

Transcript Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

30 April-2 May 2014

**Geneva, Switzerland
Day 1**

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Wednesday, 30 April 2014
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. Good morning. Welcome to the fourth meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

I'm really happy to see that there's still some interest.

Before we start the meeting, I have some administrative announcements.

So everyone is requested to put his name or her name on a sheet, a participation list which is, I think, at the entrance, eventually with the email address.

I can see -- and there's no need to repeat -- that members are sitting in the middle and observers at the sides.

There are printouts of documents which are available also at the entrance.

And the next one is, the secretariat has created the Google Doc site to put updated versions of the documents, and it will be shared amongst us.

So those who are members of either the working group or the correspondence group are fine, and those observers who would like to have access, you're kindly requested to put down your email in order to be able for the secretariat to share the document with you.

And I think basically that's the administrative part, so without much ado, I start my introductory remarks.

First of all, I would like to apologize to you for the uncertainty of the time. We have discussed during last meeting about the time of this meeting and there was some kind of hesitation, and basically the reason we had to move the meeting to this date was the upcoming meeting of the CSTD itself, and this is simply for that reason we had to change it, in order that we can feed into the CSTD session. And the document should be considered whatever the output document will be from this meeting. We had to have some time to process it.

So I plan to have this meeting as a three-day meeting, but we are going to go into details later on.

Can I have the next slide, please.

So as usual, I would like to read out the mandate we have according to the resolution of the U.N. in 2012.

The resolution invites the chair of the CSTD to establish a Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to examine the mandate of the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation through seeking, compiling, and reviewing inputs from all member states and all other stakeholders, and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate.

We have to report to the CSTD in 2014, and our mandate has been reiterated in the resolution of last year of the U.N. General Assembly.

Next one.

So this is basically the process we are in. The resolution which was taken in 2012 created the working group. We had the inputs from the stakeholders. We started the evaluation, and hopefully we are going to complete the evaluation this time and it will go to the CSTD. Hopefully the CSTD will approve the documents we are going to submit, and it will be taken forward to the ECOSOC and finally to the General Assembly.

I would like to remind everyone -- probably you know it as well as I do -- that we are feeding into the WSIS+10 process, and our meeting and our results are very important in this respect.

The working modalities I think are clear. We are not going to change them. So we are -- we will be in compliance with the mandate.

We have a multistakeholder approach and hopefully we have a mutual trust.

We tried to achieve results based on consensus.

We have observers who are here according to the ECOSOC rules, and we had the agreement of the working group that, yes, observers can follow our meeting.

And of course we have the time constraints, we have the resources constraints, and the venues. All of these are known.

And of course we are sharing all the information with the stakeholders. That is, the documents are public, or most of the time we make them public, in case they are in a state that they can be made public.

Next one.

So we had our first meeting last May. Oh, my goodness, it was a year ago. Whew! As if it were yesterday.

A second one was in November.

The third one was last February.

And this is our fourth one, and hopefully we are going to have the recommendations and the report of the working group, and I believe I'm going to present the report and the recommendations to the 17th session of the CSTD, which is going to be from the 12th to the 16th of May here in the U.N.

So just a reminder. Our first meeting, we had a very good collaboration of the participants. We decided the procedural issues. We had two breakout groups, led by Brazil and India. We identified categories for the suggested questions and we identify -- we finalized the questionnaire based on the results of these breakout groups.

Already at that time we had remote participation and audio streaming, and we decided on the next steps.

On the second meeting, we discussed the responses to the questionnaire, and there was a summary of the responses which were grouped into five groups.

We started with the submission of draft recommendations and there was a discussion about the structure of the report.

In the second meeting, we created the correspondence group for the mapping of the existing mechanisms to internal -- international forums.

At that time, we had -- in addition to remote participation streaming, we had captioning and transcripts.

And once again, I have to underline the excellent collaboration of the participants.

So we had our third meeting last February and we discussed draft recommendations in Group A, C, and part of D.

We had proposals for the structure of the report.

We had a report from the correspondence group for the mapping of existing mechanisms to international forums.

And we have to be honest. There was a big, big divergence of opinions.

So that's why I suggested to have our fourth meeting, with the hope that in the meantime in other fora such as NETmundial, WSIS+10 meeting, and the ITU -- and at that time, I still hoped that in the U.N. General Assembly -- consultation will lead to some result, but I understand that it's still going on.

So -- and with the hope that we are going to have some positive inputs or impulses on our process, we are going to achieve some results.

And I think -- I've been following the NETmundial remotely, and probably most of you or all of you have the outcome document of the NETmundial.

We can say that it was a very good meeting and I think we are going to have some statement from Brazil about it.

Personally, I think it is a good example for us, and in the final document of the NETmundial, there is a paragraph about the hopes of the stakeholders about our work, about the outcome of our work.

So it has been emphasized that it is very significant work we are doing here.

Next one. Well, probably we can skip that.

For the fourth meeting, we have the following resources.

The documents we had have been grouped into four documents.

We have statements. I asked participants to separate recommendations from statements, so this has been done.

We have a document with agreed recommendations, or agreed recommendation.

We have a document with recommendations to be revisited.

And finally, we have a document where we had no agreement.

Next one.

We have also the correspondence group's input. We are going to hear a report from the chair of the correspondence group tomorrow. And we have the compilation of the contributions. If I'm not mistaken, we have a printout form which can be collected at the entrance of the room.

And in addition to that, we have the transcripts of the previous meetings and you have the Web page for this meeting.

Oh, by the way, the presentation will be made available on the Web site, so in case you lose some information, you can always retrieve.

Next one.

So what are the resources in addition to what I said?

Well, we agreed on the structure of the report. There were ongoing discussions and finally we agreed on the following structure of the report.

There will be an introductory part.

In the second part, we are going to have a description of the meetings and the methodology.

And the bulk of the report will be about the operationalizing -- whatever -- enhanced cooperation recommendations for the five groups. And you have the five groups.

A, implementation of the Tunis Agenda; B, public policy issues and possible mechanisms; C, role of the stakeholders; D, developing countries; E, barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation; and finally, conclusion.

So at least we have the structure, and right now we have to work on the recommendations.

Next one.

In addition to these resources, I would like to have some short statement or report about other events.

First of all, the transition of the NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions, and eventually if the U.S. could give us some very short statement about it.

NETmundial. I would like to have some information about the event itself eventually from Brazil.

And the WSIS+10 MPP, where we are with that. I understand that it is going well and we are going to have another meeting before the summit, or before the final meeting.

And last, but not least, about the IGF preparations for the 9th IGF in Istanbul.

So these are the other information which have impact on our work, so I would like to have this information.

So how we are going to organize the meeting.

Well, first of all, naturally we have to agree on the agenda and the time management.

I suggest that we continue with a discussion of the remaining topics in Groups D and E, with the objective to propose recommendations.

I would like to have a report from the chair of the correspondence group and have a discussion about the document of the correspondence group which I would call a living document.

And after that, I would like to go back and I would like to revisit recommendations which we said we would be revisiting in Group A and C.

In the very unlikely case of diverging opinions -- and if I look at you, I can see that it's very unlikely, because we are going to agree on most of the things, but in case, it has been expressed that eventually

opinions should be included in the report.

I would like to ask delegations of so-called like-minded groups to formulate these opinions, in case it's needed, and it will be annexed to the report.

So we have substantial work to do. We have to do the drafting and we have to finalize the recommendations, and last, but not least, we have to have a consolidated report which I can present to the CSTD basically 10 days from now.

Next one.

So I would like to ask you to concentrate on substantive discussions. So probably I --

We know each other quite well. We know our opinions quite well and we know our point of views, so I don't really think that it's needed to state again the same statements we had before.

We should find ways of understanding and consensus.

So basically, I really want to concentrate on the recommendations rather than on statements.

So in the report, as I mentioned, we are going to give a factual description of the meetings, we had the accepted structure, and we are going to reflect the agreements, and naturally, as I said, annex the opinions in case of disagreement.

Next one.

The suggested time management. I suggest the same time management as we had before.

That is, from 10:00 to 1:00, we have the morning session. We are going to have an observers' segment before coffee break, a 15 minutes coffee break preceded by this observers' segment.

In case you think we should start earlier, I am ready to start earlier. Whether it be half an hour or one hour earlier, it is up to you.

We are going to have the lunch break from 1:00 to 3:00.

And in the afternoon, we're going to work in a similar way as we work in the morning. That is, from 3:00 to 6:00, and with the 15 minutes observers' segment and 15 minutes coffee break.

And once again, if you think that we should work a bit later, we can do it. I'm ready to do it.

Next one.

So let me call your attention again to our role.

We contribute to the WSIS process, recommending ways and means of cooperation.

We know the importance of the complexity of the issues and our tasks, and we seek points of agreement and compromise.

And of course, as I can see, we are motivated, ambitious, and realistic.

Okay. So after that, I think the following point is the agenda has been posted on the Web site. Basically, it's almost the same as we had before.

Are there any observations that we can follow our work in the same way?

I can see no --

Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, colleagues.

We do have an observation on the third item. I mean, there is lots of events happening around us. We should focus on our mandate, not to be, I mean, confused by other events or divert in our way of work, but just focus on the mandate. We do have a mandate in here. Others are doing things according to their mandates, so it's kind of parallel or separate issues between each event. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. That exactly was my intent. I want to emphasize that we want to have information, nothing else. It's just to have some information what has happened around us and how we are going to feed into the WSIS+10 process. It is not going to influence directly our work. Naturally indirectly, of course, it will. But that is exactly my intent. And I underline it's information. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. Good morning to everybody. I hope everybody is well. Yes, nobody is against the dissemination of the information. The document that you refer to, NETmundial, is on the Web site, is on the table. Thank you very much, and kindly the Secretariat made it available for those who like me lazy to go to the Web site. Very good. And that's that. So we don't need to refer to that because that is a different event of a different basis, different background, different views, and so on so forth. So it is better you concentrate the time that you mentioned on the issue before you. Otherwise you may run the risk of unnecessary discussions. So thank you very much for the -- for the submission or provision of document on the table. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. As I mentioned, I want to have as information and probably the group will take note of that and that's it. Avri, you wanted to --

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to sort of offer a -- other view on this and sort of say that we really can't ignore what is going on in global discussions that included governments on the same topic. So I understand the desire to ignore what has happened in the intervening time, but I really do not believe that we can afford to, otherwise we work in a vacuum really and I do not believe that we can afford to do so. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair, and very good morning to everyone in the room. And welcome back to Geneva for all of those who are coming from outside. At the outset, Mr. Chair, I would like to make two submissions. I think there are definitely significant developments taking place on the overall Internet governance per se and I think it's important we all in our diligent capacities must take note of those developments. There are no two words about it. Then secondly, given the time and type of mandate we have been given in this working group, those acknowledgments can come to our interventions rather than being presented as part of this working group process. Our specific mandate is slightly one dimension of Internet governance. If we try to stretch ourselves too much, assuming that there are implications coming out of various other processes, then we might lose focus and we might be, as you rightly observed in the beginning, the time is not at our disposal. So we would like to be really restraining ourselves in seeing what is relevant to this particular working group, and I tend to see the caution that is being advised by some of the colleagues in the room, particularly Saudi Arabia and Iran. I think that is particularly important. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. As I told you, I have no intent to take on any discussion what has happened in other meetings. Just factual information, what was the outcome and then two, three minutes by the (indiscernible) country. Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I wonder if there is a representative of the Brazilian government here. Yeah, there is. Okay. I think it would be interesting to hear him to have a basic information that you are requesting about NETmundial. And I can give some comments, maybe after, could make a statement, is my suggestion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. I can sense and it's -- I tend to agree with that, probably we shouldn't have a detailed discussion about what has happened in other forums and we should just have some information about it and take note of that and carry on with our work. That is my aim. Probably I didn't express myself clearly, but I understand this is the wish of some other members of the group and I tend to agree with that. Simply we have this kind of information during our last meeting. I don't intend to go beyond that. I just want to have some factual information, what has happened and that's it. And in the same way I would like to have some information about the WSIS+10 meeting in the ITU, about the ITU process, and eventually the NTIA process, which does have some affect on our work. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to our colleagues. We have now spent eight minutes discussing whether or not we would allow our visiting colleague to make a few remarks regarding the Sao Paulo meeting, and according to our agenda five minutes were set out for such a briefing. I think it's worth reflecting upon. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Very practical remark. Thank you. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm one of the business participants. I would like to support the idea of brief informational statements which are not discussed but are available to all of us. I think as someone who is participating in the WSIS+10 and also in the Istanbul IGF I'm aware -- I was able to attend NETmundial, not everyone was able to. I think short reports from all of the parties that you suggested without discussion will help us then to move forward, and I welcome Mr.

Reddy's suggestion that then any other statements that we make can take place during our -- our individual interventions. Thank you.

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I would agree particularly with that final comment that as our distinguished Indian colleague said that we should not turn this into a debate on that forum and that any other comments would be woven into the discussion, but we would welcome a short factual briefing on this as we -- we would not disagree with those who say that this group has its own mandate but we all know that that mandate does not take place in isolation and when other significant and related events are going on we would welcome hearing a short briefing on them. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Victoria.

>>VICTORIA ROMERO: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to everybody, and my affiliation to support your proposal of having a briefing on NETmundial and would support also what has been presented by other delegations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Can I ask Brazil to give us a three minutes presentation because we have (indiscernible) meeting. Go ahead.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. I would like to thank for this opportunity to brief on NETmundial. The event was highly successful in drawing attention to the importance of the Internet governance and its future and hopefully it will provide some inputs to move forward the work of the WGEC. Many had recognized that NETmundial in terms of procedure and substance fully respected the multistakeholder principle. There was a fairly balanced presence of the various stakeholders. Of the total participants representing over 90 countries, 19% were from government, 20% from the private sector, 20% from academic and technical communities, and 22% from the Civil Society. It is worth emphasizing the transparency in the process of elaboration and review of the final document. Both in the preparatory stages and in the course of the event. From our viewpoint the NETmundial multistakeholder statement gains legitimacy in the eyes of the international community since it resulted from an effort that involved the full participation of all stakeholders. As to its substance, the statement may represent an important contribution to advancing international discussions on Internet governance as it established a set of universal principles to guide such discussions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to give a very short, succinct statement.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Basically that's what we wanted to hear. I believe we can move forward and I would like to have some -- Iran, you wanted to take -- it's okay. Can I have some briefing about the WSIS+10, where we are with that.

>>Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And welcome to all delegates. It's my pleasure to update you on the interpretive process of the WSIS+10 high level event and there are only 40 days remaining to the high level event which will be held of the 10-15 of June in Geneva. And the preparatory process also already approaches its end. We held just from the 14-17 of April the fourth physical meeting which

concluded. We've come to conclusions on a few chapters of the two outcome documents, meaning the statement and our vision.

So in the statement, most of the text has been agreed. The annex is going to be still under discussion and the Switzerland has been requested to facilitate the consensus building on the listing of the human rights regulated resolutions.

On the vision, unfortunately due to the time constraints we didn't arrive to the end of the reading and the chapters on the action lines and on the measurements has been postponed to be addressed during the fifth physical meeting. And the Chairman, together with the vice chairs and in cooperation with the action line facilitators and the focal point has been requested to propose the possible text, concise text for those chapters to make this possible during the next meeting. Next meeting has been reconfirmed to be held from the 28 to 31 of May, so four-days meeting, and it's my pleasure to reconfirm also the commitment of the WIPO to have this meeting. So as we got direct confirmation of this just today and the registration is open from today for this meeting. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, (indiscernible). Iran, you want to make some comment?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm seeking a point of clarification. Did we agree on the agenda?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think I -- I asked the question if you have observation concerning the agenda, and I could see no -- yes, I did.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think some of the colleagues in the room made the reservation or observation on some matters in the agenda, and I think it's better to, I mean, go ahead with their concerns on the matter, that's the first issue.

