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

Day 3

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

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

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome also to today. I could see from the U.N. that it was a productive night, evening, morning. We have a document produced by the voluntary task force. They managed to bring down the number of issues from 483 to some 200, if I'm not mistaken. But I'm told this is not the final and there's still some work to be done.

So before starting our work today, I would like to give you some summary how I see the progress we have made during the second day of our meeting.

So yesterday we discussed Group Number 4 and Group Number 5 questions. And I think the discussion was very interesting and very fruitful, and I could sense a great deal of consensus on many issues.

At the same time, we received the spreadsheet. Yesterday it was 483. Now I think it's down to 200. These are issues which have been extracted from the responses to the questionnaire we have created. And I understand that there was some additional contributions to this spreadsheet as far as the issues are concerned.

So as I mentioned, the voluntary task group tried to eliminate the duplicates. And we are facing now to identify categories and what is behind -- what is ahead of us, in fact, is to identify

mechanisms and institutions. So probably it's a huge task and I think we can agree that probably the time which is available for us is not enough, but we can have a test run, what I will propose a little bit later.

So yesterday we have also gave some thoughts about the future meeting or meetings. And it has been said that eventually, if we could have one meeting instead of two and one meeting would be longer, it would be beneficial for all of us. And I think there was a kind of consensus on that issue. So I would propose to have a third meeting, a five-day meeting, sometime in February back-to-back to the ITU Council Working Group on WSIS +10.

Probably the secretariat should check the availability of the rooms. So what I propose is the 10th to the 14th of February. But we can discuss it, but definitely I would like to have a five-day meeting.

We should take into consideration as well that we are going to have the IGF open consultation and the MAG meeting which I think -- I can't see Chengetai now. But I think it's around the 17th, 18th. I'm not really sure but somewhere around this time. So probably it will fit into this long period.

Yes, Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, if I might just contribute to the consideration of the calendar for all colleagues for just a minute. The WSIS +10/WSIS Forum consultation dates are fixed, organized at the ITU, 17th through 18th of February which is Monday and Tuesday. Not all colleagues externally from stakeholders will be participating in person in that session but many colleagues from other stakeholders, which I'm not trying to address governments but other stakeholders, will participate in the IGF consultation, the IGF/MAG consultation.

Could we consider for efficiency's sake also the option of the week following so a second option to consider would be 17th, 18th February is the fixed WSIS +10 meeting. That, of course, needs to be respected. Then, if possible, a three-day MAG/IGF meeting, a weekend and then the CSTD working group meeting. I believe that would be the -- not looking at a calendar, but that would be the last week of February, the 24th. Because if external travelers, those outside of Geneva, do not have to travel to the WSIS +10 meeting but will be traveling to the IGF, it would be more efficient time-wise to have the IGF consultation and the CSTD working group consultations adjacent to each other. Just as a consideration.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn, for the -- for this information. I have no preference. My preference is to optimize on the costs and efficiency, of course. It is really up to you.

I'm ready to be with you, as I said yesterday, as I'm enjoying your company.

[Laughter]

And I mean it.

[Laughter]

Any time. But probably not during Christmas. But who knows.

[Laughter]

So, yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning to all colleagues. Well, just to agree with the previous speaker, we have a preference for the week starting with February 24. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. I think the point that Marilyn has made which is a lot of stakeholders will come to the open consultation for the MAG and they could stretch themselves over the weekend and stay back for the next four or five days for the conference. So that we do support the issue of moving it the week after the MAG meetings. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I have no problem with that. I think we are going to have the open consultation on Wednesday and the MAG meeting on Thursday and there will be a consultation for the donor countries, donors, which will be on Friday and probably many of us won't be involved in this discussion on Friday. So you will have one free day, Friday, to go to the mountains and ski. And it is also applicable for the weekend.

Okay. So can we agree on the last week of February, a five-day meeting?

Joy? Joy, I can hear that you want to intervene.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes. Good morning, everybody. Good morning, colleagues. I need to ask you to call a halt to this conversation because the remote participants cannot hear the conversation, nor can we see the transcript.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. I think we are going to fix it.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, everyone. We have no difficulties with the last week of February -- (typing noise). But if we could ask the ITU in the cluster groups of the council working groups in February, we need to know because it might -- the following week, usually it's two weeks, council working groups. And I'm not sure the WSIS +10, is it in the second week or the first week.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you check it?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I will. And I will get back.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: On your Web site --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: It is not on the Web site yet. I checked.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I might coordinate with the ITU and get back to you this session.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Very useful. Very useful.

Yes, ITU, you don't know about the council working groups?

>>ITU: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, but it is still under discussion and then it will be posted on the Web site soon but I will check it with the General Secretariat and come back to you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, provisionally, can we agree on the last week? I think this is the most suitable. Probably we can't find any other period which suits all of us. That's clear.

Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. Distinguished Chair, Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I support the last speaker about when the meeting should be called February 24th to 28th. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I can conclude that there's a support for this. Probably we didn't take into account the ski holidays in Switzerland, but that's another issue.

For me, the important thing is we agree on a five-day meeting. It will allow us to work through all the issues which are ahead of us. And I sincerely hope that at the end of the third meeting, we will have a consolidated document of recommendation.

Ellen, please.

>> ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. Good morning. Can we talk a little bit about whether four or five days should be the meeting length? Is there a way we could stretch out each of the days a little longer, maybe start at 9:00 instead of 10:00 and maybe keep it to four so we can do travel on the fifth day?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India, please.

>>INDIA: Good morning, Chair. Good morning all colleagues. We can fully support that proposal. If we can stretch a little more and work for four days, we have no difficulty. But we can also work five. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have no difficulty starting at 9:00 and coming back at 2:00 and working until 6:00. I really have no difficulties about that. Still, I think we have to have a fifth day as a contingency.

 Yes, Virat.

 >>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, whatever you do, please don't make it 9:00 to 8:00 and five days.

 [Laughter]

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I can't promise on the last day that we are not going to stay here up until 9:00 in the evening, but I will try to avoid it.

 Okay. Let's come back to this issue. Let's give a second thought. We agreed on the last week of February. We agreed that it won't be a three-day meeting. It will be a longer meeting, eventually four or five. I prefer to have a five-day meeting. But let's get back to that.

 Now, what I propose now, we have the document provided by the voluntary task force. And I understand it's coming or it's being -- they still need one minute. What I propose, after we receive it, we have a one-hour slot to consider this document and I would like to have proposals how to proceed with the document.

 What I can see, the complexity of it requires some further thinking. I really would like to have the proposals how to move forward. Definitely, it is a very valuable document and it will help us to clarify the institutions to identify gaps so I believe this is something we should really take seriously into consideration.

 After the one-hour slot, we shall have coffee break. Then I propose to get back to two things. There was a proposal from India yesterday to kind of frame our work that is the end result, which are recommendations. And I would expect to have some proposal from India concerning some text which is, I would repeat, a draft. It is a draft and we are going to revisit everything during our last meeting.

 Having said that, I would like also to have proposals for Group 4 and 5 questions as far as recommendations are concerned. Yesterday I heard that some delegates, some members, would like to propose some recommendations for this group.

 In case we can come up with a consolidated spreadsheet on the issues and we can come up with the framework for the recommendations and if we can somehow put some text into this framework, I think we have done a great job. And this is a very solid basis for our next meeting.

 So I'm just turning to Sam. You have the document?

 It is in electronic form? It is available for the WGEC list?

>> I just sent it to wgec@unctad.org.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you.

First of all, I would like to ask you, is it acceptable the way I propose to move forward? That is, one-hour slot to discuss the paper and after coffee break, we start discussion on framework for the recommendations and eventually populate this framework.

If it is acceptable to you, just one technical issue. I'm told by the secretariat, in case you need a printout which may be useful, it takes 10 to 15 minutes.

Joy, still have problems?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Just a question, a clarification, please. Perhaps it is an issue with the transcript or not quite hearing, I believe you suggested that after considering the document, we might need a framework for recommendations. And I just wanted to clarify that process because I believe at the end of yesterday, we agreed to consider gaps in relation to what issues proposed before making recommendations.   So I'm just trying to clarify in relation to the proposed framework how that relates to the discussion and agreement we had at the end of yesterday. If you could clarify that for me, please.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Yesterday we agreed that we should move forward with the document. I had a proposal to have some kind of test run on some part of the document to find out how it functions.

It is my appreciation that we need additional work. So I would propose to have a kind of working party who would move forward with the document which has real -- really -- (no audio.)

(No audio to the scribes.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it okay? Okay.

So in the document, we still have, I think, three columns which are empty. And it is not a one-hour job to populate it. So that's why I suggest to have -- to create a working party to propose mapping of issues, and this will be a working party basically probably most of the time by correspondence. It is up to you to find out if there is a possibility of creating some kind of collaborative platform. I'm sure there is. And naturally the working party should work in the same way as the working group, that is, with the contributions of observers.

So that's the way I propose to move forward.

Avri, you wanted to take the floor?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, I did. Can I be heard?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, you can.

>>AVRI DORIA: Because I can't hear you so I can't be sure but I can read. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chair, for giving me the floor.

 I guess I am among those who was recommending that we really needed to complete this work before moving to recommendations. However, understanding that that choice is not ours to make, I would like to point out and let the group know that a few of us within the civil society side have been working on an early set of recommendations to put a stake in the ground. So if we are going to move to discussing recommendations, we also have a set that I will send to the WGEC list during the next interval so that hopefully that can be discussed with any plans that are put there by others. Thank you.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Very, very useful and very helpful.

 Parminder.

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

 I understand we are now discussing for an hour how roughly the mapping could be done. So I would -- I think that present categories are good, kind of consolidates the laundry list and then specifies current activities and approach -- approaches.

 And after we do that, we need to convert it into what we have to come up with, and that is a study of the mechanisms, existing, needing to be strengthened and new ones. That's the core of the issue. And how these -- the list, therefore, relates to that. And we have agreed that we are not going to come up with answers to those public policy questions but only to the extent that they lead us to the institutional requirements.

 So as we started to discuss, I think we need to reach -- it's good to kind of clarify the purpose of this exercise and I understand the purpose is somewhat to validate what has already been observed in Section 60 of Tunis Agenda, that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanism.

 Now that's where the whole enhanced cooperation discussion starts. So we are kind of validating that and also adding the facts and wisdom of the last nine years after WSIS.

 So while I was thinking and also like Virat said yesterday about whether issues are local or global, there is a series of filters we can put on -- and figure out what kind of institutional requirements are needed. The first is to judge whether these are public policy issues. These are Internet-related public policy issues.

 Second, we judge whether they are international or global.

 Third, we judge whether some institutions are already dealing with them in a substantive manner.

And then we judge whether some of these issues are being dealt by some institutions but not adequately and not in a holistic manner, something Ambassador from Brazil has been insisting, that even if issues have been dealt, some of the issues are interconnected with other issues and holistic treatment requires some kind of new possibilities.

And then next category is of issues which have been called orphan issues in some of the submissions. I don't like that term. But we are talking about issues which more or less are very new and have more likely possible right now institutional home.

So that's it. So if we are doing this to each of the issues, even it is rough, we don't have to agree on each element belonging to one or two. It is enough that we find bunches under each and then we start talking of the institutional requirements, enhancements or new possibilities against each. Thank you.

I can get this list to the main list, e-list, and then people can see it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I think it will be extremely useful if you did that.

Your analysis, I think, is very close to the common understanding. Some may have different ideas.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. I'm not one for new ideas. I leave that to others better than I. But I just seek clarification as to your proposal for a working party or an ad hoc group, call it what you will, as to how you see that working going forward from this meeting in advance of our next meeting realizing that it's not that long a wait. May sound like it. Three months, 12 weeks, maybe 14 weeks. So it would be good if you could share with us your thoughts as to how you see that time being used and how that group would work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for being practical.

[Laughter]

Naturally, there should be some kind of leader of this working party or ad hoc group or coordinator. Let's call it coordinator.

And the working group would be eventually a correspondence group or it may have conference calls, but there will be a rolling document to which all interested parties can contribute with the end of filling the gaps. When I say "gaps," I mean in the sense of filling the empty columns and come up with a kind of final draft which will be submitted to this group for further discussions and approval.

Now, as for who is going to be the coordinator is up to you. It will be on a voluntary basis. And whoever would like to join this working party or ad hoc group is free to do so. I have no influence on that.

So probably it will be a good idea to start with the beginning who is going to head this -- who is going to coordinate and I need volunteers. I definitely would have a preference someone from the group, from the working group.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Into a dire space, but if you're calling for a volunteer, I'm happy to lead and take guidance from the group as to what I should be writing. So I'm happy to act as the convener of that correspondence group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So it's basically a coordination task to -- and I would invite all of you to join the group, ad hoc group. I would like you, Phil, lastly to give some working modalities as for the ad hoc group. Let it be a correspondence -- probably the Secretariat can set up a correspondence site, reflector, or if you think of other means, eventually a collaborative platform, that would be fine as well. Joy, you wanted to take the floor. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to reach out to also volunteer to support Phil and to thank him for his willingness to step forward and just to say I'm also willing to help volunteer to help assist, if needed.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm happy that you volunteer. Probably there's room. There's enough work to be done for 2, even for 40. So we are undertaking a really big task. Yes, Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chair, two points. One, I think we had some volunteers yesterday, including some observers on here who had sort of offered to help and you said you would take that under consideration, so I think at some stage if you could get a verdict on that, that would be helpful because we need many hands on this one, especially those who are passionate and are willing to do this and have responded to the question in great detail.

