

**Transcript Second Meeting Working Group on Enhanced
Cooperation
6-8 November 2013
Geneva, Switzerland**

Day 1

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

6 November, 2013
Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
10:00 a.m.
Geneva, Switzerland

(Gavel).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ladies and gentlemen.

(Gavel).

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

I would like to start in one minute. Thank you.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the second meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation in the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. I hope we are going to have a fruitful meeting during the three days, as proof was we had the last time, which was much shorter but very efficient.

I would like to greet the remote participants. I hope they are with us. And I would like to (indiscernible) to be members of the group. I would like to greet the observers who are with us.

As I told you, this is the second meeting of the working group. And as usual, meetings start with the mandate. Probably you know it by heart -- (beeping) -- but it is always useful to reiterate what the mandate of the group.

The mandate from the United Nations General Assembly resolution, resolution 67/195/2012, which invites the Chair of the CSTD to establish a working group on enhanced cooperation -- (beeping) -- to examine the mandate of the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation through

seeking, compiling, and reviewing inputs from all member states and all other stakeholders and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate.

The second part is issue a report to the CSTD in 2014. Looking at the mandate, I think we are in a relatively good position. We have already fulfilled the first part that we were seeking and compiling the input. And we had a summary which was sent out to the members of the group and which has been posted on the Web site.

Next one, please.

Just a day before yesterday, I attended a presentation on a presentation where the owner and the CEO of the software explained to us that PowerPoint is always full of bullet points and full of text, and I think he was right. Unfortunately, my presentation had already been written at that time so I managed to get one picture in it which shows the process we are going through.

So we have talked about the United Nations General Assembly's resolution. The working group has been established. We seek the inputs from the stakeholders. And right now, we have to review the inputs. And, finally, we have to give some recommendations to the CSTD next year with the view that there would be a resolution passed to the ECOSOC. And, finally, it goes back to the United Nations General Assembly.

What I expect from this meeting, I expect that we will respect the mandate, and I will make my best that it is going to be like that. I would like to call your attention that we are a group constituted of all stakeholders; that is, a multistakeholder approach. And last time I think we have managed to establish the mutual trust, and it was very useful. That was the reason the meeting was really successful.

The meeting -- last time we decided to have allow observers to the meeting, and we also decided that ECOSOC rules apply. In this meeting, we have observers. We have remote participation. We have audio streaming, if I'm not wrong. And, hopefully, we have scribes who are going to give us transcripts of the meeting. So all the promises were kept we have made last time, and I hope this will contribute to the success of this meeting.

Naturally, we have to keep in mind that we have some constraints. We have time constraints. We have resources, which are very scarce. And we have the -- I was really afraid that we have constraints as far as the venue's concerned, but right now I'm happy to see there are still some seats which are available. And, hopefully, the members of the group will arrive. I have already received some minutes from some members about late arrival, so I hope they will make it to Geneva. And I think they will contribute also to the success of our meeting.

Next one.

We had the first physical meeting last May, on the 30th of May and the 31st of May. We decided to have further meetings, three days each. This is the second meeting we have. And based on the results we achieve today, we may have one or two more meetings. It is up to you.

In case we have two meetings, I would suggest to have it in January and February. But we are going to discuss it later.

However, I have to make my report by the end of February, beginning of March and submit the recommendations hopefully to the CSTD in May. So I'm very optimistic, as usual. I count on you for the cooperation, and I hope that we're going to achieve good results in a very particular period we are in now.

But at the same time, I have to tell you that I think we are in a privileged position. We are in a position where we can contribute to something which is very important, and I would like to call your attention to this fact that we should take this meeting in this spirit. We are privileged to be in this group and to be in this discussion.

You may recall that during the first meeting, we had a very long discussion about the agenda, the procedural issues. And we had breakout groups led by Brazil and India. In the breakout groups, we identified categories and the suggested questions. I think this approach was very useful. This was really very useful. It allowed us to have very open discussions, and then we got back to the plenary. We managed to finalize the questions in a very short while and the result of it was the questionnaire which you know by heart, I think. So I have to emphasize again, that the first meeting, we had excellent collaboration, and I hope that we are going to continue this way.

As I mentioned, we agreed at the meeting to have all the facilities, that is, all the streaming, the transcript, and we agreed with the remote participation. And the real result was the questionnaire which has been posted and sent out to the members of the group.

Next. What are the resources for our second meeting? Basically I think -- (feedback in the audio).

Okay. So this is not the resource oddly.

Well, first of all, the first resource is the questionnaire itself, which is more important for the contributions from the respondents. You may note that the responses were grouped by questions at one time and then they were grouped by respondents as well.

We found that we had about 1,000-page contributions, which you can't handle in a meeting like that. The idea came that eventually we should have a summary of the responses and the summary has been prepared and has been sent out to you and also has been posted on the Web site.

I give the link to the Web site on the slide. And probably in case you have difficulties, which I think you may have difficulties finding still things on the CSTD Web site, so here's the link. And probably if you still have difficulties, you can come to the secretariat and they will help you.

Next slide.

So the questionnaire was made up 18 questions. One was about the stakeholder itself. One question was a quite open question in case we missed something. And, basically, it reflected the consensus of the working group on topics relevant to the enhanced cooperation.

We had an extended deadline, which was the 17th of September. I have extended it, I think, twice or three times and -- next one. In the end, we have 69 responses. The 69 responses, you can see the distribution of these responses. We had 29 governments, 23 civil society, 11 technical community and academia and eight businesses. It's -- I leave it to you to judge whether this is enough or it's few. That's what we have. I think the responses gave us a very, very rich input for future work.

After analysis of the responses, I suggested to group the responses. That is, in five groups to facilitate all future work. In group A, they are the replies related to the implementation of the Tunis Agenda and these are questions 2 and 3. Group B replies related to public policy issues and possible mechanisms, questions 4, 8 and 9. In group C, we have replies to stakeholders, questions, 5, 6, 7, 14 and 17. In group D, we have replies to developing countries which are questions 10 and 15. And, finally, in group E, we have replies to barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation which are questions 11, 12, 13 and 16.

What are we going to do in the second meeting? Well, first of all, we have to agree on the agenda and the procedural questions. After having agreed on that, probably we should identify and agree on topics and categories; that is, the grouping I've suggested to you. And we have to discuss responses to the questionnaire.

During the meeting, we are going to create a rolling document which will reflect the discussions we are having now. And to my best hope, on the third day, we may start drafting recommendations. I know this is very ambitious, but we have to do it. And, of course, there are some other issues to be discussed as we decide on the date of the next meeting.

What I suggested is for the time management, we have all meetings starting in the morning at 10:00 and we have the meeting in the morning up until 1:00 in the afternoon. In between, I would suggest you have a segment for observers, a 15-minute segment for observers that they may take the floor and give any observations they have and then we will have a coffee break, also 15 minutes. So probably it will be kind of flexible, but that's what I suggest.

We will have a lunch break from 1:00 to 3:00. And in the afternoon, we will have a kind of similar arrangement. That is, we will have our discussions and we will have an observer segment from 4:15 to 4:30 followed by again a coffee break, and we shall work until 6:00 in the evening.

Frankly speaking, I don't intend to go beyond 6:00. Naturally, if it's needed, of course, we can do it. But I have been reminded that the room is available up until 7:00, 7:30. But I don't believe that we will use this time. It's my best hope that we're not going to do that.

So, basically, these were the introductory remarks. As for the observers, we have to respect the rules of the ECOSOC. That is, member states who are not members of the working group can take the floor first and other observers can follow. But I would like to remind you that this is a working group. We came here to work. We came here not to make statements but to make recommendations.

And in this spirit -- and I think you share this approach, I sincerely hope you do -- so I would like to encourage you to contribute in this sense.

So after that, I would suggest that we go directly to the agenda. And probably you have it. Can you share it with us?

Thank you. So, basically, the agenda reflects what I said in my introductory remarks, including the time management. It's more general than what I think we should be doing. It doesn't talk about the grouping, but I really encourage you that we should work in this way; that is, take the groups of questions and discuss them in groups by topics.

So I ask you if the agenda is acceptable. Yes, Marilyn. Before you take the floor, I would like to ask you to identify yourself always shortly.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm one of the participants from the business community. And greetings, all colleagues.

It is a pleasure to be back together. My only comment -- And I want to thank you for the preparation both that you have put together and the time you've dedicated, Chair, but also to the secretariat. My only comment -- actually it is twofold. One is perhaps as we get into the discussion, we may find the need to flexibly adjust the agenda.

Some of the questions, responses may take more detailed discussion than others. And so I'd like to ask for that.

And then, secondly, if we could ask the secretariat to make your presentation -- to send it out to the full list. It is a bit challenging to find the information on the Web site, and it would be great to have your presentation and any other documents e-mailed out to the full list so that we could keep in touch on documents that are presented in the room. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Naturally, the agenda will be flexible. We will follow whatever is the natural way of discussion.

As for my presentation, I have made the last update this morning. Probably it was about 9:30. So -- but you will have the presentation, and I think it's already on the Web site. And to find

things on the CSTD Web site, I would go with it is not a challenge but a kind of test of ability of how you manage to get around. It's really to test your capabilities.

So having said that, any other comment on the agenda? Do we agree that we go by the way I suggested; that is, grouping the questions as they were? Okay, in that case the agenda is accepted.

(Gavel).

One thing I want to add, I mentioned that in the first meeting, we worked in a mixed way. By that I mean we worked in one part of the meeting in plenary mode and then we had the breakout groups. I would suggest that we should do the same way depending how our discussion is going to proceed to discuss questions in breakout groups, then come to the plenary, and have the whole plenary involved in the further discussions. We shall see how it goes, but I think this was a very efficient way of doing things. The breakout groups won't discuss different issues. They will discuss the same issues. And they will probably come to some kind of conclusion, and these conclusions can be merged. And that is the idea. But given the time and especially the amount of work we have to do, I think we should find always the best way to proceed so that is the way I suggest.

So I really suggest to go straight to group Number 1 and attack the questions which are in group Number 1. That is Questions 2 and 3.

I would give you some two minutes to go through Questions Number 2 and 3 and look through the analysis of these questions and eventually, if you wish, you can go to the responses as well. This allows us to solve some kind of technical problem we have with the audio streaming. Please take your time and look into the Questions 2 and 3 and we shall resume in two minutes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I can see that you are ready to discuss questions 2 and 3. So just to remind you, Question Number 2, "What do you think is the significance, purpose, and scope of enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda?" And Question Number 3, "To what extent has or hasn't enhanced cooperation been implemented?" So the floor is yours.

So based on the input we have, and based on the analysis which has been provided to you, I would like to ask you to do your contributions but try and restrict yourself to what I said in my initial remarks, to the mandate we have, to the agreed text we had, and try to discuss in this way. Yes, Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning to all colleagues. First of all, I want to congratulate you personally for the amount of work invested and for the document which is provided to us. As you have indicated, you had the challenge to deal with so many contributions and the document, the analyses of the responses I think is a very good basis for our work. Of course, there are some notions, some nuances that are not captured into this document and I -- I understand there will be plenty of opportunity to come back to some things that are missing there

from the perspective of participants would be important. However, I think it really captures most of the essence of what we should be discussing today and in our next meetings.

The point I want to make is that I think that maybe we should, on the basis of the compilation we have before us, try to identify what are the core issues that require discussion among us. Even taken into account there are different approaches to the way the questions are framed, I feel there is a large degree of consensus around some issues, the recognition of progress made, on the recognition of the value of working a multistakeholder environment. Depending on the participants, the emphasis is put on -- more on the aspect of having a half glass that is full or half glass that is empty. But I think there is some large degree of consensus that we have moved forward, to a large extent, since 2005. But I can also feel that even for those who agree that enhanced cooperation, to some extent, is already taking place and that maybe do not have -- do not need new mechanisms but need to -- even for these little things that we need to improve (typing) I think there is one notion we should maybe discuss, what we need to improve on existing mechanisms and on the other hand, as I go through the responses, on the other hand we have a group of participants that say that something else should be there. So I think maybe decided to -- maybe basic notion should be worked around in order to implement the mandate we have to provide advice on how to fully implement -- fully implement from the part of the conclusion what we have and if needed to come up with something else that would add to this. I think we should -- as you, Chair, have indicated, not lose time around issues that are consensus among us. The recognition of the multistakeholder model, the value of what we have achieved so far. That we have tried to focus on things that have emerged as differences and try to elaborate, if possible, to come to some consensus on these. Otherwise, to explicitly spell out what are the differences so we can come up with some meaningful document for the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ambassador. I understand what you're saying. How I would like to lead this group is first come to questions where we do have common understanding because in my mind we have to give them some kind of mutual trust and mutual understanding and then we can discover the differences. So if we agree that on some issues -- and I hope there are really many issues that we agree on -- then we can discuss those ones which we do not agree on and we can come to some kind of common understanding and try to understand each other, what we don't think is right, what we don't think is -- hasn't -- which hasn't been implemented. So I really encourage you first to come to this way of building this mutual trust and further building the mutual trust. But at the end of the day, I think we do agree that we have to come up with recommendations in the spirit you mentioned, how to fully implement the mandate of enhanced cooperation. I do agree with that. Probably I have a kind of slightly different approach. I would like to build on the consensual issues first, and it would give us some -- let's face it, good feeling and then we can build on that.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair, and to a very good morning to all colleagues in the room. And it's good to see so many familiar faces. We've sat through a fairly good amount of time last time in the last meeting. I think at the outset allow me, Mr. Chair, to formally congratulate you on behalf of my delegation for your commitment and your -- I would use the word "leadership" in guiding the process.

The effort that has gone into so far in preparing a kind of questionnaire followed by responses received and thereafter a report has been prepared, a summary, I think you have been very careful in using the word "summary" rather than saying -- attributing any particular notion to (indiscernible) or otherwise it is responses that have been received. I think it is good.

Firstly, the approach that you recommended, we fully support this. And also I'd like to acknowledge one colleague's recommendation that to keep the agenda a little flexible so that we place it according to the rhythm and so the progress we would be making as we go along. So these are the two, I think, pillars on which we can proceed.

Thirdly, just a quick comment on India's responses and certain changes that we have reflected towards the last (indiscernible). Just to inform colleagues in the room that with regards to questions 6 and 8, we of course submitted after the due date, just a recognition to be -- to be made in this room that India has data it supplied on Question Number 6 and 8, which we have forwarded to the Secretariat and we hope that we will bring to the discussion forum as we go along. That's the first point I would like to make.

Coming to the replies that have been received as far as the report that has been submitted, I think it's important at the outset to make certain recognition of the fact that it is a fairly small sample of responses that we have received, which is known by the numbers, the very fact that there are so many responses only. But the -- the beauty of the responses as we see it is that they cover a large and entire diversity of opinions that we -- we have been hearing and we have been -- we have heard in the earlier discussions. So we have the advantage of reflecting on those opinions as we go along. At the same time, I think -- actually a particular direction which responses have given I think we need to be slightly cautious on that. So we will be making the distinction as we go along, because in the agenda you have designed that we move towards, based on the responses that we have received, we would make steps forward, next steps forward. I guess that is the right way to do things, but again, with this little caution, that we would like -- at least my delegation would like to bear in mind which we thought it's good to let it be known.

