

Transcript Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced

Cooperation

24-28 February 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Day 1

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

24 February, 2014
Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation
10:00 a.m.
Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm pleased to welcome you here in our meeting, which is the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation, and I'm very pleased to see so many people coming to this meeting. I think it's going to be a big success.

I can see the expectations on the faces, and I have my expectations as well.

Before giving some introductory remarks, let me take the opportunity of introducing you to the secretariat. On my left, Anne Miroux, who is the head of the secretariat, director, UNCTAD.

To her left is Padmashree, who is also part of the secretariat and she was looking after us during the two meetings before.

On my left, we have a brand-new face, Mervi.

[Applause]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm pleased to greet her here next to me on my right. It's a bit unusual, but I'm very pleased to have her here. We are in good hands.

And Claudia, who is standing over there, who is looking after the remote participation, with which we have some problems but it will be cleared out.

We have Giuliano Luongo, and I think we have another person, (saying name), as well.

I think UNCTAD has provided us the necessary support and I'm very grateful for that.

So as you may know, the meeting is open in the sense that we provide remote participation, we provide real-time captioning and transcripts at the end, audio streaming, and those who registered could come to the meeting as observers.

I would like to take this opportunity to call your attention to the sheets on the tables at the very front part of the tables where you have the list of participants.

If you would like, I would encourage you to write your name and the necessary data which is requested in order to be -- for the secretariat to provide the appropriate accurate data who has attended the meeting.

Okay. So probably I'm not going to talk much more about the logistical part, so I would like to start with the introductory remarks.

So this is our third meeting and hopefully, as it is an one-week meeting, I hope to be able to finish it by Friday at 6:00. If I'm optimistic, I would like to finish it by Friday noon and let you go to see Geneva yourselves. Eventually to have an organized tour, sightseeing.

But in a more realistic tone, we have a lot of work to do and we have been mandated by the United Nations General Assembly resolution which is the Resolution 67/195, which was passed in 2012, which invited the chair of the CSTD to establish a working group on enhanced cooperation to examine the mandate of the World Summit on Information Society regarding enhanced cooperation through seeking, compiling and reviewing inputs from all member states and all other stakeholders, and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate.

This is quite a challenge.

We have to report to the CSTD in 2014. That is the 17th session of the CSTD this May.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the mandate has been reiterated last year in the UNGA Resolution 68/198.

So I show you this picture, which is a graphical representation of the whole process.

So it started in 2012 with the UNGA resolution.

The working group has been established by the beginning of last year.

We had compiled a questionnaire to seek the inputs from the stakeholders.

And we are in the evaluating phase, and hopefully by the end of this meeting, we will be able to provide a list of recommendations and a report to the CSTD which will be convened in May, on the 12th.

And as you may know, the CSTD has the mandate to review the WSIS process, and it has a draft resolution which is a resolution of the ECOSOC and in which we will be mentioned. Our work will be

mentioned and probably the results will be annexed to the resolution itself, and it will be discussed during the CSTD meeting in May and the ECOSOC meeting in New York I think sometime in June-July.

And finally, the ECOSOC resolution will go to the second committee of the United Nations and it will -- and that's why the circle is closed.

Once again, I would like to call your attention to the working modalities we have.

We have compliance with the mandate. That's very important. The working group has been established as a multistakeholder working group. So I believe during our first two meetings, we managed to build a mutual trust. We listened to each other, we listened very carefully to each other, and I hope we trust each other.

I would like to have results, and the results on consensus.

If we don't achieve consensus on some issues, then we don't reach it.

You can see in the room observers. For observers, we applied the ECOSOC rules and we had the agreement during the first meeting to allow observers to the meeting.

Naturally, we have constraints. Even though we are going to have a five-day meeting, we have the time constraint.

We had some constraints on the resources. We were told that the working group should be kind of based on voluntary funds, but we managed.

We had a constraint on the venue. You remember on the first meeting we couldn't have a meeting here in the U.N. Now this is settled as well.

And one of the most important parts is, sharing information with stakeholders.

To this end, I hope that we have all information on the CSTD working group Web site.

Just to recall that we had our first meeting, which is a 1 1/2-day meeting, which was an extremely efficient meeting. It was last May.

The second meeting was last November, a three-day meeting.

And we are going to have this five-day meeting here and now.

So we have the obligation of providing the report and a list of recommendations by the beginning of March, which is another constraint, because the report and the recommendations have to be translated into five languages to be able to be -- that we will be able to present it to the CSTD session in May.

So as I mentioned in the first meeting, I would emphasize the excellent collaboration of the participants. It was really very good. We decided on procedural issues and we had two breakout groups. One of them was run by Brazil, the other one was by India. And I think it worked perfectly well.

So I intend to follow some similar pattern.

The two breakout groups, and after that, the plenary, identified categories, and the plenary finalized the questionnaire that we have sent out.

You remember we had 17 plus 1 questions, so -- in order to be able to get the input from the stakeholders, and we had it.

On the second meeting, we made real improvements as far as the logistics were concerned.

As I mentioned, we had audio recording, streaming, captioning, and transcripts, but most importantly, we did the substantial work. We discussed the responses to the questionnaires. There was a compilation, a summary of the question- -- of the responses, and we decided to group the responses into five groups.

At the end of the meeting, I asked you to submit your draft recommendations and we had quite a lot of them during -- already on the second meeting.

During this meeting, we also had a proposal for the structure of the report, and in the meeting we decided to set up a correspondence group with the aim of mapping of existing mechanisms to international fora.

I have to stress again that during the second meeting we had also a very, very good collaboration of the participants. So after the second meeting, we received the contributions from the members for the draft recommendations. Up to the deadline, there were eight governments, one civil society, and one business entity who answered or submitted recommendations. I will come back to what happened after the deadline.

Basically, I would have expected a bit more, but that's how life is. We had that much.

We have input from the correspondence group on public policy issues and possible mechanisms.

The correspondence group, which worked on the terms of reference we accepted during our second meeting, did an enormous job. I would like to express my gratitude to all the participants of this group and I would like to express my gratitude also to those who submitted draft recommendations, and especially would like to stress the work of Phil Rushton and Joy Liddicoat who have co-chaired the correspondence group.

The results will be reported to us, I think, in the afternoon and we have, of course, a compilation of the contributions for the correspondence group.

As I mentioned, we had further contributions.

After the extended deadline, we had draft recommendations, and I'm also grateful to those who, even after the deadline, submitted recommendations because it will help us to do our work.

These recommendations are reflected in the rolling document, which I'm really grateful to the secretariat who compiled this rolling document, and sometime -- probably we didn't have time because the last one came, I think, on Friday afternoon so we didn't have time to elaborate to place in the proper places, but I think even though, it helps us a lot.

Last, but not least, I would like to mention that we are working in an ecosystem in parallel with other activities. There are other activities going on.

There is the WSIS review process and in this review process there was a significant meeting in the ITU, I think two weeks ago or last week. I'm not sure. There are so many events going on at the same time.

Anyway, and there was the IGF preparation for the 9th IGF in Istanbul.

And just to mention, there's the Net Mundial, which is the event in Sao Paulo in April, which will come up.

Before going to the substantial discussion, let me take this opportunity to ask those present who had some substantial work in the events I mentioned -- and I think about the representative of ITU, the secretariat of IGF, and the representative of Brazil -- that after my presentation, just give us some brief where we are, where we are going. This is for information only.

So as I mentioned, for our third meeting we have resources. We have the draft recommendations, which are contributions from the working group members.

We have a recommendation -- or proposals for the structure of the report.

We have the compilation of the contributions of the correspondence group.

And all these can be found on the CSTD Web page.

You will find on the Web page as well -- and you have been sent out -- the draft agenda and time management. I don't think that we have very special things in this agenda. We have to work. It's as simple as that.

We have a lot of work to do, and we have to think how to do it best.

We have to discuss the five topics -- A, B, C, D, E -- in plenary, and I suggest to have, for the drafting exercise, two breakout groups, but it's up to you if you think that is a good way forward.

Our objective is to have a list of recommendations, as I mentioned.

Probably we'll need more time for the Topic B, which has been dealt with in the correspondence group.

As I told you, we have already a proposal for the structure of the report, and I would like to reflect the discussions in a so-called rolling document which will be projected, I think, on the screen, so you will be able to see it.

So you will have two visual aids. One is the capturing, real-time capturing, and you will have the rolling document.

So we have to finalize these recommendations and we have to consolidate the report.

I expect from you to concentrate on substantive discussions. I don't really want to go into the things about procedural issues. I know that it is very tempting to go into procedural issues, but I don't want to do that.

My objective is to create a set of recommendations.

As for the report, I think the report should reflect factual descriptions of the meeting, and I suggest that once we agree on the structure of the report, let me take the responsibility of writing this report, with it only containing the factual description what has happened, and I think this way we will have more time for discussions. The essential part of our work is the list of recommendations.

So I expect from you to find points of agreement, and in the very, very unlikely case of not being able to agree, I suggest that the differences in views will be reflected in the annex to the report.

So the suggested time management, I would like to have the sessions from 10:00 in the morning to 1:00 p.m. before the lunch break. I would like to have, if time allows, to have an observer segment, 15 minutes. Coffee break will be from 11:30 to 11:45 and we work until lunch break.

And in the afternoon, we start at 3:00 up to 6:00, once again, a 15-minute segment for observers with a coffee break.

So the suggested working method, I suggest to have a plenary discussion today, tomorrow, and eventually Wednesday morning. But it is really very flexible. As I already mentioned, I would like to have two breakout drafting groups which would start the work on Wednesday afternoon, Thursday and Friday morning with the idea that they would be doing their work with the alternative -- alternating with the plenary. That is, after 1 1/2 hours, we would come back, have a plenary session, discuss the results and go back again to drafting.

Friday afternoon, or eventually morning, I would like to have a list of accepted recommendations. And I would take the opportunity to ask for your guidance as far as the final report in case you have any suggestions to give to me.

What is our role? And we have to see it clearly. We contribute to the WSIS process, recommending ways and means of enhanced cooperation. I'm sure we all know the importance and the complexity of the issues and our tasks, but I'm also sure that we all see points of agreement and compromise. As I told you in the unlikely case of difference of opinions, we come to some compromise.

And last, but not least, I can feel and I'm sure that we are all motivated and very ambitious but realistic statement.

So having said all of that, I wish you a very fruitful meeting. And I count on each and every one of you. And what I would like to ask from you, to listen, listen, listen very carefully to other people what they have to say and assume that everything, what is said, is said in good faith. I do assume it is in good faith.

These were the introductory remarks.

Any questions, remarks before I would give the floor to the representative of ITU to give us a three, four-minute brief about the WSIS+10 MPP. After it, I would like to give the floor to the secretariat of the IGF to give us a review and then to Brazil.

Yes, Kavouss.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. We listen to you, and we will listen to you and to everybody.

Good morning, everybody. Happy to see you again here. Chairman, just a very small general comment. The work we are doing is the continuation of what we have started in May 2013 with respect to the enhanced cooperation. And everybody remembered enhanced cooperation was the item that was negotiated in the last day of WSIS, almost last day, proposed by some colleagues in order to get out of the impasse.

Chairman, important things have occurred in 2013, very important. We don't want to refer to any specific issue, but an important point has occurred. The situation now gets a different dimension and, in fact, may have to go in different directions. There are a lot of activities all around the world, including a probable meeting which would be 23rd and 24th of April in Sao Paulo. We don't expect to make a miracle but to give us a way forward. So we should also take that into account.

If the enhanced cooperation is a follow-up action with respect to the Internet governance, this is an issue that is now on the table with a lot of concerns for many people.

We also should take into account things have occurred recently in Europe. I don't want to mention to anything, but there has been a proposal that may also have directions or impact on our work. These are general points.

Now, coming to your suggestion, we have to make a recommendation, yes, but we have to make a recommendation on what? We have to be very, very careful that our recommendation should be clear, precise, concise, and on point with respect to paragraph 59 and 72 of the WSIS Tunis Agenda.

We should avoid to have words and expressions which would not be implementable. We have been waiting for nine years, and we should not wait for another 10 or 12 years. They should be implementable. They should guide us to provide the way forward to what we have difficulty.

Third comment, we are very, very grateful to Mr. Rushton and his group. However, the level of participation is very, very low. You said eight governments, yes, but not eight governments on all issues.

In some issues, only three governments. And in one issue, maybe six or seven. So the level of representation is very, very low, does not represent the views of the entire community.

From now on, I don't call anything government or private sector and so on and so forth. All of the community, whether you call them a stakeholder or whatever you want, those who are involved, very, very low representations.

So we should take that also into account. We will question if we base ourselves on that, we will have a difficulty that it is a limited expression and limited view. So we have to take into account that one as well.

We have seen the document from one stakeholder -- I call them stakeholder, which is a government, India -- propose a structure is good. In that document, it refers to the mapping. It is a very, very important element. You have to find out to map.

For the time being, I have not seen any procedures or any way or any direction with respect to that mapping. So we have to also take that into account.

So as I say, Chairman, I don't want to go further. I just limit myself to that. It is a very important situation. Onward from the 24th of April, we might have a new direction. We may have a new road. We may have a new roadmap and so on and so forth, and we have to take that into account. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

As for your first remark, I have asked Brazil to give us a brief about the upcoming event. And it might have avoided your attention, although I didn't express myself clearly.

As for the second, thank you for reminding me I had a small paper in my pocket concerning recommendations. And I wrote exactly what you said. The recommendation should be broad, implementable, not too weak, understandable and future-oriented.

And as far as the third one, probably I wasn't clear either about the contributions. When I said eight countries, this number has increased to 11, I believe. And I was referring to the draft recommendations from the members of the working group.

As for the correspondence group, we have what we have. We asked for broad participation, and that was the response. And I'm real grateful to the co-chairs of the correspondence group that they were doing this extremely hard work and they tried their best with the material which was available.

I don't pretend that this is a complete representation of the entire community, but we have to do what we have to do and with the material we have.

So thank you, again, for these remarks and reminding me of some of the notions I didn't convey to you.

I can see Sweden asking for the floor. And after that, I would like to ask the ITU representative, the IGF representative, and Brazil to give us the short brief which I believe is quite important for the continuation of our work.

Having said that, I intend to have these informations only as information. Our mandate has been fixed in the General Assembly's resolutions, so I don't want to deviate from that. I don't want to prejudge any outcome of the upcoming meetings.

I just want you to inform about what is going on, and you may formulate your opinion in the way you feel like.

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning to all colleagues. We had a couple of comments on the proposed agenda. I don't know if you want me to take those now or to wait until later. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>SWEDEN: Okay, thank you. First of all, I think it's very important that we avoid a situation on Friday afternoon or evening, in the worst case, where we leave this meeting with unclarity on what we have actually agreed upon in terms of the report of this meeting in terms of the draft recommendations and so on.