The second point, I just want to clarify because Parminder has laid out the steps and I had sort of put out a five-step process yesterday, I just want to make sure that we're clear there is a distinction because what was stated yesterday, with your permission I'll state that again, is remove the duplicates which has already been done, judge whether the issue falls under internet governance talk, enhanced cooperation, third, whether it's an issue that requires domestic treatment or needs to be dealt at a sort of global level. Third is the WGEC plus classification which is proposed by the distinguished delegate from India, and the last was whether the existing processes exist or need to be strengthened or any other options that need to be discussed. So if that is not -- is that what we are following or do we have a -- more edification of that? I just want

to be -- and I think the House sort of had a broad agreement, I suppose, on that. Are we think anything different? And the second point is -- the third point is, do we -- the working group can't go after all the issues at the same time. Some sort of a prioritization might be required. So perhaps the step six, which is in terms of timelines and prioritization on which of the issues that need addressing first and which can wait, I think that will need to be done. You know, and we can talk more about why that is important now or later, but I think that is an important step, because we already have 100-odd issues, and even after filtering it there are lots of issues. So I just wanted to place that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. I'll start from the very end. And I would like to encourage all stakeholders, including governments naturally, to participate in this exercise. And the reason for that is very simple and very evident to me. We are talking about enhanced cooperation and we are talking about the roles of government. With other stakeholders probably if we are going to discuss it, government's participation is crucial. That's why I suggest again that the governments would like to participate in this exercise.

Now, as for the methodology or the steps you suggested, it's -- I think it's agreeable, probably within the group during the working process, you will find some adjustments. I can't really imagine that from the outset you know exactly what you're going to do. Probably it will be modified and probably some other ideas could be taken on board and you will find that some ideas you have suggested are not of that importance. So that's how I see as for the timeline. For me it's important that we have the kind of consolidated document for the next meeting. How you prioritize it, naturally, it's coming from our mandate, that is enhanced cooperation. So basically we have to concentrate on that, and it is my assessment from the meeting that the governments have concerns about their role in the Internet governance and enhanced cooperation. So basically priority for me in this respect.

Having said that, naturally all stakeholders are invited to (indiscernible). Brazil, please. Oh, Marilyn, you were first. I'm sorry. You're always first.

>>MARILYN CADE: That's good. You guys are looking at me for Thanksgiving, U.S. Thanksgiving holiday. I think I may be in Hungary. Thank you, Chair. I wanted to build on trying to be very practical and pragmatic about how to use the mapping document and make it simpler, while maintaining its depth and richness. I took a look this morning with the advice of some colleagues about the WGIG categories and I'm -- I think maybe you have them available. I might ask you to read them out. I was thinking one way we might think about simplifying this would be to put the -- and we could quickly do this as a small group of volunteers, kind of -- or we could do it after the fact, take the very long list of categories and put them, to the extent possible, under these four headings which I'm going to ask, if you don't mind, for you to read. And then if we added just one or two other categories, we would have four to six big categories with subtopics underneath them. And that, I think, would allow us to be much more effective in

how we work. So if I might, if you don't mind, Baher, if you could read them, I think you had them pulled up, and there are just four. And then I have one final comment.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Okay. Yeah, there are four categories. One, issues relating to infrastructure and management of critical Internet resources, including administration of the domain names, IP addresses, root server systems, technical standards, peering, telecommunication infrastructures. Two, issues relating to the use of the Internet, including spam, network security, and cybercrime. Three, issues that are relevant to the Internet but have an impact much wider than the Internet, such as intellectual property rights. Four, issues relating to developmental aspects, in particular capacity building.

>>MARILYN CADE: So I'm not -- you know, particularly I think we've got to keep the richness of the bullets that have been prepared by our team but I think we also need some headings because when we all go home, we have to introduce this document to folks that are not immersed in it. And being able to say to them there are five to six major categories and here are the sum categories I think will be a much more effective way for us to be able to use the document. And then, when we develop recommendations, we will need to be probably particularizing looking at the subpoints. I'm not suggesting that we would make recommendations only on the main headings. I do think we will need to make recommendations that are specific to the subpoints because the stage of evolution or activity will vary depending on the subpoint. So that was my -- the first point I wanted to make, Chair.

And then the second point I wanted to make goes back to, I thank Mr. Rushton for volunteering to be a coordinator/convener. Sounded like Joy was volunteering to be a co-convener/coordinator. And I think if there were -- it were possible to pass around here and then post to the WGEC list a sign-up sheet for those who want to volunteer to be in what I will call the mapping group, it -- that would be one step. But I think we also ought to take a few minutes to meet, and maybe we could meet ad hoc at lunch, to kind of sort through what do we think -- how do we think this -- these procedures are going to -- going to work. Because we're going to be widely distributed over the next 10 to 12 weeks and we could try to come up with an idea of how it might work and what the calendar might look like for us to be able to work together online. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. It's very useful, as always. Just getting back to what Phil asked me about the timeline, probably it would be a good idea to set some kind of intermediate target dates in order to avoid some rush at the very end of the three-month period. So probably it would be nice to have some kind of intermediate document around middle of January to know where we are, how we are doing. And then have some kind of final draft for the meeting itself.

Before I give the floor to Phil, Brazil, you asked for the floor.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you. Very briefly, just to agree with the idea that the work of the group should be guided or should have a parameter of the five steps that were proposed, I think both by Parminder and by -- by Phil. I think they have a lot of convergence and the core ideas are there. And also to indicate the willingness of -- the interest of my delegation to participate in the group, to support the group, and to provide input also to that priority -- prioritizing of the issues in other areas. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. I think it's -- it's some example that should be followed. Phil, you are recognized.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Just to go back to the timeline issue that you raised and to give people something to ponder on before we meet later today, I would suggest a first draft -- first run-through of the process to have been completed by about the first week in January. And to give people in this group time to review the great work that the correspondence group will do -- I sow that seed in your mind -- to have completed that by at least two weeks prior to your meeting. So we will complete it by -- if we start on the 24th of February, we will complete the work by the 12th of February. So with those --

>> [Speaker is off microphone.]

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Complete it by the 24th -- by the 12th of February. That's two weeks.

>> [Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. I really appreciate it and I think that's a reasonable approach. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I was going to say is already captured by the distinguished ambassador from Brazil. We are willing to work in this working group or correspondence group. But as stated, the terms of reference or the parameters for this group has to be very clear set before this group starts. Especially that there will be nowhere physical meetings that -- I mean, an agreement or a guided approach can be taken. What has been stated by Parminder and Virat, that we have to put in this meeting for that correspondence group what are they going to do. For example, as is stated, what are the priorities of these public policy issues or these issues or what is the (indiscernible) issues that has been dealt. Maybe before that, is this a public policy issue or not, then what is the priorities of prioritizing these issues. Then has it been dealt with or not. Has it been adequately dealt or addressed or not. And then to identify the gap in order to be able to see what kind of an action is required in establishing a mechanism or a mechanism needs to be established or enhanced, something in the -- in the existing mechanism. But these parameters has to be set in this meeting, otherwise different views will come in the correspondence group through emails and it might be difficult to come up with a very consolidated outcome from this group. And we have full confidence with Mr. Phil, and he

has been chairing so many working parties and what's the good thing this time he will not have a (indiscernible) after having it online. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Majed. We have already set out the terms of reference. So probably the only thing we have to do is go back to the scripts and just formulate it. Provided everybody feels comfortable with that. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I think that we need -- we really don't have much differences and I understand that there are two kinds of categorization that Avri mentioned and both can be accommodated, even in the existing Excel sheet. There is one column which says "consolidated grouping" and that is by subject area which can follow whether it is a CIS (phonetic) group or whatever development issues, more or less that we get classification plus something else. And the last column is status. And we all know the status is important because that directly relates to our mandate of what has to be done. And under status is the categories which I had mentioned which are about, you know, whether it is this, what has been done, what needs to be done, et cetera, et cetera. So I think both columns exist to accommodate both kinds of categories in the existing Excel sheet. Thank you.

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

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think that it's good to build on the work that has already been done. So the idea of categorizing these issues under the categories that were agreed by the Working Group On Internet Governance, the four categories, would be a good start. Then we can see if there is a need for any additional categories. But we think that it's important not to duplicate work too much and to build on what has already been issued.

When it comes to the working group or working party or whatever we want to call it, first of all, we would like to be part of that as well. We would also like to say that we agree with those before us that said that it's important with the -- in terms of reference for this working group. And we are not so sure that, for example, this working party will be able to prioritize between different public policy issues. Because that could be an issue, I think that could be quite contentious, what do we think are important public policy issues. That varies quite a lot, I think, from stakeholder to stakeholder. So my suggestion is that the Secretariat would maybe draft a very short document on -- that describes terms of reference and then we could discuss that later, maybe here today, so that everyone feels truly comfortable with the terms of reference and what tasks we are giving this group. I think for us, at least, that would be -- would give us much comfort. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Let me make it clear that the correspondence group is in no way to replace the working group itself. Probably takes its mandate from the working group, meaning as well that it doesn't take over the responsibilities of this working group. So probably the -- as Sweden mentioned, the prioritizing is an issue for the working group itself. So probably it would be too ambitious to give this task and responsibility to the correspondence

group. Having said that, they may come up with suggestions and proposals, but the decision will be within the group. Joy, you wanted to take the floor.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to support the tenor of the conversations and points and to make two points. One is about the proposed categories. I do have some strong concerns about limiting ourselves to the WGIG categories, being the clear mandate to this working group is to consider (indiscernible) and I fear that by limiting ourselves to the WGIG categories we will not adequately capture the need and many blossoming issues that are affected in the submissions that we get. So I would suggest that we continue to think about the categories, and I note, for example, that some submissions had categories in them, the Big Bits submission, for example, with a range of different categories for these public policy issues which perhaps with the opportunity to reflect back to this working group might be useful. So I would ask (indiscernible) when we go to work on this task be given some flexibility in that regard.

With specific regard to I would just make -- I agree with the point made about some terms of reference for the task, but I think rather than being focused on the activities, it be focused on the output, what is it that as a working group we need this task to bring back to us. I think that would be very productive in the limited time available. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Virat, you want to take the floor.

>> [Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh,U.S. Sorry. You're in the Switzerland's shadow.

>>UNITED STATES: We're happy to be in the shadow of the Swiss mountains. Thank you, Chairman.

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>>UNITED STATES: We certainly want to state clearly our support for this mapping effort, and of course we'll be involved and supply what we can. And we want to be in that position because we think we really need this. We said yesterday, it's true today, we think that we need to know where we are to figure out where we're going.

Chairman, for us, this mapping exercise will create a record, if you will, of information that will then be very helpful for us, we hope, to deal with priority issues. And we know that our -- some priority issues will be difficult. But in any event, this mapping exercise should -- should support the effort of this group. We very much appreciate your clarification, but this map -- this mapping group that's going on certainly isn't going to replace the deliberations of this group so that they hopefully will be bringing back all of this excellent information and then convening as a group again and hopefully making progress on what some have called the priority interest. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.S. And thank you, Switzerland. Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, two quick clarifications, since I had mentioned WGIG yesterday I think to the point that the distinguished delegate from India has made yesterday, but this morning I did sort of improve on that by suggesting WGIG+ categories. So I agree with Joy that, you know, that session of yesterday we had, I think, conclude on this morning may not have been noticed in that fashion. But I agree with the point that she's making and I think we -- most of us agree on that.

The second was the point that was made from the distinguished delegate from Sweden and then referred to by the U.S. about prioritization. When I mentioned that as a six-step prioritization, it wasn't for the working party, it was really for the group to look at after the results come in and what kind of work this group can look at as a whole because really that decision should rest where everybody is involved in a bigger discussion. So I just wanted to clarify those two points. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, after this discussion -- I haven't finished yet. After this discussion I will ask the Secretariat to draft the terms of references and bring it back to the group. And probably after finalizing the terms of references the group may start having informal consultations during lunchtime -- I'm sorry to dispose of your during lunchtime. You have heard it. So I think this is the way forward, and I am happy that many governments would like to participate and I would encourage all governments who are present and who have interest to participate in this work because I think it contributes very much to the work of this working group. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think the point I was going to make was already captured in your last speech. So I just wanted to follow-up on what Saudi Arabia and Sweden have indicated, that it would leave us more comfort if we could have clarity on these terms of reference. And as we listen to the remote participants, Joy, it is clear, for example, that in regard to categories there might be different ideas if we do not spell out clearly. And I take the point that there is a richness in the debate and that might develop ideas or improve categories, but this would, I think, lead us to lose a lot of time in this working group, this working party around, let's say, conceptual ways, so I think if we can come out of this meeting with a very clear terms of reference, as you have indicated, I think this will assist the working party and have very efficient work in such a short time frame, I think it would be -- it will assist us in the process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Two quick points. Firstly, we also wish to convey our strong confidence in Phil, and I'm sure -- and also to express that we would be very much happy to assist in any manner as a delegation.

And the second, this eminent suggestion that we have to take as the categories should be WGIG+ because otherwise we could be accused of still having a 2004 mind-set rather than a 2014 mind-set, I think. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Just to support what the ambassador from Brazil said, it is very important to leave this room with a clear mandate for this other group and especially for our experts back in capital so they have a clear idea what the work will be and how to proceed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Marilyn, then Parminder.

>>MARILYN CADE: Let me see. Since I was one of the people who talked about WGIG+ plus, let me see if I can clarify what I was meaning. I think we should drop after we finish this discussion any reference to WGIG+ plus and just talk about having a short list of headings which we work under and so we would no longer refer to them as WGIG. To respond to your comment, we wouldn't say WGIG+ in the future, we would just call them the agreed headings or something.

But I was just proposing we use the substance. And I think that's also what Virat was suggesting and Baher and others. So in the future, we wouldn't go out of here saying WGIG+, we would say consolidated headings with subpoints.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So probably we can come up with WGEC categories. So we start a new era.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I agree with Marilyn. And I think in my understanding there is already a resolution, and I will try to give my perception of it as the secretariat settles down to frame -- draft the framework of reference, terms of reference.