As regard to the response 2 and 3, which is to the five categories that you have proposed, I think if we could respond to these five categories of questions, I think we would have covered the entire spectrum to which we have recommended -- the desire which we have started we will achieve. We fully endorse this five categories approach and thereby now you focus on Question 2 and 3. Again, from our perspective, we have categorically said not much progress has been made, but when we said this it is specific to paragraph 68 and 69 of the Tunis Agenda. But there

is recognition certainly that the very fact that we have been able to look at things starting in 2005 till now, it is -- there's no denying of this fact that there is an enhanced cooperation already taking place. Again, at what levels? There are many stakeholders in this process and as a representative of the government in this working group, we find that it is lacking, to a large extent. And there is recognition to this fact, and again, going through this process of looking at Tunis Agenda as a basis. So with that in mind, I think we -- we would like to see a kind of -- a kind of a determination at this point in time. Because if you say that we made progress and we achieved everything, then the rest of the questions have no relevance in this room. I mean, let's face it. I think we need to be realistic and we need to be practical in our own approach. So I do agree with our distinguished ambassador from Brazil who said that it's a half glass -- half full or half empty, but at the same time, yes, there is a recognition that there's a gap and we need to see what gap's are there and what, perhaps, would be the most appropriate recommendation that we can make. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. I'm really grateful for your remarks. One point I want to emphasize that we have taken the sample input, and some inputs have arrived late, but it doesn't prevent us to work, taking into consideration the replies we received. And naturally at the end of the day, as I always said, we have to do the work, the bulk of the work. And you can contribute naturally the way you would like to. And you can always express your views in the way you like to. So this is only a basis, the input, but the real work is going to be done here.

And as for the Questions 2 and 3, whether the glass is full half or full empty, I'm always optimistic and I say it's full half. So let's fill the other half. Let's work in this way. I can see United States and then Parminder.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. This is, as you say, the United States. On behalf of my delegation I would be want to congratulate you for taking the -- for taking the daunting task of looking at a record of something like 1,000 pages and summarizing it to 25 pages. This is -- we were -- as I say, we offer our thanks.

We had some of the same concerns and -- or perhaps observations is the way to put it, as the ambassador from Brazil and the last speaker from India. And by that, I would just summarize it in this way, that we recognize that there are challenges before us in terms of the work of this group. We recognize at the same time we have a very useful and helpful summary that identifies topics of real concern. We agree with the Brazilian ambassador, if we've understood it correctly, that not everything is captured in the -- in the 25-page summary, and that it's even fair to say that some things are missing. And I would just join hands with colleagues in wanting to make sure that we have a record, if you will, a summary, if you will, that represents, I think as Brazil put it, the core interests. I think in our words, the priority interest of countries and regions so that as we move to develop recommendations we are well-informed as to what countries and entities are thinking, what they think is good and what they need.

So Chairman, just to offer our support in whatever way we can support putting that information together so that we are -- that we are -- that we have a strong foundation for reliable recommendations. We do have some ideas, but I'll stop right there and just offer our thanks to you and to join with other colleagues and recognize that this is a very helpful first step. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. You may remember that when I sent out the analysis of the questions, in my e-mail I mentioned that this is definitely a document which is not meant to replace the original contributions in the first -- it is not meant to be the only input. It is just to help with the further work. And I think it might be quite useful to streamline. I saw Parminder and Sweden. Sweden was first? Okay, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman, and thanks to the Secretariat for all the hard work. It has really been a mixed pleasure to go through all those pages. Those first that have not only waited for the summary but also that have read all the responses, but I think mostly it has been a pleasure because of the very well-thought answers and the wide range of opinions that are reflected in those answers. So we're very encouraged by that. We also obviously recognize, as stated by others, that this does not maybe reflect everyone's opinion. There is a limited number of answers, but we also would like to echo what was said by India, that it does at least give a very wide range of answers and we think that that is very good as a basis to start our work here today.

Also, I would like to echo what was said by the Brazilian ambassador, that we think when we have read through these answers that it's quite encouraging to see that there are a lot of areas that we have consensus on, and we agree with the Chairman's approach that we should try to focus maybe first on those areas and then as a second step we should of course also try to see if we can find a convergence in the areas where there are outstanding issues. And I think also, it's important that we keep in mind when we discuss these issues, particularly maybe Question 2 and 3, that we have different interpretations of the concept of enhanced cooperation, and it's important that we respect the fact that we have different interpretations. I think that's the best basis we can have to move the work forward. But again, thank you for all your hard work and looking forward to working with everyone here. Thank you.

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

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'm Parminder Jeet Singh from India, IT for change. And good morning to everybody. And thank you, Chair and Secretariat, for putting together this excellent summary. And I heard observations that it does not capture everything which was always never possible, but I think what we have here is a basis to work on, a certain amount of categorizations which can then be filled, and then I think agreement categories initially is more possible and easier to work on and as we progress I would suggest that we do try to make categories of things and agree on categories first. And once you -- because categories are easier to agree on rather than specific viewpoints. And I also agree with India that these five categories

which you have bunched the questions under look like a good way for us to work on rather than the questions one by one. As we agree on categories and then move categories to certain recommendations. And now I come to the questions under consideration which is 2 and 3. I think on 2, whether it has been fully implemented or not, I think people have exhausted their responses and there are all kinds and I would take a message of values view that. Let's focus on the fact that there is an agreement that's not fully implemented and talk about what are the gaps and that is kind of a consensus, that there is something which needs to be done rather than going back and forth. And agree whether it's fully implemented or not. And the gap part of it, what needs to be -- what needs to be done to fully implement what we do here and then remove other things out and that is something for us to work on. The fact that we all agree. And the response, there are public participations which need to be addressed which are not being addressed and that fact remains, and that is the focus of our work here today.

And on the second question which is about the scope and the purposes, again, being tactical and going to the Tunis Agenda, I can see that again, categories is important and Tunis Agenda gives two or three categories. It says that the general public policy issues, there are public policy issues connected to critical Internet resources and there's a third basket which enhanced cooperation doesn't cover which is the day-to-day operations and these three baskets are there. And once you know there are three baskets, three areas, then this is something which Tunis Agenda has and I don't think is very controversial. And these categories are made without specifically committing to any view on -- under each you could possibly make progress. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I can hear agreement, or partial agreement, on the categories we have, the groupings we have. I could also hear that probably, you know, we should sometime fall back to the Tunis Agenda, which naturally we do. However, we should also respect the mandate and we should discuss what is in the mandate, and I don't really think we should go beyond, unless we have some modification from the General Assembly end of this year.

Having said that, are there any other contributions on these issues? I would remind you that we are discussing first matter issues go by the groups I suggested and second, in case we do, then which I think we had some kind of consensus but it's -- it may be a good way to discuss these issues, by groups, and if it is accepted, then we go by group 1, and we have Question Number 2 and 3. So I would like to hear your opinion on these two issues. Grouping is acceptable to all of us? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, colleagues. First, thank the secretariat for the work that has been done and to facilitate our hard work. And we support the way forward to the meeting.

I mean, with regard to question 2 and 3, I mean, the responses shows there's -- it is implemented, (inaudible), it is not implemented very well. We look forward to the output of this meeting, I

mean, to come up with a recommendation to fully implement the mandate of the Tunis Agenda (indiscernible).

One more comment, that the Saudi's response is the government's response by CITC. So I mean, if we can update it that it is the Saudi government. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. It is going to be done.

Yes, Virat.

>> VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, on my behalf and on behalf of the business, a big thanks to the secretariat and to yourself for arranging the text in the manner that you have done. It is quite spectacular to see a thousand pages down into 27, 26, depending how printouts have been taken or copies have been seen at.

I just want to make one point about a general comment which is just as the delegate from India suggested we should leave it to discuss at a later stage on where we are going in terms of progress, et cetera, even though there are some basic agreements that are emerging right now, it would be helpful to also keep our mind open to while agreeing on categories that you have recommended in general, that some questions at some stage might need to move or partially move across categories. And if we can keep that flexibility as a principle in mind just as we would keep ourselves flexible towards the movement of -- in attempt to draft recommendations towards the end of this meeting. I think that would be helpful just so that we don't have it cast in concrete in the first one hour. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I think this was a very useful remark. And, naturally, I don't think everything is cast in concrete. So during the discussions, naturally, we will find that some issues may belong to more than one group, and we shall bring back these issues. Of course, we are going to be quite flexible as we did in the previous working group, and that's what we're going to do right now with your agreement.

Any other contributions regarding groups, grouping, the approach we are taking and more concretely Group Number 1, Questions Number 2 and 3?

It may be still too early. There's a remote participant. Yes, we are waiting for your intervention.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Joy Liddicoat here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Hello, Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Hello. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, colleagues, for the introductory remarks. I also wanted to thank the secretariat for organizing this meeting and also to (indiscernible) in relation to the agenda announce that there are a number of remote participants, and we would ask on behalf of them, that those in the room do speak clearly and slowly so that the transcription and audio can catch their wide words. And also that if the group

determines some group discussion is appropriate that we have some way to facilitate -- think about how to facilitate and ensure remote participation of the working group members.

And I thank you, Chair, for your indulgence with the technicalities on that.

Secondly, in relation to the summary and the submissions, I wanted to just acknowledge all of the submissions that have been received, and especially those from civil society, and to note that the summary, while it intends to catch both (indiscernible) and categories, I think it is clear that the summary is not -- it has been talked about a thousand pages of submissions. And there are some (indiscernible) for submissions. so I would ask that we refer to the submissions themselves and all of the work that's gone into those submissions by focusing on those and resisting the temptation to refer to the summary itself.

Particularly, I notice that there are some submissions which have not been cited in the summary, for example. Thank you. Those are my initial remarks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Well, you reminded me of one of the obligations, that is, I didn't thank all those who have contributed to the work by answering the questionnaire. So I acknowledge all the work which has been done.

So the breakout groups, I'm having also some concerns about the participation -- the remote participations, so I have to make some kind of decisions as far as the efficiency of our work versus the extent of participations. Probably the issue wouldn't come up until tomorrow afternoon or Friday morning. So we shall sort it out amongst ourselves. But we don't have to forget that the main task ahead of us is to give recommendations. And that is the -- what is in the mandate. So, eventually, we may have some restrictions -- technical restrictions from participations remotely. But I promise you that in the plenary, everything goes back to normal.

As for the late submissions, naturally, we had to set limits and we had to deal with submissions which came within the extended target dates. So I fully agree that all submissions are extremely valuable, but we had to set some kind of time limit to consider submissions in the summary itself. It doesn't exclude them, however, to be discussed here but to be considered by this group.

Any other contributions? Yes, ISOC.

>> ISOC: Thank you, Chair. Allow me to start by commending the work of the secretariat. It is a remarkable work and extremely useful. I think the report is comprehensive and certainly offers a very good basis for our discussion.

I would note that as expected the document mirrors a various positions on enhanced cooperation and multistakeholderism and this is not a surprise. However, there seems to be consensus on the fact that enhanced cooperation is already underway in some forms or another. There is room for improvement, of course, but progress was made since 2005 both in terms of enhancing cooperation between intergovernmental organizations and governments but also in terms of

developing working relationships, trusted working relationships, among all stakeholder groups including civil society, business and the technical community.

And I think this is very positive and encouraging. It is a very positive trend on which we can work.

Another important consensus is remarkable around the value of the existing decentralized Internet ecosystem. And that came clearly through the reports that you shared and that the IGF, including national and regional IGFs, have a key role to play in furthering enhanced cooperation in the future.

Overall, I think in terms of terminology, in terms of methodology, it is important for our group to build on areas where we can identify common ground and consensus such as the consensus I just described. And I'll just conclude by saying that the technical community is looking forward to working with all its colleagues towards a positive outcome. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see no one asking for the floor. So can I conclude that we agreed on the way -- the approach I suggested?

Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. Marilyn Cade. But would you now turn to the observers then for their comments before we conclude on this topic? Is that how we're going to proceed so we hear from observers before we move to new topics?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are not going to conclude on the topic. We are going to conclude on the approach we are going to work. I will ask the observers after we agreed on the approach. So can I conclude that we agree on the approach? Okay.

And having said that, we have already discussed point Number 1 or Group Number 1 with Questions 2 and 3. But I don't think we have concluded on that. So now I turn to observers, if they have any comments. Please be brief in case you take the floor and identify yourself when you take the floor.

Anyone from the observers who would like to comment? Yes.

>> MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. It is a pleasure to be here. I just thought it would be useful for everybody if, perhaps, also, in my case, I introduce myself so you're aware of who are the observers are.

My name is Matthew Shears. I am the director for Global Internet Policy and Human Rights with the Center of Democracy and Technology. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Yes?

>> Thank you, Chair. I would just like to follow what Matthew said. I'm here on behalf of Global Partners, an Internet policy organization based in the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

>> SAMANTHA DICKINSON: I'll just follow the pattern. I'm Sam Dickinson. I was a member on the last CSTD working group on IGF improvements, and I'm a freelance Internet governance consultant.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. In case we don't have any other intervention, I suggest to have the coffee break now. It's well-deserved. And probably after coffee break, we come back at quarter to 12:00. So this time I'm going to be to be very generous. We are going to have half-an-hour coffee break. But, please, make sure that during the coffee break, you work. You have the important conversations and discuss the issues. Thank you. So we come back at quarter to 12:00.

[Break]

(Gavel).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for being on time. Please take your seat.

So good morning again. I have one small announcement. We have a box here, and I would like you to put your business card. I'm told by the secretariat that unfortunately there's no prize at the end of the meeting and there's no drawing and you are not going to win anything. But you are kindly requested to put your business card for the record.

Frankly, I would have liked to have some prize, but anyway...

So I hope you had a very pleasant coffee break and during the coffee break you had opportunity to discuss the issues we have had before the break. And I would like to resume the meeting by saying that we have agreed on the approach, that we are going to discuss the issues by groups. Naturally, the groups aren't rigid, so the questions in the groups may be reclassified or some parts of them may be reclassified to other groups, but it is really up to us.

I have also made clear that the bulk of the work is going to be done here, meaning that in case you think you have made some contributions and you think to change or modify or to update it, probably you can do it by eventually distributing a room paper. I don't think that this is the time to do it on the Web site.

But I would like to emphasize again that we shall take all the considerations into account and it will be done during the meeting. So this is -- I think it is quite important. It's our task to give the recommendations.

So having said that, let's go back to our work. We have started the review of the first group and the two questions in the first group. I concluded that there was a kind of general feeling about the glass being half empty or half full.

