the -- in the remaining time for today and tomorrow that we will be able to resolve all issues. Of course, we have our differences. But I do want to refer back to the discussion about the Tunis Agenda and how it was reaffirmed in different foras, latest maybe the General Assembly.

I think by reaffirming that, that we can proceed today and tomorrow. We cannot really rediscuss everything from the very beginning. What we need to bear in mind in our approach maybe that we find the language that still accommodates our differences. It's not that we are trying to resolve these differences at this stage in this room. I don't think it's the task of this group and I don't think we have all the parties around the tables here today to resolve these issues.

So coming back to the text that is on our screen, I do feel satisfied with the original text that you have proposed. I think it had -- gave balance. Maybe with some enhancements we can get there. I do add my voice to the addition in 4b to add in their respective roles and responsibilities. It was added by Richard and equaled by a number of colleagues, and I do associate with that. And I do think it will bring us to the balance that we have been discussing around the table for some time. On 4a, I do think the word "mutual," in my language, I'm still not a native speaker, but I think the word "reciprocal," I do think it brings a notion maybe that we don't want to put in there. Reciprocity is that one party has to take one step for the other to take another. If you don't approach me, I don't. So I don't think we need to insert that notion. So I will be still satisfied with the word "mutual cooperation." It gives more flexibility to the institutions and processes that we want to address.

Last thing in 4c, and I -- my comment goes to the part in the first line, it says "in an informative and easily understandable way." Maybe if we can replace "easily understandable" with just "meaningful" so it would read "reach out proactively to all stakeholders in an informative and meaningful way," I think it's -- it's a more balanced language, in my view. And in the same paragraph, if we go to the second sentence, starting with "particularly" -- or "particular attention," and here I want to maybe flag my concern that whenever we put "particular attention" usually it gets the attention away from other things. So people will just in this paragraph think that the implementation is just by looking at the particular attention part. And this is why I want to propose that we take out the words "particular attention should be dedicated" and just replace it with "with due consideration to." So it would read "with due consideration to the involvement of those potentially impacted" and to the end.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your -- I'm sorry. Thank you for your comments. I appreciate. I think they are very constructive and helpful. In regard to little a, just also to recall that an alternative was also suggested by Lea that maybe would get us out of that reciprocal or mutual and maybe would not -- in my view, would not lead to a loss of the message we want to send.

Next on my list is Peru, followed by Russian Federation.

>>PERU: Good morning, Chair. My English is not very fluent everyday so bear with me if I'm a little slow today. I wanted to go back to Cuba's comments earlier. Because I totally agree with what Cuba has -- has said in the sense that I -- I believe many of us do not realize the great responsibility we have at hand here in the next few hours, the couple of days we have left, because even if nobody here agrees on a way forward regarding an international conversation, negotiation, whatever you -- however you want to call it, this is going to take place. Even if this group does not encourage that negotiation, that negotiation will take place. And that is something nobody here seems -- or many of us here seem not to realize. You think that the outcome of this group will definitely direct the following discussions, the following years regarding Internet governance, I think you're wrong.

I think many countries that are not represented here and many others that are represented here, including mine, will -- we will support and we will encourage negotiation and international negotiation. We believe the Tunis Agenda had -- it accomplished many things. But at the end the big flaw that the Tunis Agenda had, we have not been able to overcome it despite more than 10 years of conversations around exactly the same thing. So either we realize that is the situation and we decide to be part of the big change that is coming and we make sure that there is an outcome, a coherent outcome of this meeting, or we go our separate ways. But, at the end of the day, in 10 years' time, you will remember today that the change is coming. You like it or not. I think it will be much better, much more intelligent of us to be part of the change. International law has to be part of the Internet. So you either understand this now or sooner or later it will come to you through different ways, perhaps ways and countries you would never suspect it would.

So I don't want to be rude to any of you. So, if I sounded rude, my apologies. But I have been coming to these meetings for the past few years and listening to the same discussions over and over again. And, at the end of the day, the discussions tried to avoid the real depth of this problem. So let's see if now

today or tomorrow many of us decide to react and decide to start talking with the truth or with the reality that is coming to many of us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see you have no proposal for amendments. Thank you.

Russian Federation. I'd like to invite many of you, if I may, to try to be as brief as possible. Because otherwise I think we may lose an opportunity, if we cannot, to revisit and have a first read of the full text as quickly as we can then to make -- to allow us to make some reflection on how we want to proceed. I think we should make our best effort collectively to finalize this first reading, if possible, by the end of this morning session or early afternoon so we have enough time to come back and reflect on how we want to proceed.

I want to -- and I am convinced that all of us we want to make our best effort to that regard. So I'd like to kindly invite you to be as brief as possible, maybe to try to focus on the text, on the how you want -- how do you see things fitting into the text.

We have had a lot of -- I'm afraid, because I feel many interventions I have been hearing bring back again the kind of the theological discussion we had before. In other cases I don't think it's the time to do it now, certainly not in this second to last day of our meeting.

I'll give the floor to Russian Federation followed by Timea and Carlos Afonso. And I will request the report of the secretariat maybe to help me to make time management to make sure interventions remain as brief as possible. Russian Federation, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We'd like to be brief, of course. The question is really important and should be reflected.

First, we would like to answer something which Anriette raised regarding the present reality and the Tunis Agenda.

We would like to say that if -- we need to focus to our mandate. We have the mandate to make recommendations how to implement further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in Tunis Agenda. We don't have any mandate to revisit Tunis Agenda. It was done on a high level, on a summit level. It was reiterated by GA assembly. So we need to stick to the text and do not put it at the question or the mandate of our group. Or if some delegate, some participants really think that, in order to further implement enhanced cooperation, we need to revisit further Tunis Agenda, they have free way to put it into the report.

I think that, if it's the case, it should be reflected.

Then, coming to the point of the -- our discussions and to the particular paragraphs, as many people say that we really need to recognize the reality of our discussion. We need to keep the balance according to the reality of the discussion. As Peru said, we should not avoid to take depths of these particular problematic questions. And, when we see the unbalanced text, it looks like we really tried to replace

the particular role of government by multistakeholder process. And we really are not against any multistakeholder process. It should be 100% alive. It takes their role and responsibility in the process.

However, we cannot replace the role of the government, particular role of the government by multistakeholder process.

And because governments have not only rights but also responsibilities that other stakeholders do not have, because if something -- governments are always responsible for the public policies on behalf of their citizens. And other stakeholders do not have such responsibilities. Like, well, some corporations and whatever they have, they don't have such responsibilities as governments. So we cannot say that they have the same roles and responsibilities.

Coming to the overall mandate of our group, we think that we really have to focus and to address the main issues of the mandate.

And for this particular case, I would like to read 69 of the Tunis Agenda, para 69 of the Tunis Agenda and ask yourself, you know, to think whether this particular wording addressed this issue or not. "To enable governments on equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policies issues pertaining to the Internet by not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues."

So what do you think? We do not think this particular text addresses the point. Thank you. And it should be balanced.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian. We have taken on board the points that you made for the need of balance. I'd like again to say that, from the Chair's perspective, when I proposed to this text, it was never in my mind that by proposing this any of those actions would replace the role of government in any way.

My intention is to convey the message that this would indeed strengthen and lead to an improvement of existing processes. The experience, if I may say, of my country is that, every time there is a mutual consultation and involvement of stakeholders to make sure that all views would be there in an appropriate way, that doesn't mean that they would replace the decision making. But they would contribute to the process.

So I'd like to say that, from the Chair's perspective, that is not an incompatibility with this paragraph 69. You have read that by doing A, B, and C, we are further enabling and improving on the government's ability to engage in public policy.

So there are maybe different views in that regard. You have said you do not concur with that. But I tried to relate to what I thought were the views in a way that would not contradict with the positions. So just to make sure that -- and to explain and to make clear that, from the Chair's perspective, we do not -- I do certainly not share that assessment. We think this is not -- there is not an incompatibility here. On the contrary. By doing this, by doing anything that is proposing any of those recommendations, we think it would assist in further implementing enhanced cooperation and,

therefore, fulfilling paragraph 69. But it is to the collective decision of the group whether or not to accept. That was my proposal. But I need to be fair with myself to explain why this is presented like that.

Well, the last speakers on those items will be Timea, Carlos Afonso, and U.K.

And I suggest that after that we move to the next recommendations. Actually, I proposed initially to address only letter A. But I saw in the course of discussion also B and C were addressed. So I consider that the points that were -- that are made accompany all those three literals. But in case anyone else besides those three want to intervene, please let me know so I can close the list as of now and then move to paragraph 5 after that. I see no further requests for the floor.

So, Timea, you have the floor.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. And good morning. Since this is my first time to take the floor during this final meeting of our group, let me take the opportunity to appreciate this collective effort of you, my colleagues engaged in the working group and the secretariat who is supporting it. There are many of us in the room who have been on this journey together. And some have been working together on these issues across many diverse platforms and fora.

I would like to thank you, Chair, for your leadership thus far. Your draft demonstrates that you have been attentive to listening to what inputs have come from all the different perspectives.

And effort you've made based on the breadth of knowledge you have on the history of these issues and as well as your understanding of the current juncture, I think has the potential to serve us well.

I would like to offer my support to your contribution and request that we work as much as possible off the balance in the language rather than pulling apart with multiple edits.

I also strongly support what Anriette has said earlier about the progress that we've made. As you mentioned yesterday in your introduction, Chair, during our past four meetings we've developed common understandings around a set of issues. And you've captured them here as useful, actionable recommendations that I think would be constructive to anyone involved in enhanced cooperation processes and valuable contribution to the implementation of the WSIS+10 outcomes. And the business community views these as our mandate.

So regarding point C here, I'd like to support this. While governments have the right to take policy decisions, they cannot act alone when implementing policy. And I think this paragraph is meant to highlight the role of stakeholders and know, when considering international Internet-related public policy, attention should be made to make sure that those who are partners in implementation are consulted when drafting policies.

We were fine with your initial language. But I also support the change in the first sentence from my Egyptian colleague adding the word "meaningful." I would also like to support your last comment, Chair, to move on to recommendation number 5. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just for clarity, may I just -- I understand you are not supporting the language in paragraph C as amended by Egypt. You're not proposing additional amendments, or are you? Okay. Yes, that's understood. Thank you. Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Okay.

Just a question of styling. For A, it says engage in engagement. It's a bit strange. I would also suggest "stimulate mutual consultation and engagement" or something like it. And, at the end of this paragraph it says, "in regard to procedural and participation interventions." This "participation interventions" doesn't sound right either. Perhaps participatory interventions or there is a preposition missing, I don't know. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So yes, first stimulates. So put it in brackets, please.

Brackets. Okay.

And then, in the second to last line, participation, I think replaced by participatory. Right? Here again, I like to -- when we visit the text, to be able to rely on maybe native English speakers to make sure we have the best expressions here in the text.

Last on the list is U.K.

Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We just wanted to support the remarks that you made, particularly the remarks about time management. We've had a good and long discussion now on recommendation 4. And we support moving on now to recommendation 5 and making progress with our first reading. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. This is what I intend to do, as I had announced before. We have exhausted the list for this particular paragraph. May I request secretariat to move to paragraph 5 so we can have it on screen?

Paragraph 5 makes a call for stakeholders to consider how they can make factual information available including data and statistics in an open, accessible, and timely way in order to support meaningful participation and engagement in developing international Internet-related public policy in order to raise awareness, explain opportunities, and cross link initiatives.

Upon inviting comments to this, I'd like, please, to urge you to not repeat the same statement we had in regard to the preceding paragraph. We understand that some delegations have reservations to that in the absence of reference to other parts of the discussion. But I'd like to invite you to focus on the language we have before us to see -- of course, we're going to see later on the text in its entirety. But as of now, if you could focus on the language, the purpose here is to focus on the needs to have good information and the best available information available including data and statistics in order to support efforts towards enhanced cooperation. Again, we're not saying that this would replace or substitute for

the role of anyone engaged. It's just something that should be there to further assist in the process. That's why -- that's how I would like this paragraph to be seen and not to import into this paragraph the discussion around the full framework for enhanced cooperation.

May I seek your comments in that -- yes, I see Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you. And good morning to everyone. I think that the intention of this recommendation with which we agree is that stakeholders consider how they can best make factual information available. So I don't know if -- I'm, of course, not a native speaker. But how they can best make textual information available would convey better the meaning of the recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, thank you. I think this is in line with the intent I had when proposing this paragraph. I thank you for this addition.

Are there any further comments on this paragraph?

Timea, do you want to take the floor on this? No. Thank you. So we move to paragraph 6. Paragraph 6

--

>> That's a record, Chair. Let's celebrate.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. It compensates the time we lost, we vested in paragraph 4. So paragraph 6, here maybe we need some edits at the beginning of the paragraph because it starts by saying "the WGEC recommends" which is not the approach we have taken in other paragraphs, "that bodies," and here I have proposed institutions and processes because in other paragraphs we have replaced bodies for institutions and processes. So I'm not sure whether that would be the most appropriate. So "those institutions and processes involved in development of international Internet-related public policy should be urged to continue and accelerate their efforts to promote, facilitate and strengthen information sharing, capacity building and cooperation international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." Cooperation, I think we missed, cooperation in, I think, should be there. I think we are missing something. We'll hear about that in your interventions. May I seek your comments in regard to paragraph 6? Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Well, in line with your request, I have modified 6, instead of starting with "WGEC recommends," perhaps we could start by saying that "stakeholders involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy are urged to continue and accelerate their efforts to promote, facilitate, and strengthen information sharing, capacity development, and cooperation on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." Maybe I could go over it quickly again. That is stakeholders -- "All stakeholders involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy are urged to continue and accelerate their efforts to promote, facilitate and strengthen information sharing, capacity development, and cooperation on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'd like to request maybe the secretariat just to -- we don't need to repeat the full language that is already there. Just the new proposal. So I think here we will just say "all

stakeholders" and we -- it's not necessary to have involved in the development of international -- accelerate, promote, and then we just need then to insert "on" after "cooperation." I think those are the two main edits. Just make the -- it shorter on the screen. Okay. Thank you.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Capacity development.

>> (Off microphone).

>>ZAMBIA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. Just wanted to -- I know it's the first time I'm taking the floor. Just wanted to make a quick comment and just thank you, Chair, for the (indiscernible) from yesterday. And just wanted to make one quick comment on this number 6. Just for consistency's sake, we noticed at some point we referred to governments and stakeholders. Maybe just to amplify what Jimson has added, maybe we can add governments and stakeholders because I've noted the previous recommendations have been outlined like that. I think for the sake of having consistency within the document, I suggest that we maintain that. I've seen other proposals that indicating to say bodies and institutions. But whichever we adopt, but let's ensure that we have consistency. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much for this proposal. May I just here suggest one amendment because to be consistent with the way -- I'd like to request the secretariat to delete the words "WGEC recommends" so we start with the original text with "bodies" and just to maintain the same approach. So I think it's clear now how the different amendments would be alternatives to that. Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. When we see recommendation 6 similar to the section 4, so maybe it's better that you move 6 under 4, as a subsection which focus on the capacity building and information sharing. But how about we have the same I mean argument we -- yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think maybe you should say that propose to merge 6 and 4. Yes, merge 6 and 4. Because they relate to the same concepts I guess. Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. May I invite you then to move to paragraph 7, which says "relevant U.N. agencies, intergovernmental, international and regional organizations" -- I think we missed an S here -- "responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet should create and nurture an environment that supports and/or facilitates the development of public policy issues." May I seek your comments? I have United States followed by Richard Hill.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Our concerns with this paragraph go back to the first meeting we had where we discussed our working methods, our mandate, things of that nature. And one of the agreements, I believe we all consented to, was that we would not attempt to renegotiate Tunis text. And the recommendation 7 in this paragraph would seem to do that. Tunis paragraph 70 says "In this regard we call upon the organizations responsibility for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles" which seems to be very similar to this with some notable changes. We would suggest deleting this -- we do suggest deleting this paragraph because we think that this is -- you know, clearly if we're talking about paragraph 70 of Tunis, that's already with the mandate and one of the guiding principles of what

we're doing in this working group, so we suggest deleting this from the recommendation section. Thank you.

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

I take your point and I think we should look into paragraph 70. I should just say that I've been proposing that I -- I had in my mind that we should, of course, follow and be guided by Tunis Agenda but maybe you can go a little bit without being contradictory to add some elements that are not in contradiction with the text coming from Tunis Agenda to the extent that it may serve the purpose to add some clarity and -- but I take your point. I think we shall look into the light you have seen. You have pointed out that you feel there is a contradiction with paragraph 70. If this is the case, certainly that should be avoided. But we will revisit that.

Next on my list is Richard Hill and I have Parminder, Canada, and maybe a few others. So Richard, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: I was just going to suggest an editorial edit. I don't think it's the development of public policy issues. I think it's the development of public policy because you have an issue in response to development of public policy. So I think it would read better without "issues." But having heard the U.S., I have to agree with them. So please add me next to U.S. as proposing deletion of the paragraph. It's very dangerous to try to rephrase anything in the Tunis Agenda. We'll get bogged down. And no, I don't think you can extend it. That's also not our mandate.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for that. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Just a comment on the U.S. input. I think we need to be consistent, whether we are taking a revolutionary approach to Tunis language or we are not, across everything we do. It cannot be a piecemeal approach. I'm for being able to extend language as long as the Chair noted it's not contradictory. But it can't be extended here, it can't be extended other places as well. Which then brings us to focusing on what Tunis Agenda actually asks us to do. Not to revisit everything around public policymaking but the lack of agreement around one particular process of enhanced cooperation, what it means and what it could be or not. So we just go to those things which is the last part of these recommendations and do not involve language which Tunis Agenda amply provides us, including the characteristics which we have discussed. Tunis Agenda has language on transparency, inclusively, on stakeholderism. Everything is there. So why have all the language in all places but not in the places where some people would not like it. I'm happy either way, but let's take a consistent view. And I think we should not do -- run around the circles which Tunis Agenda addressed. Just go to one point which it left without addressing and passed on the mantle to subsequent groups and committees which is this committee which is to say okay, on enhanced cooperation couldn't understand what purpose it should be or not. We just say either our understanding is that this is a process or we couldn't reach understanding. So let's then abandon all these paragraphs which are playing around the -- I mean, circles around the issue all these paragraphs correspond to things Tunis Agenda already had said a few things. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning, colleagues. We had similar reservations with this proposal. First and foremost, we certainly do not remember actually having a discussion about this -- this recommendation during our meeting. It seems that this just appeared like that in the second draft.

We had questions as to what was essentially meant by essential tasks associated with the Internet because for us that sounds like if the day-to-day technical and operational matters which -- which are specifically carved out in the Tunis Agenda as not being part of what we're doing here. Therefore, we would also concur with the U.S. on recommending the deletion of this recommendation. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia. Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. What I was going to say was captured by Parminder. I mean, let's have -- I want to understand the operating recommendation. It is -- exists in Tunis. We're okay to take it out. And this is applicable to most of the recommendations here. It does exist in Tunis Agenda. But when it comes to recommendation that involve the development, we hear the colleague saying it's a duplication. So we should have an understanding of the recommendation and we support giving the recommendation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have Netherlands and Anriette. Netherlands, please.

>>NETHERLANDS: We also would like to delete paragraph 7 as this is not exactly the wording of the paragraph 70 of the Tunis Agenda. It explicitly says here, "your relevant U.N. agencies, intergovernmental, international and regional organization responsible for essential task associated with the Internet." You read the paragraph 70 of the Tunis Agenda, it says explicitly "the organization," so I cannot think of any U.N. agency which is dealing with the essential tasks associated with the Internet. But from the other multistakeholder organizations like ICANN, IETF, we're dealing with the essential tasks of the Internet. So we would like to delete this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Anriette, followed by Jimson, Russian Federation, and Switzerland, Germany. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: (Off microphone) ... deleting it, but it did call to mind for me a very positive process we've had in Africa recently where minister -- communication ministers, which are part of a body of the African Union, late last year approved a statement on Internet governance. So -- and I thought that was really useful and it took us a long time to get them to do that, a declaration on Internet governance. So I have some proposed editorial changes, but I'm also happy to have it deleted.

The changes is, firstly to delete the term "essential," the word "essential," and then after Internet insert "are encouraged to give consideration to and participate in." And then delete "should create and nurture an environment that supports and/or facilitates." So delete from "should" to "facilitates." Retain "the development of," and before "public policy" insert "internet-related."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just a -- I want to retain the original text well identified so I think we are losing sight of what is being proposed as amendments. So yes, please.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, I encourage --

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: (Off microphone) Just to extend, my intention is that we do want to encourage these agencies and intergovernmental and regional bodies to consider and be involved in Internet-related public policy, but that was -- I mean, I did not see this as the Tunis Agenda text, per se. But I'm happy for it to be deleted, if that's the consensus.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I think now it's -- yeah. Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, distinguished Chair. Well, I do not overtly think we may have to just get some dates because looking at where we are right now, wherein the business could also interact with government and stakeholders, I think it's a good thing. I will just, like Anriette said, maybe could remove the word "essential" so that we have relevant U.N. agencies. We know a number of U.N. agencies are doing a great job. UNCTAD, even ITU, yes. But also, relevant U.N. agencies, intergovernmental, international, and regional organizations responsible for tasks associated with the Internet should create and nurture a balanced multistakeholder environment, or just simply a multistakeholder environment, and so on and so forth. A multistakeholder environment. So perhaps with that it would be clear that business and other stakeholders would be part of whatever is created.

So "essential" could be removed. And then you will be balanced. Multistakeholder environment could be added after "nurture" and replaced with "balanced with multistakeholder environment" and so on and so forth.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

Yeah, first of all, we would like to -- well, to thank U.S. to say that we need to address para 70. That's a good point to say. Because it's important to follow the mandate of our working group. If we come to the point where this particular recommendation doesn't follow 100% the language of the Tunis Agenda, then, well, if we use this criteria for others recommendation, if we follow this criteria for others recommendation, we need to delete more than that recommendation, if we follow this criteria and if the group decides to do so.

When it comes to para 70, we think it's an important point. However, it's associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources. So in Tunis, it's actually the narrow part of the issue. And, when we discuss the whole scope of the public policy and Internet governance, we have right now, of course, well, it's had a lot of issues. And critical Internet resources is just the one of number of the issues. Data protection is the issue. Cyber security is the issue. Well, a lot of things. E-commerce, WTO -- it's a lot of issues now.

It's not only about critical Internet resources. We actually think that this para address is wider than just critical Internet resources. And it's easier to mirror people who will read the report to understand what the legal word is and what particular organization should be dealing in the public policies related to Internet international public policies. That's why we think this para should be kept. And, if we really want to have another one which sticks to para 70, we are ready with the U.S. to raise it strictly for critical Internet resources and follow strictly language of Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. May I comment that, upon proposing this paragraph, I had in mind very much what you said that although -- and I was not there when the Tunis Agenda was negotiated. And I do not have the history behind the word "essential tasks" used in that particular context.

I'm not sure. Maybe it was linked to critical Internet resources.

But really it's today I had exactly the same feeling that many essential tasks including infrastructure, including, as you said, data protection at that time done by other organizations beyond ICANN, IGF. So I thought that -- that's why I said at the beginning my proposal -- may be it was guided by a wrong assumption, that maybe essential tasks in this context has a very precise meaning. But I was looking at it in a more comprehensive way. But that was the purpose. And I'm saying this just for the sake to explain why that language appears there. Because, otherwise, it would be contradictory to -- if we were restricting to critical resources which refer to the day-to-day operation that are clearly outside the scope.

So I -- well, I think there are some options that are on screen and should be revisiting this in that light. And some of those aspects should be considered later on.

I have on my list, Switzerland, Germany, and Iran. And I suggest that, after those three speakers, we move to the next paragraph as we are trying to reach and to finalize the first reading of the text as expeditiously as possible. I don't see any further requests for the floor. So after Switzerland, Germany and Iran, we'll move to paragraph 8. Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. On proposed recommendation 7, I have a lot of sympathy that we shouldn't be trying to rephrase it implicitly, knowingly, or unknowingly a relevant part of the Tunis Agenda.

At the same time, I think that we can, of course, try to come up with an evolution. And this is part of our mandate to see how we further implement the enhanced cooperation provided for in the Tunis Agenda.

So, with this in mind, if I look at the text as it was proposed initially, I don't see really an added value, a difference, or an evolution regarding to what is in paragraph 70. And it is not really balanced with the danger of creating a difference or a rephrasing of para 70. And, more to the content, if you look at the sentence in para 70 of the Tunis Agenda, it is talking about this friendly environment for -- in the specific remit of the essential tasks to allow for development of public policy principles.

And I think this is what we are doing with recommendations 4, 5, 6, and recommendations we will discuss later on 8, 9 and others. So, really, it's at the different level what is on the proposed recommendation 7.

If we want to explicitly recall para 70 of the Tunis Agenda, we could do it but in a different section of the report, I guess. And, otherwise, I think the danger of being in a rephrasing mode of para 70 of the Tunis Agenda outbalances the benefit of including this very general thought under the recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So I also qualify deletion of the paragraph. So just add -- thank you.

So next on my list is Germany followed by Iran. Germany, you have the floor, sir.

>>GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As an observer who is listening carefully, let me state that it was not clear to me what was meant by the regional formulation of para 70

proposed by you. Through your explanation, I'm seeing a little clearer. But my impression is now that it doesn't have anything more to do with paragraph 70 in the Tunis Agenda. It comes a little bit out of the blue, as stated before by Canada. And so we would have to have a very fresh look now at what you're meaning with this paragraph. And it opens up a completely new window now. And, therefore, we would caution maybe -- yeah, we tend rather also to delete this paragraph and to include the aspects maybe somewhere else. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Last to speak on this will be Iran. And then we move to paragraph 8.

Iran, please, you have the floor.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, in the previous paragraphs in paragraph 5 and 6, we invite and we recommend all the stakeholders to play their roles on the international Internet-related public policy.

When they say, "All stakeholders," it means that the governments and civil society and others. The question is that the regional organization and relevant U.N. agencies are part of the stakeholders. If the answer is yes, it's contradictory to request to delete this paragraph.

I believe that the original organizations also are part of the stakeholders. So it's not a correct request to delete this paragraph. My delegation supports this paragraph and retain. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. We have not taken all of those who spoke in support of the paragraph. However, I think it's -- it is something that is -- maybe you should just be explicit about that, Iran. And I don't remember others that have spoken just for, when we come back to this, we make sure we have Russian -- yes, Russian Federation. Retain. Okay.

So with this I would suggest we move to paragraph 8.

Paragraph 8 reads, "In order to promote transparency, inclusiveness, and collaboration, institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policies should consider how they can open up their policy-making processes to the extent possible to input from all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, including the least developed countries as well as from marginalized groups and unaffiliated users."