We have a category of consolidated grouping which is what Marilyn is talking about, which was referred to as WGIG+, is now the grouping which is substantive grouping.

The next column is "current activities and approaches." Who wants to try to write what does that mean?

The last is status. And the status grouping is different from the substantive groupings which are by areas. And I think the status is still needed as the reference point for going forward in our

discussion. So I think in this matrix, I understand everything which has been said. Seems to be accommodated. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri. Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on it. I would like to support those who are suggesting that there be a wider set of WGEC categories. And I would actually like us to empower the group to basically work on that set of categories and then come back to the larger group with an indication of those categories. I think that in the discussion of issues item by item, being constrained to a short set that is determined a priori, could make the task much more difficult.

So I would like to support those who have recommended, I believe India and others that have recommended the open set to be used.

I also would like to sort of indicate that while, I think, this will be of great and indispensable use for us in finalizing any set of recommendations, I also think the work will be very valuable and an outcome from our larger group to the general ways forward for Internet governance.

So I think the work should be seen in a larger light of more than just a tool for us, that I would like to suggest that it would be one of our outcomes. Finally, I'd also like to suggest that assuming that this working party will be working in the interim on some schedule and in some manner that they basically give the whole WGEC list -- I have trouble pronouncing it. It sounds like so many other things when people say it. I'm not sure what we're saying. So I'm sticking to the W-G-E-C.

I would like to suggest that they give the list of us, the entire group, periodic updates on where they've gotten and how it's going so that we can all keep track of it and anybody that feels their viewpoints are not being represented because they haven't been participating in the smaller group have the opportunity to then jump in somehow and add their voice. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I'm absolutely sure that you will be part of the correspondence group, and naturally you are on the working group.

Now, what is -- I can see no -- no one asking for the floor. So can I conclude that we agreed on the establishment of this correspondence group? We kind of agreed on the draft -- on the rough terms of references. I would like to ask Phil and those who proposed terms of references to work closely with the secretariat during the coffee break finalizing the terms of references.

And if you have no other issues on the correspondence group, I think this is a well-deserved coffee break now.

And I propose to have it limited to 20 minutes. After 20 minutes, we come back and hopefully we can discuss the terms of references for the correspondence group and eventually we can also finalize the timeline for the work. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Can I ask you to take your seats, please. Good afternoon. Before we start discussing the terms of reference for the corresponding groups, group of -- our working group, let me get back to the date of the next meeting.

I had an update from the ITU working group -- council working group's schedule. And it seems to me that the 24th -- the week starting from the 24th is an appropriate time for us to do our third meeting.

I know that most of you would like to have a four-day -- or some of you would like to have a four-day meeting. I still have a preference for the five-day meeting. So let me propose the 24th -- the week the 24th through the 28th. And I will ask the secretariat to check the availability of rooms here in the U.N.

I am updated that the request has already been placed. A decision will be made as far as the availability of rooms here in mid December. But I hope this is agreeable to all of us.

No, it's a room. It is an internal problem. We shall have our meeting. I don't know in which room. Hopefully in this room. I believe it's a relatively good setting.

So let's get back to the terms of reference for the correspondence group of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

Phil, can you tell us what are the proposed terms of references?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. The terms of reference of the correspondence group is available in paper form at the front of the room if you have not already seen it.

Now that we've agreed to terms of reference, Chairman --

[Laughter]

[Silence]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm really pleased to see that everybody's for the paperless work. Having said that, electronic copies have been sent out as well so in case you want to fall back to the good old electronic form, then you're welcome.

Please continue.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.   So you have before you a draft set of terms of reference which I will walk through. I already have some comments and some amendments, so there will be a revised version. But I think if we can capture those as we go along, that will be useful.

So starting at Number 1, which is always a very good place to start: The correspondence group will work electronically. If necessary, conference calls will be held; but it is my intention that the main method of working will be e-mails.

Two: The correspondence group is open to all stakeholders, as you indicated in your initial presentation this morning, Chair.

Three, the correspondence group will provide three update reports to the WGEC Chair and mailing list. Those will be at the end of November, this year; the beginning of January 2014; and the end of January 2014. Again, I think that was a request made by a participant in this meeting earlier this morning.

The correspondence group will provide an initial output in the first week of January 2014 and a final document for consideration by this group by the 12th of February, 2014. That then gives you 12 days, Chair, and for our colleagues here to review, comment, criticize, rewrite or do what they wish to do to the document.

The correspondence group will review the identified public policy issues into the WGEC list. We created this WGEC list just before coffee.

I would say -- and just to make it clear, that the identified public policy issues comes from the revised spreadsheet that has been created and distributed here today.   So that would be our starting point.

B: The correspondence group will identify where there are activities associated with the issues in that list.

It will also identify, if possible, the status of mechanisms and any limitations therein to the mechanisms.

It will also attempt to identify the gaps in order to ascertain what type of action is/may be required.

The point being there for C and D, Chair, as you will see from point 6, is that we will attempt to do these activities as input into your meeting in February.

However, where the issue cannot reach consensus, it will be referred to the -- that issue will be referred back to this group. And I should make it clear, and have one amendment there, that what will be referred back will be the various positions taken on the correspondence group.

So if there are five views expressed, you will get five options, Chair.

You're more than welcome, sir.

The correspondence group -- and I wish to make this explicitly clear -- does not replace the WGEC. We are there to be a tool of the WGEC and nothing more. And just to make it formal, Chair, we say that these have been agreed by your group as of this date so that there are no misunderstandings.

I, therefore, put forward these terms of reference for your approval and the approval of colleagues with the two amendments that I have suggested, the one saying that the identified public policy issues in 5A is the spreadsheet that has been developed in this group and that any issue that is not reached among consensus will have the options referred back to the working group.

So with those two amendments, Chair, I offer you the document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil and secretariat. It was a good job.

Any comments, observations, remarks?

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: While I think the list is really exhaustive and we really don't need to kind of address issues, therefore, it may not be completely completely complete. However, if there are real -- somebody really has a pressing need to put any issue on it that wasn't before -- but that's not what I'm intending to do because somebody referred -- and I think Avri did -- that it could also be a substantive outcome in some way from the group.

And, therefore, the public policy list should not be frozen in any manner. Though, I would greatly advise we don't add too many to it.

I was not really sure with Phil's amendment whether the amendment, whether the amendment one referred to this kind of thing or it could be the identified public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.   The issue becomes if somebody comes to this correspondence group with a new issue, it will not be the correspondence group that decides to add that issue. That must be your group. That is your responsibility, Chair. I'm sorry to say.

We will only work with the list. We are a tool of this group. Therefore, if somebody has an issue that is burning a hole in their pocket that they wish to have added to the list of issues that will be considered by the correspondence group, it needs the approval of your group. We are a closed user group in the sense you are giving us a task to work to. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. That's exactly how I think.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. First of all, thanks to Phil for working this out. This is very useful. And I think by large we could go along with these terms of reference. Just a minor, minor issue, I think in para 5C talking about identifying, if possible, the status of mechanisms and any limitations therein, we might put different things into the word "mechanism." So we are wondering if we could expand that a little bit to "fora" and "processes." That's just a minor comment. But, otherwise, we feel confident with these terms of reference. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Is my understanding correct that under "mechanism," we may understand as well the different fora?

Yes, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: If the meeting is agreeable, Chair, I will make that amendment.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

Ellen?

>> ELLEN BLACKLER: I would support that and add it would also include activities, those kinds of things that business is doing to fill some of the gaps that aren't really a fora. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, U.S. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Just a question. Where we say the status of mechanisms, how should we read the word "status"?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I understand it -- Phil, please.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: My understanding, if I perhaps can offer an opinion, would be -- it would be a narrative describing the activities, the fora, the processes, and the mechanisms associated with any given issue in that list. So it would be as comprehensive as we could make it. I would look to make it, as I say, descriptive rather than judgmental. That would be for the process to be taken here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

For me, Number 7 is the bottom line; that is, the correspondence group does not replace the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. So we have a clear idea about the terms of references. I think it's mostly acceptable.

And I can see you, Parminder. I can see you.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Saudi Arabia raised the fact earlier but since I'm responding to Phil's point, can I go ahead?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

There was a discussion earlier about the status being what. And I tried to describe certain elements of it. And I don't think it is a narrative thing. It is a category thing and categories being passed to the WGEC list as well. And I remember there was a lot of support that we need to convert the issues to the requirements of what needs to be done and, therefore, we were categorizing into like: The orphan issues being met but not adequately being met, some institution is fully dealing with it. That kind of categories were the status. And it could be inclusive -- stakeholders' participation inclusive of all governments' participation. There are processes globally which are public policy bodies that are not inclusive of all governments. And there are processes which are not inclusive of stakeholders.

So the status is to find out what those mechanisms look like with reference to what then needs to be done which is the mandate of the working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to thank Phil for this draft of terms of reference.

To make it very easy to me, I'm trying to imagine that I'm now part of this working group and I have these terms of reference and I would see if it is clear to go with these terms of reference.

I heard that -- I mean, I understand that there is no possibility to add in the correspondence group any more issues. But, for example, what do we mean exactly by "review and identify the public policy issues in the WGEC list." What exactly -- reviewing in terms of what? I mean, is that -- I mean, we need to be clear when we say "review and identify the public policy," are we going to do an exercise in regards to these lists? Are we going to combine them? I mean, we need to clarify this and then we say "identify where there are activities associated with the issues in the list."

Okay. We don't want to say, okay, there is and there is not. I mean, it has to be said also if these activities associated with adequately addressing these issues. I mean, it's not like a matter of answering yes or no, especially -- I'm trying to raise this not to involve in this discussion in the correspondence group.

In regards to the "identify, if possible, the status of mechanisms and any limitation therein," I think the idea is to identify, okay, the status of the mechanisms, if it is adequately addressing or not and if there is actually global arrangements to address this issue. It has to be there. I mean, is there global arrangements? Is there a mechanism existing to address this issue? This group has to identify this thing.

I would start here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I really want in the future interventions to hear the text, not the criticism, but text you suggest to be included or to exclude. I think we are past the time to give statements.

Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Just to clarify my comment earlier, in respect to the distinguished delegate from Saudi Arabia, I didn't say that issues could not be added to the list but if issues are to be added to the list, then it has to be agreed by your committee, Chair, not by the correspondence group.

I take note of the comments and clarifications sought on 5B and 5C and would take guidance from this group as to what text they would like to see there so that we could adequately capture the text.

I have to say, Chair, that 5A, B, C and D was taken from the text that we're seeing on the screen and were the nice and wonderful words from the Saudi Arabian delegate. So if I'm not captured that right, I do apologize.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much, Phil, for your good work. I just have three brief points. The first is in relation to point Number 2 of the terms of reference. The word "stakeholders" there, I take it this includes not only stakeholder members of the working group but also observers? I would just like clarification.

Secondly, I'm a little troubled by the words in para 5D in relation to what type of action may be required. I think the word action could cause difficulties. I'm thinking, for example, of the United Nations Human Rights Council which is dealing with a number of public policy issues that have intimate related components. And I would find it difficult to imagine this working

group might suggest action in relation to any gaps in the Council's mandates. I think it is a suggestion that this working group might focus on that, that there would be some serious concerns with it.

My suggestion is that instead of "action," instead of the use of the word "action" there, we might say "recommendations" so that we focus on what recommendations this working group might want. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

As 4.2, "stakeholder" means what it means in the sense of what we mean by it in this working group and what we meant by it when we sent out the questionnaire.

As for your remark concerning "action," I fully agree with that. It probably should eventually be changed to "recommendations" or fully left out for consideration by the working group itself because the working group is tasked to give the recommendations. But I leave it up to you.

Next on the list. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Actually my question -- I guess that was -- that's the point that is exactly why I took the microphone. I wanted to ask.

As I understood this, this is preliminary and preparatory work and the drafting of recommendations would come after we've concluded this work and would come from the body as a whole.

So I guess I'm -- I might just modify D to say "attempt to identify gaps in order to ascertain what might be required" without -- because it could be an action but I think the drafting of recommendations is going to be done in the body as a whole. And I would prefer that the mapping group not start actually getting into drafting recommendations. I think we actually have quite a bit to discuss.

And that takes me to an example. When I heard our colleague from Saudi Arabia and also Parminder, I was thinking about under B -- 5B, the mapping group would be talking about activities associated with the issues, looking first to the contribution submissions that have been made but then also based on the participations in the mapping group adding additional documented -- and I would think we need to do that.

So if we're looking at the submissions, then everyone has the validation of what's been suggested. But if we are going to -- and I think we need to -- add -- potentially using additional information, what additional activities, we should in the mapping group sort of document where we got that information.

So I'm going to use a specific example that was mentioned yesterday. The European Internet Observatory, which is still under development, is an emerging clearinghouse. And it will gather -

- so if we were to add that as an emerging activity, I would expect to sort of document where the further information about that could be found.

That then let's us continue to build our own shared understanding of the activities that are going on. We are, as the mapping group, I think, to Parminder's point, then going to be discussing about how satisfied we are in order to move on to D. And that will be a gap analysis which I think, again, we're going to have to document. And to Phil's point, we may end up with different documented options that get put forward to the group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I really would like to concentrate on the text we have in front of us and to try to finalize it. Probably when we clarify the responsibilities for the group and for the correspondence group and for the working group, we have already made a great step towards finalizing these terms of references.

Phil, would you like to answer?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

Certainly under A we should put the fact and clarify the fact that additional issues to be added would require the agreement of your group, as we have said.

For 5D, the point about what type of actions may be required, the point is well made by delegates. I would say "attempt to identify the gaps in order for recommendations to be drafted by the WGEC" to make it very clear that we are just identifying the gaps.