Therefore, I wonder if it wouldn't be preferable to have the first day as -- maybe first day evening as the deadline for finalizing the recommendations and then only do some, let's say, scrubbing on the text on Friday so that everyone can leave here on Friday knowing exactly what we have agreed to and what was the outcome of this meeting.

And related to this, I would like to ask if it's needed to have 2 1/2 days with more, let's say, higher-level discussion on the -- on the different topics, if we could start the work with drafting recommendations maybe a day earlier or so.

Also, a question related to the report. My understanding of what you just said before was that we would have a chance to look at the report that you have -- that you will produce and sort of at the meeting here will approve the report. We seek clarification on that.

And in terms of the main sort of structure of the report, that is, of course, very important and we think - - thank India for starting the work with this. But we think it's really important that we do some work in this -- maybe here today or tomorrow on deciding what should be the structure of the report before we give the task to you, Chairman, to actually start working on the more detailed reports.

I just wonder if that is factored in here in today's or tomorrow's schedule, that we will have a dedicated session or break into a smaller group to discuss the specific structure of the report of the meeting. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. As I indicated, getting back to the report, I ask for your guidance on that issue. It is really up to you how you would like to have it in case you think it's only a technical document reflecting what is going on during the three meetings, and the results will be reflected in the annex that is in the list of recommendations. And eventually, as I said, in the unlikely event of not being able to come to some compromise, the reflection of the differences of opinion, in that case, probably it will be a bit superfluous to go into the case of the report.

On the other hand, if you think that the report itself has its value in the sense that it also conveys substantive information, it is naturally up to you to decide how the report will look like.

Also up to the plenary mode, it is up to you. If you feel that eventually we don't need the allocated time I intended for the discussions, it is really up to you to say so. But I believe as we proceed, we will see how we can go ahead.

I'm sure that for the discussion of the results of the correspondence group, we need some time. And we need some time eventually at least to have a flavor what the draft -- draft resolutions are.

But I'm also in favor of finishing quite quickly and going to the drafting exercise. I'm very flexible on that.

Anyone asking for the floor before I give the floor to the ITU and then to IGF and, finally...

Oh, U.S. and Saudi Arabia.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Chairman. I think that we would agree that the report is quite important and deserves some attention. Just as I think the Iranian delegate said, we would like to thank Mr. Reddy from India for his effort in providing an outline for such a report. Again, we consider the report important. It provides context for all the work that we're doing.

Chairman, we would think that the report would reflect as accurately as possible our discussions, our decisions. It would reflect dissenting views. And most importantly, it would highlight areas of consensus that I know that you're looking for and constructive recommendations for achieving enhanced cooperation.

We do have a number of comments regarding Mr. Reddy's proposed outline, and we would be very happy to share them with the larger group. It may be, Chairman, too that as we have perhaps a more extended discussion on what the report looks like because, as I say, we think it important to give context to the reader when the reader reads the recommendation, it might even be useful to take a look at General Assembly ECOSOC reports that have come on out on the topic of enhanced cooperation.

I have one in my hand. It looks like this one is from the 4th of May, 2011, enhanced cooperation on public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. It has background and organization and so on and so forth.

So, chairman, to summarize, we think the report is very important. We think it is important because it provides context for the recommendations. We thank Mr. Reddy for his work. We do have comments that we want to share with the group regarding his proposed outline, and we look forward to a fuller discussion. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, colleagues. First, we want to thank India for its draft report structure which we support.

But I think the aim of this working group is to come out with a set of recommendations on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation as in Tunis Agenda.

So our focus should be on writing these recommendations. Then we can focus on the report about how we put the recommendations in the report. To focus on the report, we'll understand how is the structure, then we come to the last days without recommendations. So whatever, without a set of recommendations, it means that we didn't do anything to fulfill our mandate.

So our focus should be on writing recommendations to enhance cooperation as in UNGA resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to all. Just as a clarification, whether - I'm not able to understand whether the report and the recommendations are two things with two different processes and authorities behind it or a single thing because as I go back to the report of the working group on IGF improvements, I see the recommendations -- I mean, there's a single report which was adopted by the group, and the recommendations are inside that report.

So just a clarification whether they are two things or one things and whether one is IGF report and recommendations of -- the group's recommendation because in the IGF improvement, as I said, it seems to me it is a single thing.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. As I indicated -- And I want to answer to the comments from U.S. and Saudi Arabia. It is really up to us how we are going to form it. If you think it's important to have a detailed discussion on the structure of the report and the content of the report, I'm open to that.

However, I was of the opinion that probably we should concentrate on the recommendations. But if you feel that the report is equally important, as Parminder pointed out, that it should be one single document, I have no problem with that either. So it means that -- in that case, we probably should allocate some more time on the discussion on the report itself, eventually to have an ad hoc group to discuss it eventually during lunch breaks or dinner breaks or night breaks or whatever breaks.

But we have to be aware that if we undertake this exercise -- and I think it's very important -- then we should allocate enough time for that.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I will open my comments by introducing myself because I am so pleased to see that the participation and attendance in our meeting is, in fact, expanded.

My name is Marilyn Cade and I am one of the five business participants in the multistakeholder examination that this working group represents.

It's really quite pleasant to be here with all of the members of the participants in the working group but also to note the expansion of the observers and participation from member states, from IGOs and from all other stakeholders.

So let me just say that I'm actually quite thrilled to be in a crowded room.

I want to go on now to the substance of my comment.

We're in a unique situation that I made reference to last week in two other meetings where I made comments.

One, the WSIS+10 meeting and the second, the IGF consultation. And that is that we have been given a rare opportunity and I think it's important that our report reflect this opportunity.

We have a mandate. It's quite clear what our mandate is. But we are all aware that circumstances have elevated the awareness around the world to all stakeholders, heads of state, governmental officials, civil society, of interest in Internet governance and in what enhanced cooperation means.

I think in our report we must take on responsibility to explain our processes and what we have done, as well as to focus in on our recommendations, to be fair to the readers who will be very widely distributed, I think, because of the increased interest in this topic, as well as fair to the CSTD discussions in May, to the ECOSOC discussions, and then to the U.N. General Assembly discussions.

So I support the chair's proposal that we pay more attention to the report, and that we also, of course, prioritize the development of our recommendations, and while not speaking for anyone else from the business community, welcome the additional focus that we will make on the report.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

If no one's asking for the floor, just let me summarize that I can see a clear preference to have a single report with the recommendations with the background information summary to -- to inform the broader community about our efforts and the significance of our work.

I would like also to emphasize that it's not only an elevated interest, but I believe that we are in a privileged situation. We live in a time when we can contribute and we can seriously contribute, so I would like to ask you to take this opportunity.

And now I would like to ask the representative of ITU to give us some short information about the ongoing events related to the WSIS+10.

>>ITU: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's my pleasure to present an update on the WSIS+10 high-level event multistakeholder preparatory platform, MPP, which is an open and multistakeholder consultation process, primarily to develop two outcome documents, the WSIS+10 vision and the WSIS+10 statement.

To date, we have received nearly 380 submissions towards this process, and we have completed the first readings of most of the action lines. As many of you have been attending the process with a lot of comments and recommendations, you already know where we are, but for the benefit of this meeting, I would like to update you about the phases.

So we just finished the third phase last week, on the 17th and 18th, where we completed the first readings on all the action lines and there were certain outcomes that came out of the meeting which are already on line.

The fourth phase is the fifth physical meeting, which will be held on the 14th to 18th of April at the ITU headquarters in Geneva, and the fifth physical meeting will be held from the 28th to 31st of May in Egypt.

So the venue on the city is yet to be confirmed, but, however, Egypt very kindly offered us to host the fifth physical meeting.

The high-level event will take place -- it's scheduled to take place on the 13th -- 10th to 13th of June in Geneva, and we will be providing all the updates on the Web site as soon as it is ready and confirmed.

So for the next physical meeting as it was requested by most of the participants and stakeholders, the focus will be on implementation of the WSIS outcomes during the 10 years, and we would be looking at the implementation aspects of the WSIS+10 statement and vision.

As far as the high-level event is concerned, we have received quite a few -- information about quite a few parallel events that are taking place during that time and as we had already announced, we will take note of these and make all attempts to ensure that they don't clash with the high-level segment of the WSIS+10 high-level event.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. And now I would like to turn to Chengatai to give us some brief about the upcoming IGF in Istanbul.

>>CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much, Chairman.

We held our open consultation and MAG meeting on the 19th to 20th of February, last week. That was Wednesday and Thursday. And Ambassador Janis Karklins became the new interim chair at that meeting, taking over from Mr. Markus Kummer.

We have a review of the IGF 2013, what worked well, what could be improved for the next 2014 meeting, and the host country gave a presentation of the facilities, the venue, and also of what they're doing to prepare for the meeting.

The next meeting, in case you don't know, is the 2nd to 5 September in Istanbul, Turkey.

We also had a discussion on the themes and subthemes.

For the subthemes, there were eight that were selected and these are: Policies enabling access; content creation, dissemination and use; Internet as an engine for growth and development; IGF and the future of the Internet ecosystem; the fifth one is enhancing digital trust; the sixth is Internet and human rights; seventh, critical Internet resources; and eight, emerging issues.

The main theme has not yet been finalized but we hope to do that on line.

And just to say that everything was discussed in light of the report on improvements to the IGF, so we kept those in mind while we were discussing the meeting.

The next meeting, we plan to have it in May. We have not yet finalized the dates because there's so many things happening in May and we just have to figure out where it's going to be. We're going to try and have it in Geneva. If not, we're looking for alternate venues.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chengatai.

Just one remark for those in the room who had been the -- involved also in the working group on the improvements to the IGF.

The recommendations of these -- of that group are being taken very, very seriously. During the consultations, it has been emphasized many times that the IGF should follow implementing those recommendations, and personally I believe the IGF is on the right track in implementing the recommendations.

We have already seen very, very promising signs during the last meeting in Bali. The public policy issues were in the front, front. The IGF itself had a lot of bilateral and multilateral consultations. And especially in view of the upcoming event in Sao Paulo.

So with that, I would like to give the floor to the representative of Brazil to give us some information about that event.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for allowing me to give a brief update on the preparatory work on the global multistakeholder meeting on the future of Internet governance that's going to take place in Sao Paulo, 23rd and 24th of April.

Before talking about the preparatory work, I think it's worth mentioning that this is an event that is not being organized by the Brazilian government. It's an event that's being organized by the global multistakeholder community, and the entities responsible for the organization of the meeting is first the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, the CTI, together with the 1net coalition.

The Brazilian government is, of course, taking part in the preparation, but I think it was worth mentioning that this is a multistakeholder approach.

As you know, the expected outcomes for this meeting is a first set of universal principles for the -- for Internet governance and a roadmap for the future evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem.

The preparatory work has been conducted by four committees. We have a high-level multistakeholder committee that's going to meet today in Barcelona. Hold its first meeting today. This meeting is responsible -- this committee is responsible for the political guidance of the -- of the event and also to raise international awareness for it.

The other committee is the multistakeholder executive committee that is meeting regularly, once a week, and this committee is responsible for the actual agenda of the meeting.

We haven't yet defined the agenda. This is work that's being done. But we believe that in March this will be finalized and we will have the agenda.

And, well, we have also a logistics committee that -- well, it's already found that the event is going to take place in the Hyatt hotel in Sao Paulo, and, well, this committee is working on organization and logistics issues.

And we have also a council of governmental advisors and that's being -- work conducted by the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil.

I think it's -- we are now in a stage where we are receiving contributions for these two outcomes, expected outcomes. It's, I think, worth mentioning that the deadline for contributions has been extended. It's now on March 8 that we expect the international community to send us contributions through the Web site of the meeting, which is netmundial.br.

I think that's it. I think I recommend everyone to -- well, to consult regularly the Web site because this is basically the main -- main channel of communication regarding this event.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil. It's very useful.

I would like to encourage all of us to look regularly on the Web -- on the WSIS+10 MPP Web site, on the IGF Web site, and last, but not least, on the Net Mundial Web site. And I understand that you can express your intent of participation on the Web site and I also understand that there are no funding possibilities, which I have to tell you with deep regret.

However, there are some promising sentences on the Web site of consideration for some participation.

So I think the three information sessions were quite useful for us for deliberations during the five days we are going to have.

Now, I think this is the time to ask for any contributions from your part related to the introductory remarks and the -- commenting on the informations we have, and this is the time for the observers, eventually, to take the floor, and I would like to ask observers and members, as well, to be very brief.

So any remarks?

Yes, Richard.

>> RICHARD: Yes, just on the question in case -- in the highly unlikely -- as you say, Chairman, your optimistic case that you will not reach agreement, then as you say, the convention is to simply say that there were two or three or six points of view expressed and summarize them, but it would seem to me that that should be not confined to an annex. That should, rather, be just in the report, so in the report you list areas of consensus and you then you list areas of divergence. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this comment. I believe that we agree that we are going to have discussion about the format of the report and how we are going to format it in that case. Naturally, it's up to you to decide where the unlikely events -- in the case of the unlikely event we don't have consensus on some issues, where we are going to place them, but it's really up to you in this case.

I understand there is a remote participant who would like to take the floor.

>>NNENNA NWAKANMA: Yes, please. Can you hear me?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, please.

>>NNENNA NWAKANMA: Good morning. This is Nnenna Nwakanma from Pakistan. I'm the Africa Regional Coordinator for the World Wide Web Foundation and I'm speaking as a member of the civil society, not representing the whole civil society.

Three things.

One is to say thank you to Brazil for extending the contributions date to the 8th of March. That will come in very handy for civil society.

The second thing is to inform that there are a lot of preparations going on within civil society organizations for Brazil and we do hope to have a side meeting convened by organizations like the (indiscernible) next week in San Francisco, and we do hope that by then even more contributions.

And finally, I would like to inform that there are a lot of civil society events that will be taking place on the margins of Brazil, so that will be before or after, just so that the organizers will know.

I understand that we may not have space for exhibitions in Sao Paulo, but just note that there will be some other events and I would like to mention these events (indiscernible). Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Now I give the floor to the European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, colleagues.

I recall that in our last meeting, there was a request by some colleagues to hear some update on the European initiative called JIPO, so I'm ready to make this intervention during a couple of minutes.

I don't know if you would like me to do this now or later during the meeting, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: If you have can the presentation -- your presentation two minutes, then please go ahead.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you very much. The broad range of policy areas impacted by the Internet as well as the very complex institutional framework are an objective obstacle for many stakeholders, varying from developing and developed countries, to participate effectively in discussion and decision-making processes on Internet-related public policies.

To put it simply, there is too much information spread over too many places for most stakeholders to be able to participate effectively in the global governance of the Internet.

In its recent communication on Internet policy and governance, the European Commission reaffirmed its firm commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and called on further strengthening of the sustainability of this model by making actors and processes more inclusive, transparent and accountable.

JIPO participates of this approach of enabling a more inclusive participation of all stakeholders, the creation of an online platform through which information can be channeled and made widely accessible.

JIPO would make it easier for stakeholders with limited resources to follow, understand, and engage with Internet governance and policy.

