

Transcript Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

30 April-2 May 2014

**Geneva, Switzerland
Day 3**

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
Friday, 2 May 2014
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. Welcome to our third and last day of the meeting. If I look at you, you look fresh, determined, full of energy. I'm really happy to see that. I'm sure you would like to have good results today. So without further ado, I would like to give you my assessment of day two, what we have achieved and what is ahead of us.

Once again, as usual, it is the mandate. I always want to remind ourselves about the mandate, what we have to do. And I think up until now, we have been complying with the mandate.

In the last line -- or last two lines, we have to make recommendations how to fully implement the mandate of WSIS with respect to enhanced cooperation.

So yesterday after my introductory remarks, we have started discussions of different technical issues. But, finally, we arrived to discussions of draft recommendations in Group D and E. And there were modifications to proposed drafts. There were breakout groups, which were very efficient. I was really happy to see the positive results. I could really feel the good dynamics. So it is a very promising continuation of our work. I hope these dynamics are going to prevail today as well.

So after the long debate on the different recommendations and different clarifications, we had the briefing from the chair of the correspondence group who shared with us the results and proposed the way forward.

As for today, I propose to continue our discussion on the results of the breakout groups which have -- which are going to present us the modified draft recommendations, Japan and Marilyn. I would like to

ask you to be brief. And in the end, I would like to apply the NETmundial rule, not the most drastic one, that is the 30 seconds, but probably it will be good if we could limit our interventions to two minutes. We have a time constraint. We want to achieve as much as we can today, so please be brief.

After the discussion of the recommendations -- the modified recommendations, I would like to go through all the recommendations we have submitted or the members of the group submitted to have a clear picture. When I said "all," I mean all.

I understand that there have been opinions prepared, so I'm ready to take these opinions as well in the afternoon, if it's needed. And, finally, also, in the afternoon, I would like to discuss the draft report.

We had legal advice about the report, and probably there was no big difference what we thought. There is a possibility of submitting the report as a report of the group. In case of no agreement that it would be a report of the group, it can be submitted as a Chair's report. But in any case, I need your approval for that. It can be an oral report, and it can be as well a written report. So I would like to discuss this issue in the afternoon, and I would like to have the work of the correspondence group as a living document.

We have to discuss as well the attachments to the report.

So the way forward, once we agree on the report, this report will be presented to the CSTD. The CSTD is going to decide about the further steps. And last, but not least, the CSTD is going to draft the ECOSOC resolution on the WSIS follow-up and the work of this working group will naturally be mentioned or will be part of this draft resolution.

So I already thank you for your cooperation and your hard work. And I hope to continue in the spirit which we had yesterday. I think it was excellent. I'm still optimistic, even more optimistic than I was yesterday or the day before.

So, well, with that, I think we may start our meeting. And I can see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. The agreement was yesterday to start with A and B directly so we would request you kindly start with A and B directly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think the agreement yesterday was to complete our work -- our (indiscernible) work. So that's what I propose to do. There has been -- there have been recommendations which we didn't visit yet, so that's why I would like to complete that, probably to take less than an hour. And then we can go the way you propose, that is to discuss A and B.

We have already started B, by the way, with the presentation. So I think it is more logical to complete one part of the work and start afresh.

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and to everybody. Yes, I hope the same atmosphere in a focal manner will govern today, in particular, in terms that each of us kindly observes a code of conduct and ethical value which governs or should govern our meeting.

Chairman, I think because it is beyond the control of all of us how long it takes any discussions, in order not to be unfair with respect to the two main parts of this duty given to us, A and B, and as was discussed yesterday, we support the suggestion by our distinguished Saudi colleagues that you start with A and B and then you go to the remaining part which are two groups. One of them, there was some agreement. And outside that agreement, there was a new text prepared which I believe would be subject to another 2 1/2 hours of discussions. The Japanese document, a few minutes before we started yesterday afternoon, the distinguished lady came to me and started something that is totally unfinished. So this is a risk that we may not even finish those two within an entire morning. However, during the break that could be worked out and should be cleaned. Perhaps we should talk with the first group that we don't need the second alternative because it was not discussed. And we and our Japanese colleagues and someone else, whoever, they could work on the text that she is very flexible to agree. But we have not discussed it yet.

So what I suggest, pursuant to the Saudi Arabia proposal, is start with A and B. This is something we request you. This is a firm request. And we would like to kindly you go ahead with that.

By the way, Chairman, we don't want to discuss an hour and a half on which item we take. I remember in one international conference, we spoke one hour whether to take coffee break or not. And, finally, we went to vote, those in favor of coffee or those in favor of not coffee. We don't get to that. Let us not waste our time to discuss this and that. Please kindly follow the two proposals or one proposal proposed by the other and start with A and B. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I don't really have any preference. I was made to believe that you had modified drafts which are in a state of -- to be discussed in this meeting. If you say they are still not -- and I think you are one of the co-sponsors of the -- it's really up to the co-sponsors to take a view whether it should be discussed, is it ready to be discussed or not. In case you are saying it is not ready to be discussed, we won't take it.

Sweden, India, and -- Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I support that the discussion of A and B groups is the core of our discussion. And, actually, it is the core of the whole discussion of the enhanced cooperation and the mandate of WSIS on enhanced cooperation. And I can propose a compromise that we make a strict time frame for the discussion of what we haven't finished yesterday. And then what we finish, then we finish, then we start discussion of A and B, for example, at 10:30. That's the compromise.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. It sounds very promising. I'm hearing, if I'm not mistaken, from Mr. Arasteh, it is not ready, not to be discussed because it is not in this final version but it needs to be submitted.

Carlos?

>> CARLOS AFONSO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to congratulate you and your team for the nice introductory document to present to us. I think it is a good start for the final document we have to present to the CSTD. We have a big challenge to keep the level in your recommendations.

Secondly, I would ask in all our discussions today -- well, we are not dealing with enhanced cooperation as the formal concept from the European Union. We are dealing with the enhanced cooperation as a concept which emerged in the WSIS process in Tunis with the concept of Internet governance. And it's very, very difficult, if not impossible, to really separate one from the other.

We had in Tunis the decision of having two tracks. One was the IGF, and the other one was this process of enhanced cooperation. But conceptually and in practice, it is almost impossible to really deal with them in complete separation.

So I would like to request that in the arguments against proposals that any one of us makes, we do not use the argument that this is not enhanced cooperation, it is Internet governance or something else so we should not discuss.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Carlos.

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We'd like to echo the previous speaker that we should try to refrain from stating what is enhanced cooperation and what is not. We have obviously different interpretations in this room, and it is not our understanding that one or the other of these five categories constitutes the core of enhanced cooperation and one or the other categories, primary or secondary or minor issues. So we think that we should keep that in mind. And since the concept of enhanced cooperation has not been defined in great detail, we need to respect each other and each other's different interpretations of enhanced cooperation.

Regarding the agenda, I mean, there are a lot of things -- we can have a lot of views on the agenda, and we can discuss it at length. We wanted to refrain from that because we thought that we could leave that up to you -- your wisdom, Chairman, to decide upon the agenda. But, therefore, we think it's a little bit unfortunate that we opened this discussion.

We were fine with your agenda. If it is the case that you feel that you want to move on in a different manner, we would be willing to accept that as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Think I heard -- do you still want to take the floor, India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just -- I was looking at the agenda, of course, the timeline given in the agenda that on the second day we were supposed to discuss recommendation A and B, so keeping that in mind and the amount of time we are left with, just half day, and there will be a report also there. So

in keeping all these in mind, we should at least give some time to A and B and we can revisit all the recommendations as we have decided earlier to visit all. I don't think there will be any injustice to any other group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Chair, I'm happy to hear the concluding remarks of this discussion which I thought you started to make before I make my comments. And in that sense, it may be superfluous.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I took the mic only to say that I do think that the work that both Japan and I and Mr. Arasteh collaborated, he and I as co-chairs, deserves to be presented. I think we can do that very quickly. If we could establish a timeline, a time frame, then way ought to be able to move ahead with devoting time to the rest of the work we've not completed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So I just understand the compromise proposed by Russia, is it acceptable? We give half an hour to present and we don't spend more time on that? Unless you think that you are not ready to present it, if you think it has some extra work to be done on for issues Group D and E, what you worked on with Japan and Marilyn. If that is your view, that it is not ready to be presented, then we can proceed with A and B.

Kavouss, I was asking you?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I was waiting for the floor to be given to me. Chairman, we have two issues to discuss. One is what is given to Marilyn and me. We had worked together and almost finished. And then I was informed that in the meantime, or yesterday, another distinguished colleague prepared alternative text. So we have not discussed that. The alternative text, we have not discussed that. I'm at least designated as part of that group. So I oppose that, and all of a sudden, Twitter starts to work as opposed to a text, unfounded and unfriendly saying that. I don't want to have the same discussions. That's number one.

Number two, the distinguished lady from Japan five minutes before the meeting said, Mr. Arasteh, I asked you to please wait but we couldn't. We have not completed that. It is not productive to start something which creates unnecessary discussions. This is just for economy of time or sake of time or productivity. That's all. Otherwise, we are flexible to start any discussion on any document. But we are driven by the reality and the reality is this. Moreover, three times the delegation of Saudi Arabia yesterday asked: Chairman, what we do tomorrow? And you said that tomorrow A and B. So we understood tomorrow A and B. And then in the absence of two other documents available, we have no option but to start with A and B. I don't think you as the Chair rule out that we are starting with A and B and any further discussions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Just one more question. I would like to ask you about the possibility of discussing the two issues in D and E first thing after lunch break? So is it agreeable? Okay. So let's start with A and B.

Do we have the document?

On the word that we are not going to vote on coffee break. And one thing is certain, we are going to have coffee break during the morning. So -- okay.

Japan. Please, you are the first.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I misunderstood that Mr. Arasteh and the other members from our group has reached consensus. But Mr. Arasteh does not agree to my proposal. So I would like to discuss, again, my -- presenting my proposal, if it's acceptable for the members of our group. Because I understand that the time is short to discuss. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So there's a draft recommendation which was submitted by Japan with the remark to be revisited.

Any comments on this draft recommendation, which reads, "Maintain multistakeholder approach, encourages as many stakeholders as possible to participate from a wide range of fields, promotes further international cooperation and including collaboration between the stakeholders, and facilitates the inclusive access to and development of the Internet, for implementation of enhanced cooperation." Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Are we discussing A and B as a whole?

Or are we limiting discussion on one that does not inflict mechanisms to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We're going to discuss all.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: So this is to start from the beginning, not to start from something that is from other shown already flexibility during the two days to discuss everything.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just let me sort out with the secretariat. As you may know that after the meeting of, I think, second or third meeting, we have -- of the secretariat grouped the different draft recommendations into no consensus, recommendations, and to be revisited recommendations. So there are two documents. Probably we'll have to look at two documents if we want to revisit everything. So I asked the secretariat to put on the screen first the -- where we have no consensus with the hope to achieve some consensus.

So, since we have already seen these recommendations, I would like to use -- to concentrate and to discuss it, but be brief and try to be very constructive. So I can see the first one is a recommendation from Russian Federation where we had no consensus. So, Yulia, can I ask you to make some comments on that?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, it was discussed; but we haven't received yet any consensus on that. However, we see that this is a very important thing. And it actually reflects different models of implementation of Tunis Agenda and enhanced cooperation. That's why it should be included into the separate opinions, separate model.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We fail to see the value of the starting all over again of not taking into consideration the last three meetings. I think we have spent considerable time discussing the original input document. And we were not able to reach consensus on some of them. And we made this distinction between those that we had hope on reaching consensus, and we categorized them in one document and those recommendations that we did not consider it possible to reach consensus on.

So we really do not see the value of revisiting all the recommendations from scratch. And we would have then to repeat the same arguments again why we did not think that one or the other of these recommendations were possible for us to accept. That's the first thing.

Then the second thing, if we are going down this path to duplicate our work and to repeat our arguments again, it's -- what we -- it's interesting to know, from what we see on the screen, if we are going to consider this recommendation in its original format or after the -- in the format that we see on the screen with some parts deleted and other parts still left intact. So that's a question. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. The reason I want to revisit all the recommendations with a fresh eye and in view of -- in light of the events we have experienced recently, we might have a different opinion. And I still want to bring on board as many recommendations in our work to be included in the report as possible.

On this issue of editorial changes, I would like to clean the document, get rid of the overstrike because it's not clear. Naturally, what we have I think should remain. But, as for the overstrikes, probably they should -- they should be cleared for the time being. I want the version with the scribe records. Okay. Saudi Arabia, and then I can see U.S.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And Japan.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, chair. And good morning to everyone. I also wanted to raise a preface question in support of Sweden's comment that we have done much work on many of these recommendations. And it seems that those that were tagged with a revisit and discussion rather than those tagged with no consensus seems to be a more positive and perhaps low hanging fruit place to start. I appreciate the effort to clean up the recommendations here. But I think the notion that we have done an -- you know, very much discussion on these already and certainly appreciate the intervening events that you reference, chair.

But the ones that were slated for revisit seem to me to be the ones that may well have -- -- I guess bear more fruit, shall I say, at the moment.

And also the other comment I'd like to make is I still think that there are some that -- you know, while we're looking at these in two documents, they may be addressing the same issue. So it may be that there's some combination or consolidation or reconciliation that also needs to be done. So I guess I support going to those with revisits. Thank you

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

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the recommendation proposed by Russia. We see it is clear and calls upon full on the Tunis Agenda, so we support inclusion of this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Just for the record, you have two alternative texts.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: The first step start calls and end with Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably in this discussion, which I intend to be relatively concise, you don't really have to argue, just express your views. It has changed all up the way we did. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We want to reference the discussions we were having yesterday. And we were trying to convince the other side that how this was relevant to the mandate of this working group. And I don't see any harm in at least persuading the other side to accept one line here calls for implementation of enhanced cooperation as referenced in Tunis Agenda. And in that view only we want to support and just request to revisit by others. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. I don't think there are other sides. We are on the same side. We see things differently, but we are on the same side.

Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to support this reading of the U.S. comment. We have limited time, but we have a lot of work to do. So we should not reopen the discussion on the no-consensus proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So you maintain your opinion.

>>JAPAN: We should focus on making recommendations. So we have to focus on the discussion on the no, not consensus.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I was going to carefully into all the sentences and words on the screen and realize there's almost not a single word there which is not from Tunis Agenda. Every single word comes from Tunis Agenda. And, if there is no consensus -- the only reason we may not state it here is that it's not relevant text regarding enhanced cooperation. This is all the relevant text in Tunis Agenda regarding enhanced cooperation. If there is no consensus to state these things, it means perhaps that enhanced cooperation is not something other than what Tunis Agenda meant, which I don't think is a mandate of this group to go into. But min any case, I wanted to point that out that it would be extremely difficult for people to go into other text if we can't agree to what was Tunis Agenda text on enhanced cooperation. And that really makes me feel a little doubtful about how we would go forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I'm going to invoke the spirit of optimism. I share the interest of everyone in the room about making progress. But I also am perfectly committed to discussion of this recommendation. And I think that we are, after all, a group with different points of view. I may not in the end change my point of view. But I certainly am committed to giving it a try where I can find compromises.

Along those lines, I'm looking at Alt 2. I know there are members of the group who prefer that we only talk about recommendations that have so far found some kind of consensus. But, if we can do this quickly and try to find some elements of compromise in various recommendations, I'd like to give that a try.

So in Alt 2, I certainly am willing to try to find a way to accommodate Alt 2. I need to study it a little bit more. But I'm not going to reject it out of hand.

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

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Well, then, to get back to our old arguments, although I cannot find my instructions any more because I think we had this discussion a couple of months ago. But I think we -- the issue here is that this is, as rightly pointed out by some others, this is text from the Tunis agenda slightly modified maybe. It doesn't, in our opinion, at all answer to the question on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation. It just says -- it's phrased like a resolution text that it calls for the continuing implementation. It doesn't read like a recommendation. And, especially, it doesn't read as a recommendation that answers the specific question on how to implement. It just says we should implement, continue to implement, which I think is maybe not extremely controversial. But it's not a recommendation on how to.

And I think that's why, in the first place we had problems with this. And then, if you go down to alternative 1 and 2, I think we come down to the question of -- I think this is taken partly from article 69 of the Tunis agenda. And then we are already back to the discussion about whether or not, when we're talking about Tunis agenda, is the mandate for enhanced cooperation only contained in article 69 or is it also article 70, 71, and 72?

Or maybe much broader than that?

So that's -- without prejudging the outcome of these discussions, I think that's maybe a discussion we would like to have about alternative 1 and 2. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes. I think these two paragraphs is more or less we should now see what happened after 9 or 10 years. 10 years ago we said the government will be given the ability to fulfill their responsibilities in equal footing, my understanding it was working with respect to the other governments, in fact, with respect to pointing to one single government that had full authority at that time. And I'm tasked with that authority across the models. Thank you, Chair. To some international group. That was that.

From that time, the situation has not been changed. Governments do not have any authority, any ability, apart from some consultative manner, some consultative manner to participate in some sort of activities related to the public policy issues.

Root zone server, no government activities. With respect to the decision-making, no government ability at all. In some area, with respect to the activities of GAC, which is mostly limited to the domain name delegation or preparation of that gTLD, they have some advisory duty. But in some cases, this even advisory group, advisory authority was not respected. There was clear advice but the management of the Internet did not take that into account. They said no, we don't want to take that. I don't want to give an example of that, but I can give an example of the TLD that GAC unanimously opposed to the delegation of that but it was delegated.

There are other areas that also GAC has different views, but it was not respected. There were two TLDs. So government continues to have some sort of advisory responsibility, which is at the mercy of the others to say yes or no. Government acting in the GAC, which in the Affirmation of Commitments of current NTIA, mentions that ICANN shall review the effectiveness of GAC, the effectiveness of activities of government. If it is in some of the paragraph 9B or so, I can quote that, that we object to that, that we are at the mercy of ICANN to say whether government activities are effective or not effective.