As we keep saying, Number 7 is the bottom line. We do not replace the WGEC. So I think these points are well made.

The point as to -- in 5B identify where there are activities, I would say we should cite the source and, indeed, would provide text at the end of B to say "associated with" -- start again, "associated with the issues in the list and cite the source for such identification." Not the best English, I apologize. But I think it does the job.

So there are some changes to 5A, B, C and D that have been identified.

And, of course, Chair, it is also important to realize that we only have three months to do this work, failure to complete the work of the correspondence group will necessitate a five-day meeting in February because we will have to complete some of the work of the correspondence group in your meeting.

However, I will endeavor with my colleague Joy from New Zealand to ensure that that is not the case. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me remind you that there's a weekend preceding our meeting in February and there is a weekend after the meeting.

Yes, Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I shall seek permission from my wife to attend.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So do I.

[Laughter]

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Very briefly, we can go along with the terms of reference as amended. And, I mean, if we would like to add some additional comfort, maybe we could add to para 7 something along the lines that would not replace the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation and will not take any decisions pertaining to the mandate of the working group or something like that, if there is such need. I'm not sure there is such a need.

Also just to answer very briefly to the comment mentioned, brought up -- the issue brought up by a colleague from Saudi Arabia, I think when it comes to the mapping, we feel that that should be a very factual thing, factual mapping of where are processes and where are issues are discussed, what are the issues and where are they discussed.

But when it comes to the more sort of evaluation of this, the value judgment on whether or not one particular issue is adequately addressed, we think that that is better handled by the group itself as well as the priorities as we mentioned earlier.

So that's our view. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. It is my understanding that there's a kind of general agreement with the amendments on the terms of reference.

I still have Joy.

Virat, you want to take the floor?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I --

>>VIRAT BHATIA: My points have already been addressed.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So, Joy, please.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Just to say that my points have been dealt with. The only one, I just didn't hear a clear statement that (indiscernible) my volunteer to assist which seems unfeasible given the size of the task and the short time available.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you. I think, just to make it very clear, as you yourself has indicated, Chair, as with the questionnaire which went to all stakeholders so that this correspondence group is also open to all stakeholders. That is my understanding. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just heard that we can further delay the talking about the adequacy of addressing these issues and not in the correspondence group but in the meeting. If this is the case, I think there is no need for this correspondence group. Yesterday the respected ladies there did a wonderful job by doing this and they can continue by just doing and adding that what are the associated activities, if any, and there is no need to have a correspondence group if they are not going to tackle each of these policy issues and see if there is global arrangements to address them or not. And if it's adequately addressing them or not by either to find the gaps and then do the required action as a correspondence group which will come to your meeting then it will come out as recommendations as the meeting agrees later on. But if there is no task to go over this, I think we can just continue without a correspondence group.

And before we approve this terms of reference, we -- if there is any amendments, we would like to see it in writing before we adopt this terms of reference. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. It is my understanding that the group will do its work in view of proposing to the working group recommendations or some -- some input for the recommendations. So, in fact, it is going to be extremely useful for the -- for the working group itself.

As for the amendments in the written form, probably it can be done very quickly. But I think it has been made clear and there was -- I couldn't really hear many dissenting comments on the terms of references, so I had a feeling that we kind of agreed on these terms with the amendments. Iran, please.

>>IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm seeking a point of clarification. I heard that this correspondence group is open to all stakeholders out of these -- I mean this group, just wanted to hear it from you, since this correspondent group is a part of the WGEC I don't think it's necessary to open it to all the stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran. It was my idea to follow the way we have been working up until now, and I do intend to continue this way. We had received inputs from all stakeholder groups, which seem to be very useful, and we have taken them on board to discuss them, so I can see no reason why we can't continue this way. It made our work richer. It made our deliberations more wider, so I think this is the way to go forward. And I think most of the members of the group do agree to that. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think I need to intervene. I was not planning to intervene, but I think it is required, I think, to make a few points.

The first and the foremost is this working group has a diverse composition. There are member states, there are representatives of the private sector, the civil society. I think there are other groups, also. Now, if we embark upon a part of reaching a particular decision or recommendation, it was -- it was useful to receive inputs. I realize that during the first (indiscernible) if you want to call it. But the challenge here is every time we put out a -- a questionnaire or a set of issues, and if you want to go to the larger stakeholder process approach, we have no difficulties. But then we only have representatives in this working group precisely for this reason. And if they wish to go in their own individual capacity, let's say the private sector wish to go within themselves, they could further disseminate among their members and collect inputs but there are representatives to this working group. The purpose will be defeated if we every time -- and we cannot embark on this process every time, and the end result would be another 500 pages a compilation and then do what? I'm sorry to pose these very direct questions, but we need to have some brevity in what we are doing. And you rightly observed that we know the issues. We know the issues, and we are now trying to do a mapping exercise. I think it's no harm if we could define that the respective groups could in turn, in their own right, because there are representatives of that particular group of the stakeholders, could collect inputs and give it to the correspondence group. That would be an easy approach, rather than the correspondence group reaching out to all stakeholders and coming up with the bulk of information which we do not know where to head thereafter. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I have some text for -- to support your proposal?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. The correspondence -- the correspondence group will be open to the members of the working group. In fact, we don't need one to -- we don't actually meant for the working group. It's a correspondence group of the working group. Which is required to -- which internally -- I mean, in its capacity they could seek other members' views. They're most welcome to do it. But within themselves, they reach certain conclusions or certain observations which is brought to the larger group. Thank you, sir.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think this is very important for us to have a very clear understanding of what this correspondence group is aimed to achieve. I don't see the work coming from this correspondence group as having, let's say, the kind of more political nature of or policy stated that is expected from this working group as a whole. I see the output of the correspondence group as a technical instrument, a tool for our work. And personally -- and I have made a point previously that personally I'm not feeling entitled to participate because I lack the expertise to engage in some of the issues. I think it is in our interest to have the best available expertise contributing to give out a very clear picture of where we stand with regard to each issue, what are the processes associated. I would be a little bit concerned if we maybe restrict the ability of people to contribute because we may be lacking some kind of input that might be necessary. And then, this will come up to the larger group and we will make the appropriate

decisions as -- because we have the mandate, not the wider stakeholder community. But I think if we can it would -- see this as an input for our work, and then, of course, as a working group we have a particular mandate and we have the composition agreed that we should do it. I think maybe that could be a way out of -- of this. Again, I think the composition of this working group, I'm not sure if we have among us as complete expertise to cover all the areas and come up with all the -- or what I said maybe the X-ray of the situation. Then this will be an instrument for us as -- as the magical group to propose some kind of intervention. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Yeah, thank you very much. With regard to what the distinguished colleague of India was proposing, I guess I don't know which of the opinions of the rest of the group, the members of the group, but if we have that question was open to every stakeholder and we have observers that can be on site and also in the remote participation channels with access to the information available. And also we -- the possibility of providing inputs. And then we accept those observers to be able (indiscernible), for example, the mapping exercise and then the whole purpose of the working group and our -- of course, our philosophy should be -- should keep open. And I understand what Brazil says regarding the goals of the correspondence group. And to be honest, I would like to be -- I would prefer to have more clarity also regarding the goals of the correspondence group as well. But I think we shouldn't go back to discussion if -- that -- if the working group should be open or not because I guess at least I have -- I haven't seen any reason why we should go back there. We should have -- we already established that we want it to be open, right? Or not. I don't know.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Chair. While I've been ruminating, I made a point and I would like to propose this text, if possible. With regard to item 2 of the terms of reference, the correspondence group is open to all WGEC stakeholders and accredited observers. So this correspondence group is of the working group, as the distinguished delegate from India underlined, and Iran. So this is what I would like to propose, the correspondence group is open to all WGEC stakeholders and accredited observers. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: I'm unmuting myself, so apologies for the pause. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to speak with those who are discussing the correspondence group being open and very much open in the same way that these meetings have indeed been open. And so I think it's very appropriate that we do that.

I also want to point out that one of the reasons I believe that we were doing this correspondence group is because we felt that this was very essential work, that it was work that was a continuation of the process that came out of the comments we received from the wider

stakeholder group community, and that it was work that we did not want to put in line for this particular committee, this particular group, but wanted it to be done in parallel. So I think it's very important that this group be able to do its work, to be able to reach out for the experience and other help that's needed. We see how much the observers have already contributed to this effort. We wouldn't be as close as we are now, I believe, without their incredible efforts, their overnight work, their over lunch work, and all of that. So I think we have to recognize that and keep that, that in.

And in terms of this group being able to make evaluations, I think any initial evaluations that they may make are an aid to our work but are something that we, as a group, would be able to take and discuss. As Phil said in his discussion on all this, nothing they do is final. Everything they do is recommendations to this group as to how to proceed further. So I think any of the evaluation they make, whether it's on things like status, on things like adequacy of the mechanisms or the processes, I think we recognize that that is all work that we will need to review as a group and be able to modify and amend as necessary before taking this document forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. When we started the discussion about the participation of stakeholders the concern I heard was a very practical one from India and it was the eventual output -- the volume of the eventual output. And for me, it's a very reasonable argument. Probably we want to deal with documents which we can handle.

Now, I'm turning to Phil, who has volunteered to this position. Can you give us some assurance that the volume of the output will be of a size which is understandable by humans?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. You do not ask for much.

[Laughter]

On a serious point, Chair, you want something by the 12th of February that is not an activity that we should treat lightly. I can empathize with the distinguished delegate from India about the volume of work. If we cast our minds back to the first meeting, a similar concern was expressed about the number of questionnaires that we would receive in response to making that open. I think we received 70 questionnaires and that was manageable. We have the public policy issues list that we started, we are going to go through and further categorize them against the WGEC list as opposed to the WGIG list -- somebody ought to change the acronyms. I think that it will be manageable. I do not anticipate people coming in with vast volumes of work. I could be wrong, but I think people actually maybe will provide the information going forward according to the process.

I think it is -- if there is a large volume of work as a result of opening this up, I think that will make your task and the task of this group more rich in terms of the information that it has in front of it. And in that terms we will need five full days. But I think it is -- we are duty-bound, given

the mandate that we have from the U.N. General Assembly, to do as good a job as we possibly can. And if that is volumes of information -- which I have to say I do not anticipate, given that we only have three months in which to gather this, so it's publication of, join our group, provide the information, collate the information -- it's not going to happen. But I think we shouldn't put barriers in the way in order for people to contribute if they have a desire, a wish, or indeed the information to do so. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. Well, let's keep the discussion on the level of -- on practicalities, and we have an assurance from the practical approach and basically that is the concern we all have. I didn't have any intervention concerning the kind of political considerations. So I would like to stop the debate on the terms of references. I'm really sorry for those who want to take the floor, but I think we have covered all issues, and the real issue is how we can move forward as a group ourselves. And that is the main thing.

We have a team to facilitate our work, our next meeting. We have a promise that it will be a document which can be handled by us, which will have our work, and for me that is, you know -- so I would propose now for you to approve the modified terms of references as they are. So Saudi Arabia wants to take the floor, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I said earlier, we want to see it in a text so we know exactly what are these terms of reference.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So let me propose the following, we come back after lunch and the text will be available. I propose a five-minute discussion on the text. A very precise discussion. If there -- if there are parts you don't like, you propose something else and we proceed. But there's a general agreement here in the room, what I can feel, that there's a need for this group, for the correspondence group, there's a need for the exercise. The exercise will result in proposals which we can take up on board and it will facilitate our work. Is it agreeable? Yes, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I will sit down with the Secretariat and get the text amended. We will circulate that to the mailing list rather than paper-based. I will be back in this room 30 minutes prior to the start of your meeting, should anybody have any comments or questions, so that we can further amend or make the proposals to amend so that we can meet your five-minute deadline. So I shall be back in here at half past 2:00 with people having any comments or questions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. Last remark before we break, as I mentioned in the morning, I would like to proceed with the framework of our recommendations, so I would like from the proposal for the framework some text, and I would like to have some rudimentary recommendations for Group 4 and 5. If there are members who would like to proceed in this way, I would like to have the text as well. And in this spirit I wish you bon appetite and see you back at 3:00.

[Lunch Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Thank you for taking your seats. And I would like to thank you also for the hard work you did during lunchtime, those of you who have had discussions. And I understand that there are -- there's a proposal for the mandate of the correspondence group. I just want to remind you that before lunch break, we had a proposal which was amended. And now I would like to see the final result of the consultations.

Can I ask Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. Indeed the revised text, as we discussed this morning, was posted early in the lunch hour. So I thank the secretariat for their support in that process.

As I also said prior to lunch, I was in this room from half past 2:00 to take comments on the amended text, and I have received some amendments to that text.

So I will read those out, if you will allow me, Chair.

So under 5A, there is a word to be inserted. And it says "now review the identified international public policy issues." So the word "international" has been proposed to be inserted.

There is alternate text to B. It says -- excuse me. Excuse me -- "list where there are existing international mechanisms addressing the issues in the list." I will repeat again: "List where there are existing international mechanisms addressing the issues in the list."

A proposal has been brought forward as an alternative to C, which is: "Identify the status of mechanisms, if any, whether they are addressing the issues." So C would now read: "Identify the status of mechanisms, if any, whether they are addressing the issues."

And then in D, again, insertion after the term "gaps," it would say "attempt to identify the gaps and required action in order to ascertain." So the three words "and required action" have been proposed to be inserted, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. I have a general remark. I don't really want to see anything in the terms of reference which is taking over from the mandate of this group. The correspondence group is to have the work, not to replace, not to override the work of this working group. So any action is within the mandate of this group.