As I told you, I tend to be of the opinion to be on the positive side, and let's say it's half full and let's discuss how to make it completely full.

Any observations on questions 2 and 3 or any other observation on what we have discussed up till now? Good. We are going at a very good pace.

So I suggest, in that case, that we go to group 2 and I leave you some time to go through the questions we have in group 2. I believe probably an additional five minutes will be enough for you to go through and to have your ideas and your contributions prepared for the group.

So I give you five minutes and we start discussing group 2 and the questions in group 2.

(Silence).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I believe you have had time to review what we are going to talk about, question 4, 8 and 9. And I have been informed that Joy Liddicoat wants to take the floor.

Joy, the floor is yours, remote participant.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Peter. I just want to make a point about the submission summary which we have been reading. I just want to note and put on the record that there is an error in the summary, particularly the first one on page 4 which purports to cite the Association for Progressive Communication's submission. It is actually citing the Best Bits submission. And, in fact, all of the APC references in the document appear to be to that Best Bits' submission. And I'm just very concerned about that because their submissions are actually different and make different points.

I also note that in reference to a (indiscernible) submission here which does not appear in the list of submissions but it appears to be a government submission. So I'm just a little bit concerned about the focus of our discussions being reliant on this document. And I'm wondering how we might deal with that. One option is to deal with it as a document in the room, not as a matter of record. But I think some guidance from the other working group members on this point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. It is very useful. Probably this is not the only error we have in it. And thank you for pointing out these errors. I'm sure this will be corrected in a very short while.

As I said at the outset, this is a kind of attempt to streamline and downsize the contributions to help us to work, taking into account there may be some errors in it.

And I made it also clear that this is not -- it doesn't replace the contributions that we received. Our discussions will be based on the contributions and, more importantly, on the work we are going to do here or remotely you may contribute.

But I promise you errors pointed out will be corrected.

ITU.

>>ITU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I just wanted to highlight a paragraph on page 4, A special remark from a civil society organization on ideals, activities and its collaboration regarding plenipotentiary resolution 101, 102 -- there was a mistake there -- 102 and 133.

We would just like to highlight ITU was working with the organizations listed and many of the organizations active in the area in the spirit of the plenipotentiary resolution. And we do report annually to our governing body's council and also other bodies on this cooperation. We would be happy to provide more information on this.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, (saying name). In this room, we are aware of the great work the ITU is doing, at least myself I am aware

Any other comments? Yes, Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Parminder.

And I think we would acknowledge that with this second set, we are into the meatiest part of our work. We are talking about public policy issues and gaps and the mechanisms that may be needed. And I wonder whether we should approach it -- I mean, otherwise, it is just too open-ended and we approach it through making certain categories. I mean, that would kind of, you know, make it a little more understandable, the kind of things we are talking about.

For example, I heard in the morning the statement being made that everybody welcomes the decentralized architecture of Internet governance. The technical community representative said that. And even in the summary, we see that with regard to Internet governance, the majority of the respondents value the existing decentralized Internet governance ecosystem, which includes - - and it goes on. But a substantial group of respondents is also open to consider the launch of new mechanisms.

Now, these actually are two different things. The ones who agree on the decentralized system which exists, I understand is already the technical and logical infrastructure system. A lot of people agree actually, including me, on that.

The "but" part about people wanting a new mechanism largely refers to a very defense side of the enhanced cooperation landscape. And if we keep on talking across these areas, we would not make progress because people would say we agree to the existing decentralized systems. They are saying we need a new mechanism.

And if we are talking about, for example, the public policy making, I'm talking about real public policy making, not about technical policies, I do not know what kind of decentralized system exists. And I'm ready for anybody to explain to me whether there is any decentralized system regarding public policy issues which are listed by many participants which could be net neutrality, which could be taxation issues, which could be education and health-related Internet things. There is a huge list.

What kind of decentralized system exists regarding that? Because it doesn't for me.

Therefore, we are talking about two different sets. As I said in the morning, if we talk about the technical policy making separately and other public policy making separately, we wouldn't be making this kind of cross-dialogue which has happened a lot in enhanced-cooperation discussions and may keep on happening.

So I suggest we discuss the technical policy side and other public policies as two separate groups, and then we would know what are different people saying within that particular area rather than cross-talking.

And just a last point about the public policy issues also, I think also the groupings can be made in this manner. Instead of going by each public policy issue -- because we are not here to give responses to those public policy problems but just to understand the landscape so we can give suggestions about institutional requirements.

So in that sense, I understand there are three groups, once which one are being dealt adequately right now somewhere by someone. There are another set of public policies which are partly being dealt by some people but requires an Internet-related aspect to be dealt which is not being dealt. And the third group which is completely -- has no existing kind of reference at all. This also is mentioned (audio interference) which acknowledges that there are public policy issues which are not being addressed.

So if we go by the fact there are three categories, then we could make progress with the corresponding requirements of institutional systems for each. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. That's very interesting remarks. Probably we shall think about your remarks.

Now, the floor is Mr. Piazza.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Yes, thank you. This is Andres Piazza, member of the technical community group. Three remarks in the same direction or at least with some consensus with the previous speaker.

First of all, there's apparently -- I guess, we can understand that the value of the current model of the Internet organizations or, let's say -- (audio feedback) -- the decentralized ICT, the value of that system is not in question. I think this is one of the points.

The second point regarding the role of the IGF could be also considered one of the key roles in the future.

And this third point that could be highlighted regarding the other issues, the other policy issues that are not currently being addressed in any different forum, what (indiscernible), and I guess we should agree also in this. We can probably agree. There's no need to duplicate different forums. But if there is the need to create a specific forum, this forum should have multistakeholder representation and not only as observers but also in the decision-making as equal footing. This is the third point that should be highlighted. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres.

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to build on, I think, a directional comment that Parminder just made by suggesting that, in fact, we are really into the meat of an area that needs substantial discussion. And this was what I was -- when I referenced the point earlier that I'd like to think we could be flexible about what responses fit into the categories, I'd like to propose we consider separating question 4 from question 8 and 9 and consider adding the question that comes later, which is about issues that are important to developing countries and think about looking at the list of submissions in question 4 -- and I'm probably blanking on the number -- I think that's question 15 and looking at those in a sort of side-by-side approach to understand -- because, for instance, we have where one respondent listed ten issues, another may have listed 46. But there are similarities and congruencies across the different lists that have been submitted.

And that would be, to me -- because identifying -- what we're here to do is to try to understand the issues that need to be addressed under the framework of enhanced cooperation. And to Parminder's point, we're not answering the issues but we are trying to sort of put them into categories.

The second comment I would make -- And perhaps Parminder would be welcome -- would welcome a friendly amendment or we could talk about this more. I think actually it's four groups, but it's somewhere between three and four. There are the topics that are underway today but can't -- the focus on them can be enhanced or strengthened. So that recognizes that public policy issues continue to evolve. And even if an issue is being addressed, there may still need to be strengthening or enhancing of the -- particularly in participation from developing countries, et cetera.

Then there is the category of their partly being dealt with.

The category that I think Parminder suggested, they are new. There is no existing reference place but we recognize them.

And then I think there's a fourth category that is more about trends which may lead us to understand that we can't predict or close out the fact that there will be more public policy issues that will emerge as technology and the number of users and the role of the Internet and its uses continue to evolve.

And that last one would -- you know, I might think that the right place to discuss those is the IGF, but I think it's worth having a conversation to make sure that we as the working group are thoroughly understanding this. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn, very useful. Virat, please.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Chairman, this is on the two comments made with regards to dividing up this group in Question 4 and the other two questions. I suppose that the issue of mechanisms is derived from the issues that we have or hope to face in the future. Because that's -- the mechanism is sort of built to deal with those issues, some that we have on the table, some that we can foresee, and others we might not be able to foresee right now. And I'm very thankful to the list that has been provided by various inputs that have come in, especially the one that you have listed in the summary which is the Brazilian government which is a reasonably large and quite extensive setup. And I'm sure there's some missing in this, but it's a good reference to begin with. And I suppose looking at Question 4 and the issue at hand which are under II listed in the mechanism section of the summary, it gives us a good idea to take this discussion forward as to which of these issues can be tackled in platforms which require multistakeholder approach and which you believe will require a different set of mechanisms. And just to -- that's what it's going to boil down to finally. What are we going to recommend in terms of how the mechanisms come into place that deal with the issues at hand. And I think the (indiscernible) is that if you would look at these issues, I think that discussion, even though we're not here to respond as Parminder said to these issues, but I suppose that gives us a very good idea on whether these issues can be dealt with only in a multistakeholder process or if there's anything else that exists out there which in turn will influence the mechanisms and also where that should be located. And including whether the current ones are good enough or they need to be extended or improved or more work needs to be done. But a focus on Question 4 and the issue is -- actually could be the debate of the entire dialogue for the next two days because that's where the issues are. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for that. Brazil, please.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and listening to what has been said before, I fully agree with those that express the need that we should focus and identify different categories of issues we want to tackle. In that sense, my view is that Questions 4 and 8 are closely linked because as we identify what our public policy Internet-related issues that we should work on from the point of view of enhanced cooperation, we should look at what are the current arrangements for that end

and I think in the -- in the spirit of what has been said before in the (indiscernible) group that we should have a clear mapping of what we have. So if we can link important issues to existing mechanism arrangements and differentiate between things that are -- have been said before that have already been dealt with by, you know, a decentralized system and that might not require any particular work in that regard. In my opinion, even in that case, we should look -- from the point of enhanced cooperation -- how the work being done in this decentralized system could be better understood and better incorporated by other stakeholder. I think that could be better indeed an angle through which we could see the work being done in this decentralized format but then we should focus on questions, on issues that although have been tackled also by different institutions might require, might be benefited from some added platform or some added layer of interaction. And then there are other issues that do not have a clear focus, a clear home and maybe that should be the one that we should focus with more emphasis in our work. I can relate to many notions that were expressed and not captured in the compilation document you have provided to us, Mr. Chair. For example, when the Democratic Republic of Congo states that too many mechanisms kill the mechanism. You should just have to define the mission of the existing mechanisms. That then we might have a very clear understanding of what are those existing mechanisms and what could be done in order to provide for better interaction with other stakeholders. And then it feels comments that emerging and often issues that have no other global home could justify a new mechanism. So again, we must, I think, by looking at the issues, what are the existing -- the current mechanisms institutions are dealing with this and how we can improve on that and for those that are not there, what should we recommend to satisfy. And on -- superceding all these and on top of all of these, I would just refer to a notion that is dear to my delegation, to others, that irrespective of issues being dealt with by different institutions or not, there is something that in our point of view is required, is a platform that would allow for a holistic and integrated view of all issues and from the point of view of enabling government to have a better understanding and better tools to address Internet-related public policy issues. This is something that, in my opinion, needs -- would, let's say, provide not from the point of view of impacting or interfering with what is being done, for example by the decentralized system, but to allow governments to be best equipped. This is something that emanates from the vision we have and the focus we tried to have in the enhanced cooperation exercise that we are focusing on some keywords in regard to the definition of enhanced cooperation. We do know that this is not -- there's no consensus, but we are focusing on the needs to enable governments to -- and I think this is maybe at the core of the enhanced cooperation from the perspective of my delegation -- to enable governments to work around Internet-related public policy issues. Of course we are talking of multistakeholder environment. This is not something to be done exclusively by government, but from our perspective enhanced cooperation have a very clear focus-oriented approach. And we would like to propose this. But again, I think maybe the preliminary thing and I agree with (saying name) and others that said that maybe this is the crucial -- at the heart of the exercise, is to have different categories of issues that should be dealt with separately. Otherwise, we see a lot of confusion and people refer to Internet Governance and enhanced cooperation, sometimes mixed issues that are by nature substantially different. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ambassador. I think it's very, very useful and it seems to me we are getting clear what we are here to do. It's a very good guidance for me as well. Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. While we're looking at the answers, some of the answers, it's -- it is easy to see that trying to list all relevant public policy issues is a very difficult task. We all have our favorites. Certainly for us, some of the most pressing and important ones are the protection of human rights online, the protection of rule of law online, and the protection of free and open Internet that enables trade and commerce to flow freely. However, we think by looking -- when looking at the answers, some of the answers, that they're -- I think it was the Indian response and maybe also the response of Finland that there are -- there has been work done in this area before, looking at the Internet -- the working group on Internet Governance, for example, and the report coming out from that working group. You can see that there was an attempt to identify a group of categories rather than listing -- categories of topics rather than listing an extensive amount of topics itself. And I think it's about the issues relating to the infrastructure and management of Internet resources. It's the issues relating to the use of Internet. It's the issues that are relevant to the Internet but have an impact that is much wider, and issues relating to development aspects of Internet Governance. Maybe we should try to, to some extent, also base our work on what has already been done. And then on the question of new mechanism, we totally agree also with what -- the response that what is highlighted earlier from Congo, for instance, that too many new mechanisms or too many mechanisms doesn't necessarily do the work. We think that we should focus on how we can better utilize the existing foras and existing frameworks for Internet Governance, how that can be strengthened, how enhanced cooperation can be strengthened in the existing foras. But let's continue our discussion on that. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to quickly go through some of the proposals that are on -- that are under this group. Firstly, with regard to the Question 4, I think it is perhaps good instruction to please recollect and give some recognition to the work that has been done by the working group which was hit up earlier on Working Group on Internet Governance. That certain public policy issues have already been dealt with, have been at least identified and the five different groups. In fact, given the Tunis Agenda we have made sort of a recognition that that working group has helped us to identify a number of public policy issues that are related to Internet Governance. So I think we are not starting from a clean slate. It's not a new kind of area that we are talking for the first time. So to that extent, I think it would be useful to see if we can -- how best we can actually recognize. They've all been categorized into five separate groups. Again, taking from there, whether we need to work forward in terms of mapping as we've been discussing, whether any of the issues which -- which mechanisms are currently being handling and if, in our perspective, in our opinion is it sufficient. If it is not sufficient, work further needs to be done. I think such an approach would help us move forward quickly. And if anyone -- any delegation has an additional item to be added, a policy issue to be added, I think we all could be

open in terms of how best -- in which category it is to be reflected. That is the first intervention as far as Question 4 is concerned.