In fact, government has no responsibility -- ability given up till now. So we want this -- I don't think implement. "Operationalize," it is not implementing, to operationalize the governments have some role in the decision-making. Governments have some role in the ability to perform the role and responsibilities with respect to the public policy issues because in a government -- in a country or a state government is defending the interest of public. And the policy of that public goes back to the government. None of these have been actualized, and they are calling for continuation. What? Continuation of what? There is nothing to be continued. Continue to be advised? Continue not to have anything that one organization kept the ccTLD of the organization? One organization totally modify the root zone? One organization totally take any action on the part of the parameters of the root. This is not -- government has no role in the maintenance of the database. Government has no role in the immunity of that. These are so many things that we don't have.

And, finally, we have seen that they want to give it to the international law organization. That currently -- government will be part of that. That will work. We have to have something.

This wording may not be better wording, but we have to have -- it is now the time that government actively participate in the decision-making with respect to the Internet public policy issues in regard to the implementation of paragraph 69. And for that, we have to find ways and means and mechanisms. And that necessitates we come up with a list what are the public policy issues: Privacy. Personal data. Intellectual property. Security and stability and resiliency of the networks. There are so many things. There are a list of all of that. Or some of them may be a different mechanism. For some of them, maybe one mechanism. So none of this has yet been analyzed. So we have to analyze them. Talking of this, we never get anything, so we have to see that now is the time that government should have a role. We believe that roles should not be advisory. Roles should be decision-making. Government has no

responsibility, has not been given any responsibility with the decision-making, to participate, but not the only one, participate with the others. Others make decisions for the governments. We are not saying that only government decides, no. Government decides with the others in general. With respect to the public policy issue, yes, government only. But none of them have been given to the government. Everything is done elsewhere. Decision makers, decision implementers, decision writers are one organization. They write all themselves. This is the way they have to do it. This is the way we decide. And this is the way we implement it. We are accountable to ourselves, self-accountability.

So everything is mixed up. So we have to find if you want to continue the discussion, even in the IGF, that is a discussion. If I come to the IGF, I raise the point. And we don't want to have IGF discussing and discussing without going into detail having workshop, workshop 72, workshop or nothing. So we have to go now to the heart of the problem.

If we don't have that courage, we could say that we are unable to do that so we will call for another WSIS to modify this. I see all of these people are not in favor of another WSIS. Some of them they want to have continuation.

So, Chairman, we have to have this paragraph correctly drafted. And we can do it. At this meeting, we can do it. Lunch break we can do it. And we have to concentrate on the difficulty and problems. Government should be given the ability to perform their role and responsibilities, one in the area related to Internet public policy issues and, two, in relation with the Internet governance. No doubt they do not get into the management of day-to-day of the Internet. That is quite clear. So the sentence should be modified. But this is the heart of the problem. What we discussed, Chairman, yesterday is a complementary part of this, but the real part of this one, if this is not discussed, those would not have any impact. Those would not even assist.

Capacity-building to do what? Capacity-building to not be able to be involved in the decision-making? Suppose they have full capacity, but I am not taken into account? Anyway, what does it mean to have capacity? I have money. I have capacity. I have knowledge. I have everything. But I'm not taken into account in any discussions. That's all.

I told you yesterday that even the GAC as an advisory group, the chairman of GAC was excluded from the meeting which was going to discuss which involved the government. And the chairman of GAC sends a letter to everybody, "I was excluded." Don't expect I could say anything in regard with the GAC.

So while the decision-making is in force, how can we expect governments to have a role?

Chairman, somebody in government has no role at all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran. Well, I heard the proposal to redraft the resolution -- oh, sorry, recommendation. And I think Mr. Arasteh's accumulating his work. He wanted to, I think, do it. So I propose that eventually let leave it for the lunch break. And those of you who would like to take up this job can join him.

I can see -- I can see a possibility to have this as a chapeau. I can see the possibility to have it included in the report itself on a high level. I can see it, in case of no consensus, not to deal with it. So those are the possibilities I can see.

Having said that, do you still want to take the floor or would you like to join the group for the redrafting?

Russia, you want to take the floor? Yeah?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: First, I would like not to agree with Sweden regarding that. It is not the recommendation because if we take other recommendations, then it actually gives the same meaning, no detailed (inaudible) on the issue. So it has the same style of the overall recommendation we have right now in the document.

Secondly, I agree with Parminder that if we cannot agree on this point, which is part of Tunis Agenda, what can we agree? Because as we discuss here in several meetings, Tunis Agenda gives us different mechanism of implementation and it has elements of multistakeholder and it has elements of Internet governance of international public policy. And if we do not agree on one part, we cannot agree on another part. Otherwise, we do not work out our mandate which is examined in the Tunis Agenda on the issue of enhanced cooperation. That's my point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I propose to form a group to redraft it? And if I can ask Marilyn as well to join, eventually Saudi Arabia if you are volunteering to do that. And I would like to ask Iran to participate in that.

After that, do you still want to take the floor? Okay.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to support the intervention made by Iran and Russia. We do have the language that was developed, I mean, based on Tunis Agenda, if the secretariat can type it as a new alternative.

"Establish an enhanced cooperation which enables governments, on equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities regarding policy authority for international public policy issues" -- "regarding policy authority" -- there is no comma, "for international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. This should be an intergovernmental enhanced cooperation body under the umbrella preferably within ITU." "Preferably," that's "probably," "within ITU."

This could be a compromise, so if someone doesn't want to repeat Tunis Agenda, this is something as emphasized by Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see Nigeria, Sweden, India, United States. I don't really want to dwell on this issue. I know your views. I can see Marilyn. I encourage you to sit down together.

Phil, I know your opinions as well.

I encourage you to sit down at the lunch break to try and work on some text which may be acceptable by this group. As I said, we are on the same side but have different views. So I believe that some of the

members of this group don't share this view. Some might share this view. So it is preferable we leave it after lunch, to sit down and work very hard because you have a lot of issues to work on.

If you agree to that approach, I want to go further. Go to Recommendation 2.

Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Just a question. Maybe we could just scroll down the document and see how many recommendations that we should go through because it's quite interesting just to see in terms of priority if we should work in small groups, that we should have these discussions today. So it's -- we are -- we should go through 20 or maybe something like that? It is just a question really regarding the doability of this and especially if we are not going to focus on what is -- what we're close -- the paragraphs where we are close to agreement and where there are some low-hanging fruits. If we go through all of these, there would be a lot of small group meetings that we would have to organize and very long discussions in plenary, I think. It is just an observation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It is a valuable observation. And I think we have agreed that after lunch we start with the so-called low-hanging fruit. That is, I count on Marilyn and Kavouss to come up with a final version for the recommendations in Group D and E, and Japan. We decided to continue after lunch with that.

But at the same time, I would like to ask you to work on other issues during lunch break. And now I would like to revert to Number 2 where we didn't have consensus.

Any remarks on -- India?

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning to colleagues. I just wish to make one general comment before we proceed to this, Mr. Chair, with your permission. This is regarding -- I do appreciate the comments by that distinguished colleague from Sweden that we should look at low-hanging fruit and then see how progress we are making. I think in all fairness, we should see whether the tree is ripe to be able to pluck those fruits before we actually vote on that part because we have tried this model in the last session, last meeting. I think we have not been able to make significant progress. There was progress, but it could not be -- that we could perhaps reach to that level. That is one -- I mean, we need to bear that in mind while doing all these recommendations. Two things we find that are very important for recognition of this group, that there are differences in terms of -- as we see, there are two key questions. These are stated very upfront since the time we've started formulating these questions, whether the enhanced cooperation has been fully implemented; number two, there is one question on which I think there are differences of opinion. We respect that. We have a perspective. Others have other different perspective.

Secondly, what is the most appropriate mechanism to operationalize this enhanced cooperation to fully implement? The keyword is "fully" implementation of the Tunis Agenda. On this, we also have fairly large number of differences. I think while deliberating on our subsequent work which you are planning to put into smaller groups, I think we need to perhaps coalesce our opinions into possibly, as I said --

that's the reason why we have been since the beginning of this meeting, this session, trying to bring this point that it is useful to recognize that there is no consensus on this, which is very well reflected there.

However, it doesn't mean that they are any less important. This is the point I want to make.

This is the core of this whole working committee. Otherwise, perhaps from our perspective, there is no need for this working group to meet and deliberate for ages. Because these two questions, recognizing that there are differences and proposing them as particular models which meet the -- let's say, in some measure, voluntarily within members of this working group. So that -- I'd like -- I mean, I've said this many times. But I'm sorry, chair, to make this point one more time, since we're on this subject and since we're embarking on certain smaller groups working on the proposal.

With that comment, coming to this second draft recommendation, I think it flows out of the same thing. That we believe that there is nothing that has been achieved or implemented under the enhanced cooperation. I mean, again, the issue is of definition. We don't want to embark on the part of definition. Because, as you rightly observed in your initial report, draft report you have given to us, that this is an idea which we will have different interpretations. It's a fair thing that -- to have different interpretations. Here, as we believe, we are talking -- in my delegation believes that we're talking about the role of governments. Again, it is not at the cost of anyone else. It is at the cost -- it's purely whether the governments have been able to define a role in association or in partnership or in any format with other stakeholders. So that is a key question. And, from that perspective in this working group, we believe that there has been -- we want to state up front that there has not been any progress on this dimension even after close to 10 years.

So I think, from our point of view, it is that search which has led us to this working group and which makes us feel compelled to retread that point and seek some answers in this working group. Thank you, Chair. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. As for the first part of your remark, yes, it's true, you have iterated many times. It's very beneficial for the work of this group to formulate the differences of opinions and start from that. Probably you have said it many times, probably it wasn't enough.

So that's why we opened up this discussion on issues which haven't reached consensus in the eventual hope that we will have some consensus. From the very beginning of this discussion, it seems to me that your point of views haven't changed. And so I would encourage, once again, members of the group to follow the advice of India and try and formulate the opinions that might be included in the report.

Having said that, let's try again and discuss very briefly the issues which haven't reached consensus. And I would like to really implement the NETmundial approach. And I would like to have -- limit the interventions to two minutes, if it's possible. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. Just following up on the colleague from India's comments pointing to the output of the correspondence group, which we recognized yesterday was

incomplete but does give some indication, I believe, about where there has been some activity on enhanced cooperation in some areas. I think that should be noted.

I think, as we also suggested yesterday, there is further work to be done. But I think there is a hint of some activity on enhanced cooperation in those areas. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I made it NETmundial or other reference. I'm confused. And you are -- I mean, how can I say it?

We don't understand the way that your -- yesterday we spent three hours discussing one issue. And we -- when we came to the -- another issue on our highest -- don't say highest, the top of our groups, we limit our intervention to two minutes. This isn't fair to deal with the group question that we agreed on in the first meeting. So I urge you, Mr. Chairman, we allocate the same time we allocated yesterday to each group. You were trying yesterday to reach consensus. Kindly repeat your effort to reach consensus on different group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia, I don't think I'm unfair. These are the issues we have discussed at length during our previous meetings. They didn't reach a consensus. We had lengthy discussions. And we know the arguments. I'm just wondering if there has been changes to these arguments. And I hope that there are changes. In case there are changes we can come to kind of agreement or to consensus, that's why I brought up this issue.

And -- but, if I can see that there is no -- or people are not moving away from their original views, I can't see the point -- if you can't argue in a way to convince your counterparts, then I can't really see the merit. So probably that's why I encourage you in case of no consensus to formulate your opinion as indicated by India.

Having said that, I think it's Iran who asks for the floor and India. Again, India. Sorry, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: India, Iran. We are 21st member of the ITU. They are 22nd member of ITU, 1896. That is no problem. We are close. Family, friends and liking each other.

So, Chairman, I think the situation has been changed from 2005. Last year was a point of changes. Many things has happened, many things. I start with good things but not the bad things. Depends what is bad, what is good.

However, I take the Montevideo statement as something that, yes, we have not been working well. If the people that were responsible for the ICANN and all others getting together all of a sudden saying that no, no, no, it doesn't work. We have not worked, and we have to change. So take it good sign or take it as a self-criticism to slow down criticism. (indiscernible) That is one good point.

The other good point is NETmundial. There was some movement to do something. Whether the result was in direction A or B, I don't want to comment. But at least the initiative was good. Lots of people talking together.

The third important point was that, again, whether, based on some philosophy or some very delicate plan, the announcement of NTIA that now we believe that it is the time that we transfer this stewardship to the outside but based on the full conditions so on and so forth.

So there are positive signs if it goes correctly in a positive direction. Now, we are living in a different situation as 2012. We can move now. The Internet governance generally seems to be moving forward internationalized or globalized in a so-called multistakeholder approach. Yet we have to define what model -- what constituencies, what role, what routine, and so on and so forth. There are many things.

Part of that is Internet public policy issue. So we are also in a different position. So I think we are better suited today or these days to try to take this -- sorry to come back to this momentum again -- now is the way that we start to redynamize ourselves to see what we can do. And we can do something. But to do something we have to start with efficiency or situational status where we are today.

Do we have -- do the governments have a role?

Yes?

What are those roles?

No?

You have to have a role. If yes, they have that role, whether they are sufficient or not sufficient. If sufficient, no role. If not sufficient, how it should be reinforced. You have to start from this pedagogical arrangement. Sorry. I have been a teacher. That is why I go always to this pedagogical. We have to go by this. And then call it for ways and means.

And then, once we have ways and means, whether it is multistakeholder approach with a definition that we have to say what is that, how it works, who are the members and so on and so forth. And then you have to talk in which area.

Then we come to the area of the Internet public policy issue. There has been some document in 2000 something, but this is just elements of document. There has been so many changes, even a report of the research of people to the Congress of the United States provide a list of all public policy issues. I have a copy of that document available on the Web site. People could Google that. 268-page document. They can go to that and see there is detailed very structured, well-structured report about this government and so on and so forth. And they mention what are the public policy issues.

Then we have to see which model should apply to what. There is room to work but not to start saying we don't have agreement, so this agreement saying that no consensus finished, another year, come back. (Indiscernible)

No, chairman, I don't agree with that. We have to be objective. We have to be positive. You have to be constructive. Even if today we have nothing, we have to say yes, these are the things that could be done. Provide a way forward.

Let us, chairman, walk towards each other, not criticize each other. Not Twitter each other. Criticize each other is not good. Destructive. Really.

Take the things in the proper context, not diverging the views, not distorting the views, so on and so forth. We want to work together for everybody. Let us sit down. I'm sure that maybe we could have something to the CSTD or general assembly. Maybe if they're working together. But, if they decide to polarize, some people are especially polarizing. Immediately they say two groups. We don't have that. No, one group, two, so on and so forth. There are some countries are specialized on that. But we are not. We are looking for consensus always. In every content we come to.

So, Chairman, you can have this working group, this legal group whatever, no matter who will be chair of that. But provided start from the positive way to see what we can do. First of all, where we are, what are the subjects, what we can do, what we cannot do today, what will be done in the future, so on and so forth.

Whether you take it, chairman, or don't take it.

(Speaking in a language other than English.) I have told you whatever I have to tell you. Whether you like it or don't like it, that is up to you. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. That was exactly the reason I brought up revisiting all of the recommendations because of this momentum. We are all over. There are changes. We are all over even in a very short time. And we're talking about to weeks, eventually months there have been many, many changes. And that's what gave me hope that, eventually, we can come to consensus.

In case we cannot, at least it is to my view, it is beneficial to see, as you indicated, what are the problems and what are the problems for others. And reflect it. And it is also something positive, because we can build on that. So, in case we can't reach consensus on some of the recommendations, I don't think it's a tragedy. That's what we can achieve right now. But at least we can move forward, clarifying -- clarifying in detail what are the problems. I'm sorry. Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning to all. First of all, I would like to -- correct me if I'm mistaken. But it was my understanding that interventions should be limited to two minutes.

Secondly, I would like to reemphasize the motivation of the technical community here to try to achieve consensus wherever possible. And, in this regard, as we are facing some difficulties on our fundamental divergencies on specifically what is enhanced cooperation, I would like to bring to the attention of this group that, if you look at Tunis Agenda, as Parminder was reminding us this morning, if you look at the language of paragraph 68, 69, 70, and 71, the fundamental question really is stakeholders. And I think this should encourage us to keep sufficient time to review together those recommendations C, D, and E,

where definitely I do think this group will be able to reach some consensus and to demonstrate to the CSTD that we have been able to work towards a positive outcome. I hope that fitted within two minutes. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. What we would respect in this working group is what you want to say to us. And in the working group methods and procedure, I would urge you, Mr. Chair, that we use our own procedures. And we do not wish to be colored by what happens outside this working group. And I think it's -- while we do have certain opinions about other processes, I don't think it's necessary to borrow the elements from other processes. Other -- we must devise our own, which you -- which we fully empower you to do so. But it should be in the name of this working group. But not in the name of anything else. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I got the message. Two minutes is two minutes in whatever way we look at it.

So I turn to you, to the floor, about this draft recommendation number 2. Have there been any changes in the interpretation of this recommendation?

I would like to ask you to flag in case you have different or modified opinions of what you had before. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I don't have a modified opinion from before. But I have an observation about both A1 and A6. And that is I think that we have previously recognized, at least I hope we have, recognized that enhanced cooperation as mandated by the Tunis Agenda has not been fully implemented and should continue. And that, to me, seems to be an underlying premise to even the establishment of this particular working group. So, while I'm not able to support other parts of the recommendation which are calling for the need to create a new U.N. umbrella linked either with an existing entity or not, but I think at least the spirit of the concept that enhanced cooperation has not been fully implemented and should continue, I think that is the premise that I would hope that most of us are in support of. That's what brought us to this working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I could hear from Marilyn, if I can interpret this, as two proposals, A1 and A6. Is it acceptable?

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Also a couple observations, the A1 or A6 -- and I appreciate Marilyn's observation of those. First of all, I think they're not written in terms of recommendations. That doesn't mean that something like this can't be included, but we just should recognize that.

But what I take from Marilyn's good comments is that perhaps we could go back to the -- my comment that recommendations or draft text as provided on similar issues might be considered together. I might

go back to the compromise language kindly provided by India on this same topic, which I don't remember the number now, that we were looking at earlier because it did encompass the notion of continuing implementation of the Tunis Agenda which my view of it is that incorporates the views of all in the room per the comments made by Constance from the technical committee regarding the expression of enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda.

So perhaps that provides some combination of things to look at, once again, going back to their kind submission. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So what is your proposal, U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: My proposal is to look again at the compromised language provided by India in the context of this concept. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. For the first A1, we have some problems with that because it indicates that enhanced cooperation has not been implemented at all, and we certainly do not agree with that.