I can see Marilyn. But I think, Parminder, you were first.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Chair, I would have to see this rewritten, but I have an immediate concern about limiting our work to using the word "international" rather than

"Internet." I think our work is focused on Internet issues. And I want to be careful that we don't find ourselves -- and I'm just going to use an example. I think that some of the issues identified by those from civil society and others who were raising concerns from developing countries might -- if we're using "international," I think we may be missing the fact that we need to be -- in some cases, there will be a need to have a regional recognition of an issue that might be arising.

So I would actually prefer that we use the word "Internet" rather than restricting it by using the word "international."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First, I would respond to Marilyn's proposal and I see the mention of enhanced cooperation in Tunis Agenda clearly refers to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. And I think that is our mandate, and we should stick to our mandate. Otherwise, we will go too diffuse and the idea is to see what are the gaps in international Internet-related public policies and, if there are gaps, what to do about it.

The prior issue on which I wanted to comment was about the composition of the group. I am for extending all kinds of outreaches to all levels and keeping it open. And if you wish to go for another round of information seeking, I'm very happy to have that because it will be more focused information.

My concern is that out of four, probably different in the new amended text, but more or less still I'm talking from the old text are the four activities or mandates of the group, three are evaluative. They consist of making a judgment.

Now, collection of information -- and this group being a repository or recipient of information from all quarters is one kind of activity and that should be and can be very open. I'm not sure how a huge group would be taking evaluative judgments.

And my concern is entirely practical, that it won't happen and we will be back in the group with a list without being able to close the gaps which I thought was the primary purpose of making a small group; that when we come back, there's more clarity about certain judgments around different gaps and then we can work quickly. And if we are not able to assemble an effective group, we would not be able to do those evaluative functions. And that's the concern, if we can separate information sourcing from the evaluative aspects of this group and organize the group in a manner which it is effective to do both the works properly. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As I mentioned earlier, the mandate of the working group hasn't changed. So in case we are thinking in terms much actions, recommendations or evaluations, it is within the mandate of the working group, not within the mandate of the correspondence group. I just

wanted to make it clear. In case you have doubts, I will put it down in my report and probably we can be done with that.

Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My intervention is more or less in the same sense of your last intervention. I see the outcome of this correspondence group as being a factual document that will assist us as a working group to move ahead and provide and elaborate recommendations and make an analysis on this. So I think this is important because the contributions that are expected from to be us, from an expanded group of stakeholders, I think, as I have said before, I think we benefit to have enough expertise and information coming from other parties.

But those contributions should not entail analysis or lengthy elaborations on the issues. I think we are expecting also very factual information, very focus-oriented inputs. I think this must be made clear. Otherwise, we'll end up, the coordinator, with extensive pieces of paper from which he will have to pick what is relevant.

What is relevant here are the factual information, one that will allow us to have a clear view, an x-ray, but not an analysis of this. As you have indicated, Mr. Chair, we are not expecting proposals of actions, recommendations, just this picture upon which this working group will work. This is our understanding.

I think that might be the understanding of the room. Otherwise, it should be specified because it will assist the working group in its preparation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. I strongly urge you to follow the wise advice from Brazil, and let's move forward. We may spend half of the night here discussing words in the terms of references for the correspondence group, which is a technical group, and which you will provide input to us and it is up to us to evaluate, to give proposals to recommendations.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. And I wish to thank Phil for certain amendments which he proposed. I think they're very valid amendments which have slightly made the task more focused, number one.

Secondly, to look at what Marilyn was saying about "Internet," the way to fix this is we strictly go by what's said in the Tunis Agenda. If we could add three words in 5A, "international public policy issues pertaining to Internet," I think that is what the text is actually. So then they were talking of Internet and again international public policy issues.

And in any case, our objective is core towards such policies only and also to identify whether there is a role at the international level, not at the national level, because the task of this group is to look at that particular dimension.

And the second one which is, again -- I don't want to open this discussion, but Jimson had made one very important amendment before our lunch break in para 2. Are we looking at it or are we going to shelve that? I just want to know that. Of course, it is clear it is not reflected so it is not there. But I thought that was a fairly good suggestion. Thank you, Chair.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

 Before we went to lunch, I really urged you, especially governments, to participate in the work of this correspondence group. So I rather concentrate on these issues than on the particular words. The sense of this correspondence group is to provide information to our group.   And if governments do participate, I think we have a good hope to come up with recommendations which are beneficial for the governments.

 I can see Sweden.

 >>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Very briefly, we support what was said by the Brazilian ambassador. We think this should be a very factual tool that we can continue to work on and base our work on. And the only small comment that we have in that regard is that we think that it should not be within the mandate of this correspondence group to evaluate whether or not something has been adequately addressed or not addressed in a specific fora, process, or mechanism. Otherwise, we are very thankful to the hard work that Phil has put into this and with contributions from all colleagues. And we think we can work on this basis. Thank you.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

 Phil?

 Saudi Arabia, you want to take the floor?

 Virat after Phil, Japan, and United States. And I would like to close the discussion because I think that we are very, very close and probably in the last two hours we should do some real work. I'm really sorry to say that. You have been doing a great job up to now. The discussions were extremely good. I really enjoy them. And we are getting closer to it.

 But after deliberation of the terms of references, I would like to have some kind of framework for the recommendations on one hand and eventually if some members think that they could offer some recommendations, then I would like to see them.

 So, Phil, please.

 >>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.   Just two comments, one to respond to the distinguished delegate from India. I would like to claim credit for the words but, unfortunately, I cannot. I'm merely the scribe. The proposed changes came from my distinguished colleagues from Saudi Arabia in the 30 minutes I had set aside. So if there is credit to be given to the terms used, please direct them to my colleagues from Saudi Arabia.

The other issue -- and it goes back to something that you said, Chair, and to the Ambassador from Brazil which is in 13 weeks -- and I keep emphasizing 13 weeks -- there is going to be no effort to judge anything. It is merely factual. I do not have time to sit down and evaluate what I hope will be input. And I hope you will reflect that in your minutes, Chair, that all I will do, along with colleagues who participate, is reflect back into your group the facts that we are given. Where there is agreement on the facts, great. Where there is no agreement on the facts, then alternate views as expressed on the correspondence group will be presented to this group to discuss and debate. I do not intend to get into the middle of an argument. That is not my intention, believe me. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Very grateful for that. Thank you. So you left me in the middle.

[Laughter]

Okay. I can see United States and Japan and then probably we can close.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Don't want to -- to take the time simply to come in to support your approach, to agree with those who see the correspondence -- the correspondence group as a fact-finding group, I think for the purposes, as was said, to have an x-ray of progress currently being made.

We agree with the comments that Sweden made. There's no rendering of judgment by this correspondence group. That is the purview, that is the work of this group.

So, thank you, Chairman. We support the approach.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We deeply appreciate the hard work to prepare the correspondence group. And Japan would like to support the work of the correspondence group and would like to be a member of this correspondence group and cooperative work of the correspondence group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan. Very grateful for that, especially for the last part that you would like to be part of it. I encourage again all governments to be part of it.

Having said that, can I take the terms of reference as accepted by this group? Thank you.

Oh, Saudi Arabia, sorry.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What exactly -- I mean, is it the way it's presented right now? Because we have two Bs, two Cs.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I go back to Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: That was going to be my question to you, Chair. I presented amendments to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: In that case, we accept the amendments. We clean up the text and we accept the amendments.

Yes?

>> VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Chairman. If we are accepting amendments, then 5D now requires the group to make -- suggest actions, which is -- that's the corrected text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, I understand. Good point.

>> VIRAT BHATIA: Which is the job of the larger group. This was debated extensively. And the word "action" was dropped because it is a synonym for "recommendations" or "towards recommendations."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you suggest text?

>> VIRAT BHATIA: We should keep the original text. I just had one more point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: As I indicated, it is in the mandate of this group to make recommendations, to make judgments, evaluations. It's not in the mandate of the correspondence group, so there's no need according to the mandate of this group to delegate any of these actions. It is us who are going to do it.

Yes, please, continue.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: The second point that I had is with regards to 5B where the word "identify" has been replaced with "list," I just want to clarify and understand that because if "list" means just putting the name of an association or a body, then that would be insufficient because for the larger group to be able to make a call on the substantive contributions of that group, then it can't be just listing. It will have to be descriptive. So if listing does not mean restricting a descriptive notion -- because the contribution and the progress can be identified only after reading a descriptive notion. And if that's not on because it is the word "list" which is just reference to a name or an abbreviation, that, I believe, will be insufficient even for the group to get their document out to us. So either we agree that "list" doesn't mean just the name or we go back to identifying we're okay with either one so long as we have an agreement and understanding.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But if there is -- I mean, if there is no meat or an output that will help us, why establish this group, if we are just going to have informative?

If we are only getting informative, it will be more appropriate, more balanced, especially with the Item 2 there, to do the same thing we did with the questionnaire. We formulate these questions, send it as a questionnaire, get the replies, then the working group will decide.

But if you are going to have a correspondence group just for collecting information, why waste the time? Just formulate it as questions, send it as a questionnaire. And it will be more balanced that all stakeholders will be -- get the chance to reply and that's it. And especially when I say if you're going to do the required action or a proposal. So you are limiting me to just say, okay, there is a mechanism and I speak about that mechanism? I cannot even say that mechanism is not appropriate? That mechanism is not international mechanism? That mechanism is not an intergovernmental mechanism?

I mean, you cannot just direct me to one corner and I just follow that based on the questions.

If the correspondence group is not going to do evaluative or to propose something, put them as a question, send them as a questionnaire, and save the time, I mean, for the correspondence group members.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Nigeria.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I have to -- I shall thank you for the great job for the comments here. Everything is (indiscernible). They actually address so much what has been happening as part of the discourse.

So that effect, I would like to be included as a member among the correspondence group. I want to be a part of the process to be helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So right now we have two Bs and two Cs, if I'm not mistaken. Any proposal how to move forward?

Yeah.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Based on Tunis Agenda and from there we get the enhanced cooperation, when we say "enhanced cooperation associated with framework or mechanisms," and that's based on Tunis Agenda, paragraph 60 -- I mean, either 68 or 69, so the most appropriate thing is to say "mechanisms or framework" because that's the thing that relates to the enhanced cooperation. Existing activities, we can have so many existing activities but it is not in the code of the enhanced cooperation, international --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is "framework" acceptable to the group? That's what you want, "mechanism and framework"?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Tunis Agenda says "mechanisms" in paragraph 60, if I'm not mistaken. Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. The second B in blue. There was a concern about the first list in point B in blue. Can you clarify what you mean by list? I think the proposal came from you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So what do you mean by "list" with respect to the intervention of Virat?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Because if we say "identify," it will be judgmental. You identify something. Should I agree with it or not? But it's just to give me something that's already established, listed to me. This is a corresponding group, okay. We need answers in one line, two lines, one paragraph, not five pages to identify something that you see as an international mechanism or a framework. It is either yes or no. Is there a mechanism? Yes. Put the name of it. That's why we said "list."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. First of all, if you could indulge a little bit the text. Unfortunately, my eyes are not so sharp.

Just to comment on the point made about analysis, analyze the material versus just mapping, I think it still has a lot of value to do the mapping. And I think it's a big difference between mapping and what we need to do sorting different issues in different categories, for example, and identifying where, in which processes, in what mechanisms, so -- in what fora they're addressed and a questionnaire.

I think the questionnaire, we have already done that; and it has been really useful. We have connected in that way a broad range of views on this issues. But I think the very nature of what we are trying to do now to move the work forward is quite different from what we can do with the questionnaire. So we think it's a lot of added value.

And I've heard from a lot of colleagues here that actually doing this kind of mapping to have a good factual base to have a more informed discussion when we are going to move forward towards formulating recommendations has a lot of added value.

So we don't really see the point made that this shouldn't be of any added value and that we should repeat the exercise that we have already done when it comes to the questionnaire. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you very much, Chair. I guess the distinguished colleague of Sweden already took many of my points, so I want to agree with him. And I want also to congratulate Phil and the rest of the group, too, for the progress made and also say that I want to be available for the corresponding group, too, in the next month. So I want to be listed. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I believe practically all the working group may volunteer. I can see no problem about that. So I just once again encourage you to do that. Virat, please.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. Chairman, on the point of listing versus identify, the notion that a one-line or two-line answer can be given, as has been suggested by the distinguished delegate of Saudi Arabia, the concern that we have with that is the following: And I'll illustrate that with an example. For example, if the discussion is about human rights and Internet and IGF was listed as a fora and it was just listed IGF, then that's actually leaving it to everybody's judgment on what IGF does. On the other hand, when the group is doing the research and getting information, if there was a list that 18 sessions across the last nine years have occurred, including one main session, and so many participants have spoken, this is the kind of text available, we expect that to come up, when that is substantively different while making a judgment on whether the IGF is an effective international mechanism for enhanced cooperation where the issue of human rights and Internet is concerned. And I think that's -- that's the kind of information that this group is looking for. And I think that's the kind of information that will come, both from the filings that have already been made by the 60-plus participants and if you were to open this further, then others would substantiate it. So the quality of work that will come in will obviously make it tedious for us to go through some more papers, but we will make a much better qualitative judgment based on the evidence that would be provided. And that is the reason why I suppose it would help to be descriptive rather than one or two lines responses back.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. As you may know, I am also involved in the Radio Advisory Group of the ITU, I'm the vice chair, and as the vice chair I was chairing a correspondence group on the improvements of the VR, this is the Radiocommunication Bureau of Information Systems. We have gone through a kind of similar debate about the mandate of the group and after they settled the issue of mandate there was a great enthusiasm from the members of the Radio Advisory Group to participate. Can anyone tell me how many people participated out of 60-plus? Three. In addition to -- two in addition to myself. But the bulk of the work had to be by me. And I took all the blame, because you can't do a good job. There's no way you can do a good job. And those of you who are familiar with the ITU know that. So please, don't insist because we are going to end up having poor Phil doing it on his own, and while I'm too pessimistic but I hope some of us will help him and some of us who made commitments will really contribute.