With regard to Question 8, in the morning we made a brief announcement that, you know, we have a data (indiscernible) response. I think it's time to perhaps to read it out and later on we will circulate in the room in the afternoon as a document. With regard to this question, the basic change would be towards the last paragraph. I would just read the addition of it and then say why we are saying this. And the addition goes that -- the last paragraph -- that after giving certain references to the various paragraphs in the Tunis Agenda we have a concluding paragraph states, thus it is a clear mandate for defining the mechanism for effective global Internet Governance. We have said that in our earlier reply. And thereafter we said what mechanism we have in mind, we will come back to you in the group. I read quote, unquote, I read, the U.N. General Assembly could embark on a creation of a multi-lateral body for formulation of international Internet public policies. The proposed wording should include all stakeholders and relevant intergovernmental and international organizations in advisory capacity within their respective roles as identified in the Tunis Agenda and the WGIG report which is also part and parcel of this discussion. To continue further, such a body should also develop globally-applicable principles and public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. Unquote. So this is the addition we have formally proposed, and the reason for this is very clearly as articulated in the Tunis Agenda itself in paragraph 29, 31 to 35 and paragraph 60. I don't need to go into the detail. I think we're quite familiar with these paragraphs. It is our understanding and (indiscernible) that while is a recognition for the governments to act on an equal footing with each other, as has also been pointed out by our distinguished ambassador from Brazil and a few colleagues, that there is not that forum for the government to see this from a holistic manner, in a manner that where there is a responsibility for the government. Again, we are saying it is not an exclusivity, certainly not. It is -- it is what we call working together kind of an approach.

With regard to Question Number -- relating to IGF and enhanced cooperation, I think it's important to recognize the contribution that the IGF has been making in enhancing the dialogue among the various stakeholders. I don't think there are absolutely any doubts about also work -- also worked on improving their working methods through various processes, and I think its contribution will remain very important to the whole process. The multistakeholder dialogue that we intend to embark upon. However, there is a subtlety which I think has been brought up in the Tunis Agenda and which has been reflected through the U.N. General Assembly resolution which was adopted last year which was 67/195 and also for the ECOSOC resolution which was adopted in the General Assembly relating to a recommendation from the CSTD has been adopted by ECOSOC where they have made a distinction between the two processes, that these two are very distinct processes and they compliment each other. That means there is kind of a constant and there's going to be a working togetherness as we go along. And they're not going to be at anyone's cost. This is two independent processes, and I think if you could make this recognition

and work in that direction, perhaps our contribution in this working group would be very, very productive and also it will further strengthen the IGF processes that we have set in motion. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Just a quick reflection. Some of us have participated in the IGF in Bali which was an exceptional opportunity.

>> (indiscernible)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We already have some oversight.

(Laughter)

So coming back to the IGF, it was an excellent opportunity and even though I know, because I was behind some of the resolutions which you mentioned, the two processes are independent. I would modify, with your permission, it's interdependent. And we are complimenting each other, I believe. The IGF and enhanced cooperation. And there are very clear signs of that, just referring to the bilateral meetings we had during the IGF which were informal but still very helpful referring to bringing up policy issues during the main sessions which were extremely useful and I believe the process itself -- both processes itself are extremely helpful for each other.

Now, I can hear different voices, different opinions which are not very far from each other. I have heard that some said that there need to be -- need to have a mapping of the existing processes. Some said that we have enough fora to discuss issues, that we have to be more precise about responsibilities and the scope of these fora. Probably this is a good way to start our discussions.

I fully agree that Question Number 4 is one of the crucial if not the crucial question when we discuss the heart of the matter, and all other issues are defending what we think, which are important for the group.

So having said that, I would like to note someone would like to take the floor? On this you want to take the floor? There's another flag up? Yeah.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you. Thank you very much, Chair. I just want to follow on the intervention from the distinguished delegate from India and emphasize that what I - - what I understood from the findings of the consultation of the questionnaire that was distributed is that there is very clearly a verity of understandings of what enhanced cooperation means. And from my perspective we should not be rushing to conclusions. We should also take this opportunity that we have during these three days to identify what works on the basis of existing mechanisms. Again, within the findings we saw, for instance, that since its creation the IGF has acted as a catalyst for enhanced cooperations. I think if we are able to identify areas of consensus, then it would certainly be a very productive path leading to useful and agreed possible recommendations for the future. I think again it's very important to work on the basis of the

verity of understandings of what enhanced cooperation means and the acknowledgment that for a large majority of stakeholders it is not necessarily solely about intergovernmental cooperation. It should include all stakeholder categories, including civil society, business, and the technical and academic community. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance. I've been listening very carefully what has been said, and I had the impression that most of the contributions mentioned that enhanced cooperation should be made, taking into account the multistakeholder approach. There was, however, I think some differences about the implementation, whether it should be a multistakeholder approach or should it be a kind of multi-lateral, that's what I heard, with advisers from other stakeholder groups. So it's up to us to give recommendations in this area.

It is my impression that the majority expressed views, those who took the floor, for the multistakeholder approach, and this is one of the critical issues of our discussions, whether we recommend either way. So any reflection on that? Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. My reflection is first of all to -- I intended to follow on the comment that's been raised a couple of times that I want to be sure that we address and that is recalling for all of us that we have previously, when this group was set up, discussed the need for a form of a mapping exercise. We've also seen a call for that from some of the comments. And I want to go back to, I think we need to look at the submissions, particularly in Question 4, and have some kind of general agreement on what's in the list of topics before we start finding homes for them, with all recognition of the comments that have been offered about different models that might offer new mechanisms. We also -- I believe I've heard colleagues call for looking at how we strengthen and enhance existing mechanisms. And so I'd like to suggest we focus a bit more on mapping first and then coming back to the question of what are the range of approaches that could be looked at for strengthening and improving existing mechanisms or for looking at what new mechanisms, if any, are then to be discussed within this group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I have a question to you. When you are mentioning mapping exercise do you have something in mind which we should be doing right here, right now, or should it be left to the Secretariat, or what is your complete suggestion?

>>MARILYN CADE: Well, particularly on Question 4, and then the other question I referenced, which I think is Question 15 about public policy issues which are of most interest to developing countries, I think, in fact, that's actually a quick process that can be done by looking at the submission of topics that have been contributed by the various submitters. There -- there's congruency for some of them. Some of them are more granular than others but do have a certain amount of, I think, the ability -- for instance, I would say that security and trust in the online world could include topics like child online protection or capacity building in dealing -- you know, I think it would be possible to begin to aggregate topics into categories.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: An additional question, how do you see it to be done? Shall we create some kind of small working group within the working group itself and which would come back to us, though I can't see it being done during the plenary. Would it be useful to have an offline group and then come back to the plenary with the results?

>>MARILYN CADE: Well, it might be interesting to understand if there's support in the room and colleagues who would like to work in that direction.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I'll let you think about the proposal, Marilyn. In the meantime, Jimson, you wanted to take the floor.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, distinguished chair, your excellencies, colleagues, ladies and gentleman. My name is Jimson Olufuye. The chair of Africa ICT Alliance. It's a private sector led ICT group for Africa. So I'm really very pleased to be one of the five business entities in this working group.

Since this is the first time I'm speaking today, I want to really appreciate the Chair, the Secretariat, for the great job they've done. And I have no doubt we're going to continue in the exact same momentum.

Well, the issues that pertain to Internet policy, with regard to developing country is also very closely related to what is of concern to developed countries. So I think just to align my thought with the view as expressed by Marilyn that it would be a good idea to outline all the subject matters or the areas of concerns and then map it really and then see where they are already functioning, where they are already actively being treated. I'm very much familiar with the core ideas which EU, African Union, and (indiscernible), that is my area. These are issues they are already discussing vigorously at that level. So if we're able to outline all those points, you can see where we have gaps. So if we have gaps, then surely let us take them on. We also know there will be many issues, many issues. It would be a good idea to see where (indiscernible) will fit in because the enhanced cooperation topic on the Internet is very dynamic and quite fluid. But as my colleague has already underscored, whatever will be done going forward has to be truly multistakeholder model. It's a great privilege that the private sector which I represent is also -- is also being considered seriously, and I think this as our issue shall continue in the interest of our citizens -- global citizens and citizens in the developing nation in particular. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Thank you, Jimson. I can identify Parminder and then Brazil.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I first raised the flag to follow up on the Chair's observation about there being a kind of talk about whether we should follow a multistakeholder approach or a multilateral approach with stakeholder participation and consultations. This actually goes to the topic, cluster 3, which is the role of stakeholders. But I think the role of stakeholders is very much tied with both kind of issues and the mechanisms. And in that sense, it fits here. And that's pretty fine.

However, I still think in case we need to go by categories -- and if that works, the mapping is fine with me because it is the nature of issues, not the specific issue, let's not get bogged down whether access is more important or network neutrality or trade issues or global taxation, that list is endless. And if we start doing that, I mean, that wouldn't be the most productive use of our time.

We are talking about kinds of issues which require different kind of institutional responses which includes very prominently different roles of stakeholders. And that is a thing we're trying to kind of sort out today.

And in that sense, again, when I hear multistakeholder approach, I'm very comfortable when technical policy is being made. Corporate sectors who have a lot of expertise would come in perhaps on an equal basis and give their expertise because they are make standards. This is completely different from substantive public policy issues like when I read the Brazilian list and the issues are there and many other issues on the list: Cultural diversity, harmonization of national policies, trade and e-commerce, consumer rights, data protection and privacy rights. They are typical public policy issues.

And if we are talking about actual public policy issues, I think we are touching the Holy Grail of democracy whether when corporate can be equal in decision-making along with a government. I don't know if that's the precise question you're talking about or even if a civil society actor can actually have a veto or actual role in decision-making. These are different sets of issues. The technical policy making is one set, oversight is a small other set, and other public policy issues which are substantive public policies and which Tunis Agenda says is the responsibility of governments is a different set of issues.

And then I get confused when people say, Okay, we are agreeing about the multistakeholder approach. Then I'm fine when it is the technical side.

Are we talking about the public policy issues side? Are we talking about global taxation on Internet issues? And what does that mean when we say every stakeholder has an equal right to be a part of the decision-making process?

I think unless we separate things in categories, depending on different kind of mechanisms and different stakeholder roles, we would still be talking across areas and which would not be very conducive to our progress. And in that sense, if mapping is the way to go, mapping is fine. But mapping by the needs of institutional areas rather than whether developing countries need it or whether it is access or whether it is net neutrality. But mapping it according to the kind of issues which need different institutional responses and also perhaps different roles of stakeholders, which is an open question. But the categories, I understand, would be this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Brazil, please.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In my opinion, the way we deal with this set of questions will give the sense of the success or not of this group. I see a lot of confusion even among people who are actors, who operate in the Internet, a lot of confusion on those issues. And I -- in my opinion, it's not have one single formulation that encompasses all situations. There's no one solution, one side, that fits all for all the issues on the table. And this has been spelled out by Marilyn Cade, Parminder and others.

So unless we have very clear differentiation between different contexts, any statement, for example, that some parties prefer the multistakeholder approach and opposition -- this would be artificial because we would be talking about different things.

Even from the part of parties that favor a more multilateral approach, you get to some issues, for example, to my understanding, they do not challenge, for example, the kind of work that is being done with regard to engineering of the Internet. So there is no point, for example, for the ISTARs to be concerned about this when -- it's not addressing what they're doing.

So I think we must differentiate. I think the idea of categories of issues is important. And the mapping exercise is important. I think it is, indeed, maybe a prerequisite for us to work, to have a clear understanding of categories and the mapping associated to it.

You have asked whether we should do it now or -- it is a rather complicated question because on one hand, I think it is, indeed, the prerequisite for an efficient work. But if we start doing it now, it will not be efficient for us to do it. So I'll leave it in your hands, Mr. Chair and colleagues, about how we can maybe move forward in that but without affecting negatively our work and the time we have aside for us.

Again, I think one very concrete contribution coming from this group would be to give clarity on this which is -- as we read pieces of paper statements, it is confusing. And sometimes we clearly see that people are talking about different things.

We see at the OECD, those have building blocks that are not necessarily in opposition if we deal differently with different kinds of situations. This is not contradictory if we are supporting fully multistakeholder approach, even without any kind of governmental participation. On the other hand, we discuss issues we want some more -- it is required some more, let's say, governmental policy-making authorities. So the mapping exercise is completely relevant.

What I would like to ask -- this is the kind of approach to take -- to have an open mind in regard to what we have on the table. We would not -- we do not want to be impeded to proceed in some direction by our own perspective. But we want to take fully into account other stakeholders' perspectives because, for example, the point of view from government for some particular set of issues is very important. And maybe when we focus on this, then we have a discourse that entails some concern. But we also want to acknowledge that for other parties, other aspects are important.

So I think as we look to the whole picture, it is important to make clear that we are -- we have to differentiate and we have to work around this idea of categories of mapping. And, again, I do not have an understanding how it would be more efficient for us to work around this. But I think it's a prerequisite for us for our work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ambassador. So I can hear a relatively clear support for the mapping as a prerequisite for work. And at the same time, I'm happy that you share my concerns about the proceeding of our work. So that's why I suggested that eventually we can have a task for -- whatever you may call it, a subgroup, which could come up with the beginning of this exercise to give us some food for thought.

And I wonder if apart from the persons who suggested to have the -- this exercise, who would be interested to work during lunchtime, during coffee breaks, during the evenings but outside the meeting and come back, say, in some point of time, to provide us with further inputs? First Marilyn and then (saying name).

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, let me ask a question. It seems to me that a first starting point would be a simple Excel spreadsheet which has on the left-hand side the name of the submitter and across the top -- sorry, I'm trying to organize this in my mind as I'm looking at it. So the name of the submitter and then the issues that they submitted under question 4, I would say question 15 as well, but question 4. That sounds to me like it is a cut and paste -- the first step is a cut and paste so that then we can start looking at it.

Is that -- and trying to boil the longer list into more generalized categories. And then taking into account -- I think the next step, taking into account the idea then of how you look at the discussion in the room coming from: So do we think this particular topic is falling into one of the four or three groupings that Parminder and I had been discussing?

But the first step sounds to me like, I would hope, a secretariat function of cut and paste to try and to get the submissions into a document. Is your suggestion that we need to find participants to do that first?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn, I have been told by the secretariat that the path of the exercise has already been done. It's on the Web site, if I'm not mistaken. But can I ask you to make some clarification to that?

>> On the Web site, we have two kinds of PDF documents. One set of PDF documents are the individual submissions. Another set of PDF documents are compilation by question. So you can download all the responses to question 4, for instance, 15 or 2 or 5, whatever.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it an answer to your question or to the proposal or you want to go beyond?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I'm very familiar with it. I'm carrying it around with me. I sleep with it under my pillow.

>> CHAIR MAJOR: No doubt about it.

[Laughter]

>> MARILYN CADE: I was thinking about transcribing it on to the pillow case. But it's going to be difficult to work with it in this particular form unless people have a paper copy in front of them. If you haven't seen it, you know basically we would be flipping back page by page.

So that was my question about -- but is the secretariat's suggestion that we volunteer task force members could spend our lunchtime filling in Excel spreadsheet? Which is possible, of course.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just a slight correction, it is not the secretariat, it is mine.

[Laughter]

So let me be clear about it. I made the suggestion, and I'm happy that you accepted it. And I would like to see more and more volunteers to sacrifice their lunchtime, which is very much approaching.

Before we break, I think India has asked for the floor. And then I propose to break for lunch and ask you as well to find a way to get together and to start this exercise which has been proposed.

Basically, I think that we are talking about the mapping exercise, talking about some kind of spreadsheet approach, if I'm not mistaken, which will take the issues and the proposals.