Second, Mr. Chairman, if we are really going to hear the briefings on the meetings we had, which is related to the subject of our meeting, it's better to change the agenda. Instead of having NETmundial briefing, we can put another language which is referring to the old -- to the old meeting and in general. Not to recognize just one out of all and to hear the briefing of all meetings. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Jafar, I'm very sorry. Probably it's my mistake. I should have enumerated that I wanted to, as we did last time, to hear from WSIS+10 and IGF. That's what we did last time and there was no problem with it, so that is my intention as well. There's no other thing I want to do. Can we go further? I just want to hear two words about the IGF, upcoming IGF, and then we can continue with our substantive work.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we have no difficulty with the way that was presented, but not on the agenda NETmundial briefing. In the agenda you have introductory remarks and the page, the information provided to us under introductory remark without referring to any particular meeting in the agenda. Introductory remark refers to many things and then also we were very happy, very happy to hear from the host of the meeting in the introductory remark under a general agenda item which is exactly in line but not refer to it because if you refer to the meeting, there are pros

and cons and we have to go to the discussions and we may not be finishing our work. So let us just minimize that introductory remark. So in your agenda if you want to approve the agenda, the first item is that remark by you and then the second item is discussion on the proposals and so on, so forth after the approval of the agenda. But we don't want to put this item because there are many issues that we have to mention. We may or may not agree with several things. So let us not to have that discussion and that is the first one. If you want to go to the agenda, approval of agenda. Otherwise we would have difficulty with that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It is not clear to me now, you suggest that it would be part of the introductory remarks that we are having now, this is some briefing even, that's your suggestion, without pointing out the meetings.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chair, I fear I was not clear. In the introductory remark there would be information about the meeting by the host of the meeting. That's all. We have no problem. We respect our distinguished colleagues from the Brazilian government administration and they are free like any of us to give any information that they wish. But under introductory remarks. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So probably we shall strike that from the agenda and we don't spell it out. Okay. Having said that, can we have within the introductory remark some information about the IGF.

>>CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much, Chair. The Istanbul IGF is still on board for 2-5 September, 2014. In case I didn't say what the main theme was last time, it is Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance. And during our last term Open Consultations we agreed on eight sub-themes which were policies enabling access, content creation, dissemination, and use, the Internet as engine for growth and development, fourth was IGF and the future of the Internet ecosystem. Fifth, enhancing digital trust. Six, Internet and human rights. Seventh was critical Internet resources, and eight, emerging issues. We also issued a call for workshop proposals and we received 210 workshop proposals, and at the present moment the MAG is going through them to evaluate them and we have to choose roughly 79 of those, which we'll do in the May Open Consultations which are going to be held in Paris on the 19-21 of May.

There's also the call for open forums which we invite organizations and countries who have -- who want to showcase their Internet governance activities offered up here to apply for an open forum which is one and a half hour slot during the Istanbul IGF. Thank you.

That's it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chengetai. The 210 workshops, you are going to kill me.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And I think most of the MAG members. I'm a bit worried.

Okay. So after this briefing, I think can we go to the discussion of our --

Just one procedural remark. I would like to ask each delegation to designate one member to take the floor during a session.

So Jafar, you can take the floor, of course, but so what I mean during a session, if you have the morning session, just one member.

Okay. Jafar, go ahead.

>>JAFAR BARMAKI: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately it's not possible with our delegation because there are some issues that I have to cover and some by Mr. Arasteh.

The point I wanted to raise is that since we heard from the latest developments on the matter, on the subject matter we are going to discuss in our working group, we will be very happy to hear from the -- also what has happened in the U.N. General Assembly with -- to -- assisted by the -- I mean, on the issue that I finish in Tunis and (indiscernible) ambassadors. That will be very useful if we hear the latest developments on that (indiscernible). Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. That's a very good point. It's a very important point as well.

I wonder if someone can brief us about it because I have no firsthand information.

My information is that negotiations are still going on, consultations are still going on. What I read as the last document, there was a proposal to have a two-day meeting during the General Assembly, but if someone has more accurate information, the secretariat might brief us about it, if you have some more information. I -- personally, I don't have more information about that.

>>ANNE MIROUX: No. Definitely we don't have more detailed information than the one that you just mentioned.

We have been in contact with the ambassador of Tunisia to the United Nations in New York as well as to the ambassador of Finland, and just for your information, the ambassador of Tunisia to the U.N. in New York is expected, actually, to participate in the CSTD, and it's a special day of the CSTD devoted to the WSIS follow-up. That is on the 14th of May.

He will either come to Geneva for the CSTD or we will have a video session with him. But as of now, I think the only thing that we can say is that negotiations are still going on.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Anne. Well, I really appreciate your question because it's very, very important in the whole process and the way we are going to contribute to the process itself.

So after that, we can go to the substantive part. You agree to that, that we go according to the points I have put out in the agenda.

So what I suggest now is to start discussing proposals in Topic D. That is, developing countries, Questions 10 and 15, which we haven't discussed up to now.

And you have the document, and without further ado, I would like to ask the proponent of the recommendations to give us short introductory remarks about the recommendations.

So the first one is Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to the colleagues.

I'd like to make a brief explanation about our proposal.

To implement enhanced cooperation and to make developing countries can play an important role in the Internet-related public policy issues, Japan considers that the international cooperation such as capacity-building, technical cooperation, best practice sharing is necessary in the field of developing ICT infrastructure, promoting ICT utilization and the application and ensuring a stable and secure functioning of the Internet. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan.

In the meantime, I realized that India asked for the floor before your intervention.

Please, India. I'm absolutely sorry. You are too close to me.

>>INDIA: No. Thank you very much, Chair.

I think I would not like to interrupt the floor at this point in time since you opened discussion on Group D, but at some stage, Mr. Chair, we need to reflect on the overall outcome that we are looking of this fourth session, fourth meeting of this working group, because we have some comments to make on that procedure.

At some stage during the course of this morning session, if you will give us an opportunity to speak on that, because eventually that would be critical in moving forward and coming up with recommendation, stroke opinions, stroke report. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Getting back to Japan, so I open the floor for discussion about the proposal from Japan.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: thank you, Chairman. I have a general proposal with respect to the output of this meeting to the CSTD or to whatever you go.

First of all, the number of recommendations should be minimum necessary. Try to avoid having multiple recommendations either overlapping or not necessary. So make it minimum necessary. That is number one.

Number two, recommendations should be coherent and relevant to the subject and should avoid having nice empty words. "Sustainable," "cooperation," "collaboration," "enhancement," all of these things are something that's very nice but very difficult to understand.

Thirdly, it must be implementable, workable, and practical. Something which is not implementable is not possible to say.

To give one example, I go to the introductory part of Recommendation 1: "Endeavor to implement international cooperation."

Why we endeavor? Why we do not go to the international cooperation? We just endeavor to have international -- implementing international cooperation? How we implement international cooperation? Is the subject of international cooperation implementation a subject of the enhanced cooperation?

And then talking of the formulating ICT market, developing ICT infrastructure, we are not talking about ICT market here. This is not our subject. It is elsewhere.

"To achieve sustainable development through the Internet." This is also not Internet governance.

So there are so many things in this recommendation by our distinguished colleagues which might be good but not relevant to these subjects and not appropriate and would not take us anywhere.

This is some combination of words, each of which might have a meaning. Putting them together does not have any meaning at all. And moreover, it is not relevant to the subject.

So this is the situation. And as I mentioned, anything we say, we should have the implementation.

We come later on to say something like "bottom-up process." We have to -- how we do the bottom-up process. I will give one example, not to go to the Japanese proposal, but there is no way how to implement all of these things. So I think that it is -- sometimes we will not be (indiscernible) at all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, the role of developing countries is, in fact, one of the public policy issues which is reflected in our recommendation under Section B. I mean, we should look and draft a recommendation under this group how we enable developing countries, I mean, to focus on the development of international public policy issues, how we can write a recommendation that will fully implement enhanced cooperation that will enable developing countries to work together with others in implementing enhanced cooperation.

By reading this and comparing this to 69, I do not know how we will fully implement 69 with this recommendation.

Here we speak about market, ICT infrastructure, where the essence of 69 is enabling government on equal footing to develop international public policy issues regarding Internet.

I don't see this recommendation as taking us further steps to achieve 69. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to express our support for this recommendation. We think it sends an important message, an important signal, about something that could be -- some things that we could do that could be helpful for developing countries to build capacity, so we support this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

Let me see if I could offer a -- what I hope might be a friendly amendment but maintain the spirit of the -- and the purpose of this recommendation.

I think that recognizing that we may have different views about how to implement enhanced cooperation, still I think everyone in the room has devoted a lot of time to supporting the idea that our recommendations should advance the availability of the Internet and the capacity-building to strengthen the participation of developing countries.

So I might propose replacing the words "formulating the ICT market" with "in areas" -- and just saying, instead, "in areas such as social and economic growth and development," which does not make a reference to markets but does make a reference to the importance of the growth of economic opportunity. In particular, in developing countries.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Avri.

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

I do agree with the word "endeavor." I think it is sufficient to say "implement." So that is something.

I do think, however, that this does contribute to the implementation of 69 in the context of 67 through 72, the broader context of 69, which we have spoken of and emphasized frequently in here.

So I think that this is actually a very useful recommendation and I do believe that the terms within it are, indeed, understood within the context of Internet governance.

We certainly could get into philosophical linguistic detail of exactly how one would define "bottom-up," and we probably have as many definitions of "bottom-up" as we have of "democracy" in the room.

So therefore, I would say that this is an understandable statement, and within the context of 67 through 72, it does -- and 69 within that context -- it does indeed enhance cooperation of states among all stakeholders.

So I would very much support this statement. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Actually, I don't understand the -- the sequences of the -- this recommendation. It looks like that developing countries should first make their capacity-building to agree to the infrastructure, promote, utilize, make the secure function of Internet, and only then we'll be able to come up with Internet-related public policy issues.

I do not understand the sequence of that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Any other --

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

Just to -- we also tend to see a big challenge in -- one is the sequence of ideas that have been put together.

Number two, if we are making a recommendation, I think it's a matter -- it's a kind of a statement that you are making. It is not -- doesn't look like as a recommendation. A recommendation would actually, as some colleagues have mentioned earlier, that it is adding value to what is already going on, number two, and there is certain actionable points that comes out of the recommendation.

So from both -- from these two tests, I think this particular paragraph, we can work on this, if you -- if you permit us to, but it has too many ideas contained in the same place.

I think we have a challenge in accepting it as a recommendation. I have no problem -- we agree with the sentence. The entire paragraph we agree with. But to be presented as a recommendation for global community, particularly in this case member states who would be coming first and then others who -- other stakeholders who want to take up lead from this, I'm afraid that there are challenges.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Very useful.

Well, probably my gratitude is going to be expressed if I ask you to move this recommendation -- or this statement into a recommendation phase, and I would like to ask other stakeholders to, during the lunch break, come together and work on it about the sequence, about the implementation of 69, about the implementation of all of this.

So I could hear different opinions. I could hear that there is value.

So I really encourage you to work on that. So if, Mr. Reddy, you are willing to move it forward a bit, I would be extremely grateful. Of course Japan, I would like to ask you. Iran. Saudi Arabia. Avri, if you are willing to participate. Marilyn. Russia. Please do sit down and make this recommendation. I think we can work on that.

So having said that, let's move to the next one.

This is a recommendation in draft which has been submitted by a group of stakeholders. Avri, if you can present this.

>>AVRI DORIA: Certainly, Mr. Chair.

Basically, should I go through the whole group or just per bullet? How would you prefer that this one be done?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you repeat?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Do you want me to just do it per bullet or do you want me to go through the whole thing?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Go through the whole set.

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

Okay. So this is basically a set where we start out with the recommendation that no new multistakeholder -- multilateral arrangements are required to support enhanced cooperation in developing countries. This builds on the ones that are future.

So it encourages the efforts of various existing mechanisms to understand Internet governance and to make public policy in light of and taking into account its multistakeholder nature. Because there are many already existing efforts of all sorts, and what we're saying is to look at these, to look how they apply to Internet governance in its multistakeholder nature and take them forward.

We encourage -- it encourages the U.N. and global Internet community to identify mechanisms that can facilitate the collection of financial contributions to support the participation, engagement of stakeholders from developing countries, in the perspective of ensuring that developing countries have equal leadership with developed countries in development of Internet policy globally.

One of the things that we certainly have noticed in Internet governance, in multistakeholder, and have even seen it in the multilateral efforts of the past, is that developing countries do not necessarily have the same level of leadership and of ability to participate, and largely that is because of financial reasons.

We've seen that often.

One of the good things about NETmundial is that it's shown us that the money is out there to do stuff, so we really just need to make a recommendation that that money be applied to developing economies for multistakeholder processes.

Encourage governments of developing countries to foster engagement with Internet governance issues at the national and regional levels. Basically, making the point that Internet governance, multistakeholder Internet governance, is not purely an international issue, it is a regional and national issue, and that if we expect Internet governance to be a consistent body, to contribute to an Internet ecosystem, it really needs to occur from the local to the international level.

And enable developing countries, including both governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders, to play a more effective role in global Internet governance by developing mechanisms at national and regional levels and by democratization at all levels, including the local -- I mean, including the global level. Excuse me for stumbling while I'm reading my own words.

So basically, it's a set of recommendations that, taken individually and together, basically look to strengthen developing countries from the most local to the global for full participation of developing economy stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Any comments? India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to give three or four submissions in respect to this recommendation. While I think it is a belief which I think we would like to -- which in our view would like to disabuse of this belief that this multistakeholderism and multi-literalism are -- it's a (indiscernible) game you're talking about. Hence, there are recommendations made often that there's no need for multi-lateral arrangements or mechanisms when we talk about Internet governance. I think in our view, they have respective places. It is primarily because there are a number of international public policy issues relating to Internet which require close and very careful attention of the governments, partly because and largely also, that governments are committing the populations, entire citizenry in their countries, to the use of Internet as a medium for communications, to public policy implementation, and a number of other issues, to the extent that the core assets of a country are now using Internet as a medium and we perhaps would be short-sighted in our approach in this working group if we want to believe that governments have no role and thereby there is no need for any multi-lateral mechanisms or arrangements to look at this very important dimension which in many countries declared it as part of the national security dimension. That's the first submission I want to make.

And secondly, while I do agree that largely the problem is the financial aspects, many countries, developing countries, do not have the financial resources to be able to not only commit their own populations, people in the country, but also as a government be able to actively participate in this Internet governance led issues. But I think they cannot be all -- they have their importance. We acknowledge that. And I think for this -- largely this has to be addressed domestically. I don't think international cooperation alone is going to find solutions. So we would like to place them in the respective positions.

Thirdly, on one hand we want to encourage countries to have Internet governance at the national and the regional level but when it comes to international level we want to be silent about it. Do we know why we are trying to reach that -- move in that direction? And for the reasons which I mentioned a little

while ago. So from that point of view, Mr. Chair, we cannot agree with recommendation number 1, and we are looking -- willing to look at other parts of the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. I'm not surprised. So I can hear from your words that there are parts or some points that you can agree on or you think they can be taken into consideration. Avri, you'd like to take the floor?