As for A6, that's something that we maybe could consider but we think that it's a much wiser approach to go -- to read these paragraphs together with the Indian compromise language as proposed by the United States. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I think it would help me if I could see the India compromise language on the screen. And, perhaps, the language Marilyn was suggesting has also not been on the screen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see from the faces of the Indian delegation that they are still working on this compromise language.

>> Chair, I want to know: What is India's compromise?

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, Mr. Reddy, we don't really know what the compromise language is, but we trust you, that you will have a compromise language. That's why I told you should be working on that very quickly because there is big hope.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Somebody counting my intervention? It should not be done. I'm not taking any more than everyone. The problem is if you take one minute or two minutes, you go ten years, you get nothing. If you take ten minutes of discussion, then you have something in your message, you may get somewhere. So please don't count.

Chairman, I don't understand why we have ten recommendations here. It is one subject, only. So if you want to give the group, a person, either to come to a consensus on one or having two or three different ways, positions, models, and so on and so forth, that's that. I don't think we should come up with ten recommendations. The subject is how to operationalize or actualize the Internet public policy, the enhanced cooperation with regard to public issues. That's all. Give it to the group to come up. Hopefully consensus. No, two, three positions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

>> (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. As you have seen, I put up my flag and put it down a few times.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Where is it now?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: It's up. I'm speaking. Thank you.

The fundamental issues keep on coming up, and I thought I would comment on the understanding of what we are talking about and Constance said. And it was supported by the distinguished U.S. delegate that enhanced cooperation is about stakeholders. And I thought I'd put my understanding of it, and I think it's basically about public policy issues on Internet-related matters. And I think I come to this meeting with that understanding, that the huge amount of stuff going on on the Internet as it impacts societies, people are concerned. They have hopes. And they are wondering what to do about it in a collective manner, and that's the meaning of public policies. And this is really about that: What kind of mechanisms do people have to exercise collective control over this huge social phenomenon? And then it is about people's rights, and stakeholders is a secondary mechanism of trying to get good policies.

The point here is that as we see the divergence of issues of what enhanced cooperation is about, whether it is about the role of stakeholders or about public policy mechanisms, I think we really are stuck there. I just wanted to make that observation. I'm sorry if it adds to the deliberation or not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Just to reiterate Ellen's point to put perhaps within square brackets the point Marilyn made into A1. No, go down. A1 under there has not been fully implemented. I think that was the point that Marilyn made. We know -- and that just ties the two up together. Thank you, Chair.

We also look forward to seeing the Indian text when it comes forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico, I think then I would like to -- Avri as well.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, colleagues. Chair, after one hour -- almost two hours of being here, actually not reaching any consensus or any progress, we also have problems the way it is drafted A1 and A6 because from our view, it seems more like a statement rather than a recommendation. And we have issues with the recommendation of Tunis Agenda not being fully implemented. And we can work also if the group responds. And we are -- again, we don't want to be an extra burden to our colleagues from India, but we would like to see their proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I really prefer it if you didn't divert the attention of the Indian delegation from the hard work they are doing now. So, please, take your time and come up with something.

More serious tone, I can hear voices that eventually would be a good thing to form a small group to reduce the number of points here on this recommendation and to come to some consensus with the view of having either recommendation or having it as a statement or eventually as an input to the opinion, which is also being formed by the Indian delegation.

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As a statement A1, which the addition of the word "fully" is certainly something I think almost everyone in this room should be able to agree with. In fact, I would also add -- although I'm afraid that that might not please people -- that "the process for enhanced cooperation as mandated by the Tunis Agenda, however it is understood, has not been fully implemented."

And as such, I'm not sure what I need in a compromise statement. That seems to be a statement that we could possibly all agree with, or at least I hope we could all agree with. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: After this positive discussion, can I ask you if we can put it as a statement in its present form as it stands? Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: As a statement where, Mr. Chairman?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably in the report.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: No, we would prefer it to be a recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can it be a chapeau?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: No, a recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Recommendation, okay.

In that case, I suggest to form a second group on this issue. We have to be very, very diligent during the -- I think it will be quite a long lunch break and try to come up with some text which is agreeable to all of us. And now I propose we move forward.

Yes, Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to ask a question about these working groups that go off -- not working groups, but these side groups that go off and work on text and the fact that we have several times seen people go off and work on text come up with text that seems to have agreed upon by people in the working group. And, yet, then we come back and those same people no longer agree to the text. So I'm wondering what we achieve when we go off into these little groups to work text. I haven't quite understood that in the process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, what we achieve is that we don't give up hope, and the hope that eventually we may succeed. So I still think this is the way forward, to form small groups, to come to some agreement and discuss it in plenary.

U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I suppose it is a little bit of a follow on as to the process question because now I'm not sure what the second group is doing vis-a-vis what the first group is doing. But, I just want to mention that in following the comment that this is sort of written as a statement or an introductory text rather than a recommendation I would posit. But it might be turned into a recommendation if it is followed by a call for kind of comment as provided by the previous Indian suggestion pending their subsequent one.

So I might suggest if the two groups you proposed should work on those two issues, that they might be combined to achieve both as a suggestion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think this is a very good suggestion. So probably we are talking about one group working eventually on two issues. But I leave it up to you and naturally India.

Okay. So, Phil, I thought it was left over.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: No. Chair. Sorry, Chair, I'm coming back again. It is just if there aren't two groups or if there are two groups, who's going to be leading the second group? If there is one group, fine. I know who is leading that. But if there are to be two groups, who's leading? And was just whispered in my ear, what time?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Kavouss?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, why two groups? I think people put in their thoughts together in one group. Having two groups, the people are absent in one, coming to the other, missing in one group and then coming to the other one. Why not have one group and we have one subject? That's all. How this has been or has not been implemented and in what way for implementation and so on and so, we have one group to give it maybe two co-chairs or one, I have no problem who is dealing with that. I think one group is better than two groups.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have nothing against having just one group and discuss all the issues in this one group.

Can I turn to India in a very serious tone to Chair this group during lunchtime with the spirit of compromise?

>>INDIA: Chair, I think it will not be possible for us. Thank you because our views are very clearly not -- I don't think it will help the cause. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I need a volunteer to chair. Brazil, you seem to be volunteering. I can feel it.

>> BRAZIL: Sorry, Chair, I think there is someone more qualified, better qualified, than I. I decline the invitation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Well, in that case, I suggest that you come together and try to self-organize. I can see no other way. I mean, I cannot nominate anyone. I trust as we have done it previously, you could work quite well in a spirit of achieving something. And if you don't achieve something, at least you can report it back to the working group that there was no consensus. As I've indicated, I can't see any harm in that. That is just the state of affairs, and we will continue from there.

So can we agree that we have one group? You are going to discuss the issues of which we have discussed up till now? And come back to the meeting after lunch?

Okay. Let's move forward.

You still recognize your submission?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I think we should also go to the same group that was trying to grapple earlier with unpractical problems. Thanks.

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

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible that the working group that you have now designated to do this job? Look at the entire document. All of them are dealing with the same issue, in different name, in different fashion, in different style, but the subjects are the same. So look at the entire document and that is more easier. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm afraid I didn't get exactly what you mean. You are referring to Group A which had no consensus, or are you referring to all of the issues?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what area we have consensus. I know that we have enhanced cooperation in terms of public policy issue application and in terms of actualizing, operationalizing from 2003 or 2005 up till now, taking into account what has recently happened. That's all. They will do one thing, the group will deal with the entire document, looking for first a starting situation statement, then ways and means to proceed, and then identify what are those public policy issues and within some of these models could have, and taking relevant paragraph of the WSIS. We

don't want to exclude any entity. We want to include entities, if they are referred to that, based on the roles and responsibilities. That is it. I don't see many groups.

Your terms of reference to resolution -- to paragraph 20 is only one area, and that is that. So I don't think you need to have several groups. This multitude of groups may not be very productive. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I agree with that. It may be productive. But I think if we try to concentrate on the original groupings we had and what we accepted, it would be a way forward because it would give clarity to our work.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. In the spirit of trying to address our organizational quandary here as to the work before us, I agree certainly with the distinguished client from Iran that these all kind of deal with the same issue. And I respect those that have indicated that they may or may not be able to chair such a group because of their opinions and their positions on these issues. And that leads me to suggest that perhaps everyone in the room has a position. And may I -- it leads me to think that the best chairman for a discussion like this may be one who has the role of revising the guidance and compromise for the group in a neutral way. And perhaps that -- I could suggest that might be you. And the group, the small group that might meet at lunchtime might be the same group that's in this room right now. So we can either do it at lunch or now to address the very important sort of issue that might take us down the road for the rest of the day.

Throw that out there for reaction and questions. Thank you, Chair

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Did I get you right, Liesyl, that you're trying to shorten my lunch break or not to have at all a lunch break or to continue -- okay.

>>UNITED STATES: Well, I -- I suppose I could posit that we could do it now so we all get a lunch break. But, if we're all engendered to work, then perhaps we could be in the same boat, Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think that that proposal is an excellent one. I think we all have trust in you, chairman. You have no specific stakes in this text in the same way as many of -- as other members of the group have. So we support that approach. And we think we need to ensure, for our physical and mental health, that we have a lunch break, sufficient lunch break, and that we also do not end up here later than -- well, preferably, 6:00, but maybe 9:00 if all colleagues agree on that. Because, as often referred to by other colleagues, we should not be held hostage to the method of consensus by exhaustion. So we propose that we move on here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Okay. I'm really honored. And I would like to honor my promise as well that we're going to have a tea break or coffee break right now. I was supposed to have it for 15 minutes. We come back after 15 minutes and start working on this issue in the way you suggested. I'm ready to chair it. With the notion that we're going to treat also items which we called to be revisited, because we haven't touched them. And, as for group B, the outstanding issues, I would like to bring on board the

finding of the correspondent group. And, if we decide that there is still work to be done, then probably we should reflect it as well.

So I propose to have a 15-minute coffee break now. And I hope to see you back at quarter to 12:00, fresh, determined, and cooperative. Thank you.

[Break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. I would like to resume. Please take your seats. Thank you. Good afternoon.

So, after the morning session that is before coffee break, we have come back to discuss in plenary how we can redraft the group of resolutions which didn't reach a consensus during our previous meeting with the hope that eventually we can come to some common agreement. And, as I indicated, even if we cannot come to some agreement, at least we can see the positions or the different views.

But the main purpose now, I think, of this exercise, as has been pointed out, is to identify what are the issues.

So going into this stage, I would propose to look into the recommendations under group A which enjoyed some kind of support. And we considered them to be revisited.

Can I have that -- -- so the first one was from Japan, a draft recommendation which we flagged as to be revisited.

Maintains multistakeholder approach, encourages as many stakeholders as possible to participate from a wide range of fields, promotes further international collaboration, and in square brackets, including collaboration between the stakeholders and facilitates the access to and development of the Internet for implementation of enhanced cooperation.

I can see in square brackets, all stakeholders should continue to implement the Tunis Agenda in a multistakeholder manner, which is a recommendation by Sweden with the remark, "If Sweden agrees with Japan, Sweden will withdraw its recommendation."

Do you have any comments on the first one?

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, very much, chair. And just to make that we are actually talking about Tunis in its kind of spirit, whenever we use multistakeholder, it's always useful to think in respect of roles of a catch phrase that makes it that, whichever stakeholder is engaged in a certain process, certain practice, certain activity, then they have certain laws that have been at least defined in the Tunis Agenda, which still -- I'm not saying they're cast in stone. I'm saying they could be undergoing changes in the future. But, whenever a change takes place, that change will not take away reflection of the fact that it has to be in their respective roles. So I'll -- if we can bring in that phrase to the proposal made by Sweden, I think that's something that should be fine for my delegation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. I think it's just our understanding from yesterday's discussion that probably we should indicate in some kind of shuffle about the multistakeholders and their respective roles in order to avoid repeating it everywhere.

So we once and for all try to make it clear. And we don't -- do not want to repeat it everywhere. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I understand that sentiment. The problem with the term "respective roles and responsibilities" is that it has, for many people, become synonymous with the government's statement of what our roles and responsibilities are.

Now, I understand that there is a willingness on some parts to discuss the relative roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, but I would suggest -- and I very much agree at various points in the process, there are different roles and responsibilities for each of the stakeholders.

And, while having no objection to indicating that, I would ask that we find a different phrase. So perhaps a phrase is "understanding the diversity of roles and responsibilities" or some such phrase that does not, in a sense, you know, a callback that every time one hears it, it invokes those government-only definitions, but allows for the fact that, yes, it acknowledges that there are roles and responsibilities and that they vary among stakeholders at different times in different processes.

So, if we could find another phrase to use that symbolized that meaning, then it would make sense. So as many stakeholders as possible understanding the diversity of roles and responsibilities. Something like that that does not harken back to that one very problematic description from 2003 that was defined by a single stakeholder. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Before proceeding, I have an announcement. I have received an email from Anriette Esterhuysen, who was the representative of civil society. And she couldn't make it, and she can't participate remotely. And she asked me to have Professor Anja Kovacs to represent civil society. I agreed to that.

Getting back to your discussion, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Sweden.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're happy to welcome the language by Japan. So, if we can add "Maintain the WSIS multistakeholder approach, encourages" -- and we'll delete "as many." Encourages stakeholders within their respective roles and responsibilities. To participate. We delete "as possible."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think reference was made that some distinguished colleagues does not want at any time there will be discussions with respect to the roles and responsibility of each of these constituencies. I'm afraid to say that it must be. Because, when you

go to the public policy issue, there are various issues. Take one of them. Intellectual rights. It says series of responsibility and laws. Go to the security. Different responsibilities. Go to the data protection. Different responsibilities and so on and so forth. The responsibilities are not the same. When we're talking of the multistakeholder, go to the private sector. Somebody speaking on behalf of themselves is different from a civil society speaking on behalf of many others and government -- and speaking or preserving or defending the rights of millions of the people. So I'm afraid we could not agree with that that they don't want any rules. They don't want any discipline and so on and so forth. They would like to have a full freedom to go and challenge all the things that sometimes are beyond their responsibility. Public order is part of the responsibility of the government. How we could say that we would deny that? Is a private person, individual responsible to the public order of a country or national security of the country?

Today, you know, Internet could play with the national security of a country. I don't think that our distinguished peoples should kindly understand that we need to refer to that within their respective roles -- and not only roles -- respective roles and responsibilities. This word was debated hours and hours in three prep cons. So either we agree or we have two different views to put two different positions. But I don't agree with some colleagues that they want to have total freedom to sit down with the other things and say, okay, I have the full right to say whatever I want. I don't care about the order - - public order. I don't think about the security of the country. I don't think about any other things and security of millions of the people. At the end, who is responsible?

That private person goes out of the room in the next minute. Who will be engaged?

The government engaged in front of the Parliament to reply. So we should understand that. Sorry. I hope people do not go to my intervention.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. I just recall your intervention -- I think it was yesterday -- when you reminded us in a discussion, the question of human rights was mentioned. But it was put into -- I think, the preamble, if I'm not mistaken. And you suggested the same approach for the respective roles and responsibilities, that it should be mentioned somewhere, you know, in that elevated manner.

So I think it was a good proposal from your part. And I think it is something probably we can agree on, if engaged with. We don't put it down everywhere. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think that there is not so much added value of this phrase of within their respective roles and responsibilities in this context.

We agree with you, Chairman, and with the proposal from Iran yesterday that maybe -- it would be useful to have a reference somewhere in the preamble stating that something that this working group is doing or is saying via this report should be interpreted to override or change or modify the Tunis Agenda. Well, obviously, we would have to work on the language; but just to give the general idea about how that could be maybe phrased. If -- and then maybe, if we could agree on such a language, maybe it would not be necessary to repeat at each and every recommendation this phrase which seems to be difficult for some to accept. If we were to work on this language, maybe something that we could try

would be to have, after "encourages stakeholders" and then maybe we could have comma taking into consideration their varying and evolving roles and responsibilities, comma. And then maybe we could continue with the text as stated.

Just a suggestion, maybe something for the room to consider. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Just let me ask you, you -- I could hear you that you were, on one hand, in favor to have the -- within their respective roles and responsibilities either specifically or implicitly as a reference to the Tunis Agenda and overriding all changes to the Tunis Agenda. You want, in addition to that, to have this text which you just dictated taking into consideration the varying roles concluded or as a complement of -- kind of -- (off mic.)

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think the text as proposed by Japan would read very well without this addition. But, if some colleagues would feel more comfortable with language on roles and responsibilities, we just offered this as one suggestion. But we could live without it and have a general reference to the Tunis Agenda in the preamble. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I think it's really important that we do include some kind of statement that we are not in any way changing or disregarding the Tunis Agenda. So something in the chapeau along those lines works. I also, though, respect the point made by Mr. Arasteh. And, as one of the businesses representatives, I do agree that stakeholders do have different roles and responsibilities. It was not language that was provided by only one stakeholder group during the Tunis negotiations. It was very thoroughly negotiated with participation from a variety of stakeholders.

So I can live with the insertion of respective roles and responsibilities as is consistent with the Tunis language or it could go into a chapeau. But I think, if we start developing new phrases at this point, that we're going to become very confused about where those new phrases would go. So I would prefer to keep it as simple as possible given the amount of work we have to do and the fact that we are, in fact, talking about implementation of the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. My comments go in the same direction as the speaker previous to me, Marilyn, that it should be retained, this particular phrase of our respective roles and responsibilities. And to justify it, I may add that the Tunis Agenda talks about these roles specifically in the context of public policy making and not generally in various other social enterprises and activities all of us get involved in.

And this paragraph also ends in "for implementation of enhanced cooperation," which in my and many people's understanding is specifically only about public policy making.

It is in this regard, that in my mind at least, I have clarity about what is the role of different stakeholders being quite different to one another. And I don't appreciate that non-governmental actors would have

the same kind of role in public policy making as governmental actors. We don't accept that in our countries, in our national, regional or local policies. That should not be acceptable at a global level either.

