

Transcript Third Meeting Working Group on Enhanced

Cooperation

24-28 February 2014

Geneva, Switzerland

Day 3

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

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

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I apologize. My card is being replaced. We worked so late last night, apparently I ate my other one.

Good morning to all colleagues. I have a couple of things to say about the structure, and in a couple of cases, Chair, it is to confirm where certain information will fall, and in another case, I wish to make a proposed amendment and move one of the headings.

So let me ask my question first and then go ahead and make my proposal and then ask for the answer to the question, if that's okay with you, so I can be real quick here.

The analysis -- we did a questionnaire. We got a lot of information. We're doing an analysis. We haven't thoroughly yet discussed and identified the gaps, but we are in progress of doing that.

Where would we put the narrative, what I think I called yesterday the picture or the story? Where would we put the narrative that identifies the gaps that the working group agrees on?

The -- a description of the analysis, I see, could go under -- in theory, it could go under "Methodology," although "Methodology" could be just a high-level statement, but a discussion about the analysis, and then followed by an identification of the gaps. Because I think there may be a range of views about gaps.

Then my next point would be, I would like to propose moving 8, and in order to do that, I would like to actually propose rewording of 7.

This says, "Relationship of existing proposed mechanisms with existing intergovernmental bodies which are dealing with international public policy issues."

I believe that, in fact, there are -- all of us, including governments, are engaging with international entities as well as intergovernmental bodies, so I would like to propose -- and understand, it will be in square brackets, inside square brackets -- that this read, "with existing intergovernmental bodies and international entities which are dealing with international public policy issues."

And then I would like to merge "Relationship with the Internet Governance Forum" as a subpoint under 7. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Marilyn.

Just, I think, you make very valid and important suggestions, that narrative, how do we include and where is the placeholder?

I think as I said yesterday in the beginning, if we are merging the 2 and 3, "Methodology" and the "Scope of Areas," under that perhaps what we could do is while we define the methodology, which is of -- doing what we did factually, and the scope of areas, we could say the outcome of the questionnaires and then the certain -- capture some ideas that has been emanating out of that.

And more importantly, as -- I mean, it's my understanding that since we have the advantage of the Web sites going to have this document -- what do we call? -- this report plus other documents, we could make a reflection in the report itself the location of such report, so that everyone has the benefit of seeing the entire report in itself.

And so we make those provisions in the report, perhaps giving the Web site address, where we hope the secretariat will keep it for a good time. I mean, rather than as part of updating the Web site, that they just don't take away the contents which are attached to the report.

And moving this -- the second suggestion you made was with regard to 7 and I think in which case if -- at which point then we will then have to look at 7 and 8 forming part of one set. I have no -- I think that that's a valid suggestion and we think it's logical. I mean I don't see any difficulty in that.

Okay. Next on my list is Sweden. Per, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues.

To start from the top, we have no problem with 1 and 3, merging them or having them as they are. It both works.

4, preference for striking out since it's already covered under 5.

The comment on the issue raised by Avri about -- under 5, it will be naturally necessary to have some kind of text to conceptualize the recommendations, most probably.

I would be -- I would caution against using the word "statement," though, since that seems to be some kind of -- that's something that maybe we do in our capacities here as individual members of the working -- of the working group, but maybe not something that would be reflected in the report. But some kind of text that conceptualizes some broader consensus or motivation for the recommendations that would then follow is probably necessary.

6 and 7 we agree with you, Chairman, that they are already -- it's better that they are submerged into 5.

And in terms of 8, we think that -- our interpretation is what we would like to do with 8 is to have maybe a concluding discussion about potential sort of overlaps, relationships, et cetera, between the Internet Governance Forum and this working group or the enhanced cooperation process.

But there might also be other things. That's one thing that we have singled out that may be of interest to draw some potential conclusions or at least to have some discussion about, but there might be other things as well.

So we would, again, prefer to have a more general type of -- maybe something like concluding remarks or summary discussion or something like that that could include such a discussion on the IGF but also other potential relationships and conclusions that we would like to draw, if it's possible. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Per. Now Mexico, followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, colleagues.