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just one clarification. The recommendation does not say that no multi-lateral arrangements are required. Many multi-lateral arrangements already exist. What we are saying is that no new ones are required. Certainly, you know, we're not advocating the dissolution of current multi-lateral arrangements, of which there are more than I could possibly count. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri, for the clarification. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, our distinguished colleague Mr. Reddy just said what I mean -- come up to say so recommendation bullet 1 and bullet 2, it is very hard for us to accept. We can work with us to focus on the international effort. Thank you.

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

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Just to be clear, unfortunately I personally will not be available during the lunch break, I have some medical arrangements. However, maybe now -- recommendation 1, if it is to be redrafted, it should point to what enhanced cooperation for the implementation of public policy issues but not marketing. We don't want to have enhanced cooperation for marketing and the development of the market, development of (indiscernible) and so on and so forth. That is actually line C2 and (indiscernible) is not here.

Now comment number 2, I just comment thanks to the writer or author of that, even new multi-lateral arrangement, who could say that is not necessary? Who -- who dare to say that it stop here. No more. No thinking to that nation? What is there is sufficient? Who could say that? What is developing, the day is changing, the time is changing, there might be new arrangements. Who could say that no new multi-lateral arrangement? There might be many others. It is totally irrelevant and inappropriate to claim that whatever is there is perfect. There is no perfection anywhere at all. The only perfect is God, that's all.

Now, comment to two issues, encourage governments for national, encourage governments for national -- bullet number 2 and 3 at the end. I think they are towing the monkey to the shoulder of developing countries. We came like many others to enhanced cooperation for the public policy issue. They say no, no, no, nothing is required. Do it yourself. You have problem with your national level, go and try do that and -- that is towing the monkey to the shoulder of others. This is also not the purpose of them. Then there are many other things unclear. Encourage the effort of various interesting mechanisms to understand. Who is going to tell these people that how this mechanism is working, saying that you don't understand it and we want to make it understandable to you, who has that

knowledge to make it understandable to the existing mechanism how the Internet governance is working and what is Internet governance? What is Internet governance? I don't know. ICANN governance? IANA governance? What is this governance? It's nothing. All of these things are worth -- and to encourage you -- we want to encourage you and to give financial support to the developing countries. There might be other areas to do that. There might be other entities to do that. So we are totally deflecting and departing from the main point. I am very sorry, this is my view. Going to the IGF arrangement, widening and widening and widening to get nowhere. In order to make people totally lost. Open the issue as much as possible then they will be totally lost in the middle of nowhere. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. I hope you can make it in the afternoon, if I'm mistaken. Avri, you want to answer? No. Okay. Phil. Parminder, I didn't forget about you. Sorry.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. I think -- listening to the various interventions, I think there are some merits in the recommendations that have been submitted. I understand that the wording may not be necessarily correct, but I think the general thrust and overall intent of the recommendations, as presented in this grouping of five bullet points, are ones that are worthy of further consideration and merit. I think the general thrust of trying to minimize the activities that we have to undertake in this area of what Internet governance is going forward, and I take note of Mr. Arasteh's note about what is Internet governance. I mean, I think that's a reasonable question going forward and perhaps not one you would want to enter into a debate, but I think it's right and proper that we look at trying to minimize the overheads that we would all face in trying to take forward some activity to assist developing countries in participating in, to the greatest extent possible, the role that we might see for enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

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

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and welcome all of you back to Geneva. I think we are now at the core of the issues which we need to sort out and again, going back to the observations which were made earlier, I think first we need to understand or accept or debate whether we need a mechanism for dealing with public policy issues around the Internet at the global level. That's the purpose. Multi-lateral or not, multistakeholder plus multi-lateral, et cetera, should come later.

The first is the recognition whether there are gaps in public policy -- addressing public policy at the global level. And we need some policies, that's the mandate.

In that regard, it would surprise me that essentially pretty strong preconceived notion or statement that no arrangement is needed, no arrangement is made at the global level. If you look at line 5, it says develop new mechanisms for Internet governance at national and regional levels. I miss the logic because if one would look at it, national level is much more natural in terms of all kind of policymaking, ministries, departments, and to say that no, you need something out there which develops some new mechanisms but not at the global level seems to be making the statement, justification behind which I'm not really clear. But it's good to come up with it. Also when I see representatives for Internet Governance Forum itself -- and we did agree that Internet governance is the government set of public

policies and that's why you needed a platform to discuss them. We did not say that it is being discussed at WHO, intellectual property at WIPO or et cetera, so we don't need a convergent forum for discussion. We needed a convergent forum and we are already in (indiscernible) support. IGF -- but when we talk about addressing the same set of public policy issues we need a mechanism, it is not clear and I think to now go ahead, if we can add in point 5 before national and regional level at global national and regional level, we at least are symmetric in what we're trying to say and then see what we can do about the rest of the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So anyone else? Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you. First of all, to respond to one of the things I neglected to respond to before. Indeed Iran is correct. To presume such bravery as to say that nothing is ever necessary for the rest of time is indeed overly presumptuous of me. And indeed it would be reasonable to say that the statement that we're trying to make is that no new multi-lateral arrangements are required at this time. And so what we're saying is the recommendation is that we do not come out with a recommendation to create a new multi-lateral mechanism.

What this excludes here -- and I think Parminder pointed that out -- is it says nothing about the absence of whether there's a need to create new multistakeholder mechanisms. I would argue -- and I'd have to talk to the others there -- that indeed what we're trying to say is whether it's WIPO, whether it's World Health Organization, that we have to interface with those organizations as opposed to creating new organization mechanisms, multi-lateral organizations, or even multistakeholder mechanisms at this time to do that. The absence has been seen at a regional level. It's too -- too -- so the set of recommendations does not want to bar new multistakeholder mechanisms, that's the gap analysis that's being done. But it also is not recommending those at this time. What it's saying is no new multi-lateral of governments only are needed for enhanced cooperation at this time is the statement that the first bullet is making. It is not precluding that the gap analysis and after work has been done with existing mechanisms one discovers that yes, a new multistakeholder mechanism is required, that it's not making that pre-determination. It's just saying it's not recommending it at this time. I hope that clarified it somewhat.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's perfectly clarified to me. However, I think our recommendations should be in the way that what we should do, not what we should not do. So it should be proactive. I think, as you mentioned, you ought to go back to your group and discuss it with them and probably you'd like to take into account all of the remarks you've received from other members and I would like to encourage you to do that and come back to discussing this point again. Personally, I think there are merits. There are variable parts which can be, at some point, turned into recommendations. Probably needs further discussion.

I have a feeling that Richard, you wanted to take the floor now? But this is the point I would like to give the opportunity to observers, in case they have observations. In case no? Yes.

>> Mr. Chairman, my point is following one. Sorry, this is my first meeting so maybe I'm a bit rough, but we should all be aware that when we have these kind of stakeholder forums it's much more forums is a

place to make decisions so we should not be expected to have the correct answers today because the agenda has already been done, the agenda has already been set.

The second thing, we all know that consensus is not -- it is about the whole process. Sometimes consensus is not the best way to take decision and sometimes consensus takes time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, I can see no other observers. Oh, yeah. Yes, Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you and good morning to fellow delegates. Thank you for the opportunity to take part in this meeting. On this particular -- on this particular approach I think it is, as I think has been said, an opportunity to have a fundamental discussion. No doubt we might have had it before. But I think if we're going to move forward with some of these recommendations we just need to discuss the application of public policy and how it's derived. And I think we should take note of the fact that public policy is being derived in a number of different fora, and as the proposer of this recommendation has recognized, some of those fora are of course multi-lateral, some of them are multistakeholder, and I think we need to recognize that in taking forward further discussions on these public policy issues that we need to involve as many stakeholders to bring wisdom to those discussions as possible. So I think there is indeed merit in discussing this and trying to agree to something that's acceptable to all parties as important. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel. Anja.

>>ANJA KOVACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm here from the Internet Democracy Project in India. I wanted to comment that I think the distinguished delegate from Iran saying that the reference to national and regional levels seem to kind of displace responsibility to developing countries for taking this forward rather than resolving it at the global level. And I think we look at that slightly differently in the sense that if you look for example in the wake of the Snowden revelations the U.S. government has a lot of critics for undermining trust in Internet governance. And I think whether governments make decisions unilaterally or in a multi-lateral process together. And if people are to have trust in those decisions, it is really important -- and I think the NETmundial also again made that clear -- that even multi-lateral processes are informed by multistakeholder processes and that there is an opportunity for wider debate around the decisions that ultimately will be made by governments. So I wouldn't read this as trying to displace that responsibility but as a recognition of the fact that it is important that this concept is developed in all countries so that decisions both multi-lateral or multistakeholder can benefit from that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Personally I think that, as I mentioned, that there's merit in the recommendations. We can work on these recommendations further with the hope of coming to some kind of agreement. As a first of my -- I recommend to you, Avri, to get together with the other proposed proponents and later on come back to us and brief us about the results and carry on with the discussion.

Now, we are on time. So I recommend to have the -- India, if you want to make your statement now, you can do it or you feel like doing it after the coffee break? After coffee break? Okay. So let's have our 15-minute coffee break now. And when I say 15, I mean it.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think we had some technical problems, but they have been sorted out.

I hope you had a good coffee, good conversations, and you are fresh to start.

I have raised a question about starting earlier. Is it agreeable that we start at 9:00, with the notion that we are going to have the coffee break a bit earlier than which is put down in the agenda?

Yes, Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, it's okay to start at 9:00, but with the understanding that the two hours lunch break will be free for lunch. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. I completely support this proposal. The two-hour lunch break is an absolute "must."

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Yeah. Happy to support that, Chair, and willing to sit down with my Saudi colleagues and work through lunch to assist them in any discussions we might have.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: All right. Okay. Thank you. So that is the starting earlier in the morning. As to how we are going to finish in the evening is a different question, and it will -- we shall see what's going to happen this afternoon and we shall talk about it.

Okay. So before the break, we discussed the -- a list of -- or a group of recommendations submitted by Avri. Let me turn to Avri and ask her if she managed to get in touch with the other proponents.

>>AVRI DORIA: Briefly, but we have not had a chance to rework. We're going to sit down over the lunch, eat, and talk words.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Right. Okay. So you will come back to us in the afternoon.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I propose to move forward.

So if I'm not mistaken, we have taken some initiatives to work over the lunch.

There's the Japanese proposal, and I asked Iran, Saudi Arabia, Russia, India, Japan naturally, to sit down, and those who are interested -- I think Marilyn was interested too -- to work on some text which is acceptable to all of us and which is implementable, which is not a negligible aspect.

Okay. And I had the answer from Avri that she's going to come back after consultation and probably we should take on the discussion on these issues.

Now, we have a draft recommendations from -- recommendations from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and U.K. Per, can I ask you to introduce the recommendations?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

If my colleagues from Mexico and Brazil and U.K. so allow me -- and I can't see them in the room so I guess I'll just go ahead, then -- so I think these are two recommendations that we put forward after discussions in our group during the last meeting or even maybe before that, and -- well, I think they are fairly straightforward. If you look at the first one, we are aware of that there are challenges for stakeholders, especially from developing countries, to participate in many of the discussions that are taking place. I think we could just look in the room here today and we will see that. And that has been pointed out before.

So I think this recommendation sends a message about that and also gives some indications about what we can do to try to address that.

And the second recommendation is also an attempt to acknowledge some of the challenges that do exist in terms of especially maybe access in developing countries, and that's a big, big challenge, of course, and gives, again, some direction of what could possibly be a way forward to try to mitigate such challenges.

I think I'll stop there, Chairman.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

I open the floor for discussion.

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues.

The United States strongly supports both of these recommendations.

We would seek a bit of clarification on the term "members" in this context. Mr. Chairman, through you, perhaps we could get a better understanding of that, but otherwise, we think the text and the sentiment behind both sentiments [sic] are very strong and we are supporters. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.S. That was one of my concerns.

Per, can you clarify what do you mean by "members"?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we had such a discussion also during the last meeting and I think we have also had this discussion internally and we acknowledge that it's not necessarily the best word to use here.

I think the original intent was that these recommendations were put forward to the CSTD, and then for that reason we were elaborating with the word "members."

But I think this is broader than just the recommendations to the CSTD. It's recommendations to the whole community. So maybe "stakeholders" would be a better word or -- well, I would be very interested in hearing what other colleagues have to say about that.

I think it's an interesting -- when we look through all the recommendations at a later stage, that we agree on how we can -- it's interesting to see how we can streamline them, and this is one of those, I think, cross-cutting issues that we have: To whom do we address these recommendations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Definitely your observation about the recommendations, they are not addressing the CSTD members. That's clear. So we are addressing a broader community, and we have been mandated by the U.N. General Assembly.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Per, for presenting these two recommendations and the countries involved in preparing the recommendations. These two paragraphs, in fact.

Mr. Chairman, I share the same, let's say, concern on the "members" with the previous speaker, but I have some other comments on these two paragraphs and seeking point of clarifications, Mr. Chairman.

For example, in the first paragraph, what are "all stakeholders" referring to here? Because I see that there are some difference between "stakeholders" in the first paragraph and in the second paragraph.

Maybe the second paragraph, "all the stakeholders" means the people, not stakeholders. Therefore, there should be some differences between these two "stakeholders" used in these paragraphs.

The other one, what are "the existing global Internet governance"? That, we think -- if it's only fora which just discussing, that's something else than what we are looking for, which are mechanisms to deal with the Internet governance.

The other matter, we're concerned about just limiting the challenges developing countries are facing to only funding mechanisms and remote participation, because -- and the problem with remote participation is the infrastructure, it's not just the participation.

Therefore, those infrastructures should be in place to have the remote participations, and therefore, limiting to these two items, I think -- and leaving out the other challenges which developing countries are facing needs to be dealt with here in this paragraph.

On the second paragraph, Mr. Chairman, I have concerns on using "fair and consistent." What is "fair and consistent"? Because "fair" has a relative meaning and everyone can interpret in its own way. Therefore, I am looking to see -- to hear the -- the specifications of the proponents of these two paragraphs on the points I raised.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran.

Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, including the comments that was said by previous speaker, if we will strengthen the participation of all stakeholders, is it equally or within their respective roles? This is a point for -- I mean, a question for us.

"Existing global Internet governance." Doing what? Developing international policy issues? There is no existing.

So we need to be specific in which area we need to strengthen participation.

The second recommendation, "domestic framework" is okay, but we need to put emphasis on "international framework," as enhanced cooperation meant to be an international (indiscernible) with respect to public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can hear from the remarks that there's room for improvement, but to me the message is that we can work on that.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Good morning. I'm Ellen Blackler, with the Walt Disney Company, one of the business representatives on the panel.

I wanted to support the sentiment here and the recommendation particularly on the remote participation. I think there's no question that where we have had remote participation, the -- we have had increased participation and more diverse participation and better outcomes.

So notwithstanding the challenges that that presents, particularly in areas of our good infrastructure, I think it's important that we have a recommendation that we do a better job with that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen.

I have been approached by some remote participants that I should increase the volume of my voice, which is also an obstacle to participate actively in this meeting, so I try to do my best and I'm really sorry I'm not being too loud.