So this -- you'll see, in regard to the first draft, there are a number of additions that were proposed by some of you, which I have taken on board. But, basically, the message conveyed here is that those institutional processes should open up or should consider open up their policy-making processes to input from all stakeholders. So, again, we're not talking about replacing the role of those who would be in the decision-making power, like, basically, the governments. But rather to be open to receive input from stakeholders.

May I seek your comments to that paragraph? I see Nigel. You want to take the floor on this?

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well, this paragraph, I think, is very positive. I think, just in terms of editorial changes, I think it could -- I think the -- "to the extent possible" on the third line is probably redundant. Because we already have "should consider how they can open up their policy-making processes."

So I think you can delete those four words, and it will just say "input from all stakeholders." And then on the second to last line I think deleting the "from" is grammatically correct. And the stakeholders you're addressing are the marginalized groups as well as the unaffiliated users. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry. To the extent possible. And then -- yes, Nigel. Delete -- okay. And you can delete that.

And as well as from -- so, again, I think that should go in the end, should go to the end of the sentence, yes. So first we have the original language, and then we have the call for deletion.

I think what you're proposing, Nigel, is to delete "from marginalized groups and unaffiliated users"? Is that correct? Oh, thank you for that.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia followed by Russian Federation.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Here again we see a redundant recommendation as it was in 4, 5, and 6.

We spoke about how to bring stakeholders together and engage them in the process to develop international public policy issues. So we see a duplication in this recommendation. And we suggest to delete it, number 8. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

First, we also have the same view that it's a bit redundant to have this text without addressing the main point.

And so we think we need to keep it in mind when we make the final balance of the text.

But right now we have very well short comment regarding marginalized groups and unaffiliated users. We believe that it is not WSIS language. And WSIS has a lot of careful wording regarding the groups for women, for persons with disabilities and special needs use and so on. But the language is not really to WSIS. We think we need to change it to WSIS form following our normal WSIS process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation.

And, Iran, in regard to this last point, I would, of course, think we need to be consistent with the Tunis Agenda. But I think if -- and I tend to be educated on this. Is there concepts that have been developed in other parts of the U.N. system, I think it would be in line also to incorporate also in our work since it is -- I don't know if it is the case in regard to marginalized groups, if there is a U.N. definition on that.

So, even if it is not in the Tunis Agenda, if it is some concept that is accepted and agreed, I don't think it would be out of line or out of scope to put it down in a text. Because we would add -- to the extent it's not contradictory with the Tunis Agenda, and I'm sure if it was developed in the U.N., it would not be -- may I hear the U.S.? You want to take the floor on this? Thank you.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. Yeah, the U.S. strongly supports this recommendation. We think it's a theme that was discussed many, many times and repeated through the course of our conversation and should be reflected in a recommendation in the report.

To the point made by our Russian colleagues, I think, as we discussed at the last meeting when there was, again, broad support for this recommendation, there was a question about the groups and ensuring we're consistent. And I think there was an openness amongst this group, if there is standard language in Tunis or from some other ECOSOC document or something of that nature, that we're open to using that here as long as the theme is not lost.

And so I think we would welcome a proposal on that in order to ensure this recommendation moves forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you. I understand you support the paragraph with some amendments or may I seek a clarification on that?

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, we support the paragraph inclusion and just would welcome maybe a proposal if the only issue is the groups. If there's a way to make it consistent, then we're opening to that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Lea, you have the floor.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. So I believe this is a really important paragraph for which strong support has been expressed in previous meetings. So retaining it is very important. It is a paragraph that complements, in my view, recommendation number 1, and gives meat to how the principles that

we've -- we recommend international -- Internet-related international public policy processes should abide by. So I think this is important as it kind of moves us further from just those principles and sends like -- and how they should be implemented. I also like Nigel's additions and support the U.S. and I guess Russia's position to make sure that the language corresponds, the WSIS language. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Egypt, followed by Richard Hill.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I -- and this -- this paragraph, I think, most of us here, and particularly myself, I find it a little bit confusing towards the end of the paragraph starting with "particularly from" and as I mentioned in an earlier intervention, whenever we put the word "particularly" or "particular attention" or that sort of attention, the rest of the meaning usually goes away. We unintentionally sometimes remove the focus from other areas that we want to be included as well. So perhaps and also to (indiscernible) this more closely to WSIS connotations, I think if we can replace the text starting from "particularly" on the third line and towards the end and we replace that with the following: "With a development-oriented approach." So it would read "Open up the policymaking processes, to input from all stakeholders, with a development-oriented approach." And then I do think the deletion suggested by Nigel to the -- of the words "to the extent possible," I think it's also doable. But I still don't see so much harm in keeping it. But I -- I would be more -- I think it's very important to be more clear on what we mean by "particularly from" and starting to enumerate special groups. I think we should -- the main meaning in this recommendation is to open up, so let us not just put focus on some groups and leave the others.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt, for your comments. I have on my list Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to pick up on a point that Lea made. But let me back up because I really don't understand what we're doing, I have to say. But maybe that's my problem. We've heard repeatedly that we should have recommendations that are actionable that are going to have practicable effects and that will be implemented and that when people read this document without knowing the context they're going to know what they have to do. And Lea pointed out that in her view this is one such recommendation that goes to the meat or the heart and we can do something. So I'm trying to transpose it to known issues, and I'll give two examples. We know, or at least I think, that the ITU is not sufficiently inclusive. Now, the way to make ITU more inclusive unfortunately involves changing the Constitution and convention, and I already know that at least some states have no intention of changing the Constitution and convention because they have said that publicly. So I'm thinking that when we adopt this particular recommendation, is this going to have any effect on the ITU? I doubt it. Is it going to have any effect on the World Trade Organization? I doubt it. And so how is this recommendation actually helping us to move forward. I don't expect an answer here, but maybe during the break people can come over and explain to me how this recommendation actually helps us to move forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I see no further requests for the floor on this particular paragraph, so I would propose we move to paragraph 9. So yeah. So just separate 9 from 10. Oh, I'm sorry. So just before we move to 9, I apologize to Russia. Please, take the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, we actually see that the point that Richard opened and, you know, because the phrase how they can open is also the question where they can open because the -- the use of the recommendation, where it can be implemented is very important.

Second point would like to keep, to the extent possible, because we still have a lot of -- well limitation, also with duplication. So one hand, this is also a part of this limitation. To the extent possible, if it's possible, yes. If it's possible to the extent to keep it.

Then regarding the WSIS language. WSIS have for the wording "marginalized and vulnerable groups." And we would like to keep it like marginalized and vulnerable groups, but without the footnote. Because reading the footnote, well, it's really for me as a human being, it's very strange to see women in the marginalized groups because still we are the half of the world population, fortunately still. So --

[Laughter]

So thank you. We would like to delete the footnote. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. One -- I'll give the floor to Marilyn Cade but before that, just one comment. I think we -- all those recommendations are expressed -- sent to me about things that should be done that would lead to improvements and would assist in further implementing enhanced cooperation. I think per se they have -- they sent some messages. I see in intervention of some of you an interest in knowing how this is going to be implemented, how this is -- I think it's not our task here to try to anticipate that. We are sending a message when the Human Rights Council, for example, adopted a resolution saying that human rights offline should be applied online. They were not set about exactly and they did not specify how that would be translated in each and every (indiscernible). I think this is not something that is called by us. We are sending a message. We are -- if we can agree that some things should be done and that would lead to improvements in the overall effort towards enhanced cooperation, that's what we should do. I don't think it would be useful and we don't have certainly the time to provide the details and the specification. We are not mandated to do that. And I think that would be, I'm sorry to say, a waste of time if we engage in that direction. May I turn to Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Marilyn Cade speaking. I think I'm going to have to describe myself as the chief cheerleader for taking a positive approach because I actually -- when I read this, I was struck by my own experience in working over a number of years at the ITU on behalf of a major corporation in several of the sectors and study groups. And also participating in the council working groups. And attending several of the plenipotentiaries. I'm going to make a comment about UNESCO and also about UNCTAD as well.

I read this paragraph with great optimism because I'm quite aware that even though the Constitution and convention of the ITU was not modified, yet in the past couple of years the ITU council has agreed to open up access to the documents of the study groups without ties, without a requirement to be a sector member. Thus providing more openness and more transparency and more access. I'm also aware that one of the council working groups on Internet international public policy now holds a -- an open consultation. I'm also -- I could go on. The UNESCO is doing outreach and actual consultations

around the indicators project and they are meeting locally in many countries. Again, while we haven't changed the Constitution and convention, we are seeing some examples of more openness to the extent possible. And so I just -- I actually like this paragraph because I think it also acknowledges some of the steps in the right direction.

I will reference UNCTAD that is doing significant work in the area of trade and development and reaching out to SMEs. So I just give those examples, not to offer language but to offer my support to keeping the paragraph and suggesting that perhaps there is more positivism out there than we might have been recognizing. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. With this I suggest we move to paragraph 9. In paragraph 9 a call is made for "institutions and processes involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy to give appropriate consideration to proposals from all stakeholders and that they should encourage results that take into account the fundamental importance of ensuring that Internet remains an open, interoperable, secure and reliable platform for general public use." So again, here we are referring to how stakeholder input is going to be taken on board by institution and processes involving in the development of international Internet-related public policy, and there is also an expression of one of the goals or maybe one fundamental goal that Internet remain open, interoperable, secure and reliable platform. So I'd like to hear your views on that formulation.

I see no requests for -- yes, Saudi Arabia, please. Go ahead.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Towards the end of this recommendation is it a platform only for the general public use? So government now is using Internet. Everyone is using the Internet. So maybe end the recommendation "and reliable platform." To delete "for general public use."

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just one typo. There's a missing definite article. There's a missing "the" in front of Internet. So importance of ensuring that the Internet. And then to address the comment that was just made, I would propose that we -- after secure and reliable platform we add comma, including for general public use. I'm not sure if you would be happy with that, but I agree that certainly we want to not limit it to general public use.

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. We actually agree with the Saudi colleagues and support deleting this. It's just not a term that's usually used in this context. I think it does -- it's too narrow for when you're talking about the uses of the Internet and we also just don't think it's necessary in this case. So we would support Saudi's proposal to delete.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: (Off microphone).

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, we believe that -- well, this phrase makes sense only with understanding about what we mean under institutions and processes involved in the development. Without this understanding, well we think we -- we will not support this phrase because it doesn't make

sense. It doesn't show what's -- what we're talking about, what institution, what processes involved. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you I suggest to say -- yes, thank you. I see no further requests for the floor, so I suggest we move to paragraph 10. Paragraph 10 refers to recommendations addressed to in the context of the development of international Internet-related public policy and there are a number of suggestions that are made in that regard. There are four bullets in that paragraph. The first refers to "Support the participation of stakeholders from developing countries, in particular least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, and small island developing countries taking into account language barriers and the resource and capacity constraints faced by these countries." The second bullet refers to "Support the achievement of the internationally-agreed development goals, including the sustainable development goals and in particular help to bridge the digital divide." The third bullet refers to "Take into account the need to ensure adequate public investments and regulatory framework as well as to build an enabling environment for private sector investment and fostering cooperation partnership in order to promote investment in infrastructure and increase affordable connectivity in developing countries and marginal and underserved rural and urban areas." And finally, the last bullet refers to "Promote enabling environment for innovation that abides by existing standards and best practices, including fostering cooperation to ensure that the Internet remains an open environment that facilitates innovation." Is it possible to have on screen the full paragraph 10? Yeah. Because I -- yeah. Maybe if we delete -- okay, good. Excellent. Because I would suggest that maybe you could take one by one, but in the light of the previous experience, I see that sometimes comments overflow to other areas. So I'd like to invite your comments. I'd suggest to take first little a. Are there any reactions to that? Iran, followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we need to highlight the role of the governments in our recommendations. And in the first line this mentions stakeholders, and in the continuation it says that from the least developed countries and landlocked developing countries. If it means that the stakeholders that governments and other stakeholders, we need clearly to mention governments as well as other stakeholders from developing countries and least developed countries. So we should not avoid and we should not water down the role of the governments because the mandate of the enhanced cooperation coming from the Tunis Agenda and Tunis Agenda based on the international cooperations and the total of this international cooperations is the governments. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. I think your point is well understood. However, I should again stress that, when preparing this, I had in mind the overall framework in which you are working. Paragraph 69-71 in particular. And the language that says that we need a process towards enhanced cooperation to enable governments on any proper footing to do this and to do that. So the role of the government is already part of the background we're working. So those recommendations are aimed at providing some elements that may assist in doing this. So we're not rephrasing. We're not recall or ignoring the language of paragraph 69. Here we basically think the intent was to say in literal A that the efforts of governments towards agreeing on or developing international public policy should -- could be strengthened if there is participation from stakeholders.

So, just to communicate to you, I'm not replacing the role. This is something that would indeed -- that was my intent to say that could assist in that process.

But, anyway, I think we take on board and it is reflected on screen your concern regarding that we do not lose sight of the role of governments.

But I want to be clear that I had that in mind when I prepared that draft.

I have on my list then Saudi Arabia and Cuba. Russian Federation. Yes. Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. In 10 we see it's a very general recommendation. The development should support the participation. The development should support the achievement. The development should take into account public investment. I'm really not sure how this will be implemented in the ground. Something should be along the line that development of international Internet-related public policy should ensure security, safety, and privacy. These are the issues that we're facing now in order to be direct and action-oriented. These are elements of the plan, but that should be captured. Security, privacy, data protection.

So these are the elements that the development should take into account and try to sort. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I -- yes, I -- it is reflected on the screen, your proposals. I'd like us to comment that the approach here in this paragraph was somewhat different. Maybe in literal A the intention is more to focus on the process rather than substance. But I take on board your concern. It is reflected on screen. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I want to refer to C and D. I believe that what we're talking here in this working group or regarding enhanced cooperation it has to do with international public policy, not to inside the countries.

That does not mean that there's some things for the development of Internet that have to be done to the inside of the country. Everybody recognizes that. But here that we're talking about enhanced cooperation. This international public policy.

So I believe that, when we're saying in C that we need the need to ensure adequate public investment and regulatory framework, we're talking about international regulatory framework. It's very surprising for me that the delegations here will be arguing in favor of an international regulatory framework to ensure investment in an Internet environment.

So I think that I need to clarify. And, if it's as it should be, that is international, to put "international" word somewhere there.

And also the same in D, of course. I am in favor for innovation and all that. But here I'm still -- I repeat - - we are in the international arena what we're having in enhanced cooperation. So I think that the word "international" should be as well put in D. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba.

Yeah, in regard to C, I should also provide some additional information in regard to the origins of this paragraph. Originally, we had just a call to have an enabling environment for investments. But there were in your reactions a call to balance these because that recommendation was addressed, basically, to the private sector but also to balance with reference towards governments should also do that, will refer to public investment and regulatory framework.

I take your point that by doing so, maybe the paragraph in itself seems to be a little bit in contradiction with what we have stated up front in, I think, recommendation 1 that one of the high-level characteristics would be to be international, not national. So I think we should look at whether there is an incompatibility or not or to retain it -- in order to retain it or not.

I just explained that we started with something, we developed something else. That might have created an additional complexity for that conversation. Thank you for highlighting this. Russian Federation, you have the floor followed by the U.K.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

We're looking at this para. And would like to say that para 4 looks very -- well, like this. And we don't see the reason why it's in different paragraphs. Here we're talking about development of international Internet-related public policy issue. There we have developed international public policy issues. So it's also have a number of proposals. And we think it should be easily come as one point. Because it has a lot of commonalities more than differences.

And so, just to simplify it, we propose to make it as one para. And the comment the whole we'd like to reiterate that it should be balanced with the role of the government and to the way how this role shall be institutionalized. Otherwise, it will not be balanced. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation.

I have U.K. followed by Lea.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Regarding C, we would suggest deleting "and regulatory framework." We recall the discussion on this topic. We wanted to have a recommendation about investment, investment from the public sector and the private sector and the need for investment particularly in developing countries.

And introducing the regulatory framework here, it seems like it's a slightly different issue. And it's sort of confusing maybe this recommendation. So we would suggest deleting those words.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair.

On 10a, I would like to suggest a text amendment of the word "support" and replace "support" with "enable the participation of stakeholders."

So just replace that with "enable." I think it's more clear what is meant. If we say, "enable support" for me is a little ambiguous.

And to the proposal -- I think it was a comment made by Saudi Arabia. I think it is a fair point. It is, however, I think different than what we're trying to say in this particular bullet, which really goes to the participation of stakeholders from developing countries. So I think, if we're talking about adding additional elements, that would need to go in a separate bullet. If we are to do that, which I don't actually think we should, in that case, we'd very much like to see reflected in that also human rights. So, if we're talking about what those policies would support, "respect for human rights" would need to go in there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see the flags up. Carlos Afonso and Richard Hill.

Carlos Afonso, first.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. Minor point again. In 10d, you quote a phrase from an Internet society document. But where the quote begins I'm not sure. I think just before "abides."

"Abides by existing standards." So the quote is missing there. Just a small thing.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think my intention here was not to have any quotes. So the quote is a mistake. So just delete the -- after "practice" yeah. Actually, I was not aware that was the same language coming from ISOC. But, anyway, yes, I think for the moment that's -- yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. I'll come back to the U.K.'s comment. Maybe, U.K., you and I can work that out offline. I understand the sensitivity. On the other hand, I don't think we want to say that we just give money without any constraints. Because, as we all know, there's issues of corruption and so on. So we need to find some language there. So, if you just mark for now R. Hill the alternate language to be developed, I'm sure Paul and I can work that out.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have on my list Anriette followed by Egypt, Saudi Arabia. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Yes, I support the amendment. I also agree with Russia. I would like to see some emphasis on governments here. I think so -- my proposed change was in A the "participation of all stakeholders, including governments" or could even be reversed "participation of governments and all other stakeholders. But I do -- I would like to see an emphasis on the need to include governments. Because I think that is a challenge in some of the existing international Internet public policy processes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I think we should reflect in the text the amendment proposed by Anriette. "Participation of all," that's it. All stakeholders.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I'll give you one option I had. "Participation of all stakeholders, including governments." Or, if people prefer, we could put governments first. So "participation of governments and all other stakeholders." That would be an alternative formulation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Let's keep the original language "participation of stakeholders from developing countries." And after that we have Anriette's suggestion. Say governments and all -- not "all."

"Governments and all other stakeholders." And you close the -- yeah.

Okay. Thank you.

I have Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. In recommendation number 10 item C, I think there is a little bit of imbalance when we are addressing the need for the two kinds of investment -- the public investment and the private sector investment.

And this is a delicate question, and it has so many aspects that relates to the context from one country to another.

And I fully understand the concern expressed by my colleague from Cuba in this regard. This is quite a domestic question other than an international one.

So perhaps not also to lose sight of what we are trying to achieve in this specific item. If we can actually focus our recommendation on promoting investment, in infrastructure in general where, without delving into the delicate question of regulatory framework or public or private investment.

So my proposal for the text is to put in square brackets after "need to" in the first line and to take out the text until the third line just before the word "promote investment."

So item C will read, "take into account the need to promote investment in infrastructure and in case of affordability connectivity in developing countries and marginal and underserved rural and urban areas." I think this will solve the paragraph just not to delve into other questions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt, for this. I think it's very constructive. Because I think it retains the main message of the goal that is to be achieved. And we get rid of that discussion involving how to bring on board and articulate the participation of the different stakeholders that will be promoting that, right? I hope that will be accepted in that form.

Last on my list is Saudi Arabia to speak to that particular paragraph. Saudi, go ahead.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. In D, can we just explain the existence of the footnote? Why it does exist?

>>CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yeah, I -- when I was preparing this, I decided to incorporate that language, I thought it would be useful to retain the footnote in order to provide some more clarity on what we were doing.

But I think I should revert to the original proponents. And I think that was Richard Hill, please. Go ahead.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, when I proposed that, I just gave the footnote to show the source. I don't think we should have the footnote here, Chairman. If we agree with this language, we adopt it. I just didn't want to be accused of plagiarism. But now that that's clarified, we can take that out.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. My intention when I retained it -- because I think that refers to be the state-of-the-art of the discussion in that regard. And so it would add clarity for colleagues that consider that text later on when what we're talking about. But, if there is any sensitivity. And if we want to retain the concept, I think the footnote should go. I agree.

Are there any further comments in regard to paragraph 10? I think, in the course of the discussion, we addressed the four bullet points in paragraph 10.

Yeah, I see Lea requesting for the floor. You have the floor. Please go ahead. It was Timea Suto. I'm sorry for the confusion.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Well, just one thing to make -- we make to propose is the yes, the investment is a very important part of this enhanced cooperation. But regarding to this particular -- specific paragraph, my question is, do we have to separate the public investment and private investment? So my -- our issue, our concern is that the public sector will very (indiscernible) to invest any infrastructure of developing country but it can't be forced by some policymaking or political environment. So it will -- we want this to be totally a market mechanism and our decision, private sector's decision. So yes, I'm not saying that it is not important to think about the private sector investment, but the -- maybe if we can consider that they do not separate private -- public investment and private investment here. Just say as an investment. That's my concern. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Yokozawa. I should apologize to you. First confused you with Lea and then with Timea, but I couldn't see the plates right from here. I apologize for that. I think the point you made, to try to avoid that discussion on whether it was public -- I think that was addressed by the amendment proposed by Egypt that would get rid of that discussion. It would focus on the goal to be achieved. So I think that -- I think that go in the same line. But your -- your contribution is reflected on screen. Thank you for that. I think the last speaker on this will be Mr. Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: No, no, I think we're completely denaturing that recommendation. The point of that recommendation was to say that we do need public investment, in some cases. Of course, not everywhere. I mean, everybody has heard of universal service funds and such things. Maybe Mr. Yokozawa could "accept ensure adequate public and private investments." That would be okay for me. So if you could put that in. Public and private.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yeah, thank you. Yet another alternative way and also straightforward way to say that. And avoid the discussion we had before. I thank you for that. Are there any further comments in regards to paragraph 10? I see none. Well, I think we have rapidly approached our time

for break, for lunch. I -- (indiscernible) I would expect that we had already finished our first reading of the text. I am concerned that the remaining paragraphs will elicit and require some extended time. I was hoping that today at some point we could try to move into a more informal setting, trying to bridge some of those areas that appear there. But I feel that we should at least complete the first reading before doing that. Therefore, I would urge colleagues to -- when we resume the afternoon, to make sure we can go as expeditiously as possible so that wishfully by mid afternoon we could take stock of what we have been doing and agree on a way forward. We'll have very limited time. I think there are still very wide areas of disagreement. We have heard some pessimistic appraisals of the situation. I do not want to go in that direction as of now. I think we still have an opportunity to try to come up with something creative that could make the -- we are all on the same page with regard to the knowledge of what took place in those meetings. We know what is agreeable. What is not going to be agreeable. So I think basically we are -- we are discussing how to reflect things on the paper. So I think that if all of us, we make an effort to -- to find that kind of formula, I think it's within our grasp to do that.

So I thank you. I wish you a good lunch, and hope to see you here back at 3:00. I'll make a point to start at 3:00 sharp so we have plenty -- well, the time allotted to us in full -- in its entirety to go through the remainder of our work for today.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Shorter? Oh, I -- there's a proposal that we could resume a little bit earlier. If that could be accepted by the group, I'll be glad to let's make it at 2:00.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: 2:30. At least half an hour, we can get an extra half hour. So 2:30 we'll hope to see you here back. Thank you.

So just for clarity, we are resuming at 2:30 in the afternoon. Just after lunch. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good afternoon, colleagues. I would suggest we could start. Let's take just one or two minutes while other colleagues are coming in. We'll be starting soon. Thank you.

Okay. Thank you for coming. I suggest we could resume and other colleagues will join us as we go along.

So I understand we had completed our first reading until paragraph recommendation 10.

So I invite the group to consider recommendation 11. It is on screen, which reads "multistakeholder fora dealing with international Internet-related public policy should consider how best to balance stakeholder participation with a view to ensuring that all stakeholders can participate fully in each forum in their respective roles and responsibilities."

May I seek comments, reactions to that recommendation, proposal? Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Benedicto. I like the existing text. I would just propose that we add -- Juan mentioned this earlier -- some of the reflections post Tunis Agenda.

So just to add -- put a comma at the end after "responsibilities" and then add "recognizing that these roles and responsibilities vary according to the issue under discussion."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see the secretariat is reflecting it on screen. Thank you.

Just some background information for this. You'll see that refers to multistakeholder fora. So I avoided saying that they would be involved with the development of international Internet-related public policy in order to differentiate from institutions and processes that are developing.

So you'll see the language used dealing with it. So it's a way of trying to differentiate both situations. I hope that helps when looking at these texts.

I have on my list Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

We actually support that all stakeholders can participate. And in their respective roles and responsibility we have nothing against.

However, we think that it's not enough just to say that with respect to roles and responsibilities because we do not understand how they should implement their roles and responsibilities in these fora, especially when it comes to the role of the government. We do not see how government should implement practically their roles in international Internet-related public policies. That's why we think it's not balanced just to say so, because we have the issue of implementation of this para. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair and colleagues. We were listening to your explanation of this paragraph. We see this as clear outside of the mandate. But, however, we're not sure how the roles and responsibilities will vary according to the issue under discussion. Roles and responsibilities are the same.

Discussing one or another issues. So is the role of government to be different from an issue to another? We seek clarification in this regard. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yeah. I see the secretariat is reflecting your request on the screen. And I look forward to that issue later on or even now if Anriette wants to comment on that. Otherwise I would suggest we could park that discussion and move forward. And then we come back to that, of course.

With this, since I don't see any further requests for the floor, I suggest we move to paragraph 12.

Paragraph 12 starts by saying "In that context the WGEC recommends that capacity building efforts should include the identification and monitoring of capacity gaps with a view of development of

appropriate solutions to Internet-related public policy challenges. The United Nations secretariat should consider how it can provide better informational resources; aggregate information on how, where, and when international Internet-related public policy is under development to facilitate the ability of member states and other relevant stakeholders to participate in relevant activities."

But, by reading it now, I just realized that the beginning of this paragraph should be slightly changed. So to facilitate, I would suggest the secretariat to delete the first few words. So we delete "In that context" because it is totally detached from what precedes it. And we also delete "The WGEC recommendation that." So we start with "capacity building efforts."

You allow me maybe to take that liberty, because I just realized in making that small change, the substance is still there.

May I seek comments in regard to paragraph 12? Yes, Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, distinguished chair and colleagues. Just to maintain consistency with my suggestion earlier, that, whenever we seek capacity building, we can actually have capacity development. So it's okay to begin as "capacity development should include" and so on and so forth. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Jimson.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Bearing in mind the modification in the second line, we suggest just to delete the word "capacity." And then at the end "policy is under development." So "policy is under or required development." Required.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for that proposal. Does anyone wish to propose some -- or any other comments?