But I believe, let's stop now the discussion here, try to stick to some -- some of the formulation. Believe me, it's almost irrelevant, at the end of the day, what we agree on here. Because the work we are going to have is the more important one. So I really ask you to approve whatever we have and let's move forward. It is going to be a very useful thing for us as a group, and we will be very grateful to Phil and a few others who are going to contribute. And I really hope there will be more than two, as was in my case. Thank you. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Just to save myself the embarrassment in February, Chair, unless there is input, I will do nothing.

[Laughter]

So it is up to others to contribute. I'm sure that will not be the case.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was not going to intervene but just to agree with one point that was raised by Saudi Arabia, that if the final outcome of the group would be thinking to identify, at least without any kind of judgment recommendation, that would be -- not would be in favor of that. But if it is an intermediate step, as a tool to assist us in a second stage then to have -- to provide for analysis on this. So I think the way you are proposing is just okay.

There is one point of clarification I would like to ask you because in both of these refers to the status of mechanisms. What is exactly meant by the status? Is it -- I don't understand what is the concept of the status? Is it something that is apparent to you, something that is -- what -- what is the criteria to judge the status? I'd like to have some more clarity on this, please.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Valid question. Before I give the floor to India, can the originators of this brilliant idea, this spreadsheet, clarify the status, meaning of the status. Parminder, are you able to do that?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yeah. After disclaiming brilliance, I can try to say what it was supposed to mean, and it was supposed to mean along with a (indiscernible) that was sent to the list which was about four or five lists, we will try to judge the mechanism like it is validity with the subject, it is (indiscernible) with the subject. So there's a certain list which would be used and it has a proposed list. Otherwise all kinds of judgments, and we can -- I think that work can be left to Phil to have four or five categories, which have been discussed since the morning, about what are we talking about, what kind of judgments we are putting on the mechanism. Whether it is international, whether it is dealing with the subject entirely or partially, and that kind of categories. But yes, it is a judgment, but we can keep it closed by giving four or five, six exhaustive options.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It is my understanding that the group intends to have an intermediate -- intermediate report by the end of November, and most likely in January, and we'll have time to

comment on that. So basically if we are in disagreement with something, probably we can contribute the same way. And it is also up to us what we accept and what we don't accept. And we can allow the group to make mistakes. I know that they are not allowed to, but still, I believe they will make mistakes, they will make errors, and we have to be very lenient. India, please. And I believe I would like you to be the last one.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I thought Phil should be worrying about which, we should take the blue or the black. You have two choices.

>> I prefer the blue.

>>INDIA: You prefer the blue. Okay. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: But what is more important for me, the number of people contributing. And don't forget that. Can we go? We delete the black and retain the blue. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Well, just to make clear, I think the blue is the one that is giving this group a mandate to evaluate its existing mechanisms, as it's phrased, or addressing the issues in the least. So we would have preferred the black one, and I think that is what I have heard a lot from the room. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I really understand your concerns, but believe me, it's of no significance. I'm really sorry to say that we shall see from the number of contributions. I may be too pessimistic as opposed to our assignment really because I'm generally an optimistic person, but from my experience I'm -- I believe that the main thing is -- just sets the working group -- the correspondence group and let it work. Yes, Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Chairman, can we suggest a compromise where we can go with blue with the exception of listing to be clarified to be descriptive or support the point made by Sweden, sort of go through identify and then take away the required action. That certainly is a -- is a problem. So if you can take those two out, then we can go with blue, it can work.

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>> We took away "required action"? Okay, fine.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: There's no action to be taken. There's no "required action."

>>VIRAT BHATIA: The only point left is --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So can you please reflect --

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Retain blue? Okay. Delete black.

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The other way around? Virat --

>>VIRAT BHATIA: There's one indication of I just -- I read this when you say, list the existing -- sorry, this is a bit difficult to read for me. List what the existing international mechanisms addressing the list means, nearly half or more of the list that has been prepared and provided by the 60 or inputs are going to be wiped out of the discussion, if -- I mean, we should either say national/international or not have international because this means half the work that's been done, or maybe more than half of the work that has been done, could be wiped out. Just a suggestion for the room to consider. So I'm suggesting either international and national or remove international.

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You want to take the floor? Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: I just want to mention to colleagues that that was why I intervened before. We sent out a questionnaire with 18 questions in it and in good faith and we worked very hard on that questionnaire, as I recall. I think some of you actually left me unsupervised for an hour or two until midnight or something, but we worked very hard on that questionnaire, as we all recall. We sent it out and then we all worked in good faith to get people to fill it in. And the people who filled it in, a large number of them, the majority of the responses came from governments. I think there's a real problem if we restrict our analysis now in a way that will not take that input into account. If we could go back to -- I share the concern that Virat Bhatia has raised that the word "list" could end up with just a narrow term that people wouldn't even understand. If I listed APWG or MAAWG, M-A-A-W-G, most people in this room wouldn't know what that is but it's the Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group which does a huge amount of work on spam and that would be relevant information. So I'm hoping that we'll be flexible but not get multiple pages, just a short description. But the thing I'm most concerned about in B is, whatever the word is, "list" existing mechanisms addressing Internet public policy. I -- isn't that what we asked people to do, to respond to. And how do we do the analysis if we do not include the kinds of mechanisms and framework -- I went back and looked at the Tunis Agenda and I believe it says frameworks or mechanisms, if required. But let's say the concern here is we need to be able to include the scope of the questionnaire that we distributed. It is really unfair to those people who we asked to contribute if we do not take their input into account.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. And it's also against our intentions. Parminder and India.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I think we have a duty towards all people who have given inputs, but we also have a duty, which is quite friendly, to the UNGA which gave us a mandate. The mandate is here, and we have to respond to the mandate. It is good to work with a big broad based pyramid, but you have to go towards the tip which is the recommendations which are in

accordance with the mandate. And if you had to go towards the tip, we need to focus on our mandate which is very clear about enhanced cooperation which is defined as pertaining to international public policy issues. That's what the mandate is.

So now defeatists say that because there are responses of certain kinds we need to know -- our recommendation has to be based on that. That's a good material for us to understand the issues, but we need to work on the mandate. And the mandate is very clear, it's about international public policy issues. I don't understand what we would be doing about talking about what, for example, India is doing on (indiscernible) diversity on the Internet within India. That's not what we can put in our recommendations. So we want to waste time of the group spending time talking again about those kind of issues when we are now supposed to be giving recommendations outside the mandate is my concern. Therefore, the international public policy issues and international mechanisms is precisely now trying to get narrowed down to what we are supposed to respond to. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we've been constantly compelled to make interventions but at one stage you are gaveled with talking about moving forward but again, it's a very fundamental issue. Given the mandate of this group, I think we need to bear in mind that the way in which even the Tunis Agenda has evolved in Paris with 60, 61, they talked about an adequacy of mechanisms of frameworks for what? For the international public policy issues. Now, there could be a mechanism at the national level which is dealing with a possible international public policy issue, but that is not the relevance or the mandate of this group to identify. We're looking at an international mechanism, if we -- quite possible in the middle of the discussion we may say well, it's already clear, that's a different story. But at this point in time we need to look at those international mechanisms. And that is the spirit with which we are all in this room. So let's -- I have no problem in listing all that, but the only thing is you go further and we'll have a much larger database and then we'll have to sift through the same process, the process through which you're going and stick only to the international issues rather than the national issues. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, as a matter of fact, I do trust the correspondence group to make appropriate judgments whether it's relevant or not relevant, and I really trust them, since they are also members of this group, to come up with a final document which will be -- which we will be able to handle in the proper way. And so I tell you, I don't really want to spend much time on that. We are just going around and around and we are just postponing to do real work. I'm really sorry to say that. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry to prolong the agony. But I am now, as one of the co-conveners, slightly confused. I am told on the one hand I should make no judgment, there should be only factual information. Now I am being asked to make a judgment on whether

or not something is international or national. I think the bottom line is, if the information comes in, I will put it into a form that is agreed to by the correspondence group and you, too, will have to share my pain, Chair. I am sorry to say this. I will buy you a nice cup of coffee afterwards. But I will make no judgment. This -- I reiterate for the fourth time, this correspondence group is merely a tool for the working group. It is the working group's role, expertise, to make the judgments. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I will ask you for the coffee a bit later. Let me propose the following thing: The output of this correspondence group will be a Chair's document and it will be my responsibility to take and make any judgment which I think is appropriate. Is it acceptable? Okay.

[Speaker is off microphone.]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You want to take the floor, observer? I have taken the decision over.

>>MATTHEW SHEARS: If I may, Chair. Matthew Shears of CDT. Part of the mandate of this working group is to seek, compile, and review inputs. If we're moving to a terms of reference -- and I apologize for prolonging this further but I do feel this has to be said -- if we're moving to a terms of reference that focuses on mechanisms, international mechanisms as some have inserted in here, rather than fora and other activities, we are effectively removing a considerable portion of the work that should be done as part of that review process. And it is quite astonishing to me that we have 60 or so inputs to this process and now we're saying that most of those inputs actually don't meet some kind of new set of criteria. They have not been reviewed. Those issues should be reviewed, as a part of this process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Just let me repeat, I expect an output from the group which will be my document, and I will make the judgments. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I -- as I see it, I think the -- this correspondence group is still not -- is fully consistent with the mandate we have. I think actually in spelling out the questions we have been fully respectful of all input received. I think we initially had this lengthy list of over 400 contributions, collecting all of the views from all participants on the relevant issues to be examined. So what we are trying to do to organize our work to make it workable for us is to request for an input. What is the input? On the basis of these contributions we have, we want to have a document relating these to saying whether those issues that were identified by submissions that were obviously related to something that is theirs, who is doing what, I think this is something that we find -- we found as a group properly to have in order to move forward. But this is, to my view, fully consistent with the fact that we are being respectful of the submissions that we have received and trying to relate to them. But making it into a way that is workable for us, otherwise either we cannot make out the work that was mandated to this group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. I will reflect the results of this discussion in my report, and I suggest we move forward. We have two hours to go. I closed -- I closed the debate. I would like to move forward, and I would like to ask India if you have any proposal for the framework for our recommendations?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. At the outset I must say that I have not really been able to come up with a very serious framework, but something which I attempted which would -- would be in the form of what were the broad elements of the report rather than put together language at this stage. So that is my -- this is based on the discussion that we had and the similar reports that have been produced by the working groups. If you permit me, Chair, I just will highlight some of the elements of it rather than going into the specific details because it will be -- it would be quite unfair to draw a conclusion when we are not even started making serious assessments about various contributions that we have received.

With that admission, Chair, I think firstly, the way we look at this, we could have a kind of introduction to the report which would talk about the mandate that has been given to this working group by the U.N. General Assembly Resolution 67/195. With a specific recommendation made -- or recommendations to be made on how to fully implement the mandate of the enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda and how we went about doing this process, the modis operandi which the working group has chosen and the meetings that have been set up and how we arrived at the questionnaire. So this could be captured in the body of the report in the form of an introduction. And of course, today's development which is talking about this -- talking about the correspondence group which has been tasked with a very sensitive assignment of -- I do not fully agree with saying it is not just reporting of what has been given but I think it's a very sensitive job of even to put together those ideas and presenting it as one particular input to the working group. And based on -- the next part of the report could be looking at what is the broad approach that we want to take on this. The group seems to have taken a clear recognition that there are a large number of issues above the Internet and also on the use of the Internet that affect most of the people who have access to it and also looked at areas where people who have no access to it and how to perhaps look at addressing those issues.

Secondly, there are also issues which needed a holistic examination on the use of Internet because it -- one way or another it will touch upon the concept of enhanced cooperation. So that would be the next element. But we also have seen some acknowledgment in the room, at least some delegations have said that there are issues that are to be dealt with by existing mechanisms and then others who said that while there is still no home for some of the issues, that when they say issues they're talking about the international public policy issues pertaining to Internet, I think.

Having made this broad position of what has been achieved and what are the gaps, we would then look at what are those relevant areas, relevant broad areas that the working group could look at as a possibility, again flowing out of the Tunis Agenda which is firstly talking about this identification of those international public policy issues pertaining to Internet which is an

exercise the correspondence group would come up with which will perhaps could be part of this particular portion of the report. And there are technical issues as well as issues relating to the oversight. That would be in the range of the -- thereafter, I think the most would say assessment-based aspects will now have to come into the report before we actually go into the recommendations.

Now here, when you talk of assess -- prior to assessment we also need to look at the role of various stakeholders. Now, this is where there seems to be some lack of convergence, if I can use the word. The issue which is of whether what has been described in the Tunis Agenda of the relative roles, do they still remain intact or there has been certain cross -- cross, what do you say, movement of some of the responsibilities of the various stakeholders. But I think it will not be inappropriate, at least to begin with, to use what is the language that's given in the Tunis Agenda, for example, with regard to the role of the governments and with regard to the role of private sector, the role of civil society, and the role of Internet -- governmental organizations. And one thing we must certainly do is bring in the role of academic and technical communities which -- who have been left behind for God knows what reasons. I think their contributions also need to be recognized and see what relative role they can also bring into the whole enhanced cooperation element.

At the end of this -- I mean, here we need to -- again, in each of these, we could have a shepherd which -- initiating from what is given in the Tunis Agenda. And if there are any changes, the group feels need to be added or to be made, and that is something -- that would be part of an assessment, frankly an assessment we'll have to make, given the views that are prevalent in the room.

Then comes the next level which is the inputs that are going to be moving into the mechanisms or frameworks. There are views about fora, the colleagues have said, or activities.