Marilyn, can you be clearer on that? What is your proposal exactly?

>>MARILYN CADE: Well, I don't think it's just my issue. I think if there's interest in doing a mapping exercise, we should hear from others who are interested in it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Brazil?

>>BRAZIL: I'm sorry, but it's more a point of clarification because when we are proposing these mapping exercises, we are looking to something that is not exactly to map what the different responses were and to identify the issues but to link this, the issues to the current arrangement and mechanism.

So this is something that in our view should maybe be done -- I could not volunteer. I do not have expertise to link some issue to some current arrangement. But I think this is something that would assist us in moving forward.

This was the understanding I had of the mapping, is that it is required for us to move forward. And I think this is something that will not emerge only from compilation which has already been done by the secretariat, by the way.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I understand your concerns, and I share them. I'm sure that not all of us have the expertise here to be part of this group. I think it can be only regarded as a start for this exercise. And probably it will be helpful maybe for all meetings right now. I think it will be useful for the future meetings, if I'm not mistaken.

India, you wanted to take the floor?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm glad this clarification has already been given. I think mapping exercises not with the proposers of those proposals but rather with the issues, public policy issues versus the mechanisms, existing. So that would lead us to the next questions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So it seems to me that we are on -- yes, Virat, I suggest you are the last and we break for lunch.

>> VIRAT BHATIA: We have two sort of options here. One is the WGIG document that was mentioned, which has under Section III "identifying public policy issues that are relevant to Internet governance and addressing the advocacy of existing governance arrangements mentioning A, B, C, D," four issues. And then we have the Brazilian government's list which is about five issues mentioned, but they are not necessarily corresponding to each other.

So I suppose if the mapping exercise has to happen, then we'll have to mention those under the WGIG documents classified, those 48 or 45 issues and then start linking them to mechanisms as well as the roles of the various stakeholders. I think that would be two exercises.

And if it's -- I think that will lead us to deciding what the mechanisms should be. And whether an existing mechanism has a home or we need to find a new home.

I think these two documents will have to be merged for us to get -- because the submissions to question 4 has five different inputs ranging from 13 to 49, issues identified by various stakeholders. The set we are going with in terms of WGIG is four. So we can possibly pick the biggest set -- let's say the Brazilian set, for example -- and try to match it there and work from there. We are happy to provide an Excel sheet without promising no mistakes.

[Laughter]

And then the team can change it around in case some have to shift and link it to a mechanism, if that is helpful. I'm just offering that help.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, thank you for the support of this proposal. I think the secretariat can give you further support in that. So probably if you request them to be part of the exercise, they will be happy to help you.

As for the time frame for the exercise, I'm not really sure that we can come back after lunch, but I hope we can, and we can continue all discussions still on group 2, taking into account your input or your results. And I think that would be quite helpful.

Having said that, I think we can break now. I want to see you back by 3:00. And I encourage you to spend your lunchtime the most efficient way you think.

[Lunch break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I ask you to take your seats, please.

Thank you. Welcome back. I hope you had a very good lunch, good discussions. I want to start with an announcement. India had made an update to the contributions. And you have the update in paper form on the table, I think, at the entrance of the room. So feel free to pick up your copy.

It is my understanding that the voluntary task group undertaking a kind of mapping exercise has made significant progress. We are talking about the grouping of -- we have the Questions Number 4, 8 and 9. It is my understanding that the mapping exercise has been started and taken into account the contributions to reply to Question Number 4.

So we are going to discuss this afternoon the questions in Group 4. I would like to ask any representative of this voluntary task group if they feel like reporting on the results. We are very keen to know where we are.

Yes, Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'll open my comments by saying that the voluntary task group is going to be seeking further collaboration and participation, so if you didn't -- if you didn't spend your lunch hour with us, don't think you're off the hook.

But let me give you a quick update. What we did -- and two members of the voluntary group are still trying to finalize a working document. Virat Bhatia has also engaged some of his team to also help. What we're doing is taking -- sort of envision Column 1 as being a consolidated list of all of the bulleted items that were submitted on Question 4 from any submitter, starting with the Brazilian list and then consolidating all of the bullets.

So if a submitter wrote a paragraph we've not been able to figure out, those will not have been reworded. But the first column will be all of the bullets. There will be a lot of duplication or phrases which may mean roughly the same thing but they're worded differently.

The second column we're proposing -- this will, of course, be up to the participants to decide, but we're proposing then to try to come to a grouping that is more consolidated. So envision Column 1 as possibly having well over a hundred bullets in it with duplication in it. Maybe 80 but it will be a long list of bullets.

And then the second column would be consolidated headings where we would try to come up with categories that everybody felt comfortable with that that long list of bullets could be consolidated into.

The third column we are proposing drawing from the submissions would be the list of activities. We are using a very general heading, the list of activities that are underway. So if someone submitted an example that the ITU is doing work on child online protection or the ITU submitted that, that would be go in there. MOG (phonetic) was mentioned by another group, so that would go in that.

And then we'll have two blank columns.

The fourth column would probably, in order to make this a useful tool, need to be sort of a general assessment of satisfaction with progress on enhanced cooperation. And I'm really using that as a very general term, taking Parminder's suggestion of three categories, and mine of four. And then there is a column that just says "comments."

So by tomorrow morning, we would expect to have -- and actually have it to send to everyone by later today this Excel spreadsheet. And then we would want to try to figure out what the consolidated headings are for Column 2. So this would be a mapping exercise for one question but a question that, I think, everyone has agreed is a very significant question and where there was a significant amount of input.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. And thank you for all who have participated in this work and who are going to participate. And I really encourage all of you to participate and to contribute.

I think the result of this exercise may be a very valuable document. I think as well that due to the complexity of the issue, probably many of us would think that we have to take the document back home and consult with relevant partners. So having said that, I'm looking forward to have this document eventually by tomorrow. And I'm sure the secretariat will give all the help which is needed to finalize in a way that we can use it for our future discussions.

So we are back to Group Number 2, Questions 4, 8 and 9. And before lunch break, we discussed many issues. I'm turning to you if you have any other comments or observation on these questions.

My intention, that eventually we will go through in a relatively quick way all the groups and all the questions and we shall revisit them naturally in more depth. And probably we will take two groups of questions in the coming days with a view of eventually arriving to some kind of draft recommendation.

So any comment on Question Numbers 4, 8 and 9?

Well, I can see no one asking for the floor.

Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. I actually think for myself I got very diverted on to Question 4, and I don't feel like we have talked through 8 and 9. And I would ask other colleagues. But I think there's a merit to talking about 8 and 9 as a pair right now. Or if people don't feel prepared to talk about it, then I would like to park it and come back to it because they are two questions that I otherwise sort of feel like we're stranding.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I fully agree with you. That's why I asked the group to comment on that. I can see the United States asking for the floor. Please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps not to comment on that particular point but to take your earlier point, I guess, when you were just asking generally for comments related to various questions. So in the arena of Question 4, I would just make a note that for my administration, from the United States, we see no hard distinction between public policy issues and technical issues in terms of broadly governance. Both, whether we are in a technical arena or in a public policy arena, for us we think that it's important to take in the views of all stakeholders, not just simply government, not just simply the private sector. And that's the way we can best progress. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.S., for this comment.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: If as Marilyn says that 8 and 9 has to be treated together and 8 is about mechanisms and 9 about the role of IGF and also taking from the United States' intervention that if -- I mean, I have been trying to insist since morning that categories of technical and public policy be separated because the nature of stakeholder roles are different.

And, now, if -- now, we have to then connect to the point where they are different or non-different. I think that point, even between the mechanisms and the IGF, is the decision-making procedures which the Chair has very appropriately put as a subheading in the summary itself.

I think the core issue is this. People do agree that, yes, whether it is technical or public policy, everybody's views have to be taken. They could be heavily layered and intensive processes of

view taking and reporting back why the views were considered and not, et cetera. And all of this are fine.

And I think the real point is the decision-making procedure regarding different kinds of issues. And that's where the difference lies. In technical policies, the decision-making could still be shared in some manners. But there is some kind of public policy issues, e-commerce and consumer rights and taxation, a whole host of them here. In international jurisdictions, we are also very clear that the decision-making is done in a particular manner.

So I think if we discuss the decision-making procedures part of your summary, then we would be going to the meat of this particular question.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just want to have a quick clarification from Marilyn. I think she made a point about Question 4 being closely looked at with Question 10. Is that assumption correct?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry. I think it's Question 15. It is the one that identifies public policy issues of most importance to the developing countries. 15, isn't it?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Any other comment? Yes, Virat.

>> VIRAT BHATIA: I think the point that's been brought up by Parminder is an important one. And I think there are two views emerging which we need to sort of take cognizance of and then work away to try to close the gap as much as possible, which is are there areas where the decision-making has to be such that the other stakeholders have a lesser or a different role?

And I think we have not reached that conclusion based on the submissions yet. So I think that should be open to an evolving dialogue during this discussion.

And I don't want to go into the specifics that have been mentioned, but I think business believes that -- and I speak for my colleagues. I think we -- we believe that stakeholders need to be on that table on an equal footing to make those decisions as much as they have to be on an equal footing in the policy dialogue that occurs in places such as the IGF.

Part of this is because if not all, vast majority of the infrastructure that currently provides access to nearly 7 billion mobile subscriptions in the world, citizens who are online, which is 40% of the world and 40% of the households across the world, that infrastructure is provided by the private sector.

So even if access was an issue -- and we can go on to any number of issues there -- I think any policy that will impact the investment possibilities across the world and given the fact that there

is free flow of investment now across the world, just citing one of the many, would require stakeholders to be in this decision-making process at an equal footing and more importantly have a mechanism which allows for everybody to be on an equal footing, not just to be consulted but, in fact, the views should be considered and discussed. And if there is a result that we reach after the discussion, it could well be that one of the stakeholders was wrong and the other stakeholder was right. That decision can only be made if the mechanism and the platform provides for all the stakeholders to be on an equal footing.

If the status of the stakeholders is decided before the discussion occurs, then the decision-making will shift to a certain different stakeholder. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for these remarks. Definitely no one really thinks right now that we are at the state of conclusions. We are just starting our discussions. And we are here to express the different approaches we have and we try to find some common understanding, which approach is advantageous to one issue and which approach is advantageous to another one. So probably at the end of the day, we may have a better understanding. I don't think we are going to arrive to some conclusion -- well, at least not today. I hope we are going to arrive to some conclusion on Friday evening. If not, I think we will have other meetings.

We know the issues are complex. We know that. And the issues are new. Even though the decision which was taken during the WSIS dates about almost nine years now. But still the evolution of the Internet itself and all the issues which we are facing every day are new. So I think we are in a learning curve, and we have to take this also into account.

So any other comments on Question 4, 8 and 9? There was a request or a call from Marilyn that eventually we'd like to discuss 8 and 9 which haven't been touched upon.

Yes, India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I'd just like to reflect on some of the comments which have been made just now by colleagues in the room. I think -- I think to be drawn into the initial comments you made at the beginning of this meeting, I think they're very critical and important. The mandate of the group here is very well-specified through the General Assembly resolution. I think we need to be extremely mindful, which you have reminded us quite very early in the discussion, that the challenge that we face is -- there are obviously evolving subjects, evolving issues.

And having said that, I think it would be important to bear in mind that we are not here to rewrite the Tunis Agenda. We are not here to redefine the roles with respect to stakeholders.

I think if you go down that path, we may have difficulties in arriving at conclusions or the way decisions are to be made. I think these are larger issues that we should leave for some other mandated body to look at it.

At this point in time, the route we embarked upon which is to define those issues which we decide as public policy issues and technical issues and then going down the path of looking at what mechanisms that are existing and if we need to further strengthen them. I think perhaps that could be the right way to do, in our opinion. So I think it's important that we continuously be reminding ourselves of the importance of this particular dimension of our work.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this remark. And you maybe show that I will do my best to stick to the mandate we have. However, we should also take into consideration that we are part of a process and this process is the WSIS +10 process. We should provide some input to the final evaluation of the WSIS +10. And we cannot exclude some elements which may be beneficial for the revision of this process, for the review of the process.

Before I give the floor to Avri, Carlos asked for the floor. Carlos.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Yes. I would just like to compliment what you just said, Peter. I think that the document from LACNIC, the response from the questionnaire, it says an interesting thing that the Tunis Agenda, the results of Tunis, we don't have to take as a Bible in every paragraph, sentence, or word because there is a dynamic. There is a process in which the Internet is evolving. The technologies are evolving. The relationships between states and other stakeholders are evolving as well.

And this is the reason why we are here, exactly too precise or to attempt to focus more on these issues of cooperation amongst stakeholders. So let's not be fixed on the idea of "in their respective roles," and let's be much more open about it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos.

Avri, remote participant, and then I see Phil and I see Sweden as well.

>>AVRI DORIA: Good day to you all. Sorry I couldn't be here. Saying good day from lovely Vancouver where the IETF meeting is being held this week.

I wanted to come in behind what Carlos has said and comment on the role of stakeholders and the notion that that is something that is somewhat sacrosanct and cannot be modified.

I rather say that it is something that must be modified. It was a government proscription for the roles of all stakeholders, the roles and responsibilities. It does not reflect accurately all the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders in the Internet governance environment.

And unless we can adjust that to reflect reality, to reflect real capabilities, we are condemning ourselves to sort of wander around in circles where some people assert that roles and responsibilities that others have and must take cannot be the case. So I really do beg us to take the redefinition of those in a multistakeholder model as opposed to trying to constrain the

discussions in such a way that only one stakeholder defines the roles and responsibilities of another. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Very interesting remarks. And we are aware of the enormous task ahead of us. And we should also understand the delicacy of the issues. So probably we have to be very cautious in using words such as "must." We shall, of course, consider things. But I would caution you to follow a kind of process which is very cautious.

Phil and then Sweden.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. And good afternoon. I listen with interest to this discussion and my mind goes back to the very interesting and varied interpretations that have been put into the responses that we have received as part of the process. And I think the points that have been made by yourself and others are ones that we should take into account.

WSIS was nine years ago, and the world has moved on since then. To some it has perhaps not moved as much and as fast or, indeed, covered a number of the points that would have been liked. But the journey, as many refer to enhanced cooperation within the responses, has started. And I think it's important certainly bearing in mind the point made by Virat and by others that it is -- it is a start. And stakeholders, as part of the debate, now need to be included as a general inclusion in discussions and decisions going forward. I don't think we should try and lose sight of that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I agree what was said by India. We are not here to rewrite the Tunis Agenda. That's not within our mandate obviously.

However, what I think we all have to do, given that the Tunis Agenda is, say, a high-level document -- high-level principles are enclosed in the Tunis Agenda -- is that we have to interpret the Tunis Agenda. And that's, I think, something that we all do here. So there is a clear distinction there, I think.