My delegation would like to -- just a clarification, because our understanding was that the -- that there is a proposal to merge Number 2 and 3, which we support. I don't know -- I've heard something about merge 3 and 1. Just a clarification.

And Number 4, we believe that this already contained, as we mentioned yesterday, in Number 5. And as well, we support the proposal of merging Numbers 6 and 7 because it's very difficult to see -- for us to see where the boundary is between one and -- one -- Number 5 and Number 6 and 7.

Regarding 8, we would like to see how it evolves. Maybe it's very -- has some way to leave it where it is.

And regarding Number 9, I remember with some delegations that yesterday expressed that we would be prejudging the position of UNGA, so perhaps we can find another title that reflects the conclusions or something that comes from this group, rather than a way forward.

Thank you, Chair.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Mexico.

Now I give the floor to Saudi Arabia, followed by Japan.

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

Well, after listening to you and the distinction was made by UNGA and ECOSOC between enhanced cooperation and IGF, I think maybe 8 is needed, to put the same distinction very clear when we write our recommendation.

6 and 7, I think merging them with 5, I think it's an okay process.

I think 2 and 3 are a subsection of 1, so all falls under introduction, but I think I mean that is now acceptable to us. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. Next, Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Japan agrees to the chairman's proposal concerning Section 2, 3, 4, and 6, 7, and I'd like to agree to Sweden's proposal on Section 8, and I'd like to propose to merge 8 and 9, section 8 and 9. The title is "Conclusion." Somehow build on the future -- the summary of discussion in the conclusion, merging Section 8 and 9.

And I think regarding the recommendations, I think it's a very good idea to use the format of the report on the working group on the improvement to the IGF, I think. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Japan. Now I have United States, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. Good morning to everyone.

We think that we're generally going in the right direction, Mr. Reddy, so we want to say thank you and appreciate very much the efforts that you've made in putting some definition in the report that we'll need as we leave this meeting.

One thing that we would want to support -- and we think we heard this from a number of speakers -- is that there has to be -- the right word might be a chapeau, a narrative, but something that makes our work understandable to a general readership.

And I'm actually thinking of maybe Mexico's earlier comments from yesterday, where we made progress, where we -- where we couldn't.

We think that's an important element that would be of interest to the -- to the CSTD.

So just to summarize, that we don't want to lose sight and we think it's important, as has been mentioned by a number of speakers, that we have a narrative that gives context to any recommendations developed.

A question for you, Chairman, is the work of Mr. Rushton. And it's our expectation that his work would somehow be reflected in the report of this meeting. Where will that be seen?

And we think it's particularly important because Mr. Rushton is attempting, and through the correspondence group, is attempting to identify facts upon which some of our judgments may be based.

Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you.

I think I will start with the last question that you raised.

In fact, I've been -- since the beginning of this session, at least in a national capacity, we've been very appreciative of the work done by the correspondence group, Phil and Joy, and I think the placeholder for this would be now in the reformed 2 and 3, merged 2 and 3, where we would be talking about, under the methodology, that such a group has been created, and then we would make a reflection, perhaps, of the title of the -- or the -- what do we call -- the mandate given to that particular correspondence group, and the output as -- not necessarily an attachment to this report, because it will become very bulky, as we all understand -- as a location where that particular entire text would be available on the Web site.

So I think that is the intention I think we can work on.

But now, I don't see -- Japan, you want to speak? All right. And Marilyn, I see that your flag is -- no? Yeah.

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes, Chair. I just needed to go back and clarify.

I'm still -- thank you very much for reviewing my earlier comments, but I was unable to comprehend what happened to my suggestion to modify 7 to add -- to make it read, "existing intergovernmental bodies and international entities."

Was that -- I didn't -- was that accepted and put in square brackets, as I asked, or has that not been included? Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Marilyn, at this stage, I think we have not agreed on anything except that we're discussing, but I've certainly taken on board your suggestion to look at Number 7 and we will revert back -- I'll try and conclude towards the end to see whether I captured you correctly. If it is not, then you are most welcome to rebut again on that particular topic.