Of course, we're not accepting anything in the plenary. We're just trying to make sure all the alternatives are there for consideration of second reading. Yes, Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, just to note that just simply replacing "building" with "development."

Not "and development." Okay. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. I was wrong. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I really have a question for clarification for whoever proposed this or perhaps it's the chair.

Are we talking about all capacity building efforts? Because this is unqualified. And so all capacity building efforts should include identification monitoring. Seems to be a very broad kind of request and maybe even more than what we're trying to create here. So I would just ask for clarification on that point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I'd say, at least from the perspective of -- my perspective when I was preparing this paragraph, I thought this was the same kind of general call that are made towards efforts that are undergoing. So I didn't stop to think whether there would be an implication of the word "all." Capacity building, in general, I think. But I -- maybe without wanting to turn around but just to, if you can, maybe explain what would be the implication of having "all" or taking out -- having or not having "all" here, there being some duplication.

>>UNITED STATES: Well, I think there's capacity building outside of the topics that we're discussing in this room. And for us to make a very open and general point about capacity building needs to include aspects of international Internet-related public policy. I just think it's a very broad and kind of unbounded statement that -- you know, I just think there needs to be a way to tighten that language up.

While I have the mic, I also would propose -- I think the second half of this paragraph is also quite wordy and maybe unclear. So I would suggest a simplification. And maybe just can write it below since it's a new text but shorter.

It would say, "The U.N. secretariat should consider how it can provide better informational resources on capacity building efforts related to international Internet-related public policies."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. In regard to your first point, would it address your concern if we said, "capacity building efforts aimed at further enhancing" -- but that's the kind of addition you'd like to see here?

>>UNITED STATES: I think we can look at it. I think we've also got capacity building in other places. And maybe there's a structuring in this in the document that maybe in some ways it would make more sense somewhere else. Perhaps we can go back and look and find if there's a way to make this more coherent in the document and more connected.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I agree.

I see no further requests for the floor.

Hungary and U.K..

>>HUNGARY: Thank you. I don't really have any problem with the text. The only thing I really want to have clarification on, why do we single out the United Nations secretariat? Up to now we haven't mentioned any of the relevant international organizations. Why start with the U.N. secretariat? We have been always very general. Probably relevant human agencies or relevant institutions.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Peter. I think it's a relevant point. So I see it is reflected on screen for our second reading.

I give the floor to the U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. Yes. In the first sentence here we're not quite sure what we mean by "capacity gap." That's a new phrase to us.

And also recognizing the point made by the U.S. about scope here.

We would like to suggest in the second line, say identification and monitoring of capacity challenges. And then delete the rest of that sentence.

So it would include the identification and monitoring of capacity challenges. And then delete the rest. And then we think it's much clearer. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for the secretariat. I think we should say U.K. replace "gaps" for "challenges" and delete the rest, not clarify.

So replace "gaps" for "challenges" and delete the rest.

Thank you.

Thank you. I suggest we move to the next paragraph, paragraph 13, which states "Stakeholders should consider how to best" -- sorry, we're moving to paragraph 13 which states "Stakeholders should consider how best to build cooperation on emerging topics including issues presented by newly emerging technology in a way which allows all stakeholders to participate.

If I look at it, I think the language needs to be improved there "to emerge" and "newly emerging." So maybe there is an overkill of some of those expressions. So I look forward to your comments in that regard. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah. We'd actually like to say a few words about 12, para 12, regarding the deletion of the last sentence. We think that, if it's not perfect, it would be rephrased and the group with work on this. However, we think the deletion of this will delete the part of the discussion we had in the group regarding the needs for coordination of Internet-related public policy activities around the world, around some organizations. And there are a lot of activities which could be somehow coordinated. And, if we delete them, we need to point somehow in the discussion on this issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Regarding clarity, you're supporting retention of the paragraph. Okay. Thank you.

Paragraph 13. Are there any comments? I see none.

I then invite you to consider paragraph 14.

14 "The WGEC recommends" -- so maybe you can also amend and delete those initial words. So we delete "The WGEC recommends that" -- and we start with "A dedicated debate: So "A dedicated debate on how to further implement enhanced cooperation as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda should be held every year by the General Assembly under agenda item Information Communication Technologies for development with a view to promoting dialogue and coordination among member states and other stakeholders and to increasing understanding of emerging issues, sharing of best practices, and raising awareness. A process to enable open engagement of all stakeholders to contribute should be considered and enabled."

Here we're starting to discuss paragraphs that, as I said in the beginning, I decided to propose my own specificity trying to reflect on the discussion we had on that topic.

So it is an effort on the part of the Chair to come up with some formulation that could retain the idea that we need some kind of follow-up to make sure that we have in place, after we finish our effort within this group, that we indicate the needs for discussion to pursue in some institutionalized way, if I can say it, under some existing organization and mechanism. We're not proposing the creation of anything new, just using the existing mechanisms to try to make sure that we allow ourselves a place and a moment to keep the discussion alive.

So this is the intent of this -- well, we are going to discuss other ideas. But in paragraph 14, the idea is to resort -- take into account that the General Assembly discusses every year an agenda item of Information Communication Technology for development. Within that item, it is mandated to discuss the follow-up to the WSIS outcomes. So we propose that a dedicated discussion be held on enhanced cooperation.

This is for your comments.

I have on my list Saudi Arabia, United States, Cuba.

Saudi, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. My comment is on 13. Also 14. So, if you want me to go back.

On 13 we didn't understand how this would be related to enhanced cooperation, as we said earlier.

On 14, we think it's a good idea to have the discussion on enhanced cooperation, not on how to further implement enhanced cooperation.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So that's -- so for the secretariat, in 13 first, you can just indicate that Saudi indicates lack of relevance. And then in -- yeah, to delete "on how to further implement."

How to further -- yes. Yes, I take it that's right. Thank you.

Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

I think, to be frank, the U.S. does not support this recommendation for a variety of reasons. I think first, in discussing this recommendation with many of our colleagues in New York, this is not really a standard practice and something that's done often. I think it is done on a case-by-case basis when the General Assembly itself has decided that there's an issue warrants a dedicated debate. Those are usually one-off type instances. Having a standing recommendation for that seems appropriate.

I also think it would reflect poorly on this working group when the U.N. General Assembly asked this working group to come with recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation to then provide a recommendation back to them that maybe you all should have a discussion on how to

further implement enhanced cooperation. And it just seems to be a little bit of deflecting our responsibility back onto the General Assembly. It's not something I think that is really done. And I think it also has the potential to undermine other conversations that are happening in the General Assembly. When you're talking about the process towards enhanced cooperation, we've already noted that that is included in the ICT discussions, usually every year. And nothing stops a member state from raising that issue within the resolution. If we're talking about specific public policy issues, I think there are already a wealth of conversations that are happening across First Committee, Second Committee, Third Committee, the plenary this year, even Sixth Committee, and sometimes Fifth Committee, on issues that pertain to this. And so we would in some ways be creating a duplicative process if we're talking about the issues. And if we're talking about the process, then that conversation is already happening in the Second Committee resolution. So I don't think this would really add anything to that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So yes, I think proposing deletion of the paragraph. I should only this regard, and I think the points you made, they are important, when I was preparing this draft, and you may agree with me, it was not a -- I tried to take into account many subcommittees that I'm involved. Well, first of all, I thought it could, it is within the scope of the group, the mandate of the group to propose, of course, is there anything that will be contingent upon a General Assembly decision. So as you have said, the -- in some cases, sometime on a case-by-case basis, but the General Assembly has the authority to make any decision that it wants to make. So I thought it would be important for the group to convey the message that some special dedicated discussion on this issue is still needed, which does not mean that we would say that we are diverting back to the General Assembly their work. We would at the same time produce some results to provide some recommendations. But at the same time, indicating there's still a need to pursue discussion on this. So I don't see any consistency or -- but this is just to provide some background to what was behind my thinking when I prepared this paragraph.

I give the floor to Cuba. And I also have on my list the U.K., Parminder, and yes, ISOC. So Cuba, please, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to ask the floor just to clarify this point, but I think the previous intervention I would also -- I think it will clear some of their concerns.

I think the proposal that this comes from -- one of the Cuban proposal, I propose here not to debate. Instead of enhanced cooperation, dedicated debate. Instead of putting "on how to further implement enhanced cooperation" to put "on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." Why I'm proposing this, because as we said, and my previous -- the previous speaker said and we discussed yesterday, every year enhanced cooperation is actually being discussed when the secretary general's report on the assessment, on the progress made and implementation and follow-up of outcomes of the World Summit On Information Society is discussed in that agenda item. Because if you recall, that report always have a section on enhanced cooperation. So that we cannot recommend something that it's already being done. The recommendation that we should do -- and I think this addresses the previous speaker concerns -- is on Internet public policy -- is in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. That's how it's in the WSIS agenda. And, of course, what the previous speaker said, of course, this has already been discussed in many places. And it's natural that it's being

done like that because Internet is every -- increasingly important to the world at large and to the international community. So to have a place where there's a dedicated device to address these things holistically I think is a clear contribution and many member states will be willing to accept that in an existing agenda item in the General Assembly.

So I will say again my amendment to the paragraph. To substitute from when begins "a dedicated debate" and beginning in "on" to delete that "till Tunis Agenda" and substitute that for "international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." I'm not seeing --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think now it's well captured.

>>CUBA: Okay, thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for clarification. United Kingdom.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We would also like to propose deleting this paragraph. As the U.S. has said, the General Assembly asked us to discuss this issue. We're not here just to kick it straight back to them. And the General Assembly also gave responsibility for WSIS follow-up to CSTD. The discussion on the process of enhanced cooperation is a discussion which needs to happen within the context of WSIS because that's where it comes from. And we're sure that we will continue to discuss enhanced cooperation, along with many other Internet-related issues, in our CSTD meetings.

We think that the General Assembly -- to answer Cuba's point -- discusses many, many public policy issues and some of them will have connections to the Internet, some of them may not. It's really not for us to tell the General Assembly how to manage its agenda. So for these reasons, we would suggest deleting this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next on my list is Parminder followed by ISOC. Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I think from this recommendation onwards we are looking at, in our view, the meat of what we can see as a group to have delivered which is new and different. And I agree with the U.K. and the U.S. that yes, they told us to sit and do our job. And if kicking it right back to them is not the way we should do it, we should also understand that we did not do the job. We did not come out with anything substantial which can be considered as sort of implementing enhanced cooperation.

So where we stand now is what we're looking at. We're at the end of a process. We recognize that we are not at any consensus about any actual institutional mechanisms and therefore, we need to assess where are we in this whole process of when Tunis Agenda said one of the big things is that public policy related to the Internet has to be developed on an international level and there are some gaps in it. From that point onwards there has been a discussion in the international system about what to do about it. And now we are trying to deal with, as we close our job, where do we leave this ball? We could have given an institutional mechanism, which we have not. We agreed to that.

Now in default of that, what is it that we can do? We are at that point, and I think these proposals have to be looked from that real point. It's obvious that developing countries who have been making this demand -- although Europe was one of the big demanders during the Tunis of this particular kind of framework -- developing countries who have been asking for an institutional mechanism are not going to accept a report which closes this question which whereby it would have meant that not only there is no new institutional mechanism but the question of whether it is needed and what is needed is also closed is not going to be acceptable. There is no question that there would be a report which does not - if it does not give a new institutional mechanism, which is out of question now, does not also give a continued possibility of that discussion, keeps the question open.

So now we are looking at the institutional mechanisms which can at least keep the question open and give future groups and other leaders opportunity to do something on it. We are dealing with that question. So let's look at it in that context. There's no question of developing countries and many others here accepting a report which actually closes that question. That's a big step backwards for many of us. And that's not going to happen. That's -- that should be obvious, I think. And better to realize it and accept that fact.

Now, so that this is in a context of, what can we leave this place with? So I would read this part with another suggestion about keeping an open-ended working group in CSTD which keeps this issue being discussed and simmering, and whenever there's enough political will, most probably caused by a crisis which the Internet will bring, you then are able to do something.

So there is a working group in the CSTD which is able to keep talking about it and then there is a discussion space in the General Assembly which can quickly take up the matter. For us to keep an institutional mechanism alive which keeps the question alive, not the institutional mechanism as we need it, is the least we would go out of this group with. In default, there cannot be any agreement.

So I was framing it because I think unless you look at these things in this larger context, it makes maybe less sense. So the least is that we have this space in the General Assembly which has a dedicated window of talking about this issue and we have a working group of CSTD which connects, you know, kind of that (indiscernible) work towards those discussions. We have a mechanism at least of keeping the question open, even if we don't get the final mechanism.

So not only I strongly support this in combination with the working group, open-ended working group proposal of CSTD, but I'm quite positive that that's the least many of us can accept to go out of this particular working group with. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I think the secretariat has already reflected on the screen the -- the synthesis of your proposal, that is, to have that dedicated debate in the GA together with an open-ended working group so it is there. Thank you for your proposal.

Next on my list is ISOC, followed Japan and Saudi Arabia. ISOC and Netherlands. So ISOC first, you have the floor, sir.

>>ISOC: Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon, colleagues. Just first very briefly, I would just like to express our gratitude to the working group and secretariat and you, Chair, for the hard work you've been putting into this process and continue doing in guiding this work.

In regards to paragraph 14, we were a bit surprised to see this paragraph since we could not recall a recommendation like this having been discussed in previous meetings. To us it's still not fully clear what the benefits would be and to us it seems very contrary to our efforts to further implement enhanced cooperation to have a recommendation from a multistakeholder body like this to recommend to a government only body to continue the discussions. I think we're moving forward in identifying constructive recommendations and recommendations that my organization see as important. For example, the characteristics that was discussed yesterday. But we believe that recommendations like this sort of delude other recommendations of this report, especially since we see challenges in terms of inclusiveness for all stakeholders to participate in such debate, which again is an important characteristic of enhanced cooperation.

Finally, I would also agree with previous speakers that it seems a bit strange that we would recommend to the body that asked us to discuss enhanced cooperation that we recommend that they should discuss enhanced cooperation. So therefore, we would support the proposal to delete the paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, ISOC. Let me just add also, to provide for the explanation on what was my intention behind proposing this. There was indeed the discussion, as Cuba has said around the proposal by Cuba. I tried in my proposal to in a way save the proposal by trying to respond or to address some concerns that were expressed. Also in my first draft and on the basis of the reactions I received to the first draft, I tried to come up with some formulation that could address those concerns. And you may notice that at the very end, the last sentence also suggested a process to enable open engagement of all stakeholders to contribute should be considered and enabled. So this was also an attempt to indicate the need for the discussion to take into -- although in an intergovernmental fora, to take into account stakeholders inputs. So that concern about inclusiveness was already there. So again, it is an attempt to address concerns. I was -- it was very clear to me that there was no consensus behind the idea. I was just trying to come up with something that maybe could meet the agreement and address concerns. But I see there are some differences that still remain very wide apart in that regard.

So I thank you for this. I will turn now to Japan, followed by Saudi Arabia, Netherlands, and Iran. Japan, please, you have the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I thank the chairman for the effort of drafting the recommendations. But Japan think powerful thing is very controversial. We, a member of this working group, have very different views about how to further implement the enhanced cooperation. We had the long discussion here and we should avoid repeating the same discussion in the U.N. General Assembly. We should use the resource of U.N. General Assembly in an efficient way. In other words, Japan would like to propose (indiscernible) powerful thing. Just to support the U.S. and the U.K. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you Parminder is being added to the list. Saudi Arabia you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We can see that we're here as a group throwing the ball back again to UNGA. What you're saying is a dedicated debate annually on the (indiscernible) international Internet public policy issues, are to be held. We're not telling UNGA to develop recommendation. This is something different. It's a place where all government on an equal footing will go to UNGA and have a discussion on the matter. We're not expecting from UNGA to develop recommendation. So it's totally not -- it's not -- it's not the view that you're throwing the ball back to UNGA to deal with it. We see this is the minimum, to give member states a venue to discuss international Internet public policy issues. So this is the minimum for us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, I think the main aspect was that to retain the paragraph and to -- I think Saudi Arabia pointed to the differentiation between what is required from this working group and what would be requested from the GA. Maybe if you can -- yeah. Thank you. Netherlands, followed by Iran, Cuba, European Union, Canada. Netherlands, you have the floor.

>>NETHERLANDS: The ultimate goal of this recommendation is to, as stated, to promote the dialogue and coordination among member states and other stakeholders to get -- well, to raise awareness and to share best practices. This through an annual meeting of UNGA.

But, Chairman, it's already happening. We have an annual WSIS forum meeting where all these issues are being discussed. It has been mentioned there are UNGA committees debating these topics already.

There's an UNCTAD program, ICT for development, a place where lots of discussion is going on including the involvement of stakeholders. And, apart from that, I think it's not the appropriate way to instruct UNGA to take up this job and to instruct what to do to fulfill this statement. Thank you very much. So we would like to delete this paragraph as well.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Netherlands.

I give the floor to Cuba followed by European Union and Canada. Cuba, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Please excuse me for asking for the floor again, but I have to react to some of these comments.

First, the comment from ISOC of the inclusivity and that. I have to remind you that the basis document for us is Tunis Agenda. And please go to paragraph 68 and 69.

It's all a part -- of course, we already support the multistakeholder process, IGF and that. But this process of enhanced cooperation it has some states, member states. And read paragraph 68 and 69. I'm not going to repeat it here. That's the thing that we need to discuss, the public policy, international public policy pertaining to the Internet. That is the topic.

Enhanced cooperation is a general name for this kind of process. But this international public policy pertaining to the Internet.

And my friend from the Netherlands mentioned that, of course, this has been discussed in many places. But surprise! What result have we had that we're still going back to the Tunis Agenda? We have not any new result. And everybody knows that where the political discussions are carried out is in New York in the UNGA. So that does not mean -- and, by the way, the proposal of Parminder is not to substitute 14. It's to complement 14. So please make that clear in the screen.

So, to have this discussion in General Assembly, it could pave the way for all the things that everybody here is criticizing that we have to update the Tunis Agenda, that we have to update the roles and responsibilities, that we have to create new barriers for the participation of the stakeholders. And you all want this. But you want to happen by a spontaneous creation? We have to work for that. And the way to work on that is for member states to sit in the political place where this is discussed and put that over the table.

All of the opinions in front of you from Japan, from all the countries. And that's the way. As a matter of fact, I think that the world with all this cyber security problems, the autonomous weapons that have to do with artificial intelligence and ICT and all this on the Internet more closely into the economy and all that, I think the conditions have been created, in my opinion, maybe to have a summit in 2020. Because all those things need to be renewed to see with a new view not from 15 years ago but with a new one. But that will not happen out of the blue, and it will not happen.

Brazil had a very good initiative two years ago, three years ago to have this NETmundial. And there are some other initiatives over there. But nothing substitutes the United Nations and legitimacy that United Nations gives to all this, gentlemen.

At least to discuss there. Maybe even some of your delegations will have something to say in that day, in that place there.

And that's why I'm saying -- and it's very -- from a formal point of view, I agree with some of the other delegates that say it's not nice to throw the ball back. That's why I don't want to put enhanced cooperation there in that day. I want to -- that day is to debate international public policy pertaining to the Internet.

And what harm is that? Everybody, ISOC agenda will advance there. Everybody will gain from that. Maybe you cannot be there, but you can send a paper. Somebody will present it. Or maybe you can be there because ECOSOC says you're nominated with ECOSOC and you will be there.

I really don't know. I think that maybe people here are entrenched in positions for whatever agenda that they have. But, if you really listen to the reason and the reality of this world, 2018, my God, to discuss this in the General Assembly, this is one of the most important issues in contemporary world. Gentlemen.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statements. I give the floor to Iran. I apologize. I think you were high on the list. I just mixed up. But, please, you have the floor, sir.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in our discussion to Tunis Agenda is a roadmap for us. And, as Cuba mentioned, that article 68 and 69 has reflected this paragraph.

There is two points at this paragraph. It is not ambiguity despite of the previous paragraph that says that the stakeholder -- all the stakeholders -- and we don't know what does it mean "all the stakeholders" and "stakeholders" in previous paragraphs. It means that the governments, civil society, for example, relevant U.N. agencies.

But at this paragraph, clearly without any ambiguity, it's addressing the member states and other stakeholders. This is the first point.

And second point is that related between the development and technology and information technology cooperation.

So, regarding to these points, why we should ask to delete this paragraph? This is, I think, the only paragraph that clearly addressing the member states and other stakeholders to cooperate to implement enhanced cooperation. So you don't support this paragraph with this amendment that was made by previous speakers. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Support ,retain with amendments. Thank you, Iran, for your statement. I will yield the floor now to the European Union followed by Canada.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like here to make an observation and then ask for clarification. As it is stated now, the paragraph -- we do not see a real added value on something that has discussed so far from the interventions is happening, can happen in an ad hoc way. So we have to see a little bit further on the added value of this proposal here.

And ,in this context, I would like you to make a clarification about the last bit of the paragraph which says, "A process to enable open engagement of all stakeholders to contribute should be considered and enabled." Can you elaborate a little bit on this? Because for us, as it is stated, it is not clear. And under this context we could not see the added value as it was in this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So, if I can respond to that before giving the floor to other speakers.

As I said, the idea behind this paragraph, my proposal was to indicate the need that ,in addition to the work that has been done -- might have been done by the group in regard to developing recommendations that there is a need to go on. The discussion should go on.

And in an appropriate place, in my view, would be the General Assembly since it has already one agenda item dedicated to that.

At the same time, my proposing that and taking into account the very strong message emanating from this group that the multistakeholder dimension or, in other words, the involvement of all stakeholders in their capacities to full involvement, their input to the discussion should be there. The idea behind that -- and, of course, the language can be improved. But the concept is there that, by proposing this to the

General Assembly, you'd also be saying to the General Assembly that the dedicated debate should also be informed by some strengthened stakeholder participation than the usual, let's say, U.N. practice.

So that was a kind of trying to convey a message that would be I think consistent with the work we had been doing. Again, it's not a final thing. I was just raising the concept for your consideration. I'm not sure if that responds to your request for clarification. Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: I think we need a little more clarity on what sort of process are we talking about here concerning the comments that were raised by ISOC in response to comments made by other colleagues. Our concerns are also, if we cannot see a clear process there for engaging all stakeholders, I think we cannot subscribe to that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: In that regard, I personally thought it would not be appropriate for us to be prescriptive to the General Assembly how they should do it. We were just saying you should discuss this and you should make sure stakeholders are involved .and there should be a process for that. So it would be up to -- we can maybe provide some detail. Instead of allowing them to speak at the end, they should also participate in the course of the debate, as we had been doing here. I find it would not be appropriate since we are speaking in more general terms. So maybe to give the right answer, I -- the call is there. The message is there. But not with the detail that says -- that you -- as I seem to understand you think would be necessary to accept that motion.

Do we also have a point of order? Yes, Parminder, very brief, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Just help the Chair in this particular explanation to EU, by your permission. For example, we had a lot of events and a lot of processes around the UNGA as taking up of the WSIS 10 resolution. There were a lot of civil society group meetings, and there were meetings along with the governments. There was a system created during the WSIS+10 process where there was some degree of enhanced participation of other stakeholders. I'm very sure, if you want to do that kind of a thing around Internet-related public policies towards that one day in which the discussion takes place, those things are possible to be done in New York in the way they were done at WSIS+10. I just thought I would give that additional input in this particular discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, yes. I think that's going in the same manner of saying there are examples on how process can be established to allow for more participation. But I -- I don't think it would be appropriate in that text to provide some more detail. I think the message is there. The GA has creative ways and to decide in a political debate on how that should be done, if the recommendation is to be provided and if it will be accepted. So there are some contingencies in regard to that.

I give the floor now to Canada followed by Russian Federation. Canada, please, Lea.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair, and good afternoon to colleagues. Canada would like to associate with those countries who call for the deletion -- complete deletion of this paragraph. We've heard very passionate arguments recently for the need for more mechanisms. But, in all of our meetings, though I've heard this called for again and again and again, not once has it been explained to

do what. When we talk about, for instance, what our Cuban colleague has listed, the laws are a big impending threat. I forget the whole list. That one stood out in my mind in particular.

But these discussions are already taking place. They're taking place inside the U.N. They're taking place right here in Geneva in the conference on disarmament. When we talk about e-commerce, again all of these things are taking place in U.N. agencies that answer to the U.N. General Assembly.

So I'm a little bit at a loss to figure out what it is a new mechanism on enhanced cooperation would do.

Now, if they're calling for a new mechanism to do Internet-related public policy, well, then, we have a problem. Because we already have many institutions who do this.

We have ITU. We have WTO. We have UNCTAD. We have the CSTD. We have the first committee of the General Assembly. All of these bodies are working on some aspect of Internet-related public policy, as they should; because they're experts in their respective fields.

So, when the WTO proposes a guideline on spam, for instance, they do it because it can erode user confidence in e-commerce. So they're not doing it to govern Internet. They're doing it to promote e-trade.

But, yes, it is Internet-related public policy.

And we can question the fact that perhaps the role of stakeholders here is not as perfect as it should be and we take note. But it is still happening.

So, if we're talking about a new mechanism for enhanced cooperation, I've heard absolutely no argument to say what this thing would do. There are existing laws that are here that the general -- the group of governmental experts have endorsed that was endorsed by the General Assembly. International law applies. International humanitarian law applies, international human right applies to the Internet to cyberspace.

So okay. We're pretty clear on that front. There are a lot of body of laws that exist. If it's not respected, that's another problem. But there are laws that are in place.

So what exactly would a new mechanism do? A new mechanism would look at how everybody is doing better consultations on Internet-related public policy?

Well, I've just not heard that so far.

Therefore, such a discussion at the General Assembly, in our view, would be duplicative and would not really solve the problem which, from what I understand, these countries are trying to solve, which is to have one single place inside the U.N. where we do only Internet-related public policy. And, unfortunately, I do not think it is very practical or it would be very useful. Because we would just be a bunch of experts worried about Internet when, in fact, Internet is also about trade; it's also about human rights; it's also about security. So, no, that's not the same thing.

Therefore, very vigorously oppose the inclusion of this paragraph. And I'll end there, because I think I said plenty. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, I have a request from Cuba. I think a point of order on this. But just before that, just to provide clarification on one point, from the perspective of the Chair, when I proposed this -- and I said at the beginning and I repeat now, I was not -- I do not see this paragraph as by me as proposing a new mechanism. On the contrary. The starting point is that there's already debate within the GA on enhanced cooperation as part of the WSIS follow-up. So the idea here was to strengthen that -- to provide, of course, the operational aspects that are not being addressed. And maybe there is some lack of clarity on how stakeholders should -- but the idea is not to create something new. It's rather to reinforce or strengthen something that was in existence. That was the original intent coming from the Chair at least.