Just also to comment on the issue that was discussed before about separating technical issues from public policy issues, I think we are also of the view that we do not see a clear benefit of making such a distinction given that we think that it's very important to deal with public policy issues also in a multistakeholder environment. So we are not sure that that would add any benefit to the work here to do such a clear distinction, separation.

If I also may very briefly comment on Question 8 and 9, since you asked for that, although we can come back with more details later. But for us, enhanced cooperation is a process. And I think that's -- that's very important to keep in mind. And, therefore, it's not something that is

implemented through one mechanism or in one specific fora but a process that is taking place in many different foras.

And we definitely see IGF as one of those foras where enhanced cooperation is taking place, not the only one, though, but one of them. So that's how we -- that's our take on Question 8 and 9, I think. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Again, the remote participant, Joy Liddicoat. Joy, you have the floor.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Peter.

I wanted to just make a couple of comments with respect to comments made so far. This is in relation to Question 8 and coming from mechanisms.

(Background noise).

(indiscernible). I think that's critical to underscore. I think there has been a (indiscernible) of mechanisms on which enhanced cooperation has been quite constant. Tunis Agenda was agreed and that includes both new and existing mechanisms. For example, there are some mechanisms considering (indiscernible) issues including the United Nations (indiscernible) which have not previously been considered before in some respects which cover an actual cooperation's mechanism of stakeholders. And that I think with regard to whatever form the mechanism takes, it's going to be more successful in enhanced cooperation that people participating can do so with confidence.

And I think that, therefore, (indiscernible) to which people have a stake with an existing governmental system, there are many opportunities for governments who participate, some obviously more than others. And the challenge, I think, is to give developing countries more voice but also to just civil society and other stakeholders with some existing mechanisms.

(indiscernible). I would agree that this decision of public policy and technical issues (indiscernible) because if we are going to define substance from the former works we discussed, then I think we are at risk for (indiscernible) public policy.

And I would remind (indiscernible) members to think about (indiscernible) enhanced cooperation. Cooperation is a positive tool. It's a tool that is designed to catch (background noise) (indiscernible) that some participants are working on over the months. But it would be an useful one for us to go back to and consider this afternoon. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. You sounded a bit distant from us. She's talking from New Zealand.

We are -- I think all of us are aware of the importance of the process we are in. And enhanced cooperation means something very positive to all of us, I believe, well to me at least. And I would like to encourage you to take this positive approach as well.

So having said that, anyone on Question 4, 8, 9? Especially 8 and 9.

Yes, an observer.

>>MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Chair. Matthew Shears with CDT. I think just a couple comments on what's been said so far. There is an incredibly diverse -- great diversity of views on enhanced cooperation, and that is reflected very well in the summary. But I would like to take a couple of particular points, especially when it comes to mechanisms. People have mentioned how the world has changed, how the Internet has changed since the WSIS. And I'd like to say that when we contemplate moving forward in this particular working group and we talk about multilateral models that have other stakeholders in some consultative role, this doesn't seem to me to be a step forward in any interpretation of the word "cooperation."

I think to come back to the things that were said earlier on today, it is important that we be open to the views of all of the parties. It is important that we reflect on how the Internet space has evolved and how there has been cooperation and enhanced cooperation and that we take that view forward.

And I would like to say that for all those who have suggested that we need to look at the issues, this is exactly the way to go forward. Let's look at those issues. Let's understand how they are being addressed. Let's then understand in what ways they are being addressed and how those ways can be improved upon, and let's take that as the basis of our discussions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, it seems to me that for the time being, there are no more contributions concerning the Group 2; that is 4, 8 and 9. We have the promise of the voluntary task group to come up with a document tomorrow morning so probably we shall discuss this issue tomorrow as well.

Now, I suggest that eventually we move to the next group. This is Group 3. I will let you look into the questions pertaining to Group 3. Probably five minutes would be enough to refresh our memories and then we shall start the discussions after the coffee break which I think will be around 20 past 4:00. So please have a look at the questions under Group 3.

[Reviewing document.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it seems to me that five minutes goes really fast and you seem to be very much absorbed in your exercise, which I'm very happy about, but I believe we have to get to the point now. So it's Group 3, and I would like to hear some comments from you.

So far, if I'm not mistaken, we are talking about Questions 5, 6, 7, 17 -- 14, and 17, which is quite substantial. And they're all of the stakeholders we have already touched upon, but our (indiscernible) this is the nature of the thing, but we come back to the same issues from a different angle. But right now we have to concentrate on this particular issue, which is the role of the stakeholders. So who would like to contribute, and I would like to have -- of course, with all my respect to you, Brazil, I'm all ears for the comments. I will give you the floor shortly, but let me ask those ones who seem to have some kind of jet lag or some kind of fatigue because of the - - we're at the end of the year and we have many meetings, I understand. But I would like to encourage you, those of you who haven't done it yet, to contribute to the meeting, to collect more views and to make this meeting really fruitful. Brazil, please.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, I also joined a group of people that are jet-lagged. But anyway, maybe I can just make a few comments. First of all, in the light of the discussions we had before, if we agreed that we want to examine the issue of enhanced cooperation through the angle of differentiation among issues, then Question Number 5 should also take this into account when we ask, "What are the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation," so various aspects relates to different kinds of circumstance that should be dealt with differently. So, in a way it is linked to the discussion we had before, and in a way to have meaningful discussion with this we would need the work that is being -- that they can -- I understand by Marilyn Cade and others, that can provide us with some more tools for that regard. However, I would also -- from the point of view of governments, I would recall that in another section in the context of the Council Working Group, the U.K. has come up with a proposal that is very interesting from the point of the view of the role of governments in Internet Governance as a whole that provides very useful elements for examining this issue from the perspective of governments. And the way it indicates areas in which governments can -- and certainly from the perspective of public policy -- can provide very specific contribution for the environment, the legal environment, legal framework, regulatory framework, and also as a catalyst for the multistakeholder ambiance as a whole. So I think even if it is not in the context of how it will work, it will be useful to relate to this document.

Question Number 6, of course, is -- in our view is also very clearly -- 6 and 7 to the discussion also we had before in the sense that the -- also if we identify -- oh, I'm sorry. Yes, because then we are maybe focusing on mechanisms, and I think this is something that might be useful to use in conjunction with Question Number 8. All of these questions relate to each other. It's not easy to -- it's not so clear how to tackle them separately.

In regard to Question Number 7, I would also again refer you to this U.K. paper, refer that enhanced cooperation, from the point of view of governments, from the point of view of the enabling environment, it certainly will also be a tool for participation of multistakeholders and in itself with assist them also to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

One comment in regard to Question Number 14 is that I think this is, of course, a very useful issue to be examined and I understand for a few participants a very important issue and for my own delegation a very important issue, the local language contents. However, in this case, I -- my feelings are that maybe it should not be the main focus of our work. I think we should -- I think this is one of the issues that should be dealt with in the context of enhanced cooperation. That's -- the focus of our work should be the structure and the kind of framework we want, more than the issues themselves. So my feeling is that although very important aspects, that should not maybe be the focus of our work here.

And finally with regards to 17, yeah, again I would just refer to the reply we gave on the policy development institutional multistakeholder framework, and I want to make reference to the model we had in Brazil in the steering committee which is one of the possibilities in which that would be translated to a concrete achievement. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Just a couple of comments. I think one thing that is important to keep in mind when we are discussing about the roles of different stakeholders is that we are dealing with a very rapidly changing environment. So rules of stakeholders might also change over time. Also, we think that it's quite important to not have too much of a top-down approach on this. Roles of stakeholders will be defined by stakeholders to a large extent. And not by -- by people outside of, let's say, the Internet Governance Eco-System.

Just to also comment briefly on how we see the role of the government, we definitely think that upholding the rule of law online in the same manner as we do offline is one of the main roles of the government as well as them upholding human rights online in the same manner that we uphold human rights offline, as well as facilitating multistakeholder dialogue on these issues. I think a lot of that has also been captured in the U.K. proposal that was mentioned by Brazil, and we very much appreciate that contribution and looking forward to sort of a dialogue on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. So anyone -- yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I would just like to build on a reference that Brazil made about the submission of the U.K. into the international public policy working group because I think it is an excellent resource. It is only available to governments or to parties that are on government delegations, so it might be possible maybe to contact the U.K. and ask them if they would provide an information document which could be shared. I will note -- I'm sorry, I don't know -- the pages aren't numbered on the submission, but the U.K., the summary for the U.K. submission on Question 5 has a very high level reference that identifies some of those topics, and I would call that to everyone's attention because I think it is a useful discussion about the -- first of all, it recognizes the mutual recognition of the respective roles, but it does go on to

identify some of the activities that were mentioned in the -- in the U.K. submission to the ITU working group.

I wanted to make a couple of comments about, I wonder if perhaps on Question 14 -- and I think there may be a couple of other questions like that which are specific to particular areas that need to be -- need to evolve very rapidly in order to ensure that all citizens of the world can use the Internet and the World Wide Web. Maybe we might take those questions and put them in a category to come back to and -- because it may be that we will not, in this working group, be able to be very specific but we might be able to summarize that the interest of those who responded to the questionnaire showed strong support for continued work being done on these particular issues. And this one is the development of local language content. I wouldn't want to lose the submissions, but I -- I agree with Brazil that it may be too granular an area for us to spend a lot of time on. And we didn't ask questions about every other issue.

And then finally, I think Question 7, I guess I'm really quite surprised that there's not a lot of flags up to talk about Question 7. So I will say that I think it is a question that we need to talk about a lot more. And if we don't talk about it now, then maybe we could talk about it tomorrow whenever we get the Question 4 documents and come back and talk about this question in more detail.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Before I give the floor to Parminder, I turn to the U.K. and ask, for she has already the answer, and my question is, there was reference to the ITU working group public policy issues and the contributions came from the U.K. Do you think there's a possibility of making this available to the group here? Thank you.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to thank everyone here for such positive feedback on that paper which was put together in a multistakeholder group in the U.K. I'm sure it would be perfectly fine for us to share it with the group here. I'm just double-checking with London, but I can't foresee any problem. I'll get a copy sent to the Secretariat so they can make sure that everybody has access to it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Not -- just not to lose not only that, I made the reference also because Mr. Ed Vaizey made a presentation on this at the IGF meeting so that might also be a source, the speech he delivered captured the main points. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So probably if Mr. Vaizey's speech is available, it would be also useful -- his speech during the IGF, it would be useful. But I think there's a transcript, so -- which is available on the web, on the IGF website, which can be consulted as well. And it's open.

Okay. So having said that, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. One of my points was undisputed by Ambassador (saying name). I do not have access to the U.K. document submitted to the ITU, but I remember sitting through the first session in the IGF and the minister detailed four levels of governmental role as they saw in Internet Governance and I nearly agreed with the whole framework there. And having heard that framework and agreeing to that, I'm a little unclear about certain conclusions of the discussion and I think this particular discussion is important also to figure out what mechanisms are necessary. Because after my early intervention which said that the main point here is the participation and decision-making, the rest -- everything is fine, number of consultations, back and forth, you know, drafts, et cetera. But decision-making is in terms of public policymaking in democracies and after my intervention I had a lot of people saying no, they really want other stakeholders to have an equal role in decision-making in public policy processes. Now that really kind of freezes my mind about what are we talking about here. Because public policy and the role of (indiscernible) in public policy is not an issue of Internet Governance. It's an issue of global democracy and it's an issue of national democracies, and the proposition that corporations and even citizen society groups would fit and we equally participate, have equal role in public policymaking, it's something completely beyond my democratic understanding. And I think there's something which I'm missing here because I don't think that could be what people are saying because it's purely post-democratic narrative for people to say that no -- yes, we're talking public policies and we are talking that non-governmental stakeholders will have an equal role in decision-making.

So I think whoever make that proposal, I would like to hear more about what really they mean. Because at one point we were ready to separate the technical part of it, the standard setting, logical infrastructure that's different, people can have an equal role, so can we separate, call public policymaking. And people say no, we still need equal role in decision-making in public policymaking. That's beyond my understanding. For me that's the Holy Grail of democracy is what I already said. And if that point is resolved, then my mind could get out of this stalemate of what really is the difference of view between different people here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder, for that thought-provoking contribution and probably those who propose the multistakeholder approach can give you examples how it is working in practice. I can see a lot of flags. Saudi Arabia are welcome to.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon to everyone. In regards to the list of three of the questions, about the roles and responsibilities of all of the stakeholders, my intervention was much covered by from Parminder in regards to the decision-making process. And this is what I would like to hear more about because when I heard the discussion, it seems that like if the roles of the government has been actually implemented since 2005 and now we are examining the role of the governments in regards to the Internet Governance, but in the reality the role of the governments in regards to the Internet Governance has not been implemented. I know that there's been an advisory group, but it does not reach to have a decision-making -- I mean, a decision-making mechanism in regards to Internet matters.

What we're talking about here is the international public policy that is -- relates to the sovereignty of the states and relates to the cooperation between states to another state. I was in Korea and the cyberspace conference just recently, and I see some faces who attended that conference. I mean, there was a big number of foreign ministers and most of them talked about that we need cooperation in regards to issues that has to be decided by governments. We cannot have a good faith in regards to the whole private sector and the technical community in regards to aspects. We have to have a decision made by governments in regards to the child, for example, pornography, child online protection. If there was no decision made by states in this regards, we cannot prevent or have something in that matter. For example, there was a big discussion about the privacy, the recent talks about the privacy and that privacy and freedom does not conflict each other. But there has to be a very high guidelines. I heard, too, the Swedish foreign minister, he declared seven principles, global principles to be adopted in regards to the surveillance. That's the things that we -- we -- I'm talking about being a government, that needs to be very high level in terms of international public policy. We're not intervening in the day-to-day operational -- I mean, operation, because we don't want to drift from the role of the governments. Governments does not have interest to go very low in technicality and how things functioning and the standards and all these things. We need to set principles that we negotiate, we have a mechanism that governments can negotiate to each other, governments can solve problems based on agreed international public policies.

I will stop at this, but in regards to the roles of the -- of the stakeholders, we still believe that -- I mean, Tunis Agenda, even if it's been nine years, still, I mean, the roles is very reasonable in regards to, for example, paragraph 35. Wherever there's matters relates to the sovereignty of the states, it's the right of the states to tackle these matters. When we talk about the technical policies, that is the international organizations, the technicality and so on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I would like to ask you, all of us, in fact, that once again, the way I started that we have a mandate and probably we should stick to the mandate and the mandate was established by the United Nations General Assembly. So I really recommend you to discuss the issues we have agreed upon in the first meeting, to concentrate on the questions we agreed on in the first meeting and to follow up on.