I have Iran now, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to everyone. Listening carefully, Mr. Chairman, to you and the other colleagues in the room, first of all, we have -- Mr. Chairman, we have to think about the usefulness of the report.

As bulky as it is, then less attention will receive the report. We have to be to the point.

In order to do that, I agree with you that some parts which we are going to deal with in -- deal with in the recommendations, it's not necessary to have another or separate part in the report.

I agree with merging 2 and 3, to delete role of the stakeholder, since we have it in the recommendations, and also Number 6, we have reference in the recommendations under Section D.

And IGF, Number 8, I think it's considered under Part B, in the recommendation part.

If we are going to have a separate part on IGF, then I think we have to take whatever in recommendations out and put it in Part A because I don't think repetition is good, even for IGF to have in recommendations, and to have a separate part. We have to deal with each issue just once in the whole report.

The relationship on -- of existing and proposed mechanisms, Mr. Chairman, I think you referred to very well after the intervention by Marilyn because I think that's the product of the correspondence group, in fact, relating to that part.

I think reference to that work in Part -- merged Part 2 and 3 will be more helpful than having a separate part on that matter. And as I think the room agreed, we -- we don't need the way forward. We are not going to judge the work of the CSTD and the rest of bodies on the matter.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Iran.

Okay. Thank you, colleagues. If I've -- let's go step by step, I think, and see how much of it I have absorbed and see if we can start making changes on line.

Can we just start there?

Can we do Number -- so delete 2. And you could have methodology followed by the -- of the working group, and within brackets, you can keep first meeting, second, and third meetings.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>B.N. REDDY: Yeah. Just square brackets. And scope of areas.

Do you think we can agree on this? Which will -- yes, Marilyn. Please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I would look to other colleagues from governments. I will speak only as a business representative.

A CEO or senior manager reading a title called "Methodology" would not -- would think that this was something about only how many meetings were held and how many people attended. They would not assume that it was a substantive discussion that included the summary of the information that was received, the analysis, and the identification of -- and the discourse summary.

I very often find actually "methodology" as an annex in other reports that come out of CSTD and UNCTAD and various other places.

So I think my anxiety is about the fact that the word "methodology" might not be descriptive.

If I'm assured that what is now under 2 and what has been proposed about the inclusion of the substance -- but I just want to note to colleagues that "methodology" is not a sexy term, so to speak.

>>B.N. REDDY: Marilyn, point well taken. However, I know the challenge we have as a working group, we seem to have evolved over a period of time, very constructive and very innovative wings like you see, for example, and also following a certain sequence that has been provided by the General Assembly. And that sequencing was important. I think in the room, everyone had -- had truly expected the sequence in terms of first we created the questionnaire compilation, followed by responses received, correspondence.

So all it did -- it sounds to me a little mathematical, so a mathematician would like this terminology, and I'm sure that as a civil -- as a civil servant, we will not mind, but simply as the private sector, it's not only too sexy but as long as it captures what we intend to do, I'm sure I think we can -- unless you have serious objections -- yes, Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER:

I support your idea that as long as it captures the substance of the -- our assessment of -- where mechanisms exist and where the gaps are, I would worry less with the title. I agree with you on that. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you very much. Now, with regard to stakeholders, I think we'll keep it in square brackets because Avri raised this important issue of, if there are statements and certain kind of gentle assertions not bordering on recommendations, if they have a place under 5, which of course we'll leave it to the good -- leave it in the safe hands of our Chair to make that, and in such time we'll keep it as square bracket.

Coming to 6, I think there was broad consensus received that it would be reflected under 5D, so can be deleted. Thank you. Now, with regard to 7, suggestion made this was about -- one is, of course, the place where this heading should come. Is it possible that we shift it to, let's say, ahead of 5 which -- the existing 5, which means it would talk about certain relationships and then goes on to make recommendations. Because then it will also reflect on what the outcomes of CG could be captured in and recommend the table that CG has produced the first ones because we can capture parts of it there and then move on to the recommendations. So the suggestion is shift this -- 7 ahead of 5. Thank you.