Victoria?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Just to -- to thank you for your remark and sharing with us the feeling of the group regarding the improvements that we can have in these recommendations, and sorry if I take the floor before consulting with my fellow co-proponents, but Mexico is willing to work with the -- with some of the issues that were already stated by some colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Excellent. That's the type of intervention I am looking forward to.

So as we mentioned, we are going to have this two-hour lunch break. Probably a short part will be dedicated to take some food and the other part will be dedicated to work on the recommendations, and I encourage those who would like to work on that -- in particular, eventually Saudi Arabia, Iran, Mexico, Sweden, Brazil, and all others who are interested -- to -- do not miss this excellent opportunity to work on this recommendation.

Before we go to the next one, let me take the opportunity to ask India for the general comments you wanted to make.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I didn't want to interrupt the process, but since you asked us to take the floor, I want to touch on two aspects of our work.

One is the procedural and the other is the substantive dimensions.

In terms of procedure, Mr. Chair, one is, we do have a lot of contributions made by members of the working group, as well as other part- -- observers and various other participants. While we do respect their views and however divergent they are, given the vast range of opinions that we are having to attend, it is important that the recommendation that we want to make try and capture, as much as possible, the diversity.

And while we want to go through these proposals and agree on some, at the same time -- like for example, the procedure that we are following is we agree on some paragraphs and move forward, but I think we have to recognize also the fact that wherever there is no agreement the text is being taken out, naturally, but the challenge is it has to be seen at the end of the entire process in its entirety.

I mean, we have this saying in the U.N. system that when we agree on some paragraphs, we say agreed ad referendum, with the intention to come back and see in its entirety when everyone agrees on the overall text, then we take that as an agreement of the group which is working on it.

So I think that principle is important from India's perspective, and I'm sure many of the colleagues who have been working in the U.N. systems, this is followed and I think it provided a good result. Sometimes it's a little painful but that's how it is. That's number one.

So from that perspective, I would -- it would be useful to keep this -- at least we would like this point to be reached -- I mean, it would be made time and again if required, but I think this point is important from our delegation's perspective.

Second, which I wish to also make is, you had earlier in the initial intervention -- initial introduction very kindly agreed that we would also look at the possibility of capturing the broad opinions, and we have said it in -- even in the previous sessions of the working group that the -- given the enormity of the challenges that we have in terms of bringing an agreement on fairly important, as the delegations perceive, it is -- we have to recognize that it will be difficult to bridge those gaps on some of the core issues because the discussions are not taking place only here but outside this working group, both within the U.N. system as well as further beyond.

So if you can give this recognition, then we as a working group perhaps could be able to provide the diversity of that opinion presented as models, and without prejudice to the opinion that is contained in other places and on a voluntary basis, if the groups within the room -- if the opinions can be consolidated and taken as part of the report, not as an annex to the report, because the annexes tend to not sometimes make the same impact as much as you have it in the body of the text.

Such an approach would help us to arrive at the recommendations that we were looking at. That means we will have clearly defined models with broadly the -- within the working group there seem to be maybe two models, maybe three, and third, thereafter, we have some commonly agreed recommendations which are to be read in conjunction with whichever one -- models that has been agreed to be included.

And thereafter, third point I also want to make is that this is a very dynamic process that we are engaged in. I think it will be our endeavor to arrive at a decision on some of these recommendations, but I think there are challenges which you yourself have pointed out that how do this working group take the benefit of developments outside.

As I said, they need not be presented as submissions but they can be -- each member in the group can bring those into the sort of discussion platform and we are able to arrive at some more concrete recommendations.

So at the end of it, Chair, we are in your safe hands. We know that you will steer us well and through the end, but we would encourage you to take these views on board as you go along. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. I'm not in disagreement with you.

So reflecting on your first remark, naturally we shall follow the U.N. good practice.

As for the opinions, it's up to the group how to include, because we did agree that we -- in case -- in case of difference of opinions -- and I couldn't hear any differences. Yeah?

Anyway, so in case of differences of opinions, probably this will be reflected. Whether it will be in the body of the report or if it is annexed probably is up to the group to decide. I have no preference. It can be anywhere. As to where to put it, at the beginning, at the end, I have no preference either.

And, well, I can see no problem with this remark.

And probably as for the -- what I call a moving target, in view of the -- all of the processes going on and all of the developments, probably this is a good way to bring into this discussion the experiences on personal interventions. We are not going to make any judgment about other processes, naturally, but we shall learn. And we -- I am not afraid of learning from other processes, and probably I assume that you are not either.

So now let's face it. We are talking about something which is -- which has been established 10 years ago. The Internet itself has been established 20 years ago. The Internet -- I don't know where to start, from TCP/IP protocol, whatever, but we are not talking about something which has been around for centuries. So we are -- we are in a learning curve ourselves, and to learn from a process which has been going on for 20, 25 years is not a big deal in terms of history.

So there's nothing wrong about learning from other processes and other experiences.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just a brief comment on the proposal made by India just now. I think we spent also considerable time discussing this issue at the last meeting, and it is our opinion that we should first and foremost focus on our mandate, and our mandate is to produce recommendations. And the working method by which we do so is by consensus in this group. So although we thank the Indian delegation for their remarks and contribution, we think that already now starting to mentally focus on -- on drafting divergent models or statements on how different groupings within this working group -- what kind of -- what would be the ideal, desired results for the different like-minded groupings would take us away from our main objective here and it could also be confusing for the reader if we were to include this divergent sort of models or views in the report. We think that if there is -- if it's necessary to at all state different grouping positions regarding some of the issues that we are not able to reach consensus upon, it would be easier to do so in an annex. But we are not even convinced that we need such an annex or that we need such an annex or that we need such a statement at all. But if -- if it's the sentiment of the group that such statements are needed, we would have a preference for doing so in the annex. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I believe it's -- the most important point for me is to take up all the valuable information or valuable contributions we have, even though we mightn't have agreed to some of them or some part of the working group didn't agree to them. But this information eventually at some later stage or later time -- and I'm talking about two, five or whatever number of years -- can be

revisited and to see what we have been doing here, to have a document, a documentation what has been going on. So it's naturally up to you to decide if it's -- it is desirable to have this kind of opinions or processes, it's up to you in case you decide that yes, we should have that but this will be -- I agree, it should be at a later stage that we have already at least gone through all the recommendations, all the draft recommendations, and we have some kind of feeling where we are and what we have achieved. Because I'm sure that we should achieve some positive results and we should end on positive results.

So I think I would like to ask Saudi Arabia if you want to comment on that, and anyway, I want to turn to you because next -- you are on the next recommendation. So please, go ahead.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously we strongly support the proposal made by India. We believe that the recommendation of the working group should be consistent, coherent, and they should follow a rational, analytic manner. The Saudi proposal, including this proposal and the section 3, are both based on -- if we take A, B, C, D, and E, you will see there is a rational analytics behind drafting this proposal. So separating them will be misleading really when they read the full report or the full recommendation. So again, we support the Indian proposal. And based on the recommendation, our view is enabling the recommendation to the developing countries. We see that there is a need for a platform for all member states can come on equal footing to development of an ISOC policy. This platform would take care of capacity building, education or technical support. Financial support, as we know in the U.N. system, are taken care through these international body platforms. So the whole support we provide to developing countries by establishing such mechanisms. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, right now I think we have taken note of the Indian proposal and we have taken note of the different opinions, and I suggest we proceed with the discussion of the Saudi proposal draft recommendations. Anyone -- any comments on that? India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. This is a proposal I think we fully endorse for reasons which I had explained in our intervention and also in the IGF meeting also. There are, I think, two critical elements which are one, global Internet governance to be on equal footing and number two, with regard to the importance of capacity building as well as financial dimensions. So from that point of view, this -- obviously we will have to put it in words in terms of having to make it as a recommendation. At this point in time, it's an idea which we endorse fully. Obviously we'll have to see how it can shape as a good recommendation. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. It seems to me that you are trying to accumulate as much work as you can for your lunch break.

(Laughter)

No. Joking. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I can see this proposal also -- this proposal has some reflection of the previous one. I can see lots of elements that the previous proposals we have been discussing are

(indiscernible). And naturally the proposal that follows this, the one by Mexico, and I can see many of the elements that we have in these three elements on the previous one.

Just one question regarding the first recommendation, providing a platform. My colleague already gave us a brief explanation, but it wasn't quite clear to me. Sorry, I was not following, and probably we can work instead of having three or four different paragraphs and three or four different processes between delegates, we can have only one and make a merge of all the recommendations because I see many -- it's just an echo of the previous one. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria. Did I get you right, that you are suggesting to have a kind of group which would discuss the previous proposals and this proposal and try to come out with some kind of common -- I'm all for it. Anything which is a positive approach, I'm all for it. Marilyn and then Iran.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I will support Mexico's suggestion that the recommendations which are about capacity building and a focus on strengthening participation of developing countries come together, and I would like to join that group and discuss the practicalities of how to advance a recommendation -- maybe more than one in the end, but at least one -- that can enjoy broad support.

I do just have a question for clarification. My exposure in the past to seeing how recommendations that require U.N. funding are treated in the U.N. budget has -- would perhaps cause caution to me to think that U.N. funding is going to be easily available. So perhaps the group can also take up a discussion about the practicalities of funding. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. This is indeed a very significant aspect, funding. And we know it from experience and in particular from this working group, which is almost self-funded. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief since we are going to convene in a small group on this paragraph and the others. Just I wanted to mention that I agree with the previous speakers that there are some points that shares in this and the other -- in this paragraph proposed by Saudi Arabia and the others. But the difference is that here we have a very clear separate - - three separate items that -- which are very important for the developing countries to focus on. Therefore, these paragraphs could -- I mean, the very basis for the group to work on that, and I think that there are maybe some items that is out of that which I would like to stress and which is also beside technical support, also be the developing countries technological support. That one is out that we would like to insert in the -- the group discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. From the interventions up to now I could hear positive attitudes toward this proposal and probably I can -- I could also hear that there are commonalities with the previous proposal. I will give you the floor, Saudi Arabia. And I heard the suggestion to have a kind of just one group to work on that, to merge different proposals. Is it agreeable to the proponents? Saudi Arabia, I'm asking you. And Iran, you'd like to participate in that as well. I'm just happy to hear that. Saudi Arabia, would you like to comment?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comments goes to the financial support. I'm sure that developing countries, if there is a clear mechanisms that will enable them, they will be the first to fund such funds. They would be the first to send money so they would be enabled on equal footing with other member states to perform their agreed role in the Tunis Agenda. So funding is not an issue. Once we have a clear picture everyone will come and I mean contribute wisely, financially to this mechanisms where everyone would perform their role as the Tunis Agenda.

Regarding the merging all -- I mean, recommendation and another section, we agree but keeping the essence of our recommendation to be focused on international equal footing. I mean, we can work together on this in these three days. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Actually I would like to say that we agree with the main logic of this recommendation and we see that the equal participation of developing countries in this process is really the issue and we also would like to take part in the group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Russia. Anyone on this issue? U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United States would agree that individual bullets within this paragraph have some good ideas as far as capacity building and encouraging greater participation in international Internet governance of developing countries. However, just to take a larger perspective on the overall proposal that these boards are contained in, the U.S. is not at all supportive of the idea of creating a new U.N. body on this matter. People have raised funding issues. That is one concern. We also believe that a new U.N. body would completely go against the multistakeholder model of Internet governance which the entire WSIS is supportive of and the U.S. in particular are supportive of and just like to remind everyone that paragraph 106 of the Tunis Agenda mentions that implementation of the WSIS outcomes should not require the creation of any new Internet operational bodies. Thank you.

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

Let me ask you, would you like to participate in this smaller drafting group? I can see you're nodding. Okay. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just to indicate our interest in participating in this group as well and then that it's possible to merge different recommendations and elements in different recommendations, we see value in that. And regarding this specific recommendation from Saudi Arabia, we agree with Mexico that there are some similarities with the previous one that we just discussed and there are some good elements. However, along the lines of what was just said by the delegate from the United States, we do also have difficulties with the idea of a new -- a new platform or a new mechanism for enhanced cooperation. But we are willing to discuss this further in the small group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Saudi Arabia and then Japan.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are willing to listen very carefully, especially the section on the Internet governance. I would love to draw their attention to paragraph 60 that the current mechanisms are not adequately addressing international public policy issues. Paragraph 61 this process could envisage creation of a suitable framework or mechanism, so this is possible. The resolution of (indiscernible) was very clear, to fully implement enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda. So we can't write a recommendation on creating a new organization. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan also has difficulty to accept to setting a new -- a new mechanism, but the rest of the proposal, including capacity building and financial support, we would like to support. And I think that the other Japanese proposal also included capacity building. So I think we -- we can cooperate with each other to make a recommendation. So I would like to support the Mexico idea. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I have heard all of the opinions. I can sense some convergence. I can still feel some divergence, so I would like to encourage you to use your lunchtime in a very efficient manner and come back after lunch break with a kind of joint recommendation which is implementable. And for me this is the keywords, "implementable."

Is there any member who would like to take the floor on this issue? If not, I give the floor to observer. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. I just once again would like to draw attention to the elephant in the room which the coded language is carefully avoiding. As far as I know, the only area where in fact there is a lack of equal footing among governments with respect to what may or may not be public policy issues is the supervision of the Internet domain names and addresses. But I think it's important to stress that the NTIA, the United States has now announced a (indiscernible) by which they may pull out of that. And if they pull out of that, then that particular equal footing problem would hopefully be resolved? So I think it's important to keep that in mind when going forward, that historically this language came from that and that problem may go away depending on what the U.S. does later on.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard, for reminding us of this very important aspect and probably all of us are aware of that. It's an ongoing process. It's outside the mandate of this group, and naturally we follow with interest and some of us follow it actively, the whole process within other fora. But for the time being we try and concentrate on the issues we have put forward ourselves or we have received as contributions. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief. It's good of you to call observers. I mean, clearly the whole discussion on the new process and new mechanism, whatever, is something that's -- that is live. All I wanted to note is that in the -- in the ICANN context, the equal footing of governance is pursued through the Government Advisory Committee where all governments

have a role to play in developing policy in terms of the Government Advisory Committee. And they do participate on equal footing in that context.

On the point that Richard made in terms of the NTIA announcement -- and of course I think you mentioned that you would perhaps invite the U.S. government to make a comment on that -- all that I would say is that the responsibility of ICANN is to pursue a consultation, a dialogue on the effect of the announcement.

That, we are doing. There is an ongoing dialogue taking place that people can contribute to on line. But of course there will also be discussions in other fora going forward, including the Internet Governance Forum.

I know it's not germane to this group, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel.

Well, as I said earlier, we are all aware of these this events which have taken place, but probably we have to concentrate on our work.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I know that we are not at that granular level to talk about oversight of critical Internet resources and their mechanisms because our disagreements right now float at a much higher level and we need to cross those levels before we come to the details, but I just wanted to make my observation or express my opinion on whether what is happening in terms of what Richard pointed out, too, is a part of our mandate or not. And it's my understanding that oversight of critical Internet resources was always supposed to be a part of enhanced cooperation rubric and debate, and the Tunis Agenda is very clear that enhanced cooperation includes development of public policy principles related to critical Internet resources and those public policy principles are relevant only to the extent that they can actually be inputted into the critical Internet resource management system and that inputting structure, mechanism, or whatever you call it, therefore, is a part of enhanced cooperation and discussions. Thank you.

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

Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm sorry to take the floor again.

Well, we know that the Internet management encompasses both (indiscernible) public policy issues, so the recent announcement dealing with the technical part we look here at the entire (indiscernible), what the global Internet governance can enable everyone.