But I turn to Cuba. Is there a point of order in regard to the debate or to this particular point? Yes, please, go ahead.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. I am concerned on the manipulation. You know, everybody here reads newspapers. We not only read newspapers, but we read what is happening inside the U.N. And I am in charge here on ITU affairs, ICRC affairs, Assembly affairs, CSTD affairs. So I'm going around different rooms all the time. I drive a lot. First, in the conference [indiscernible] we have been 20 years without any treaty. And we have been since 1996 without any work [indiscernible] common members.

Today we were in a plenary meeting where different delegations are asking to discuss, not even to negotiate treaty, on the new and emerging technologies. There is no agreement. There are members from the conference [indiscernible] that are proposed to even discuss informally, not formally, even discuss informally on cyber security. They don't want to discuss cyber security. They don't want to discuss new or emerging technologies. That's the first proof. You can read the press release. That is going to be published on the Web site. So it's a lie that the conference of [indiscernible] is having a discussion on these issues.

Second, I participate in the first governmental group of experts on the convention -- on conventional weapons last year and we have in three years discussed informally the issue of fully autonomous weapons. That is, new robots that their software are going to decide on the life of the people. The (indiscernible) we're doing the work today is that the human being decide when to kill a person. What we're discussing in this GGE that met for the first time last year is to prohibit the development of fully autonomous weapon system that will change completely the way of doing war. And there is a group of countries that are the same countries that are here today that are opposed to the prohibition, the legal prohibition, that are opposing to negotiate a protocol to the convention to prohibit this new technologies that are emerging.

So it's not true that we are discussing a topic under the umbrella of the conventional weapons. That's the second proof that we are not in the same (indiscernible).

Third, all of the people that are present here were in Argentina where there was a big social movement and was a lot of critics because the whole processing the World Trade Organization was being manipulated by the same countries that are putting amendments to this report. So it's a lie! It's a lie!

The only proposal that we are presenting here is to have a discussion. That's the minimum. To discuss openly and Democratic and with the presence of the stakeholders. We are not proposing a treaty. We are not proposing to take a decision. Just to debate.

So for me, there is a lie in there. And second, they are not in favor of Democratic discussion among all of international community on this topic. Those that are presenting amendments to this report, they don't want to even discuss. So it's very unfortunate. Because as Juan said, the world is moving in a different direction. And those that are opposing the amendments to this paper are the most affected by the attacks, cyber attacks and so on.

So the life is going to -- at the end they are going to be affected. The most affected one are the most opposing this report. And we can go through other channels. We don't need to go through this channel. We go to GA, we go to New York, we present a draft resolution, (indiscernible). We have a resolution. We don't need this. If you want to kill the report, it's their responsibility to kill the report. It's not developing countries. Because we are very much presented a minimum options, a minimum options of debate, of discussion. It's not (indiscernible). But it's not in our hands. If the group of countries, if a group of members of this group, they will to kill the report, they want to kill any option to debate, to discuss, as Parminder mentioned, this idea of having like a working group in the CSTD to continue debating what is enhanced cooperation, what is it we can do, okay. But there is no will. The problem is that there is no will. And let's face it, it's not developing countries. We are open to any option. As minimum as possible. But if there is not even a minimum one, well, we are here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Well, thank you. I -- let's go on. I think -- one thing I'd like to request colleagues, because I think we are still -- there's still -- we have to finish discussion on this and there's still two paragraphs that I feel that will also prompt some very lively discussion, so maybe if we could strictly restrict to comments addressed to the text because I feel that we do not have time to provide for some larger or wider contextualization of our discussions. I think at this point everybody is -- in the room I think has a very fair understanding of positions and some reservations. So I -- I would sincerely like to have the opportunity at the end of this day to plan with you our last day of meetings. So to do that, we need to move as fast as we can.

I see a number of requests for the floor for that 14th recommendation. I would take this on board, but I would suggest that after this we close the list and we can move on. So to allow us to complete the reading and to have the full appraisal of all the text so we can have a very clear idea of where the difficulties lie. I would be very saddened if you would lose too much time on one point. And I think now the alternatives are very quite known. So I would certainly urge colleagues to be as brief as they can and to the point of the discussion.

I have on my list Russian Federation, Lea Kaspar. I read the full list, just to make sure I have everyone on board. Russian Federation, followed by Lea. Anriette. The U.K. Richard Hill. Jimson. Latvia. I think

that's -- and Saudi Arabia. And after that I would suggest we close discussion on this. We park that to our second reading, as I hope we'll have time to come back to that. So Russian Federation, please, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Actually, of course, we will give our comments regarding para 14, but I have to -- to react somehow on the very emotional wording from Canada just one minute. And it's really, you know, surprising that we are -- have the reference to ITU because, you know, it's just the history of one week ago that in the ITU we have the working group meeting regarding public policy issues related to the Internet. And Canada was actually the most active part of this group who said that there is no need for any discussion on this issue in ITU under the mandate of ITU. And when it comes to the discussion of what is at least one example, I remember we have the discussion on examples of what can be the output of these public policies, international public policies. And one of the example was data protection frameworks. For example, very important point actually and needed on the international level for further development of the Internet as the organize -- organism.

So coming to the para 14, first -- well, first of all, thank you, Chair, for telling your point of view regarding these and we support this, that it indicates that villainous of somehow to this -- this discussion to go on to be followed somehow in the right relevant place. And we 100% support this because we -- as we see it now, that's coming to the focal point, like Iran said, focal point of the discussion, para 68, 69. We lack -- lack WSIS consensus on the question on how the role of the governments in the international Internet-related public policy should be implemented, institutionalized, and practiced.

So we understand the reality that the group probably will not come to the conclusion, consensus conclusion on these. But then how this important point will be followed out afterwards, how it will be discussed afterwards, we think it's extremely important to follow somehow. And we see the -- we see the discussion that -- well, there is some opposals on this proposed formats and we understand that it would be different views inside the group on the proposed format, but we welcome these participants to propose their own formats, how they see its relevant place and how these dialogues should be prolonged and followed afterwards. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. I will give the floor now to Lea Kaspar, followed by Anriette.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. This is Lea Kaspar speaking. So my understanding of the intention behind this paragraph -- and thank you, Chair, for elaborating a little bit on that. It was helpful. So my understanding of that was that this paragraph was trying to clarify what will happen with this discussion after we leave Geneva tomorrow. It was not about establishing new mechanisms. It was just about what happens with this discussion next. And I -- I appreciate that intention, and this is the perspective I'll be commenting from.

So I have some issues with this paragraph. And there are two specific points I'd like to bring up. One is speaking as someone who has been participating in now two iterations of this conversation, both in the Working Group On Enhanced Cooperation, the first iteration as an observer and now as a member. I agree with the previous speakers who have said that kind of kicking the can down the road. Or no,

that's not it. Or throwing the ball back to UNGA would be useful, so I don't think that's -- in this current framing, I don't think that this paragraph would be helpful, having in mind the discussion that's been taking place in this group and the previous group as well.

Which brings me to my second point. And a bigger issue that I'm having now listening to this conversation is that we seem to have resigned ourselves to coming out of this meeting without recommendations. And I -- I would like to just be more optimistic. And I think it was Parminder who said, you know, we might not be able to come up with recommendations and new mechanisms. Okay. That might be true. But there are other recommendations on the table that we are discussing and that hopefully we will find consensus on. Which brings me back to the text on the screen and the intention behind this recommendation which is about what happens next. And I do think that something is missing. And what might actually be useful is to ask UNGA, instead of -- and I'll propose language, not to debate how to further implement but rather to review progress on implementing these recommendations that we hopefully come up with. I think that would be a useful -- useful use of UNGA's mandate.

So let's think about what happens coming out of this group, as if with the intention of coming out with a consensus based report that has recommendations that will need implementation and will need someone to review how that's going. I don't know whether that's UNGA or CSTD, but if we can reframe this paragraph in that direction I think that would be useful. I can send text to that effect, but it might be a compromised solution here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lea. So maybe Claudia, if -- first of all, I think we need maybe I -- could we -- Russian Federation, Iran has proposed to retain the paragraph with amendments and you made, I think -- so we can add Russian Federation here. So to retain paragraph -- and I think the proposal that Lea would be reflected just before -- just before "should be held" you open brackets before "should be held" and you put Lea, "review of the implementation of the present recommendations," something like that, "should be held every year." We can improve the language, but I think that was the intent behind your -- yes, review progress. "A review progress of the implementation," yes? Of the present should be held every year. So I think we have on board your -- the main aspects of your contribution. Thank you very much. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: ... Benedicto, and I'll try to be brief. Which is a bit difficult because we are, in fact, retreading some of the fundamental concerns. And in the spirit of your intention with this paragraph, I have some textual recommendations. But then I will also make my own general comments.

The textual changes would be to change it so that it reads, "The WGEC recommends that" delete a, "dedicated," replace "debate" with "discussions on" and then insert "internet-related public policy issues be held as needed at meetings of U.N. bodies, comma, including among others" -- have you got it -- "at the CSTD and at the general" and then continue with your text. And "at the General Assembly under." So that would be, you know, an attempt at a compromised proposal.

But I just wanted to remark on the experience of the General Assembly. For both civil society and many of the African governments that we collaborate with, New York is simply a very difficult space. The

developing country missions that have an expertise in ICT and Internet-related matters generally are based in Geneva. And for civil society to get speaking spots in New York is actually very difficult. We did achieve that during the 2015 WSIS+10 review, but there was even some civil society organizations, prominent ones, who complained that they were subject to bias. It's very difficult to get a really inclusive discussion.

And then just in response to Cuba, I -- I accept completely, you know, the difficulty that you're -- you're expressing, but I think to create new spaces where the deadlock takes place is not the answer. There are certain discussions that are constrained by deadlock at the moment, and I don't think we're going to overcome that deadlock by creating new mechanisms. We need different approaches, more time maybe, maybe a more gradual process of developing agreement on more specific issues before we can have more effective deadlock. I think just taking that deadlock from the GGE to whatever new mechanism, or to the General Assembly, is not actually going to take us forward.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Anriette. I think -- I suggest we reflect Anriette's proposal, just delete please that bracketed language and at the end, as we have done with others, just say add Anriette's. So I think the -- if I got it right, I think there are two basic things, points. She proposed discussion as needed, discussions as needed and be it at the CSTD so she's not pointing to one particular place but as needed and deletes proper context.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: And including? Yeah.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Maybe you can say better. Yeah. But I think the important thing we retain is those discussions would be as the need arises and maybe in different contexts, resorting to the existing - - not creating new mechanisms but resorting to existing fora for that. Thank you. U.K., followed by Richard Hill, Jimson, Latvia, Saudi Arabia, and then we are moving to the next recommendation. U.K., you have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, we are very surprised at the suggestion that the U.N. General Assembly is not discussing these issues. The General Assembly discusses international Internet-related public policy issues every year, and you can just look at the resolutions that were agreed in 2017 to see that. Resolution on the impact of rapid technological change, a resolution on agricultural technology. A resolution on science technology and innovation for development. A resolution on the role of science and technology in the context of international security.

These resolutions are directly relevant to the Internet-related public policy. And there's other resolutions where the Internet is directly relevant -- the resolution on the rights of the child; the resolution on violent extremism; the resolution on international trade and development covering many of the issues that we've discussed in this group and where the Internet is relevant. The General

Assembly is discussing these issues. Now, of course, we would want to make sure that, when the General Assembly discusses these issues, it takes into account the importance of the Internet.

But it really makes no sense for us to say to the General Assembly that they should take all of these issues and put them in one big bucket and discuss them all in one debate. These issues are being discussed and they will continue to be discussed. But paragraph 14 to us just does not make sense. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And I think your opposition to the paragraph was already expressed there. So thank you for those additional comments. Richard Hill followed by Jimson, Latvia, and Saudi Arabia.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I really want to thank Canada for having explained to me why spam is a trade issue, because I never understood that. So, if I understood the explanation correctly, it's a trade issue because spam reduces consumer confidence and, therefore, consumers are less likely to do electronic trading. That's an argument. But, of course, lack of security also reduces consumer confidence and, therefore, reduces e-trading. And, actually, it's been documented, if you look at my paper, that consumers are becoming reluctant to use the Internet because of lack of security. So then security is also a trade issue and should be discussed and decided in WTO. Fine, that's a point of view. But then I would urge these countries to take that point of view to initiate the right processes inside WTO to inform ITU and other bodies that WTO is going to do it to avoid duplication. We've heard a lot about the need to avoid duplication. But, if European Union is proposing to do this stuff in WTO when it's already being done elsewhere, we're creating duplication. I look forward to these countries taking steps to open not just WTO but also the like-minded group of countries that it's going to be discussing in e-commerce to be open to civil society. And I personally look forward to being invited to the kickoff meeting of the group of countries that's going to be discussing e-commerce on the margins of WTO. I'm really looking forward to that. I can help you on e-signature where I happen to be a subject matter expert.

Canada said, when are we going to discuss? As U.K. and others have correctly pointed out, some things are being discussed. Chairman, I think everybody knows that I prepared a 26-page paper with detailed references outlining issues that are not sufficiently discussed. We never introduced it for the sake of time. Maybe I should now take two hours to introduce it so everybody really understands the issues that remain to be discussed. But I think, Chairman, you're not likely to allow me to do that. And so I will not insist.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I thank you for your approach to this.

I will now turn to Jimson followed by Latvia, Saudi Arabia. And then we are closing discussion on that particular paragraph for the moment and moving to paragraph 15. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished chair. First I would like to request some clarity to our business on how we'd like to speak, participate actively at the GA scenario. Because, as far

as I know, it's mostly in government speak. A place where business can speak, [indiscernible] civil society can also speak. So, please, I need clarity on that.

And then to Parminder's point, that, yes, from CSTD discussion can move to GA. Basically, I think from CSTD, it goes into ECOSOC and finally goes to GA as the case may be. So that pathway, I have no problem, of course.

But I really want to be educated on how business without any constraint can inclusively participate in any discussion at GA. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Jimson. And, again, I just maybe repeat what I said in reply to what was already asked by the European Union.

My idea at least on proposing this was to indicate to the GA the need or the interest in having some further debate within the GA on that under the particular topic of information and communication technologies, the existing topic, and advising or recommending that a mechanism or a process -- a process, not a mechanism, should be there to enable wider participation of stakeholders.

So we'll stop at that in my thinking, because it would not be appropriate to tell the GA how to do it.

In that regard, I'd like to say that within the United Nations some experiments have been taking place in that regard. The IGF, for example, is something that emanated from the United Nations. This format is endorsed by the GA. So it's not to say that the GA will be limited in each and every stance to a particular format of work. So I think the message is there. That was my intention to propose that some further discussion was needed but within wider multistakeholder -- but I don't think it would be appropriate to be prescriptive and say you should do this, should do that. We are sending the message, if the group accepts. But then we leave it for the political debate and discussion among the GA members how to do it. That was my intention behind my original proposal. So, if that could be satisfactory for the moment, I turn to Latvia followed by Saudi Arabia. Latvia, you have the floor.

>>LATVIA: Thank you, Chair. I will try to be quite brief. And I would like to fully share the understanding explained by the U.K. and others on discussions fully taking place already.

On the other hand, I would also like to share the concerns expressed by the European Union and also by Anriette on the possibilities to ensure full participation of stakeholders in the discussions in line with paragraph 71 of Tunis Agenda.

And, therefore, I would like to ask to add Latvia to those requesting deletion of paragraph 14. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

When -- we're surprised. When we come to CSTD, especially WGEC, we heard that there are other agencies that deal with international Internet-related public policy issues. And, when we go to that agency, especially ITU, we didn't have a mandate. So let's put this in clear in here. If some delegates read ITU is a place, we put it down. So, when we go there, we can develop a policy on technology issues. But debate as a ping pong when we come here, you send us there. And, when we go there, they send us here. We should have a very clear mechanism for a place that we can discuss those issues.

And, as we said it again, debate is different than discussing resolution. When you discuss a resolution -- we've been to UNGA. We discussed a resolution and the committee were experts. But why debate at the level of the General Assembly is something different. So there is no comparison between a list of resolution [indiscernible] to those dealing with the matter, no. It's not dealing with the matter.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

With this I suggest that we could move to paragraph 15. Of course, this is not solved yet. We'll come back to that.

Paragraph 15 provides for recommendation that, consistent with the Tunis Agenda, the Internet Governance Forum may provide support for the development of international Internet-related public policy and should, therefore, be further strengthened by increased participation of all stakeholders, particularly governmental stakeholders in the annual IGF sessions as well as national subregional and regional IGF initiatives.

So the idea behind this paragraph is to contain the notion that what IGF does can indeed provide support and strengthen the work towards -- the process towards enhanced cooperation. That link has been recognized by the General Assembly a number of times by saying that both processes should be pursued in distinct but complementary ways. So I think this would be a way to try to explore that notion of complementarity.

So the IGF would provide for a place -- or could provide, as I said, support for the development. It would not replace the process of enhanced cooperation, but it would support that process by increased participation of stakeholders and particularly governmental stakeholders. I made that reference to particularly governmental stakeholders in response also to the notion and to the reality that government participation in IGF needs to be limited in relation to other stakeholder groups and the understanding that governments are engaging in enhanced cooperation efforts could be strengthened and could be -- their participation can be improved by being further exposed to IGF discussions. So this is the idea behind that. And, again, it's a proposal that tries to reflect on discussions we have had in the past and also to incorporate some of the concern we expressed at that time. So it's for your consideration.

I have on my list Canada first and then Richard Hill. And Marilyn Cade. Yes, Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, chair.

We like this paragraph. I think it could be just a little bit changed. I noted that in the compilation of comments that we had received, ISOC had reformulated this paragraph. And I thought it was perhaps a little bit more desirable in the sense that it recognized that the IGF already contributed to Internet -- to the development of international Internet-related public policy.

I can read it, or you can just fish it out from the draft. I don't know which you prefer.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Maybe you can read it, and we'll take it on board immediately.

>>CANADA: The Tunis Agenda -- and here I propose a small change. That "the IGF continue to support the development of IIRPP and should be further strengthened by encouraging and facilitating the participation of all stakeholders in the annual IGF sessions, as well as in national, subregional, and regional IGF initiatives."

But, I mean, if there's really resistance to changing the paragraph, fine. But I think it would just -- to change it a little bit so that it reflects the fact that IGF already significantly contributes to IIRPP. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. Next on my list is Richard Hill followed by Marilyn Cade. Taking on board a few others. Please, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. So I get more and more confused as we go through this meeting. As far as I know, IGF has no formal outputs. So I don't understand how it can support the recommendation of Internet public policy. Maybe people think that just talking about issues is supporting public policy. I think talking about issues is talking about it. It's not actually developing policies. So I don't think it would be acceptable to add the modification proposed by Canada.

And, actually, I don't think we should have this paragraph at all, Chairman. So please mark me down as proposed deletion.

Everything you said is correct. And, as part of a package, I would be happy to keep this. As I said from the beginning -- and I have not changed my position -- I think we should just have accepted your report the way it was and not gone through this painful exercise of discovering that we don't agree on anything, because your report was a very good compromise. So, in the spirit of a balanced package, it was fine.

But now, if we're going to delete everything concerning governmental mechanisms and U.N. mechanisms and things like that and only extol the IGF, I don't think that's acceptable. In particular, because it's not our mandate to extol the IGF. It's very clear, as you yourself said, that there are two separate processes that were included in the Tunis Agenda. One was IGF, and the other one was enhanced cooperation. We're here to talk about enhanced cooperation, not about the IGF. So I don't see any justification whatsoever, if you're talking about the IGF. This particular paragraph should be deleted. That's fine, secretariat. What you have is excellent.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard.

May I request to delete the second reference to Canada. Because later on, actually, proposed actual language., again, as I said before, the link I think is recognized by the G.A., that they are distinct but complementary. As I said, this is an attempt to translate that notion of complementarity in concrete terms, relying, recognizing differentiated roles and differentiated functions in the system. So it's correct, as you said, that IGF does not produce principle outputs or -- will not be called to develop international Internet-related public policy. It was my understanding is that -- and that was conveyed by the paragraph -- the proposal is that, through participating in IGF meetings, that could lead to improvements in enhanced cooperation efforts so that the wealth of information that circulated there can indeed support the implementation of the process of development of international Internet-related public policy. But, again, it's up to the group to consider and decide.

I have on my list Marilyn Cade followed by Anriette, Saudi Arabia. I have, yes, the chair of IGF and then Turkey.

Marilyn Cade and Cuba.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, Marilyn Cade speaking. My comments were going to be about the NRIs, the national and regional IGFs. And I wonder, Chair, if I might beg the indulgence as I see the chair of the IGF MAG here. Perhaps I could suggest we hear from her. Because I was going to also make comments about some of the outputs. And I think, since she's here, perhaps I could defer to her and I'll take a later place in line.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So we'll come back to you later. Anriette.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair. I am not opposed to Canada's edit. But I'll make my remarks on the original text. Because I think there's one aspect of it that is important that's not in.

I like your formulation, Canada. But I think my edit -- there's something you put in the original formulation. So my addition is that, after "stakeholders, in" we insert "IGF intersessional work such as best practice forums," comma.

And the rest can remain as is.

And just a comment on Canada's formulation. I like it. But I do feel that it's important to emphasize increasing participation of governmental stakeholders. So -- and that is in the original formulation.

And then I do feel that it's important to mention intersessional work. Because, Richard, that is where the policy recommendations are emerging from and, in fact, being taken up by national governments. And I can mention examples, if you need any.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just checking, Anriette. I think the secretary has already is checking whether it's appropriately reflected on screen what you have just proposed. I think so. You had proposed to add -- you are amending what was proposed by Canada.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Reference to stakeholders. So it would read -- all the text would be the same. And then it would read "particularly governmental stakeholders, in IGF intersessional work such as best practice forums, the annual IGF sessions as well as in national, subregional, and IGF initiatives."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you.

Next on my list is Saudi Arabia followed by the chair of the IGF. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. As you mentioned very clear, Internet governance has two separate tracks, enhanced cooperation and IGF. Both tracks might be complementary. We don't see putting a recommendation in here for IGF instead of focusing on recommendation and how to implement enhanced cooperation.

So we're going beyond government mandate -- implemented perfectly. And we're developing -- we just are lacking the relationship with IGF. We lack the existence of enhanced cooperation in its entirety.

So, therefore, we suggest to delete this paragraph as it is out of context. It's out of the mandate.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I give the floor to Lynn St. Amour, the chair of the IGF.

>>LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Chair. And as this is my first time taking the mic here I would like to thank the Chair and certainly all of the members and observers for all their dedication to this topic. It's obviously critically important. I'd also like to thank you for the openness of the meeting as well and allowing observers to speak.

And for transparency, I was the IGF MAG chair for 2016-2017. The current MAG chair position has not been announced yet.

A lot of what people think about when they think about the IGF is what it was initially which was an annual forum. Since then, as both Marilyn alluded to and Anriette said, the work of the IGF has advanced very, very significantly through many different types of intersessional work. Marilyn can speak much more probably passionately than me. Maybe personalities, but about the NRIs for sure. She's been a fearless advocate for the national, regional, subregional and youth IGF initiatives for many years. There are now over 100 of those, and they are all very, very active. The vast bulk of them hold annual meetings. They operate according to the same principles as the IGF and as outlined in the Tunis Agenda with respect to multiple stakeholder, open and inclusive, and they also publish reports on their activity.

As Anriette said, one of the more, I think, substantial pieces of output from the IGF activities -- and we're starting to refer to in some circles as kind of an IGF ecosystem to fully reference all those intersessional activities -- is, in fact, the NRIs which are autonomous, independent and basically arose when people saw the value of the IGF at a global level and recognized the need for these same discussions at national, regional, and subregional levels. So we actually refer to those as one of the

more significant pieces -- more significant outputs from the IGF process itself. There are many other pieces of intersessional work. We do our best practices forums. This past year we had three, one on local content, one on gender and access, and one on cybersecurity. They produce papers every year, a lot of discussion. And just as with both the sessions at the IGF and all the intersessional work, the benefit of the discussion, I think partially in response to Richard Hill's comments, is the fact that they inform discussions and decisions that are taken elsewhere where we rightfully believe they belong. That is not to take anything away from sovereign responsibilities of governments or frankly from the private sector with respect to their considerable activities in supporting the Internet's development.

We also had dynamic coalitions. There are 17 of those at the moment, and they address everything from gender and access and Internet of Things and cybersecurity. Artificial intelligence data, if I didn't just say artificial intelligence twice. We also have just completed the third year of a major policy program called Connecting and Enabling the Next Billions, which really tried to identify very concretely in an escalating process and, in fact, Benedicto was the chair of that first effort in its first year. Tried to identify very concretely policy activities that can be taken back to a very local level and used to advance Internet matters that are of importance to countries and other types of diversity, whether it's a gender diversity or a youth diversity as well.

So the IGF is a continual evolution. We are trying to increase all of the process and step up our processes with respect to outputs, but I think it's more accurate if we actually think about it as a series of events including all the intersessional activities that take place over the course of the year and not simply an annual forum.

So thank you very much again, Chair, for letting me take the floor.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Lynn. You're most welcome to the discussion. Thank you very much for your contribution. Next on my list is Cuba, followed by Nigel.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair, and excuse me for taking the floor again. I don't want to put into any doubt the value of the IGF. As a matter of fact, I consider the IGF its -- as a policy dialogue space for all stakeholders. It's an essential step in the creation of public policies for the Internet. It's like the scouts that scan the horizon and paving the way for those that have to come back and do the actual policy. As a matter of fact, this is how it was discussed in the preparation of -- in the -- in the prep that went to Tunis, in Tunis Agenda. And that is why when you get in Tunis Agenda you see from paragraph 66 that it's -- that it reiterates the Geneva principles of Internet governance, that it's all stakeholders has a role. Then the -- the following paragraph just says that, that we "agree to invite the U.N. secretary general to convene a new forum for multistakeholder policy dialogue to open the way and to lead all the stakeholders to get into the policy area." But then in the next paragraph is where they say, "We recognize that all governments should have an equal role and responsibility for international Internet governance. And for ensuring the stability, security, and continuity of the Internet. We also recognize the need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders." And then the rest, the other paragraph, as you know, for this enhanced cooperation name was there.

So as everybody know and you very aptly have said, this was a package, and our two complimentary process. One that feeds the other one. And as such should be seen.

So now we come to this document. In this document that we are placing our gaze into enhanced cooperation, we need to have balance. I have nothing against to have paragraph 15, if we have some complimentary paragraph on enhanced cooperation. But if all the paragraph that has to do with any proposal, concrete proposal. I'm not talking about characteristics and all those things. Any concrete proposal have been accepted, then this paragraph has no place to be here. It's totally unaccepted because it's totally out of context.

So I think that as originally it was a package, here it's also a package. We should not speak here or mention IGF if we don't mention enhanced cooperation. And that's simple as that.