I can see Sweden, India, and -- I can see Japan. And finally I have Joy, remote participation, and Jimson. After Jimson we shall break for -- we shall break. And I promise, Brazil, you will be the first speaker after the coffee break. So Sweden, India, Japan, Joy, Jimson.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Well, just to say that to us enhanced cooperation is not only about decision-making, but about cooperation in a broader sense and about dialogue. But even if you're talking about development of policy, I think it's important to do that in an open, transparent multistakeholder model. If we're talking about decisions, legislation, for instance, obviously at the national level, that's what parliaments do. But when we're talking about enhanced cooperation, for us it's much broader than the decision-making part. Sometimes, obviously,

states come to that as well. We have to make certain decisions, adopt certain treaties, adopt recommendations, so on. But when we're looking at enhanced cooperation, we see that in a much broader sense about cooperation, about dialogue, about policy dialogue, and Policy Development, because Policy Development is also much broader than just decision-making. So that's where we're coming from. Thank you.

>> (indiscernible)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. We'd like to make two quick comments. First, I think some pertinent questions have been raised about the definition of multistakeholder approach. I think at some stage during our deliberations we clarify this. I think there are issues relating to -- dimensions have been brought up. One, as I said, at the policy-making level, consultation level to leading (indiscernible) and other sort of relative roles of the various stakeholders in the decision-making process. I think if you are planning to write this particular phrase, I think it's not a bad idea that we eventually lead up to defining what it means in this working group. That's one solution.

Secondly, coming to the specific group of questions that you have reflected, I think we have very -- very clearly said that enhanced cooperation is also a dynamic process. It is a dynamic process because the Internet -- the way it is evolving is dynamic. So we cannot have static solutions. The solutions also have to be dynamic. But this does not take away the responsibility of this group today to decide to sort of postpone decisions, to postpone that talk, we will not do it today but we will do it later. Because it's so dynamic we can't really perhaps sort of put our finger on a particular process or a particular mechanism. I think this is important.

Bearing that in mind, we have in our replies also defined a large number of areas, largely drawing upon the previous working group which just touched on this. What are the specific roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders. When we refer to Tunis paragraph number 55, I don't think we're trying to create a kind of silo. No, the idea is not to create a silo. The idea is to broadly define what is the relative roles and responsibilities. But this, I think, has been moved on. I think this is a question in which we have in our reply tried to elaborate a number of pages where there are relative responsibilities of various stakeholders. I think if you -- we could act on this list, and I'm sure there are ways to do it because as I said, we are -- we are encountering a new -- new developments in the use of Internet.

Going to Question 6 and 7, I think these are closely interlinked as some colleagues have pointed out a little while ago, I think to be very frank, I think governments are also trying to discover what is their role in the Internet. Today the challenge is that. It's not the other way around, that we are trying to define the role of other stakeholders. But I think governments also are very mindful, very cautious, about what are the mechanisms that we look at evolving. Does not in any way sort of lessen or make the dynamic nature of Internet to stifle. It should become a platform

for innovation, platform for greater social economic development, because the tools that we are employing back home using this medium -- I mean, I'm sure we all do in our own country, but in India we are very proud of what we're doing. I don't think governments are interested in any way trying to stifle this process. I think that's to be very clear, and we are very committed to that particular process.

And this -- while saying that in the relative roles and responsibilities, when you talk of governments, since there is a question about how do we deal with this, since there would be some areas where there is a public policy space that the governments ought to make decisions because they answer to their own people. The medium is Internet here. We agree to that. But there are two -- but the way the convergence of technologies are taking place today, that everything -- any transaction that an individual in society will do will eventually touch upon the Internet space. So there is definitely a responsibility for the governments, both in the national space as well as in the international or the multi -- some colleagues may not like the word "multi-lateral" but in the larger international space, I think it is precisely there that we are coming in. It would only enhance the processes. As I said, it is not with the intention to stifle them. That being clearly said, it is -- on the reply to Question 7, we are looking at further enhancing the role of the stakeholders, other stakeholders, because the big question here 6 and 7, we're touching on governments in one question and other stakeholders. Again, it is not -- I don't think we should vote on the part of saying that there's a prioritization here. No, I don't think that is (indiscernible), but the way it is structured I think the replies are also provided in that manner. We're open to this idea as to how we need to define -- if it is -- if it is a proposition in the room that how do we define the roles of other stakeholders without -- again, the issue is not to undermine the existing roles. It is to see how further it can be enhanced and see that everything can go together. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. It's very thought-provoking and, thank you for the remarks. Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In addition to the role and responsibilities of various stakeholders, I think it is very important to consider the cooperation among the various stakeholder to facilitate enhanced cooperation and to address the international public policy issues related to the Internet, how to incorporate each of it effectively. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan. I have Joy. Joy Liddicoat.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of points to touch on (indiscernible) this discussion about roles and (indiscernible) I know we're focusing on the role of governments but I think it's very (indiscernible) that enhanced cooperation can't be tweaked to (indiscernible) stakeholder design. (indiscernible) I do think it's important we define (indiscernible).

Civil society participation is (indiscernible) to be strengthening. And I do think it is important that (indiscernible) part of the Tunis Agenda in relation to the roles of civil society and

government is inadequate in linking civil society's role with (indiscernible) and not working well with government.

For example, civil society does have a key role (indiscernible). And it is particularly important in terms of the (indiscernible) to governments, specifically analyzing and supporting governments is positively challenging in purporting government action.

So I think in that respect, it is important to recognize that it is government's responsibility as well as role. And this is something we have touched on before in our working group discussions. We have responsibility, for example, (indiscernible). I think that is something that can be (indiscernible) debate that can be.

I would just like to support the comments from governments of India and Sweden in relation to the (indiscernible) in relation to the government relationships with each other and equalizing those relationships. (indiscernible) submissions from examples (indiscernible) is a third round in relation to (indiscernible). I would just -- support of some of the other participants to think it is helpful of the roles of governments (indiscernible). Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Unfortunately, we had some sound problems. Your message came through, however. In case you think you can just write down in short summary, what you said, it would be very useful for the record and for further considerations. There were a lot of points which did not come through.

The last speaker before the coffee break, Jimson.

>> JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair. I would like to first thank my brother Parminder for his sincere desire to know why -- (indiscernible), for example, wants to be involved into decision-making. And also want to thank the distinguished representative of India for his own position and Sweden for the response.

Well, I'm coming from the private sector in Nigeria. And I witnessed the dynamics of Internet development in our country way back in 2000. By that time, there was serious problems. And the government listened to the cry of the private sector. We need to work together. And so a policy was developed together with the government. And we all agreed, we start together, agree on the framework of implementation. And today it is a success story.

Nigeria recalled the I.S. connection rate with mobile Internet in Africa today, what was unimaginable ten years ago.

And three days ago, when it comes to electrical infrastructure, the government implemented a position agreed together along with the private sector concern that the electricity needs to be privatized. And the government handed over everything about electricity to the private sector three days ago.

So there is a momentum going on. And I'm happy the representative of India said we don't want to be (indiscernible), we don't want to be hindered. We also want to really move forward and transform the socioeconomic life of global citizens and citizens from developing nations in particular.

And if that's our objective, why shouldn't we -- if you look at the Internet infrastructure, if we boil down as Virat said, the private sector implements a number of these decisions, then what is wrong if we all -- because we have the agenda of the global citizens in mind. Based on the fact that we're enhancing cooperation, why can't we all listen together and then enhance the framework for decision-making?

Yes, we've been discussing the IGF. Very productive. We now understand the processes. But to firm up a way forward, I think it just makes sense for private sector in particular -- and I believe civil society to play a very strong role -- to be involved. And together we will make one Internet forward for the global socioeconomic well-being of our people. That is my thinking, and that is my response to what I think the sincere request from my brother Parminder, why private sector should be part of it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. I think we had a very fruitful discussion this afternoon. We are going to continue it after the coffee break. I suggest we have a 20-minute coffee break. And after, when we come back, it will be Brazil who will take the floor, I promise.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ladies and gentlemen, can I ask you to take your seats, please. I would like to resume in one minute.

So welcome back to the meeting, ladies and gentlemen. Phil? Can you take your seats, please.

[Gavel]

So before the coffee break, I promised Brazil the floor. I have one announcement. During our discussions, there was a reference to the U.K. contributions to the upcoming Council Working Group in the ITU. You have hard copies of the contribution here, I'm not mistaken. So please take your copy. I think it's at the end of the table.

So having said that, I pass the floor to Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, I'd like to make a few comments that might sound very obvious but I think that in light of the discussion we have had before break, I think it might be worthwhile making.

First of all, I think -- and the Chair has mentioned this a number of times -- that we are not supposed and we are not mandated and we should not redraft the Tunis Agenda. So the context, we have the mandate and we have the Tunis Agenda. If we go back to the Tunis Agenda, paragraph 35, which spells the roles of stakeholders -- and I take into account the sense that we should not look at these as something written in stone because particularly, for example, with regard to civil society, we must maybe have a more open mind in regard to the roles.

But as regards the role of government, it is very clearly spelled out that the policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states. So I would like to echo what was mentioned by Parminder and others that may be one basic assumption we should -- that should guide our work is in cooperation with what's in the Tunis Agenda that's public policy for international-related lies within government.

But then as we look to the paragraph on enhanced cooperation, there is the differentiation, a clear differentiation, that must be made between those international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and those technical and operational matters. And I think the differentiation is already there. It's not something that we should ourselves decide if we are making or not the differentiation between public policy -- it is already there. What I think the contribution that could come from our group, that would be a major contribution, would be to put some more meat and interpret and elaborate on this.

And this brings us back to the issue of separating the different issues having categories. If as a result of our group, we can lead to a better understanding of what are those technical and operational issues, how they are being dealt with now, how from our perspective of enhanced cooperation something could be done to improve this -- and from our perspectives very clearly there is a need for information, for governments, even if they are not involved with this technical and operational daily activities to be more informed and feeling themselves also as involved in a way what's being done there is being cooperated and acknowledged. I think this is something that is missing until now.

And, again, on the issue of public policies, to identify those -- to have different categories and in each one to specify whether this is being dealt with in some forum, how it is being done, what can be improved, and in cases there are no home, no -- I think as the APC has mentioned, are orphaned issues. What could we come about?

I'm saying this because I saw in previous interventions the kind of rhetorical discussion that I think we should not let ourselves engage. On one hand, some parties are defending the role of one stakeholder that we should not put in place multilateral institutions that do not take into account... I think this is fully acknowledged and understood. What we need is more clarity with regard to very specific issues, categories, what we should do about this to make the spirit what is contained in the Tunis Agenda a reality.

Again, we are not reformulating the Tunis Agenda. We are implementing and we are trying to come up with recommendations. But, again, the debates and the prerequisite is to have a clear understanding.

And I refer to the text of the Tunis Agenda because some of the things that were said before in a way might be interpreted as seeking to reinterpret what is in the Tunis Agenda. Public policy issue is something that lies with government because it's part of the government mandate to do this.

But what are those issues? What are those areas that should lie -- that should fall under this category and how that could be done? I think this is the kind of approach we need. And, again, we have to take a very open view in acknowledging everything that has been done, the decentralized system that should be fully taken into account and incorporated (indiscernible) but also take into account I think in some areas, also some particular mechanism should be -- this is our view. But we are open, of course, to the discussion and see how that can be addressed, even if within an existing mechanism.

But I think this is the kind of discussion we might have. Otherwise, we will be falling back into rhetorical discussions. And I think this would not -- especially in light of the time constraints, we have not led to very concrete outcomes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ambassador. I think we try to avoid rhetoric and rhetorical discussions. And as far as I'm concerned, I would also like to avoid going into definitions. I prefer to have some kind of common understanding. But we are not supposed to come up with definitions, which will take up all our time. I'm sure, if we can come clear to some kind of common understanding, probably it will be sufficient for future work.

I don't deny that definitions are extremely useful, and they give clarity. But probably if we want to have some result as a result of our work, then we have to avoid that.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to take the opportunity of this discussion on several questions to react to some of the comments that have been made in the room and evoke perhaps some of the pieces of our submission that might come into play.

First of all, I want to thank Saudi Arabia for their reference to the Seoul cyber conference and just add that, you know, it was part of a process of conferences beginning in London two years ago and then Budapest last year and will continue on into The Hague now next year.

And as that set of conferences has transpired, has become increasingly more multistakeholder in its participation and its input and, also, particularly on a set of issues dealing with international security, cybersecurity, combating cybercrime and capacity-building. And I think the discussions there mirror much what they do in other venues in that they address areas (dropped audio)

behavior, for example, and also in areas where cooperation is a real key in collaboration across stakeholders. And global collaboration is the key. In that sense, I would really like to affiliate with the elegant comments made by Sweden on the fact that solving problems does not always need a public policy process or a decisional process.

That goes very much to the call for practicality and practical measures that we've heard from both colleagues from India and Brazil in addressing what is a very dynamic environment and decision-making processes are very difficult, have a great difficulty in addressing those in a timely manner in what is such a fast-moving environment.

Therefore, enabling factors are important. And that is something that we think may be evoked in the U.K. proposal that we have been discussing but also to some extent in our submission, that national frameworks can enable not only consultation and engagement with stakeholders in a national context for national public policy making but also for enabling international cooperation whether it be building transparency with counterparts in other countries, whether it be addressing confidence-building measures or to evoke the full conference, once again, affirming norms of behavior. But importantly for engagement and collaboration on what those practical measures can be don't need a decisional process necessarily to collaborate to find solutions.

And then, lastly, there was a comment made about the responsibility of governments in addition to the role of governments. And absolutely we are not saying that there is no responsibility for governments in this area, but it's not only the responsibility of the governments.

So I'd really like to leave sort of three notions that encapsulate our response to this set of questions which I hope provide some examples of how not only we undertake in a consultative and multistakeholder process in our public policy making at home but our efforts towards empowering, enabling, and engaging roles for each of the stakeholders in any given particular policy or functional aspect. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

I would like to remind you that for the scribes and the remote participants, it will be very advantageous if you can speak up loudly a bit slower.

>>UNITED STATES: Sorry. Thank you for the reminder.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It is not only for you, for all of us. Don't take it personally. No, no, no, no.

[Laughter]

I perfectly got what you wanted to say so I have no problem with that.

Anyone want to take the floor concerning -- Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Continuing from the comments made by distinguished delegate from Brazil and then United States, on the role of governments, typically as we discussed this issue -- and I think Parminder raised the point just sort of directly and eminently -- that this is typically a role for the governments, to represent the interests of all stakeholders at international fora.

There are many U.N. bodies that see that process. However, the Tunis Agenda which was a result of perhaps the world's largest multistakeholder meeting, approximately 9,500 or so -- not quite sure what the numbers are -- which included very large participation from the government, recognized the role for other stakeholders on an equal footing along with the government thereby also recognizing the fact that where Internet governance was concerned, other stakeholders had to be brought on board. And this was, in some ways, innovative and a deviation.

So we should remember that -- and remind ourselves as we discuss this because we all agreed we don't want to redefine the Tunis Agenda. It is the Tunis Agenda that brings in stakeholders in a way that many other international documents don't in many, many other areas of work.