The concept of JIPO was launched in May 2013. This global Internet policy observatory will serve as a clearinghouse for monitoring Internet policy, regulatory technological developments across the world using (indiscernible), analytical and visually -- okay. Never mind.

[Laughter]

Analytical -- I will try again, and visualization tools. I made it.

The European Commission will provide seed funding to launch JIPO without necessarily managing it or being the sole sponsor. The EU is actively engaged in consultations with many countries from both south and north as well as other stakeholders to build a multistakeholder alliance around JIPO.

JIPO will not replace existing mechanisms in fora where global Internet governance is discussed. Its objective is to be a complementary tool for stakeholders to strengthen Internet policy-making processes making full use of modern technology.

The European Commission is currently carrying out a feasibility study into JIPO. And pending these results which are expected in April, May of this year, the development of the online platform should commence in 2015.

I don't want to be too long, Mr. Chair. But I have more information if delegates want to approach me informally on this. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, European Union, to making -- visualizing the ongoing activities. And I hope to be able to go to the JIPO Web site soon.

Anyone else who would like to take the floor before we break for coffee and we -- I suggest after the coffee break we come back and start the substantive discussions. There was a suggestion to make it shorter.

I'm ready to do that. Anyone asking for the floor? If not, I suggest to have a 15-minute break, coffee break, come back at 35 and continue our work. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think I'm going to resume in one or two minutes. I will wait until people come back from coffee. I understand that there was some logistical difficulties getting the coffee.

Let me take this opportunity to ask you, the members of the group, if you received my email about the invitation to book launch? I'm told that some of you or maybe none of you received the invitation.

Yes, Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Can you clarify when you sent the email out so I can...

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm reminded that I sent it to the secretariat and not to the whole group. I'm sorry about that.

So I sent it, I think, on Thursday or Friday. I'm not really sure.

It is about a book launch which is going to take place in the World Meteorological building organized by DiploFoundation. So if I made this mistake, let me rectify it and let me give the floor to Jovan, who is the director of the DiploFoundation to give us some information.

>> JOVAN KURBALIJA: Thank you. Thank you, Peter. It is great to see old and new friends. As Peter said, the email disappeared in digital (indiscernible). But, believe me, there is no conspiracy about it.

We are organizing this evening at 6:00 a launch of two books. One book written by Roxana Radu and Rolf Weber on multistakeholder governance. And the second book is written by Richard Hill, who is here with us, is on international telecommunication integration, including reflections from the preparations and what happened in Dubai.

Therefore, the event will start at 6:00. It will -- I think it's 6:00 -- no, no, it's 6:00 -- 6:30. Wow, see? I'm the organizer, and I don't know the name. Not a promising start.

But it will be followed by a reception. And I will really appreciate if you could drop us the line if you can join us because our catering will have to take care of sandwiches and beverage.

Therefore, what do you suggest, Peter? Shall I send an email to you again or to... just around the corner. When you leave the U.N. compound, you should turn left and go towards the WTO building. On the right-hand side, there is the glass building, blue, World Meteorological Organization. We are on the second floor. And this is important that you are listed also with security for access.

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

I will ask the secretariat to send out the email with the details of the meeting of the book launch. And while it is informal, I believe it is well that it will give us a good opportunity to have an informal get-together for the members of the CSTD working group. So please feel free to register for the security aspect. And I hope to see you, all of you, at the book launch. It is a beautiful building, by the way, WMO. It is an recent building. And I understand DiploFoundation has recently moved to this place.

Okay. After this short announcement, I think we should resume our work. And according to the agenda, I suggest you go to the rolling document. And I suggest you start the discussion on point A. As I mentioned in my introductory remarks, we received the latest contribution on Friday, if I'm not mistaken, afternoon. So the version you have on the Web doesn't reflect yet the most up-to-date version. But you have printed hard copies at the entrance of the room. So feel free to take your free copy and free copies -- I mean, the printed copies are for members.

I'm sure that the secretariat will update the rolling document on the Web as well.

So I'm reminded as well that you had a very productive weekend and you had the opportunity of reading this because you were sent it by the secretariat as an attachment on Saturday. And I'm sure -- I just forgot that I was reading it during the whole weekend, and I'm sure you did the same.

So all working group members received it by email. I know that all of you prefer to have paperlessly. You are very, very environment conscious. And I promise you this is the last time we are distributing papers.

So everybody has the appropriate copy? And I can see Avri asking for the floor. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I want to say how happy I am to be local this time and at the meeting as opposed to remote on the other side of the world. But I do want to indicate how -- my

thanks to the members of the secretariat and others that helped me participate in the meeting last time. And thank you for all putting up with my voice on the end of what I'm sure was a scratchy connection.

In terms of the looking at the Tunis Agenda, one of the things that always occurs to me when I look at it is that while conversations often start with point 69, that the Tunis Agenda really discusses enhanced cooperation within the context of paragraph 67 through 72 and that just picking the one starting point, 69, that mentions it, sort of gives us a problematic way of looking at that, and that it really needs to be understood.

And pardon me if I use the word "needs." That I really need to understand it in the larger context of 67 through 72 and such.

And I also -- in terms of looking at implementation of enhanced cooperation in that context, I find it difficult to understand how we can say that it hasn't started yet.

I see an immense amount of enhanced cooperation. I see government, civil society, private sector, Internet community interacting with each other in so many venues in so many ways, in ways that never used to happen, that -- so I have trouble understanding when people say that it hasn't started.

Now, perhaps there are interpretations of what "enhanced cooperation" means, that some had in their mind in one point in time that haven't begun. But to insist upon those implementations when so much has happened and so much is ongoing, again, is something I have difficult time understanding. And perhaps it is just my poor ability to understand.

I beg your indulgence on bringing up one non-substantive practice point. I understand that it is your prerogative as Chair to organize the meeting as you wish. And I don't wish to presume to tell you.

But I worry about the observers being restricted to only commenting at a point after all the discussion has happened, before we are all ready to go get our coffee and they are interfering with our coffee by commenting at that point.

And while I understand why you might want to give deference to those of us that have named flags and are members of this group and responsible for the work, I'd like to ask you to consider giving them the ability to comment on a topic while that topic is still the topic we're talking about. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I'm really happy you could make it to Geneva this time. As for your comments related to a different understanding of different issues, we are here to clarify these differences. And I do have a respect for all opinions. And I have the relatively difficult task to make these opinions (indiscernible).

I believe the perception is extremely important thing in our lives. So if there is a perception, as you mentioned, for some participants here that enhanced cooperation hasn't started yet, there are probably -- other people who have a different perception should have a very convincing way of conveying all the information which are needed. And I'm sure we are going to do that during these couple of days.

As for the observers, it is not a question of principle. It is a question of practicality. I know that all opinions are extremely important. However, we have had enough time to consider online submissions and we have been open to online submissions. And naturally in case we have the discussions in breakout groups, I have no objections to participation from the observers as well.

But I have to give preference, which is natural, to the members of the group. As you have mentioned, the members of the group have the responsibility of providing the recommendations and finalizing the report. It is our responsibility. It is not the responsibility of non-members.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. First, a minor process point. I understand this document -- rolling document is still rolling. And I had submitted some inputs for the cluster E and cluster B this morning also because I wanted to review the outcome of the correspondence group which was supposed to tell us -- give us information at least about the gaps, if any, from which institutional recommendations could probably come out.

I was able to see those and assess them over this last week, and I'm sorry for the delay perhaps. But I could only submit my inputs in the morning today for cluster E and B, and I will be able to do about other clusters later on.

I just hope as the document rolls, those inputs which are coming now would also be shown on the screen. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I'm sure your thoughts will be reflected. I can see Sweden and Andres.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I would like -- I seek a clarification on the agenda, if we are going to go through the agenda as originally planned or if there will be any changes, given the interventions earlier this morning, especially in relation to discussing the report and the draft structure of the report.

We would welcome if a slot could be allocated maybe later today or tomorrow morning, since we think that is an important issue to take into consideration.

Then secondly, a question about this exercise that we started just now. Is it that you would welcome general comments on the proposals made at this stage or is it -- is it that we are going to go into discussing the specific wording and how these draft recommendations are structured?

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Per, for these very important remarks.

First of all, yes, I would like to allocate according, to your wishes, some slot for the shaping of the report.

Secondly, for what I expect from this general discussion, I have had indications that sometimes those which were considered to be draft recommendations aren't necessarily draft recommendations. Rather, they are statements. And probably these statements should be placed as kind of chapeau text in the report, and in the plenary, I would like you to identify or at least indicate what you think, that yes, these are draft recommendations and -- just to be productive, to move forward and to shape our final document.

So I could see Andres and I could see India.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you, Chair.

First of all, one of the -- my main doubts was the same that the distinguished colleague of Sweden already said so I'm just -- it was already clarified.

But on the other hand, I wanted to point out that I remember the first meeting of this group, like almost a year ago, and these two different vision were -- in general, that have been expressed in the moment, whether enhanced cooperation is underway or it hasn't been addressed yet, and I believe it's a little disturbing that after all the mapping exercises and the correspondence group work, the general point -- the general notes for the first part of the discussion of this meeting are in the same page as at least what I saw a year ago when we discussed this with the -- at the first meeting, and I guess this -- we should face that this group has not a single interpretation whether enhanced cooperation was or not achieved in the past, but we can focus in the future and in the progress.

I guess we can agree that we disagree in some interpretations and we have to already establish that.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this positive term.

India?

>>INDIA: Chair, thank you very much.

As I take the floor for the first time, allow me to welcome all my colleagues. It's very happy to see many of them are back in this room where we met a few months back, and also colleagues who are on -- off line -- on line, that managed to be present in the room. We welcome all of them.

Mr. Chair, I think I'd like to make my comments on two thought topics which you have allowed us to do at this stage.

One is with regard to the report; and then secondly, with regard to the recommendation that we are looking at.

With regard to the report, I also wish to thank all colleagues who made some comments on the structure that was presented by India in the last meeting, as promised, and when we attempted this, it

was to partly oblige you, Chair, and also to satisfy ourselves that this particular structure would help us move forward.

I think it's important, in this report -- when we initiated this idea of having to write a report, our objective was to have it as the report of the group, the working group, because we eventually are mandated to come up with a report which will have recommendations. So from that perspective, I think it will be very useful.

We had brief discussion -- I entirely agree with our distinguished colleague from Sweden who said that it would be useful to have clarity on the structure of the report. I think this is important, because eventually that is what will even -- will be presented to the CSTD.

In our view, I think the report should have two parts, which is two integrated parts, not very distinct, which is: One, having facts about the working group's creation to procedures, to -- and that aspect; and the second part would be the recommendations.

And we think it is best we embed these recommendations as part of one integral report. Then it would read for the sake of clarity.

You did raise a very pertinent point: What if there is, perhaps, differences of opinion on some aspects of the recommendation or some aspects of the report?

I think the report ordinarily would have to have a recommendation on a range of -- on each of the topics that we are considering. I think it shall be our endeavor, we are very confident under your chairmanship -- chairpersonship we would achieve that consensus at this point.

So I leave these comments on the report.

With regard to the second part, which is on the recommendations that we are looking at, I sometimes want to speak very freely about it. I think the whole purpose, why are we here? I mean if -- we have spent almost -- this is the third meeting. I think it is important for us to recognize that the U.N. General Assembly or United Nations system, which actually recognized the WSIS outcomes and thereby they became a formal document, developing a number of processes that have been unleashed.

You start, for example, when the WSIS Tunis Agenda was adopted and brought into the -- as acknowledged by the U.N. General Assembly, the Secretary General is mandated to do various things. One was to create an IGF; number two, to look at enhanced cooperation as a process; and number three, as part of enhanced cooperation, a series of attempts have been made in 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012.

So I think the recognition is very much there that this is something that is an unfinished task, and we fully endorse your initial approach at the very beginning when you initiated the discussion. You shared with -- your idea about the specific mandate, the core mandate of this working group. I mean we don't need to quibble on which paragraphs, but at the end of it, as we see it, the core mandate lies at the heart of what is the role of governments. How do we enable the governments to carry out their responsibilities on an equal footing in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

And it is not yet answered. That is why we are trying to find solutions. And the working group exists because of that.

And -- but of course at this point we would like to be very clear and we are very conscious of the recognition that we need to give to the roles and responsibilities of all of the stakeholders who have --

I mean there is -- I don't think there's any dispute on that issue. I think we are all on the same page.

But this little distinction that we would like to draw at the beginning would go a long way in coming up with a specific recommendation on how do we enable the governments to --

There are colleagues who are in the room who believe that governments are already enabled to do what they like, but I think they're able to do it in their national capacities and their national domestic situations, but when it comes to the international, their participation is there, but I think it is -- as we view it, is rather very stunted. Rather, very peripheral.

That is why I think we would like to see a certain clear recommendation coming out of this.

And having said this, Chair, one last comment I'd like to make.

I think our group's contribution would be very crucial. I think let us not forget that we are in very, very difficult times when it comes to Internet governance is concerned.

If we make no attempt now, I think the history will not forgive us for not making a serious attempt.

Why? Because the governance issue is talked about in no unclear terms and it should not lead to a stage where we might end up having to see an integrated Internet remains a distant dream. It is a fact now. It might become a dream soon if we do not recognize this particular dimension, and I think we have a lot of important responsibility and we would be very -- we are very ably guided by you, Mr. Chair, and I thank you for that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy.

I just want to assure you that I will do my best that this group would fulfill its mandate, but I am too little to do it alone, so I need your help, and I'm sure we have come here in good faith to do it and I am sure we are going to do it.

Phil, you wanted to ask for the floor?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair.

Just a question of clarification, noting that this is going to be a rolling document and recommendations will be added as we go forward, which is a good idea as our ideas become clearer.

I'm just wondering what the process would be to make sure that we have sight of those, so we can discuss them and further contribute to the work of your group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Before answering you, Mr. Reddy, I forgot to answer your question.

Yes, we are going to allocate a slot to discuss the report and I would suggest you have this slot tomorrow morning.

To answer your question, Phil, I think the rolling document will be made available at all time. I hope it will be made available also on line in case you feel like working on it overnight, and I'm sure you would like to do that, as all of us would like to do that, and basically my idea is to separate issues on the work -- on the rolling document which we consider to be draft recommendations and those which are more general text, in order to move forward informing the report itself.

The next is Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What I was going to say was said by our distinguished delegate from India and we welcome that we discuss the report but not to make it our first priority before the recommendation.

Let us work on the recommendation. Then things will be very clear on how to format the report.

So which one do we discuss first, the recommendation or the report, and I think drafting the recommendation is more important now than looking how the structure of the report will be or how it will look like.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. If you may remember, in my introduction that was exactly what I suggested and it was my understanding as well how I could -- I am bound by the obligation to other members who would think that the report itself is equally important.

So probably we will consecrate some time to have some general idea of how the report would look like. We are not going to finalize, naturally, the report. We are going to talk about only the structure at our first slot, and then we are going to finalize it probably by the end of our meeting.