Then coming to relationship with IGF, now here again, since we still haven't had discussion on the IGF segregated topics under the -- one of the topics dealing with 5B. I think for the time being we can leave it in square brackets and we will keep an open -- keeping in mind the broad range of views are expressed but are -- will be on board and we will take a look at it later.

On 9, I think one suggestion made was that instead of saying Way Forward, because it again would be a summary of what we would intend to do in the future, we could call it -- use the word Conclusions. Well, the Conclusions can be very -- we'll see how brief they can be, but it will not necessarily, as I see, as summarizing the whole report or the whole thing. We would then be duplicating it in a sense. If that is

the understanding, then I can -- I can -- I would like to make this proposal of having used the word "Conclusions." Okay. Now I have U.S. and Sweden and then the Chair has given me -- I asked him for five minutes, he said two minutes. But I hope we can quickly take comments. U.S., Sweden, followed by Saudi Arabia.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Sweden was most definitely ahead of me. He was right in my line of sight, but he's giving me the floor. Thank you. Chairman, a couple of points that we think are important perhaps have yet to be reflected in this table of contents. Our first conceptual point, when we look at the organization and in particular when we've seen it before, which is the relationship between existing mechanisms, whether there were existing international government bodies which are dealing with international public issues, Chairman, we think as we started this work we had categories that we were to attend to. Categories A, B, C, D, and E. And the idea that I think was expressed by many is that we should not be elevating one subject category over another. And unfortunately, I think that's what is happening with the inclusion of number 4. That's point one.

Point two is that I think there has been, at least to this -- to my -- to my ear, there has been -- there's been support for attempting to make this report very understandable to the CSTD and in order to make that happen we need some sort of narrative chapeau, we need to interest them in the report. I'm not trying to run away from the facts or the conclusions of this meeting, but I am looking for some sort of emphasis that gives some comfort that that very important -- this is very important we think to do. And we just need to realize that it's going to be part of this report.

So Chairman, to summarize, we think that number 4 needs to be put perhaps in the -- in number 5 or eliminated from the -- at least not -- not called out to our attention in the way number 4 does call out to our attention this -- this single issue. And secondly, Chairman, we'd like to -- in the narrative we'll make it understandable to the reader what we have accomplished, how we have advanced the work in this meeting, and perhaps what yet needs to be done. Thank you.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think that the distinguished colleague from the United States captured most of what I was to say but we're of the same opinion that we treat all the five categories that have been identified equally, and not singling out eliminating one category from the others. If we see the case with 4. And we would request 4 to be suppressed and included under 5 or as an alternative suggestion, suppressed and merged with 6 in some kind of concluding paragraph or chapter.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Sweden. And Saudi Arabia. The last on my list.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I think putting 4 ahead of 5 will assist us in the correspondence group on how the mechanisms I mean exist and what is enhanced cooperation, whether it's there or not. It's about keeping 4 before 5, it will guide the work of us. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you. And have the last speaker. Go ahead, ma'am.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Yes, it was also my understanding that the current category 4, which currently only covered intergovernmental bodies, there was discussion and I had a (indiscernible)

of adding intergovernmental bodies and international bodies, which would have given a very broad and general scope to this specific section. But now as it reads on the screen, it seems very narrow, and I would support the comment made by Sweden and others requesting that this -- the content going under section 4 be merged with current section 5. Thank you.

>>B.N. REDDY: And the last speaker, I guess. Mexico. Please, go ahead.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with the others that have suggested to merge number 4 and number 5 and I reiterate that you also remind us what this document has to be very concise, very precise, and we cannot start talking about the enhanced cooperation, suppressing immediately after what has been done, the relationship with other mechanisms, that it's something that -- it's part of the process but as (indiscernible) said, it's very important to our delegations to see the limits, the ways, the boundaries between number 5B and 4, what would be the difference. And we also suggest deleting number 4 or merging with number 5 or in the last case somebody mentioned to merge something with number 6, but definitely not as it is on the screen. Thank you very much.