There is a real reason for us to insist on it because I remember in the second meeting, I specifically asked the question about people asking for equal roles and asked whether they really are seeking an equal role in public policy making. I asked it from the private sector representative who then responded, saying I speak on behalf of the private sector and they say, yes, we want to an equal role in decision-making on public policy making. That is part of the record of the meeting. It is this kind of revisiting democracy which has acutely bothered us. I have said this earlier. But I insist to say that again because therefore our insistence on roles and responsibilities comes back again. For me, that is important, and we would like that phrase to be retained. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. First, we obviously the Japanese proposal but the starting doesn't seem to be language too much for recommendation.

The second observation that we have is that way can live with the original -- within the Tunis Agenda, sorry, language which is the second option.

We also are in the line, as Marilyn said, it is probably better not to start drafting new language. But we consider that -- we have it in a chapeau as you propose, and it was also presented yesterday by Iran. It could have a much better impact on the whole text rather than having it in one recommendation and not into the other one. And the other point that we have is in this specific second part of the paragraph is to participate where because it seems that there's a little -- it is not clear to participate and then from a wide range of fields, it seems a little complicated. And we would like to work probably on the language there because it's not clearly the meaning of what we want to achieve here. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the evolving roles and responsibilities, as we came from Tunis Agenda, the involvement or evolvment of roles and responsibilities shouldn't be discussed here. The roles and responsibilities are defined, so let us stick to the Tunis Agenda text. I mean, evolving roles, reviewing the different roles should be done at the overall review, not in a recommendation that we draft to fully implement enhanced cooperation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

I didn't hear any voices who want to revise, just the contrary.

Iran?

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

Iran also supports avoiding using the same languages in different paragraphs, and we prefer to have it somewhere in the text, just once.

But we have to be very careful, Mr. Chairman. Some phrases get the meaning when it comes with the right part. Therefore, whenever we have all the stakeholders, we need to have within their respective roles and responsibilities. Every one to transfer all second phrase in one part, it is better to also have the first part. We don't need to repeat everywhere all stakeholders. We put it somewhere once, all the stakeholders within their respective roles and responsibilities which is part C, talking about the role of all the stakeholders. We don't need to repeat it everywhere. We just start with where. No matter how and who is going to do that, that one can be done in part C which is talking about all the stakeholders.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that's the best way to go ahead, to avoid just increasing the volume of text. In that case, it will be very precise. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: While you have the mic, can you indicate to me the text you want to see?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, will you repeat your question?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Will you indicate to me the text you feel comfortable with in case we delete everything what you said or eventually we put it in a different place? How will it read?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, we can go to part C, as I said, talking about all the stakeholders. We can have within the respective roles and responsibilities there. Whatever way want to have, it can be done there, not in different places talking about all the stakeholders should do that, not all the stakeholders should not do that, all to be multistakeholder approach.

All these things can come in one place, which is part C, and we go ahead with the implementation, not who is going to do this implementation. Most important is we need the implementation. Who is going to do that is in part C. Each stakeholder has it own rules and responsibilities. Then we discuss about that in part C. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So you're proposing to put it in part C? Okay.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, I obviously need to clarify my remarks in that I never said that I wanted a free for all or that all stakeholders would always be the same and always have the same role, as was characterized.

I understand not wanting to change the Tunis Agenda. It is a historical document, and one cannot change a historical document.

What I do want to argue for and what I do want to -- to borrow somebody else's term, to insist upon, is to that the Tunis Agenda and the language of that is a decade old. It is something we need to build upon. The Tunis Agenda was a very revolutionary document for its time.

So, for example, in that first sentence, I have difficulty with "maintaining the WSIS multistakeholder approach" because the multistakeholder approach has grown and advanced. "Maintain the multistakeholder approach initiated by WSIS" would be something I'd be very comfortable with. I'm very appreciative of the language suggested by Sweden there that basically acknowledges that we have varying roles, we have different roles. There's no absence of acknowledging that fact.

What is being insisted upon, again to use that language, is that those roles have evolved, that those roles as defined by governments and perhaps my distinguished colleague Ms. Cade was able to negotiate that language. But the rest of the non-governmental community was not able to negotiate that language and wasn't in the room when those negotiations were happening and even allowed at the back of the room, was not allowed to participate in the discussions, let alone anything resembling the decisions.

So that language is not acceptable language for today. It was acceptable for a historical document. I'm not suggesting that we change history. But what I am suggesting is that we acknowledge that in the network, the Internet of today, a network that is so radically different from anything any of the people in that room could have imagined, that we have to take into account the realities of the Internet within which we live in trying to achieve enhanced cooperation for all stakeholders as was suggested by that marvelous historical document. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. What is your proposal?

>>AVRI DORIA: I gave two proposals. One, that the first sentence becomes "maintains the multistakeholder approach initiated by WSIS" and, two, I am supporting the insertion of "taking into consideration varying and evolving roles and responsibilities" as was suggested by Sweden earlier and removing "respective roles and responsibilities." And when we come to the chapeau, that we acknowledge that there was originally a definition of respective roles and responsibilities but that we have moved beyond that to varying and evolving roles, always acknowledging that, indeed, at the end of the day, legislation belongs to sovereign countries. And whatever system they have, whether it's monarchy or democracy or what have you, but that those roles do evolve over time. They are different but they evolve. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

India?

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think this is the third most contentious issue that we all have different interpretations. I think we do respect -- we do acknowledge that a lot of work has grown since 2005 Tunis Agenda. I think we are cognizant of that. However, the challenge that we are facing is what is the platform at which -- whatever has been agreed in Tunis can be revisited.

Now, here we have a certain role in making certain recommendations, if possible, on some of those evolved issues. However, having said that, we are of the opinion that if there is any fundamental change in the character of Tunis Agenda implementation part, the most logical and most appropriate platform would be the same way these decisions were taken.

Now, if we engage in that debate in this working group, there are constraints with some delegations because, as I said, if this was done at a summit level in Tunis, we believe that any such transformation of the roles and responsibilities should take place in a similar platform because then it is well-empowered and well-authorized to do so, I think which obviously we are looking forward to that, hoping that in New York very soon our colleagues will give us the good news when and where we can do that.

Our idea is that we could have a recognition of enormous transformations that have taken place in usage of Internet in its -- extent of its use, diversity of usage. To those dimensions, we can have a recognition. But to qualify that the roles are changing, I think that determination in our view should be made in such a similarly placed platform.

In this, our constraint, as I said, is to -- if you wanted to convert these constraints into opportunities is to recognize the transformations that have taken place rather than acknowledging that roles have changed or are likely to change because even to characterize that, we have challenges. So I would urge colleagues to look at the other way rather than -- look through that process by what changes have taken place in the usage, et cetera. And hence we can make a comment that roles and responsibilities is an aspect which needs to be examined by the WSIS next summit, if it takes place ever. We should do that. Thank you, Chair.

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

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Actually, we support the roles and responsibilities should be clarified and agreed, understanding of diversity is not enough because it's a lot of discussion around that. And real clarity and agreement is needed for that.

And we really support what India proposed, that if we think that there is evolving process of the roles which actually I -- well, can partly agree on that because nine years is not the big issue of the time frame. And, you know, taking that in nine years everything has changed, then we have to rewrite every document we have, like every constitution of every country saying that nine years comes and language now doesn't reflect the reality.

I think it can reflect reality more or less. However, if there is initiatives to ask WSIS to revisit the roles and responsibilities for next time, then we will support that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Listening to some colleagues that they want to replace the word "respective" with "evolving," it is not acceptable to us. If you look in some of these

public policy issues, (inaudible), cyber security, network security, many others are different from, for instance, property rights, human rights. Some of them apply to all individuals. Some of them apply to the group. Some of them relate -- if talking about security of network in the top level apply to the country, to the government, to the state. They have to establish the order.

So we cannot replace the word "respective" by "evolving." That would be vague. You introduce another ambiguity because you already refer to ambiguity. I propose to delete that later on. But you introduce another ambiguity. "Evolve," evolving in what sense?

The role of government is the role of government. It is in the constitution of the country. If it is evolved, it is evolved in the constitution. I don't think we should make such a separation in a country under government, under government, under government.

"Respective," I was there. Many, many hours was spent to arrive at that consensus that according or within the respective roles and responsibilities.

"Access" is a responsibility. And roles of the government, there are also roles of the private. They want to have access. Nobody could deny their access. But after that, you have to see something which is general for the public and for the government.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. Please do not take that path proposed by colleagues, "evolving." I don't want such a word of I-N-G that continuous tense of "evolving." One is evolving, that means you do not have any definitive responsibility. You never can address that. So we disagree with that.

Now coming to the situation, you want to talk about multistakeholder initiated.

Multistakeholder was not initiated. Was referred to and has not been changed. Only thing is that was defined. We do not know that was multistakeholder. The only thing we have some nice words -- inclusive, democratic, open, transparent. But none of them are implemented. There is no democratic at all.

A group of people wanted to join a network. They were denied. This is not democratic. This is not open. The country was deleted from access to the network. It's not democratic. It's not inclusive. So all of them are nice words.

We have to see, okay, multistakeholder. Take into account that the constituencies yet to be defined within their role and responsibility. Once again, we would like to know would somebody coming on the table speaking on his own or on her own behalf, what is his role and responsibility with respect to another person speaking on behalf of one billion 300 million people in the world. They don't have the same voice.

And they should not Twitter against that one. This is the situation. Something we cannot change is this term, within their respective roles and responsibilities. This is eternal and must remain for years and years and years. If you want to take multistakeholder here, take it. Don't talk about the respective roles. If multistakeholder here, within their respective roles must be here. But not in the chapeau. Chapeau

for section C, B, D and E, but not here. You have to define what is multistakeholder. You have to define what is constituencies. You have to define what is a model. Because approach is different from model. You have three definitions -- multistakeholder approach, multistakeholder partnership, multistakeholder process, multistakeholder model. Four different. ICANN use multistakeholder model. This is model of ICANN. Then we have multistakeholder partnership in the WSIS. What is that?

Then we have multistakeholder process. What is that?

Then we have multistakeholder approach. What is that? What is that approach, process, partnership, and model? These are vague, and we have to embark on this. If you want to do that, yes. If you don't want to do that, state you have two or three different positions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. What I can hear is no (indiscernible) To revisit, visit, and especially with this document with the mandate of this working group. So probably we can stop discussing whether we are going to do it or not. It is not in the mandate of this group to come up with definitions. As was mentioned by India in the update of the upcoming meeting in whatever modality the U.N. is going to choose to revisit the issue.

So I'd like to ask you to concentrate on the text in front of us. I could hear some proposals which for some are acceptable. There are other proposals which weren't acceptable. I heard the proposal to move the whole stack to another section that is in group C. Basically, it's up to you what we do.

So I heard that the text multistakeholder approach initiated by WSIS is not acceptable for some.

I heard that within their respective roles and responsibilities is acceptable for some and not acceptable for others. I heard that a proposal to replace it by varying and evolving roles and responsibilities is not acceptable for some people.

So I don't think we are moving forward. I -- on the other hand, I heard that there is merit in this proposal, so I don't believe it should change the status of it.

It will be revisited. It is not in the category of consensus, because I think the spirit of it does enjoy consensus. There are some wording issues which are fundamental. I tended to take off the proposal from India. Apparently, it doesn't have full support. It has some support.

So I believe we leave it as is. We move to draft 2. Yes?

Parminder, I'm sorry.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. One specific text position which perhaps may help balance the consensus, to put democratic before multistakeholder, to maintain the democratic multistakeholder approach. And, well, I mean, I wanted to also argue about issues about the varying roles. But then the chair has clarified it will come back again sometime. So go ahead. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Personally, I find the proposal from India extremely interesting to mention the transformation of the team, of the Internet team. Naturally, we never -- in 2005 we didn't hear about Twitter. We had hardly any news about social network, and there are lots of other things we have heard about that transform not only our lives, private lives; but, eventually, it has some impact on our meeting as well.

So I think it's a very wise advice. I let you think about it.

I think it may be included in the report on a high level. But I leave it up to you, if you wish it included.

Before we go to the next one, Richard, you want to have something to say?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I won't come back to what I was trying to say yesterday. We'll see if we find time for that. But, no, Marilyn actually stimulated my memory as to how we got these roles and responsibilities. And I'd like to draw Avri's attention to the fact that, actually, this comes from the report from the working group on Internet governance. It's, actually, section 4, paragraph 29, following the WGIG which worked out those roles and responsibilities. And the WGIG was an equal footing multistakeholder model. And it's true that the result of the WGIG went into the WSIS. And, at the end of the day, it was a declaration that was true. I don't think it's fair to say it was done only by government, because the discussion took place in the working group on Internet governance in the first place. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. I know your remark is provoking a lot of thoughts and emotion.

And, Avri, I think you remember the WGIG. And is she well-placed to make any comment on the work of the WGIG, as she was a member of it? Or we let other people tell what happened during it. Please, Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've heard that several times. And I want to, as a member of the WGIG, point out that when that language was brought up in the WGIG, it was taken from the Geneva document and was declared a creed language. And no discussion or change of it was admitted then either. I have been having this discussion since then.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Don't change the structure of the draft recommendation.

We go to the next one. Again, as a purpose of enhancing cooperation is improving and democratizing the governance of the Internet at all levels, therefore, its implementation is continuous and needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis throughout the Internet governance ecosystem. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This could be read as a statement. But, however -- I mean, this is against the text in 69. We cannot limit the purpose of enhancing cooperation and the improvement of such -- I mean, enhanced cooperation, it was very clear in the Tunis Agenda to enable governments. We didn't see it as capturing Tunis Agenda mandated enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What I can see is in -- needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis, I think this is the recommendation. Any other views?

Nigeria?

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Actually, the aspect I want to point out is needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis throughout Internet governance ecosystem. But the word "evaluated" I don't know is up there, because it's talking about enhancement. But there it's talking about evaluation of the systems. So I'm thinking that we could replace the word "enhanced." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: There is some change. Yeah, okay.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say, again, my proposal I made in my previous remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in part A we are talking about implementation of the Tunis Agenda. Means what to do. In B talking about the possible mechanism, how. And C, on the stakeholders, who is going to do that within their roles and responsibilities?

Therefore, we have to avoid mixing all these three separated categorized items together. We don't need to have how and who in here in part A. Let's only concentrate on what we need to do. Regardless of who and how to do it. In that case, I think we'll be, Mr. Chairman, simpler and easier to go ahead and to agree on the text. Otherwise, we are not going to reach any result or consensus with the way we are going ahead, Mr. Chairman. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jafar. I completely agree with your assessment. In this case I can see the what. In the original proposal, I think it was their evaluation. Evaluation is what?

Not how, not by whom. It's what to do. Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we are talking about the democratizing the governance of the Internet, it means how. We have to delete it and leave it for Part B. That's one part we need to remove from this part. That's talking about how to do that. That's one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Did I get you right that you want to strike the record the democratizing. Yes?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: It doesn't mean that we oppose democratizing. I hope it's not going to Twitter.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, I didn't take it.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: But I'm talking about it belongs to the other part, not that part.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no. It was very clear to me. Any other views?

As it stands, we have two square brackets. There's one proposal to replace "evaluated" by "enhanced." And there's a proposal to delete "democratizing." Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Here it is implementing instead of improving. And ongoing basis. It's -- I think, another part that it's also talking about how. Because we're not going to talk about how to do it. Because ongoing basis means the basis on how we are going to do it. Thank you. Which belongs to the second part. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I tend to agree with this last proposal by Iran, implementation. And also we support the proposal of Nigeria. We think it's better reflected to enhance rather than evaluate, because evaluation is a different process. So, with these two modifications, we can work on the proposal and we support. Thank you.

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

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. At this point, I am losing the recognition of a draft recommendation that I can support.

By saying that it's to implement governance of the Internet is to imply that the Internet currently has no governance. And I don't see how that could be accepted. Certainly, it can be improved. Things can always be improved. And I can -- get me at the right time, I can give lots of things that need improvement. But to say that it's not implemented at this point is difficult.

Also, the notion that enhanced cooperation needs to be enhanced on an ongoing basis is difficult for me from a sentence, grammar, understanding level.

I think "evaluated" is, indeed, a necessary word. I think, as anything moves on, as we do anything, we need to evaluate. For us to come out of this meeting to sort of say nothing needs to be evaluated, nothing needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis, basically, leaves us in a static position where nothing changes, where the whole purpose of this working group was to say enhanced cooperation isn't moving along as well as it should. We need to -- and some people say it's not moving along at all. Some people say it's not moving along as well as it could. And to, basically, get things moving further, to harken back always to we must not change anything so that something can change becomes a very difficult concept for me to hold on to. So I don't recognize this any more as something I can support.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Avri, I definitely understand your feeling. It has completely -- it is completely different from the original one. And probably may like to work on that a little bit. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with your assessment that, although we, of course, appreciate all the drafting efforts that have been made in order to improve the language, we intend to

hand those proposals, we think of. But they have changed the meaning of this paragraph and the original intent is not captured in the same way as it was with the original language. That goes, I think, in particular, to the first sentence where we think that improving and democratizing would be more appropriate than implementing. We have difficulties with "implementing" in this context.

As for the proposal made by Nigeria, that's something that we can accept, I think.

Another alternative may be could be to stop after "therefore, its implementation is continuous" and leave the rest out. That's one way forward, maybe.

Yes. I think I'll stop there. And I think we are hungry and tired, Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I give the floor to Iran and then Saudi Arabia and then to our stomachs. I'm sorry, yeah, yeah. No, no, no. I think U.S., you were first in the line. Sorry about that. You are far in distance but not from my heart.

[Laughter]

>>UNITED STATES: That's good to know, Mr. Chairman. Likewise.

Just to -- I think echo the statement from Avri. In this context, "implementing governance on the Internet" doesn't make sense. Obviously the Internet is governed in some capacity. We are here in many ways to discuss how that governance is done and work to improve it.

I think improving governance on the Internet makes a lot of sense, and I think it should resonate with the other members of this group as well.

And then on the second point, I believe that "enhanced" -- in the second sentence, or the last part there, "evaluated" makes more sense or perhaps "assessed," if people don't like that word. But I think those are better options than "enhanced" at this point. Thank you, Chairman.

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

Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take the floor again. Mr. Chairman, when I read the paragraph carefully, I see the first part up to "therefore" is a statement. I don't think we need to go to those kind of statements.

And for the second part of the sentence, I'm trying to find an action. It is talking about the ongoing approach for implementation of the Internet governance or enhanced cooperation, which I believe that it's talking about how to do that because when you say it is ongoing, you are talking about the kind of approach which belongs to the second part, "to be."