I can see Peru. You asked for the floor?

>>PERU: Yes. I was wondering, Mr. Chair, if perhaps our colleague from the Russian Federation could allow us to rephrase the recommendation that they have put forward since it doesn't -- it's not inclusive. It's not -- it doesn't end -- it doesn't include all the references that are given in the same group by the rest of the countries or groups that have submitted ideas.

Perhaps if after the word -- the word "paragraphs" -- "recalls paragraphs," we could make it more inclusive and not signalize one specific paragraph but a few paragraphs.

Perhaps that would make it more inclusive for all and we could go forward to the next recommendation.

That's what I wanted to say.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I'm sure we are going to consider your suggestions.

Marian, I'm sorry, I just didn't call you.

Yes, please, go ahead.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I guess this is what comes from sitting in the -- so close to you.

Chairman, thank you for creating time to discuss what we think is important, which is the structure of the report. It was remarked on by India. It's been -- it's been the subject of other interventions. So tomorrow morning for our purposes sounds fine.

Chairman, another couple of housekeeping issues. I know that it -- there was some -- there was a proposal that we try to finish our work on the recommendations on Thursday night. Does that sound like a good idea, so that we're -- we're ahead of the game so that we can see how much progress we've made and make an assessment by Thursday night? It's simply a question. It sounds to this administration like a good idea, but not insisting.

And then finally, does it make sense, before we proceed to discuss the recommendations, that we hear the -- from Phil Rushton on the report?

I ask this for the following reason: When we were discussing the mapping exercise or Phil's report, as it's now called, we talked about trying to get the facts to try to know where we -- know where we are before we know where we can go, and I think that was something that was supported by many colleagues. If this is -- if that was the motivation for doing the mapping exercise, would it be helpful to get the facts, or we would call them the facts, to get a sense of where that research or where that outreach -- what it resulted in so as to inform us in our discussion on the recommendations? Thank you.

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

According to our plans, we are going to hear the report, Phil's report, in the afternoon, so it precedes the discussion we are going to have this -- about the structure of the report, so that is the idea.

We are going to -- hopefully after lunch, we are going to discuss Point A and then in the afternoon we start with Point B and he's going to brief us in some detail about the work they have been doing and the outcomes of this exercise.

So after that, I believe we will be in a situation where we can already discuss, in case it's needed, the structure of the report and to get back to more detailed discussions.

As for the report, we are going to -- as the first step, as I indicated, we are going to discuss only the structure of it, not the content.

As for finishing our work or just making an assessment of our work on Thursday night, well, I intend to make this assessment every day.

So I start my -- my session every day to assess what has been achieved already in the previous day and -
- but I do agree that if -- in case we can proceed in a very fast pace, then I would be more than happy to
come to -- close to a finishing stage at -- on Thursday night.

Making this remark, it reminds me that I have a theater ticket on Thursday night. But it --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You do.

So it's a real constraint.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Joy Liddicoat from civil society, participant. This is
my first intervention. I also want to join in welcoming our colleagues here in thanking the Chair and the
secretariat for their work between meetings.

I had a couple of remarks in relation to the discussion that Jordi (phonetic) commenced and also a
concrete practical suggestion.

The first is in relation to the structure of the report. I think it would be helpful to have some slightly
clearer roadmap of what the structure of the report will be. However, I also think agreeing with our
colleagues from Saudi Arabia and India, that it would be preferable if the majority of our work is focused
on the substance of what we think we can agree on rather than the form in which it might take in
relation to the report. I think some balance there would be useful, but certainly some more detail
relation to the overall structure of how the report will set would be useful.

Secondly, just in relation to the recommendations themselves, I'm just somewhat concerned at how we
might proceed through these for several reasons. The first is that some of the recommendations which
appear in group A are referenced in relation to group D and also in group C. And I'm not sure we can
proceed to take them in a linear way. I think they would prejudice our recommendations in group C, for
example. And secondly, because -- some of the recommendations are very clear. They use language
that we're familiar with, recalling certain things, affirming the methods, noting, and so on. Whereas,
other recommendations are more narrative and are more commandeering with conclusions. I'm
wondering, therefore, in terms of a practical suggestion, whether it might not be useful over the lunch
break for some clustering if you would like of the recommendations to take place in terms of how
they're structured, leaving possibly even the substance of the issues we're dealing with, so that we can
somehow work through them once we've had a chance to consider them in a more holistic way and
using language which is perhaps more consistent which is perhaps more consistent across the
recommendations themselves.

And I make those remarks without any criticism of the recommendations themselves. I think they've all
been thought through and crafted. I'm just thinking of how to practically support the shaping of these

recommendations to affect our work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. I think it's very helpful, and I'm really happy to hear that you already think in terms of lunch breaks being used in a very useful manner, not forgetting that we need energy as well for the upcoming sessions.

But I really encourage you to make advantage of all the time we are spending here to proceed.

If you think that it will be a useful exercise to have a small group or a group of as many people as would like to take part to kind of have a unified language for the recommendations, you have my full support to form a group like that. And it is an informal group naturally. But it will be extremely useful.

Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. May I suggest to you, Chairman, the following. First of all, I think it is come to protect if you start to say whether enhanced cooperation has started or has not started or has started partly and so on and so forth. Let us not discuss that. This is totally counterproductive. Point one.

Point two, with respect to the structure of the report, I think you devote some time at the second part of the afternoon, a general discussion. And perhaps may I suggest our distinguished delegate of India with some of the colleagues after listening to general discussion on the structure of the report form a little group and start to prepare something for your consideration or our consideration on Wednesday.

And then the remaining part, we go to the recommendation. We leave it to you to categorize which part you want to start, which sections. For us, it doesn't matter.

We leave it to the Chairman between now and the afternoon to start which section you want.

Now, going to the recommendation, once we discuss the recommendation, we should decide which are the recommendations which are clear-cut recommendations and which are, as I mentioned, narrative or, let us say, some statement type which, in fact, is not a recommendation, does not recommend anything. May not be useful.

I'm not undermining any value of them. All of them are appreciated very much. But we have to categorize which one clear-cut gives a recommendation to achieve the objective of enhanced cooperation. We will go to that one as well.

So by this suggestion, I think the second part of the afternoon, you will have a general discussion about -- an hour or so, about the structure of the report. And then if our distinguished colleague from India accepts this invitation, he will be engaged with some of the colleagues that will be interested to go to the draft of the structure and propose something on Wednesday.

In the meantime, you go to the recommendation to finalize which ones are clear-cut recommendations and which ones are a narrative and the statement and would not be part of the recommendation. May have some other arrangement to be included in the report.

The importance is the recommendation. The section of the report is just issues. I don't think we should spend the time starting from the structure of the report at the beginning. Let's go to the heart of the business. Let's go to the issues before us if you want to have something on Wednesday or on -- sorry, on Thursday or Friday. Otherwise, that is up to you.

This is my recommendation, my suggestion to you. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. In fact, it seems to me that we have spent some time together in the ITU, and we have the same line of thinking. I was about to suggest an even tighter time frame. I would like to invite those interested in this exercise about the structure of the report to come together tomorrow at 9:00 after we have had some kind of discussions in the plenary here to come together tomorrow morning at 9:00 and to come to the meeting at 10:00 and report about the structure.

We are not very far from a final structure, I believe. We have very good proposal from India. We have very good suggestions from other stakeholders. So I think we can be very productive on that. And probably in a first reading, we can have something already tomorrow at 10:00. That's one thing.

As for the recommendations, I personally also think that we should concentrate on recommendations because we may have a most visible structure. If we don't have substance, then I'm afraid we haven't fulfilled our mandate.

So I have heard a proposal to kind of align the draft recommendations on one hand. I had proposals for shaping the structure of the report. It is getting clear to me that we have to work sometimes in smaller groups outside the allocated time that is -- as I indicated, tomorrow we may start at -- those who are interested in the shaping of the report should start at 9:00. And those who are interested in aligning the text of the draft recommendations may take advantage of the lunch break.

And I really encourage Joy to lead this group, which is an informal group with the aim of just aligning the text on one hand. And eventually I may ask Mr. Reddy, if your time permits, to come together with those who are interested in shaping the report tomorrow at 9:00. I know it is very, very early, in Geneva terms and the U.N. terms, but probably this time we can make this effort.

Is it agreeable to you? And I would like to -- as I said, it is going to be informal. It is going to be informal. I'll let you make your inquiries by the two persons I named about how we are going to proceed.

Mr. Reddy, you wanted to take...

>> B.N. Reddy: Thank you very much, Chair. Just to say our readiness to do so but provided there is consensus in the room that we would undertake such an exercise. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see no objection to that. But this is the time to speak up if you don't feel comfortable with a small, informal group. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are happy to work in a smaller group but with a clear mandate, so a point of clarification.

What is the other group doing with the draft recommendation, aligning it and so forth, in particular to us? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for this important remark. My understanding, that in the rolling document there are recommendations which have come from different parties. Correct me if I'm wrong.

The concern was that they were of different language levels, if I'm not wrong. And the exercise would be just simply to align them linguistically. Am I right?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Joy here for those who are remote participation.

No. My comment was that -- twofold. One is that there is different language used. Some are recommendations. Some are statements. Some are narratives. And the suggestion was that for the purposes of recommendations, there be some consistency in the language that may be dealt with as we come to them in a case-by-case.

My particular suggestion in relation to clustering the recommendations was that perhaps some reflection could be done over the lunch break, in the next few days, to look at the recommendations as a whole and see, for example, if several of them deal with the same subject matter, just to cluster them together under the various groups, not to in any way change their wording, but just simply to help triage, if you'd like, and cluster those recommendations together. If this is helpful or not helpful, it is up to the group to decide.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have already had concerns about the submissions that some of the submissions contain more statements or general text rather than recommendations which I'm really sensitive to. So probably as I indicated, our main aim is to come up with recommendations rather than statements.

And probably I can have some help from the secretariat to proceed in this direction; that is to separate or give you a suggestion, give you a proposal in this sense to collect from the text. We have in the rolling document those text which are to be considered as recommendations rather than statements.

So if your exercise, what you suggested, would go in this direction, then I would also recommend you to rely on the secretariat's help. And I want to make sure that nothing -- and I repeat nothing which comes out from the informal group is not accepted until everybody's happy with that. So I want to have the full approval of the group. There will be no such action as one group is suggesting something and it is being accepted -- pretended to be accepted by the group. No, we are going to discuss everything which comes out of the informal groups.

Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Any distinguished colleague volunteer to do something, we very much appreciate. We should be a little bit careful. For instance, for the group relating to the report, when I propose the distinguished delegate of India -- and, in fact, there was not only no objection but everybody agreed with that, I propose we have some discussions at the meeting here. This is okay.

Now, for the recommendation, I don't think at this is a stage we need to go to any exercise of clustering. We have to first discuss the substance of the recommendation. Once we agree that the substance of the recommendation is generally valid and appropriate and relevant, then we could find out whether we could cluster them together, that we could group them together. And then the last thing is alignment of the languages is the last, last part. I don't think that we start from the alignment of the language of something which we may disagree totally with that.

Let us appreciate and welcome the work of distinguished lady who wants to do that but not immediately. Let's first discuss the recommendation to see to what extent we agree to the substance of the recommendation. Then once we agree to that, then we are very happy that the distinguished lady will take care of that and try to cluster them or combine them or group them or whatever.

Therefore, I suggest that similar to the report arrangement for the recommendation, also we start to discuss them immediately after the lunch. Or if we want to do it now, I don't know. But immediately after lunch.

And then we go to cluster or to combine and so on and so forth. Otherwise, Chairman, there would be some difficulty. We may do some exercise which may not be productive. We cluster something that may be in contradiction with the other, or the substance of all of them as a class we disagree by the people. So the other recommendation will also be penalized which is clustered.

Let us discuss first this one, and I think that would be more easy and more constructive. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss. My understanding was a little bit different. We have already grouped the main themes according to the questioning into five groups. And if I'm not mistaken, the suggestion of the use of the word "clustering" is probably not the best one. Eventually some recommendation would fit into a different group better than the other one. That was my understanding.

But if there is no agreement to form such a group, then probably we may like to postpone it. But I would have liked to take the advantage of the momentum we have right now to proceed.

Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, colleagues. My question -- I have a question, Mr. Chairman, and it is regarding the mandate of this group because for us, it is not quite clear that if we are going to check or to revise the draft recommendations of the rolling document, what is going to happen to new submissions? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Naturally nothing prevents us to consider new recommendations if it is coming from the group or the members of the group. My preference is we consider the ones which have been submitted up to the deadline and eventually a bit later but before our meeting. This is clearly my preference.

Because we have so much to deal with, that if we kind of go after a moving target, there is no way we can finish our work. So I really encourage our deal with whatever we have at hand to consider the existing recommendations and we have quite many and very valuable ones.

And in case we discover that something hasn't been covered and we have very good recommendations, that will be the time to consider it. Otherwise, I would like to stick to the existing ones.

Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. As one of the business participants, I would say I found Joy Liddicoat's suggestion very useful. It may be that perhaps we work a bit more and then figure out at what time we launch that.

I will just say that, of course, any work that goes on in a small group is going to come back to plenary. So, you know, I feel as one business representative very comfortable that we might make some preliminary work in this way and then bring it back in and sort of test it out.

I primarily wanted to comment on the discussion about the organization of the report that you had invited Mr. Reddy to organize and to note that as this is a multistakeholder effort within the working group with participants from governments, IGOs and three stakeholder groups, that I welcome the opportunity to have a full collaboration in a small group led by Mr. Reddy, then again coming back into the plenary. And should he wish to start at 7:00 a.m -- that was a joke, colleagues.

[Laughter]

But I was just going to compliment our Chair in his foresight in opening our meetings at 7:00 which gives us a working hour before each day and ending our meetings at 6:00 which gives us several working hours, Chair, at the close of the day.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I would like to remind you again that we have been invited to a book launch. Some probably are talking about 7:00 p.m. I would put it at 8:00 p.m. Having said that, you may feel free to form any group in your spare time that is in lunch breaks or evenings. And I will be just happy to learn about the results of your consultations, let it be informal or let it just be kind of ad hoc or whatever. Whatever is going to contribute to our work, I welcome.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. This was regarding the status of the rolling document, and I would once again request that additional inputs be taken, along with a bunch which we look at at any one time.

This also -- I'm sure the chair would have forwarded a deadline, but I remember seeing only the 14th of November that e-mail which is appended to the rolling document which does not have a deadline but has structures, but possibly there was a deadline letter which I missed.

But also it is relevant that I was waiting for the work of the correspondence group because it's clearly the mandate of the group to look at the gaps and then give recommendations. It's probably they're even framed in the United Nations resolution. And, therefore, without getting -- seeing the work of the correspondence group, I could not have inputted the recommendations and, therefore, I once again request that all these recommendations come from having judged that information sheet and this be considered as we go along, because if we leave the additional recommendations to the end, they would almost certainly get crowded out and that would not be right, I think. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I've been reminded by the secretariat that the rolling document has been updated. It takes into consideration submissions which have been received just immediately before our meeting or eventually from, if I'm not mistaken, Mexico during our meeting, but these have already been included.