>>B.N. REDDY: Now I see that Iran is also wanting to take the floor. I urge now the last speaker on my list. The last. Thank you.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. Regarding merging 4 and 5 on the screen, Mr. Chairman, I think there -- they have different nature, number 4 talking about the current situation, but the recommendations are different. We are talking about what we would like to do in future on the whole process of enhanced cooperation. In nature there are difference. In sequence you put it's very good, would be helpful in understanding the recommendations better, and I have a question to proponents of the Way Forward. It's still not clear to me what you -- I mean, those people who suggest having Way Forward and Conclusion, what exactly wants -- they want to have in that part of the report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>B.N. REDDY: Thank you, Iran. Now I think I'd like to conclude. I've heard all of you. With this understanding that the table as it exists has still some unfinished job. One with regard to number 3 of course I explained earlier and I think we will be guided by Chair at some stage on this issue. Number 4, there are two views in terms of one is very -- merge it with 5 or the other one is to retain it in its current position or to keep it -- revert back to the old position, which would follow after 5. So this is three options.

So with regard to the "Way Forward," our Conclusions, I think if people have no strong feelings on this, we can just keep to those conclusions and we will put it back, it's not called Way Forward. Conclusions can be something about what we have done. Way Forward is something influencing the future in which we might get into difficulties because the working group has a limited mandate of just report to the council, to the CSTD. If that is the way that we can have conclusions again and square back because there are some colleagues in the room that feel perhaps there's no need to have any further pronouncement on what would happen to this report, whatever the working group would be presenting. But this, and I see that Saudi Arabia and Iran wants to the floor. If you keep it to the Conclusion part of it would that suffice for the time being? We need to discuss this further, but if you have no difficulties

with that perhaps we can close this and yield the floor to the Chair who has been very patient on discussions on this chapter. So given last position which is on the corrections, you can make -- instead of Way Forward we can put conclusions and -- ah, we have it done. Colleagues, with that, I think we will meet some more time and that will be determined by the progress we make during the course of the day. Particularly on -- I see that 4 and 5 and 6 would definitely be reflected in one way or the other in our discussions on our way to subgroups on item 5. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, and good morning. I've been listening very attentively to your discussions, and I fully appreciate your efforts. I would like to remind you that we have an enormous task in front of us. And if we manage only to have a final structure of the report by Friday evening, then we are useless. So we should keep in mind what we have come here for. And with this reminder, I would like to invite you to have your coffee break for about 10 minutes and come back and start working on issues we have come here for. Thank you.

[break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good morning. Welcome back to the meeting. I know that you're full of energy, determination, with innovative ideas, patience, tolerance, and you are aware of the task ahead of us.

As I promised to you, I am going to give an assessment of the work we have been doing on Day 2 and I will share with you my ideas how we are going to proceed.

So as usual, I would like to recall the mandate. That is the reason we are here. It says the working group has been established -- it's a multistakeholder working group -- to examine the mandate of WSIS regarding the 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.

There was some kind of doubt what the second mandate means. To me, it means how enhanced cooperation is being implemented.

We have the obligation of reporting to the CSTD in its upcoming session in May.

And as you may know, the importance of the work is appreciated by the U.N. General Assembly. It has reiterated our mandate in its resolution last year.

So let me stop here for a while on the report. I have been following your discussions on the report itself and I know it's extremely important. I know it's very exciting to talk about the structure of the report. But as I mentioned earlier, in case we have come out with an excellent structure and nothing inside, then what is the reason to be here?

So I would like to ask you to suggest a report as simple as possible. I would suggest you to have the following items: We have an introductory part; we have a methodology part; we have the recommendations; and we have the conclusions.

It's as simple as that. That's what we are expected to do, according to the mandate.

If it's acceptable to you and I have your endorsement on that, I will ask the secretariat to work in this way.

Is it acceptable?

Thank you.

So let me go back to Day 2.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Just a question for clarification.

The concluding part, I mean what are we going to put in the concluding part? Could you please clarify? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I cannot prejudge. It's up to you. I hope we can conclude in some way, and a very positive way.

Maybe we have nothing in the concluding part. It's really up to you. It's not up to me.

And I know you are in good faith. I know you want to collaborate, you want to cooperate. I'm sure you have come here in the good faith with the determination of serving, and we are really serving a big community. You don't have to forget it. And we are in a privileged situation. You have to remember that. We are creating something. It is unique. We are doing something for our children, for our grandchildren. You don't have to forget that.