Therefore, I have two suggestions: First, to delete the first part after the "therefore." And we need to start with where because we need to talk about the action.

And since it is talking about the approach and the way of doing that, I prefer to send it to part B, without the first part, which is a statement and not to discuss it in here, which is talking about the implementation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Personally, I can see nothing wrong about transferring one recommendation to another section. As for the action, I can still see the action even if it is overstroking, "evaluated" or "assessed" and was suggested by the U.S. I can see merit in that. It's very important to see where we are.

I mean, that is always the basic question, well, we don't really know where we are. And we had quite a few consultations on these issues. And we want to do it on kind of a regular basis, if I understand the wording of this recommendation.

So it calls for an action to me. It calls for an action with some kind of instruction about an ongoing basis. It has merit.

Saudi Arabia and then I would like to break for lunch.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Iranian proposal was very good. If we shifted this to Group B and we see as a whole the entirety, we would see the link with this current statement or recommendation. So I think the Iranian proposal is a good way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Okay. I propose we come back at 3:00 and we resume our session. We have a lot of things to do. I suggest you to bring some food with you because I really want to have some substantial resource at the end of the day.

Thank you.

[Lunch break]

***Live Scribing by Brewer & Darrenougue.

Www.quicktext.com***

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

2 May 2014

3:00 p.m.

Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good afternoon. I can see that you are fresh and inspired and relaxed in the same way as we were yesterday when we left off. And I hope that spirit is going to prevail in this afternoon's session. And I hope to be in a very good mood by the end of the day.

When we broke for lunch, we were on draft recommendation 2. And I heard very interesting interventions. And after the session I heard some interesting conversations as well.

One of the most remarkable was, for me, was I had with the delegate from Iran, Jafar. If you still recall what we were talking about, it would be extremely helpful if you could share it with the other members.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, everyone. Regarding to what the chair said with, being that, if we focused on what we need to do regarding the enhanced cooperation, I think we can reach a consensus on the matter. Just what we need to do, not how and who.

We're limited to part B and C. Mr. Chairman, I have a very short proposal for the first paragraph we have under section A. If you scroll up. The first one we're talking about the implementation of enhanced cooperation. If you would like, I can read the very short and simple sentence on the matter.

So I will read it in dictational speed.

"To fully implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in Tunis Agenda." And the second one can be an alternate to what every -- I think scroll down to the -- yes. Here. It would be alt to that one. "To periodically assess the implementation of the enhanced cooperation."

Mr. Chairman, I think it's good for a start. Some of the colleagues can have their input just to focus on the action, not how and who is going to do that. I think with that approach, we can have a consensus on part A. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jafar. Any comments on this proposal?

Still early. You had a heavy lunch. Or you're tired. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much to Iran for this proposal. It sounds very productive and concise, which may be a good way for us to strive in the future and for the rest of our work, too. If we can go to many statements of this nature that we can agree on, then it will make it perhaps more productive for us as we move forward. So, just speaking as an individual business person, I find myself in agreement with both of those statements. Thank you.

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

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, I would like to thank Iran for its work on this paragraph. And we see that they have some value. A question is just whether or not we are -- because I think these are alternatives, if I understood it correctly to the draft we see above as proposed by Japan and then by us.

And there is one element that is important in the original recommendations that might have been lost. And that's the important aspect of the multistakeholder approach. That's, I think, sort of the essence of both the Japanese original proposal and the Sweden's proposal in this regard. Having -- so that's just -- that's just a question. If we could in some way reintroduce such language, add that to the Iranian proposal.

And then about the first text, if we could say "to continue to implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda" and then maybe, if we could add something on the multistakeholder model or approach, that would be also of added value, I think. But we think this is something that we could work on further. Thank you

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

>>AVRI DORIA: I still can't press it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the contribution made by Iran, and I truly do appreciate something that would be short enough to fit in Twitter. So it gives me great pleasure to see that.

I appreciate the content. I agree with the comment made by Sweden that it would be good to have each of them tag on to the end. And this would still be short "in a multistakeholder manner" at the end of each of these. And then at which point I would find little to disagree with in these statements. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues, commenting on what we propose. Mr. Chairman, since we -- I think we agreed that we -- in this part we only concentrate and focus on what we want to do. And leave it -- the way of doing in the other part, which is B and who is going to do that in C. Therefore, if we concentrate on that part, I think it will be easier. Multistakeholder and the other stakeholders or whatever approach we are going to accept is in the other part. Here we are concentrating on action. In that case, I think step-by-step we can solve the divergence on the issues. At least on part A. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Iran. Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, chair. I agree with the approach by several delegations to delete fully as it implies that in some way we could complete the process; whereas, the mapping exercise has shown that this is a dynamic and living exercise. We will never have completed enhanced cooperation, and we need to consider it as an ongoing effort.

So in the spirit, I would -- I would support the request from Sweden to include language saying "to continue to implement." An alternative might be to further enhance cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chair. I, too, would like to join others in welcoming the proposal from Iran. I like the -- you know, like others also short and concise proposals, irrespective of Twitter. And I would also support the suggestion to, you know, amend the text a little bit to reflect the continuity of the process. So suggestion by Sweden, ISOC, is welcomed. And I think is -- and we can also say to continue to implement the process of enhanced cooperation. Tunis Agenda also referred to the enhanced cooperation as a process. So maybe this also reflects the, you know, nature of what we're talking about. Thanks.

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon to all colleagues.

I would like to, first of all, thank Iran for these proposals. I think it's in the spirit of working together this afternoon that I hope continues.

Using that magical word "continue." We would prefer the term "to continue to implement enhanced cooperation" in the first recommendation. We believe that it's been shown in the work of the correspondence group and others that the process has started. Whether or not it's completed or not I think is subject to debate. So I think we could -- if it could read "to continue to fully implement enhanced cooperation" so on and so forth.

We also support the inclusion of "in a multistakeholder manner."

For the second one, we did prefer -- I think in Avri's original contribution it said, "In an ongoing basis." We think that's a better construction than "periodically." Periodically would seem to represent on a defined timeline, perhaps indicating an event or something of that nature; whereas, ongoing is perpetual assessment. I think that's more appropriate. So it would read "to assist the implementation of enhanced cooperation on an ongoing basis."

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.S. I'm not sure if you're -- if I heard you right. You mentioned in the first "to continue to fully implement." Did you mention fully?

>>UNITED STATES: I did say "continue to fully." Continue to is the more important part as far as we're concerned. Fully is more subject to -- thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I am not 100% sure that this formulation isn't closer to the original. Anyway. India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. And good afternoon to colleagues.

Quickly, I think any benchmarking on a sentence like this is useful to go back to the resolution which created this working group. And that particular resolution asks or requests this working group to find, make a recommendation to fully implement the mandate of what is a mandate of?

The mandate was on how to realize this enhanced cooperation. So, from that perspective, I mean, we can -- we can perhaps find alternative languages. If you want to be true to the work the resolution wants us to do, I think it's only appropriate that we use the word "fully." And it has its own interpretation. It doesn't mean that it's not implemented. Obviously, there's an acknowledgment that there's an implementation there. But it's asking for full implementation. So, from that perspective, "fully" will not take away. And it doesn't say that you stop at a given point in time. One could determine at the end of the process that, okay, even after two years it might say that, okay, it is not fully implemented so the process, as some colleagues said, it might give a determination that it is going to end at a particular point in time. I don't think that is the case. So from that perspective, I think we can -- "fully" was the right phrase here because of this.

And number two, how it is done again, we're bringing in this concept of multistakeholder, at this point in time, perhaps is not relevant. It is important. But, in this particular process, it comes as part of the implementation. You could have how you want to do it. That's where we'll answer this question through various means. Thank you, Chair.

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

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the previous speaker because it makes life easy for me. His words captured part of my comments on the matter. Just "fully" doesn't mean that nothing has been done. And, therefore, it's very clear that one. And it's, basically, showing that we'll continue whatever we have done on the implementation of enhanced cooperation. What we are going to do is on the basis which has been done before. That's the first issue again on -- the way of doing will make problems, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that it's necessary to have it here. We can deal with the related part. And on the periodically assess -- I don't think we have to recommend here what is that prior period to discuss about or to recommend to the CSTD. We'll leave it for the process to think how it's necessary on what basis they can assess two years or three years or whatever. We just want this periodically assessment to be done. Because we think that every time we need to get back to what we have done to see what is our failure to remove those failures in the process. Therefore, I think, just to leave it as a general "periodically assess" I think it is very clear. Because we are going to send a very clear and general simple message to CSTD to go ahead. And we are not here to finish everything and to send to CSTD. Because there are some other bodies to work on that issue. And we are not going to burden all the jobs on our shoulder. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Yulia.

>> Yeah. Thank you. I would like to answer to this expression "in a multistakeholder manner" that we should not limit ourselves with only manner of the multistakeholder. And, to balance the tools for implementation, we need to add multi. Otherwise, the implementation will be undone.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. I would comment on the process of enhanced cooperation. We know that there is process towards enhanced cooperation. So to establish enhanced cooperation. Enhanced cooperation itself was not seen by Tunis Agenda as a process. So even under consideration, it's hard to fully implement enhanced cooperation. That's the process of enhanced cooperation. We should be very careful when we think about the process. We're not going to implement the process. We're going to implement enhanced cooperation. So I'm for including the process of -- in this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I deeply appreciate the proposal by Iran, Sweden, Russia, and the other previous speakers. And I'd like to support the description, continue to implement the enhanced cooperation. And I'd like to support the description in a multistakeholder manner as well.

And, in addition, I think the international cooperation and the collaboration between the stakeholder is very, very important issue. So I'd like to add the -- at the part -- at the last part, leave, leave or by -- I'm not sure -- international cooperation and collaboration between the stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I also join others in thanking Iran for the proposals, and we are afraid that we are losing momentum, the momentum in which we started of with the original proposal, and we are still keeping adding things, and probably at the moment the further we are from reaching consensus.

Going back to the very original proposal, and there is recognition that something has been done, then we can continue to build on that.

And my delegation likes the approach of having multistakeholder manner, but we see that if it's the same case as the role and responsibilities of stakeholders, why don't we put it in a chapeau and then we can avoid having this same discussion every time, and probably we can work on that only once and not in every single item or recommendation.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Victoria. Basically I think that was the original proposal of Iran, that is the way forward to define the "what," to define the "how." And if there is some support for this modality, perhaps that might be a way forward.

So I really turn to the floor if this is acceptable, this approach; that is, to in Group A we define the "what," in Group B -- help me, Jafar. In Group B, we define the "how," and in Group C, "who."

And it's my take to have some target dates, but never mind. It will be too concrete and implementable.

By the way, just mentioning that probably that was one of the concerns of the previous working group, that we didn't define in a very clear way the what, the how, and the who, and the target date. So especially the who. And it made life a bit difficult. But we can work on that.

So Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Okay. Just to point out, Chair, which I'm sure the room is very conscious of, that "fully implement enhanced cooperation mandate" is the description of the mandate of this group. And I would think that if you are -- unless we are able to give -- I mean, you are not giving full (indiscernible) of fully doing it, so at least we can say that we accept what they have said to us as a mandate, to further fully implement.

So I wonder why shouldn't we really talk so much about the "fully" part, that being our mandate.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: In fact, I didn't hear very much against the "fully." It was recognized. I think I heard the sentence, "to continue to fully implement." And that was, I think, from the U.S.

So I reiterate my question again. Is the approach what was proposed by Iran acceptable? That is, what, who, how.

And all general description should come under a chapeau, or eventually before the recommendations in the general text.

Because we get stuck every time.

Okay. So I can see Sweden, Constance, Nigeria, Iran, Ellen, Phil.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think that one of the challenges here in the last year is we have different interpretations of the meaning of enhanced cooperation. And a lot of our arguments here boils down to that fact.

We do see enhanced cooperation as a process, and a process that is ongoing and continues. And that's why it's important for us to acknowledge that. And we think that by the wording "continue to" or potentially "continue to fully," we capture that.

We are also interested in exploring the proposal on the process of, because that could also be maybe a way to capture that. If we have the process of, maybe then we do not need "continue to," because we capture that -- that very important element.

Regarding the issue of multistakeholder manner, I think it's important to remember when we're discussing these two paragraphs that we have in front of us where they originally came from. I've understood that this is an attempt to revise two paragraphs or two proposals, one from Japan and one from Sweden. And when we -- Without losing the original intent. And that's just what I'm a little bit concerned about; that if we do not make here reference to the multistakeholder approach or

multistakeholder manner, which seems to be the core of these two original proposals, we are not really true to the original proposals and true -- we're not reflecting the original intent of those proposals. Then we're actually discussing something completely -- completely different, or at least something that has....

So that's why we think it's important to -- to insert this reference.

And on the second paragraph, we think that maybe we could try with the word "to continuously assess" the implementation of enhanced cooperation. Because we heard some concerns about "periodically." We share those concerns, and maybe "continuously" is a better word here because we want to assess it, and we assess it every day, but we do not necessarily want to assess it once a year or once every quarter or what it could be.

So I think I'll stop with those comments.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you very much, Chair.

We would like to echo the view, definitely, that enhanced cooperation, we see it as a dynamic and ongoing process. Again, the mapping exercise really showed that we needed to have a very dynamic and ongoing approach.

At the same time, we do hear some of the delegation that insist on the fact that we need to make further progress. So in a spirit of compromise and with the idea that perhaps we need to strengthen the dynamic, I would propose at the beginning of the paragraph that instead of "fully," we say, "to continue to implement," or maybe stronger, "to further strengthen enhanced cooperation." "To further strengthen enhanced cooperation."

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you, Constance.

Nigeria. No?

Iran.

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

Mr. Chairman, our proposals propose, in a way, to avoid any divergence. We try to introduce very simple words; not to make any party sensitive to the matter.

Any new proposal will change the spirit of the Iranian proposal, Mr. Chairman. So I still prefer to speak to the original one.

On the proposal and second alternate, "to periodically or continuously," I have no problem to accept "or continuously," but normally we say in such documents "periodically." "Continuously" means all the time to do that and it's impossible. But periodically means every two years, three years, four years, it depends on the -- "Continuously," I don't think it's practicable to do that.

And the other matter. When we are using "continuously" or "periodically" the same meaning with an ongoing basis. There is no difference between these two parts. Therefore, I think if we are going to use "periodically," "continuously," it's not necessarily to have "on an ongoing basis," because both are saying the same thing but the adverbs are in different part of the sentence.

And again for the last part, still I would like to see it in the relevant part, which is Part B, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you.

I will come in first to say that I think "continuously" is a good compromise word there and I would support that. I did want to address a little bit the general organizational question you raised about looking at this as the what, the how and the who. I think that's a promising organizational theory to use to think about this, but I could use some clarification about the chapeau and what would be covered in the chapeau, and when we would talk about the chapeau. Because that seems to be an important matter if we're going to use that structure.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: To answer your question concerning the chapeau, it's up to you what the content and words will be, so it's up to the group. And in the chapeau, generally you capture kind of principle-like statements or just describe what you have under the chapeau, and that is the idea.

Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thanks, Chair. Just to support what Ellen said, and "continuously" is good compromise going forward. I would also like to thank Jafar for his efforts over lunch introducing the text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil.

Parminder? Oh, no.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry to take the floor again, but since we are now getting to the approach, contrary to what you proposed, I think you proposed a very large-scale approach of us to approach this issue through three questions of what, how, and who.

I think since we are also touching on the process which includes how and comments have been made, I cannot but come in and make one or two comments on that if you approve of it. Okay.

Since we are talking about how this is to be realized, we have, I think, a few more principles we consider as the core principles of Internet governance overall, and enhanced cooperation being part of that process.

It must also have -- the order in which we would like to see is it is in a multilateral, democratic, representative, transparent, and multistakeholder manner.

I think we -- we think this sequence is also important, because, again, this will include all stakeholders. But the process through which we would like realization of this is that sequence.

So if you will kindly permit, then I can request the inclusion of those phrases, in the first at, in perhaps -- no, sorry. It's already there. You can say in the second line, the beginning of it, "In a multilateral, comma, transparent, comma, democratic, comma, representative and multistakeholder manner."

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We would also like to offer an alternative to para 1, trying to capture some of the elements that have been emphasized in the room. So it would read like this: To continue the process of enhanced cooperation, to fully implement the Tunis Agenda in a transparent, multistakeholder manner.

I think that might capture some of the elements that we are trying to get at.

Yes. "To continue the process of enhanced cooperation to fully implement the Tunis Agenda in a transparent multistakeholder manner."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Iran, and then I can see that Parminder now remembers what he wanted to say.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think everybody is right, but we started to have a simple sentence and now we have alternative and alternative and so we will get nowhere.

Why not try to see whether you could avoid having an alternative and try to possibly integrate the views in the paragraph but not make it unmanageable to implement.

The idea was initially to be simple, general. When it was mentioned that as envisaged by WSIS, it is already multistakeholder there.

So that was the idea; not to get into this problem that to what extent to talk about multistakeholder, then when you get there to say in a transparent manner. Some people may add in transparent, inclusive, democratic. Often you add adjective and adjective and adjective, when "as envisaged in the WSIS," it's covered.

So we wanted, in fact, to have something. But if you start to do that, I think -- We wanted to have something, but now we have something which more element than is necessary. And all of these additional elements create new discussions. Further implement, fully implement, continue to implement, ongoing, continuous, periodically.

"Continuous" is very difficult because when you continuously assess, you have to have time to see what is the result of that. But when you say "ongoing basis," "assessed on an ongoing basis," may be something in between.

So let us not fight with the words and so on. Make it smaller, the sentence simple. You will make it bigger. And I think (saying name) was going to propose another sentence taking into account something, and he will propose that but with the hope it will not have a long sentence, that we go back to the initial division.

So there is another suggestion to take into account that Jafar will propose and we will discuss it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Jafar, do you want to --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have another alternate for the next.

Which is, I think, 3. In addition. 3. Roll down, please. No, no, no. For paragraph 3. Because already I propose two for the first two. Now it's the third one.

"To identify best practices of cooperation -- other cooperation mechanisms in other fields to fully implement enhanced cooperation."