My remark about further submissions is just that -- in case we don't treat the submissions which have -- which we have received after the deadline, then somehow our way of working will be very unbalanced, and I really want to treat --

I'm sure that we will have zillions of ideas. It's clear. We are in an environment, in an ecosystem, which evolves. Even while I'm speaking, it does evolve. So at one time, we have to say, "Okay, we stop here and we try to work with whatever we have," and I really suggest you to take a few ideas in case there is a clear indication that, well, this is something we have missed.

Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, all. This is my first intervention.

I just wanted to say, in terms of structure for our work, I want to remind ourselves of the mandate, just sort of to bring our focus on the work which requires -- invites the chair of the CSTD to establish a working group on enhanced cooperation to examine the mandate of WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation through seeking, compiling, and reviewing inputs of all members, states, and all stakeholders, and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate.

This is a fairly stepwise, day-follows-night process.

At the first stage when we met under your chairmanship, we decided to put out the questionnaire.

At the second meeting, we got the mapping exercise started.

Between the second and third meeting, the correspondence group has completed the mapping exercise.

Any attempts to jump into the heart of writing the recommendations without going through the very detailed work that has been done by the mapping exercise and the correspondence group which identifies the extent to which enhanced cooperation already exists at several platforms, would then negate and try and put the cart before the horse.

So my request would be that the discussion on the extent to which enhanced cooperation already exists is a very important step which must be discussed in order to complete the exercise of the mapping that is in front of us before we can start identifying the final gaps and writing the recommendations.

I would request that we try and follow that, rather than take positions on what the recommendations would be without having discussed the entire work that Phil and the correspondence group has led and provided us those inputs.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat.

My intention, according to the agenda we have in front of us, is that we are going to have a lengthy discussion on this mapping exercise and it will be one of the most important topics in front of us.

Having said that, there's -- as I said, nothing prevents us and -- nothing prevents the members of this group to form any ad hoc group or interest group, or whatever you may like to call it, to treat any subject which is of interest to them outside the meeting hours.

I can see Lesotho asking for the floor. My good friend.

>>LESOTHO: Thank you very much, Chair. Being the first time to take the floor this morning, I want to also, as others have said, congratulate you, Chair, as well as the secretariat, and most importantly Phil and the group in compiling the document.

Chair, where I was leading to, I think you've just touched on, in terms of the agenda for this afternoon, is that we would have a discussion on this report, and then secondly, the issue that I think is -- I would seek your clarification has been raised a couple of times in this meeting in terms of the wording, as it is, in this document.

Some is in the form of statements and then the recommendations themselves, and I want to go back to our colleague just outlined what is the mandate of this working group. It is to come out with the recommendations. And how would we be able to steer towards that.

Because I see whether we talk of new issues, even if we bring them in and we put them in the form of statements as we -- as some are in this very document, we will still have not moved. The issue is how -- which I would seek your clarification, Chair, is: Where do you see us working now towards the drafting of the very recommendations?

Seeing -- as one was reading it, there are some of the statements which are repetitive. Some of the recommendations are repetitive. And I think that the core issue is: How do we then lead towards the very recommendation?

And I appreciate that it is important that this very afternoon we have a discussion on the document that can sort of drive us towards working to those representations, but I just wanted to remind us that ours is to come up with the recommendations at the end of the day, and I just wanted to get your clarification, Chair, on how are we moving in addressing the question that was raised by our colleague from Iran as well as Saudi Arabia. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Lesotho, for these remarks.

Well, as you mentioned rightly, this afternoon we are going to discuss the mapping exercise and the outcome of it. At least to have a better understanding of the work of this correspondence group and the results of it.

And based on this discussion, I intend to continue the discussion on Point A and Point B, with the aim exactly to separate the recommendations or draft recommendations from statements like sentences and have a clear picture.

And also, in the afternoon I would like to have a very short discussion about the structure, and as I indicated, tomorrow morning I would like to have an ad hoc group to come together at 9:00 in the morning, with the aim of giving some indications about the structure of the report and we will continue tomorrow morning with the substantial discussion.

I can see Ellen and Jimson.

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

I just wanted to support the idea that we look closely at this mapping so we can identify with some specificity the gaps that we're trying to write recommendations to address.

I look forward to that discussion.

And also like to propose that people, when we think about the recommendations, we think about actually mapping those recommendations to the specific gaps that we've begun to identify in the mapping process. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen. That's very useful.

Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen.

Jimson Olufuye, chair of Africa ICT Alliance and I run an ICT integration company based in Abuja, Nigeria.

It's a pleasure to be here again.

Indeed, I want to appreciate the chair. The chair has been extremely scientific in his approach to addressing our assignment, and I want to recommend that that methodology continues.

We have already gotten a number of mapping exercises done, and -- which is quite illuminating. I think it is really very, very appropriate that we look at what has been done, as has been emphasized by my colleagues from the business sector and from other stakeholders.

Once those areas are clearly identified -- because there are a lot of things happening even in the ecosystem -- then it will be much easier for us to really evolve our recommendations and different formatting that we want to bring to it.

But in the interim, a number of recommendations are in the pipeline and must be there, but I really value that it is very, very logical that we review the assignment that has been given and then from that, there will be clarity and consensus, possibly, on maybe the recommendations that will come afterwards.

Thank you, Distinguished Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson.

I -- yes, Nigeria.

>>NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just briefly want to observe that there was a submission I made in our last meeting on the role of stakeholders which I think was not captured. I don't know if this is the right time I should tell you that or whether that is later. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I believe this is a perfect time, and I would encourage all of you, in case you find out that your submissions haven't been reflected in the rolling document or it hasn't been made available to the rest of the group, then please just indicate it to the secretariat and they are going to rectify it.

In case you do have the -- your submissions and eventually it hasn't reached the secretariat, probably this is the right time to come to the secretariat and share the information with them.

So having said that, is there anyone asking for the floor?

Okay. So we have five minutes before lunch and I don't intend to start discussions on -- substantive discussions on the issues.

From this discussion in the morning, I assess that there's a great interest of the report from the correspondence group and an explanation of the work they have been doing and the results of it, so I'm looking forward to hearing it this afternoon.

I have also heard that there was interest in the format of the report itself, so we will -- we will have some time to discuss it also in the afternoon, and we shall resume at 3:00 with these discussions, and probably tomorrow, as I indicated, we will have a kind of informal group chaired by Mr. Reddy about the

format of the report and probably we are going to have some conclusion about the format at the beginning of the morning tomorrow.

So having said that, I wish you bon appetit and I hope to see you at 3:00 here and those who would like to have some kind of informal group about grouping or misplaced draft recommendations, please contact Joy. Thank you.

[Lunch]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. I hope you had a good lunch, a good rest, and those of you who worked over the lunch break, very fruitful discussion.

In the afternoon, we proceed with our agenda and we come to a point where we would like to hear the report of the chair of the correspondence group. And without further ado, let me pass it over to Phil, Phil Rushton, who chaired the correspondence group with the help of Joy Liddicoat.

Phil, the floor is yours.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. As Peter indicated, I was the co-convenor of the correspondence group that we established at the last meeting with Joy. So thanks to Joy for all her help.

We, basically, took an action with a very limited set of terms of reference whereby this group indicated that the correspondence group should not take any decisions. It was only an information-gathering exercise. And we had to make that group open to everyone.

The challenge that we had was we only had, in effect, three months to do the work. The correspondence group kicked off in October, November time. We had some challenges which I will comment on in a moment. I will describe briefly the process we used and then some observations.

So we effectively had 19 people contribute to the correspondence group. Some may say that was not many. But looking at the 97 pages of documents that has been produced, that's perhaps more than enough. I had not realized it was 97 pages when I compiled the report. And thanks to the secretariat for saving a few trees.

We provided three reports to the working group's chair, as we said we would do, just to keep the chair and this working group informed of the activity such that it was.

We took as the basis a condensed set of the 200 issues that emerged as a result of our last meeting. That continued to be, as I say, condensed, and we came up with 24 broad issues that covered those 200 issues. So they didn't replace them. They were just a broad-brush description that could be used to generate interest.

That work was, as agreed at the last meeting, continued. And we submitted that to this working group for agreement just before Christmas, 19th of December.

There was no comment on those 24 broad issues and, therefore, we submitted that then to the correspondence group to take forward.

And it is against those 24 broad issues that comments were sought. We did not stipulate in the correspondence group the format of the information to be submitted, the nature of the information to be submitted. We just said, This is the broad terms of reference. Please identify in your views to the many members what you think should be included in a report back to this working group.

That in itself perhaps was a mistake, but, hey, you always learn from your mistakes. So going forward, would we do that again? Quite possibly not. We would perhaps be a little bit more prescriptive in the nature of the information that we would seek.

Though we only had 19 contributions, there were 119 members of the correspondence group, so it was very wide and a complete membership in that respect.

We looked at three broad areas where we said to people, Please supply information and that was where there were existing international mechanisms addressing the issues in the list; identifying the status of those mechanisms, if any, and what issues people thought they were addressing; and then, thirdly, identifying the gaps in order to understand what type of recommendations may be required to be drafted by this group. And that was in line with the terms of reference from your previous meeting.

We set a deadline of January 31st. But deadlines being deadlines, that got extended thanks to the chair which also then meant that a second round of identifying additional options for mechanisms, gaps, et cetera, could not be undertaken. So in that respect, we could not do a second -- a second tranche of seeking information.

We compiled the document which you see before you. And that was sent for your consideration on the 14th of February. A nice Valentine's Day present for some of us.

There were 19 inputs received as identified: Four were from government, six from the technical and academic, five from civil society including one from three groups, and three from private sector. There was one from one intergovernmental organization, and that's listed in the 97 pages that you see before you.

So what were the issues? We had a challenge in establishing the correspondence group, but we overcame that. There were two issues raised after the working group gave its support to the broad areas. There were three supporters from the correspondence group saying that there should have been a broad area enabling governments on an equal footing to participate in the Internet governance process, should have been a broad area in its own right. That issue does exist, and it is under the stakeholders and governance broad issue.

One of those supporters raised financial issues including tax as a potential broad issue. That issue exists under applicable jurisdiction/cross-border coordination area.

There was also an issue raised of non-receipt of emails, specifically the one of 19th of December regarding the acceptance of the broad decisions. And that was raised specifically with regards to the issue 106.

As I say, there was a conscious decision not to specify formal input structure. And though it did allow for free format of input, as you see before you, it made the final compilation difficult. And I have to say if anybody has got any complaints about the 97 pages, I take responsibility. It was one of those eureka moments as I was getting out of the bath that I thought would actually deal with the issues quite reasonably. It was not the best solution, but I think it's a way of sharing the information that has been submitted.

My observations are that the submissions that have been made indicate that there are diverse opinions as to the mechanisms that are carrying out work on what people believe are public policy issues. There appears to be some areas of overlap in those views. And there appears to be some area of concerns about the lack of progress in some areas.

There is no clear consensus in identifying particular gaps; therefore, no consensus on recommendations emerging from this activity.

I would have to say, however, the quality of submissions made to the correspondence group was on a whole very good. And I identified the substantive submission from Kyoto University as worthy of further consideration.

Perhaps one thing as a good consultant should -- I always suggest there should be some further work, if that's possible. And that may be to just delve down into the areas that have been currently identified. But that depends very much on the time that we have available.

I think overall whether or not you look at the time frame from 2005 till now, I think it shows what existed in 2005 and what exists now, the world has changed and there has been some activity in a number of these areas. I think it's not something that's complete by any imagination. But I think had you done the same exercise in 2005, you probably would not have found such rich data as the 19 provided.

My one regret, I suspect, is that perhaps not more people had time to contribute. But I think the people that did contribute should be congratulated and thanked for their efforts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. I just want to repeat again thank you for your guidance. Thank you for your chairmanship. And thank you, Joy, for the chairmanship, co-chairmanship as well. And, of course, big thanks to those who participated in this exercise and all contributed.

And while naturally you complied with the mandate you have been given, the terms of reference were respected and it is up to the group to take your contributions as input for further considerations and to carry on your work, if you judge it worth the while to come up with recommendations on these issues.

I would like to continue before going to substantial debate, underline what Phil mentioned. We received -- the correspondence group received a valuable contribution from Dr. Yokozawa from Kyoto University, if I understand correctly. So I would like with your indulgence to ask Yokozawa to give us a very short presentation of his contribution. Thank you.

>> Okay. Thank you, Chair. My name is Makota Yokozawa.

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm one of the Japanese delegates. But this research is from the purely academic point of view. And, again, I am informing Phil that this research is not worthy of writing any view or any opinion or any decision to the reports or recommendation of this working group. But I just wanted to show how this kind of scientific research and objective research analysis is valuable for us to talk about the future of enhanced cooperation-related discussions.

So, well, the purpose here is how the issue structure looks like compared to -- the "issue structure," I mean proposed from the correspondence group. We have the good structure to discuss, and that was our basic line to how we grasp the other fora in other organizations are talking about enhanced cooperation.

Now we have the IGF. So the question -- natural question is how it differs and how to compare to the IGF discussion.

And the second one is what we can hear from the IGF's experience so we need to summarize over the five years or seven years' discussions in IGF we have. And the third one is the -- I just emphasize -- I just want to emphasize that I am not obliging to what has to make -- has to make or just I want to say what we experience.

So the first slide, the analysis was done based on the workshop proposal to the IGF. So everyone is familiar with how the workshop is carrying on every year at the IGF meetings.

So this chart shows the number of the workshops. They are growing now. In Bali, we had over 150 workshops. So they are doing pretty well, and they are very busy.

And what we have done first is we categorized these over the 500 workshops to certain categories or certain groups of the categories by a very, very scientific way.

I mean the scientific way is the -- it's a long-gauge analysis called LDA, which is latent Dirichlet allocation method. It's a very difficult method but we can obtain a very objective result from this -- from usage of this sort of scientific analysis.

So just to skip to the next slide, this is what we have done by the scientific analysis. And the next one, I am skipping this because I don't have any time. And just next.

Okay. This slide. This slide, we have obtained many, many subcategories and keywords, which is related to the topics similar to the (indiscernible) groups topic structure, so next, please.

So yes -- and next, please.

Okay. So after that, we have done analysis, quantitative analysis, by calculating how many people -- or how many categories are covered by who and when.

So this is one of the results we had from the 2008-2013 Bali. We had this distribution of the stakeholders participation as panelists to all of the workshops, so as you can see here, the civil society has a very good number of the panelists participation, and the -- of course and governments like you has good coverage, and a slightly small contribution from the private sector can be observed.

But here, academia is doing good, and the -- well, a significant number of the participation is from -- is growing from the civil societies.

So this is kind of the analysis and learning that can be obtained by this quantitative analysis.

So next, please.

And this is a similar chart. This is some -- we have the international organizations. This is the ratio of the growth of the participants from each stakeholder.