So as the negotiation is going, please, I suggest to delete paragraph 15.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. Next on my list is Nigel and then I will revert to Marilyn Cade for her comments. Nigel, you have the floor.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think actually with your indulgence, I think Turkey and Marilyn Cade were before me, and I think perhaps Turkey ought to take precedence. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, Marilyn, please. Go ahead, then. I heard you wanted to make some comments but you deferred to Lynn, so I think that was very extensive explanation Lynn's part. So I -- I would just urge you maybe to be as brief as you can because I think we have already heard about the importance of the work that is being done, so I think we need to see more in terms of how the issue itself will fit, and maybe -- but I leave to your wisdom and look forward to your brevity. Thank you.

>>MARILYN CADE: I'm not going to repeat what the chair of the IGF MAG said. I'm going to make a related point. And thank you for returning to me. I remain optimistic, as I think Lea said she was, and I believe some others are, that we can find a path forward. And I say that because I -- I do believe that we have a synergistic dependency between discussions that go on at the IGF and elsewhere, not only at the IGF but elsewhere, that can and are needed to feed into discussions that take place between governments in talking about public policy. And so I'd just like to ask that we consider keeping 15 for now but strengthening it somewhat to reflect the fact that there does need to be significantly -- a focus on increasing the engagement of governments very broadly in this activity and also then in reflecting into the work that governments may take forward into other settings. So I think other than just coming back later to perhaps focus on a small word change, but I will not repeat further elaboration on the national and regional IGFs but I will offer for anyone who's not familiar with them, I'd be happy to share more information with them later. But there are many, many examples where governments have come together at the IGF, have talked, and then have taken ideas forward into other intergovernmental activities. And I think that's worth noting.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn, for your statement. Thank you for your brevity. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps you'll take Turkey afterwards. Very, very briefly because we've all discussed this. Two points. I think in the first line we can say "may continue to provide" to take up the notion that other people have spoken about and that the Internet governance has been doing this. And I don't think we need particularly government stakeholders. We need all stakeholders to take part in the IGF. Yes, we need governments, we need business, we need civil society, we need academics, we need parliamentarians, we need a whole range of stakeholders, and we do have a range of stakeholders. And it was marvelous to see so many people here in this -- in this building not so long ago in the IGF.

The second point is, and, you know, let's perhaps not get into these things in too deep philosophical gaze, if you like, but policymaking -- and, you know, having spent 30 years in government, I think I can say something about policymaking, Richard Hill. Policymaking is talking. Policymaking starts with talking. Policymaking starts with dialogue. That's what we do. Policymaking starts at the bottom. It can start anywhere. It can take place in a cafe. It can take part in a bar. It doesn't matter where it takes place. The IGF, the discussions that take place, we take to other places. We say yes, this was a discussion. Let's take it elsewhere and discuss it elsewhere. Let's input into the OECD, let's input into the ITU, let's input into ICANN or wherever.

So I think this notion of policymaking is very important indeed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Nigel, for your statement. Next on my list is Turkey, followed by European Union, Russian Federation, Jimson, Peru. And I think after that I would suggest we move to the -- our last paragraph. So Turkey, you have the floor, madam.

>>TURKEY: Thank you, Chair. I will be very brief. I don't want to repeat what my colleagues already have said. We think that IGF supports the development of Internet-related public policy because it started to produce very useful documents such as best practices. So we want to express our support for Canada and ISOC. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think it's enough to add, after Canada, Turkey. So not to complicate too much the text. Just add -- yes, thank you. European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Chair. I would like also to express my support for this recommendation. I think your initial statement, I understand how you made it for stressing a bit the role of governments. We can live with either the first or the -- the later proposal by ISOC and Canada.

Further, to interventions of IGF and also from Marilyn Cade we find this recommendation quite -- very useful, and I suggest that we keep it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. First of all, we would like to echo with those who made reference to the mandate of IGF and that the development of the public policy is definitely not part of the mandate. And we don't have any intention to diminishing the importance of the work done by IGF. It's very important discussion place. However, we doubt that we can leave it here without -- without the

intention to speak about the enhanced cooperation because we think, and we clearly see that in the Tunis Agenda that IGF and enhanced cooperation are different tracks, separate, probably, yes, we agree that complimentary but separate tracks. So we think this -- this paragraph should be deleted because of lack of relevance to the main point of the discussion. And coming to the -- the text, we especially would like to stress that when we come to the participation of governments in the IGF, we really do not see any obstacles for participations of the governments. So we don't think -- see the actual point. Any governments can go to IGF and participate. There is no -- how it can be supported. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see the secretariat has added your name to those calling for deletion. I have on my list Jimson, followed by Peru. The Netherlands. Egypt. And with your indulgence, I'm closing the list after that and we move to our final paragraph. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished Chair, colleagues. While this paragraph is quite relevant and the last IGF in particular I saw the role played by Juan (phonetic), excellent role played and excellent coordination. Had very good interaction with some member on the panel, and important feedback, as I have on that addition of IGF. And generally and broadly, everyone in Nigeria and West Africa and Africa in particular, IGF has helped a lot to stimulate policy development in our various countries, subregion, and the region. So, in fact, I think it may provide support -- it provides support, not may. So maybe now on the international level, there's no doubt it is providing support. And it's very relevant, and I really want us to consider it. IGF, enhanced cooperation, they are not parallel processes. Not parallel at all. Yes, complimentary and empowerment, as Nigel rightly pointed out. In fact, IGF helped a lot in enlightening our decision makers, the parliamentarians, and et cetera, et cetera, when it comes to formulating policy and the kind of policy they formulate. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Peru.

>>PERU: We would like to delete the paragraph. We believe the concept of the IGF could have been mentioned already in paragraph 7 when there is some paragraph that starts with relevant U.N. agencies, intergovernmental, international and regional organizations responsible. You know, I believe the IGF is among those institutions that have been mentioned. And, if there is somebody insists on including a special specific paragraph on the IGF, well, you know, perhaps we should put a specific paragraph about each institution we mention in paragraph 7. There's a saying in Spanish that says that everyone tells how the party went, how you -- if you had fun in the party, dependent on how it went for you, you know? So I am sure the IGF has been very fruitful for Africa and for many other countries. I don't think I can say the same for Latin America. So, in fact, ICANN is another institution that at some point gives us a lot to learn and some other takes away from us many more things and so forth.

I could make a list of all these institutions that are linked to the Internet. And at some point or another they have different behaviors. They give you sometimes. They take away sometimes. They don't do nothing some others. So I think we should leave things the way they are.

Even more, when the IGF -- it's not supposed to be part of the enhanced cooperation. It's a totally separate independent mandate. So we insist on deleting that paragraph.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Peru. I see the secretariat has included your comments that that should be in contrast by paragraph 7. So it will be there for our second reading. I should only comment that, at least to my understanding, recommendation 7 addresses a different set of institutions because the first two U.N. agencies -- intergovernment international regional organizations, I don't think IGF fits into these categories. But I'm not starting discussion on that now. Let's back that, and we'll come back to this. We agreed to see all the entirety of the document in its interrelations. So we'll come back to this. Thank you.

I will now give the floor to the Netherlands. And after that we'll hear Egypt. I had a few -- Switzerland. You withdraw. And Hungary and Mexico will speak after that.

And I suggest we close discussion on this and move to another area of our work. So, Netherlands, you have the floor.

>>NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chair. As government official but as a member of the IGF multistakeholder advisory group, we'd like to keep this paragraph. Yes, indeed, IGF should be seen distinctively from enhanced cooperation and both are complementary.

And precisely that complementary aspect can be seen in this text. Namely, IGF is supportive to this enhanced cooperation. Examples have been given right away. And like a best practice fora, from cyber security, the NRIs. And the list can go on. I think it was Jimson who rightly pointed that out.

So this text can be kept in the paper.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Egypt.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

Allow me to start by maybe saying that, when IGF and enhanced cooperation are indeed, two distinct tracks. But they're not actually permanent tracks. I like the word my friend Jimson used. They are interwoven tracks, maybe. They are distinct, but they should not be perceived as permanent. Most colleagues before me mentioned more than one reason why the IGF is important to the discourse of discussing international Internet-related public policy issues and how it has supported the making of policy in a number of places whether at the international level or international or regional or subregional level. Last month we were in Egypt. We had the luck to host two events, the African IGF of 2017 and the first North African IGF as well, which manifests how the IGF is playing out in different regions, how it contributes to a discourse, how Internet-related public policy issues, especially in Africa. It has over the past years actually also contributed to a ministerial declaration, which is a governmental process inside the African Union. But it was then moved by discussions in the African IGF itself.

So I don't think we have much disagreement in this room if IGF is relevant to the international Internet-related public policy making or not.

I understand why we need to take a holistic look maybe at the recommendations and try to do a balance. This is understandable.

I just don't want us to leave this point without recognizing the input of IGF to the discourse, especially for developing countries in a number of places. It raises awareness. It keeps the discussion alive. And it makes more government engaged in the discussion, which is very important if we are to go anywhere with enhanced cooperation.

I might come back to this later when we are in a second reading maybe. I don't think much discussion at this stage would make much difference.

But I want to stress something that maybe Anriette has also mentioned, that the focus in this context or in this report should be on how to enhance and improve government contribution and participation in the IGF, especially in developing countries. It's quite obvious for anyone who has been to a number of IGFs that government participation is on the decline. So this is something that needs to be looked at, not necessarily in this working group. But, if we are discussing the role of government, which is a focus of enhanced cooperation, obviously, we should also try to look at the problem of why governments are not enough engaged at the IGF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Egypt.

I give the floor to Switzerland. I had misread your -- you had lowered your plate, but you raised it again.

So Switzerland, followed by Hungary, Mexico. And I think Poland is also asked for the floor. So those will be the last floor intervenors here. Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair for giving me the floor. I would like to very quickly support what so eloquently has been put by Anriette and Jimson and also others and just underline the thought that the IGF is really very tightly interwoven with the idea of an enhanced cooperation.

I would say that, if we look at the policy cycle of -- at the international level of developing public policy principles on Internet-related matters, the IGF is not only active in identifying emerging topics in shaping the agenda of what is being discussed. It is also active in assessing and benchmarking what the different institutions, organizations worldwide are doing.

And I think that we had very good discussions in that regard in the last IGF, which happened here in Geneva in these very rooms. And so I think that, if you look at the policy cycle, really, the IGF is not present in only one of the steps, which is the decision-making step. But, if you look at the other policy steps, the identification of the issues, the discussion of the issues, the assessment of the issues, the evaluation of the policies -- it is there all the time.

So it really does make sense for me to separate the IGF from the idea of enhanced cooperation on the development of international public policy principles related to the Internet.

As far as participation of the governments, we know that the IGF is open and that you can participate. And we've seen it in the last IGFs. And I was, obviously, very active and present in the preparations of the last IGF.

There is room for improvement. There is potential for more government participation. And possibly there are ways and means of being respectful with the current mandate of the IGF of improving the participation of governments of making a more, let's say, government-friendly environment, especially in the selection of sessions, of workshops, in the identification of teams for organizing the main sessions and so on and so forth So I think that the recommendation 15 is absolutely pertinent to the work of this working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think add your names to those who are in support. Thank you for this.

Hungary followed by Mexico and Poland.

>>HUNGARY: Thank you, Chair. I changed my hat. I want to take the floor as a former chair of the CSTD working group on the improvements to the IGF, which was a successful working group. And it's produced a valuable document which has been recognized by the WSIS+10 outcome document as well. On the issues of shaping the outcomes of the IGF meetings, that is developing outputs. We had a recommendation to develop more tangible outputs.

And, as I have said in the outcome document, the work in the IGF has been recognized as well.

So the recommendations the group gave to improve the IGF have been followed and are being implemented all the time. And the quality of the IGF discussions are extremely high. So I'm changing that again as Hungary.

What I see here is just along these lines that we propose to continue this work to produce support for the enhanced cooperation. So I think we should retain this.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Mexico wants to express its support to keep this paragraph and the changes proposed by Canada because we think it's important to give the idea of continuation of this support. For Mexico, IGF is relevant because it's an open and evolving forum. And we are convinced that we should take advantage of the forum as a space to discuss.

As Switzerland, Mexico hosts the IGF. And we are convinced about its contribution on several issues related to Internet.

And to finalize, I agree with the delegations calling for spaces to discuss. And in our view, IGF allows that. So we should not put it apart, this paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your statement. Please, Poland. You have the floor.

>>POLAND: Thank you. I would like to support my previous two speakers and highlight that why, from our perspective, IGF is very important. There are many reasons, but I will only mention three of them.

First of all, it's a structure and agenda.

Second is society which is always ready for discussion and debating.

And last, but not least, a culture, culture of debating in the multistakeholder model which is for our policy crucial. And on published IGFs we have hundreds of appearance. And we discussed in dozens of workshops. It is very important, and we're trying to keep the society always under state by [indiscernible.] And that's why it's so important and I'm absolutely sure that for the rest of the countries should be always important this multistakeholder model. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Poland. I think we have exhausted the speakers on that first round for paragraph 15. Just before moving to the last paragraph in the second draft proposal, I'd like just to make two logistical discussions with you.

I would suggest that we could break now for 10 minutes, not more than that.

But, in compensation I would like to propose you that we can agree to extend a little bit beyond 6:00 p.m. I was told by the secretariat that the room would be available for us until 8:00 p.m. So I would be more than ready to stay that long. But I'd like to check with colleagues if that would be okay.

So we can -- my intention -- the game plan would be to finalize the first reading and, if possible, to at least have an idea of how we should proceed in relation -- in regard to the further steps of our work.

My impression and my feeling is that, if we cannot get out of the room today with a very clear idea of where are the main -- what effort is required and in what format in regard to very specific points, that we do not take some kind of light, it might get very difficult tomorrow to resume in that same fashion.

So my proposal to you then, the package proposal is to break for 10 minutes but then to resume and to keep going as further as we can, as far as we can, if possible, until 8:00 p.m. or if it's not possible to sometime before that. But we can make an effort, an additional effort today in order to ensure we can at least give us the opportunity to finalize the first reading and allow the reflection on how to move forward.

I have a few requests for the floor. Richard and Saudi Arabia.

>>RICHARD HILL: I like your plan in general. But I think we should do 16 first. So let's do 16, then we break. And then we come back and we decide how long to stay. I'm prepared to stay here all night.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Richard said what I was going to say, so let's do 16. And then we --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So I feel the room -- I think there was a sentiment in support of that. So let's keep moving.

So I would invite your comments on paragraph 16. Just as -- just to introduce the paragraph, here again it's an effort on the part of the Chair to reflect on proposals that were made that were controversial in their previous formulations. I tried to, to the extent possible, to address concerns that were expressed. So, basically, this paragraph unfolds in three different bullets that through which the WGEC would recommend further consideration to be given to the following initiatives.

So we are just sending to the General Assembly or to ECOSOC and to General Assembly a set of ideas that could help in moving forward the discussion. The first one refers to the creation of a permanent and open-ended working group under the CSTD with full stakeholder participation to prepare and support discussions on enhanced cooperation.

The second refers to the establishment of a permanent mechanism that would meet under manners of IGF and to discuss the complementarity between both processes -- enhanced cooperation and IGF.

The third one would be establishment of a facility within the IGF to optimize the role it can play in providing governments with an opportunity to access knowledge and share information.

So again, I repeat what I said in the first day, the criteria and the approach I took to that to accept and to propose those ideas is that I understand that it does not refer to the main controversy opposing different camps in the room. Which, of course, would lead to non-starter proposals. So I'm not proposing the creation of new mechanisms to the extent that the IGA is to resort to existing mechanisms to strengthen and to see how, through the existing discussions, existing foras, interventions could be made to allow for further discussion on -- regarding enhanced cooperation. So I think those ideas meet that criteria that we are not creating a new mechanism. Rather that we are, within existing fora, trying to think creatively of things that could be done. That was at least my intent and I -- I can anticipate there will be some times that regard that it was, let's say, my last effort to try to not to lose some ideas that I thought were very helpful when they were presented and discussed.

So with this, I'd like to hear your thoughts. I see Richard Hill asking for the floor. You have the floor, sir.

>>RICHARD HILL: Again, Chairman, I think we should have approved your report as it stood, but given the way the discussion is going, I want to put in some caveats. So if the secretariat could note at the end of the second bullet delete "It could be accepted as part of a package." Same for the next bullet. And then I'd like to add a new bullet which reads "The specific recommendations contained in the proposals presented in Annex II." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. See the kind of killer proposal. Let's see. Marilyn Cade.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. My comment -- Marilyn Cade speaking. My comments are going to address primarily bullet one, and I do have just a brief comment about bullet two and three. And this is a comment, and then I'll make a language suggestion.

My comment is that to me, it's really important to remember that the work of the CSTD is always reflected then into ECOSOC in the form of a resolution and also into the UNGA. And so I want to suggest that we find a way to reflect on bullet one when this says, "Creation of a permanent and open-ended

working group under the CSTD with full stakeholder participation to prepare and support discussions on enhanced cooperation in the context of the review of the implementation of WSIS outcomes." Here I would like to make a small edit, and I would just like to remove the word "annual" here and instead leave it as "in the CSTD sessions, which would include intersessional and the annual meeting. And" -- this is an addition -- "And reflect those -- the outcome of those discussions into ECOSOC and into the resolutions to the UNGA." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. "And reflect the outcome." Yes, okay. Thank you. Are there any further reactions to this? United States. Russian Federation. Yes. Please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So I will -- I'll start with the first bullet in this section. And for us this -- this proposal is problematic really for the -- one of the same reasons that the proposal for UNGA is problematic. The mandate that we were given in this working group, from WSIS+10, is to discuss how to further implement enhanced cooperation. These proposals seem to be more about how to further discuss how to further implement enhanced cooperation. And this is really getting into a follow-up and review type process or discussion. And that's not our job. Our job is to make recommendations on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. Now certainly this report will be presented to CSTD in May where it will be discussed, including by the member states, at ECOSOC when that resolution moves forward to ECOSOC, and perhaps by the General Assembly, depending on what the member states decide. So there's opportunities for these proposals to be made in those places, which is the appropriate place for taking consideration of the recommendations and then deciding on appropriate follow-up and review process. And so we just don't see it appropriate to make those kind of recommendations here.

Now certainly CSTD has a role, I think as (indiscernible) has said, as Marilyn said, in the follow-up and review of the implementation of WSIS outcomes. And if there's a way to appropriately scope that role within this report and make sure that it's reflected that we understand it and we're trying to adhere to it, then we'd be open to that.

For the two -- for the two -- the second and third bullet which were related to the IGF, I think we've had a general conversation about the IGF and how it's reflected in this document and discussions about should -- we didn't intervene at the time but I think that for us it's -- it's really frustrating that there's an argument against including the IGF in this report. It's clearly been -- it came out of the same Tunis process. They've clearly been linked for a long time. There's clearly enhanced cooperation happened at the Internet Governance Forum. And we really think this report should reflect that.

With that said, I think that these proposals related to the IGF, we have some concerns with. But perhaps there's a -- can be a discussion amongst the IGF experts, which there's many in this room, many people on the MAG who have been on the MAG or heavily involved in the IGF, to take these kind of proposals and the previous recommendation 15, take into consideration some of the concerns raised by members of this group and come back with a recommendation on how to appropriately reflect proposals for the IGF in this document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. For the secretariat then, I think in regard to the first bullet the proposal for deletion and for the two -- yes. And for second and third would be to maybe examine some revised language, something like that. So you actually not proposing but thinks it requires some reformulation in the light or so of the discussion on paragraph 15. Thank you.

Just one -- I have a list of requests, but one thing I forgot to say, when I -- it came to me to be important for the group to propose some way forward in the discussion. I understand the point raised that that might seem contradictory in itself since we're asked to develop recommendations but then we are asked to work to proceed. I take -- first of all, I repeat something that was said before. I think we will differentiate the recommendations we can offer at this point are these, but we also suggest part of the recommendation is that the discussion should proceed. I don't see a contradiction doing that. And the reason is, and you maybe will agree with me, is that when we were doing our work we could not -- we examined and considered many issues that were considered as very important by all of us, but we could not address, we could not come to a recommendation, could not even agree whether it was in the scope or not. So just to say that the discussion around the -- the issue is not exhausted. It's not completed. So there's still some work to be done. So I think there is not a contradiction saying this is what we can offer now. But we recognize there are some issues that should yet be further discussed, examined. Maybe they will never lead to any kind of consensus, but at least there are some issues that are there. Some issues that maybe even within the group if we have more time. I don't think it's the case we could have further developed but the -- the message would be that there are still some -- and I think this is consistent with the message coming from the WSIS+10 document that enhanced cooperation is a work in progress. That something has been done that we need to further implement. So I think we will only be doing something in line with that. So that was the intent behind this proposal. But again, I've turned again to -- to my list. Next on my list is Russian Federation, followed by Saudi Arabia. I also have Anriette, Turkey, and Jimson. So Russian Federation, please, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Actually we can agree with you as we also have difficulties with the words "discussion on enhanced cooperation" because it's too wide and we think that not really to the point, no.

[Laughter]

Yeah. That the -- the point of the discussion of the -- our working group and, you know, the main point is the practical implementation of enhanced cooperation, how to further implement enhanced cooperation. Not on discussion of -- on enhanced cooperation. So this is an important point.

Another one is, as we said before, IGF, we think it's a separate -- complimentary but separate track of Tunis Agenda and so we agree that it could be considered as a complimentary part to another one if we come to the -- the decision on the practical implementation on enhanced cooperation, what we think is the main thing is intergovernmental mechanism. Then in this way it could be complimentary also to be part of the -- this number 2 and number 3 of this para included. And what we already proposed we just remind you, Chair, that in 14bis we proposed the real mechanisms and we just would like to consider it in the combination. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'm not sure how to reflect that on the paper. Maybe you would like -- the first bullet I think you suggest replace discussions for implementation, yes? And I think you also make a call to discuss, maybe as a new bullet point, the proposal you made before in regard -- okay. Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. We agree with the U.S.

It's not a matter of discussion in this regard. Therefore, we suggest 16 out, and I would redictate. So "recognizing the need for the development of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, it is urgent to establish an open-ended working group and that UNGA, to enable governments, comma, on equal footing, comma, to carry out their roles and responsibilities." So we see this is a direct recommendation on how to further implement enhanced cooperation. And with the details experienced in the previous submissions, as Richard Hill said that the specific are contained in the annex, or we can copy it and make it in here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I see we are populating this paragraph with other -- note that the areas that are central for many participants, but that we discussed before. So I -- we'll take it on board for the moment. We'll have to see the text in its entirety. But I am a bit concerned about the direction we are taking here. But let's see it and have a second reading of that.

I have Anriette, followed by Turkey, Jimson. I have also the U.K. I have Nigel -- okay. And yeah, we'll take it from there. So Anriette, you have the floor.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Chair. And I support this paragraph, and I would suggest we keep the text as you drafted it without making any further changes. I feel that it's not framed as a solution, a definitive solution to the challenge of enhanced cooperation. I think your wording is very clear. Initiatives aimed at promoting dialogue and coordination. So it doesn't actually use the term "discuss." It says, "promoting dialogue and coordination among member states and other stakeholders." So I see this as a complimentary suggestion -- a suggestion that's complimentary for initiatives that are complimentary to enhanced cooperation and I think it adds value to the report. So I'd certainly like to keep it. Particularly in the way that you have framed it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Turkey.

>>TURKEY: Thank you, Chair. I think our report must involve a mechanism to be articulate test of each recommendation made by this group so that our recommendations are still relevant in future. And to make sure that our recommendations are taken into account or not by relevant stakeholders. Besides, how are we going to be sure that the cooperation in question is enhanced enough. So the creation of an open-ended working group under CSTD may perform these functions, and we support this bullet also. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this intervention. Jimson.

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

I think, when we look at the process of implementation of enhanced cooperation, while, yes, the government is actively involved with the Tunis Agenda, stakeholders need to be able to be present and able to provide constructive inputs. It is wise. I like to recommend that we keep bullet one with some adjustment to reflect implementation. So the edits I'm providing is with respect to creation of a permanent working group on CSTD with full stakeholder participation to prepare, support, and implement -- and implement. So I'm adding an implement instead of just discussion, enhanced cooperation on international public policy matters pertaining to the Internet with the existing framework of CSTD. Otherwise, the output from here will go through the usual process of ECOSOC and then UNGA.

So just beginning implement, implement enhanced cooperation on international public policy matters pertaining to the Internet.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K. is next on the list.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

In our view we don't think that creating a new working group is the right way forward. But CSTD does have an important role to play here.

The general Assembly gave CSTD responsibility for monitoring and follow-up of WSIS. And that includes enhanced cooperation. And usually we discuss enhanced cooperation in CSTD each year. And we are open to consider how we can make that conversation most relevant, how we can continue to follow up enhanced cooperation in the CSTD.

But we don't think creating a new working group for that is the answer.

We'd like to make a proposal to the text which would say CSTD should continue to discuss the issue of enhanced cooperation. And then take the text from the second half of that bullet which says, "In the context of the review of the implementation of WSIS outcomes in the annual CSTD sessions."

Just say we think there is an important job to do here, but it's the job which has been given to CSTD by the General Assembly, not to any new working group. And we think that CSTD should continue to do that and make sure that CSTD does that in a way which remains up to date and relevant and takes into account the work that has been done here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your proposal.

Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just very briefly.

So, on the first bullet, I think we would echo, actually, a combination of what the U.K. and Marilyn said earlier. I think the CSTD has an important role to play in the annual discussions on the WSIS outcome. Indeed, it perhaps could be asked to ensure that, within that role it plays, that it does discuss and take into account the work that's taking place to enhance and to sort of further the implementation of enhanced cooperation.

I think this is a subject we've discussed before in that enhanced cooperation is something that needs to be improved in the various fora that it takes place already. And CSTD can be a vehicle for issuing like monitoring that and presenting recommendations through the ECOSOC resolution, et cetera, on how that should be effected.

On the other bullets -- well, as others have said, perhaps we should have a more general discussion on whether some of the notions reflected in the second and third bullet here can be tied up with the earlier considerations we gave in paragraph 15. I don't think we'd be in favor of a permanent mechanism that can meet on the margins of the IGF. Of course, any stakeholders can meet together in the margins of the IGF. And indeed they do.

And civil society take advantage of the presence at the IGF to have a meeting. And that's really great that that takes place.

But establishing a permanent mechanism just for government seems perhaps not the best way forward.

Thank you.

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

Just one point of clarification with regard to bullet two, if we can have it on screen. I think that's also what has been said by the U.S. Can we go up to the second bullet?

So, when I proposed establishment of a permanent mechanism, you notice it does not indicate it should be purely intergovernmental, just for clarity. Especially if it is going to examine the relation between enhanced cooperation, the IGF -- IGF being, by definition, a multistakeholder mechanism, I think it would be contradictory. It would be restricted to the intergovernmental format,

just for the sake of clarity and to that to the proposal.