Thank, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jafar.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It was just to agree to the form of what, how, and who as touchstones because questions help us focus our discussion so we can -- the chair can keep on checking against any wording whether it does address a question of whether it's what, how, and who. That's all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you. My comment's on the second alternative. So to continue the process toward enhanced to fully implement -- to fully implement towards enhanced cooperation.

No, it is there. To fully implement the mandate of (inaudible) -- thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I don't know why I have the feeling that we have seen that and we are going in circles. I don't really know why. Even though I can feel really good intentions. And I really thank you for that. I know that all of you come here with good intentions. And it's probably my fault. I can't really think of anything else. It's really my fault.

Anyway, let's have another try. Let's try -- because I think we were quite close. We started on very good ground. We had the very good proposal. The spirit of it was accepted. And all of a sudden it started growing and shrinking and growing. So let's have a last try. Then we shall leave it.

So Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, so now we need to concentrate to clean up the paragraph, some of the square brackets and some things we could easily -- well, not easily. You could agree to do that.

For instance, I think that we need to talk about whether we're talking further sentence, fully continue, strengthen and improve, fully or not fully. But something -- just a personal view. The word "fully" is very, very difficult. You say fully do something. Fully means perfectly. You never reach perfection. You never reach perfection at all. Everybody agree. We want to follow the majority. Fully, fully. You have to select fully a sentence. I don't think that fully goes with a sentence. Strengthen, further strengthen or improve, you can do that. Then we cannot continue. So you have to select a shorter sentence, maybe a shorter sentence. To continue to strengthen and improve, that would be to continue. Strengthening, sorry, strengthening and improving, or to strength and improve. Doesn't matter. Any of strength and improve. Maybe put it as well Strength and improve. Yes?

Yeah. Then the implementation. Enhanced cooperation, you put process at the end whether we agree to keep it or not agree, but I think process is good. It is a process. But, if you don't want process, take out process. That's it. As envisaged, essential element is Tunis Agenda.

Then the part proposed by distinguished colleague from India, perhaps you have to clean it up. Multilateral, transparent, demographic, representative. Transparent, demographic, representative -- I don't know, inclusive. All adjectives, it should go at the end. Then you should in a -- I think you have to put multistakeholder (indiscernible) or multilateral to see which one is appropriate. If you agree for the multistakeholder, no problem. But, if someone pushes for multilateral, you have to put both. You cannot put that, because one does not replace the other. They're complementary. Either you put it in a complementary manner, or you put it in the replacement manner, or you take multistakeholder. The multistakeholder, Chairman, it's been something that is evolving. That's all. We can get rid of that. But you'll have to. But, if you want to retain multilateral within multistakeholder, then you go to all adjective -- transparent or whatever you want to say. And then after that, you do need all of that with international, cooperation and collaboration -- you don't need all that. Make it very short.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: To continue to strengthen and improve the implementation, the process of enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda in a multistakeholder manner. That's what I heard. Shall I repeat?

"To continue to strengthen and improve the implementation the process of enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda in a multistakeholder manner." That's what I assessed from your intervention. Correct me, if I am wrong. Anja?

>>ANJA KOVACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I wanted to join the voices that had to join Iran for this very good proposal. I thought this was a very good way to move forward in the different issues that we need to address. And I want to comment briefly on the first two paragraphs, perhaps, that we've been discussing. I actually thought the proposal earlier made by Saudi Arabia was acceptable as well, if it would end at involving all stakeholders. As we have been discussing that in the proposal for the overall text made by Iran, the issue of roles and responsibilities would be dealt with elsewhere.

So, in the spirit of trying to limit the language each time to the very minimum that needs to address in each section, that proposal would be okay keeping in mind that roles and responsibilities would be addressed in the chapeau.

With the changes that have been made to the earlier option now, I think that looks fine as well for the same reasons. I think it has already minimized the language. And I wanted to just point out to the delegate of India who had added two objectives that there's actually a similar proposal that also refers to demographic, inclusive, transparent, accountable, et cetera, in section B. So, in any case, this issue and discussion will come back there. And perhaps again keeping in mind the proposal of the Iranian delegate, section B might be a better section to actually address this. And then on the second draft recommendation, if you can go down, I can see the point that continues assessment is difficult. If one wants to do it well, you need to document it and mark it. But I think the point is here to say that this is not something that we do every five years, but that this is something that happens at a frequent basis. So perhaps we should say, instead of periodically, regularly assess. And also make it the ongoing implementation of enhanced cooperation. Because I think this is the point that's being made repeatedly is we can't look at enhanced cooperation as something which is finished at some point. If we make it clear that the process is ongoing and at regular intervals we have to assess how it's going, perhaps that would be a solution. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden and Saudi Arabia. Before you take the floor, I really want to concentrate on number one, the first one. And then, if we are done with that, then probably should go to 2. To me, it's a bit difficult to concentrate on two issues at the same time. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. If I've understood it correctly, the text that we now have on the screen as alternative 1 is what was after the proposed changes by Iran. "To continue to strengthen and improve the implementation of the process of enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda in a multistakeholder manner." It's just a clarification on that, if that's the proposal by Iran.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It was my understanding. But I turn to Iran to confirm.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I said at the beginning, we prefer very simple language unrelated to the other parts. Therefore, very simple, concise, short sentence. The original one that was proposed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It means to me that you don't want to see the "in a multistakeholder manner" in this text. Okay?

>>SWEDEN: It's a little bit confusing to me, because I don't know what I should make out of the last drafting exercise then that we -- I mean, I think that Kavouss was drafting this text. But then should I understand it that it was this text but without the last part?

Okay. Well, well, I think it's an improvement of the language. But we still think that it's important to have the last part reflected as well "in a multistakeholder manner." Otherwise, I think that, with the modifications as proposed by Iran, the text reads better. But we would like to still see the last part included there.

As regards to alternative 2, we had difficulties with the two words, instead of "of." I think that changes the meaning quite substantially. But we could accept the proposal by Saudi Arabia of regarding all stakeholders. However, we'd like to stop there. So, instead of having in a transparent multistakeholder manner, we could accept the Saudi proposal until, involving all stakeholders full stop. Thank you.

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

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But our preference is the original Iranian proposal. Very short and sweet dealing with one item on this issue. And let us figure out the issues of multistakeholders in the other section which is related to the all stakeholders. So let's focus on the original Iranian proposal. I think we can accept it and see the multistakeholder issues on the second part. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me ask you, Jafar, you still have the original?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I raise the flag to do that. I can read it again -- I would like to have it as the first alternate here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Zero, yeah.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: "To fully implement enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda."

Mr. Chairman, sorry. Now the colleagues in the room have the chance to see the three alternate language. I think now -- I mean, find out which one is better and which suits their interest. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. USA.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think that we've -- I think we agree with your comment that we've gone around and around in circles here. And I think there's been some good interventions about

ideas and text that represent some of the discussion -- well, much of the discussion that we've been having. And so, therefore, we would very much like to interpret the proposal by Iran, the original proposal, which I think is now their current proposal once again, as a succinct way to capture neutrally the various views that have been ascribed by other interventions. And, in that case, it may be acceptable. But the only thing I would add is that we would then want to see what evolves in the subsequent areas in the what and the by whom and areas of our outline here before finally agreeing to it. So, if that -- in the spirit of trying to be constructive, we offer that process and comment. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, U.S. Is it acceptable that we proceed in this way, but, if we coin this as a - how did you say that? Well, based on conditions that we can agree on the how and the who. So is it acceptable in that way?

Russian Federation, you ask for the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. What I would say is what about alternative we will prefer, we prefer zero alternative, which is as envisaged in Tunis Agenda. Because we see the manner and how it should be implemented is the question. And only put it in multistakeholder manner is not enough and not sufficient in order to understand the balanced process of implementation. So we propose to stick to alternative zero.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We think that we are sort of taking one step backwards. Because we thought that the -- we really appreciated the attempts by Iran to find some compromise language under alternative 1. And, to continue in that good spirit, we would then say that maybe we could stick with the language in alternative 1 without "in a multistakeholder manner." So we would stop by Tunis agenda. We think that is a good compromise. "To continue to strengthen and improve the implementation of the process of enhanced cooperation as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda." We think that would be our preference, and we thank Iran for its constructive engagement on this one.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. I, too, thought the proposal by Mr. Arasteh, which was Alternative 1, was a good compromise. And again going with the approach of, you know -- I don't remember the sequence but what, who, how, whatever it is, I think we can stop at "Tunis Agenda" and drop the rest of the statement.

Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

Avri.

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

Except for the fact that the split infinitive continues to bother me, and would prefer "fully to implement" or "to implement fully," I could live with this as a revisit until we actually see -- so agreeing with the U.S. here, until we actually see the who is the what.

I agree with everything that has been said about others, about the notion in the others, but at this point, given the time keeps creeping on, to basically see what the others have, so if we mark this as "revisit" and moved on to look at the others, I would not be overly distressed.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sure the group will endorse the view that if ever we have to have a narrative of this working group, we all shall rely on Avri's intellect and her ability to speak the way she does.

We -- I do sort of agree with her kind of frustration with the process that we are going through, but I think the way out that you suggested for us was a very good one. In the three different parts, you know, what, how, and who questions. And thereby, we can come back and reflect on them in their entirety. Without prejudice to what we are going to say in the next part, because then if you see them in totality, perhaps they will look much better.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>INDIA: So thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So can we clean Alternative 1?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

My understanding was Alternative 0 is agreed based on the agreement of the paragraph will follow in section -- in other section, how, who, what, when. Is this, my understanding, correct?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Partially. There's no absolute truth.

I can sense consensus on Alternative 1 the way it was formulated by Sweden; that is, by dropping at the end "in a multistakeholder manner."

And to me, Alternative 1 conveys the meaning of Alternative 0, and it is enjoying support from members.

So I suggest to clean the text.

Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Japan supports Alternative 1, but I'd like to say that in Japan's original proposal to emphasize the necessity of remaining multistakeholder, promoting international cooperation and the collaboration between the stakeholders to implement enhanced cooperation. So if the multistakeholder international cooperation and the collaboration between the stakeholders cannot be included, this proposal is not the totality of our proposal but a new proposal.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

(Saying name.)

>> Thank you, Chair. Not being able to speak completely perfect Australian English, and noting that English is fairly flexible, given the amendment made by Sweden for Alternative 1 and your comment, Chair, that it conveys Alternative 0, I can live with Alternative 1.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. So Alternative 1, that's something that we can accept. But just along the same lines as what was just said by Japan, we consider this to be a new recommendation rather than a recommendation that fully reflects the original Japanese or Swedish proposals.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

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

I was very clear since the beginning, we have issues with "continual strengthening" (indiscernible).

We said Alternative 0. It is a very general recommendation; will bring everyone on board. So we insist on accepting 0 based on the agreement on other part that will follow this recommendation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Russia.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We still support Alternative 0, and it also actually have the same text as the mandate of our working group because the mandate of our working group doesn't look like to see how to continue to strengthen and to improve implementation, but to how to fully implement.

So I think to speak to model, too, and the purpose of our working group, it's better to agree on Alternative 0.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Then if there is no consensus around Alternative 1, then I suggest that we keep both alternatives and we come back to that at a later stage.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Very constructive.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to express our support for Alternative 1 as was formulated by Sweden to stop right after "Tunis Agenda." I think that's a reasonable compromise that gets at the point -- points that we can all agree on.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We tried very hard to -- to full an agreement, a consensus, on Part A, which could be very easily get out of that and to go for the other parts which I'm sure the others are -- I mean, the room is interested, not only one party.

Mr. Chairman, now we are almost at 4:30. We have no more time.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You need coffee?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: No. I don't drink coffee or tea at all; therefore, I don't care if we have coffee break or not. But, Mr. Chairman, we need time to work on the models. We cannot leave it like this. Therefore, in that case, I'm sure if there will be any other suggestion for any other parts, we'll face the same issue, the same problem.

So it's better to go directly to develop different models and to have it in the report. I think that's the only way out.

I don't think to discuss on very simple issues, which can be simply solved, will -- will make us to have recommendations on these matters, Mr. Chairman.

So please, let's allocate the rest of our time on the models which each group will go to its own, and we have it in the report. In that case, each group has its own taste on the report. Otherwise, it's not possible to reach any consensus.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, thank you, Jafar. You don't sound optimistic. You sound very realistic.

Okay. I still felt that we were close. We were quite close.

I had the feeling that we had support for both alternatives, alternatives 0 and Alternative 1, irrespective -- from respective members.

If that is the general feeling that we cannot come to an agreement on this, and I also qualify it a simple issue, then probably you may be right.

Nigeria.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually, a lot of work have been done by distinguished colleagues on this recommendation. For me, I don't see what we are -- I don't see the diverted views by which -- what I'm trying to say, that (indiscernible) Alternative 0 should be alternate, but I believe my (indiscernible) support Alternative 1 because to me it appears more constructive. And what is in Alternative 0 has been buried in Alternative 1. So I should suggest we look at that, because I don't see any difference between the two.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At this time, it's better to be realistic than optimistic. It is very clear that on very simple issue, we couldn't reach an agreement. So we should take a decision now, how are we going to finish the work.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So -- Well, probably we stop here. In spite of everything, we are going to have a coffee break. And I will inform you about my decision, how we are going to proceed after the coffee break.

Thank you.

We are going to have 20 minutes.

[Coffee break]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back. So, after the discussions we had up to now and after the conversations I had with many members, I came to the conclusion that probably it's time to stop the discussions on the recommendations. I'm very sorry to say that, after the very fruitful work we had yesterday and the spirit of consensus yesterday, we somehow missed it. I don't know where and how, but it did happen.

As I indicated to some of you, this is not the end of the world. I hope we will survive. And I know that there were two groups who worked very diligently yesterday on some draft recommendations in group D and E. I'm told by secretariat that these texts have been captured in the appropriate document. So they have been updated.

And now I suggest to you to go straight away to the report of this group with the option that it will be a JAS report about the progress we have made, which will be reported to the CSTD. I don't think we can have a working group report, because we haven't finished our work yet. And it's up to the CSTD to decide how to move forward.

There is an option that we can continue our work, but this has to be decided by CSTD.

So, in any case, I am obliged to report on the work we have been doing, report on the four meetings we had, mentioning the status of the recommendations. As I indicated, the report will be factual without any judgment. Naturally. I mean, it will be natural to be neutral.

You have a draft copy of the report. And I would like to have your comments on the report. So let's go section by section.

Yes, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We're ready to examine the report. But, in light of the little time available, could we exclude the explanatory part, which is useful but may not be absolutely necessary, and sort discussions exactly from the resolutions 67190 or you report pursuant to paragraph 20 general assembly resolutions A-67195, the chair of the CSTD establish the group. And not talk about the preamble, saying that whether the text is ambiguous, not ambiguous,

Perhaps it is not up to us to judge about the ambiguity or otherwise of the text of the WSIS because it has been in one or two article, I have read that. Ten years ago this text ambiguity was there.

I can even give you who wrote that. But I don't think we should -- better not to get to that part of the discussion.

So if you agree, it would shorten the discussions and you start immediately from the subject. Present the resolutions, and you start and you don't discuss paragraph one nor paragraph two. And the middle of the paragraph three, you start the discussions -- present the resolution.

This is by way of suggestion.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Is it agreeable to you? Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I'm not prepared to agree right at this moment, because I wanted to make a broader introductory comment before I comment on this.

Casting my mind back to the formation of this CSTD working group, I believe by my count, I may be slightly wrong and the secretariat can correct me, but I believe of the 43 member states elected by ECOSOC to the CSTD that we have roughly 50% of the member states who are actually able to be members of the working group due to the balance that has been created, the five plus five plus five from the technical, business, and civil society, representatives from the IGOs but not the regional organizations, such as OECD, CITELE, et cetera. And then about 50%, and again, I say may get this slightly wrong, which means that we need to remember, in my mind, that one of the main audiences for this report will be the full CSTD, and as well as the broader audience.

So I just want to keep that in mind, that if a member state is in the working group but if business is in the working group or part of the technical community is in the working group, we maybe deeply steeped and familiar with the issues, but the report, of course, has to be easy to understand by a much broader audience who is in a different place from us in terms of level of detailed understanding.

With that in mind, that's what I'd like to keep in front of all of us as we go through, then, the preparation of the Chair's report.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn, for reminding us about the CSTD membership and the task of the CSTD. As you may know, the CSTD has a mandate -- in fact, it has two mandates. One what is called the traditional mandate of science and technology for development. The other mandate is the WSIS review.

It is always assumed that member states know what they are talking about. But it is always very good to remind newcomers about the relevant topics. So it's a very delicate balance how to find this way.

I think the introductory paragraphs reflect this kind of knowledge. What I assess from the proposition from Kavouss was we do know that here. So it's not needed to discuss in detail and he suggested us to go straight away to paragraph 3 and second half which talks about how this working group has been established and what is the working group itself.

So if you accept that I would like to proceed and go directly to paragraph 3.

Nigeria.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Actually, the announcement you made after the coffee break sounds a little bit of bombshell to some of us, because we so much appreciated your decision actually to visit some of the recommendations which were actually -- it was ongoing, and then I so much appreciate my distinguished colleagues that were following the issue. We know it's not an easy task.

So I was hoping that probably my inquiry, that of my delegation, could have been visited since I made some in the record.

So now there is to some decide there's nothing to debate on that. So that's what I was thinking it could be.

But if the Chair and the distinguished colleagues can be consistent, then okay, but if not, no problem.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigeria. I'm very sorry to disappoint you. Believe it or not, I'm disappointed, too. It was my real hope that we shall achieve much more here.

I knew that we couldn't achieve everything, but I hoped to achieve something more. Probably we have to find explanation for that. And I'm trying to find it, and trying to correct, eventually, in case we may continue our work.

But as I indicated, it's up to the CSTD to decide how this group is going to continue, if at all going to continue, and how its results will be taken on board.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, chairman.

I think you -- maybe you touched upon what I was going to ask about just now.

Is this a chairman's progress report or should it be considered a chairman's final report? Because it might influence what we would like to have in there.

If this is to be considered to be a progress report, maybe we can be very short, very high level. And you mentioned, you suggested previously that one alternative might be even an oral report instead of a written -- written one.

Were however, if this is to be considered to be the final chairman's report, we might want to elaborate a little bit more on the substance of the discussions that we have had here.

So that's a question and that we seek clarification on.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, for the time being, I consider it to be a chairman's progress report. I have indication that eventually CSTD may extend our work. So that's why I think it's going to be regarded as a progress report.