So in Bali, we had a very good growing number of the participants -- or panelists from the international organizations like ITU, U.N., and OECD.

So next, please.

And here, if you can -- if you have any difficulty to see this, it is very small so I can -- I'll be very happy to deliver this document afterwards by PDF, and the -- anyway, this is the distribution of the organizations by their participants.

So we can observe here a long-tail structure.

So many of the institutes or the fora, organizations are sending many people, and on the other hand, a very small number of the participants from the other organizations.

So this type of distribution is noted to say something about the multistakeholderism.

So next, please.

And next, please.

Okay. And next. I'm skipping this also.

Okay. Here, let's stop here.

So this is a topics map, and a little bit different meaning of the map, but the -- on the top, we have the 2008, '09, '10, '11, '12 and until '13, and the rank is 1 to 5.

So this table shows that in 2008, we had capacity building-related workshops that's number one popularity, and number two is accessibility. Number three, IGF and multistakeholderism.

And the two thousand- -- in 2013, we had the -- on the top of that, the freedom of expression was the number one category in our workshop discussion.

So -- well, I don't say any more, but if you look into this table, you will see how the popular topics in IGF workshops is changing, so -- by history.

So someone -- some of them -- for example, the ICT4D or the capacity building -- capacity building used to be very popular in 2008 to '9, but in 2010 and '11 we had less discussion about capacity building, but 2013 we had number two about the capacity building discussion.

So it's very interesting to see sort of the table and learn from that.

Next, please.

And the -- I am giving some related charts that is how about the government is interested, in what, and how the IGO or civil society and tech community and private sector and academia are interested in what like this.

So I am not going into this set, so next, please.

And -- oh, so I have -- we have done a little bit about the organizations' interests. ITU, OECD, UNESCO, and U.N. as a whole.

Well, they have their preference in having an interest in each topic or category. It's also very interesting to see this kind of distribution.

So next, please.

So this is another interesting one. So it may be a little bit difficult to see, but each circle has the name of the country.

So the biggest country is the EU, the red one, and the second biggest one is United States, and the other ones.

So this shows how the country has a good relationship to others, or in other words, it's between willingness -- the size of the circle is proportional to the -- between how the country is centralized. It has a central role.

So this is only the facts and nothing more to say which is good and which is bad, but this is sort of the structure or the relationship of the countries observed in IGF discussion. That's it.

Next one. And the -- yes. We have done how the categories relate to the Tunis Agenda paragraphs, and maybe all -- most of the paragraphs are covered by any -- some of the workshops.

Next, please.

And also, we have a good historical change for each topic like this.

And next one is the -- how the -- each stakeholders participate -- participating as a panelist to these categories based on discussions.

So you can see that the civil society, which is the green one, has very good interest in the child safety. And also, the -- the magenta is the private sector, and it has the most similar interest over the -- most of the categories like this.

And so this is some sort of the structure of the multistakeholderism and the -- I don't -- I didn't want to say which is good and which is bad. One can assume that equal proportion is good for this kind of multistakeholderism. And also, any other person can think that this is good, they can have the diverse distribution is good.

So this is just the fact.

So I hope this can help anybody to think about this, how the enhanced cooperation, its discussion, can be reflected.

So thank you very much for your attention.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you very much, Dr. Yokozawa.

I think it's a fascinating analysis of the events which have been going on since 2006, and it gives us some thought to how to proceed and how to take it on board in our discussions.

So we have heard Phil Rushton about the work of the correspondence group. We had a very interesting presentation of analysis of the IGFs and the related issues to the Tunis Agenda.

I would open the floor now for discussion on these issues. I could see Marilyn asking for the floor.

Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair.

I actually had a point of clarification for Dr. Mak that I'll make very quickly and then later in the discussion, I may come back with a comment related to the submissions.

One of the charts that Dr. Mak provided looked at the network of governments and institutes for 2012 through 2013, and that is the -- I guess for a layman, I'll just call that the circle chart. The one that's got all the circles on it.

I was thinking that it would be interesting for us to see, over time, the grouping by country within region to see how -- because I suspect it's really grown. I'm just speculating on that because I've gone to all of the IGFs, and I very often personally look at the attendance list and do a count.

So that's probably not a very scientific approach, however. But I think that an analysis of the change of participation by region, if -- so if it wasn't just the European -- because the European Union, of course, is 28 states, I think, or something like that, but if there were a grouping also for the African region, for the

Middle East, for Latin America, the Caribbean, over time that might also be informative to us to see how the -- and what I've noticed, and I think there are host countries who are here, is when the IGF is in a region, there's a much higher percentage of attendance from that region.

But those are just -- I'll be happy to talk to you off line. I wanted to thank you for this. As business people, we always like to be informed by facts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

Would you like to reply?

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Well, okay. Well, thank you for your very good question, and the -- oh, yes, and this kind of chart we have just tried to -- as a first experience, so maybe many different view or many different idea for the different analysis can be achieved in future research. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran, you wanted to take the floor?

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

Very interesting paper. We have no difficulty with the paper, nor we have difficulty with further information dividing by region, by subregion and so on and so forth, but we would like to discuss the relation of this with the paragraph that we have before us.

If we are discussing this paragraph, let me -- or allow me to say something.

This paragraph, which is quoted from Paragraph 69, whether in the view of Mr. Rushton these boards have been changed or have not been changed, that is another issue, but I think whether changed or not, the essence and thrust of Paragraph 69 is still valid.

So Paragraph 69 is starting to say "enabling governments," first element; "on an equal footing," second element; "carry out their responsibilities," third element; "international public policy issues pertaining to Internet," fourth element; and fifth element, "not get into the day-to-day."

So why -- not why. How this document and how the recommendation addressing this issue?

Enabling government on an equal footing. What is the recommendation to enable government? And what is the criteria for equal footing? Equal footing how?

And on the public policy issues of Internet, there is no relation between this document and the paragraph below that from our distinguished Japanese colleagues and this paragraph.

We would like to see what is the mechanism by which the government will be able or enable the government to carry out their responsibilities on equal footing.

We have to reply to these very simple and straightforward questions. No reply was given, unfortunately.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Would you allow me to finish my --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think the message has come through.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Excuse me. I have not finished, Chairman. If you don't want that I speak, very good. No problem.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, I really --

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: But I would like to mention that we should limit ourself to the issue under discussions, but not -- we are not opening another IGF here. Whether the IGF has 25 workshops or 125 workshops, that is IGF very good so far so good. We are dealing with to reply to this paragraph. Could you kindly tell me that? Which recommendation replies to this paragraph? Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Kavouss.

My interpretation of this presentation was that we have had a correspondence group working on the issues of mapping and we have a very valuable submission to the correspondence group from a member of the working group on enhanced cooperation, so I judged it valuable to have this information made available to the members of the group?

We are just giving this information and it's up to us to interpret.

Anyone else who would like to take the floor? Yes, Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I'm glad that the distinguished colleague from Iran asks this question and raises this issue because as I was analyzing the current version of the document, even the outcome of the correspondence group and also the draft recommendations that we have compiled until now, I -- personally I was also speaking with another distinguished colleague of another government that has a similar concern regarding which contribution has -- is addressing this intention of having governments on equal footing in public policy issues, and I would certainly say that even if there are a lot of recommendations that I agree personally with them, there are no recommendations at least directing in that -- in that -- apart from other recommendations that are beyond the role of the working group that -- for example, to carry this to the ITU or something. That's beyond our scope. But I remember some -- something from last week, a LACNIC contribution to the open consultations in the IGF, that, yeah, I understand and I agree that -- with Iran that the current IGF is not throwing these type of responsibility -- these type of concerns. It's not a body able to raise these type of concerns. But at the IGF, in the public consultations of the IGF, there has been proposals. And our organization said -- and if you allow me, I will read just two lines -- that IGF, it is specialized enough to focus in precision results. We believe that the IGF should face the complex challenge of producing concrete results based on the search for consensus without implementing formally official mechanisms but with providing recommendations.

This will be, like, in their (indiscernible) of the IGF, this was not able to be done. But now we believe that we have been defending the IGF as it was in the current status from the very beginning. But now we understand that the IGF should be reloaded in some other more stronger way.

I want to ask the Islamic Republic of Iran and other countries that are concerned about this, what about trying to get a statistical proposal? What about an IGF reloaded with governments providing in equal footing with the rest of the stakeholders, but not only with workshops but providing recommendations? Is that something that could be similar to their expectations or have something to do with the expectations? Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres. Let me remind ourselves that we are not discussing IGF itself. We have had a mapping exercise just showing some participation of governments inter alia in the activities of the IGF. And it is very valuable information.

As for the improvement for the IGF, it was a topic of the other working group. We have heard come out with a series of more than 40 recommendations to improve the IGF itself which has been endorsed by the CSTD, by the ECOSOC, and the United Nations General Assembly.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has been requested to report on the implementation of these recommendations. And this was reiterated in the resolution of last year, information technology and communication technologies.

Now, I --

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Chair, can I comment?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No. I haven't finished.

I expect that the Secretary-General is going to report to the United Nations in his report during the next session of the General Assembly on the implementation of this exercise.

So as I mentioned, in several resolutions, the United Nations identified enhanced cooperation and the IGF as two separate processes. So I'm not going to discuss the IGF here on its own.

However, in case we find that there are good opportunities to involve IGF in our recommendations, probably no one will object to that.

So that's how I see the things.

Sweden asked for the floor, then Virat, Avri, Saudi Arabia. And, Andres, you are going to close the line.

Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank Dr. Yokozawa for this very valuable contribution. We found it extremely interesting to see some facts on how participation looks in the IGF.

I think this is highly relevant for our group and is, of course, very much interrelated to the work of the correspondence group because what we take away from this presentation is that we have in the IGF a quite balanced participation between different stakeholders.

We saw that government is increasingly active in the IGF as well as civil society and other stakeholders. And one of the issues that we have been discussing here is whether or not there is a platform for equal participation or participation on an equal footing between stakeholders. And that's also what the correspondence group has tried to identify.

And our interpretation from the presentation just made is that this seems to be the case.

And if I should also just very briefly comment on the work conducted by the correspondence group, first of all, we would like to thank Phil for his efforts. And we take away from this compilation of issues and places where those issues are being addressed that there seems to be a lot of, let's call it, mechanisms or processes where these 24 categories of international public policy issues are addressed. But we can discuss that further. But that seems to be one of the conclusions that we would draw from the report of the correspondence group. That doesn't, of course, mean there might be improvements to be made. And let us discuss that. But that's just a preliminary comment on the work of the correspondence group and how that relates to the presentation just made by Dr. Yokozawa. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I wanted to congratulate both Phil who has done this outstanding work -- and I promised to call him "My Lord" during the duration of this meeting given the status that he acquired to try and put together this very, very complex, very detailed 97 pages. And equally a big thanks to the secretariat for presenting this in the manner that they have.

Also, to our colleague from Japan, for his outstanding contribution, it will be impossible for anybody to deny that IGF is a recognized a global mechanism process -- we can work with the words -- to discuss international public policy issues.

In furtherance of that discussion, I'd like to present the following. In the wisdom of the working group, this exercise was conducted at this extensive level including the work presented on the IGF. So, we respect that and we welcome that.

The discussion about the fact that we need to focus on a certain paragraph is not something that's mentioned in the U.N. mandate. The U.N. mandate does not mention that we need to focus on para 69. The U.N. mandate talks about a much broader discussion on enhanced cooperation.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that we need to look at the Tunis Agenda as a whole and not just in pieces or try and find the relevance to the presentation to a single paragraph.

More importantly, there are 69 which has been referred too often actually uses the word "international public policy issues."

It doesn't talk about decision-making. It doesn't talk about policy decisions. And the same language which relates to international public policy issues actually flows into para 72 of the Tunis Agenda. I can take the time to read it, but I think it's very well laid out there.

So, in effect, the presentation that has been made by our colleague from Japan very much addresses the para 69, which is about international public policy issues which then finds its way in 72(a), discuss public policy issues related to key elements, on and on; facilitate, discuss between bodies dealing with cross-cutting international public policies, on and on; interferes with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions which is, again, about public policy issues; interferes with -- facilitate exchange of information and best practices in this regard to make full expertise of the academic, scientific, and technical community.

This is like we have a group of countries that work together such as ISOC which exchange best practices on public policy issues.

So, in effect, not only is 69 about public policy issues, the discussion must be of the entire amount. I just want to close by suggesting that we shouldn't read para 69 where we need to read the Tunis Agenda as a whole. And we shouldn't read "decision-making" where we need to discuss international public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat.

I listened very carefully to what you have said. And it is my impression that in case we start discussing the Tunis Agenda, we will need to have at least two more weeks, at least.

I don't intend to discuss Tunis Agenda. We have a lot of things to do. We have a lot of contributions, and I believe that what is more important, what is our contribution as a group.

And we may go around the Tunis Agenda days and nights, but probably it will lead nowhere. It is not our task to go into details. It is our task to give recommendations based whatever we have worked on. And what was the work we have done, we have come up with a questionnaire. We have collected input from stakeholders or stakeholders -- we have grouped these responses together. And based on the responses, and naturally on our experiences, we have to give the recommendations. And we are capable of doing that.

And in this line, we have valuable input from the correspondence group as well. And I suggest to you to discuss these inputs and not to go back again and again to the WSIS agenda and just speak one of the paragraphs or the other paragraph and so on and so forth because our aim is to come up with a set of recommendations. So that's how I see things.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm very appreciative of the work of the correspondence group. And it is -- it was a group we asked to do an analysis for us. And I'm very appreciative of the analysis they came back with.

It is very interesting in looking at it that while there were some gaps, they were very few far and between and I think that's something we can be heartened by and hopefully can reflect in our work.

I'm very grateful to our colleague from Japan for the valuable report. I think it was very informative and is directly applicable to our subject, to the task before us.

In response to the very distinguished member from Iran, I would like to point out that this report shows a very critical response to the question he asked, to the question that is before us. It shows just one view, one view of perhaps many views, of activities where a great number of opportunities in which governments participated on an equal footing in all of the issues that are before us and all of the issues that are in a document that you asked me not to refer to.

Finally, I wish to associate with the comments made by my colleague Virat who reiterated the broader context, again not mentioning a document, the broader context in which we must be taking our work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After listening to you, (indiscernible) described by your speech. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, Andres.

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Just a brief comment that was intended before, Chair. This is not a suggestion being considered the differences between enhanced cooperation and IGF. Of course, we don't want to confuse that. But we -- I guess I'm concerned about the outcome of this week, and I guess this group should have some creative mind in order to come with some recommendations that could be acceptable for all because as far as I'm seeing, until now, we are far from consensus. And I guess these concerns that some other countries have are not being addressed. And this could be also a danger for some other proposals or recommendations that we -- maybe most of us agree with.

So I guess we have the responsibility of having a creative approach to these recommendations. And that's only the message. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. It was very informative reading the report of the group -- correspondence group. And as always, reading these compilations where wisdom comes from many corners. You learn so many new things which one saw in that mapping.