Now, this is where we need to be making perhaps a very close -- we will be taking a close look at this part of the report which would talk about the need for strengthening the existing mechanisms and at the same time talking about the need for having possible new mechanisms.

And this is where the direct input we will get from the correspondence group which would have done a certain mapping of the existing -- of identified international public policy issues. And then we have the mechanisms or frameworks which are existing. And if they're not in the view of the group, then we need to perhaps touch upon that part in this part of the -- in this part of the report.

And there's one more dimension which we might need to reflect, again, this is the relationship of whatever mechanisms which are existing or new ones, with the existing bodies, international bodies, which are dealing with international public policy issues. Just to give an example, like WIPO. There are issues which are already being dealt with by WIPO, similarly ITU, some aspects. We could come up with this relationship of those existing mechanisms or the new ones

with this new body -- with the already -- with the part of the United Nations system because they are already part of it. And there is also already a big debate in the WIPO how to deal with issues relating to what has been transacted on the Internet.

Toward the end, I think it will be very important for us also to look at -- I mean, this is one thing which I thought would be very relevant to look at the relationship with the IGF because as we made this process that we should have two processes which are complementing each other and working on a side-by-side basis.

Of course, I did hear some views today that some believe that it is in itself part of the enhanced cooperation. That's debatable. But I think we need to, given the current mandate of the Tunis Agenda and the U.N. General Assembly resolutions, very clearly pointing out that these are two processes distinct and having certain complementarities which need to be further strengthened, in a sense. It could be a very good relationship between the two processes.

Broadly, I think -- the last issue which I think will be a final outcome of the correspondence group would have to come under the relevant roles which we are going to define. The role of, let's say, a particular stakeholder and possible areas under which have been identified by the group, those could be either listed there or could be annexed to the report. So that -- to keep the main body of the report relatively shorter and to have an annex which gives those areas which we have -- perhaps believe could be part of a particular stakeholder's direct response.

Here comes the challenge. There could be areas where they are cross-cutting, where everyone is involved. We need to devise the mechanism of how to list those international public policy issues that we would like them to be looked at by a stakeholder or stakeholders. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

It's nice to hear one's own ideas back. You are already writing my report, so I'm real grateful for that.

I think there is great merit what you have said. And probably what I suggest to you is taking from -- either you can provide the written form or we can take it from the transcript. And I will ask the secretariat to start an initial rolling document in this sense which really makes sense. And probably it's something which people can contribute and say, no, we want a different categorization, we want a different structure. But we have to start somewhere. And that's my main idea, that eventually we should come up with some kind of structure for our recommendations.

I fully agree that naturally we will have an introductory part. We will have an analysis part. We will have all the text which is needed for this report.

But to have some kind of structure for the recommendations, it is really needed to think about how we are going to formulate.

One idea I had was based on the document which was offered to you as a summary of the responses, which is strictly related to the inputs we had and which also reflect the mandate. And it may be also an idea to reflect these categories what we had in the summary paper in the recommendations. In the process of our work, we may find that eventually we should deviate or we should split some of the categories. It may be that we shall merge some of the categories. I still don't know. It very much depends on you and on the way we are going to move forward.

I really thank you for your contributions. And if you want to add, please do it.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I was remiss on my part not to mention another important dimension which is relating to the developing countries of which I think there is -- some contributions are coming in. And that would be a part of the report which will have to come perhaps just before conclusions, I guess, because it will also be drawing upon some of the recommendations that the group would be making on whether it is on the relative roles or whether it is on the mechanisms.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any comments on the intervention of India?

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, first of all, I would like to thank India for this work. I think it is really a good start. Definitely something that we can work on. We're looking forward to seeing it in written form, and then we will analyze that further. And maybe we can work on a rolling document, as you said.

I just want to make one thing clear from our perspective for the record, that when we're talking about "mechanisms" here, our interpretation of that is that it can be a process, it can be an organization, it can be a fora.

So that is -- potentially, that's a list that could be expanded. I think that's very important to make clear given both the mandate of the correspondence group and the structure that was proposed by India on the report. But we are -- once again, would like to thank India for that. And I think we can work further on that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Chair, for giving me the opportunity to speak. I just wanted to mention that several of us put forward a document that was intended as food for thought and I believe is in many ways complementary to many of the recommendations just made by India.

In that document, we try to reflect the reality with the Tunis Agenda as the starting point for all of our discussions but that it is also not the last word on Internet governance or the roles and responsibilities in an evolving Internet.

It takes into account and respects the many views that we have received to the questionnaire. It appreciates the existing mechanisms respectful of the idea and the many organizations of the Internet technical community.

And it attempts to avoid any top-down recommendations that would harm the organic international Internet processes that are ongoing and constantly evolving.

So on behalf of those who contributed to the stake in the ground, I would like to ask the members of this community to consider our offerings as we move forward. Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I think your contribution has been circulated within the group to be taken into account. And I would like to remind us all that we are all part of the process, which is the WSIS +10 process.

So with this in mind, we have to pursue our work. So we are going to contribute to this WSIS +10 process.

I can see Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair. I want to really appreciate you for the way you have moderated thus far.

I would like to speak to the proposal or the submission of distinguished representative from India.

Actually, I wanted to comment to talk about: Have you left us out, the developing countries? And then he came up again and talked about it.

So I think a bigger gap on enhanced cooperation is to focus in on what happens at developing nations. That should be given a lot of recognition in the report.

And, also, to agree with the distinguished delegates from Sweden with regard to what we mean by "mechanism" because there are a lot of processes that is ongoing that is also facilitating the process of building confidence with regard to formulating international policy pertaining to the growth of the Internet.

And, lastly, there was a very important forum that took place here in Geneva that was May last year. There was a lot of inputs in that forum, very rich because I read the script and everything. So I think it also would be good if we make reference to that. The correspondence group can have it, actually can look through it, can be part of the reference group because I can recall a lot of vital inputs in that discussion, the first discussion enabled by the CSTD.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. I believe the document has been made available to the group. It was the initial document -- one of the initial documents for the first meeting that was the transcript of the 2012 May meeting of this year, so open consultation the CSTD had in the ILO last -- not last May but May 2012. So thank you. It's well taken, but it has already been made available. If you wish, we can resend it.

Virat, you wanted to take the floor. And then even though I told Brazil we are not going to have coffee, we are going to have coffee.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to come in and throw our weight behind the framework presented -- the early sketch of the framework presented by distinguished delegate from India. I think we don't -- we perhaps don't realize the importance of this because otherwise this could take one of those four days. And so if -- I think this is really excellent use of our time. If this framework that has been stated in some ways can be structured and put together for comments, then it would be our -- it should be our endeavor to try and agree broadly or as closely as possible on at least the framework when we begin the four-day meeting.

You see I'm emphasizing again and again a "four-days" meeting in February because we all want to be back on Friday evening home.

If we could try and do that, then I think it will help to have an effective Monday morning rather than spending half the day just arguing on the framework.

As the contributory groups work on their mapping exercise, the other larger group on e-mail can mail this as close to as possible. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat. That was exactly the reason, I'm sorry to say, that pushed India to make public this vote and share with us because I want to save time. And this is a very, very valuable contribution and it will save us a lot of time.

And I just want to ask you, in case you have something electronic -- in electronic form, to submit it to the secretariat. And, eventually, probably we can work offline to put out a document on the working group Web site and for consultation with the other members.

And when we come back in February, we are very prepared and we know what we are going to do exactly.

Having said that, I propose to have a 20-minute coffee break. And after coffee break, I would like to ask the United States who submitted some contribution in form of a recommendation to propose to us. And I would like to close our meeting, if possible, before 6:00. Thank you. So we will come back in 20 minutes time.

Oh, Sweden, sorry.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Just to say also together with Brazil, Mexico, U.K. and Sweden, we have also worked -- well, Sweden, (chuckles) we have also worked on some recommendations that we would like to present to the membership.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You are more than welcome.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. Can I ask you to take your seats, please. Thank you. Right.

So before we broke for coffee, we had a wonderful contribution from India for the framework. And we were promised to have the electronic form in a short while, probably by Monday. And I'm going to work with the secretariat to have the document out on the Web site in order you can have a look at that and comment. Probably this is going to frame our work for the next meeting and will save a lot of time for us.

The other thing I mentioned before the coffee break was that we had contributions from several participants, members, in form of recommendations.

So who would like to start with the submissions, please raise your flag and let's try to finish before 6:00.

I would like to emphasize that this is a draft. We are going to consider it and probably we shall get back to the recommendations -- draft recommendations in our next meeting. But probably this is offered by some of the members for your comments.

I believe United States wanted to give the recommendations and eventually from the group of countries, Sweden or Brazil. I'm not sure.

Okay. United States, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Sure. Thank you, Chair. In the spirit of the guidance that you provided earlier today about looking at possible draft recommendations that could be put forth, particularly in the discussion we had about looking at Group 4, perhaps to start, we put together something to offer for the process.

Should I just read it?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay. "International Internet organizations should continue to evolve to meet the needs and facilitate the participation of all stakeholders (including particularly those from developing countries) in their collaborative mechanisms and stakeholders from all groups are encouraged to engage in those Internet institutions to further realize the benefits of their participation.

Where participation may be hampered by lack of awareness, educational opportunity, political priority or financial resources, the Internet governance community should endeavor to help find ways to enable such participation."

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, USA. It is very helpful. And as I mentioned to you, this is a draft and probably you consider it also as a draft. And we have to start from somewhere. And I'm really glad that at least we have some draft recommendations.

Any comments? You are not obliged to give comments, of course. But if you feel like, raise your hand. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I would like to thank the U.S. for this.

Mr. Chair, I think this is language that captures much of what we have said. And, of course, we would think that meaningful collaboration from this group should go beyond this and provide some more substance to those recommendations. But I think this is -- this captures the framework in which we should work. So I think it's valid that if we can come out of this meeting with some formulations upon which we can build, can try to insert more substance but will, let's say, already give us some direction, not start from zero.

In that same sense, we have been working with Sweden, and my colleague from Sweden will introduce the text.

It is something which is not at all our ambition at this point in time. We are not, of course, prejudging the outcome of the discussion we have but will provide for some sort of initial way to try to figure out how the recommendations made from this group could look. I would like this to be seen in that light, not something that reflects something that is -- reflects our ambition. It certainly does not. But it is an initial step in that regard.

And I thank the U.S. also for this. I think it is very important that we initiate our next meeting with something already in writing to -- not to start from zero and lose time, even in trying to figure out how to go about it. This is the purpose of this. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil.   That is exactly my thought when I asked the participants to contribute in this sense, to start the process of producing recommendations or just the beginning of recommendations. It is also the most difficult part to start something.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And thanks to the U.S. delegation for starting off. As the Chair says, it is a difficult thing to start off, and we have something we can build over it. And building over it -- I'm going to a layer part, not that I have a problem with the process. And we are into talking about recommendations about part 4 and 5. I mean, the sense of certain discomfort about talking about this has not gone, and it is also exemplified with the present text on the screen. That is not a part that something is more important than the other, but some set of questions are dependent on other sets of questions. And as I now engage with this particular discussion, I again feel that 4 and 5 is so dependent on 2 and 3 that your mind is going to start making contributions not knowing we are trying to increase participation in what mechanisms, we are examining the role of developing countries in what.

And that comes back because I don't disagree with that part which is on the screen. However, it's one part. Existing international organizations who are doing work should be more inclusive and the reasons given are about awareness, finance, et cetera which, again, are an important set of work. But a lot of people here earlier, yesterday, or perhaps the day before, said that one of the biggest reasons developing countries can't participate is because there are no mechanisms. And that was repeated by a few people. That's the big thing.

Now when we discuss -- having not discussed that big thing, you already are uncertain about the contributions you are making. I mean, what is it you're talking about. And if we speak about that, I mean, I would like to contribute that the biggest problem of developing countries' role is an absence of mechanism. Then I'm probably discussing 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 which I should not do.

So that makes me unsure what should I do in this part because for me the biggest problem of participation is absence of international forums where all countries are on equal footing and they can start from the agenda onwards to the final outcomes be a part of the process.

So I would think that for me is the biggest excluding factor. And other factors are important, but they come later. And I agree with those factors which have been put on the table. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Ellen, please. Oh, no, Jimson first. Sorry, sorry.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I would just like to say in response that I had -- I have some of the same concerns, that it's difficult to do recommendations without having kind of this fact basis that we were looking for. But maybe if we can have an opportunity to review things we come up with

in this process in light of the facts again, we'll be able to make some progress, that it is not an either/or operation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just reflecting on that naturally, it's an iterative process and we are going to review and probably not once.

So, yes, we take it on board and probably with the mind that we are going to have other inputs from the correspondence group. We are going to clarify issues, what Parminder has raised. And in the light of that, probably this will fit into whatever we are going to recommend.

Now Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Distinguished colleagues, I would like to also join us to appreciate the contributions thus far and in particular the recommendation coming from United States.

Well, we know that the issue at hand is an ongoing work and there is nothing wrong for us to make progress as much as we can, even as much as we are within the bigger picture.

Well, I want to say I agree with the proposals and I have one or two other propositions here, recommendations. It's similar to what has been proposed, but maybe we can marry them down the line.

The first one is that, that the ongoing inclusive national, regional, and international cooperation on matters pertaining to the Internet be sustained among all stakeholders with governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic community actively playing their respective roles.

Then the second one I would like to propose, that the mandate of the United Nations Commission for Science and Technology for Development be enhanced to coordinate international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in a collaborative, multistakeholder framework that include governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic community on an equal footing.

Thank you, Distinguished Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. I can see Phil -- oh, Sweden, sorry. I'm sorry, Phil. Sweden asked for the floor first.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I just also wanted to thank the United States and Jimson for those contributions. I agree that it's a good starting point, and I think that's how we should see it. And I think we all agree that what we have on the table now -- right now is only draft, and it's a way to move the work forward.