You may push back your particular interest. You are representing stakeholders. But at the same time, and most of all, which is more important, you are representing a big community, the community of the Internet. So don't forget that.

So back to Day 2.

We have started discussing two groups out of the five yesterday, in two smaller groups. This morning when I woke up, my wife talked to me, "You look tired."

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: "Why?"

Well, I told her I received yesterday two e-mails. There were two attachments, blue and green and yellow, but most importantly, what I saw, "no consensus," "no consensus."

Yes! Out of 20, there was one consensus.

Why?

I don't understand. Really, I don't understand why.

It seems to me that yesterday, we have had some kind of discussions on Tunis Agenda, trying to repeat or get into our recommendations. We are recommending something which already exists. Why?

We have come here to recommend really something which doesn't exist or we have come here to improve something. Don't forget that.

So I really suggest now to continue our discussions on the plenary. I'm going to chair the discussions and I will try and focus on the issues we have come here for. I'll try to get different views, get closer, and to come out with real results.

We have to listen. That's what I said at the very beginning. We have to listen to each other. We have to understand what is behind. And there are real concerns. We have to understand that as well. There are real concerns on each side. And we have to respect -- and having said the word "respect," we have to respect each other as well.

If we don't do that, we can't achieve anything.

Respect. Mutual respect.

And after that, we have to have some kind of mutual trust.

So in the previous working group, we managed to have this work with mutual trust, and in our previous meetings I think we managed to build up some mutual trust. So all of a sudden I can feel that this mutual trust is just starting to evaporate.

So I'm here to rebuild the whole thing, and we are going to finish in good faith and with results, I assure you.

So as I told you, I was a bit unhappy about the slow pace yesterday, what I anticipated. I really want to thank you for your effort yesterday, and I really want to thank the conveners for their hard jobs. I really appreciate it. I wanted to be smart. I wanted to get rid of some of the responsibilities. I wanted to relax a bit.

Apparently I didn't manage.

I told you that I have theater tickets on Thursday. I know you don't like it. You want me here on Thursday night. Well, let's see.

Anyway, so right now I want to have people who are equally happy, rather than equally unhappy.

So I try, in the plenary, to have you finalize the recommendations for Group A and B and we shall see how we are going to proceed with Groups C and D. Should it be small groups, should it be informal groups, or should we do it in plenary?

It's really up to you.

We may have informal groups. We may have interested parties coming together before plenary. I don't really care. What I care about is we have results.

As I indicated, on the technical part, we are going to have all the documents on Google Docs, and basically I don't really want to change the schedule I offered to you yesterday, so I really want to move forward today to have the bulk of the work done today, and I want to concentrate tomorrow on issues in Group E, and I want to finalize the structure of the report and in the way I suggested to you, and on Friday I really intend to discuss the report.

I don't doubt you will have issues. We are going to sort this out. And as I told you, we are going to have recommendations in the report where we have consensus, and we are going to have a part where we don't have consensus but we are going to reflect these ideas.

So that's the way I suggest to go forward, and I really want to remind you of our responsibilities. That is, we have to fulfill our mandate. We have to be innovative. We have to give meaningful, concise, and last but not least, implementable recommendations.

So there's no point of giving something which is not implementable. We have an experience of just giving recommendations which require financial resources. If you look at our group, I'm sorry to say but we don't really have the means to offer you a lunch or to offer you some sandwiches or some drinks because the whole group was created with the understanding that it will be based on kind of funds -- voluntary funds.

So if we anticipate some recommendations which require big financial implications, we may just forget it. It may be wishful thinking. But we have to be very realistic about the situation we are in now.

So as I told you, we are accountable and we are accountable not only to our communities, stakeholder communities, but to all the Internet community.

So that is my assessment of Day 2 and that is the way forward I propose to you.

I hope you -- you agree with that. And now I would like to start with discussing issues in Group A up to lunch.

We are going to have the lunch break as indicated at 1:00.