I roughly place about six categories of responses. I mean, there may be many. But just to put my point forward, I'm making six, seven categories.

One set was replied that there is an issue but it is being taken up by the IGF, a very big number of it. This issue has partly been dealt with by what the chair said about the two being different.

Also, in a substantive level, when the Tunis Agenda talks and defines "enhanced cooperation" in a particular paragraph -- because the definition is important, it not only says international public policies but enable governments to carry out the responsibilities. And governments' responsibilities are not to discuss policies but to frame policies and, if needed, enforce, link up with others to get it enacted. So that's the part which enhanced cooperation deals with, and the IGF hardly is doing that kind of a thing. So a lot of responses are about IGF being replaced.

And then there is a second set of responses which talk about frameworks like OECD, Council of Europe, electoral bodies taking up issues at the global scale. And I remember when the mandate of the terms of reference of the correspondence group were being framed, it was included that it talk only about existing international mechanisms. And that word was put there precisely to say we are talking about really international globally democratic mechanisms. That's the whole idea of how these global issues are being dealt with.

So good to read about OECD's and COE's (phonetic) work on taking up issues at a global level, but that's hardly sufficient and does not really address the issue which is raised in the relevant parts of the Tunis Agenda, which is to have governments on an equal footing and to democratize global governance of the Internet.

Thirdly, there are other areas in the correspondence groups Excel sheet in which we are talking about day-to-day technical matters which are also explicitly excluded from the definition of "enhanced cooperation." Again, interesting to read but doesn't go to the heart of the matter at all.

And then there is a fourth category. There are a lot of voluntary implementation mechanisms. Again, very useful in the chain of how public action takes place but not about public policy making. And, therefore, that's not also what we are talking about.

Then comes two issues which are really public policy, and some of the responses talk about some issues being taken up in places like WTO and WIPO.

And here the issue is that most of these cases which are Internet-centric are not adequately addressed by any of these bodies.

Whichever issue you take up -- for example, if it's Internet commerce -- it has a relationship with the Internet architecture, it has a relationship with privacy, with freedom of expression, it has relationship

with UNESCO protocols on cultural products, whether they are tradeable goods, it has relations with access, so we need a more holistic treatment of Internet issues and they're only partly dealt when we talk about WTO and WIPO.

These are some sets of responses in the correspondence group's report.

And the fourth one is lots and lots of issues which clearly are stated not to have any home and normally only a few important global issues are enough to start a new system within the U.N. Many of these systems deal with only one or two important issues and a host of them now often are being addressed to as "orphan issues." I don't like the term but we are now increasingly accepting that there is a huge set of issues which are not being dealt with, and I think that should be enough for us to make progress.

When we want to go forward, we don't talk about what has been done but we talk about what has not been done, and if we can at least come up to at least there are some issues which need to be addressed, let's have a road, then proceed from there onwards, and I think the report, therefore, does show that there are huge gaps and there are -- some kind of new mechanisms are needed for that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Just a thought about the existing mechanisms which have been identified.

Even that part I find extremely useful. It seemed to me, as well, that there were a lot of mechanisms, I wasn't even aware of the existence of these mechanisms. I didn't know a lot of activities going on in the ecosystem of the Internet governance. So I really appreciated the report itself and I think it's something extremely valuable and it's a good basis for discussion in the future, and that's really what I want to proceed with, to discuss it, and which are the elements which we can use in our work as a working group.

Next on my list, India, then USA and Joy.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Just quickly to comment on two or three points you may raise.

At the outset, we also would like to congratulate Phil and Joy for their wonderful work. It's a tremendous effort that has gone into this, and they've given us a very clear basis for us to move forward in this working group, and I think we all -- I'm sure everyone in the room endorses this view.

Secondly, with regard to the discussion that -- about -- the presentation, again, we'd like to thank Professor Yokozawa for your presentation. It's a very interesting presentation, knowing to see the very important advances that IGF is making on various mandates that it has been given, and it is obviously evolving into a very truly multistakeholder-process-based approach.

Now, then comes the next question, which, Chair, I'd like to really endorse your approach of having to see these two things in a distinct manner. And others may like to ask this question: Then why are we talking about IGF in this room? But I think we also have to recognize -- and we have recognized through the General Assembly resolutions -- that they are complementary.

So to that extent, the complementary nature of these two need to be recognized as we make progress in the working group while talking about enhanced cooperation.

To that extent, what -- if there are any -- while talking about the existing gaps, if IGF is stepping in at some places, yes, it can be recognized, but it has to be seen, as we believe, that -- as a relationship of enhanced cooperation with the IGF. Some -- some part of our report can look at that dimension.

I think the distinct identity of the two, the complementary nature being recognized, would go a long way, and that is what I think the General Assembly has made this recognition in its -- even the last resolution in December last year.

And lastly, with regard to the various elements of the compilation that has been provided by Phil and Joy, I think -- I'm sure we all will have to rack our brains to find out what is in it in terms of there are many informative strands that we have seen for ourselves, which I entirely endorse colleagues in the room who felt that these things were not really known earlier. They've become known and the challenge now is to see where the gaps exist and how do we move forward.

So I think it is that challenge that we have to now grapple with, rather than how much of it has been achieved, I think, but to see where the gaps are and then perhaps make some meaningful recommendations as a group.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy.

As you pointed out, there's a big challenge in front of us. Based on all this information, we have to sit down -- and probably we will do that in smaller groups -- and to deal with the recommendations based on this information we have.

Next on my list is USA.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Like you and many others, we want to express our appreciation for the report. Thank you, Phil, for providing an important context for our deliberations. I think this was a point made by another speaker.

Chairman, I suppose it could be said that the facts speak for themselves. To our mind, the information that's been provided by this survey, this chart, certainly it would seem to us that some progress has been made. Again, it would seem that progress has been made.

Secondly, it demonstrates to us the distributed governance system of the Internet.

And thirdly, Chairman, it would seem with these facts before us, it -- it's hard to imagine that a single -- that a single body would be able to address all of the public policy issues that have been raised by those who have brought their issues to this working group.

Thank you, and again, a very big thank you to Phil and all who contributed.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marian, for this contribution. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to comment on the analysis and (indiscernible) not from my role as co-chair but more from the perspective of civil society, and I think that this is quite a revealing exercise from that perspective, particularly, for example, in the area of human rights. When we looked at the more than 200 issues that had been collated from the initial submissions last September where there were more than a dozen human rights issues identified, and then collating those into a broad subset, we could see that there were many, many human rights mechanisms that were touching on Internet-related issues and Internet-related public policy issues within their mandates, whether those were special rapporteurs, whether those were regional bodies, whether at the national level, or here at the U.N.

And I think that what was clear from that was that governments were on an equal footing participating in those intergovernmental bodies looking at some of those public policy issues.

Civil society was also perhaps less directly involved on an equal footing, but leading to an increasingly (indiscernible) the scope of its engagement on these policy issues across multiple mechanisms, and I think that, for us, gives pause for thought about what's needed in terms of recommendations for how civil society can continue to move in this evolving atmosphere where there are many more mechanisms and how to do so constructively in terms of the public policy issues as more human rights issues, for example, get raised.

So I think that this was a rich exercise that merits further work, and certainly, you know, we would want to think about some recommendation towards that end during the course of this week. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

As the chair of this group, it is not my role to make any judgment about whether the appropriate paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda have or haven't been implemented. It's up to the group.

My role is to guide you through this process, and the way I see it now is that I will suggest you have, as I mentioned earlier, to have two breakout groups, which I would like to start their work tomorrow morning and concentrate on Points A and B separately and come back to the plenary with some recommendations.

Basically what I would like to see, points of agreement rather than points of disagreement.

So I would suggest to concentrate on issues first where you can agree on, and then treat the rest a bit later, and in case we find ourselves that we are in disagreement, then we just list it as it is.

I have a remote participant who would like to take the floor in case no one else would like to take the floor from --

Oh, Jimson. I'm sorry. Jimson, please.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Distinguished Chair, Colleagues.

I would also like to join everyone to deeply appreciate Phil and Joy for the excellent work they've done.

I am also a busy executive and I know the time requirements for such an exercise, so again, well done, Phil, and thank you.

Also, I do want to appreciate Dr. Makoto for his report. An excellent report as well.

My comment is in regard to a takeaway that I could glean from that report, which is the reality of what we see, in that if we look at the participation of the private sector, it is not as maybe voluminous or as high as others, but the gap may be participation of SMEs, you know, (indiscernible) from developing nations or least developed nations. And they are there. So moving that to our discussion on enhanced cooperation is a gap that we need to take a serious look at; that we need to ensure that businesses from developing nations are enabled, you know, to be part of these processes. And I will say that just to also note that even these three meetings that I've been here as an SME, that's a great commitment even on the part of my company. It is a small company. SME. So we need to work some mechanisms that will ensure that many voices that should be there needs to be heard and maybe begin to propose more recommendation we were to cover this line as well. But it's clear enhanced cooperation is working. We see it strategically showing but we can always improve on what we have.

Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Jimson. Anyone else who would like to take the floor from the members? I can see you, but first I think there was a request from a remote participant.

Okay. You can go ahead with the remote participant.

>>DAVID ALLEN: First of all, let me check whether or not the microphone is doing its thing and you can hear me there, or if not, please let me know.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. We can hear you. Please go ahead.

>>DAVID ALLEN: Excellent.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And identify yourself.

>>DAVID ALLEN: My name is David Allen. The organization is the World Collaboration (indiscernible) policy (indiscernible) here in the U.S. We are global in nature. I appreciate the opportunity to expand on the submission we made to the correspondence group. Unfortunately, the presentation finally presented in the spreadsheet presents only half of the proposition. It really doesn't make sense until

you have both of them. I'll say it as briefly as I can. I'm not going to read. I'm going to do it extemporaneously.

On the one side, these are, as stated, two major gaps that define the state of Internet governance today. One-half -- on the one side is the absence of democratic arrangements and that means democratic governments together in concert regionally and globally exercising policy discretion and then executing policy. That's, on the one side, the first major gap.

The other is a failure to protect freedom of expression. I don't have say these two gaps address the two sides who have been in conflict for maybe 15 or 20 years here on this turf. What is, therefore, useful to appreciate, we trust, is that these two gaps are each a counterpoint to the other. Governance by democratic governments control and direct. Free flow, on the other hand, in a tension with governance, creates the possibility to -- open to uncontrolled change, and as the submission said, better living standards that innovation can bring. Not to mention free flow is also the bedrock for successful operation of democratic governance.

Thank you very much. I do hope that this will be corrected and reflected in the spreadsheet now on the Web site.

My very best wishes for your discussions. This is a most difficult topic and I, for one, are quite appreciative of your efforts. Thank you. David Allen here signing off.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, David, for your contribution.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

Actually, I thought I'd start with a little joke to lighten things up and then I have some other comments.

Marilyn Cade told us that decisions in private companies are made on the basis of facts. Well, I've been involved in ICTs since 1970 so that's about 44 years and I spent about 30 years in the private sector, and in my experience, the decisions are made on the basis of what top management thinks is right.

[Laughter]

>>RICHARD HILL: And I hear chuckles. Those may or may not be facts and in fact my career has been somewhat limited over time because I am a statistician so I do present the facts and they don't always like that. Avri started by saying that she didn't quite understand why some people say that the enhanced cooperation hasn't been realized.

Well, I was -- as some of you know -- I see that there are about four or five people here who were actually involved in the creation of the Tunis Agenda and those people will remember that I was one of the secretaries for that work. I was in the ITU secretariat at the time.

So I think I have a pretty good understanding of what that text was supposed to say and why it says what it does say.

The first point is that there's a great deal of creative ambiguity. That was done on purpose. The only way to get consensus was to have text that was not entirely clear and could be understood in different ways. That's common in these organizations. We all know that.

The fact of the matter is that the people who put the language in on enhanced cooperation had a specific objective in mind, but we don't like to name countries, and so I won't name the country but everybody knows what it is.

The enhanced cooperation was shorthand for "We're not comfortable with the fact that one country has a predominant or asymmetric, or whatever you want to call it, role, and so we're calling for enhanced cooperation to find a way in which we will no longer have this asymmetric role by one country."

Now, not everybody understood that that's what the language was supposed to mean, and certainly immediately after the Tunis Agenda, people jumped up and said, "Oh, no, no, no, that's not what enhanced cooperation means at all," which is why it's being dragging on for a long time and you, Chairman, have been chartered to sort that out and to try to find some agreement on what enhanced cooperation means, which we may or may not succeed in doing. You're very optimistic, Chairman. Congratulations for that.

The other thing that amuses me is to see how the phrase "equal footing" which appears in one place in the Tunis Agenda is used to say other things than what it was intended to say in the Tunis Agenda. Now, that's okay. Those are English words. You can use them any way you want. A lot of people think that equal footing means that everybody involved in Internet governance should be on an equal footing, so governments should be on an equal footing with private industry, with civil society, with me, with anybody else. And that's fine, but that's not what it was used for in the Tunis Agenda. And let's not fool ourselves. In the Tunis Agenda, it was very precise. It was, again, addressing the issue of the fact that one government has at present a different role than other governments. And the equal footing in the Tunis Agenda was about saying, well, all governments should have an equal role in the governance of public policy for the Internet. Maybe they should have no role. That's a different story. Certainly we're not comfortable with the fact that one government has a role that's bigger than another government. So let's not forget that that's what this discussion is about fundamentally.

In terms of the working group, the correspondence group, as some people know, I worked for many years very closely with Phil Rushton. And he did a great job given the constraints, but there were constraints. One is there was not enough time for the correspondence group itself to validate the report. So the correspondence group has not seen the report, and some people in the correspondence group may feel it does not correctly reflect their inputs.

My bit -- there was a mistake but Phil corrected them. So my bit is okay. Contrary to what Phil said, I believe gaps were identified in the correspondence group that are not reflected in the report. But this is no criticism of Phil.

The mandate of the correspondence group was written a certain way, and Phil fulfilled that mandate. And there wasn't space to say other things. For example, I identified two things that in my opinion are gaps. One is the one I just mentioned, equal role for all governments. That's a big gap. There is no mechanism addressing that. You can say what you like. That's a fact.

And the second one is that there is no mechanism for addressing the tax issues that arise from the digital economy. Now, that's not me making that up. That's the G20 who said that.

If you look at the Saint Petersburg declaration of the G20, there is a tax annex and it says exactly that.

Nobody is proposing a single body to handle all issues. I hear sometimes people saying, well, no single body can handle all issues. Obviously not. Nobody has ever proposed that.

The proposals that have been put on the table including your meeting, Chairman, are to strengthen existing bodies and ask them to deal with certain issues. For example, for taxation, the G20 made a specific proposal. They said that the OECD should look at that issue. Why not? Okay. It's not fully multistakeholder because it is government-only and it is not all governments because it is only OECD. But at least, it is a starting point and then they can bring that somewhere else and it can be discussed somewhere else.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Richard, can you conclude?