So I see no further requests for the -- yeah, Egypt, sorry. Egypt, please. You have the floor.

>>EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I think one way of progressing on recommendations in number 16 is maybe to take an approach that would combine some of the ideas in the 16A and 16B of first bullet and second bullet, meaning that we think that the creation of a standing or permanent open-ended working group in CSTD might be a way forward for a continued discussion. And, of course, with the ideas for change for the text that could be accommodated. But, mainly, we think CSTD would be in a position to take forward this discussion in a working group that is of an open-ended nature and, of course, with

implementation of stakeholders. We think this same working group could find a way to maybe reach out to the IGF perhaps the MAG through a liaison and the chairman.

I see Lynn is already here with us in this room. I see some mechanism or liaison between the two processes can be envisaged to look at the complementarity between the two processes and to look at the question of how to improve government participation in both enhanced cooperation processes and IGF as well.

This is a question that has been on the table even in IGF discussions inside the MAG. And we think the CSTD can do this work to coordinate the gaps between the two processes and how to maneuver with the complementarity between the two processes.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. So I suggest reflected on paper after you have the combined bp1 and bp2. And then we have a OEWG, open-ended working group, under CSTD with a liaison to IGF, something like that. OEWG would also look into the links with the IGF.

I know it reflects your proposal, but just to retain the idea that Egypt is trying to make a link between bullets 1 and 2.

So I thank you for that.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Canada would not support the creation of an additional group. But I think that it cannot be denied that the CSTD has a very explicit role in this process.

And so I think I would propose that, if we could take the language that U.K. took and, in fact, make that not part of 16 but make that as a stand-alone bullet in the similar way that we have a bullet on IGF, because I think that we do need to be explicit about the fact that in its review process of the WSIS, the CSTD should give special consideration to the level of implementation of enhanced cooperation.

And that should be part -- like, very explicitly spelled out that it is a clear limit of the review process. And I think that would perhaps need to be a stand-alone bullet rather than included in the 16. Thank you. But that's the proposal. I'm open to discussion on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So yes, after the U.K., I'll just open another bracket and say Canada proposes that this out -- language be a stand-alone paragraph. Yeah. Thank you.

Are there any other views in regard to proposals contained in paragraph 16? I see none.

So I -- well, we have finished our first reading. So it's 5 -- almost 5:40 on the second day. So I think it's not too -- there's not too much optimism with regard to the rest of the work we have yet to do.

So, at this point in time, I'd like to, again, come back to the proposal I had made that we could break for 10-15 minutes most and then come back. And I would encourage you and invite you, urge you to make an additional effort that we could stay as much as we can. We can be in the room until 8:00 p.m. I think we should make an effort in that regard. I think at this point we could not look at this exercise through a business as usual because we are at the very last minutes of our work. It would be, I think, very frustrating for all of us if we -- maybe some additional work could be done that could lead us to some outcome. Otherwise, I am in your hands. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Just could you please ask the secretariat to circulate the last version in the break time? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, certainly that will be done. And anyway we'll have on screen the text. But I think it's useful to have the full compilation text.

So with this then I will suggest we break for 15 minutes. And we'll be back in the room at -- five to 6:00. 6:00. 6:00 p.m. So we'll allow ourselves time to get -- we can be right back here at 6:00 p.m. Thank you.

[Coffee break.]

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, colleagues, I would invite you to resume our meeting. May I kindly ask you to take your seat so we can start?

Well, I should start by thanking you for accepting to extend a little bit our work today. I think this time that we took for a break was very important for us to reflect and to have some -- maybe some informal discussion on some aspects of our work.

So the one thing I'd like to do now -- I'd like to very briefly to work through the text with you very quickly. And I would like, by doing so, to express what I see from the Chair, what are the main points that need to be, let's say, from which I'll need to have guidance from you in regard on how this should be reflected in the report.

I'm saying this because, as I looked into the result of our first reading, it was clear to me that in some cases in a number of paragraphs there were issues that are important. There are some opinions that are not totally in coincidence. But I feel confident that I could try to arrange this through and to come up with some proposal for you. I don't think that we'll have time to discuss each and every remaining difference if we follow -- if we take the same approach we have been taking, certainly we'll not have time for that to discuss extensively each and every paragraph.

So I -- my idea of the way forward is to, as we go through the text, maybe to identify some areas or some paragraphs in which the positions were clear. There are some differences. And then I can try to come up with some revised text. But, in regard to some main sticking points in which there are still very wide differences I would need guidance from the group on how to proceed.

And for that purpose, I would -- when it comes to this, I'll make a proposal on the procedure to do that.

So for the moment, I would just ask the secretariat please to walk us through the text. So I think you have also on your devices -- the first paragraph I would -- the experience we had in discussing it, I think we should leave it to the end and adjust it accordingly when we have the rest of the text. So let's just jump this paragraph. We know there are a number of issues that were raised, and they are all reflected on paper. As we go through the introduction part, first paragraph, there was no difficulty, no particular concerns. Same applies to the second paragraph.

Third, fourth, 5 and 6.

Paragraph 6 is one example of what I mean by a paragraph in which the group has not yet agreed on unified formulation. But I think I could, in the light of the comments that were made, in light of concerns that were expressed to -- and in the light of the report of the meeting itself, transcript, and so on and so forth, to come up and propose to you language that could be accepted. So I would suggest we should not lose that time for the moment with 6.

7, there was no particular concern.

8, of course, refers to the result of that -- of our fifth meetings of today. So it's not something we'll be addressing now.

Paragraph 9 -- I will give the floor to anyone who wishes to make general comments after I finish. But I would like, please, if you like, let me to finish the presentation. And then I'll receive any comments you may have.

Paragraph 9 also refers to -- also there is not yet full agreement, but I would feel that the third important point but one I could try to come up with some formulation of that.

Paragraph 10 is the same thing.

Paragraph 11 has some concerns, but I wouldn't say these should deserve our particular attention at this point in time.

12 and 13 -- 12, there's no particular concern.

13, again.

And then that leads me to 14, 15, and 16. I think those -- that's first set of paragraphs is a first set that I would like to draw your attention. And I'd like to propose that we could get some effort in trying to figure out how to further address that topic. That refers to how to address proposals, how to reflect on the report, the proposals that were controversial, that -- around which there was no consensus. That refers to the proposal to establish Annex II or rather to adopt some kind of "some said this, some said that."

So I think 14, 15, and 16 deserve certainly some very focused and I would say discussion to allow us and particularly myself, in case I'm coming with a revised proposal to come up with some revised formulation.

Moving to the recommendations part, I would say although 1 and 2 -- so the recommendations paragraph 1 and 2 are certainly very important and refer to (indiscernible) principles, element that should be there, but I would say they are not, at this point, the main sticking point. I think I feel confident that this could fall into place as we can go along. Paragraph 3 is -- also has its difficulties. However, I think it's -- could be addressed by being the light of the comments you made. So at least with 3bis, 3bis the rationale for the Russian proposal I think should be -- is part of the discussion on how we want to address the controversial aspects and those proposals that have not had full consensus. So I would highlight 3bis as well that needs to be further discussed on a priority basis.

Recommendation 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 are also very important. Of course, I'm not diminishing the importance of the differences that remain in those paragraphs but I would say that the -- in terms of the prioritization of the group, those would not, at least from my view, deserve that treatment. But when we turn to 14, 15, and 16, then I think we need to have some more, I would say, discussion on that in order to -- to -- for us to be able to assess whether there will be consensus in the room to address those issues. And I'm not saying to solve the issues, but to address the issues in the context of the report. So basically to summarize, I think there is a set of paragraphs that refer to proposals that did not lead to consensus and how they would be addressed in the report and that refers to the introduction part, the three last paragraphs plus the proposal by Russian 3bis. And then in the recommendations section we have the three last paragraphs that basically refer to follow-up, if there is to be some recommendation coming from the group in regard to follow-up or in regard to the work we have been doing.

So my proposal for you would be for us to focus on those sets of paragraphs because I feel that by the end of the morning tomorrow we need to have some idea on whether we can make an attempt to have -- to have before us for the afternoon session maybe a clean or most clean version we can, version of a report that can be then considered on a final basis. We can have the afternoon for that. Again, some of those paragraphs I can try to come up with some revised formulation on the basis of the discussions you had, but in regard to how to address controversial proposals, how to effect them in the report, and also in regard to follow-up, I need to have certainly a very clear guidance from you in order at least to try to prepare some text you can see in its entirety in the afternoon, to see whether that could be acceptable or not. I think that would be our final attempt to come up with a report.

To did that, in order to do that, in order to be able to examine those two sets of paragraphs, my proposal would be, because to change a little bit the way we have been operating, we had from our first meeting, I heard from you there was a very strong preference in working plenary. However, I think at this point, to address those two particular sets of questions, my suggestion would be that in between now and 8:00 p.m. we could work in a more informal setting which would -- I think maybe the rigidity of this -- the rules we have to follow we lose some time sometimes in regard to direct interaction. I think we need some more direct interaction to try -- try to see if there is a way out in regard to those two issues. So my proposal would be for us to move into another room the secretariat has prepared for us. I would, of course, invite all those who are interested to be there to work in that forum, particularly those who have been intervening frequently on the issues. I don't want to mention. I think it's more or less obvious who are the -- the actors that have been expressing very strong interest in regard to some issues. So I would like to make that proposal to receive, of course, your reaction to that. But my

proposal now is to move, to stop the meeting in plenary at this moment, to move into this informal setting in a place the secretariat has prepared for us, and then there we would address specifically those two sets of issues. In the light of what is in those paragraphs I have highlighted what -- is there some possibility we can try to envision some way out in regard to how to address it in the report or not. And then I think that might assist us when we resume work tomorrow, to have a better idea on how we can get and blissfully we can complete our work. So this is my proposal for you. I would like to have your views. Otherwise, I would suggest that we -- we can move to the room. It would be room 1058, 60 -- I think it's just behind here on the way to the cafeteria. It's one of the rooms there. Not as large as this room, of course, but I would invite those who are interested to come and to -- and to -- I think this is -- I think we need that kind of ambiance that is provided by the room. You can sit in one single table and have more interactive discussions. I fear that the format it is, of course, very inclusive, but I fear at this point we may need that kind of more direct interaction, which, of course, would go -- come back to the plenary at some point. So it's just some attempt to try to -- to catalyze some more discussion on those two crucial issues, because I think those are issues that have permeated the discussion since the beginning. It's not clear to the Chair on how -- whether -- if and whether it's possible to come to some consensus way of looking at how things could be addressed and I'd like to offer us this opportunity to try to do it in that format. Could that be accepted? U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I'm just trying to understand the process. So the plan would be to break this meeting, have informal discussions as a group to try to work on those issues while you'll be available. What's the room over here? What was the room over here?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, thank you for the question. No, no, the idea is not for the group to meet but it will be for this group or a smaller set of this group to move into the room. I will facilitate the discussions there and we'll try to address those two sets of questions. But it would be one single meeting to address that. Yes, Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I'm not -- I'm not yes or no either way. I have a few questions. For one, we have remote participants on with us. They've been very quiet so far today, but they're here. So what happens to them when we're in the other room? Will the other room have transcription or is that the idea that we do not have transcription? So I -- you know, I think that transcription has been a very valuable tool for us so far and I -- I would regret having some discussions without it so that in future we can keep referring to what was said, understand the views of other people much better if we have it in transcribed format.

And a third thing is, if we all want to go in the room, then we're not going to be solving anything. So I would be just curious maybe if you do a quick survey, a show of hands, who would want to go in the room to discuss, and if we all raise our hand, then I'm not sure that it's -- it's feasible. I'm -- these are legitimate questions in terms of our process. I have no view, firm view one way or the other. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. In relation to the first questions, the answer is no, there will be no transcription and there will be no remote participation. I think that would be, let's say, one kind of

discussion that would try to facilitate the discussion plenary but even the nature of what is intended is -- would be -- and technically I think it's not possible to have that kind of resource there. And in regard to the size of the room, I turn to the secretariat. I'm not sure how many would like to come. Maybe all of us would want to be there. That might be a problem. I'm not sure how we could solve that. But that was what I thought would be useful. So I do not have the exact answer for the third question. I think that would depend. I do not want to say someone should be there because I think everybody has the same let's say legitimate interest to be there. However, I think that might raise an issue, as you have said. Turkey.

>>TURKEY: Thank you, Chair. I have a question also. You have said that we're going to an informal meeting and at some point we may like to come back to the plenary. Personally I would like to follow plenary but I won't be able to join informal meeting because I'm very sick. So I want you to leave the room with confidence. I have to be sure that there will be no plenary this night. So can we make it clear? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: In case my proposal is accepted by you, yes, there will be -- we will not be coming back to plenary. The outcome of the discussion, anything that could be, would be reported tomorrow at the beginning of the meeting, in the morning session. And we will decide there will be a plenary discussion on its outcome. But no, there will be -- in that case, in case we can move into that informal setting, there will be no further plenary tonight. We would resume the plenary formally tomorrow.

Maybe I can follow up on what I have proposed. Yes, and maybe have some kind of indication of who could -- or would be prepared to go into this kind of informal setting. Can I have a feel of the room, whether everyone would -- can I have a show of hands maybe of who would be there so we can ...

Yeah, I think that number of people could be accommodated there. I'm not sure. Secretariat maybe can speak to that more than us.

>>ANGEL GONZALEZ: I'm not sure myself of how many chairs we have there, but it would be practically full. The room would be practically full. I think it's between 15 and 20-something.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: I kind of hate making proposals when people are restless, but I don't know if it would be necessary to move rooms. I mean, if we're breaking the plenary and everybody wants to participate. I don't have a problem moving into a less formal setting to discuss some of this and maybe there's a group working and people having conversations. I think that's very useful, and I think it could be helpful. What am I doing in here, so it's fully transparent, anybody can participate. We have this room available, so maybe that's an option, but it's just a thought. It's -- logistically it's hard to move to another room.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, building on that, maybe since you have identified different blocks that need attention, maybe we could just create parallel groups to look at those different blocks and then come back together with the results of the smaller groups.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Just to -- I don't agree with Richard's proposal because I think the major issue or issues now which are controversial are connected in this single set kind of a thing. I don't see it being cut into three or four issues and now groups being formed and then coming together. I'm happy to do the informal setting the way the Chair decides here, outside, the whole group becoming a little informal by cutting out the transcript, whatever. But I'm really concerned we're taking too much time to make the decision. We should quickly do that and start on with the work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: U.K., you want to take the floor again on this. Yes, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: First time I'm taking the floor on this, Chair. We support your proposal, provided it's on the understanding that anything which comes from the small group needs to come back to the plenary and plenary can discuss it and change it if it wants to. But we think this is the right way to go forward now. And we also think it might be a good idea to move to a different room and try to create a different dynamic. And we hope that there will be a small number of people in the small group because we spent two days now sharing one another's positions. I feel like I understand my colleagues' positions extremely well, having listened not only the last two days but over the last 18 months. And if we are going to have a report then we need some space to show flexibility, to try out different ideas in a more informal setting. And I hope we will have a report. I don't know if we will. And I hope we are all able to find the flexibility to bring our different positions together into something that we can all agree. I think as you've outlined there may be four or five issues which we need to address, and they are linked, as Parminder says. And I think having a bit of space to get together in a smaller setting and more informal setting where we can try out different ideas, explore one another's proposals, would be very, very helpful at this stage, so we support your proposal.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Chairman, of course, we are in your hands and we will support whatever decision you take, but we want to make clear one thing, that any solution that implies that any diverging views -- because I'm reading here (indiscernible) in 65, that we have to take into account all the diverse view. Any solution that implies to mute a diverse view, no matter which delegate here is defending that, will be unacceptable. We could not impose on somebody else's views. If we don't get to a common view, then those diverse views will have to be reflected, and I'm not talking in Annex. I'm talking in the report itself because you know Annex are not being read.

So having said that, I'm happy to go to you to the up floor, to the (indiscernible) to any place. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So having heard you, I'd like to -- and I fully respect all the views expressed. What I'd like to proposal is to make an attempt to work in that format. I'd like to be very clear about one thing, it's not -- there is no -- should not be interpreted as lack of transparency, of inclusiveness. It's just an attempt to inject some more dynamics into this discussion. Because having gone through this, this is our fifth meeting on the second last day, I fear that the approach we have taken has been very, I think, informative for all of us, but at this point in time certainly if we try to finalize the work we have before us following the same pattern, clearly there will be no time for that. So that's basically what I'm proposing. So I would invite you, those that are interested, to join me now so break the plenary meeting now and we move into room 1058. And meanwhile, the secretariat is just checking whether there -- if there is a problem of space there, if we could move to some other room.

>> This one is ready to work all night but the other one will not because it's the lighting and all this is automatic.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So let's try to do it in room 1058. I thank you for that. I'll meet you there.

We had a problem in the room. Unexpectedly, the room was booked for the full day. I wasn't told by the secretariat. But you're right it's being cleaned. So my suggestion is to have that informal session we agreed here. I would advise colleagues to sit around this table. I'll be here and try to facilitate discussions. I think that might be as informal as possible. But not in this more cozy room. I think that can address the issue of how to accommodate the number of people that will be interested. So I would invite for you to come as close as possible so we can start.

So let's get started. I'd like to stop at 8:00. Thank you very much for staying that extra hour. As I have said, I'd like to focus discussion -- this informal -- around two sets of paragraphs.

First of all, paragraphs 14, 15, and 16 of the introduction part.

And, since we are in this room, maybe we can have those on screen. Because I think that would facilitate -- or otherwise we'll have to look in your computers.

But, basically, in here we are -- I think the main one of the main issues or maybe the most important issue that has been up in discussions is how to address in the report the recommendations that could not -- around which there was no consensus. We have been working since the beginning in the context in which, although they are different views and approaches and different participants emphasize different aspects of the mandate, there was a very clear guidance I received to favor a report that would focus on recommendations that could be accepted by consensus.

I think, when our mandate refers on the group to develop recommendations, it certainly expects recommendations embraced by the group as a whole. So this is the focus of our report. And, wishfully, we will be able to provide some recommendation in that regard that can be embraced by the whole group. And this, indeed, will further assist in the implementation of enhanced cooperation efforts. However, that leaves us with the topic on how to address proposals that did not lead to consensus.

Particularly among these, I would highlight the importance of proposals that related to new institutional framework or mechanism.

So the proposal from the Chair -- and we have gone through this paper. And we see different comments -- is that those should be referenced in the report, in those three paragraphs.

First of all, we recognize the fact that not all proposals led to actual recommendations embraced by the whole group. Then that was my proposal to indicate that those appear nonetheless in an annex so they can be recuperated by anyone who would be reading the report. Nothing would be lost in regard to proposals that were made. And my suggestion in recognition of the fact that the specific issue of this institutional framework deserves so much attention is to provide also a paragraph highlighting that importance but also indicating that those proposals -- that set of proposals are also contained in Annex II. And there was a discussion whether it should be clustered, whether we need some additional organization of the recommendations. But, basically, this is the approach I have taken.

If I can recall from the discussion, there is some degree of acceptance to that, although some parties insist that the report should not be restricted to the consensus recommendation -- recommendation that you not lead to consensus. So my intent here in this -- let's say more informal format, I would maybe just organize discussion try to make sure all interventions are taken on board. But I would invite comments, maybe not attach it to the actual language. I don't want us to address language. My suggestion, basically, is to have them contained in Annex I. There are different views. And I'd like to have an assessment whether there can be some common ground in regard to how we can do it.

Anyone wishes to start? I can maybe look -- but look -- yes, Cuba.

>>CUBA: Just very fast. As I said before, I don't believe that the solution is in an annex. It has to be the main body of the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, U.S. Yes, yes. I think that's --

>>UNITED STATES: When we say it should be embodied --

(Speaker off microphone).

>> PARMINDER SINGH: We cannot be in generalities. Not specifically. So not the whole gamut of things which were agreed or not agreed. Somebody said net neutrality. Somebody said private investment. We're not talking about that part. We're talking, if you remember during the process, there was a time in which the process got into institutional processes being bunched into a few groups. We did that I think in the last meeting. So we are talking about the WGIG model, which also kept on coming throughout our discussions in last two or three meetings.

We're talking about two boxes on what the two different views are on the studies of enhanced cooperation. What you will understand is that there is no need for new mechanisms. Mechanisms are currently working well. And this needs to be done. And there's another view which says we need a new mechanism. And these are some of the outlines of those mechanisms.

So these are two divergent views about what precisely would be or could be a mechanism. So we're just talking about that divergence being captured as the WGIG -- original WGIG captured in two boxes. The rest can be commented on the rest of the report.

(Speaker off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Again, if I can repeat the question to Parminder -- because I understood from his statement that, when we are addressing this issue of how to deal with proposals that do not lead to recommendations, that particular concern related to new institutional mechanism.

So, in your view, at least in your view, the other proposal that did not lead to consensus could go into an annex. So that's for clarity. That's what I understood.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Okay. So, yes, at least we agree that one step, as Chair clarified, this is about institution proposals. We can talk about the width, which you are saying. But it's not about all kinds of differences of views. We just narrow it down right now a discussion that this is about institutional processes as we understand what institutions and the mechanisms are. Not to answer what Justin was saying, there were not two. There were more. And there were shades of it. Yes, that's our task. I'm happy to make it four. But clarity comes, if we can have one, which is new mechanisms, other existing mechanisms, and there's a proposal of improvements. Or it could even be -- it cannot be 18. But three, four -- I'm fine with that.

Because that gives anybody who's reading our report -- it's like the quantum theory. You're at stage quantum 1, 2, 3, 4. So you have specific -- or you can apply your mind that these are the kind of things which can be done. If you just write a narrative, it does not cohere in people's mind in the same manner. My proposal is it can be four. It can be two. I thought there were two or three. And it's about institutional mechanisms, as the Chair has clarified.

Other differences -- it's my view and I think there's some other people who share it. Of course, not all differences can be within the report. The public/private investment difference is not going to be inside the report. Net neutrality or something else. No. These differences can go into there next. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this. You do not agree? Do you want to intervene? No? Because I just wanted to make sure that those who -- as Parminder and you have associated with Parminder and Saudi Arabia, that for you the most important thing to be highlighted -- I think the body of the report would be -- the other proposals would be -- that's what I was clarifying. Yes, okay. We're on the same -- that's -- okay. I think that's good to have clarity on that. Yes.

Yes, please.

>> So just a question for clarification. That would include there would be a box or set of boxes on institutional mechanisms that would include the position that there is no need for additional as well as --

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Sorry. One box could and I think should clarify that there is no institutional mechanisms. And I think proponents would explain that existing mechanisms are working, and this could be done. Whatever to make a cogent statement of that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, please. Justin.

>>UNITED STATES: Just one more question. Why boxes? We've done a lot of these reports. I'm just asking why -- why, when we all deal on the basis of written words, of paragraphs. I'm just asking because -- I really do want to understand.

I think that's why we're doing this tonight.

What's this notion of a box or something? And how would that be different than a paragraph which we've been negotiating for the last two days.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Boxes tend to -- that's what the WGIG report -- boxes tend to show that they're exclusive. Paragraphs, in the individual manner in which we read things, they don't look -- and we can write text that this is exclusive. But boxes means, basically, when you box something, it looks like okay. Box A, box B. This is -- the WGIG boxes. You can show it to Justin. Those boxes make it exclusive options not together. Just a visual thing.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. Thank you. Let me just comment here that, when I made my proposal, I did not take on board -- I took that on board on my first proposal suggesting that that box could go as Annex III. But, among the reactions I had, this was very clear expression of concern because we all have on the one side of the box a very well-developed proposal regarding the creation of new mechanisms. But, on the other side, since those who oppose the mechanism did not have time to engage in the same kind of development, it would seem unbalanced. So there is one of the issues why I tried to avoid that in my second reading. Because I think that would bring to the plenary that kind of discussion.

So I'm just to say that, independently of whether it would be a box or a paragraph, there might be that issue on how to balance the two views in case this would be in the report.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: If I can briefly -- we don't have a problem. If it is written to address your concern that this box is well-formed and another box is not too well-formed yet. One is they could well form the box. I could see great ideas to put into a box, which belongs to the idea of no new institutional mechanism. But we're fine. If we write on the top of a single box that, while we are doing institutional mechanism, the following box contains views which were agreed by many members but not all members who did not agree to new mechanisms and then be a single box, if that just deals with the question of there not being good material in the next box.

So we're fine with clarifying on the top that material contained in the box was presented and supported by some people but not agreed by one people. So single box will do that since clarifying, this is not everybody's view. But we just are happy to give other boxes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Marilyn. Marilyn Cade asked for the floor. Just keep the order. Marilyn, and then I'll come back to you. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. I want to -- I'm going to ignore right now voting for boxes or paragraphs and just make a -- make a comment. I do think that some kind of structure, and that's I think what the use of boxes sometimes does. The use of structure which delineates something can be helpful. Where it goes is a different question.

My point, however, is I really want to reiterate that I think there are at least three views, maybe four, but at least three. There's the idea of no new mechanisms are needed, new mechanisms of some kind, and I think we've heard even different examples of different new mechanisms, and a view that enhancements to existing mechanisms would be a path forward. So regardless of how we structure it, I think to me that -- and I made that point earlier, that these three different views have to be in some way described. Again, I'm not making a comment about where the detailed description goes, but I do think I see at least those three.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Marilyn. But maybe I'm wrong, but I tend to think that enhancement to existing mechanism is not incompatible with new mechanism, either/or, because you can support a new mechanism and be in favor of strengthening the existing ones or you can think you don't need anything and also be in favor of strengthening. So it's not, I think, an alternative. Juan, yes, I'll give the floor to you, Juan. Yes, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: The microphone. Yes, I think that what Marilyn suggested, I think it's very good because the main objective of our report, it has to be clarity. And not only clarity in explaining to others, but clarity about the views within the group. So if she feels that there's a third variation, those that it's been proven of existing, nobody here should tell her no. That's a valid position, so I think that that's the principle. To respect other's opinion. Of course, if there's 15 opinions, then we will try to merge some opinions in order to get as few as we can. But three is okay. Even four is okay. And another thing, I'm not agree with what Parminder said of only one box or the other main text. Because the other thing is that all these opinions or views should be treated equally and there could be some implication some is in the box and the other is in the main text. Which one is the main and the other is the alternative. No. We have to treat them all equally because all have value for those who propose it.