The view that we shall mention the previous works -- I mean, the whole process we were in. That is mentioning the four meetings we had. Very short. Capture what has happened during the four meetings.

India.

>>INDIA: Chair, thank you very much, and I think the approach that you have initially outlined, that you would like to keep a factual, kind of neutral, no judgment kind of progress report, I think that would be the most appropriate way, as we believe. Without any attributes to the nature of discussion. Because eventually, anywhere we get into substance, it could lead to quite unnecessary debate and discussion on how the report should be formulated. That in itself can become a topic in itself, and we could perhaps best avoid at this point in time.

I think most important thing from our perspective is that one -- that this working group has devised a number of ways and means to address this problem, address this task that has been given to it. I think that is -- needs to be highlighted, whether you wish to refer to the questionnaires, to our creation of the Correspondence Groups, to its outcomes, and what are the elements of it.

And more importantly, I think it should also give a sense of the members of the working group about the future. I think -- With that, I think we should try and wind up, rather than entering into a debate and discussion, except stating the fact that we did, of course, identify those five. Because part of the five categories that have been outlined, and then opinions have been elicited. I mean, that's the farthest, perhaps, you may wish to go. Of course, it's your report. We would encourage you to be as brief as it can get. And number two, I totally agree with the opinion of our colleague from Sweden, which -- wherein you could perhaps desire to have an oral report. In which case, it would -- obviously, it will be circulated, I'm sure, in the documents which will be eventually given to the members of the CSTD. And for anyone interested, the Web site that has been created for this working group has this wealth of information.

So I think we can -- We will be best done by keeping it as factual as it can get. Avoid any kind of, let's say, attribution or let's say opinion in the whole process.

Thank you, chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. For your information, I would like to tell you the CSTD is going to have its regular session starting from the 12th of May to the 16th of May. And according to the agenda, on the 14th. Wednesday, on the 14th, I believe from 16:30 to 18 hours, I will be giving my report, and we are going to have a big, big discussion on that. And judging from the last meeting of the CSTD last May, there was a considerable interest.

So I expect that there will be a kind of similar interest this year as well. And as you rightly pointed out, in that sense it will be an oral report, but naturally a paper from it will be circulated. And it will be, as I indicated, neutral and factual.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, most of my question was answered based on the question was made by Sweden and India. So again, an oral, let's say, reporting, precise, neutral, fair, will give the issue -- I mean a clear picture for CSTD members on how to go forward with the work (indiscernible) hand.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you. Two issues. One is that I understand that we have kind of done or not done our work, so I think taking a sense of closure to this meeting, it's good to spend very little time to get the sense of the group on what they see as the way forward, and whether there's a general sense to recommend to the group -- to the CSTD for continuation or at least one more meeting or not. And I do understand that independently, even if there's no agreement of the group, the chair on this particular point should be able to give his own recommendation. But getting the sense of the group would be useful in this regard.

And I have some mixed feelings, which I will put aside. But I think a quick discussion or a round on that would be useful.

And second was I heard that you mentioned something of the status of the recommendations, and I want to know whether there is any document that's going out of the meeting, unfinished work and as status of different kinds of text which we have been going through and whether that's -- that's a -- that's a document coming out -- going out of this room.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, as has been indicated by India, there's quite an amount of work which has been invested, and there's quite an amount of documentation which is available and which has been made available on the Web site.

So the idea is to have it made available on the Web site, but probably it's not going to be circulated in the CSTD itself. I can't really see the point of going into details in that body. It's not their task to go into detail. And these documents are kind of living documents or ongoing progress documents. So just for information, and it's not going to be distributed in the room.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Two or three small points. One is the status of this -- I saw in the first page you're talking of the working group report, which is in accordance with resolution. The resolution says working group should report to the CSTD. Then we can go to that and

approve that, according to the situation. Or if you want to read chairman's report, you want the support of the group, then still you have to process it in a way to be supported. But, if you want to write your own report without being discussed here, we can say -- you can put any report you want. It is up to the people at the CSTD to say yes or not they agree or disagree. I don't believe you were seeking for that because it would not be very good that at the meeting people are saying no, we don't agree. We want to continue to trust you on everything.

So I think that you have two options. Either taking a working group report, which is better in our view, or chairman's report approved by the working group. Both is possible. But chairman's report I think is better than working group report.

Now, with respect to whether or not you propose to have another meeting, I don't think that this group should propose it because it takes a lot of time. The people whether yes or no. It is better you give your status report according to the working group report and up to the CSTD to see what work needs to be further pursued. If they decide according to the other people, higher level or same level, it is better we do not mention the need or otherwise for continuation of the work. We can just give a status of the work. And the people over there are sufficiently wise and conscious to identify whether there is continue. With respect to what would be attached to that, that is something you have to mention sometime. But let's go, if possible, quickly to this if we can address it. And the way after this does not mean that we don't agree with what you put. You want to make it shorter. And it's better that you start from the heart of the matter. According to resolutions, you have this. And I can suggest you a small wording. And I think the secretariat may take it. And then you continue with the paragraph. There are some small changes that you propose. Others may have -- by the way, I'm not talking about others. I will be your guest up to 7:30. 7:30, I have to go. But you prefer that. I don't know whether this is sufficient time. At least we give my comments. But my distinguished colleagues are here. And my deadline is 7:30

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. Well, to answer your question, the purpose of this session right now, exactly what you said, to have your approval. And I intend to -- as indicated, to have it as a chair's report, a chair's progress report but with your approval. I don't really want to joke about things you may be aware of. And everything will be according to what has happened, neutral, impartial, factual way, but with your approval. Okay.

I will get back to you for the changes. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. And, after listening to other colleagues in the room, we agree with India and Saudi Arabia that an oral report if the group would be willing to task you with that along the lines of what was described by our Indian colleague and by our colleague from Saudi Arabia as something factual that is describing in a brief manner the process. Acknowledging the resources that exist on the Web site. And the fact that we have worked on five different categories that -- at this stage, although we have had extensive deliberations, we have -- at this stage, not managed to reach consensus on draft recommendations. Something along those lines. Very factual. We would trust you, chairman, to do

that in a short, brief, oral manner. We think that would probably be a more productive way of moving forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Does this mean that you don't intend to discuss the report as it is right now, or does it mean that after discussion you trust me to do it?

So my question, your intervention means that you don't intend to discuss the details of this report here and now?

>>SWEDEN: Chairman, I think if colleagues agree to put our trust in you to report along those general lines that were described by our Indian colleague, I think maybe it's not necessary to go through this text. Because my interpretation was that this was a draft of a written chairman's report and that maybe your oral report would be, by the very nature, shortened and maybe, of course, then leave out some of the elements that are in here such as recommendations, such as opinions, and so on.

I think that would not be part of such an oral report, I guess. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay, thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We trust you. Mr. Chairman, I'm seeking a point of clarification. What is the difference between oral report -- I mean implications, legal implications of oral report and written report?

Practically, here we are going to have oral report of the chair. It means we have to work on the matter from the scratch in CSTD again. And we're not going to send CSTD anything for last one year's work we have done. That will be the case, if we're going to have the oral report.

Is it the intention of the group to say we have done nothing or we have to start from scratch in CSTD?

I don't think that people are going to do that. Oral report means that. You're not going to give anything to the CSTD to continue on what we have done here.

Still, I'm -- I would like to hear from the chair or the secretariat the implications, different implications of the oral report and written report. And, Mr. Chairman, we'd prefer to have working group written report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I am honored by the trust you place in me. And I mean it. Personally, I prefer to have a short discussion on this paper. I want to have your endorsement on it. Now, the way we are going to call it, I prefer to have as a chair's report since we didn't come to conclusion. Had we come to some conclusion, I have nothing against having it as a working group report. However, I have a feeling that we have made considerable progress. We have come to some mutual understanding. We know our points of view. We know our differences. But we know, at the same time, that we're capable of overcoming our differences. We came so close in some very important issues. We were very, very close. As it happens, we couldn't manage it. But I'm confident that we will manage it. That's why I don't consider it to be as a closing document. I think it's a progress report. And I'd like to convey this

feeling to the CSTD itself. It's the wish that, eventually, if they agree, that we continue and conclude this very important task. Because we all know that this is very important. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: I'd like to agree with my -- with Iran about the need to have a -- I think this is what you are saying -- that there's a need to have a document that embodies the work that we have all done. It has nothing to do with the trust I have in the chair or the trust I have in all the other members. But time goes on. And documents are what we refer to to refresh our agreement and understanding.

And so I will go back to the point I made earlier when I introduced the fact that 50% of the member states of the CSTD are not a part of the working group.

I really feel that we ought to be able to agree on a factual report because we've lived through the facts for the past four meetings. And I think that would also strengthen the receptivity of the CSTD toward the output that is given to them.

I just want to say one final thing. In the version of the draft that we have in front of us, there's a paragraph 11 which makes a light reference to the correspondence group. And I think that, in particular, we also need to discuss what kind of supporting documents will be referenced or appended to the report, again, realizing that people receiving the information do need more detail.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. India. Before that, I really appreciate that you trust me. Thank you, Marilyn.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to add to what I've said little by little, it's our belief that this report of the chair is to report on the progress.

Number 2, it also gives an indication as we believe that it's a work in progress. Thereby, there is no conclusions. It further needs -- and you could perhaps convey the sense that the group would look forward to complete the task perhaps with an additional time/meeting, depending on how you want to phrase it. And also could refer to the Web site where we have this wealth of information.

So, with certain looking-forward features, it is going to give that impression naturally that the working group's work is inconclusive in nature. So, if that message is clear, then I think perhaps the apprehensions that this -- whether it is a final report or a progress report leading towards a final report, these two dimensions are addressed in your oral presentation, I think we would be moving forward. Because the challenges of entering into discussion on the text of it is -- I think it will be a rough ride. Because with this understanding that you would keep it factual, I think we would all be able to leave this responsibility in your hands. And we have full confidence that you will do that. There is no question that we have anything other than full confidence in you. Thank you, Chair

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it seems I've tried very hard to get a device from you. But you're pushing it back to me, which I'm comfortable with. So there's no problem.

But, anyway, let me ask you if there's something really striking which you think should not be in it, or is there something you think is not being reflected which should be in it?

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes, Chair. I agree that this is a useful approach to take assessment. I think 90% of it is factual of when the meeting happened, what happened. And people won't disagree much on. And, to respond to your comments, I think there are only perhaps some issues in the first paragraph where we are ascribing intentionality to the head of states having done something which they have done, which was to create ambiguity in the document, which are -- the two sentences are not really very particular. I'm going to leave it. I think that's the point.

And two places where the mandate of the correspondence group is given, I just want to add violated check (indiscernible) or description of the existing mechanisms. They also did analysis or at least a collision of the gaps in the policy making mechanisms.

So that though it's written that there's existing mechanism for the gaps part needs to be added in. For my judgment, when I go through it, I couldn't find anything else. And this was a kind of factual, I think, language, obviously, since the mandate is only a factual thing which can be added. Perhaps members can really directly go and see if there's anything which they have a problem with. And I really do hope that with an hour and a half, we could close this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Very useful. Anyone else on this issue?

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with those that have said I think this report, as you've written it -- sorry. My microphone wasn't in front of my face -- that this report that you've written is actually quite accurate and very good. I do think that you have perhaps the one thing to consider is that the work of the correspondence group, there were very definite recommendations, as there were, on that. And I don't know whether that is something that should be considered moving forward while everything else is being -- or I personally agree with the notion that this group pauses, that the state that it's in is saved. You know, as you say, there's a lot of good options. There's a lot of good words. There's a lot of good thoughts. I think you are correct. At times we came tantalizing close to something but had some barriers in terms of going that last bit. And I think that, after things like NETmundial have had a chance to sink in -- we just came from there last week, and only a few of us were there -- and the rest of the events that are going on this year have had a chance to transpire, that one can get back to these issues with greater clarity of thought and actually, perhaps, overcome those last barriers. So I think the notion of the status report with, perhaps, some emphasis on the correspondence group work and its necessity to continue, no matter what happens with the rest of this, is, you know, something that I would recommend to you as the person that needs to make the decisions on it. And, you know, that's what I had to suggest. And oh, yes. I should probably say like everyone else. But of course I trust you to do it right.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Phil, U.S., and then Constance.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. And good evening.

As I -- and I'll make this as the chair of the -- or one of the co-convenors of the correspondence group. As I indicated yesterday -- and you can probably pick it up from the transcript -- I made three proposals. And I would urge you to look at those proposals going forward. I think there was reasonable consensus in the room -- I wouldn't say total consensus -- as to the fact that it should be a living document and passed to the CSTD to take forward. With regards to the state of work, I did point out that there were proposals for some gaps that had come in after the deadline that we'd set for forwarding the document to you. And they weren't really considered by the correspondence group. There was, in fact, some pushback on the correspondence group. And, when I made the first intervention yesterday, I did draw your attention to the fact that that again could be pointed to in the transcript. So, with that in mind, I think one of the activities that could usefully be done at some point is deciding how the work that has been done can be used, taken forward, and further developed. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. Naturally, I'm going to consider all the proposals you have made and going back to the group, I'll report accurately. (Inaudible.) And I will forward these proposals to the CSTD. And it's up to the CSTD to decide. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to, perhaps, get a couple points of clarification in the draft as we received it. But, first of all, I have no issue with shortening the document for a factual and progress report as with the proposals that have been made regarding the introductory comments.

But on page 3, there are a couple areas in brackets regarding opinions and results of the mapping exercise that I presume were in -- more in line with the final report, potentially. So am I correct to assume that those would be taken out? Thank you.

Then just one remaining question in paragraph 10 and then the number 5, it refers to agreed recommendations. And can you express where we are with that status?

And would they be included here, or would it be considered as part of the record in the meeting efforts on the Web site?

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for the questions. Yes, your remark is pertinent. And, when this document was drafted, it was meant to be a final document. I expressed my optimism.

And well, naturally, the scribe record is not part of the document. And, as for the reference to approved contents aside from recommendations, they'll be referred to on the Web site. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we state previously, we need a very short neutral representation of what happened in the working group. We do want to create judgment of CSTD on

anything. This is on one issue. On the other hand, the work of the correspondence group. As we know, the correspondence group was established in order to help us here inside this working group to write recommendations. And, up until now, the correspondence group did not achieve fully as mandated. So we cannot go forward. It's an incomplete progress report. So this is one issue we are not sure of, I mean whatever should be done to the CSTD. We would be cautious to do this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. I agree with others that I think a written report from the chair would be more useful. We need to reflect the amount of work that was achieved within this working group and including the amount of work that went into the correspondence group and the mapping exercise. And, from a practical point of view, with the number of dialogues going on on Internet governance, it certainly seems to be useful to have written documentation coming out of this work. I would add that in case the work of this working group resumes, again, it would be good to have a written basis to start again our work. Thank you.

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

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chair. I was -- at some point I was a little confused. I heard discussion about oral report. And I was not quite sure whether this would exclude the normal practice of written report. But then from interventions, recent interventions by many participants, I thought that probably I was wrong and we're talking about written report and then the chair would be giving his oral presentation at the meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Your assessment is correct. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. This is regarding the intervention by the chair of the correspondence group. I'm not even talking about the partial gap analysis which was submitted by some members to which I would come later. But the original correspondence group report, as well as the new one, has a column which talks about gaps, apart from the column which talks about existing mechanisms. So the gaps are already there. And they were also there in the earlier report.

So, just to that extent, paragraphs 8 and 11, which talks about what was done by the correspondence group, speaks about existing mechanisms and the status of implementation but not the gaps which were also identified by the group. And I think it should be added, including identifying the gaps which were found and information regarding which was submitted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. This is the type of information I would like to hear. It's very, very useful. Thank you. So what is missing should be included.

Okay. Anyone else?

India, please.

>>INDIA: First take the floor again. I just want the final confirmation that there will be only one chairman's report, which contains -- it's an oral presentation, number one, and number two, characterizations will not be there. Like, for example, in para 10, what bothered the committee, for example, the group, in terms of we have dot -- there are three dots in there, what paragraph of the Tunis Agenda are most relevant to the process.

I think this is all covered by the very fact we have covered in 7 by defining the categories and the questionnaire that was devised. So all those things would give a fairly good sense of where we are.

So that's -- I mean, I need some clarification on that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So it will be a chairman's report, after the discussion with you, which will be presented orally. But there will be a written part. There will be a written paper. Naturally, in the room.

I mean, let's face it, in a U.N. body you like to have something written. If there is nothing written it, doesn't exist. It's as simple as that. And we do want it to exist. And I'm going to give the presentation based on this report which is not going to contain any judgment, any value judgment and so on.

Okay. Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, I understand from your last statement that we will have a chairman's report. We will approve it at this meeting, and then your oral presentation would be within the framework of that. Maybe not word by word, but you take the essence of that and present it at a meeting. And subject to the views of the participant or chairman, you may provide further clarification on that.

But you should not do -- you should not add additional things which were not discussed at this meeting, and so on, so forth.

This is understand, so in that case, (indiscernible) have to observe the (indiscernible) in Turkey, perhaps you start to go immediately to the report to see what we can do, and take some of the very few changes and then to approve that and then give it to you.

With the respect to the Correspondence Group, perhaps I think you should be cautious.

You can say views were expressed for the need of Correspondence Group but, however, this was not fully debated, and that's all. And so I think we have not yet discussed that. Unless you want to discuss that and get views that everybody agreed with the continuation of Correspondence Group, because we don't know because it depends what is the outcome of that.

So I give you the caution of the action to that, but this is a substantive issue.

Let's go to the report and try to finish it maybe one hour. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. If you don't have any general comment -- You do. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

It was our understanding that one of the benefits with having a chairman's report at this stage was that we didn't have to sort of, let's say, micro-manage the chairman's report or go through detailed drafting, and, rather, just voice specific concerns or questions that we would then take into consideration. So we would be in favor of such an approach along the lines of what India previously has outlined. And just to add two comments to that. It is then our understanding that -- well, paragraph 10, 11, and chapter 5 and 6 would most probably not be there.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think your understanding is correct.

So anything outstanding or something which absolutely needed to be corrected or wording should be changed?

I know it's perfect. I know the document is perfect on its own, but....

Yes, Iran.