>>RICHARD HILL: I am finished.

And there are also proposals to create a new body for certain issues that have not been addressed in particular to ensure equal roles for all governments with respect to the management of Internet names and addresses because there is no body that's addressing that particular issue. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard, for reminding us of history and what were the intentions of the founding fathers and mothers.

As for -- I'm not really sure that everybody shares, in this room, your vision of not proposing a single body. I see some contributions which did suggest a single body for handling all the public policy issues, but I am not here to judge any of the contributions.

Basically, what I intend to do now before we break for coffee, I would like to tell you what I intend to do after coffee break.

I would like to have a suggested discussion, a very short one, on the way we think the structure of the report would look like, just some guidance for the other group which will be convened tomorrow morning at 9:00.

And at the same time, as I mentioned to you, unless you -- in case I have your agreement, I would like to start the work of the breakout groups because probably it will be nice to have a long, long discussion on each of these issues. But it will be equally beneficial to have the discussions in smaller groups as well with the view of coming up with recommendations.

So what I suggest is that as of tomorrow at 10:00, we start forming two breakout groups. I will decide on the chairmanship of the breakout groups. And I would like you to attend or participate in the work of these breakout groups which we will talk with first group A questions, one of the groups, and the other group will focus on group B questions. And after 1 1/2 hours, they will come back to the plenary and report and we shall see how it goes.

Now, before we break, I understand there is one more request for the floor in the room?

Right.

>> VIKRAM TIWATHIA: Chairman, thank you so much. This is -- we come to watch in this corner of the room. Maybe it is not easy to catch your eye. Thank you so much to provide this opportunity for an observer and being an observer for the first time in this meeting.

At the outset, compliments to the entire group to have presented all that you have done so far. To introduce myself, I represent the Cellular Operators Association of India, which provides mobile telephony to about 700 billion people and about 250 million Internet subscribers which are directly dependent members of us. So all the deliberations that I have here are intrinsic to the way we will have to work.

Just as a quick one, because I know -- you know, we follow up with coffee, the thing that I wanted to emphasize for us -- and I take the queue from what Mr. Reddy said, yes, there is a lot of complementary efforts and a lot of progress that has happened in enhancing the cooperation that has happened. And I think that has to get captured as we go along.

Because as you yourself observed, the listing that has been done in the reports which have been presented today do actually put down on paper a lot of good work that has been done.

So, you know, to some of the interventions that were made that maybe you need newer platforms and newer offices to be created, I think what we could do as part of our work in the rest of the week is to make sure that the balance between all the stakeholders is suitably maintained as we go along and the existing frameworks which are there, which have been working well, could be further strengthened.

So I will leave it at that, and I will be happy to work along as we go the rest of the week.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I'm always impressed by the figures which come from India or China. It is really amazing.

Okay. So we are almost there, that is, coffee break.

I would like to have you back by quarter to 5:00 and continue with the discussion on the forms -- structure of the report and then carry on with all other issues. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you for being on time. I would like to resume our meeting, which is the last short one hour.

I would like to follow on what has been said this morning about the structure of the report with the intention to give some guidance to a small group, which will be convened by Mr. Reddy tomorrow morning at 9:00. Am I right assuming that you will meet here right across the room in this cafe? This is suitable? Eventually -- I'm not sure if the room is available at 9:00. The room is available as of 9:00 here. In case you don't feel like taking coffee here, you can just sit down here.

So there were some concerns as for the structure of the report. We had an excellent submission from India you remember during the last meeting, and it has been made available in the documents.

So you had a chance to look at it. You had a chance to think about it. And now you have the chance to comment on it. What are your thoughts about the structure of the report and what other guidance you are going to give first to the smaller group. I expect from the smaller group to have a discussion, about a one-hour discussion, to come back to us and to report on their findings. And we have to consider this finding. And in the best case, we approve them.

So I open the floor for your comments on the structure of the report. It seems to me that I heard that there was already some comments eventually from the U.S., if I'm not mistaken. You had a submission about it. If you think this is the appropriate time to intervene, I would like to encourage you also to take the floor and give your thoughts about the report.

Yes, United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I'm happy to do that and happy to take the floor again. Many of our points were made this morning. And perhaps the most expedited thing that we could do is to make available to the entire group the email that we sent to you.

But simply to repeat it for those in this afternoon's session as we started -- as we put into writing, first of all, we would like to thank Mr. Reddy for his efforts.

We believe that any working outline must reflect accurately, as accurately as possible, our discussions and our decisions; reflect dissenting views as appropriate; and most importantly highlight areas of consensus and constructive recommendations for achieving enhanced cooperation.

We think that the outcome of our deliberations can't be prejudged, of course. And to the extent we can be helpful in terms of working with Mr. Reddy on his proposal, we will be happy to do that to achieve what we think is a very common goal here.

I suppose I should stop. I could go on, Chairman, if you -- why don't I stop here. We have also done some thinking about what the report should be, but let me give the floor to others. So I'm just registering again with colleagues the comments that we had made in reaction to Mr. Reddy's outline.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, we would like to thank Mr. Reddy for his effort in involvement in this report, which we support. We think it would give a fair examination of the mandate and it will put the recommendation on the right track. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any further comments about the structure?

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate this opportunity to make preliminary comments. I thought that perhaps as we -- several of us from the business community are looking forward to being -- attending the small group, these are just my individual comments.

I really welcomed -- personally I welcomed Mr. Reddy's initial contribution, but I think we've had time now as well as others to think a lot about both the structure and content.

And I think it is going to be important for us to take the idea that we are explaining in the introduction or background or something at the beginning. We're putting enough information in so that the rest of the world -- and I made this comment earlier -- the rest of the world those are not part of the working group can really understand what led to the creation of this working group and the work that we did.

So I'd like to support that that is also taken into account and included in the -- in the report. And I'm assuming that there will be a section in the annex at the back which would have the factual information about meetings and the participants in the group. Also, as we've seen now, the fact that we've had a number of observers, I think it would be very helpful to include in our report the fact that we have had participation from observers throughout our meeting. Those are the kinds of things that might not be normally thought about, but I think they are important for us to include in our report overall as well as a substantive section where we share the information about the discussion that we've had about the questionnaire responses.

So many people took the time to make responses. And I know that while 19 responses may not seem like a large number, in fact, it is a very significant amount of information, as Mr. Rushton said.

So I do hope that we'll have a -- it will include a discussion about the examination of those topics and then get into the areas where we have recommendations, where we have agreement, where we may have some non-agreement, and then a way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

I have some thoughts about the structure myself, and I would like to have your opinion about it. I fully agree we should also report in the annex to the report the number of participants, what were the meetings. I also think it might be a good idea naturally to annex the questionnaire we have and, with your agreement, the outside of the exercise from the correspondence group. So I'm still in your hands, and I would like to have your reactions in general and to have specific recommendations as for the structure of the report.

Sorry, yes, yes, go ahead.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I expect that the report would not be a summary record of the meeting nor minutes of the session of the meeting. The report needs to contain the mandate -- no, how it was established, one; what was the mandate, two; how many meetings it held, three; what was the summary of the progress made at the first meeting, what was at the second meeting and third meeting; list of participants, yes, either totally or individually by each meeting; if possible, all categories of participants; questionnaire, yes, because it is a discussion reference.

And then you start with recommendations and go topic by topic: Topic A, following consensus was reached to provide the recommendation; topic B, no consensus was reached, full stop; topic C, following the recommendation is a result of consensus and so on and so forth. That's all. That is what we expect.

It would not be very useful if we mentioned who said what. It would not be useful if we try to provide in a narrative way the quotation or a statement of each individual and so on and so forth. It has been done. There are people who look at that one, the captions and listen to this one, everything is there. But I don't think that is input.

And, moreover, if you try to put all of these things, it would be boring and would not be read properly by the people. We should limit the size as possible areas we are able to give recommendations, so far so good; areas we are not giving recommendations, we cannot give, no consensus was reached in this regard. That's all. These are our suggestions. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. That also coincides with what I suggested. I can see no contradiction in that.

Yes, we have to be very concise because we are dealing with a lot of issues. Even if we try to be concise, I'm afraid the report will be quite lengthy.

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree that it would be to the report's benefit and to the meeting's benefit if we can produce a fairly short and concise report, if that's possible. We will definitely not object to that approach.

Just to highlight one issue maybe, we think that it's of great importance that all the five categories of issues that have been identified to have relevance for the implementation of enhanced cooperation is

given equal sort of attention in the report. We think that it is something that we should bear in mind when we are discussing this tomorrow. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Anyone on the structure? Anyone on the annexes? U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Simply to support your proposal, if I heard it to be a proposal, that we should annex the questionnaire and annex the report that was produced by the correspondence group.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So I turn to Mr. Reddy. We've heard the different views which are not very diverging views. In fact, I think they are quite converging views. I believe the exercise you will make tomorrow morning is facilitated by this short discussion.

So I expect that you can come up with a kind of final draft for the benefit of this group which I hope to be able to discuss at the very beginning of our meeting tomorrow morning. So I wish you good luck for your work.

If you think -- well, probably this is not a good time to start this work because we have -- some of us intend to attend the meeting -- or rather the book launch by DiploFoundation in the WMO. So I recommend you to start your work tomorrow morning.

And I encourage those who are interested in this exercise to come at 9:00 either to the room or to the cafe. Probably the cafe is a kind of more pleasant place to go to and discuss the structure, and I'm sure that you will come back with a great result.

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, could we have a show of hands about the number of people who are going to come because I found very often that in the cafe, 12 people can huddle but 37 can't. So maybe we could -- and we could huddle better if there is a large number of us in this room perhaps.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think it is a good suggestion. I doubt there will be 37 persons.

Who has intention to participate in the work of this group? Marilyn, you may be right.

[Laughter]

I still hesitate to take your coffee. Having said that, I'm not sure you are allowed to have your coffee here.

Yes, Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm just wondering, this room can be used for the meeting tomorrow, can't it?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you, I just wanted to check it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's correct. That's just a concern that Marilyn expressed, that eventually the cafeteria -- or the cafe over there won't be most adequate place. Okay.

So I think we can go back -- yes, India.

>>INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair, for entrusting the responsibility in me. But we will do our best.

At the outset, I think it will be a useful idea if colleagues can perhaps start to reflect on what is there in the text. I suppose some elements -- we can do it in two steps. The first-step process could be where we look at the, let's say, headings, headers, sections of the report that we would like to have. I think that's -- I would like tomorrow to pose this question to participants.

And, thereafter, would be to look at two other subsets which is obviously we're not going to be commenting on the content but clearly on the recommendations part of it. Naturally, that's the -- the whole week is for us to reflect on that.

And then the third dimension is the amount of documentation that would go along with this. One advantage we have is since we are in the age of Internet, some of the documents can be prescribed to be available on the -- at an opportune location of the U.N. Web site because the challenge would be in terms of translations because the secretariat will have to undertake as and when the final report is produced.

I think we have to bear these three or four challenges from the U.N. perspective, the secretariat's perspective. And I'm sure we'll have colleagues making recommendations which I'll come back and report to the larger group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mr. Reddy. Very good advice. I'm turning to the secretariat and I have a question if we have the obligation of translating, for instance, the participants, the list of participants, into six languages.

>>ANNE MIROUX: Just one thing. The first thing is that when we have a document which is submitted, it's translated in full or it's not translated. Basically, it's very difficult to say you translate Section 1 and 2 and you don't translate Section 3. I don't think that the U.N. secretariat will basically accept that.

Now, the list of participants, I mean you don't translate the names, but there is translation concerning, you know, translating sentences and so on, so either you translate it in full or basically you don't translate it.

In this particular case, if you have a report with a -- you know, a huge amount of annexes, we can ask for some things but on a kind of exception, which could be understandable, unless you issue the annexes with a different document number, in which case we can play with that and (indiscernible). That's one thing, but I think somehow the most serious issue right now for the report and the translation is that basically if the report is available only in March, for instance, or mid-March or end of March, I

would say virtually -- normally, according to the rule, it's already too late to get it translated because there is a rule of 14-week submission prior to a meeting and then another rule for 12-week submission which is a late, late, late submission, which is basically three months before the meeting, and then we would not, in any case, fill the requirement for the meeting of the CSTD which is supposed to begin on the 12th of May.

So there I think this is the most serious section that questions, you know, whether you translate annexes or not.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ms. Miroux.

I understand from your statement that it is advisable for us to finish our work by the end of this week, including the report itself, to have it approved, rather than just put it off and approve it at a later stage, and I'm sure we can do that based on the -- and let me prejudge -- on the excellent work of the ad hoc group tomorrow which will suggest the structure, and probably in the structure we are already going to have part which can be accommodated. I'm referring to the previous meetings. I'm referring to the mandate. So there are sections which we already have.

Naturally, we can't put in the recommendations. I wish we could, but we cannot. But hopefully these recommendations will be consolidated and we will find the places to put them in.

So even though the task seems to be a bit complicated, it's doable and I'm sure we are going to do it in a proper way.

So I essentially hope that we are going to meet this 12th week deadline which is needed to be able to present the document to the CSTD meeting in May.

I naturally want to avoid any misunderstanding or any refusal from the CSTD part, saying that, "Well, you have the document only in English. We are not going to treat it. I would like to have it in the other five languages as well, not to have any obstacles for participants to understand. We have to take into account that there are participants who are Francophones or Hispanophones who" -- and so on and so forth. So -- but we try and respect these constraints and I'm sure we are going to meet the expectations.

Anyone else on this issue?

If not, let me go back to the original agenda where we started discussing our rolling document.

Probably, as I indicated, we shall have two breakout groups starting from tomorrow morning, after the presentation of the ad hoc group on the structure.

I will inform you about the methodology we are going to follow, but basically it's going very similar to what we had during our first meeting.

I encourage you to read attentively Group A and Group B because I intend to treat these questions.

I have already had some remarks about the interrelationship of the two groups, which is evident, and I believe it's true for almost all of the groups that there is interrelationship and for some delegations being incapable of participating in both groups at the same time, I know it's a constraint but the way I see it now is we're going to have discussions in small groups and we bring in the results to the plenary after some time of discussion in the small groups and we discuss it and we shall decide on the way forward how we can handle this constraint of smaller delegations not being able to participate in the work of one or the other breakout groups.

Any questions or remarks concerning the way forward?

I can see no hands no place.

As a last thing, since we still have half an hour, basically that is the way I would like to proceed with the following issues as well.

So I hope to be able to finish with Group A and B in some time and pick up the other groups, so that is C, D, and E, which will be treated on an equal footing as far as attention is concerned.

I will pay as much attention to the other groups as to the first two ones.

I really count on your active participation in both groups and in the plenary, and I want to ask you again for the constructive approach. That is, to find issues we can agree on rather than to find issues where we cannot.

So having said that, I don't think we should start anything new right now, so I strongly encourage you to start your exercise for tomorrow, go through again the documents we had, and I would like to greet you tomorrow morning at 10:00 here. Thank you.