As I'm taking the floor, if we can before the break specify how many, I mean, either groups would like to work together, so we can -- we are a small delegation -- so we can cover the net between each other. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So this is one of the most relevant questions about the number of groups, so I -- let me turn to the secretariat to take note of the groups we propose to form.

In my understanding, we are talking about two groups. One of them is going to deal with the proposal of Japan, and the -- later we merge two groups. A proposal -- a joint proposal from Mexico, Sweden, Brazil, U.K., on one hand, and I believe Saudi Arabia -- Saudi Arabia's proposals on the other hand.

And if I -- did I get you right that you wanted to merge relevant elements of these proposals?

So that is my understanding, that there will be two groups during lunch break.

So if I were you, I would take a half an hour lunch break and 45 minutes for one group and 45 minutes for the other group.

But it's up to you.

Oh, and we are still waiting for Avri's consultations with her group, so we are looking forward to have a very nice lunch break. Probably in the remaining five minutes, I think we still have one observer who wanted to take the floor? Yeah?

>>GEORGES RADJOU: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah. As I understood the problem of Internet, for me I see -- my vision is about the fact that we may look for -- we may look to know who owns Internet, because at the moment I feel there is -- there are two trains in the room. The train which is -- which is -- which is thinking Internet for the consumers, which are the people, who are the civil societies, and on the other side, you have people who think that Internet should be the game of the states, and that's -- what's governance? One speaker said that governance is not a matter of money because they have the money, but if I compare with something I know better than Internet, which is water, water -- country -- some countries have a bunch of water so you may say that because they have a lot of water and because water is in all process of human beings, those countries should be developed. In fact, they are not. And countries who don't have water are very developed today, just because of better governance.

So money is important, but be- -- beyond money, it's governance which is paramount. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Just a last word to you. Can you introduce yourself?

>>GEORGES RADJOU: Oh, yeah. Sorry. Sorry. Yeah. Civil society. This is BIRD, Business Innovation Research and Development. NGO.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

>> (off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sorry.

I think we have covered what we wanted to cover in the morning and I'm really glad because I can feel some kind of willingness to move forward, so I encourage you to use your time in lunch break for that purpose and come back at 3:00. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. Well, I'm glad to see that you had a large group discussing recommendations for Group D. I've been briefed about the state of the affairs. I wouldn't call it the results, but the state of the affairs.

It's not what I expected in either sense of the word. It's better, but it can be improved.

So what I suggest is that probably there should be some more discussion on this issue. I think there is some common ground and I would suggest that you continue this discussion after the afternoon session and eventually you can come back tomorrow morning and tell me about the results.

What I would like to see is to have recommendations which are relatively simple, relatively short, and as Mr. Arasteh said, which can be implemented. And that is the bottom line.

Recommendations should be implemented.

Now, before the break, I asked Japan and other interested parties to have some modifications to the draft recommendation of Japan.

I would like to have your report about the work, eventual work you have done during the lunch break.

No?

>>JAPAN: The -- including Japan, the related members meet together and discuss the recommendation, but we have not still reached consensus, so we haven't amended the recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is my understanding correct that you had a separate group? You had a separate discussion from the big group I saw here?

>>JAPAN: No. We -- the three groups merged to deal with the whole similar recommendations.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So I -- let me repeat what I said, that I hope that in the -- after the afternoon session, some of you who would like to get engaged in formulating this group of recommendations, but I can see some common ground and I can see some convergence of ideas. Of course there are divergences, I can feel that. I would like to ask you to sit down and again and try for a second time, eventually a third time, and come out with some recommendations.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think perhaps you have different ways to proceed.

One way is to continue to have first some general discussion that everybody listens to everybody else and then go to the level of the small group to try possibly to have some consensus on some things but not the entire text, because they are repetitive in various recommendations and various elements. Perhaps we have to take it starting from a subject we have started before and have an understanding, and the areas we could agree, yes, we agree, and the areas we could not agree, we could not agree.

But I think you have to take any of these resolutions. You continue to other parts of the document a general discussion and then going to the level of the group. That might be a possibility.

As far as I understood in the last half an hour before your meeting, that there is a ground -- or there's room for some type of understanding among the people. It's a matter of wording, it's a matter of structure, it's a matter of how to address, and it's a matter of approach. And the issue is this: No doubt people differently or separately have written that. They have a right to what they're writing but we have to have a common understanding and have to have a structure, a style, and methodology or approach and so on and so forth. That is my suggestion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think we are on the same wavelength.

Okay. So I think as for general ideas, we have already had three meetings, so we more or less know what we are talking about, And since these draft recommendations have been around for some time so it's not -- nothing new, you had ample of time to go through them and eventually you might have had some ideas how to take similar parts, similar ideas from different recommendations and put them together. So it's really a matter of wording and I think if you accept my suggestion to work after the meeting hours, then we can achieve something.

Saudi Arabia, you wanted to take the floor?

Yeah.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, my question, Mr. Chairman, we know the divergence is under Group A and B, so -- and I see it is necessary that you go to A and B and resolve the divergence. Once we do this, C, D, and E will go smoothly. Because if we keep talking about C, D and E, issues from A and B will jump in the discussion.

So we are not going anywhere without resolving A and B.

At least this is my understanding, but I mean it's up to you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I take note of your remark and probably as I indicated and we accepted in the agenda, we are going back to this issue, but first I really want to go through, at least once, all the recommendations.

I mean, people have been working -- you know as well as I do you have been working very hard. Other people were working very hard. So let's go through the draft recommendations at least once and see the whole picture, and then we can revisit things we think are beneficial for this discussion.

Avri submitted a new version of the recommendations from the group, so can you introduce the new text?

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

Okay. What we tried to do -- and this was the whole group of us, minus one, who happens to be on an airplane at the moment and I guess one was there some of the time but not always.

So what we tried to do was get rid of the offending language. We tried to sort of avoid the twin towers of A and B conflicts while still making the points.

So in the first -- and we removed one of the points and brought the content into the others.

So the first bullet being, "Recommends that existing mechanisms for public policy related Internet issues take into account existing multistakeholder approaches to Internet governance."

On that one, I realize that the word "existing" got used twice, once in reference to mechanisms for public policy and once in reference to multistakeholder approaches. I'm sure a better grammatical choice could have been made.

The second one, "Recommends that existing multilateral and multistakeholder mechanisms be used to support enhanced cooperation among all stakeholders, including governments, on an equal footing."

Third point: "Encourages the U.N. and the global Internet community to identify mechanisms that can facilitate the collection of financial contributions to support the participation/engagement of all stakeholders from developing countries, to ensure that developing countries have equal leadership with developed countries in development of Internet policy globally."

Again, the issue was not that the U.N. had to provide money, but to help identify mechanisms for finding money. So that wasn't removed, although that was one of the comments made.

"Encourages and enables developing countries, including both governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders, to play a more effective role in global Internet governance by developing multistakeholder mechanisms at national and regional level and by democratization at all levels, including the global level."

Now, there had been a note there that said "this should be mechanisms at international," but what we were trying to say here is that we need to further develop the national and regional levels to contribute to the international, so it seemed redundant to put "at international, national, and regional level."

So that -- we tried to take into account the comments, tried to fix the language. I think it's all implementable, but I leave that to others.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I will give you a couple of minutes to go through. Probably this is the first time you see this version. Before taking your comments, please take the time to go through and then I will turn again to you for your comments.

Okay. So I can identify Iran, then Parminder, Saudi Arabia.

Please, Kavouss.

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

I think what was read is still overlapping some of the ideas -- national, regional, and so on -- and sometimes in some earlier text, it was too extensive and too descriptive, using words that may create difficulty. Perhaps we could reduce that to the minimum necessary.

And then I mentioned at the meeting before your formal meeting that there is currently no general understanding of what is multistakeholderisms, their constituencies, their roles and responsibilities, and their footing.

People refer to equal footing. Still there is misunderstanding of what equal footing is.

If you want, we can explain. If you don't, we don't explain at this stage, because this is coming from the WSIS 2003, 2005.

So still this text need to be shortened and should be more precise and more concise and avoid overlapping, mentioning that this issue needs to be formally and properly addressed: what is multistakeholderisms, what is the constituencies of that, and what are the roles and responsibilities of those, and what is the meaning and criteria, the criteria of equal footing.

This should be mentioned. It is already elsewhere. We should also mention it here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

The first two paragraphs speak of existing price and generally says that the existing organisms, existing stakeholder approaches, and I don't see what -- how it constitutes really a recommendation, especially in terms of practical, implementable. I just -- it seems to me to say that, well, things are what they are.

And the second one which says that existing multilateral and multistakeholder mechanisms be used to support enhanced cooperation, and in the smaller group, some participants rightly observed that there's not going to be an acceptance because people don't agree that a new body or mechanism may be

needed, which is fine, because there are people who don't agree and therefore, we cannot have a consensus on that.

But to recommend that existing mechanisms, whether multilateral or multistakeholder, be used to support enhanced cooperation as a recommendation of a group which has been tasked to give recommendations to fully implement Tunis Agenda in terms of the enhanced cooperation mandate is to say that you don't need a new mechanism. And there are many people who do not agree to that particular stance as well.

So in negative, if you say that there is no need of new mechanism is as divisive here as perhaps to say that there is a need for a new mechanism. And therefore, this negative language really does not -- is not acceptable, as you would know, for many people in the room.

And the Paragraphs 3 and 4 seem to suggest that if developing countries are not able to participate in global public policymaking on Internet issues, it is either because of the funding issue or because there is no capacity at national and regional level, which I don't accept is the main fact. The main fact is that there is no global mechanism for developing countries to be on equal footing to develop Internet-related policies and these policies are largely developed at the level of multilateral bodies like OECD, Council of Europe, and such bodies which make international treaties, international principles, et cetera.

The absence of mechanism is the issue and not the funding and capacity at national and regional levels.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, our concern still exists regarding Recommendations 1 and 2, so in short, we don't believe that there is existing mechanism dealing with international Internet public policy issues.

Regarding the third recommendation, we are under the group of developing countries and we speak here about "to support the participation and engagement of all stakeholders from developing countries to ensure that developing countries have equal leadership with developed countries in the development." That means equal footing in the development, which is against the Paragraph 35 that defines the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. I mean, it is -- this is even against Tunis Agenda.

The last one, "at national and regional level and by democratic at all levels including global," we do have mechanism at the national and we do mechanism at the regional. The issue is with the international level. There is no mechanisms at the international level to enable all government on equal footing.

So I don't see how this recommendation will fully implement enhanced cooperation as (indiscernible) now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I wanted to speak in support of this -- these recommendations, and it might help -- if it helps clarify on the second one the multilateral and multistakeholder mechanisms we're talking about, we could say -- reference the mapping that we've done that lists a great many of those.

So we could perhaps, if it helps clarify that, say "recommend the existing multilateral and multistakeholder mechanisms, comma, examples of which are in the mapping document," and that may help clarify it.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. India?

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Just quickly, I don't want to be repetitive. Some of the ideas which we had on the first three paragraphs have been captured by Parminder in more or less very clear terms.

I'd like refer my comments to the last paragraph, which is -- see, here there is a contradiction from the perspective that we hold. It would be true from Avri's point of view. But I think the challenge here is twofold.

One, we are tell -- we are asking the developing countries themselves to have a greater role in Internet governance, but we're not talking about developing countries. They're already seeking a role. They're saying there is no role. But the perspective that we have to look at is, by making a recommendation like this without defining what is the platform on which you are providing this role, it doesn't make any headway, number one.

Number two, well, multistakeholder mechanisms I think -- you know, in formal discussions, I think they - - this point did come up about the need for having greater clarity on multistakeholderism.

I think after a very decent meeting, you know, our conviction has become more stronger that there is -- absolutely there is a need to define multistakeholderism, multistakeholder approach, multistakeholder process.

As to -- because it means different things for different people who are participating in the meetings.

I mean, if there are a group of people who are interpreting the wide swath of opinion that comes in front of the audience and they become adjudicators for everyone else's opinion and thereby it becomes a decision, or whichever way you call it, is an outcome document or a consensus, but whatever name you want to give, and thereby we all clap and go home happy, I think it calls for more serious and thorough engagement of ourselves in defining, on some of the parameters which we have heard some positive elements, which I must con- -- duly acknowledge, with regard to the accountability mechanisms, et cetera. Of course this is not relevant to this particular recommendation that we're making. I think it will be a fitting thing for this working group to certainly pay some attention to this dimension. It only

enhances the overall global approach towards multistakeholderism. We're not opposed to this idea, as I said in the beginning also. It is just that we need more greater clarity, and unless we reach that particular level of confidence to use this particular phrase with greater appreciation and greater acceptance, we'll have to do some more homework for which I think this working group might consider, at some stage, spending some time.

And with this comment, Mr. Chair, the last paragraph, I think we have challenges on that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I am glad to hear that you had challenges only with the last one after having told your opinions about the previous one. So multistakeholderism and definition of multistakeholderism, I understand the desire to be precise, but I just want to reiterate, I think one of the first meetings I quoted Max Planck who was the father of quantum mechanics and he was asked, what is quantum mechanics and he said, I don't know but people get used to it. So having said that, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. And we would like to thank the proponents for reworking these recommendations and we would also like to express our support for these four recommendations that we think are very valuable.

Just to maybe pick up on the comment made by Parminder previously about the issue of existing mechanisms and the fact that the room is somewhat divided on this issue, we do think, of course, that there are existing mechanisms for dealing with public policy issues related to the Internet and we think that the work of the correspondence group is worth consulting regarding this issue. But we also acknowledge, of course, that we are probably not going to solve that division of interpretation of this issue today, so maybe for the first recommendation if we, instead of talking about mechanisms, could talk about dialogue, which is maybe more general because it's -- maybe that could make this recommendation more acceptable to some. That's just a proposal to try to be a little bit constructive here because I think most of us would at least acknowledge that there -- it does -- there does exist a global dialogue on public policy issues related to the Internet. So that's just a proposal. Thank you.

>> My distinguished colleague from Sweden prefers and prefers and prefers to dialogue. Dialogue is already in paragraph 72. How do we have to, after ten years, saying that we now contend that the dialogue is mentioned here. If policy dialogue called Internet governance -- the dialogue is already there. So we not talk of dialogue. So we should talk about the mechanism. The multilateral mechanism and multistakeholderisms and so on and so forth and if there is a need to something. But something we forgot, that is the paragraph A of 35. Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issue is the sovereign rights of the states. That's not the other multistakeholder. Other multistakeholder is paragraph B, C, D, and E. So we have to be very clear. We would like to find a mechanism which could enable government to observe the public policy issues. And admitting of everything -- and my distinguished colleague prefer to dialogue. I don't think we need to. I think in this recommendation the only paragraph is mechanism. What mechanism we have to mention? Existing multilateralism and multistakeholderism with the need to define what is it. People are talking about Civil Society, private sector, technical community, the other academia and the added users, they've added other people, we

don't know. An equal footing. What is equal footing, Chairman? Equal footing in WSIS was within the governments only. Not one single government has full authority on everything. Equal footing is not between the government for public policy issue and private sector. Someone will speak on behalf of himself or herself could not say that or have the same footing with somebody speak on behalf of the one billion seven -- 300 million people. This is not equal footing. Public policy issues you'll find by the government who protect the interest of publics. Until you say that no direct government is in the works, everything is out. If you agree that everything is democracy, the government is protecting the rights of the public. So public policy issue goes to the government as we have here. So if you have to mention it. I don't think that we could agree with reference to dialogue. Thank you.