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

Just want to be sure and to repeat it again that we are going to have a report by chairman, progress report, which we are going to approve it in the working group and will be presented by the chair orally to the CSTD.

Is that the case? Or we are not going to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: -- discuss it?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are going to discuss it, and I am waiting for your comments.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I am in your hands -- I am really in your hands. And if you have -- I don't -- If you don't have issues in greater lines with the report but you have comments on some details, this is the time to tell me.

But what I heard from your comments, you don't have issues with the whole -- with the report as a whole. You might have issues with some spots or some details which may be corrected or the wording may be changed. So I'm ready to take your advice.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you mean the report on the screen, yes, I'm waiting for my colleague to come and present to you the details.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Anyone else?

Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm getting confused, so please forgive me this question.

So I thought that this was essentially the chairman's report with some of the things that we have added, and that this is our chance to talk about it; that we won't be talking about it again at some other point; correct?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I might offer, then, a reference to paragraph 8. And I would propose a section under that, which probably is a subparagraph, which just gives a little more fact to the number of questions that were in the questionnaire and the number of responses we received. And then to describe just a little bit more the work that was done by the Correspondence Group. I'm not suggesting it go into any kind of analysis, but that there be a little more information.

Right now you read it, it says the group agreed to establish a separate Correspondence Group to continue the work between the meetings, agreed on its terms of reference, but the terms of reference aren't noted.

So we need to figure out if the terms of reference need to be noted or not. This is just a question.

And then I think, as I said, underneath that paragraph, another paragraph could include the number of questions that were included in the questionnaire, the number of responses that were received.

And then I'll pause at that point, since others may have comments about that.

But what I'm looking to do is just provide more facts. Short facts, but more facts.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. Probably the number of questions, the responders, and all the material related to that should come before the establishment of the Correspondence Group, but that's a detail, and probably it will be included.

Thank you for this remark.

Saudi Arabia.

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

If we go to paragraph number 4 --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Number 7.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I'm in paragraph number 4.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Number 4. Sorry. I understood "before."

>>SAUDI ARABIA: If we use the same language from the -- let's call it -- I didn't think it was the resolution. It was the composition decision. So members and invitees from private sector, civil society, (indiscernible) communities. We should reflect the same language agreed there.

And then in paragraph number -- number 5, this say that "work was also carried out electronically between the meetings." Do we mean discussions or exchange of -- We should be very clear what kind of work was carried out between the meetings.

The third issue is "member states and invited other stakeholders participating on equal footing." Such language is problematic. We invited others to participate in this group. Very general, very -- We should be very careful with these words.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: And our understanding from Iranian's first comments that paragraph number 1 would be deleted. Will go direct to the resolution, first one resolution.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's up to you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah, yeah. This our preference, to go direct to the resolution.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Anyone else?

Yep, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman. Because there are two of us working on the document, the part that I would understand, paragraph 1 and 2 would be deleted; paragraph 3, half of the paragraph and starting from the (indiscernible) resolution. And then I just give it to you -- leave it to you, but perhaps we don't need to say that the chair of the -- it's paragraph 4, chair of the CSTD of that time, Mr. (saying name), and so on, so forth. You just come that the meeting, that means your group chaired by Mr. Peter Major. That's all. You don't need to involve the ex-chair and previous chair and vice chair.

So you don't need to talk about this. You just talk about the group was established and chaired by Mr. Peter Major.

And then with representation from government and this and this and this. And whenever you have invited you talk about, they were invited, like international organizations and so on, so if they are.

So whenever you have invitees, you talk about the invitees.

Then in paragraph 5 you are talking that since the first -- Sorry. The third line, you talk of equal footing. We don't believe that you should mention, whether orally or written, as a equal footing. The way you have managed, it's managed, and you don't need to talk about that because this we have not discussed. We implemented without discussion. Nobody said that sometimes it would be better not to put in written form but to implement that. Equal footing, sometimes even if it's not equal footing. Sometimes it's whole different than equal footing. But I don't think you need to talk about equal footing.

Then the fourth line, "Since the first meeting the group opened its meeting to observers." We should even allow to a little bit shorten that. "The Chair allowed the observers to express themselves after the members." I don't follow that. You give the observers whenever they wanted. You don't need to say they were after the member states or before the member states. They have -- I didn't count when you have given them, so you don't need to make such a distinction between them, that they have -- when they have asked.

Coming to paragraph 7, then it says that "the questionnaire following the categorization suggested by the chair. The responses to the questionnaire were grouped." Perhaps we shorten that. You say that in its second meeting held in 6 to 8 November 2013, the working group reviewed and analyzed the responses received to the -- or by the questionnaires. That's all. And then given as follows, you go to the following category. And then 8, "The group started to identify."

Sorry, if you want, paragraph 7. Paragraph 7, the first line, "Analyzed the responses received."

And then if you want to talk of categorizations, you have to talk what categories, because category A, B, C, D, E, you have to mention that somewhere. Either here or elsewhere because you have mentioned it somewhere. It is mentioned in "A," but you have to have "as follows," these categories at the end as follows, and you have five categories with the capital A, capital B, C, and so on.

Paragraph 8, it says, "The group started to identify."

According to these categories.

I'm talking about 7. 7 at the end, "These categories as follows." "These categories as follows," and then you have A, B, C, D, whether capital or whether noncapital. And that's all. If you allow me, I read paragraph 7.

In its second meeting, held so on, so forth, reviewed and analyze analyzed the responses received to the questionnaire. Full stop.

And then you continue the responses were grouped according to these categories as follows.

Paragraph 8, you don't need to say the group started. The group identified categories of different public-policy issues. And then second line, "to which" -- okay. Second line. "To which they were pursued and status of implementation." I don't think you need "and status of implementation." They were pursued.

And then you start, "It was decided to request or solicit input from all the stakeholders to the above."

Paragraph 9, first line, no problem. At the end it says it's based -- it's based -- "it based its discussion on the so-called rolling document." What do you mean "so-called rolling document?"

So maybe you need to find another thing. "Which gathered together." That should also have another word, "Which gathered together." When you say "together," you have to have "with" after. "Together with the draft recommendations."

Then fourth line talks about divergence of opinion persisted in number of issues. You have to talk under what category. Here, the earlier that you have agreement, you have to put group C, D, E, and the area you don't have agreement, you put category A and B. You should go to the category rather than to the issues.

>> Kavouss, excuse me, request from the secretariat. Do you have that in written?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: I have it in this here.

>> Can you send it electronically?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Electronically, I have to (indiscernible) my finger to take. Sorry. Excuse me.

No Twitter, please. All the Twitter in the back, don't send our offices that we have a problem with the finger. Please.

[Laughter]

I don't want that tweeting.

[Applause]

If you are not in hurry, I will continue to do day after tomorrow, at home. I give it to someone to type it. With equal rights.

[Laughter]

And equal balance.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for the opportunity for general reactions and questions regarding the chair's progress report. And of course any number of us that take pen to paper welcome editorial comments, so -- to improve our text. So I hope those will be taken in the spirit in which they were provided.

One question -- One -- what I will suggest hopefully in improvement to paragraph 8 is to specify the group identified categories of different public-policy issues as were submitted in the questionnaire responses. I think that is one sort of cap element that is missing from there that I defer to the Correspondence Group or the terms of reference get the exact language. But I think that appropriately reflects what was not from thin air. It was from responses that were submitted. And I think that's an important clarification.

I think that may be it for now. But again, we have great trust in you, Chair, for your -- for your capturing of the chronology and content and discussions that we've had, and I look forward to the progress report in a week's time.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Liesyl, it seems to me that the secretary wasn't able to capture. So what you mentioned, that identify different public-policy issues based on the responses?

>>UNITED STATES: That had been -- Yeah, based on the responses provided to the questionnaire.

I think that covers it.

The group identified categories of different -- basis on the responses provided to the questionnaire pertaining to enhanced cooperation. Yeah.

You May need another comma.

Sorry, Claudia. I realized I tend to speak a little fast. Sorry.

I mean, I think that's fine. But anyone in the Correspondence Group want to correct? But I just wanted to capture the idea that they had been in the questionnaire responses, not devolved from thin air.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I've got three comments, Chair, currently. I may come back for more, you'll be glad to know. First is just on what Liesyl was indicating. You'll recall that we had over 400 public policy issues identified on our questionnaire, but, during our meeting last December was reduced to 200. I don't know if you want to make reference to the fact that those 60-odd responses generated the public

policy issue. The rolling document that Kavouss identified in 9 was the spreadsheet that we'd taken away and got some feedback to. So I'm happy to try to provide you with text to address the rolling document clarification, if that would help you.

Finally, Chair, in 11, if we keep your 11, to bear in mind the correction that Parminder gave me with regards to the gaps, I would suggest making an amendment in the third to last line where it says, "And the work to identify further information on the mechanisms," I would say to identify further information on both the mechanism and gaps within the mechanisms. As he quite rightly pointed out, there is some gaps analysis in that document. And, hopefully, that will address his concern. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. If we go to paragraph 10, it is then our suggestion that we stop at "should be subject to further discussion." Then the rest will be deleted. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. Thank you. I'm going to need to ask for clarification about what just happened on paragraph 10. But let me hold that and go back to paragraph 4. It now reads, "The chair of the CSTD of that time." I'm wondering if perhaps the secretariat could advise on a better phrase for that. It may be the chair of the CSTD and then the period of time. So that might be a small improvement there. Going down to the under two methodology under number 5, right now there's the first sentence starts "since its first meeting."

It probably would be better grammatically to say, "At its first meeting, the group opened its meeting to observers."

And I would propose to strike the sentence that says, "The chair allowed the observers to express themselves after the members." I think that would be consistent with a comment made earlier. And I would propose a small modification. And that would be -- so the previous sentence would read, "At its first meeting, the group opened its meeting to observers, both governmental and non-governmental, in the remit of the ECOSOC rules and regulations, and established a process to allow observer statements"

without going into when people spoke. I think that would accommodate the comment that was made earlier.

And then I'm going to go over to 10.

What I understood just happened was that the three bullet points were proposed to be struck. Is that correct?

I would think, though, that we have to rewrite paragraph 10. The second sentence says, "The group concluded the revision of the draft recommendation and reached consensus on a set of recommendations." Didn't we agree earlier that that paragraph is now going to have to be updated?

It would be "The group continued to discuss the revision of the draft recommendations." But I'm -- if we're not including recommendations where we have consensus, then probably that sentence has to be modified. I do think the sentence that says, "The group also noted a number of issues where divergent views persisted," I might use the word -- perhaps "persisted" is the right word. I would have said "where divergent views continued and which should be subject to further to discussion." And then we strike the three bullets. So it's mostly the second sentence I feel we should reach a revision on. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder, you wanted to add something?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes. Thanks to Phil for that amendment. But I would like to slightly revise it. Because it's -- it's not just the gaps within the mechanisms, of course. It is gaps vis-a-vis lack of any mechanisms or any mechanisms. So they are two different things. What was the analysis -- most of the point of analysis are not gaps within the mechanisms but gaps where there is lack of any mechanisms.

So -- yeah. Just find a good text which recognizes that. Thank you

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I may make my most helpful intervention of all time by suggesting that I just want to correct the issue on the rolling document. Because the rolling document, if I remember the naming conventions, really refers to the recommendations. So just to correct my dear friend Phil that that wasn't referring to the correspondence work -- correspondence group document, but rather the recommendations document. So it's correct in here. But, perhaps for ease and clarity, just take out rolling, so-called and rolling, so it refers to the recommendation documentation.

With regard to the mechanisms and gaps, I mean, since it's an ongoing set of work, can we just say gaps?

Thank you, Chair. Any pertinent gaps.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is my understanding correct that you're referring to the rolling document in paragraph 9?

And --

>>UNITED STATES: Yes, sir.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And what do you want us to do with that?

>>UNITED STATES: Oh, I was just trying to clarify it, base this discussion on the documents of -- which gathered together the draft recommendations. So take out "so-called" and "rolling."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Which document is that?

>>UNITED STATES: I think it has to be.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, I think so. In speaking order, India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If we could go to paragraph 10. I understand first report is not there. But then there are some corrections here. So first sentence is maybe all right. The fourth meeting of the WGEC was held. And then the group continued discussions on the draft recommendations and could not agree. And after that I understand the agreed recommendations are included in the following paragraph had to go, because this is not included here. The group was so -- also maybe we need to have some sentence that discussions were not concluded, need to continue or, if you need to have some divergent view or not -- I'm not very clear here that what you would like to represent here. Because we don't have the agreed conclusions here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Do you have some specific text?

>>INDIA: No.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Don't be shy.

>>INDIA: The group could not be concluded. So the discussion was not concluded. I don't have precisely the right at this moment. But then maybe I'll come back. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You can come back later. Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We feel confused now jumping from paragraph to paragraph, from line to line. This is very clear that this is a drafting exercise. So let us go word by word and approve it. Otherwise, I cannot follow the whole discussion. We agreed in a time to delete this. Now others come and make --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I think you are not alone who is a bit confused. I'm confused myself. So let's go. Okay. Let's start with the new paragraph one starts with in its resolution, establishment of the working group. Is it agreeable as it is?

Can you read the numbers?

Sweden, yes.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think this is what we wanted to avoid.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>SWEDEN: And maybe an alternative is that, now we have given our general input, views on things that we want to see included and things that we would prefer not to be included. Then my proposal would be that the secretariat would take these recommendations on board and revise text accordingly. Come back in a week, send it out to us, and then we can approve it. There is no point of us sitting here hour after hour going through in detail whether or not we have had two questions or three questions or whether we should mention that we have had two questions or three questions or a number of questions. And, if we have had 69 or 68 responses or a number of responses and so on and so forth.

I really fail to see the value of what we are doing here.

I think it would be much more productive to task the secretariat to take our comments on board and come back to us. And we have full trust in your judgment and your fair assessment of our comments. And, if there is any unclarity, I think we are all available. We have e-mails. We have phone numbers, and we can consult. This might be a very lengthy exercise that we're getting involved in now.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. I asked for your advices. I got your advices. And I'm very grateful for that. And I believe it's really time to stop it. And, as you indicated, based on your trust, I am able to have reflection of what has been said here and have this report as neutral as possible and factual as possible.

As for getting back to you, I'm not really sure that it's possible. Due to the rules here at UNCTAD, a document has to have a number. And it's so complicated a decision that I'm not able to understand. But, in brief, it will take a week to push through this document in order to have it at the CSTD.

But I have your trust that I'm not going to put into this document anything which hasn't been discussed. And I think we have gone through the document. And I really thank you for that.

Nigeria, you want to take the floor on this?

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I think there's nothing much different from what my (indiscernible) colleague has said. I just want to say that he is not alone. I really endorse what you said. We have confidence in you. And we fully support the decision you have made (inaudible) So thank you, Chair.

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

>>INDIA: Chair, one last dimension which we need to reflect in our report to the CSTD relates to the time that group meets or number of meetings that it meets. There was a comment on that that would help the CSTD to arrive at some kind of, you know, concrete decision. Because the CSTD itself -- CSTD decides on behalf of ECOSOC. So this ECOSOC resolution, when adopted in July, would actually give conceptual shape for the convening of the working group meeting. That becomes a legislative mandate. From that perspective, I know you have the prior experience.

If you could just give us some clarity based on your understanding, we complete our reports for the evening and go home and have a good weekend. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have good news. I have talked to the security, and we can stay over the weekend. No. More seriously, yes, you're right. We have to -- it would be advisable to propose something to CSTD. What I have in mind we need one or at least two meetings. My intention indicates we have the intention to have a meeting in September and the last meeting middle of November, end of November, after the plenipotentiary conference of the ITU. I think this will give us enough time to conclude our work with the new information we have. By then, I think in New York, there will be some decision about the modalities of the WSIS review. And in the ITU, there will be also a new management team in place that is decisions about the ITU strategy plan, budgetary plan, and so on and so forth. So -- which will have all the available information.

And this also leaves the possibility of contributing to the upcoming Secretary General's report and to have a final report for the CSTD on its next meeting in 2015 with a view that it will go through the same way as indicated in my introductory remarks to ECOSOC to the general assembly and to really feed into the WSIS review.

That's the way I see it. As I indicated, I can see one or two meetings with the dates I indicated. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you. On the side of the delegation, we do have -- I mean, we didn't have instructions at this moment for extension. So --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's not to us.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: We don't want to prejudge.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, I'm not prejudging. I was asked a question how I see it.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah, okay. Is this going to be in the report?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. It is not going to be in the report. It will be in my oral presentation. I'm not going to prejudge anything, because I have no right to do that.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: This will be decided during CSTD.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I agree.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for chairing those observations. I think they were helpful. I would just ask that for all of us to consider the option, if there are to be two more meetings, I think we need to all have a chance to consider the agenda of meetings between now and the end of the year before a date is chosen. So, yes, we have the decision to take up at CSTD. But we also have to -- each of us has to consider the timeline of existing committed meetings that are on the agenda.

And, personally, I wanted to nominate a particular date for everyone to take into account. It would always be good to be in Geneva again for my birthday over the U.S. Thanksgiving holiday. Okay. That part was a joke.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right. Okay. Thank you, Marilyn.

Naturally, in case CSTD did decide to have this extension, I will start a consultation with the members of the group about the time and the duration of the meeting. I'm not going to take any decision on my own. I promised you, I will take into consideration. And probably I will have to take the decision after I have gotten your input.

Okay. So Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: One last question: What would be the title now for this document?

Is it chairman's report or chairman views or -- no. I think it's better to say chairman's report. Thank you

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Okay. So after that, it -- I have the task of concluding. First of all, I would like to thank all of you for your patience, for your contributions, for the discussions we had. I think it was a very useful meeting, in spite of the fact that we didn't manage to conclude.

And I am really hopeful that, in case we have the extension, we can come back with a new spirit, build on the results we had up until now and come to a real conclusion which will be quite valuable and which will be a very good input for the WSIS review.

So, once again, I thank you.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the secretariat for the preparation. And I would like to thank the scribes for the work which might not have been very easy, especially the late session we had yesterday.

I have been asked if we are planning to have a late session, and I gave the reply yes. So it may be some satisfaction that we are going to complete our meeting now. So thank you again. And have a safe trip back. Thank you.

[Applause.]

***Live Scribing by Brewer & Darrenougue -

Www.quicktext.com***