On the issue of public policy at a high level and not doing day-to-day which is the other piece that was made out with regards to government, I think it is important to note that what might be high-level public policy for one is day-to-day for the other. For example, there are organizations that handle CIRs every day and for them it is day-to-day. But for governments, it might be a global dialogue in a public policy discussion.

So there is this distinction that we hope to make. This fine distinction is not that easy to make. I'm just taking one case, but we can go with child pornography. We can talk about something as basic as "Internet for all" which would certainly be a sovereign declaration by most governments. And I might add that not a single government in the world, at least today, would be able to do that with the involvement of the technical communities and the private sector. So even high-level principles.

Case in point, at the time the Tunis Agenda was written, there were 2 billion mobile connections in the world. There are 7 billion today. 90% of those have been provided by the private sector, not something that the Tunis Agenda could have envisaged.

There were 52 million connections in India. There are 900 million connections today, almost all provided by the private sector with a lot of innovation and help from academy and other stakeholders.

Internet users, the same. 950 million around the world at the time Tunis Agenda was written. 2.7 billion today. Vast majority of those are on private sector networks.

In India, 38 million at the end of 2005. Today, 170 million.

So I think as this process evolves -- (echo) -- that role is fairly defined and, as I said, something that's very high level, access for all.

Everybody hearing an echo? Should I go again? Okay. I think it's better now.

But let me just directly and quickly go to the sections of the Tunis Agenda that are often invoked in discussing the roles of the government.

Section 29, it actually states in no uncertain terms "with the full involvement of the governments." Now, it need not have said that. In fact, says "with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, the civil society, and the international organizations" which recognizes the fact that they use the word "full involvement" and immediately after that it states "all the stakeholders." By the way, it leaves out technical community and academia, which is a section by itself here, which shows how much the world has developed. There are five principles here that were not mentioned in the Tunis Agenda as we discussed Section 29.

Section 31, "based on full participation of all stakeholders," it uses the word "full participation of all stakeholders."

Section 60, that is also referred to, which talks about that "the current mechanisms require attention are not adequately" -- "which are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms."

Now, this doesn't mean that they cannot be currently addressed. It says they are not currently being addressed. And there are a lot of suggestions in response to the questionnaire which we have seen which says we can expand, improve, enhance the role of IGF and any of the other mechanisms that currently exist. It does not say it cannot. It says "may not currently."

Again, 68: Governments in an equal role. And it talks about development of public policy. It does not say "decision-making" in public policy. It does not use the word "decision-making."

So if you were to -- 69, same, uses the word "government on an equal footing." There would be those who could interpret that an equal footing with the other stakeholders. It is also a matter of interpretation.

But if you were to focus our entire attention on the Tunis Agenda, then there is sort of sufficient language here which can be interpreted as one that lends itself to an equal participation for all the stakeholders, including some that were not envisaged at the time the Tunis Agenda was written.

The last piece that I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, is that the products, the services, the offerings that are coming out and the innovation that is coming out can become a casualty to any public policy decisions that are not taking into consideration at an equal footing all the stakeholders in the room. And that would be a bit of a tragedy. And, therefore, I think we should be careful as we interpret the Tunis Agenda one way or the other. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. I think it was a very useful reminder about the different paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda. Virat relates that we look at the Tunis Agenda with a fresh eye.

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Well, just very briefly because I think most have already been said by the last intervention we heard. But I think it's very important that we read the Tunis Agenda as a whole and not cherry pick too much specific articles there.

And I wanted also to highlight Article 69, for example. But I think that is very important to keep in mind.

I would also like to take the opportunity because our colleague from Saudi Arabia mentioned the Seoul conference on cybersecurity, and that was also mentioned by our U.S. colleague and how it has been -- how that is an evolving process that is to a larger extent also including all stakeholders.

But since our minister made certain remarks there about proposals on potential principles on surveillance, I think it's very important to keep in mind in that context that that was a product that he presented, a product of extensive multistakeholder work and multistakeholder dialogue. And I think that's also -- I just wanted to make that remark given that it was explicitly brought up here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Just a thought. We are here as a Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to fulfill a mandate. We are here to evaluate, to review the inputs which have been submitted by stakeholders. I understand it doesn't exclude that we revisit the Tunis Agenda. It doesn't exclude to refer to other events which have taken place. I would like you to concentrate on our main task.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. The main point I wish to make was just a correction to what my colleague Virat spoke about. There is no mention in Tunis Agenda of an equal footing among stakeholders. It is only mentioned in 69 in a specific relevance of governments in terms of "equal footing of all stakeholders." I'm not presenting my views on this issue, just a correction of the fact.

I also heard with a lot of interest Sweden's and U.S.' interventions on the decision-making procedures and relevance of the role of different stakeholders. And I did hear them say that not every issue requires a decision-making process or a public policy response in which I completely agree that, yes, a lot of stuff doesn't require that kind of response. And that also is a part of Internet governance systems.

However, as long as we are talking about actual public policy decisions, that still remains that decision-making process has to be done by representative bodies.

And just a last part, because this issue has come in two or three interventions, that why private sector should have a role in decision-making is because it lays the infrastructure. And that's a rather new kind of argument because private sector organizes productive systems of the society in all sectors. Medical practices are based on medicines which are exclusively made by the private sector. Surgical instruments are made by private sector. It does not, therefore, mean that pharma companies have a veto on health policies in any country.

So I think the fact that somebody has the productive resources is not a good logic to say that they have a role in public policy making. So since that came -- that logic came as explaining why there should be a role here, I thought I should make a comment on that as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. Majed.

Saudi Arabia, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My intervention is about when I heard our colleagues try to explain the Tunis Agenda, I mean, item by item. I would like our interventionists to concentrate on the mandate of our work.

However, I would rather if the paragraphs that has been read in full not just to single out some of the words there just to give the real meaning for that paragraph, for example, 68 and 79, because when it talks about the equal footing, it was following the sentence to enable governments in an equal footing. So that means the governments in an equal footing.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is not the place to discuss this. And I would like not to see that we are just arguing about Tunis Agenda and trying to interpret it, as, I mean, everyone differently.

But in regards to the multistakeholder model, I noticed that even in the many conferences, they bring this issue that some governments speaks as a government, some governments with the multistakeholder model and the others is against the multistakeholder model. And this is not true. Saudi Arabia supports the multistakeholder model. However, the reality or the fact that people trying to not talk about the roles of the multistakeholder in that model, that's the -- I mean, what's the matter for us. We agree on the multistakeholder model, but we need to implement the roles for each stakeholder. And it is becoming annoying for me just to see in many fora that people just stress the multistakeholder model.

And if Tunis Agenda actually recognizes the multistakeholder model, it identified the roles of the multistakeholder model. And what we want as a government, speaking from Saudi Arabia, is to enable the governments to implement its role based on Tunis Agenda and based on the -- what happened after the nine years still. we need to enable governments to take the role and responsibilities.

And in regards to the Seoul conference, it's a very good conference and but still the purpose of such conference is to bring the -- raise the awareness, and it's a very good conference to see the different perspectives in a very high level from countries. But at the end, it's for raising the awareness and perspectives of governments or other stakeholders. And for me, this is still missing something. Missing recommendations or policies and output that when we meet we agree on something, we have something like a public policy that we can implement when we leave. And that's what we need in regards to the enhanced cooperation. We can talk and talk and talk, very good talks and we agree in this talk, but we need to see how we implement this. And that's what we need to have an international public policy, to solve the issues we face now in the interim. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I think you have formulated the role of this group as well because we are supposed to give recommendations concerning implementation of the enhanced cooperation. So I think all of us are aware that at the end of the day we should come up with recommendations.

I can see Marilyn asking for the floor and then Virat. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'm struck by a couple of things, and one of them is that for many of us who lived through the four years of the two phases of the WSIS, and participated actively in the final word selection that forms the Tunis Agenda, I think we need to remember that there were two phases and there are -- also the WSIS outcome documents also include the principles, the declaration of principles. Because I think perhaps we're losing a little bit of vision that we came away from the WSIS. If I recall, when we started the first phase of the world summit, stakeholders were not allowed in the room and governments were meeting with all good intentions, talking about highly technical issues but without the participation of the -- of the stakeholders who bring a unique understanding. And who often bring not just technical information but also understanding about legal structures, understanding about social structures, understanding about services and products in the same way that government representatives do but with different -- with different areas of perhaps accountability or focus. Paragraph 72 in the Tunis Agenda, I think the -- our colleague from Sweden reminded us of something that is very wise words and that is, this document was agreed to by heads of state as a totality. In fact, heads of state didn't sign off on a single paragraph. They signed off on the entire document. And there's a lot in paragraph 72 that also talks about the role of the IGF in discussing public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance, facilitating discourse between bodies dealing with different crosscutting international policy public issues regarding the Internet and discussing issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body. So I would just think that as we go away for the evening we probably all want to think about how we take into account the agreements that were negotiated and how we look at our assignment.

We will also have tomorrow morning the initial mapping document to look at and to see if that helps us in thinking about how issues are being addressed and where they're being addressed, and

what the satisfaction level is about how different issues are being addressed and it will bring us perhaps to identifying gaps and to being able to think about what spaces and places can be turned to and whether there is a need for any new places and spaces.

I'm sorry to hear Saudi Arabia say that it's becoming annoying. I think maybe fatigued is the word, perhaps, not to -- to hear us talk about multistakeholder but I think what I'm detecting is perhaps a different -- different parties have a different expectation about what multistakeholder means and whether multistakeholder is bottom-up participatory and actively engaged at all stages versus consultative. And that may be a difference of opinion by some parties versus others. For myself, as a business representative, I think the issue for multistakeholder is that it must be bottom-up, it must be participatory, and that governments, I think, share with citizens of their countries and of the world the interest in making the most informed, most effective, most responsible policies possible. And to do that, we need to put as many brains and as many perspectives into the discussion as possible.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I believe this group is on the right track. We have the brilliant brains here, we have the experts here from all stakeholders, and with all the hope that we shall come up with some brilliant recommendations.

Are there any other (indiscernible), Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Just a very brief comment, and taking what has just been said by Marilyn Cade and recalling the audience that prepared at the beginning of these -- holding the side around Internet Governance with the exclusion of civil society and now we are thankfully incorporating discussions. But one thing that disturbs me at some point as a diplomat that in some sense we see it to be reverse movement. Governments that were in the front line, in the limelight in the beginning, are now -- there's a clear movement to exclude government, it seems on some -- at least from some -- at least from some -- specifically the beauty of the pact of the Tunis Agenda, the outcome documents emerging from the World Summit on Information Society to recognize that the different stakeholders have different roles and responsibilities. They should work together. They should work mutually to find ways as Marilyn Cade said to lead to very informed decisions, to provide an environment to assist everyone in this collective endeavor. And it is somewhat disturbing to see some -- sometime there is a confusion about this, and maybe in the minds of some it may be the lack of historical experience of some actions undertaken by governments. (indiscernible) maybe not to allow governments to fulfill their roles in regard to -- specifically in the issues we have before us, that is public policy. So there is -- it is -- maybe disturbing is not the right word. But some people say no, let's not leave this to governments. Let's lead together because that's the spirit from -- that is the spirit from Tunis multistakeholder. That's recognizing that each stakeholder has different role and responsibilities. And I find for governments clearly a role for public policy. I think the -- our task is to interpret this in a way that is consistent with the spirit of the Tunis Agenda. But saying that an apple is an apple, a pear is a pear, not making a decision, otherwise the discussion is -- I think the kind of confusion that

has been taking place over the years found in the -- the cacophony and the lack of a common understanding of differentiation of situation that requires different responses will not be healthy if we do not guide our work by very clear understanding of the picture, of the differentiation of the situations. And there, specifically trying to figure out what lies -- what falls under this category of public policy that will require, let's say, governments to be enabled to fulfill their roles with the fullest seasoned participation of stakeholders to the benefit of all. But I would again -- I see that kind of, let's say, reversal of the situation and a movement in the direction that is not also, I think, the right direction. I think we should be working together collectively, a joint effort with mutual respect, mutual recognition of different roles and responsibilities and be open on all parts to fully engage to the benefit of the eco-system as a whole. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. I can see Grace, but I have been advised that there is some problem with the microphone for remote participation so I ask your indulgence and I would like to suspend the meeting for about three minutes. So bear with me, and we shall resume in three minutes time.

(break)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for your patience. I think we cannot solve this problem but it doesn't affect our meeting. I'm really sorry about the remote participants. We have about 10, 12 minutes to go until the end of this meeting, and I can see two nameplates. So first Grace and then (saying name) and at the end of the meeting I would like to turn to the observers, if they have anything to add, to say or any observation, and then I would like to conclude our meeting for today. So Grace, please, take the floor.

>>GRACE GITHAIGA: It's just some very quick -- very quick comments. One on multistakeholder and one on roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders. And it's just to support what Marilyn was raising, that multistakeholder is really -- must ensure participation from all stakeholder groups. It also needs to be inclusive, transparent, and accountable and must be global in nature and needs to be managed in such a way that none of the stakeholders or regions can determine the outcome without the cooperation of all other stakeholder groups and regions.

And in terms of responsibilities of the different stakeholders, I feel there needs to recognize that the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders in Internet Governance cannot be fixed and they will vary depending on the issue or the process or task at hand. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think after the intervention by our distinguished ambassador from Brazil, I think not much is left to say. We also have same as -- concerns in terms of the direction which we are going. And again, we would like to just flag this issue that between enhanced cooperation and IGF, I don't think we're talking one against the other. I don't think that

is the right way to go, if you compare them and then we say we're doing good there and everything is covered there and thereby -- the whole purpose of the working group is perhaps not there, and so I think that -- we should not try and sort of reduce the importance and the relevance of this particular working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. It was not my understanding that we are going against each other. It is my understanding that we are talking about complementary processes. As I mentioned this morning, interdependent processes. Or rather independent. And we may discuss eventually the same issues in both places, but probably the accents are a bit different and the outcome may be different.

So today we have gone through three groups of issues. We have discussed quite a lot of questions, so we have a kind of feel for the questions. And I'm really glad that we have very useful and very fruitful discussions today and it's very promising for the coming two days.

I'm turning now to the observers, if you have anything to add or complement. Anyone from the room, any additional comments? In case you don't have any comments, so I would like to see you tomorrow at 10:00. Hopefully by then we are going to have this spreadsheet document from the voluntary task force and we shall resume tomorrow at 10:00. I hope we can go through in the morning the remaining two groups and to go into the deeper discussion on some of the issues with the hope of coming with some recommendations at the end of Friday. So have a nice -- yes, Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Just a housekeeping question. Can we leave some of the documents here, will the room be locked or should we carry everything back? Because there's a lot of paperwork here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I am advised that you better take everything with you. So thank you for your active participation, and I wish you a very nice evening tonight. Have a nice sleep for those who are having jet lag, and hope to see you tomorrow at 10:00. Thank you.

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