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

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of points. First of all, I thought we were sort of trying to stay away from replaying A and B in this one, but I'm more than willing to sort of remind that when we're talking about the roles of stakeholders we still have a large gulf. Many of us see the roles of stakeholders and enhanced cooperation not within a single paragraph but in the context of a wider set of paragraphs. Even when we look at paragraph 35, I'd like to point out that there are two sentences in 35. That sovereignty is referred to within the country. It then has a second sentence that sort of says and they have special rights and special response -- they have special responsibilities within the context of international public policy. But it does not say that they have sovereignty within the international public policy of the Internet. So we have two sentences there that get confounded constantly. And that becomes a problem when we try to say that therefore, because of their sovereignty within a nation, that they therefore have sovereignty over public policy in the Internet. Those two do not derive from each other. So --

Now, in terms of equal footing, indeed we do need to go back to A and B and discuss what it means for sectors to have equal footing, not one person versus a government. When people talked about definitions, I come from a philosophical background and I could cover probably a full semester's discussion on just about every word there and the varieties of meaning in that. I'm surprised that nobody challenged me on the word "democratization." That sort of is another word that is difficult to define and I'm sure that if we all defined democratization in this room we would find multiple definitions of it.

Also the last thing I wanted to point out is while I have submitted it, there was sort of an implication that this was a northern statement but that the statement was indeed crafted together by Civil Society, by non-governmental actors from both north and south. I just happened to be the one with my name attached to it and the one talking about it here. Thanks.

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

>>MARIA VICTORIA ROMERO: Thank you, Chair. Just to express that we feel sympathy for -- we feel -- we like the first paragraph and if you allow me to express that in the case of Mexico it was a very good experience, especially for preparing for NETmundial, to have this multistakeholder approach. And I think it could be very, very useful as well to implementing the whole region with all region of developing

countries, especially for Mexico to the south. So I think we have a good experience with the multistakeholder approach. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon, everyone. I -- I would like to support the recommendations offered by Avri and the group. I think I can understand that some language, and particularly in the fourth paragraph, may raise some concerns, and I think we can work on the language. But in general, I mean, I can just focus on the second recommendation that says that existing mechanisms can be used to support enhanced cooperation and just gives, you know, one example by -- I mean, just focusing on ICANN where I come from and many participants in this room have participated in different ICANN constituencies and processes in the past and I think some of them have noticed that in the past maybe couple of years, through different programs, different initiatives, that the role of the - the Government Advisory Committee has improved. The Government Advisory Committee played a key role in decisions that were made in one particular program, that is the new gTLD program. Governments had the -- Government Advisory Committee do participate on equal footing. Some people see that the GAC within ICANN is a multilateral process within a multistakeholder mechanism or process. So I -- you know, I don't agree to the notion that there isn't any international multistakeholder mechanisms on IG. I'm just giving an example in one very narrow area which is, you know, DNS which I understand is not expand to cover other IG issues, but I think we -- we need to recognize that there are existing mechanisms in some areas, as much as we need to recognize that there are gaps in any existing mechanisms. And I think that the mapping exercise have identified existing mechanisms and identified certain gaps in those mechanisms.

So I think we need to put this -- or take this into account while we're looking at any recommendations because, you know, I think there are some good suggestions and proposals made during the day and just keying that we do not, you know, lose track by just saying well, we do not agree to this language. We need to go to Tunis Agenda or to that language or whatever. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher. USA.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. The United States would also like to give its support generally to these recommendations. Obviously there's some words that we might like to wordsmith a little bit, but generally we think these are very good recommendations.

And on that note, I guess I would like to agree with the statement by some previous speakers that it's important with the little time we have left to concentrate on what we think we can reach consensus on. Obviously we understand that there's very entrenched views on whether or not there needs to be a new U.N. body. Some of us believe that there should not be such a body and some of us believe there do. Some of us believe that there's no organizations that governments can affect public policy related to the internet. Some of us see the work of the correspondence group and realize that there are quite many. I don't know if that will be solved today. But these are all very good, positive recommendations. You know, we get bogged down talking about the WSIS text on the political level but it was a development oriented summit and these are all expressed needs from the developing world that we can really make

some effective contributions and recommendations on. We think it's valuable to move forward in that vein. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Yulia.

>>ELANSKAYA YULIA: Well, regarding the stakeholder including government on equal footing, we also cannot agree with that because we are talking about the equality among governments on equal footing and that was the -- just the -- a lot of times we're talking about that.

And also, I would like to comment regarding the GAC committee. First, I do not think that this is level of our meeting and our mandate to deal with the GAC statement. First of all, it's advisory committee only, not decision-making committee, first. Second, it's the part of ICANN. It is not -- and we believe that ICANN is not the platform for international public policy issues. So it is not, you know, just the -- the issue to discuss in the level of equal footing participation of government in the international public policy issues.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any one of the members who would like to take the floor? Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we've had so many times regarding the GAC, that is very clear from its name, governmental advisory group, which work --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Committee.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Committee. Which work within ICANN and one country alone. So there is not equal footing between government. It is not an international mechanism or framework. So let us be very clear, Mr. Chairman. ICANN is something different, GAC is something different dealing with small part of Internet governance which is technical. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any other members like to take the floor? If not, observers? Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I just wanted to make a couple of comments there. My interpretation of the Tunis Agenda is not the same as the one Avri Doria gave. It seems clear to me the Tunis Agenda is saying that for matters of public policy that is the sovereign rights of states which have responsibilities to their citizens and to me that's clear because it seems to me implicit in the right to influence decisions which is enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and also in the ICCPR. So every individual must be able to influence either directly or to his chosen representative public policy decisions and you cannot do that if private companies are on equal footing with Democratically-elected states. I just don't see how that could work.

Indeed, the GAC is subordinate to private companies because it has only an advisory role and the GAC representatives on the ICANN Board does not vote. Now, that would not be a problem if there were no public policy matters but if you look at the mandate of the GAC, the mandate of the GAC is precisely to handle public policy matters. So there's a bit of a contradiction there. And as you know our group, The Adjustment Coalition, believes strongly that matters of public policy must be decided Democratically by the elected representatives of the people.

Now having said that, I think everyone is talking cross purposes because I think everybody understands that the multistakeholder process -- equal footing multistakeholder process is extremely useful to develop ranges of views and possible consensus. But then when decisions are made at the national level, they go to a national Parliament. And when decisions are made with respect to international law, they're made through the form of treaties. So I think maybe people are just arguing at cross purposes because I don't think people are suggesting that treaties should be made by any mechanism other than elected representatives of the people. I don't think that anybody is saying that laws should be made by any mechanism other than international parliaments.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. Nigel.

>>NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to be very brief because I think the U.S. delegate is right, we need to move on to text that we can -- we can agree on. But just, I mean, this isn't supposed to be a discussion on ICANN and clearly Richard doesn't seem to quite understand the workings of ICANN, and I can of course discuss ICANN at length but I won't do so. I mean, certainly governments aren't subordinate to private interests at ICANN.

But the real essence of my intervention was that I -- taking the first, the first sentence, there is nothing contradictory at all in the first sentence with the Tunis Agenda. The first sentence is not, in any sense of the word, saying that governments do not have the sovereign right to make public policy. That is understood and that's in the Tunis Agenda. But it's also the sovereign right of governments to determine how they make public policy. It's the sovereign right of governments collectively, whether it's in the European Union, the African Union, APAC or whatever, collectively in the WTO, WIPO, or whatever, to have the sovereign right to determine how they make public policy. And in making public policy and exercising that sovereign right, many governments have exercised that sovereign right through a multistakeholder process. Throughout consultation with stakeholders, through joint consultation, through joint discussion, through the evolution decision-making processes with stakeholders. So there's nothing contradictory in encouraging the -- or in governance -- for mechanisms of public policy related Internet issues that take into account multistakeholder processes. It's not saying that governments are losing responsibility or losing their sovereign right. It's just saying that in certain circumstances taking into account a multistakeholder approach could be beneficial. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel. It's definitely not the purpose of this meeting to discuss activities of ICANN and I don't really want to dwell on that issue. There are different views on the role of the Government Advisory Committee, but we are not here to discuss that. Furthermore, I don't think it's in the mandate of interpreting every word of the Tunis Agenda. We really should stick to the mandate and accepting differences where we can accept them and expressing differences where we should express them. However, as it has been said many times, we should concentrate on issues where we can have some common ground and we can have some common understanding and that we can have some consensus of. And before lunch it seemed to me, it seemed to me from your intervention, that the recommendations offered by the group of Avri's was quite favorable and I believe these modifications have been made by Avri according to your interventions. So I can still feel that you are not happy or satisfied with the modifications. So it is not absolutely clear to me that we are -- we are not talking now

about wording but we are talking about basic concepts and we didn't have that before lunch, so I'm not really sure where we are now. Eventually, Kavouss where we are. Iran?

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

You have rightly mentioned it is not up to us to interpret the wording of the WSIS, but I can't agree with my distinguished colleagues from ICANN Europe that, yes, it is the right of the government, however the government needs to consult and needs to take into account or engage different multistakeholder in their own country.

That is a policy of the government. We are not here to instruct any government how to establish public policy issue inside the government. This is up to them. They are elected by the people, they are in place by the people, and they know -- and they might have some formal or informal consultation and so on. It is not up to us to say that.

But never ever the government has been in the existing situation taken into equal footing.

The GAC, which is the governmental section, it is an advisory capacity, nonvoting in the entire system. Nonvoting.

The one who elected by the government, the chairman of the GAC, is elected by us. Next year -- this year we elect a chairman for 2015 to 2019 but all governments, 154 governments, members of the GAC.

Then this gentleman or lady goes to the meeting of ICANN without any right to vote.

With respect to whom? With respect to the other board members, they are not elected by the government, they are elected individually -- or not elected, designated by the nomination committee, by internal issue of GAC -- of ICANN.

How they could compare that as a representative of government participating in a nonvoting capacity vis-a-vis 16 other directors which are designated, nominated personally by the nomination group?

Please read ICANN bylaws. If you read -- read it 10 times. You know, there is no role of the government. Governments have no role at all.

I don't want to even have the example. There was a discussion in ICANN with respect to two gTLDs and then the chairman of the GAC was excluded even to participate on nonvoting capacity.

Dear Mr. Baher Esmat, the chairman of the GAC was excluded for participation in the review of the two gTLDs. So how could say that government have roles? Government has no role at all. Advisory. Okay. You advise. But I don't take it. This is advice. So I think we should be there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

As I indicated, I really want to stop the discussion about ICANN. This is not our role to go into details of bylaws of ICANN. I really appreciate the time. I'm a member as well of the GAC myself, but I don't think this is a proper place to discuss it.

I think we should come back to our basic role. That is, to give recommendations. And the recommendations to my mind are recommendations, they are not treaty, so it's take it or leave it.

And with this eye and with this in mind, I would encourage you to be positive and go in this direction.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to respectfully disagree with your assessment that these are mere recommendations, take it or leave it.

I think at least for India they mean much more than that.

The reason being we are created by a U.N. General Assembly resolution and these recommendations would be considered, I'm sure, with all seriousness in the higher levels of the U.N. system as and when they're discussed. And these also come at a time when possibly U.N. General Assembly might come up with a particular mandate for overall implementation of the Tunis Agenda.

So from that respect, our work is important.

At the same time, it is -- I mean, as a member of this group, we want to be as responsible as we can get, and at the same time, it is -- there are certain fundamental positions that I see in this group that are -- as -- at this point in time, that seem to be not finding a point of convergence, and I think it's very important that we make that recognition and identify those points of con- -- divergence.

I think it is -- it will not be -- I mean, we'll not be faulted for having identified those differences, listed them, and number two, move on, that on these issues, well, we could -- as you have agreed also in the past, that we could perhaps list out our opinions and present them as a particular aspect of this group's work.

And thereafter, I can be very sure that we would find any number of points of convergence where, if we have identified those core issues of divergence, I think that would be perhaps the right way to do things and we would be -- we will not be faulted, as I said, for having agreed to identify those points of convergence and state it up front.

And that is where we move forward.

Otherwise, we are caught up in this -- you know, as someone very rightly has pointed out, one of the members -- I forget who it is, but they said that everywhere our vision is getting colored by what we have not been able to achieve in Section A and B, and that particular filter comes in front of us every time we see a recommendation in the subsequent segments.

So I think -- I don't think we are right or we're wrong, but I think it's just that the approach that we've adopted is stunting our ability to make any substantive or otherwise progress in the deliberations.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

When I said that we are creating recommendations and not a treaty, I meant it.

I am aware of the seriousness of this group and I know the responsibilities we have, and at the same time, I know that draft resolutions of CSTD are being drafted late in the night during a couple of days, and after coming to some conclusion, it is passed to ECOSOC, and then you have the second committee which takes on board the resolution of the ECOSOC and changes it completely.

So taking into account, naturally, the resolution of the ECOSOC, there is no doubt about it.

So the bottom line, I'm aware that the responsibility we have here is very big and I think all of us do know that.

I don't want to belittle it.

What I meant by "take it or leave it," it's not treaty like. That was the only thing.

Now, as for the opinions, I have nothing against that you come together and present me for tomorrow your opinions. I have nothing against it. I -- I said it last time as well, that you can sit down together and formulate a one-page, one-and-a-half-page as short as possible opinion, and probably I encourage eventually those who may be interested to formulate their opinions in the same way, but I don't really want to have a lengthy one.

And if you think this is the way forward and this will remove the obstacles to create recommendations, I'm all for it.

So my main purpose is that at the end of the meeting, to come up with some results, because I don't really believe that during four meetings we can't get some results. Especially after the beginning when we managed in one and a half days to formulate a questionnaire of 18 questions, we received substantial replies to the -- responses to the questionnaire. We had a very, very rich contributions. Based on these contributions, we could identify different topics for mapping, existing mechanisms for mapping, finding out what are the gaps.

We are in the middle of this exercise.

So I think we have gone through quite a long way to achieve something, so if you think -- and that's what I heard as well -- that there are basic things, the differences in Group A and B, I encourage you to formulate your opinion and eventually if there is other groups which would like to do that, I encourage the other group as well to come up with this formulation, this opinion, and let's go on working on the other issues.

Is it acceptable? Do you think you can do it for tomorrow? You had -- whatever.

I mean, you formulated and other people as well formulated that you'd like to present some opinion about it, about the divergences.

Yes, Mr. Reddy.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for giving me the floor again on this subject. I think -- well, I -- as I mentioned in the morning, we could adopt a voluntary process of identifying certain opinions of a group within this working group -- you can call it a subgroup -- and then they perhaps, as I said, without any prejudice to what other group would come up with, the other subgroup would come up with, and we could state up front what are those clear understandings of this working group, that what is said in the report, while there could be consensus and agreement on the overall report but it is not necessarily prejudicing the opinions that have been expressed in some portions of the report. Those caveats can be very clearly explained, and thereby we would have an opportunity to come up with a tangible one.

And the second question that you asked me, Chair, about the -- whether I am ready, I think you have -- I will try and -- we'll work along with some colleagues in the room, whoever would like to join, and thereafter we can come up with at least one opinion which can become a basis for other groups, if they wish to. Otherwise -- I mean, we can go parallel. I mean, we are in your hands. Whichever way you wish to do that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I don't expect you to be in two groups. Anyway, Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, I think we can call the model to implement enhanced cooperation, model to implement enhanced cooperation, and let us be limited to a maximum one page for each, I mean, views and maximum two models. I think this is better. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Basically, I have no problem with that, so I always want to keep things simple and short but understandable. That is also very important.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon.