And as Parminder says, I don't think there will be any lack of content arguing in favor of all those. I think that even myself can write for the other camp of the reasons of why because as Paul Blaker said, we've been 18 months here listening to the other opinion and I -- I think I know more of his opinion than he does. You know, what I mean. So maybe we can write about that. So I think we should try to have a balance. I think it's good what you say to have balance in the boxes. Not one with many words and the other one. But that is achievable in a few hours.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. But let me just try one thing. I think we can hear any proposal from anyone that deserves respect to be addressed, but I think we have to use our collective wisdom to refine the ideas. And if there is an idea that has some inconsistency, for example, they should not be allowed in the text just because it was proposed by someone. What I'm saying here is that I see the

need for someone said need for new mechanism and those who defend no new mechanism as two very clear alternatives. When you say enhancement to existing mechanisms, it's not. Because you can be in favor of new mechanism and support enhancing of existing mechanism. You can be against new mechanism and so it's not an alternative. So that's what I'm saying. It's not out of lack of respect for anyone. This is something I have been making a point to follow all through this process. So let's keep on. I think it's very helpful that we are having that kind of discussion. Lea, I think you had asked for the floor, and then Russian Federation and then Egypt.

>>LEA KASPAR: Yes, thank you. Just practically I just want to note something I see might be a challenge in this approach. Maybe we can come up with a solution. But what we're really talking about here, if we're trying to impose some sort of new structure onto existing material, this will inevitably lead to interpretation, right? Which to me means potentially original content. If you're trying to impose a new structure (indiscernible) we've already had the discussion, I think that creates an issue for those of us who -- or for everyone who didn't engage in the discussion from the beginning thinking that that would be the outcome. And I think the also poses challenges, and I might be wrong, but I think when we get to it and if you just try thinking about what you would have potentially in those categories, I don't know if it's feasible to organize what we have so far in a neatly -- in a neat way that everyone would be satisfied with. I would be really interested to hear how that would work. I can see issues and kind of a potential challenge in doing that, if we say that we want to treat all proposals equally. Because this will inevitably lead to some sort of grouping. So you would have to come up with what those groups are, and that is inevitably original or new or interpretive text. So that's -- can I finish?

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah.

>> (Off microphone).

>> Don't cut people off. Juan, let her finish, please.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CUBA: We're talking informally here. You know, first, everybody -- this is informal, so clearly you say are you willing to try or not? And are you willing to try, let's -- the people who defend one of the position to write the arguments and what for them. I'm sure that the people who defends one of the position are very capable to write the real reasons why they're having that idea. They write it and then write it and then maybe the chairman with the drafting committee will value if some is too extensive and other is too extensive, try to put some balance. But if we don't begin to try, I think that the first thing Lea, I'm going to ask you, are you willing to try or not? Say it. Explain that. Willing to try or not?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. Let me just say one thing. I invited you to come to this meeting for a very focused idea. I wanted to have a discussion, very focused discussion on how the different participants view how the proposal that did not reach consensus could be addressed in the report. I think we had initially some very interesting discussion brought by Parminder, the U.S., and others that

led us to think that maybe for some it's like a red line if there is not such a box or -- so it's very -- so -- but I will -- I feel that the discussion is -- is in a way moving away from that and we are bringing the -- so I'd like to bring us to that point. What -- is there a way that we can propose here or to discuss informally among us that could help to bridge the differences among those who don't want anything controversial to appear on the text, that want it in Annex II or otherwise. So I'd like to maybe your comments be focused on that. Because otherwise we'll be touching with different aspects and the discussion will go on forever. Yes, Russian.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. First of all, we think we all understand that we are here to avoid the situation with no report. And so when it's difficult -- it is difficult but it's always difficult if we're in difficult situation. So we need to find the way out. And, you know, the proposed way out, we think, are reachable and applicable. And we think that according to our view, as we said from the very -- very beginning, the resolution should be reflected and the proposed box idea is good. Why? Because it can address it clearly on the question. Not on the whole number of the parameters and characteristic. It's can be applicable for only one question. So if we have the diversity on the question of the role of the government and implementation of its role, then we have the -- the box explicitly for this one. Then it's easy to read the other one. You know, we have, you know, consensus in here, in here, but we have diversity here. It will be achievable for us, I think, achievable. Because it will create some balance.

When it comes to what Marilyn said, the three views, absolutely. Actually following the whole discussion I would always say that we do not have two views, we have three views. So it's even better, you know, to -- if we -- really to present three views, because three is more stable usually.

[Laughter]

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Egypt.

>>EGYPT: Thanks, Chairman. I think from the way you have described how we can move forward I just got alerted to something and I -- in this informal setting very clearly. We don't want to force us into boxes that I have to subscribe to this view or this view. Because obviously there are -- there are a number of views. Some of us recognize the same problems but we have different visions of how to go about these problems. So I hope in whatever way we decide that we put this in the input, that it's not actually a reflection of two views. Now definitely it's not. Maybe three, maybe more. But I don't want to be forced to subscribe to one view or another. Let there be some space for other views as well.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi, you want to --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. I think as it was mentioned by Russia, we're facing a difficult situation now. If we want to rebuild the solution, we have boxes to where all views should be respected and reflected (indiscernible). We think that there is no more than three options, or three boxes. So we look forward -- I mean, this is the first meeting that we know all views and what approaches others are

looking for. So we didn't think it is a difficult task for us to set up the boxes and include it in your report, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Well, I won't repeat all the arguments about why our report needs to be a consensus report because you've heard it before from me and from others and Juan knows it better than I know it myself. But I find this exchange helpful just to try to understand what's driving some of the points being made. And so really I only have a question, and that is, why? Why do you want boxes? I really don't think I've understood why you want boxes. I've heard the reference to WGIG, and that's been made before. WGIG was a preparatory process coming up with options for the WSIS to choose from. So we're in a very different situation. We've just finished a WSIS review. We're not having another process after this to choose options. So I'd like to know more about what -- what you see happening in the future with these boxes. Why are they -- why would they be in a report that was asked to make recommendations? Who would use them. And my feeling is that you're asking for these boxes because you -- you see them as kind of options for the General Assembly to choose from and give an impression that the working group agreed there was some options because the working group hasn't agreed there are some options. So I've -- I'd really appreciate just some more clarification. Why do you want the boxes? What are they for? Because I don't understand that. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, please Juan, Juan. No history at this point, please.

[Laughter]

Maybe I can just respond.

No, no, no. He's addressing a point that's supported by many participants. As a Chair, I think I could provide -- no, no, no, no. I will respond. I'll respond.

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, no. Juan was not ascribed. I have a list of people. I will speak to that, and I will give him the floor if he wants. The point is I think the need for a box -- I would say, interpreting what has been said, there's not a particular need for a box. There is on the part of those who defend the need to have reflected in the report at least listening to that part, the difference of approach be it through a box or through a paragraph with bullets or something else but to document their position. I do not have the answer for you how that would be implemented. I don't think we are at this stage of the work going to that part. We are providing some recommendations.

I take the point you made that we must make sure that anything that goes in the report is not interpreted as things that are being embraced by the whole group. I think this is something we agree

should differentiate, what is consensus, what is not consensus to be very explicit and to concentrate on the part because this is the response of the mandate we are given but at the same time documenting inappropriately.

Basically what we do here is try to see here how we are going to document that part of the discussion.

>>CUBA: I'm believing it's true that I'm understanding Paul even better than he because --

[Laughter]

-- his question was not about geometry. His question was why do we have to put in a report different opinions because he said. And I give that -- in the WGIG report, this was to a process that it was still ongoing of negotiation for a summit, that it made sense to put some options. That is not the case here. That's the essence of your question? Okay. So then now I will answer.

As a matter of fact, as I told you -- and many of you may know here Carlos Afonso, Anriette -- no, not Anriette, it was Karen, Karen. But we are members of WGIG. And this particular part that was the method, the institutional arrangement, I lead it with an U.K. person, David (saying name). And the boxes and the four options, it was not a design. It was like here because there was a moment and it was impossible to get to one opinion. And then when we realize that it was impossible to get to one opinion, we said, okay, let's try to get at the less number of different opinions as possible and to pass it on to the other part.

Here, Paul has a point that this is not a preparatory process behind ourself. But this is not the end of the discussion because we are not closing this issue. So we only stating the fact of what happened in this working group, and we will pick up in the CSTD. It will be picked up in ECOSOC. It will go to UNGA. And they will use it as they see fit. But what he said, it's totally valid because it's not the same situation. But the origin of both situations is the same, the impossibility to get only one opinion, union opinion.

[Multiple speakers]

>> PARMINDER SINGH: These are not options. He's right. These are opinions.

These are not options.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I have a list. Let me just tell you one thing. I thank Juan for this. But although it is an informal meeting, I have here a list of speakers and I would like to be respectful of all those who have request.

I am putting your name, Parminder, also here.

But if possible, I would like to maintain this. Because other wise it becomes difficult. Switzerland is next. Please, Jorge, you can go ahead.

And I urge all of us to please be as brief as possible I would not like to lose the momentum for discussion on these particular topics. Please.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you. I wasn't aware I was next on the list.

[Laughter]

I see so many tags, name plates there. So I didn't know the order.

I think the problem with the boxes approach, it doesn't really reflect how we worked during the last four meetings. We didn't try to distill but to converge on options or on possibilities on approaches. We discussed -- we discussed positions and recommendations and distilled those who -- which have consensus and those we discussed further and we tried to reach final consensus on some of them. And those are the ones we have on the numbered recommendations.

So we didn't really get into a discussion on, okay, let's discuss this possibility further and see the pros and the cons and the arguments against and in favor. We didn't do that and we can't do that now when we are just reflecting and documenting what we discussed in the prior meetings.

>> (off microphone)

>>SWITZERLAND: It's an approach that leads us to a street without an exit because it's not something we have been working on. We should -- we would need to make it up now this night and tomorrow and that's not what we are here to --

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I just, yes, comment here.

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, no, please. Please.

Juan, I'm putting you on the list.

>>SWITZERLAND: I don't have -- I don't have any issue with responding.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I --

>>SWITZERLAND: It's consistent.

-- just to finish. It's consistent with what we have been doing, which is to finalize the distillation of those recommendations where we have consensus.

>> There is no consensus.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think the point is very well made. I would like to make a comment here, and I would go on with the list.

I think what Jorge says, I think he reflects a view of those who opposed a new mechanism. In fact, we did not engage particularly in that kind of discussion. But to be fair to those who defend the

mechanism, they have been making a point from day one of this and they have developed -- made proposals to that. And as I have said in my previous -- in my first draft, that discussion has permeated the whole discussion. So it's not to say that the issue was not discussed or is not there. It was. And those who defend it made very clear their position. They got together at some point. They made a joint presentation. So I think it's a very well path of all the discussion, although it did not lead to consensus. But it was there -- I think in fairness, what took place, we could not say it was not part of the discussion. It was. And let me proceed.

Anriette, I have then U.S., European Union, Parminder, Juan, and Richard Hill.

So, Anriette, please.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Benedicto.

I really just want to reinforce the difference between a format that worked well for the output of a preparatory process and the format of a report which is intended to make recommendations to the General Assembly. So I like -- there is -- the box idea I like. It's a way of making the ideas accessible.

But then I think it should go into an annex because I think if we put that in the report, then the decision on what does the General Assembly decide, to discuss, or to focus on more opens up. And that could -- and, I mean, in a sense that could create new conflict. It could -- it could actually create a debate about the process of the WGEC itself.

And I think that would be helpful. I think using that format to reflect the different positions, putting it in an annex, I could live with that.

I don't think we can put it in the report because we're not feeding into a preparatory -- we're not a preparatory process. We are asked to make recommendations to the General Assembly.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thanks. So I think we've been consistent throughout that we really feel strongly that we should have a consensus report and that that should be the basis of our discussions.

But we've also tried to be, I think, very flexible on how you reference factual things that happen within this working group, right? We've discussed some. We've had meetings. There was proposals made that, you know, can be referenced. There's a transcript, so everything we talked about is a public record. So there's no willingness to hide a discussion that has happened in this room. And so I think that that's really important, and I think that offers us a lot of space to get to a "yes" on this issue.

But my problem with the boxes, and this kind of proposal, is I think it kind of changes where this discussion is going and where these -- a change and maybe a moving of the goalpost of previous conversations.

I agree with my Egyptian colleague down here, just because you don't agree with one view doesn't put you in another camp. It just means you didn't agree with that view.

>>CUBA: (off microphone).

>>UNITED STATES: My view is clear. We don't support that proposal that came forward, right? We don't support it. We don't. And it does raise, I think, a concern I would have in this box format on the "whys." We have had a lot of discussion on the "whys." We discussed the whys and the rationale behind things we agreed to in consensus but we don't include all the "whys" in those recommendations because that was for us to consider and then we put our proposal down there.

I think for the U.S -- and I don't want to get into a negative report. If we start articulating the "whys" of why we wouldn't support the proposal laid out there, it would include things like, you know, our fear is this will be used as a mechanism to restrict the participation of many stakeholders in this process as we've seen repeatedly.

I think we would fear that it would be used to restrict and not promote human rights, which we've seen in this context.

So I think that a lot of those rationales that we would want to include in here, in my mind, would take a report that right now reads positive. It provides a lot of good advice to the international community. And it would turn it into a negative discussion. And I just don't think that that's helpful or useful or is going to be in anybody's kind of -- beneficial to anybody moving forward. So...

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Benedicto.

I would try here to understand a little bit with this boxed approach what we want to achieve because my understanding so far with the process was that we would try to put every time the arguments in place for every single recommendation that we were discussing in all those meetings.

For me, it was not an exercise where the institutional mechanisms was like the holy grail that we were trying to no matter what go for or against that. Every time there was a proposal about the institutional mechanism, at least from our side, we were asking what, how, in what sense we were asking for clarifications. We were trying to see how constructively this could have a chance. And I think all this has been recorded so far.

So, still, I think even in our last discussion we were having a possibility to dig further into those proposals. And I don't believe that putting those in boxes one, two, three -- and I think those three boxes do not reflect what was discussed and the reasoning behind those attempts that were made by the participants are going to be reflected fairly in one, two, or three boxes, as Marilyn said.

I think for every single one, we had a contribution there and should be -- if we want to be fair to convey this work that we have done in four meetings, we should put it in its fairness back to the CSTD. That's how we see it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

(saying name), then I will give the floor to Parminder and Juan.

>> Thank you. Very briefly, my understanding of the process in para 14, there is the phrase that, "During the discussions held within the group, several areas of commonalities were identified." This is the gist of our work here for me, for us. I think that those commonalities will then be reflected in the recommendations.

And I'm still an optimist. I think that we will formulate recommendations at the end of our work. And we should perhaps mention that those commonalities are part and parcel of the recommendations. And all the rest should be identified as nonconsensual. Then, of course, we have no problem with that, describe a little bit what was not consensual. But the main part we have to achieve here is to formulate our commonalities.

So I would suggest that we do not lose too much time on that paragraph and that we make our work a little bit more focused on what is really a positive outcome, if there is any. My feeling is that we can reach a positive outcome, that we can reach consensual elements here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Parminder and Juan. Parminder first.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Thank you, everybody.

First of all, I was trying at that point to clarify to Paul that it's important that there is no mistaken belief among the people who reported these options and options are, I'm happy with A, B or C, whichever you do. Equally happy or almost equally happy. That's not how options were listed in WGIG. But they are not to be listed here.

They are clearly being said that people were not agreeing to any one of them. Therefore, people are agreeing to different ones. So these are not options. These are, as he said, opinions and they are clustered in a manner in which it makes easier for anybody who takes final decisions to be able to work on it.

And in that sense, working to a WSIS process and working to a GA decision-making is not very different. These are advisory bodies, and advisory bodies do this kind of thing, that, okay, I'm advisory to so and so and I have been asked to do assessment of economics and possible things.

I finally go and tell my minister that these three things are not -- knowing what your priorities are, but I have made the task easier for you and these are the two, three cogent ways, not like telling the whole map is open and you go where we want to. You clarify things.

Now, the problem was we could have boxes. But that's not how we function during the process. I remember advice very, very clearly -- and also other people -- I kept clarifying it any time that we can discuss other items. But for us institutional mechanism is what we had been asked to do. We don't want

to be viewed and not talk about other things. But everything depends on what we do here. This was prefaced almost every time I spoke and other people spoke. We can discuss private funding or

something. But all this is related to that X whether we agreed to institutional mechanism or not. So I don't think I'll be able to agree to anything outside mechanism if we do not agree to institutional mechanism in those boxes as options.

I'm really sorry to say there's no way there is going to be a report of issues that are not related to institutional mechanism without at least putting the options. And consensus looked for people looking outside institutional options. Yes, we are still ready to talk about other things, if at least you give us options. Because otherwise we would -- we are not ready to talk about enhanced cooperation in abstract because we don't think this exists. To say that properties X and Y should be here in enhanced cooperation is around conception because it makes it look like things are existing, it is against what we think. So no proposal can be agreed to until we actually address this issue.

There's only one sentence in our mandate to say how to further implement. How to further implement is a mechanism. How it -- like if I ask you tell me how to implement, you put some boxes and say do these things. We are very clear that the rest of the text is associated with institutional mechanism. And so that's why we're ready to do it like WGIG did. And we can make opinions. As long as there are one, two, three, four opinions, we are ready to talk about other text. There's no other text, no other main report. I'm very, very clear about it. It's not assessment. I know that there would not be a report without institutional mechanisms. So there's nothing to be agreed out. About the annexes, as I said earlier, annexes -- to put something in the annex is a right of any member of any committee who can get up and say I don't agree with what you're doing, my statement, Chair. I take it as a right. So annex is not a matter of negotiation here. Nobody is offering anything to anybody else by saying okay. We agree to put your views in annex. There's no agreement. Annex is right of members. So that comes tomorrow at 6:00. The discussion here is not annexes. The discussion is the body of the report. And institutional mechanisms are essential to have any other reference to enhanced cooperation for us. The word "enhanced cooperation" can only be used in any manner for us if at least options are done. And otherwise, therefore, logically I can see a report if you don't give those options. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA:Thank you, Parminder.

Juan. And I have Richard Hill, Saudi Arabia, UK, Lea. I'd like to take these speakers. But in a way we are repeating ourselves.

>> I'd like to have -- and that was the purpose to have an idea of what would be -- I'd like to focus on this. After hearing those people, I'd like to suggest from the Chair how we think -- but then I'd like to do one followed by the other.

>>CUBA: I'm reacting sitting at a table. I don't want to repeat. I'm not going to answer the option question because it was answered by Parminder. This is not options that are going to be in the boxes or the bullets or the paragraph. In the views in the mandate we received from the resolution 70/125 to take into account the diverse view.

Now I'm going to say something for people. Because maybe there's persons here, diplomats. And they really don't know the story of Internet and Internet governance.

Here the key thing, the key thing, the most important and I will say the only important thing in this group isn't institutional mechanism. It has been since more than 20 years when ICANN was created that's was the issue. But then it was separated. ICANN was the day-to-day -- remember this was in the Tunis Agenda. And maybe you don't understand why that mentioned. And not in the day-to-day Internet. Because that was already given to ICANN. And that -- and you know that the process to get the ICANN was complicated, was famous memoranda of understanding. The MOU of 1995. So that was lived there.

But it was still pending for more than 20 years. The problem of how to do the international public policies pertaining to the Internet. And this came to the first part of WSIS. They didn't agree. The WSIS -- the WGIG was created. And the most contentious was this. Boxes. And it came to Tunis. In Tunis it was not in agreement. It was going to collapse. The European Union invented this term -- very clever. A term that doesn't enhance cooperation in order to get a way out. And that's the story until now.

So I'm telling you, gentlemen, those who said that we have all the results in this document, that is totally not. That is water in the soup.

That it's only -- and I can tell you that we are all here diplomats, and we're negotiating since day one. There are many things that many delegates here don't like.

And we let it pass. We let it pass. We strike it or we subtract it, because that's the history of negotiation. You accommodate somebody else's views. And the rest accommodate your views. And that's what we are doing. But I repeat without mentioning -- that would really be a scandal that we have a document and not even mention institutional agreements, arrangement. And we're not saying that that's going to be part of recommendation because it's not a consensus.

Just simply, as you were proposing, Chair, in your different draft. That, regarding this point of institutional arrangement, there was no agreement. So there was opinion A, B, and C. And for those who say that there are so many opinions like that, I am not very keen on numerics. But maybe this is not binary. Maybe it's trinary. Because, as Marilyn said, it's an opinion. I think it's valuable to get variants of this.

But, if somebody feels like our colleague from Egypt that he's not with three variants already, please, be my guest. Propose your other box and other things. And we're happy to take it in. Because we have to respect all the opinions. Nobody in the country is big or small or is an NGO or a company. All opinions here have to be respected and have to be passed because that is our mandate. In our mandate we said we have to take into account all the diverse views of all the relevant stakeholders. This is our mandate, and we have to take it into consideration. And no annex. Because annex is burying behind paper in the main text.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I hope people appreciate I've been unusually quiet.

I have to say, Chairman, I'm really disappointed in the discussion. Because I've heard a lot of very well-formulated cogent and passionate defensive positions. But we already heard that. And we already knew that. I was hoping that people would come forward with concrete suggestions that would accommodate the other side.

And I did hear one, and I'd like to build on that.

Germany, I think -- I won't attribute it to Germany. But something Germany said gave me an idea.

Boxes is a little complicated. And I agree with Justin and others starting to put reasons. And it's complicated because we're going to put reasons for and reasons against. And we're never going to end. We don't have time to do that.

So I suggest a simpler solution. We have a session on agreed consensus recommendations. And then we open a new section, recommendations or whatever you want to call it, where there was not consensus. And then everybody can put in one paragraph on what they want. And put a line limit in so it can't go on and on. And, if it's too long, as in my case, I'm happy to put that in the annex or refer to the general annex with all the proposals. I don't care. And I think then you'd have maybe three to four to five paragraphs showing proposals that were made but that did not achieve consensus. And, if people could accept that, then that could be a way forward. Otherwise, I honestly don't see how we're going to get there.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think the problem with this would be that would be -- would have different sections in the text.

But would reflect different levels of precision by the group and development by the group.

So, if we take one section, just say recommendations that do not have consensus, anything can go there, even things that were not considered. And we'll have it for the outside public the same kind of status in regard to those to which you dedicated a lot of -- I'm not saying it's up to the group to consider. But I think that --

>>RICHARD HILL: You're going to shoot down my proposal right away, it's not going to go anywhere. So why don't we stop. No, really.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I have a proposal. If I can do my proposal, just to anticipate -- because there are a number of speakers. But I -- clearly having heard all of you all throughout these meetings and and here - - and we're going to hear yet some -- I'm convinced there's only one way out to address the issue in the introduction part, as I had proposed, to acknowledge that there were issues that were not -- did not lead to consensus, which was the ultimate objective of the group, that those proposals are being addressed. And they can be referred to with some resources we'll put into the text.

And then, in the light of what was discussed here, I think we should add a paragraph stating that for some people, the issue of institutional framework was so important that we -- and we can have one single paragraph of that. The compromise would be that this part, the institutional -- would not go into the recommendation part. We'd document in an appropriate way in which those who are in the support of the proposed new mechanism would feel satisfied because they see their paragraph documented, but not in the recommendation part, in the introductory part, in a way that is acceptable to them. And their recommendation would stick to what is consensus. And then I think that that is, I think, the possible compromise. Otherwise, I see we can go on for hours and hours. I don't see that we'll get out of this that discussion. Because I -- and I think that would indeed maintain the integrity of our group. We are focusing. And the core part are the recommendations that are agreed by consensus. But in the introductory part also that documents the process. We clearly and very -- let's say appropriately record that there were differences. The differences are in an annex. But that particular difference is highlighted. And those can come to a formulation that, if that can be agreed, I think that could be done, could be accepted.

That is my -- let's say my proposal. Otherwise, we might get nowhere.

I have a number of requests for the floor, I would like to follow the order. But I have Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, U.K., Lea, Iran, Parminder, Nigel. So let's try to be as quickly as we can. Russian, maybe if you can even react to what I said because I think this is -- maybe it is -- from my perspective that's the -- what I'm taking from this discussion and what I'm prepared to offer as the chair as a way out. Yes, Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I will try to be short. First, you know, in reaction to what (indiscernible) has said, we are here not in this late hour, not because of we have some similarity or camaraderie. We are here because we have diverse views in the main point of our mandate. This is the way we see this situation. We have three or two views, diverse views, on the main point of the mandate of the working group. That's why we think it should be reflected. And we're really disappointed by, you know, the started opening the question, whether we have consensus recommendation or not consensus recommendation because we have the discussion, and we don't see any wording in mandate that we're getting consensus, but we have the wording in the mandate, diverse views to be reflected. So we understand it like this, and we will stick to the mandate, from our point of view. That's why we will not accept the report without the diverse views on the main point of the main task of the mandate of the working group.

And our text is here. We already put it into the text in the drafting. So don't ask me what do you want to be reflected. It's already in there. So we put it. It's already inside the draft of the text, as the proposal of the Russian delegation. However, this text was not from the Russian delegation. It's from a contribution of a number of participants and member states and stakeholders. So we knew what -- what is the point of the discussion. We just need to understand where and how we can put it into -- into the -- in the main part of the report. And we are here discussing this point. Where we can put this wording. So, you know, how are we sufficient? We proposed -- a number of people proposed the box approach. We think it's fair, equal, and we -- we think it's useful. And if other want to say that no, we

don't like it, okay. But please propose something. Please propose alternative solution. Please propose something. Because what you propose, you know, will not give us the solution. Regarding what Chair said, well, we think that we cannot keep a recommendation like this, you know, because, you know, when we read this through, it's the majority of it, or mainly 100%. It's not about what's the -- what we think the -- the important element is missed here. Key element is missed here. The implementation of the role of the government. And the understanding of the role of the government in the enhanced cooperation. So we cannot just say that this is the -- the number of recommendations which is consensus. We should balance this somehow. We should balance, you know. Otherwise, you know --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: May I respectfully just respond to that because if you insist that in the recommendations part there should be something that clearly does not have consensus and we have the general sentiment that what should be there should be consensus, so you are saying you don't want the report because you are asking something that will not meet the agreement by the end of the day. So my proposal seeks to seek some compromise. To highlight the issue in an appropriate way in the report, to document it, but to stick to what has been developed throughout the process that we are trying to come to the consensus recommendations. Maybe we could prolong this, but to my understanding, if we are from day one trying to come to consensus recommendation at this moment to say no, I won't accept the recommendation part if it contains something that is not consensus, it's difficult.

>> (Off microphone).

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: You know, how I see your proposal, you know, the remaining part of recommendation will just address the point that we need to stress a multistakeholder model.

>> (Off microphone).

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes. This is, you know --

>> (Off microphone).

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: If we lose the balance, it's all about how to stress a multistakeholder model. But without -- without, you know, balance it with an intergovernmental mechanism, how can we -- it looks like we agree only to stress a multistakeholder model. And this is not the way we see it. You see?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I think -- I do not want to monopolize and abuse my position as chair, but I think it's important to understand because -- and to Russia because from my perspective and from the perspective of, if I can say also from a national position, we are, of course, in support of the unilateral approach but we are also firmly behind intergovernmental. So we don't think one thing should be -- they could go together and reinforce them.