And I think it's good that we work in parallel with the mapping and the drafting of recommendations. So I would like to thank, again, those that made those contributions. And after we have had the discussion on this, I'll come back with our joint recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Phil. No? Okay. Anyone asking for the floor, I just want to repeat, this is a draft. We are going to revisit it in our next meeting. This is something, just a beginning. I can see Nigeria and Marilyn. Nigeria, please.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to proffer this proposal to -- that international (indiscernible) is already addressing international public policy issues pertaining to Internet strategic awareness and capacity building programs particularly in developing countries and across all sectors, including governments, private sector organizations, civil society, technical and academic communities. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigeria. Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to join with others who express appreciation for colleagues in the room who have already put forward some drafts for us to be thinking about. I'm very impressed to have already some language and some good thinking. But I wanted to ask, since I'm a bit slower in thinking, just to think about perhaps there would be a process for us to be able to not wait until our next meeting, but to be able to accept drafts of further recommendations and have a kind of a rolling single document for those -- a place where those would be aggregated so that we can not have to search through the mail list but, you know, have a place where we can find all of the drafts that are submitted as we go forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for the suggestion. Probably we are going to do -- not probably. We are going to do it. Sorry. It will be posted on the Web site. And you will have opportunity to contribute, even in between the two sessions we are going to have. Feel free to submit your proposals for recommendations, and it is most welcome and it will be reviewed, I think periodically, by all of us. I expect you to go from time to time to the Web site and find out if there's something new. But at the same time, probably we should establish a mechanism of kind of alert that there's something new. So we shall work it out within the Secretariat.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's good to accept drafting recommendations but we share the views expressed that when writing recommendations about Cluster 4 can 5, and without covering the Cluster 2 and 3, it's not really clear what kind of recommendations we want to come -- to put. However, we do -- can offer a recommendation as it's a draft and will be looked at at the next meeting. We could say that enhanced cooperation will help assure that Internet governance is carried out according to WSIS principles with full participation from all stakeholders in their respective roles. And enhanced cooperation will enable governments on an

equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities pertaining to Internet and that by operationalizing enhanced cooperation through a body under the U.N. umbrella international public policy decision will be legitimate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I think, as I mentioned, all submissions, all proposals for recommendations will be included in this rolling document which will be posted on the CSTD Web site. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. Well, Brazil, Mexico, United Kingdom, and Sweden would then like to put forward some draft recommendations. We have tried to capture what we have interpreted as some of the areas where there might be emerging consensus, especially in relation to Group 4 and 5 of questions. And we would like to emphasize that this is just a starting point and it's not a finished product in any way, but something for the group to consider. That's the first one.

Members should explore ways to strengthen participation of all stakeholders from developing countries in existing global Internet governance flora, including through funding mechanisms and alternative working methods such as remote participation.

Members should increase efforts to empower stakeholders to participate through capacity building, including but not limited to training programs, awareness raising, best practice sharing.

Three, members should work with developing countries to create a fair and consistent domestic framework that stimulates competition and creates affordable access for all stakeholders.

And four, the role of government should include but not be limited to, to empower Internet uses, ensure a fair and consistent legal framework that is transparent, accountable, and equitable, and protect human rights online, to foster a robust global Internet infrastructure and support multistakeholder processes and partnerships.

So once again, I would just like to underline that this is just something that we see as a starting point, something that we can build up on, and I believe we can send -- send those drafts to the Secretariat. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden, Brazil, Mexico, and United Kingdom. I hope I didn't forget anyone. Naturally, we expect that you submit it electronically to the Secretariat that we would be able to post it on the Web site and the same applies to Saudi Arabia. We would like to have your contribution in print form to be posted on the Web site. I can see India, then Mexico and Phil. And Japan. Sorry. Japan was the first. I'm sorry, I couldn't see you. So please, take the floor.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I deeply appreciate the U.S. and Sweden and Brazil and Mexico and U.K. to prepare the great contribution, preparing the draft of the recommendations for starting point of the discussion. Japan would like to submit the region comment and other

input concerning the recommendations after the meeting concerning with the -- the regional organizations within Japan. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan. We are awaiting for your submissions. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to flag that we would be making a recommendation on the list to address that particular dimension relating to the digital divide and the need for certain measures because where there is no access, no Internet, I think they also need to be brought into this before we can start talking about their empowerment, which some of these measures would empower those or make them part of the operation system. But we need to perhaps address other dimensions. On that direction we will try to put a recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Understand I can't help myself to sharing with you that when we were in Durban there was a -- one morning I think many of the participants went to a school which was some 40 kilometers from Durban to help them to paint the walls. And after this very nice action there was some meeting with the students, young students. I believe it's a secondary school. And there was a question asked, how many of you have you heard about the Internet? Of the 30, there was one student who raised his hand. Just one. So I think there's merit in what you're saying. Okay. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to thank my colleague from Sweden to introduce this proposal, recommendations, because we thought that, as you mentioned, that the objective was to have something -- quickly to start something and have it in black and white. So we think it's a very good step, and as you said, this is -- this -- all these contributions will be a working process and contributions regardless of what we decide on the other points, but it's a starting point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Much thank the contributors for providing the thoughtful and thought-provoking contributions. I'm sure, as the distinguished delegate from Mexico said, it is a starting point and something to evolve. The only point I would ask is that when the documents and proposals are posted on the Web site, could we also have the source of the proposal identified so that we can engage in conversations and discussions going forward to see and understand and hopefully when we come back in February to be very conversant with the other's views and hopefully agreements. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it is my understanding that we shall quote the sources. I mean, it provides the understanding of the sources as well and it's not really the understanding but I would assume the wishes of the source to be quoted. Yes. I can see Parminder, and before -- and there's --

[Speaker is off microphone.] Mexico has already taken the floor.

We have to recognize also some contributions were received by e-mail which will also be posted and there were contributions from Finland, Mervi contributed, and we have contributions from Avri and Carlos. So all these contributions -- and Joy. All these contributions will be posted on the Web site. If you feel like introducing them, that's perfectly okay. If you don't, that's okay as well. So I just wanted to flag it that we have further contributions that will be posted on the Web site. Probably at this hour we don't really want to go into detailed debate, but as I indicated to you, I think this is just the beginning. Lesotho.

>>LESOTHO: Thank you very much, Chair. After sitting here a little bit quiet for the week, but solely because most of the points that have been raised are things that we are agreeable to. Chair, I just wanted to reemphasize two points that have already been raised, particularly for developing countries and more specifically least-developed countries. For them to be -- this relates to capacity building as well including their existing mechanisms within, basically national as well as regional mechanisms that are in place.

And lastly, Chair, the point that you raised about the school you went to, seeing that Durbin is also very close to my country, the issue about digital divide that -- that has been raised by other colleagues here already, that it is very important that we -- it is very much captured.

And lastly, Chair, I just want to thank all the -- the various speakers that have made their various recommendations and we look forward to going through those in preparation for the February meeting. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Lesotho. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I -- my first comment is that was what was originally proposed by Marilyn Cade and supported by you but we should have a platform that would allow us internationally to feed into some other draft recommendations that will enable us at the beginning of next meeting to have a set of formulations we can work on. I think this would be very helpful from the point of view of efficiency of how we work. And then we, of course, also benefit from having the mapping exercise, I think we'll have tools that will assist us in our further work.

One thing about making these proposals, and I have insisted in exercising the aspect that these are initial and they do not, I think, address correctly the vision and do not adequately encompass the mandate we are given. And if I can quote a thought from my compatriot, Carlos Afonso, we are discussing yesterday and he's been in this process for many years and he was just recalling that much of what we have been doing here has in some way already been addressed. So we run the risk in the end of just repeating formulations that have been already known. And so if we want to move ahead and make a contribution, real contribution, we must make a very good effort to go beyond that. I think the mapping exercise will be a tool for that. I think if we can have those formulation can think about these and try to put more substance. I think certainly we need

to go beyond the mere identification of the issues and making a call because these are things that are already there.

One proposal we are not -- but I'd like to indicate in line with what we have been saying, and Saudi Arabia has also made a proposal in regard to Groups 1 and 2 and 3. And one thing that is independent from this mapping is our assessment that we would like a platform but to enable for holistic integrated discussion. So this is something that we can, I think of as of now, we will in the next few days or so forward a proposal for that. But look something like operationalizing enhanced cooperation requires that we should maybe say multistakeholder platform through each government an equal footing could engage in the discussion and possible policymaking of international public-related issues, or something in that direction. And we think it's not pre-judging the outcome of the mapping exercise because we think this is something that is needed. And then I think we'll have to discuss, in our next meeting, whether we can -- there's enough consensus where that should be located, what to be formed. I think that will be relevant discussion. I think on the basis of the proposals from Saudi Arabia, Iran, and others, maybe we can have enough substance of discussion and try to frame some way to address this. And of course, the specific recommendations relating to the mapping exercise of more specific issues.

So I'm very glad that we have come to this. I was a bit concerned that we would come out of the meeting without something more concrete. This is not yet -- I repeat, that does not affect the foundation of the (indiscernible) but it is a step in the direction of building something that I think in the interest of calling us to go beyond what we have already have on the table. And as Carlos Afonso has reminded me, and I'm very thankful for him to recall this, not to give impression that we are just, let's say, rephrasing and giving better wording for things that are already there, even in the Tunis Agenda. I think we must go beyond that, and we have this opportunity and I think the moment is right to do so. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. I can promise you we will go beyond. I have no doubt. And Parminder, you want to take the floor? Okay. So I think this is a time to -- Oh, India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I couldn't but make this one last comment before we conclude. This is on the lines the distinguished ambassador from Brazil has mentioned of the various stakeholders. One idea which I'm just throwing it up here which we could pursue it in our future intersession as well as during the next debate, there are obviously few models which -- wherein governments have taken certain initiatives in some regions on how to prepare those Internet -- principles on Internet. One I can certainly recall is the OECD which has been referred to by some of the colleagues. And there are distinct areas where I think there is -- there is a felt need to have active role of governments, of course with the involvement through various processes of all other stakeholders. To just to name some of them, which I'm interested in reading, going through some of the documents that have been adopted by this body, and there is a call to see how it can be made applicable, replicate such things in a global manner. Whether it is cybersecurity, whether it is consumer rights, whether it is children online, whether it is international cooperation

Internet governance, cross-border enforcement cooperation. There are some areas I think where we would eventually be required to make a comment on. And I think it will be another important contribution from our point of view, that where such areas -- again, the least possible, what we call friction, these are areas I'm sure all stakeholders are involved but there's a certain lead that the governments will need to take. Just a very indicative list. Which have been acknowledge and which are a part of the established documents which are being already followed by a few governments by virtue of a certain regional engagement. I don't think we will be out of place to reflect on some such areas and how we can see that such a mechanism or a fora, better way you can call where governments can actually take an active role (indiscernible) in our discussions in future. Thank you, Chair.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

 I believe this is the time to conclude. I won't be long. Japan, you want to take the floor.

 >>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one question. To submit contributions and a comment, can you tell us the deadline to submit the contribution and the comments to the contributions and how to submit such kind of contribution? Thank you.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably the best way to submit your contribution is to the secretariat. The secretariat will post it on the Web site. As for the deadline, probably it will be the beginning of our next meeting. But all of us would prefer to have the comments, contributions, much before. But even during the meeting, you can contribute. We have no deadline. But please set yourself a deadline to do it considering what you would like to have from others.

 Parminder.

 >>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Again for clarification, I propose, that if the groups are submitting proposals and for the purpose of the consideration of other members of the group, to submit them on the list because then everybody immediately knows that there is a proposal because you never know how often to keep on going to the Web site. Just a proposal. People have different Web or Internet behavior.

 When the group gets it, they kind of respond to it immediately. So that's the whole idea so that probably it would be good in addition, of course, to putting it on the Web.

 >>CHAIR MAJOR: I think this is a good way forward, yeah. Okay.

 So please make your submissions in any way.

 So, ladies and gentlemen, we have come to the end of this meeting. I really want to congratulate you on the good cooperation you have shown. I think all of you contributed in a very, very good way. And it helped us, all of us, to have a better understanding of the issues which are ahead of us.

We managed to go through the contributions. We analyzed the questions. We decided to set up a correspondence group. We decided on the terms of references for the correspondence group. We had a submission about the possible framework for all recommendations. But last, but not least, we had quite a lot of submissions, proposals, for recommendations.

So I'm really pleased with the result we had up to now. And I'm also optimistic about the future meeting we are going to have in February.

There is a great work waiting for us. I would encourage you to contribute to the best of your knowledge to the work of the correspondence group and to the work of the working group itself in forms of submissions, of recommendations.

And please be prepared that for the next meeting, we are going to have a very, very hard task. We have to finish our work by providing recommendations in the sense the Ambassador of Brazil reminded us, that we should go beyond what has been done up till now. That is the reason we are here.

And last, but not least, I would like to thank -- well, not last, I would like to thank, first of all, the secretariat for the excellent work they provided for us. And I would like to thank the scribes who have followed us. They did a great job. So I want to give a hand to them.

[Applause]

Thank you for your presence here, for your contributions. And I wish you a good journey back home.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But we cannot conclude without also thanking you for your able leadership and you deserve applaud and a hand from us all.

[Applause]

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Chairman, just one last point. I think for the last meeting, since we are timing it very carefully next to the MAG meeting and I suppose a lot more observers and especially from the civil society would want to participate, if we can be explicit about the date and the timing and the process for their participation as observers well in advance, it will help them to be here because they will be planning their visit to attend both meetings, including the weekend, so that will be helpful for them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right.

(Meeting has concluded.)