Can you just clarify the process that we're entering into now? I'm slightly confused as to what we're being asked to do or what's being asked. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: There was a request of India to express an opinion on basic questions which were formulated, I believe, in A and B, and in general about the whole process of implementing the enhanced cooperation, and they wanted to have opinions formulated in a short way with -- I believe with like-minded members of the group, and I encouraged them already during our last meeting, our third meeting, and I already said that -- in our third meeting that these opinions can be part of the report.

The modality, in what way it will be part, we shall discuss. And at the same time, I also asked, naturally, that other opinions can be included.

If there is a need, then there is a will to formulate such an opinion.

And I have been told that probably once we have these different opinions clearly stated, we can go ahead to find the common understanding on issues where there are convergences of opinion.

So basically, that's what I said. And I expect to have these opinions the earliest possible. If it's tomorrow morning, then so much the better. I -- this is wishful thinking, of course, but I hope to have it by tomorrow lunchtime. It would be nice to have it.

Because let's face it. We have been talking about that and you have been discussing it amongst yourselves, so probably it's -- it comes down to to sit down and draft it.

Or eventually it's my job to draft it. I don't know. So basically, that's what I said.

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I'm sorry. I just want to check my understanding.

So is the idea that we -- that people draft these one-page opinions and we use that as a basis to better understand each other and continue to try to come some recommendations that would form the basis of an outcome document or are these things that would -- you're envisioning being part of the outcome document?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I would think it's the second option. It will be part of the outcome document, just outlining the two possible visions, or eventually more, if need be, of implementing enhanced cooperation.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

Like others in the back row from business, I'm seeking clarification, which may mean I'm in need of remedial help, but I need to just further my understanding here.

I thought one thing I was hearing proposed by India -- and I could be wrong -- was the idea of expressing -- and I misunderstood, perhaps. When the word "opinion" was used, I thought that was a brief recommendation, but I'm now understanding that "opinion" is sort of a statement of position, so to speak, which describes a particular perspective, and I -- so that would be one clarification I would seek.

The second clarification I would seek is, I actually don't discern only two views in the room. I think there may be at least three.

So to that point, are we suggesting that these statements would have drafter names on -- draftee -- drafter names on them or a small -- would they be small working groups with participants in them? They would have drafter names on them?

And then to the question of how they're used, I really would ask that we postpone making a definite decision about how they fit into the report until we see how they may help us to advance our work on recommendations as well.

But my first question is: So are we looking at a one-pager? Two-pager? I would think --

"opinion," to me, it's sounding more like a position paper, but that may just be a business -- you know, I'm just looking -- I'm looking to know what we're going to do.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm sure I can answer your third question about how to include and where to include and what I'm -- naturally, we are going to take a decision at a later stage.

As for the two other questions, I will let India eventually answer your question, provided you still remember.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I mean, when we set this particular format of report, if I have to draw the attention of colleagues, we have precedent in the past. We're encouraged by that approach, because when there is significant differences of opinion and each have a respectful place and we are providing that space for that particular opinion in -- as a particular model of achieving enhanced cooperation and thereby fully implement the Tunis Agenda, if we take that as a basis, then we have this work -- the formal -- another group which was set up but already came back, they also came up with such models.

Now, I don't think the working group then, I'm sure, was confronted with a very similar situation, that -- where we are today. I don't think they shied away from stating those possibilities up front, and perhaps enabled us subsequently to be picked and chosen from that particular existing models as -- at the higher levels of decision-making.

So taking that cue, I don't want to prejudge how many opinions are there in the room, but broadly, as I see it, there are some core issues on which there are a fairly small number of opinions, and subsequently there are many areas where we have some divergences but they can be coalesced into a formal recommendation.

So if we provide for those core divergences into those models, into one, two, three -- I mean, two, I guess, would be all right, three, I mean, depending on how you eventually see it, Mr. Chair, and thereafter we can also identify those specific areas where we can perhaps come up with recommendations excluding those few things.

However, having said this, the process -- I mean, again, Chair, we'll be guided by you. It could be a voluntary process. I don't think we need to create subgroups, identify each group, who will go in which group. I might be liking some ideas and other opinion -- in another model which is coming up.

So it is a voluntary process which you could help us to sort of lead in that direction. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. There's nothing wrong or harmful to include these models or opinions in the report. I should only call your attention to the fact that comparison to the previous working group of Internet governance had a slightly different status. It has been convened by the Secretary General of the United Nations where this working group has been created by the General Assembly of the United

Nations. So I can sense some difference as for accountability, and I wouldn't dare to use the word "impact" but eventually even the impact would be slightly different.

Having said that, reflecting on the voluntary nature of this group, yes, I agree it should be voluntary so I don't really want to create subgroups. I'm -- probably you can organize yourselves according to your wishes. And it can be done after working hours. And hopefully it will be a very productive outcome. And which will really help us to move forward. And that is the main idea, to move forward.

And I have to repeat, even if it seems to be a long time, ten years, it's nothing. And for those who have a long culture and a long history, they know that ten years is nothing. So please be patient. Be patient. We haven't come here to change the world from one day to another. No. It wouldn't work. We can do some small contribution. And if it can come up with eventually these models or opinions and we can really create some recommendations, I think we haven't done -- we haven't done really badly. So probably we have done quite a good job. Sweden, you wanted to take the floor?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just a couple of reflections. I think we are going down a very difficult path to -- but we are prepared to do so, if that's the sentiment of the room, that we should start to focus on where we have some divergent opinions. However, it's important that we make clear what these opinions should be about. Is it on how to implement enhanced cooperation generally or is it on some specific categories of issues that we have recommended? That would be very helpful to know before we start our drafting exercise. I also agree with, I think it was -- well, one of the previous speakers at least that said it might be difficult just to identify two views. I think we are -- we're 25 participants in this working group or 30 maybe, so we -- in theory we could most probably come up with at least as many views. But having said that, we are willing to work with like-minded to try to express some opinion on enhanced cooperation generally, if that's what we will be tasked to do, or some specific categories of issues that have been identified, if that's what we are -- will be tasked to do. However, just two things, to highlight two things that we think might be of importance, one is that -- well, other colleagues have said it as well, we would have to see how we use this -- how we use these opinions and if they would be needed in the end to attach to the report in form of an annex or something like that. But if it's the case that this is going to be a product or 2 or 3 or 4 or 30 products that should be attached to the report, for us, for Sweden, it's very important that it will be explicitly stated which view we subscribe to. Others might have different views on this and might not want to associate themselves with one or the other opinion. But for us, it's very important that it's explicitly stated which opinion that we subscribe to. So I think that may be something that could be dealt with through an annex opinion by, and then you list the different stakeholders that subscribe to opinion 1 and then to opinion 2, and so on. I think that's -- at least for us, that's very important to have that reflected. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think we are approaching the treatise status. Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, I am not thinking of treaty status or anything like that. I think that the discussion's turned around, in my view. Three issues. How to implement Internet public policy issues, roles and responsibilities of each player. One. Two, mechanism. And three, participation. If you

have another one, you identify it. Once you identify that, people interested try to sit down and write something, perhaps you have two models, two positions, or three models, but someone wants to have 25, no problem if we have 25 or 35. It depends how many you produce. But I thought we might have two or three. But first you have to come up with topics. I don't see more than that. I think this paper is turning around to three, how to implement Internet public policy issues, roles and responsibilities of each player. Two is mechanism and three is the participation. That's all. And we should sit down and write people is interested either together or two different groups or three different groups or ten different groups, write down something and just present it to discussions. Whether put it in the report or annex, I don't think that we have anything more than this, so what the report would be? The report as we get to it here, have tea and coffee and so on and so forth and produce this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for reminding me of tea and coffee.

(Laughter)

But we are not there yet. I understand your subconscious. Before I give the floor to Parminder we have to think about the readers who are going to read the report, and I would like to ask you very humbly to try and limit the number of opinions to two or three at most. But if you go beyond that, then I don't think that readers will take it very seriously. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Taking forward the (indiscernible) parts, which is emerging by interventions by my colleagues and the summing up and also points made by the Chair, I think we -- we need to understand why we are at this stage when we are looking at possibly two or three different opinions. And after understanding that limit our divergences to the small set of things rather than have three or four separate reports. And we would agree after four meetings that there is some developments which comes when you talk every day public policy issues. We agree they are very important. We agree they need to be solved and addressed. But when you come to this point of, you know, a new mechanism or strengthening existing mechanisms, you kind of get into a touchy area -- get into trouble. And I think that's a core point at which alone we -- we should remind the divergences and then concentrate on common points in the report. And therefore, if we can develop two or three models and I'll come to that number later, will we see that after having agreed that they're important public policy issues, they're global in nature, we need to do something about it. Then (indiscernible) and say okay, this is one set of people who think that this is what needs to be done, which is perhaps in nature of some mechanisms, and others who say no, this is the way existing mechanisms have to be strengthened. And I would expect that either one is very practical, implementable, and so on about if somebody wants to understand existing mechanisms, how to do it, whether they want to put a core condition in the mechanism, whether it's not just (indiscernible) or information sharing, et cetera, et cetera. You write here about that heart of the matter, one, one and a half page each, and then again carry on with common elements which all we agree on participation of developing countries has to be increased, stakeholder participation has to be increased, the roles have to be identified better. There are many such things it would be much easier to have a good text, which is common. And now, once we identify this is the reason we are splitting one part of the report, we could also get (indiscernible) how many. And I think if you go back to having 30 submissions, it would be like the initial input stage where

each of us told what we really want. And here we want to at least do some convergence work. We agree that we are not able on certain points to converge to one. But if we converge to two or three, we will have done some work. That energy and that purpose is needed. And if we just go back and say each of us really have a different view, but if we don't even do one step of work we will not have contributed something important in this meeting. So meeting the numbers -- and we can -- by participation say only two views. If somebody says no, my view is different from these two views, then perhaps the third view. But effort should be collectively to converge two kinds of views of different -- at least give them -- the people are going to consider write a report two set of options and there are certain kind of body (indiscernible) about it. I agree that it's different from the GAC because it was an expert group and this is a members based group, but still Chair said this would be considered by CSTD and by ECOSOC. And it will be a lot of General Assembly seeing that you have two ways of doing things. You just have to send one thing. But since you are fitting into two different processes, two sets would perhaps be better as you go up and they can resolve into a single set.

Lastly, whether we should have names associated with each set of opinions or it should be general, I'm again open, but I think it would be fair to say that this group had divergences and these were two or three sets of groups. Even if I don't agree with that group, to say that there were three groups would still be a statement of fact. But I'm fine either way if there are names associated with each process and not just mention model 1, 2, and 3, which we can consider in the later part of this meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I really appreciate your optimism concerning CSTD, ECOSOC and United Nations merging or coming up -- or downsizing the number, but let's be optimistic. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. And apologies for taking the microphone again. I agree with your statement. I think we do need to respect the poor reader in all of this, and I think that should be borne in mind when we're developing opinions going forward. I think if we are to go down this road of developing opinions, I don't think we should be constrained in the nature of the opinions to be submitted nor in the approach that a particular opinion takes. I think whilst having a general format or a general size of document may be useful, I think you've got to allow flexible to ensure that the variations and the nuances of various positions are expressed. I'm hoping that that might lead to some agreement in some places. But I don't think we should try and constrain what is said or what is not said going forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. As a fourth vote, naturally I do not want to constrain the opinions themselves. However, probably it would be nice to have some kind of similar approach, in formulating the opinions, to have a kind of similar format in submitting these opinions. And I really rely on you to find out this is the case. USA wanted to take the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions and concerns on behalf of the U.S.

I'd like to start, if I may, with a question to you, and perhaps you could respond at some point. I guess my understanding at previous meetings, we discussed the nature of a Chairman's report and perhaps how that might attempt to capture differences of opinion in the room on issues where we were unable to reach consensus on. Obviously there's advantages and disadvantages of doing that, and we have

these opinions. I just wanted to check in with you to see if you could assess your concerns about that or your ability to accurately reflect the visions of the opinions in this room over the course of these several meetings.

Would agree with the statement of previous speakers that there are probably more than two opinions on all of these issues. I'm concerned that trying to limit the number to two or three, it's a difficult task in itself.

Also just as a -- a side note, we did, everyone I think in this room and many other people submitted responses to questionnaires which in fact went into great length to express their opinions on these issues, which is a valuable resource that we can continue to draw on. I'm not sure that boiling it down to a page or two is -- is possible or is a better move compared to those lengthy questionnaires.

I agree with you to the extent that the opinions do need to be scoped and we need to be pretty clear on exactly what we're addressing here. I'm not sure right now if we're talking about just A and B or the entirety of the issues we've discussed here.

Would also just like to express some concern about the difficulty of doing this in a day or two. I think we'd have a difficult time at the U.S. government getting clearance just amongst yourselves on a document, let alone finding other partners to agree and then to clear on everything as well.

I'm concerned also about the absence of some members of this working group who are not here, governments and other stakeholders as well. Particularly those who have contributed quite strongly to meetings in the past and were unable to attend this meeting. I'm worried about the -- the absence of their views to be reflected in these opinions.

And then finally, another question for you, Mr. Chairman, just what -- at this point what do we make of the recommendation, are these opinions going to be a full substitute for any recommendations? Are we going to continue to work on recommendations on perhaps ones we thought we were getting close to or are those completely out the window now? Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Definitely you don't make my life easier, do you? You have very delicate questions. I think the first one was on my capacity of being able to draft a report and have the opinions reflected in the report. I think I'm still capable of doing that. If the group wishes to have these opinions reflected in my report or if you trust me enough to reflect your opinions in my report, I'm ready to do that. This solution would provide you I submit some facility not to ask for clearance from back home because it's less -- it's the Chair's report. But it's really up to you. If you want to have it in the group's report, which I still think we should do, and the core of this report should be the recommendations as we are mandated to do, then it's -- as I said, it's up to you.

Now, as for the scope of the opinions and having as many opinions as is needed, I have nothing against. I just caution you that if we have too many then we have none. So that's why if we try to keep it in a manageable size, then I think it's better.

As for the members who have contributed actively up to now but they are absent, I have all the sympathy for that but probably we have to complete our work during this session and report to the CSTD. So I fully agree with you that probably these opinions should be taken on board as well, but I'm afraid we can't do much better than that.

As for the rich contributions we received from -- as responses to the question have we tried our best and a large part has been reflected already, I think, in the living document of the correspondence group, and I stress the word "living document" because probably it will be took on in some way either by the Secretariat or by CSTD, but this is also a decision of the CSTD on how we are going to handle it.

So what I really want you to do is, I think it's time to have as -- I have been asked to think about coffee or tea break. During this coffee or tea break, please try and get together, find out how many opinions you'd like to reflect, either in the report or in the Chair's report, and come out with some kind of scope and form what the opinions would look like. And as it has been mentioned, I think it's a voluntary work, and I sincerely hope that once we have that we can proceed with the real work of our mandate that is to give recommendations. So I think we can have a 20-minute break now, and I encourage you to get together and form your groups and come up with some definite results. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I ask you to take your seats for a few seconds?

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I'm happy to see you are in good mood. Welcome back to the meeting after 20 minutes' tea or coffee break, which was about 50 minutes ago.