So the proposals we don't see as only strengthening the multilateral approach. In some cases we are emphasizing the need for a multilateral input or for a multistakeholder input but in support of the process of enhanced cooperation that basically would be the relation among governments. So it's

interesting to see that maybe the -- the starting point from where you see different from -- Saudi Arabia would like to comment on this.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Well, it's a surprise that we hear now from either colleague that we have this question and how and why. I haven't heard a response. We gave detailed response during the previous meeting. We've submitted contribution reflecting our views. So as our recommendation have question on how and why, even the other recommendation have why and how. We've said how, this doesn't fit the mandate. So we don't see any consensus around any recommendation.

If you will split the recommendation into two categories, it's difficult to say this recommendation gained consensus and the other doesn't have consensus. So it should be a section, a recommendation section where all views are reflected. Otherwise, there is not a recommendation frankly.

[Laughter]

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, I'll go on with my list so we can exhaust the speakers and maybe you can -- I'll propose to wrap up and resume at some point tomorrow. Not at some point. At 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. I have U.K. followed by Lea, Iran, Parminder, Jimson, UNESCO. U.K., please, and U.S.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I think this conversation has been helpful to understand the points about consensus and boxes and stuff. I regret that it's getting quite late and we've only really tackled one issue, because I would also like to understand better colleagues' views of the recommendations. We've started talking a little bit about that. Because we are linked, I think, as Parminder said, but we haven't really talked about them yet. And during the last two days I've heard colleagues questioning the recommendations, rewriting them, editing them, and sometimes there are some genuine issues there around UNGA, CSTD, IGF. There's some issues that we need to work our way around. But there are others where, to be honest, I've asked myself, do they really object to that recommendation or are they only objecting because they want something else? And I don't know the answer to that question. So I would really like to use this opportunity to hear some views on the recommendations and try to get a better understanding of whether there are real objections to those recommendations and if so, which ones exactly because then we can focus on trying to work our way around them. As I say, at the moment I get the feeling we've been going round and round listening to objections which are not really priorities. And I'd like the opportunity to get more clarity from others on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think -- oh, I'm sorry.

[Laughter]

I'm getting tired. No, I think you are right and that has been expressed in the meetings, that there is -- and many times I recall the word "balance" was used and on many occasions, those who defend new mechanisms have said, we do not oppose those, we do not see any problem, but we need these to be

balanced with the notion that we need some -- some new things. So it's -- I think you're right. And I think that leads -- that reinforces my belief that we need some compromise because that's -- the balance requires some compromise. The compromise that would be consistent with the way we have been working my view would be the one I have just expressed, to refer the issue in the introductory party in a proper way in which would document very clearly the position and to be explicit that for some that issue is of paramount importance that -- and then we revert to recommendations. And I think maybe if we have -- wishfully if we have that kind of strong reference documenting the -- their position, that could be seen as the -- the condition for -- that was required from the beginning, the balance that would be required to accept recommendations. But I'm trying just interpreting in light of the discussion we have. I leave maybe for others to comment. I have Lea, I have Iran, Parminder who might speak to death, Jimson (indiscernible) and the U.S. So Lea. And Nigel.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you. So there are a number of conversations happening, but I'd like to specifically comment on the question of how we reflect diverging views in the report, because I think that that's the point you were, Chair, trying to address as well in your proposal specifically. And just to be clear, I wasn't objecting to reflecting the views in the report. I was just wondering about the format that was proposed with the boxes. I think there is a way to reflect that that might be more appropriate. I was earlier working with Anriette with some text that we've sent -- I think Anriette sent it to the group. I don't know if you had a chance to look at it, to do explicitly that. Our proposal was to replace, I think it was paragraph 16 or article 16 with the text, and there are two options. And the only -- I don't think now is the time to go through text. You said you didn't want to do that, but the point of that was to try to, to the best of our abilities reflect factually the divergent views and the range of the divergent views. And if we can do that, I think that would be excellent. So I'm happy to discuss the proposal either today or tomorrow when you have a chance to look at it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chairman, all the views as reflected in the text, including divergence and convergence, and the important matters, reflection of the divergence views, is not we'll called the boxes or bullets or sections. Important issues that consideration of the (indiscernible) procedure of the U.N. And everybody in the room are familiar with the U.N. system. We have many reports in the U.N. system. The reports come from the (indiscernible) system. It's include all the views, including divergence and convergence, in the main report. And when we're talking about the annex, I should say that annex is out of negotiations. And we should at least consider the procedure of the U.N. in preparation and drafting of our reports. We cannot go a different course in our negotiations. We have many reports in the U.N. system. Please look at these reports and we could easily to draft our reports without any divergence (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to respond to -- what I see is one major issue here. It seems that there is an impression that the two kinds of text, possible recommendation text. One which is agreeable, and the other is not agreeable and very divergent. It seems that some people who hold a

strong view among divergent views are trying to hold you agreeable part hostage to their desire to get one of the divergent views.

Humbly, I want to say that that's not the case. One also use the word do they really object? And the problem is for us, what is considered by many people as agreeable or agreed text contains references to enhanced cooperation, which reference, absent our opinion on what we think enhanced cooperation, is not only meaningless but gives the contrary impression of what we believe enhanced cooperation is. That is why for us they are linked, organically linked.

We cannot -- it is not hostage strategy. We cannot agree to them. Because, if we don't get this recommendation on, the whole narrative causes a certain epistemology around what is enhanced cooperation, which is the wrong impression. And we won't allow it to be done, because then it will be decided this has agreed to be enhanced cooperation.

So our problem is not -- we're not taking one as a hostage to the other.

The only way, therefore, we can accept is, that at the top of the recommendation or at the end of it, we say that on what are the actual mechanisms of enhanced cooperation. The other views -- and then there could be texts which is agreeable or agreed text. When, therefore, enhanced cooperation, we can always say we always meant as per our view as well. And others can say no. So, when we -- because any useful text has to reference to enhanced cooperation.

The text which contains about private sector investment is not really the -- sorry. Okay. That's not the real stuff. The real stuff is any text which actually referenced to enhanced cooperation should include more stakeholders.

All this text for us is meaningful only if it relates to our conception of enhanced cooperation. Separately it's -- I'm repeating myself -- for us not meaningless. It's contrary to what our conception of enhanced cooperation is. And that's the concise reason we cannot allow it to go. Because in allowing it to go, we accept some enhanced cooperation that many people will not be able to report back to their capitals. And I'll not be able to report back to my constituencies. That's the linkage. And I wanted to relate that.

Chair's for me compromise is not clear how exhaustive it would be. For us the clarity of our model is important. And we -- because we want our model to be very clear, we know that it looks very lopsided, that if we put our model very clear, other guys haven't had equality of space. And that's why we're saying okay, you guys -- whether it's the thing which Jim has proposed or no institutional mechanism, we want to give them space. Just giving our paragraph for us would look like disbalanced. And you'd try to reduce the paragraph. And we'll not allow it to be reduced because we want our minimum stuff in.

We're happy to have that. But that's why we want other people to have the space. We want all the text which we put in the last proposal as a common thing to be there together. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Just maybe to clarify, I do not have a text for this paragraph. I'm saying that is needed. I think this paragraph should be developed and accepted by everyone as reflecting that would address but at the same time be accepted. So I'm not there to propose it as of now.

May I just say one thing regard to -- I think you made very clear to see there would be a contradiction in adopting recommendations in absence of new mechanism.

The problem with that is I think those recommendations are -- they have -- they address the situation. The situation that is recognized by WSIS+10 that process towards enhanced cooperation is going on. So those recommendations address to what is going on. And do those address in the future would those -- I do not see that the failure of those recommendations would be linked to the creation of a new mechanism that, if no new mechanism is created, that they do not have available themselves. That's maybe an inconsistency I see in your -- I'm sorry to say. But, yes, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: I completely understand. And I understand, in all honesty, you are seeing it like that.

But the way we see it -- and since Tunis onwards, whenever developing countries agreed to any description of enhanced cooperation, they were agreeing it when the dialogue of enhanced cooperation was continuing. And the fact that something more has to be done was there. They were linked. Because, for us, if you remove that and if you start reading that recommendation in isolation after one year or after six months, that looks like we are addressing an existing cosmology of institutions who are working in a certain manner. And we're talking about them. That's why I used a very difficult word. Epistemology.

You start talking about how public policy is taking place. And that's how the impression will go. And I'm very certain that's how it would go. And I understand I may be more paranoid than you, but that's my view.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. I have -- just to be fair -- and I thank you for also being very frank. But what I was trying to say is that, from my perspective, those recommendations are neutral from the perspective of the discussion whether it needs new or -- they are neutral, because they would apply to any -- okay. No, no, I think -- no, I thank you. Because it made me understand more clearly your point.

So, Jimson, I'm sorry to keep you waiting. Jimson followed by Mexico, U.S., and Nigel.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished chair and colleagues. I really want to commend everyone for the tenacity and the spirit you're bringing to bear on this.

It was very clear that we're going to achieve some results. The chair proposed something I see as a compromise solution in the reporting. And I think that has been factual. Because, if we truly disclose all these issues, you have to -- we need to find a way to reflect it --

Okay -- in the report somehow.

Now, this is what I have in mind. Kind of in tandem with what the Chair has proposed. That yes, you have the title. Yes, you have table of content. Executive summary, the introduction, views expressed. So under views expressed, we have a summary talking about a new mechanism or existing mechanism or [indiscernible] mechanism or basic top level bullet of discussions wherein we can say the details, full details, capturing maybe a paragraph or summary. The full details are provided in annex. Then after that, we move to recommendations. I think we've had a degree of consensus on some points. There's no doubt about that. Recommendation can then flow. And then we can have conclusion, which will be a brief summary again of rule setting.

So I think the structure is clear. And let's try this and respecting the facts. Let's try it. And I think it should work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much, Jimson. I think we are -- I think we've shared the same sentiment on how to address the issue. I thank you. I said we need maybe one paragraph, but maybe you need two or three. But that will -- it will be up to the group to develop if this approach is accepted.

Mexico and then U.S., Nigel. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I just want to support your proposal. I think I will have to make the difference between views and opinions and recommendations. I can say this is convenient, this is not convenient. But it cannot be taken like a recommendation.

So I think we have to be clear on that difference because otherwise we are confusing things.

I think this factual description you are proposing to us I think is fair. Because no one here in the room can deny we've had the discussion. There were different views. And these views can be reflected on the text but not as a recommendation. Because these are views, opinions, but not recommendations. Thank you.

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

>>UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Chair. I think there's been a lot of talk about the mandate of this group. And often it's very editorialized. Not all of us have been around as long as Juan and can talk about WGIG and Tunis and summits and all that.

But I think it's important to remember that the mandate from this working group did come from WSIS+10, which many of us who are in this room were sitting in the room.

And all of this discussion we're having, there was a discussion very similar at WSIS+10 around this issue, around new mechanisms, around progress. And the verdict, the outcome from that -- not to creating the work. [Indiscernible]

Also I think you've got what would be the implications of no report? Last time we had no report in 2014 from a very similar working group and WSIS+10 was the next year. And the verdict from UNGA was go

back and have another working group. And now we risk not having another report. And what's going to happen? My guess from those who really care about this issue is just it's going to be dropped for seven years. And we'll talk it at CSTD, but it really won't be raised in New York.

So for those who are really passionate about this issue and want to continue the process we've been making, I really encourage we need a degree of flexibility. Because we want to continue the conversations. We're trying to continue the conversation. But there are certain lines that are very difficult to cross. And it's hard to cross those lines. So, with that said, I think we disagree on mandates. I think we disagree on definitions. And I think they're very challenging for what we do here. Let's try to be reasonable and flexible. I think that it's getting late. The Chair has offered a path forward. And it's -- you know. I think it will all depend on language. And you know -- but, at this point, I think we have to be open to looking at what the Chair's proposal would be, too. Because I don't hear anything else other than threats to walk away. But I think -- but there are threats. And I think that we should -- we should entertain the Chair's idea. I want to signal an openness to do that. But I think that others in the room at almost 9:00 p.m. on the penultimate day of this working group that's been meeting for two years need to signal a same openness to a reasonable approach. Because, without that, I really don't know where we're coming in tomorrow morning to this discussion.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, very, very much, Mr. Chairman. We certainly -- or ICANN will want a conclusion and a report. And, although you might be right. It might be another seven years in the U.N., I don't think that's the whole issue at all. I think the issue is that you know, if 12 men -- 12 good men in truth can't get together -- and I'm not getting derogative here -- and agree something, then there's something wrong in the state of Denmark, so to speak.

But I think what the Chair has proposed is the way forward. I was going to talk in paragraph numbers to try and sort of lay out a format.

I think, as we said earlier in this discussion, perhaps on the first day, that this particular text needs to tell a story. And I think the chairman's draft did that, as Richard and others have said.

And part of that story, of course, is to comment on those proposals that either didn't or did gain some acceptance. And we discussed these paragraphs.

And it seems to me that what the Chair was suggesting is the way forward in that we do have one or two paragraphs that discuss this in some way. And then we use the annex for the wider list of the various proposals.

And I'm sure Parminder is right that they can put whatever they like into the annex. But, hopefully, we can have an annex that at least makes some sense that these people can find the different references that they need.

So I think it comes down to this description. It comes down to how we describe this. And, I mean, there's ways of doing it. And for those of us that were in Geneva last week, we sat through some ITU

discussions that tried to do this. This house thinks, on the one hand, X; and this house thinks, on the other hand, Y. And, you know, that isn't necessarily a good approach. But to have some description that there was a proposal for X, we didn't find favor. And, therefore, you know, X or Y, is I think, is as the Chair described, what we have to do here. Perhaps not having a box, because I think that's -- that might be too complicated in terms of putting use for and against, but having a couple paragraphs that describes where we are.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Peter. I leave the rest of the speakers. I have Peter, Cuba, Canada. And I suggest we close the list and we take stock. Cuba has left. Okay.

So we have Peter and Canada. And I suggest just take stock and resume tomorrow. We start losing people.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Benedicto. I tried to take a very personal view as vice chair of the CSTD. And we're specifically going to chair the WSIS follow-up resolution in May, which means that it may come back to us in May.

I'm just reading once again what we have already done about the mandate. The group will submit the report of the 21st Session of the Commission on Science Technical and Development for inclusion in the annual report of the CSTD to the ECOSOC. And we serve as an input to the regular reporting of the Secretary General on business implementation.

So to me it means there are two tracks.

One track is to the ECOSOC, and the other track is to the GA. They are not necessarily linked. So, if there's a concern that the discussion is not going to be reflected properly in the report, I don't think this is a real concern because it will be reflected one way or another.

Are they to be reflected in a report? And it should be reflected also in the Secretary General's report?

Now, as for the new mechanism, I would call your attention to the WSIS agenda point 106, which explicitly says that there's no need for a new mechanism. Once again, 106.

So these are the -- I can read it out explicitly.

>> Why didn't you tell us earlier?

[Laughter]

>>PETER MAJOR: I tried to. Those of you who know it by heart probably just go and see for yourself. 106. This is the paragraph about the new mechanism.

Tunis Agenda. This is this small (indiscernible) that usually go around. 106. For the implementation of WSIS. This is part of the WSIS. This is part --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay, I think we should --

>>PETER MAJOR: Basically the thing I want to say that we are going to reflect whatever has happened during the meetings and all the information will be transmitted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, Peter. So second last is Anriette. Please go ahead.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Very quick and just to express support for you, Chair, for your proposed approach. And just a question for clarification, so there would be a paragraph that reflects what the proposal is of the participants in our working group that support a new mechanism, correct? Will there also be a paragraph then that reflects the rationale and position of those who feel no new mechanism is necessary? That wasn't clear to me whether that be one or both.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: As I said before, I do not have a specific text. I think this text should not be too long. But it should document that for some participants that was of major importance. They defend the new mechanism. Maybe you can add a few features that -- from that perspective there. But in my view, at least in my view, we do not need at this point to elaborate extensively because one of the reasons is that that elaboration is already there in the proposals. I recall one proposal coming from the joint -- joint participant -- joint proposal that indeed has this. I'm not too sure because I think if we would insert such a long text that would certainly affect the balance of the whole report because I don't see any other -- but I think it's important to mention it, to highlight the importance of it. I do not have a very strong opinion about having another paragraph saying that others had -- I'm not sure if this is needed, but in case the group -- I'm the head of the group and anything that would be -- you think is necessary we can insert there, but I think the important point would be to document the position.

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I would agree and I don't think it requires a lot of text. I just think it's important to describe in the descriptive portion of the report that there were these quite starkly differing positions. And then I really do feel that we need to -- I think as Parminder said, as others have said, the discussion will continue, and I think it's important that our report reflects that firstly, we did discuss this and secondly, that there was no consensus. But I also think that we did have consensus on various matters. And some of them might not be -- address those fundamental proposals that you've listed, but I think it would be really regretful if we don't actually record and reflect and share the consensus that we did achieve.

>> (Off microphone).

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: For example, the -- the need to full participation, for including, for improving existing initiatives.

>> (Off microphone).

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I don't think so. I think most of the initiatives we're actually addressing and that we discussed did not exist during the Tunis Agenda.

>> (Off microphone).

>>ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: But let's not -- I don't want to belabor it. I just -- I support the Chair's approach.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. As most of you know, Canada initially was absolutely dead set against having a report that did anything except offer recommendations. After hearing our conversation, I was starting to think well, perhaps indeed we need to go back to the original text that the Chair had proposed outlining a little bit of the essence of the -- the scope of views that we had on this question of mechanism. But then I heard the comment from the Russian Federation, from Parminder, that even with that, the recommendations were still no go. And then Parminder very clearly stated it, and I think that perhaps for the first time I really truly appreciate the huge difference that we have in our position because Parminder said that, you know, our -- the conception that he has of enhanced cooperation is that it is a new mechanism whereas the conception that Canada has of enhanced cooperation is, it is a tool that you can apply to any mechanism. So hearing that, of course, I can appreciate that perhaps the recommendations that we have now make no sense because they don't relate to what he conceives as is enhanced cooperation. It's a mechanism, and right now there is no mechanism.

So now I'm really quite worried because it's not just a question of whether or not we want a mechanism. It's a really fundamental question that we don't even agree or understand what is an enhanced cooperation. It's a mechanism or it's not. It's not even if there's a need for a mechanism and the scope of it.

So, you know, I'm starting to think now, oh, my God, we don't have a report. There's no way we can find agreement. So at this point, I think that, you know, I would like to give us one more chance to explore perhaps going back to the draft that you had with your paragraphs 14, 15 saying that there were divergent views. But it's not just -- we need to be very specific. It's not just divergent views on the need for mechanism. It's the profoundly divergent views on what is enhanced cooperation. For some it only exists in a new mechanism. And for others, it is a tool that applies to all mechanisms. And so I don't have really good advice at this point. I will, you know, put it back to you, Chair. And I'm very sorry because it's going to be a very horrible thing to have to deal with tonight. And I'm -- and I don't envy you. And I don't know that I would be able to find a solution, frankly. But I think that we're in front of a very almost irreconcilable view. And I find that completely bewildering, that we have been living with this Tunis Agenda for so long and for so long our views have been so completely polarized then, of course, there's very little space for us to find consensus. And in my conception of enhanced cooperation, I would find it very, very sad if we could not have a report with some of the recommendations that we had because, I mean, for the countries that believe that this is what enhanced cooperation is about, I think this would serve as a guidance and it would help improve some of the bodies that deal with Internet-related public policy. But, you know, maybe it's just not going to be possible. I don't know. I'm hoping not, but I'm starting to become very cold and realistic. All right.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have some requests for the floor. I'd like to just say that I think this difficulty regarding different interpretations, I think have been there since day one, and in spite of that, we have been trying to work and --

>> (Off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. So I -- I remain, I'd say, optimistic with regard to try -- maybe I'll give the floor. I have the U.K., Parminder, and Switzerland. Just before that just say that my intention tomorrow is to, if we can in the afternoon to have before us I would say a final clean text that would be revised and, of course, discussed by everyone to see if that final piece of document could be -- I think the discussion we had I think could assist me to try to come up with something that would be considered by you to see if that could make the (indiscernible). I would certainly like to -- I didn't have time to look into the language that Lea and Anriette have provided. I think we had some good discussion that could. But I don't think it would be useful again to spend time tomorrow in plenary or even in this format to keep discussing this. But I think this will boil down to some formulations that if there can be acceptance well otherwise we'll have to see. My suggestion for tomorrow would be to try to have the same kind of conversation we had with regard to these in regard to the other part that I have highlighted. That for me is a very second very set of issues on the follow-up. If there can be some follow-up or involving the IGF, involving CSTD, if there is some possibility to try to find some common ground in that regard and I think also to assist me together with the secretariat to come up with some -- the other part of the document I think we can make that attempt in the light of the discussions and that this would be for your consideration in the afternoon. So this will be the last attempt. But I apologize then to (indiscernible) U.K., Parminder, and Switzerland. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Very briefly just wanted to follow up what Canada said because we feel the same. We said at the very beginning of this process that we knew it was going to be really difficult and we needed to take baby steps along the way. And we know that there are lots of areas where we disagree. And we, as U.K., have really tried to make proposals which we thought could take us at least a little bit forwards, find some areas where we can agree and try and take this debate forward. And we've tried our best to contribute to that. But what I think I heard from Parminder was that you could have all the boxes that you want, all the bullet points, all the options, all the circles, et cetera, et cetera, you would still fundamentally disagree with the recommendations as they're drafted. If that's the case, then I'm afraid I share Canada's pessimism at the moment, if that's really what you're saying. We're still hopeful. While there's life, there's hope. And we're still open to the conversation. And this format is helpful. Also just one-on-one conversations to develop ideas and bring back here, very open to that. Any creative thinking together around this. But at this stage, if what I heard from Parminder is correct, then yeah, we just share Canada's sentiment at this stage, I'm afraid.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I need to first clarify. Peter is not clear. I'm sorry. But that's a misinterpretation entirely of what the Tunis text is. Text 106 is talking about WSIS follow-up. And implementation mechanism does not need an operational body. That's very different. It's not about

Internet governance. We already have a body called IGF, which you saw has a big body, which is residing in these rooms with a month back. So there's a body already in IGF.

To read that there's no enhanced cooperation is entirely wrong. And I need to put it on record. Rather read 61, which is enhanced cooperation area. It says we are convinced that there is a need to initiate and reinfluence as appropriate a transparent, democratic, and multilateral process with private sector, civil society, and international organizations in their respective roles. This process could envisage creation of a suitable framework or mechanism where justified, thus sparing the evolution of current arrangements. That's what is written about enhanced cooperation, long assessment. We're sorry for that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. After Parminder, Switzerland. And we're closing the list. Yes, U.S.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thanks for understanding and now putting it in your words the difference of the position. And I need to excuse myself from I hold that position or I don't hold that position. This position is held by more than 100 countries. There is input of 77 during the WSIS+ 10 process, including 77 which clearly says a new mechanism. Separately.

But G77 had a full text which calls for a new mechanism during the WSIS process. More than 100 countries. Calls have been there since 2010, I think or '9. And so all developing countries have agreed to new mechanisms. I will not be able to take the whole burden of this position. And same with policy issues. I'm surprised I'm saying it, but probably you're surprised. Proposals you said you're ready to take baby steps. I'm sorry because I'm not giving threats. Actually, I'm sorry. No, the baby steps have been taken here. Nobody offered developing countries who have been asking for so long to give us a mechanism. And we have been begging that, even if you don't give us a mechanism, can we keep talking about the mechanism? And this group you're going to be refusing to give us even a place to keep talking about it. I don't consider those baby steps. That's from our side. That's from the other side.

The last part, Paul, you said boxes given you're not sure we've agreed on a lot of text. I think the boxes given there would be considerable text, which is there on the table which can be agreed to. That's my assessment.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Switzerland and U.S. will be the last speakers. And I would urge you to be as brief as possible.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Benedicto. I'll try to be very brief and try to refocus our discussion on your proposal. I think your proposal has a lot of merit. I think you're really sincerely honestly trying to find the right balance between the different positions, so I think we should focus on that and see how you come up with a text.

And I think that the right combination will include that good, crisp, factual description of the divergences on what is the concept of enhanced cooperation, which, after all, is something the WSIS+10 outcome document called us to continue the dialogue on.

And the other part will be, of course, the consensus recommendations. There, where we already at this stage, we are able to find compromise. And, if you -- if we look at that as a package, I think we will be able to reach a consensus tomorrow on the report.

Thank you.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. I'll be quick. I know we want to go. [Indiscernible] And you don't want to get in his way.

I sympathize with our Canadian colleague on this definitional issue and how concerning it is. And I hear the Chair. It's been around forever. Since the beginning there's been this question of the definition and the question of how. And there's been very divergent views.

I think the reality that we need to recognize is enhanced cooperation, however, you define it, however, the processes that you're looking at is happening, it's been happening. Whether you believe it's intergovernmental, that has been stricken. Whether you mean it's government on equal footing within any organization, that has been happening. Whether you believe it's all stakeholders, that has been happening. In the last 12 years on all those fronts enhanced cooperation has been happening.

I think one of the tragedies, though, is this group within the WSIS community, these kind of processes have not had as strong a voice in how. And making recommendations for those processes -- because this issue has been held hostage by one thing and that's creating a new mechanism.

And so I think that's unfortunate, but I think it's the reality. And I think this is an opportunity we have -- and I think the text, as the Chair has drafted, can get us there. And that's one reason we're trying to be very flexible and understanding to other people's positions is that we have an opportunity to actually provide recommendations on that process, which the communities are just moving forward with without really any input from groups like this.

So that's why I would encourage folks tonight, tomorrow morning, to try to think of ways that we can work out this issue that addresses everybody's concerns but doesn't make this community silent on these issues, which I think are very important.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think with this, I'd like to thank all of you and to invite you to resume tomorrow at 10:00. As I said, I do not intend to -- in plenary we can report the discussions, but not go on discussing that particular topic in plenary. I'd like tomorrow to discuss the other set of topics, which I think for me and for this group we need some guidance and to feel more the temperature of the room how we can maybe address some issues that were also very controversial when discussing plenary. I'm not sure which one we should take. I think this one was maybe a very productive way of -- at least for me, I think it was very productive to feel the substances behind positions and to understand better maybe try to put on paper something that might be useful for everyone. Otherwise, we move to traditional format. Anyway, I look forward to that. And my best expectation is that by the beginning of afternoon session, we can have a clean version before you. So we've all been trying to put into one single piece all the beads of our discussion and see it in a full package.

And I think at that point I'd like to look at a compromise. I think compromise is required. I take the point Justin made and others is required. And I think on everyone's part. So I would think it is within our grasp. It is something we can achieve. And I would invite you tomorrow to resume with the other set of topics we have. Thank you. I wish you all a very good night. Thank you.