>> (off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I will be very short and brief.

One administrative request, as I have indicated to you at the beginning of the meeting, to put down your email addresses. For those of you who are not registered for the Google Doc documents, the secretariat can register you for that. That's Point 1. That was the administrative information.

The second thing, before the break we kind of agreed that we are going to formulate -- like-minded groups are going to formulate a statement, slash, opinions. We shall decide whatever we are going to call it.

So I can sense that this is a kind of important issue for many of the members of the group, and probably I think, in case we can get through formulating these opinions, we can go back to the core of the -- of our mandate and formulate recommendations.

So at this point of time, I think I would like to stop the meeting in the plenary way and I would like to encourage you to use the remaining time -- probably the room is available up to 9:00 -- with the notion that there is a soccer match tonight, Chelsea-Atletico Madrid today. It starts at 9:00, if I'm not mistaken.

So for those of you who have other interests as well, which I can't really imagine that you have other interests than Internet governance and enhanced cooperation, so -- but in the exceptional case, so there's this match which you may like to watch.

USA, you wanted to take the floor.

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

My good friend, Mr. Chairman, I think you're going to like me a lot after this intervention.

[Laughter]

>>UNITED STATES: You know, I mentioned before the break some of the concerns we have as a government about this route that has been proposed. I don't think it's been agreed to. The route that's been proposed about having opinions.

And after discussing it with our delegation, we would actually -- we think it's a better, more appropriate route, for you as the chairman to attempt in your report to reflect the nature of arguments in this working group from its onset, do the best to capture where there are areas of agreement, the areas of disagreement, and capture that in your report.

We trust you. You've been an able chairman and we think that given the mandate of this group, where opinions of state -- these opinions that never came into the mandate, we think the questionnaires already reflect their opinions on this. They can stand on their own.

We ask you, then, Mr. Chairman to include in your chairman's report the nature of discussions in this group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As I indicated, I have nothing against including it in my report if the group agrees to that, and naturally I'm capable of doing it, provided you give me input.

And irrespective in whatever form we are going to do it, I think the way forward is what has been indicated by the delegation of India to come up with these concise opinions, and in case there's a wish to have it in my report, it will be included in my report.

In case we have no agreement on that, then we shall discuss it.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We, too, are a little bit concerned about where we're heading now, and we have two more days before -- of this meeting, and after that we should report to the CSTD on our mandate. And our mandate is to make recommendations on how to implement enhanced cooperation, and I don't think that's where this work is leading us at all, actually.

Instead of trying to reach consensus and spend the next two days on trying to reach consensus on some recommendations, it seems that we should focus our energy on formulating divergent views and opinions, and that's not a good way of utilizing the two days that we have left, so we also think that it would be much preferred to have -- to give the task to you, Chairman, to reflect in the report in a factual and a high-level manner that there were some views -- that there were some issues on which we had divergent views.

We think that's a much better way to move forward than to task ourselves with drafting maybe rather maximalist positions on certain issues and have that reflected in the report.

We think that it's really -- really not within the mandate of this group and so we support the intervention by the U.S.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So you want to increase my workload. Okay.

Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I think Japan was first.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh. Okay. Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to support U.S. and Sweden's proposal because we have limited time so we have to focus on making recommendations, so I think we should not take time to develop opinions and diversity of opinions should be reflected in the report of the working group, so we should focus on making recommendations and to reach consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to also add my voice to some of the previous colleagues that are saying that we are really wondering whether the way forward that you put we have in front of us is the best one, and for my delegation, it's very difficult to make recommendations because our recommendations are already in this document and we are flexible enough to try to accommodate some of our concerns in others' proposals, and if we are not going to negotiate and if some others are not willing to negotiate and be flexible enough, then we'd rather trust you to reflect in your report our views, and there is nothing else we can do, and thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia?

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

Well, I think since the first meeting, all of us came here with good faith to develop a set of recommendations, and at the last meeting, as we showed, the divergence got larger and larger and larger and this option was flagged since the last meeting, where I think there was a majority of agreement there is no consensus number of models will be included in the report. So I don't see this -- that this option now is a surprise to many of the members. It was, I mean, flagged last meeting.

If there is no consensus on the major issues, as stated by either delegate drafting the report with no much recommendation in how to implement enhanced cooperation, it's only words on papers. We don't need this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran?

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

You know that we like you very much and we don't want to bother you and we don't want to give you such a big responsibility, although you might have wider shoulders, but we don't want -- we want to share everything with you but not giving everything to you as related to the report on behalf of us in your colleague -- chairman's report or chairman's summary, because the resolution does not ask for the chairman's summary. It's a report of the meeting.

And it would be good if we can have on any point consensus. So far so good. But if we cannot, we could not make a miracle and we could not invent anything.

If, on the main subject, we don't have consensus, on the subset, consensus has no real meaning.

So first we have to have how to handle the enhanced cooperation with respect to the Internet public policy issues including the roles and responsibilities of government and so on and so forth.

And the second one is the mechanisms. We have to see what are the mechanisms that we have -- multistakeholder, multilateral mechanisms -- and then the responsibilities and the definitions, footing --

Third one is participation. In third one, which is a subset of the two, we may arrive at something that's participation but also that one goes to the first one, when you talk about multistakeholder.

If you have difficulty how to define multistakeholder, how could we talk about the participation of multistakeholder?

So that is the -- see, they are connected to each other.

But I think we have no problems to have the various views, different positions, and so on and so forth.

Should people believe that we could have some consensus on the multistakeholder mechanism or multistakeholderisms, we try, but I don't see that one.

What we don't want to mention that we come to here after several meetings saying that, "Okay, we recommend to each other to dialogue." There is no need for any recommendations under everything, including the human rights. We are free to dial up with anybody and everybody. We don't need any

recommendations because it weakens the essence of the dialogue if you recommend, because the recommendation, you make take it or not take it, so I don't think that we should go with the dialogue and so on.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I wanted to support Japan and Mexico and others who expressed skepticism at this process. I'm afraid that it puts our energy into articulating our differences and not working on our common ground, and frankly will be a reiteration of what people have put in -- both in the questionnaire and in the recommendations. I just don't see people saying new things. They're going to say the same things they've said and we know what they are.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen. India?

Oh, Nigeria. Sorry.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, there are issues that seem to be a cog in the wheel of progress, and when we come to interpretation of the Tunis Agenda, Paragraph 69, at times make reference to it as a Constitution, forgetting that there are Paragraphs 70 and 71 that actually should have some kind of flexibility in that area.

In a situation whereby we may think that (indiscernible) saying anything about Internet matters is an exclusive precept of government and any policy that will not -- make government not to be at the helm of affairs will probably dictate what happens on the Internet may not be --

[Scribes have lost audio]

-- to the, for example, the General Assembly, I do not see how the Chair summary that we go from this working group can be nothing but a factual report of the meetings that have taken place and a clear recommendation that no recommendations could be made by the working group without attributing the differences of opinion because they're already contained in the Web site, they're already in the same argument which some of the colleagues have put forward. By the same token, the Chair should merely state the facts, that so many meetings held, these are the dates, we tried very hard, too bad we couldn't make recommendations, hence that is the report of the chair, if there is a Chair's report, and that is the direction which we are planning to go. I don't think there's any option and those commenting on the merits of the opinions, because they are contained in the various contributions that have been made by members in this group and there have been commentaries on it and there have been interventions by members in this working group as well as those observers, as well as remote participants, they're all available to us. After that I don't think there's any further need to compress that into an opinion of the Chair. It should merely be a statement of fact, if that is the direction the working group is asked to go. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I just want to reflect on what you said. I'll be surprised by the pessimism you expressed. As you know, I'm still optimistic. I'm optimistic that we are going to achieve and we shall fulfill our mandate.

As for the report itself, I know the wording of the UNGA resolution. I chaired the previous working group on improvements of -- on -- of the IGF which had the same wording, and on this occasion it was my report which was presented to the CSTD with the recommendations. So the factual information which was contained in the report was supplemented by some descriptive information and followed by the recommendations. So it wasn't clear at that time and it's still not clear how -- what is meant by the working group report. At that time the group gave me the mandate to draft it, and I have heard voices here as well to -- that say trust me. I had words -- even -- I didn't hear any comments about mistrust. But more seriously, in whatever way we are going to move forward, it would be useful, I think, that we had these opinions or statements, even though we had them extensively on the Web site, we have it from transcripts, we have it in the recordings, but it would be nice to have some in a written form, in a short form. And I didn't hear any objection against that, except that you need clearance, which is -- I understand is a very substantial argument. But first, I think we should try it. We should try it and in any case, in any case, if it comes to the option that I'm going to write these divergence opinions, I'm going to rely on the transcripts and on the recordings. So basically the only thing I ask from you is do it for me. That's how I see things now. I heard also quite a strong wish to clear the obstacles from formulating recommendations by means of having these opinions because I was told that the main obstacle to formulate, to come to a common agreement on details, on recommendations, is the fact that we don't have an agreement or we don't have a clear view of differences on some kind of basic issues. So that's why I thought that it was kind of agreed by many of the members to go in this way. Now, I can see that not all of you would like to do that. So I am a bit perplexed. Because, in fact, I didn't ask for a great thing. I just wanted to ask you to write down your opinions about basic issues. Nothing else. So I could see Sweden and India.

>>SWEDEN: And thank you, Chairman. Unfortunately, I think we would have to disagree with part of your summary because I think, first of all, some delegations just raised concerns about this way forward with drafting opinions by different groupings, expressing divergent views and emphasizing contradictions because that's, in fact, what we will be doing most probably and that's not within our mandate and it's also not within the spirit of the working method of this working group. I think it was made clear from the beginning a year ago that we were supposed to work by consensus and so that our target, our objective, was to achieve consensus recommendations. So I think there were some divergent views on this actually.

And it's not only not necessarily a good usage of our time and against our mandate, but it's also putting emphasis on contradictions within the group and that can -- in our opinion, that would not be very beneficial for the process forward and for the CSTD when the CSTD and the ECOSOC should evaluate what's the -- what's the contributions of the -- and the results of this work.

We also question whether or not there is common understanding in the room that just because that we have stated positions on some issues that we will be able to -- that that would facilitate our work with

recommendations on some issues. Because I think there are divergent views here. There are those that think maybe some categories, some of the five categories are more core to -- more of the core of the enhanced cooperation than others. And then there is another opinion that we share and that's that all these five categories should be treated equally and they're equally important for enhanced cooperation. So that goes back to the very understanding of the concept of enhanced cooperation and we have been discussing that at length as well.

Then finally, I think it's not as easy as it sounds just to go -- go away and write statements without knowing on exactly what these statements should be about, how they should be used, where they should be reflected, and whether or not there will be attribution to those statements or not. So there are a lot of outstanding questions also regarding the -- the way forward, if we were to go down this path to -- to spend the rest of our time here this week trying to carve out our differences and our contradictions. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I didn't want to take the floor again, but just to mention that I have a copy of the report of the working group on improvements of Internet Governance Forum. It is indeed a report prepared by the chair. But that is -- took all the recommendations the report has been prepared. But the chair summaries of each of the working groups sessions have been listed as attachments. Available at a particular Web site. But what potentially the report contains is the recommendations of the working group. So I just thought it's useful to have clarification that -- what can be part of the chairman's report or chairman's summary because if we are unable to make recommendations, I -- we fully understand that there's a challenge and I think we all want to go in a different direction, that's why India suggested a way out at the very early stages of this meeting, so that looking at the large interest that we all have in success of this working group, that we agree on few but -- vaguely but we state that what are the requirements and therefore be able to move forward. If that approach is not something which is not a way to do -- go forward, then I'm afraid as to -- to see any qualitative report -- we can have a quantitative report but not a qualitative report of the chair. So that's the challenge which I think we should recognize. And we would be very keen to see as to what would go into the Chair summary, which will be eventually submitted to the CSTD. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for reminding me of the report, which is my report which I completely forgot. However, you reminded me of a very important part, and in fact, it's a report which has followed the way you described. And we had also groups of recommendations and we had a chapeau for the groups. And, in fact, the chapeau was kind of capturing the essence of the topic itself. And even though the task was much simpler in that working group, though at that time it didn't feel it, we felt that we are overwhelmed by the enormity of the task but compared to this one, it was a simple task.

So getting back to the chapeau, I had the honor of writing the chapeau. So if this is the way forward, and in the hope that we are going to have recommendations, I'm ready to do it again, to formulate in a chapeau for each group the possible approaches to tackle that group of issues which are under the

heading of the five headings we have. So I leave it to you to decide if this is the way forward and the way out. Because right now I think we are in a stalemate. Saudi Arabia. You're on. Yeah.

>>IRAN: Saudi Arabia start with A, so first Saudi Arabia. Iran start with I. After A. Thank you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay, Mr. Arasteh is older than me somewhat.

[Laughter]

I mean, this practice is kind of confusing us, our Saudi delegation. The process isn't very clear now. We would take the legal adviser's opinions on the Hungary resolution, what is our working group report, who will write the working group report, and these issues attached to the Hungary resolution mandate to us. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We have seen or we have witnessed many, many other meetings. It will be extremely difficult, even Chairman's summary that be properly reflecting what has happened. There's no point to all the discussion of tossed or not tossed. The problem is that you are a human being and you have a taste of the word, choose or selection of the word and any adjective you use may be subject to various interpretations. So we suggest that you just -- as to our different views, you reflect a different view, then your report will be very simple. Distinguished Chairman of the CSTD please find attached the various views expressed at the meeting with respect to the following topics and put the topics, enhanced cooperation implementation, according to WSIS and the second would be multistakeholder -- I'm sorry, (indiscernible) implemented and that would be how to -- and fourth would enhance or -- foster the participation, that's all. Any -- any -- any attempt that you try to put would be misinterpreted in one way or the other. You have seen that in the WSIS forum. There was problems and so on and so forth. So we don't want to prepare any ground to criticize you. We want to have you as a good friend and always be in the safe side and not to having subject to any criticism for any side. It will be very difficult for you, Chairman. So I don't think that you should try to have that one as the Chairman's views and so on and so forth. Your views, you can tell it to the CSTD personally, this is your views, verbally or orally but I don't think that any written form. It would be extremely difficult. If you could have any consensus, so far, so good. I don't think there are any grounds for consensus. If there is any, okay, let's do. If not, different views, different positions or whatever different models, different -- I don't think what you call them. And that is that. I don't think you could invent anything. And it would be difficult if we leave it to you as you prepare your Chairman's report, Chairman's views and so on and so forth. Difficult. Misinterpretation, we have that. I'm sorry, I didn't want to give any practical example of that. Please accept that. Otherwise it would be problems if I quote any particular meeting. We have been in many meetings. We know what has happened. A lot of has happened. Chairman, you are dealing with one of the most serious, most delicate subjects of this booklet. So it would be extremely difficult for you to report any board or Chairman views. You give your own views and we cannot share them. And we don't want to say these views are not shared by X and Y. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I don't expect that the outcome of this meeting would end our friendship, and I trust that this is true for all of you.

But in a more serious tone, I think we have come now to a stalemate. I would like to stop here. I would like to give you some time to think about how to -- how to come out of this.

I expect you back by 9:00 tomorrow. You may use your time in whatever way you'd like to.

Those of you who would like to form your opinions, do not hesitate to do that.

We have a few who would like to have a clearance. Do not hesitate to make a phone call. And those of you who would like to watch the soccer match, feel free to do it.

Thank you. See you tomorrow.