During lunch break, I encourage you to have informal consultations, with the sense of coming to some kind of consensus agreement, and we come back after lunch at 3:00.

I know that you like to work late at night. I have nothing against. I will be available. But today. I'm not sure about tomorrow.

Okay. So let's start with the rolling document and where we are with Group A.

So all of you have it. It's on the screen. You have all the -- yes.

So is my understanding correct that in this Group A, Number 1, "Calls for the continuing/full implementation of enhanced cooperation as referenced in Tunis Agenda" is the one we are going to discuss in this forum. And I can see a lot of lines which are striked out.

So I can see the whole thing is in square brackets and in the square brackets, I can see the "continuing/full" also in square brackets.

Can I have some explanation where the problem is?

It's almost the mandate we have.

To remind you, we are going to give the mandate in the introductory part of the report, so if you have the mandate, which is almost -- almost similar or the same thing as we have here, I have nothing against. I always start my presentations with the mandate, so if I do it twice, it's okay.

So Question 1: Do we need it?

Question 2: In case we do, in what form?

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. In our opinion, this is, as you mentioned, a repetition of the mandate and also a lot of paraphrasing from the Tunis Agenda. We do not see the need for this one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me phrase it in a different way.

Does it make any harm?

Does it make any harm? Does it give new information? Does it give something which resulted from this group?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, Russia asked for the floor.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Russia. I'm sorry.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Actually, we see there is a need for that because our task of our group was the examination of the Tunis Agenda in the case of enhanced cooperation has been implemented or not, and we see that it is very important that -- to stress that -- sorry, these particular points was not

implemented and we would like to have the recommendation to call for implementation of the Tunis Agenda regarding enhanced cooperation and then put the wording of the Tunis Agenda. And we have the -- more than the one-hour discussion yesterday regarding this and we think that equal footing between governments is very important and we cannot agree to change the main principle of the United Nations about the equality among all nations and we cannot agree that the voice of India, for example, can be equal to the voice of Google, for example, but the voice of India should be equal to the voice of Russia, as an example, and there should be the possibility for governments to discuss and make the decision-making on equal footing, in particular, part of international public policy issues.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Russia. I think I'm a bit lost now. I have been reading only the upper part of this screen. You are referring to the lower part, I believe. Am I right?

They are complementary or they are options, so I did not create any -- are we talking about the same thing, same recommendations in two different formats or -- or even three?

And in case we have three options, if I'm not mistaken, then which one are we talking about?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Take the third one.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: The third one? >>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah, because it was the most clean version, compared to the others.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I believe, referring to the question, I believe that was one of the questions in the questionnaire, am I right?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: However, it was -- we need to put forward involvement of all stakeholders in the respective area into the square brackets. That was the actual end of discussion of yesterday.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Now Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, I think Russia expressed our views very clear so -- but I was discussing option 1, 2, and 3. Which are we discussing now?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't know, I'm asking you.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I mean, if we go to the --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Take your option.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: If you go down to the (indiscernible) one, yeah, I think maybe this is the clean one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Am I right in assuming that this is a kind of word-by-word from the Tunis Agenda? Do we need to tell people the Tunis Agenda?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I mean, we are here to implement enhanced cooperation as Tunis Agenda. If we see it is no implementation so from there we'll bring the language. If it is not from the Tunis Agenda, we should stick to Tunis Agenda and implementation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm not questioning whether we are here for implementing the Tunis Agenda. My question is whether you should be.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah, but this part is about the implementation. We see if there is no implementation. So I mean, if we find there is no implementation, we should implement enhanced cooperation as Tunis Agenda. Very clear. Very clear and short.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I agree with that, but I think we should give the how, as indicated in our mandate. And that's what we are expected to do, the how.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: How comes in B, D, E, C. That is the how.

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

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, all colleagues. The U.S. would certainly agree with your assessment that this paragraph or this recommendation might not be necessary as we understand our mandate and all of us are of course very familiar with the Tunis Agenda text. I feel like if we get into this conversation we will inevitably get into the pattern that we tend to fall into choosing, selecting paragraphs that we all like. As it stands right now it is a paraphrase of one, perhaps two paragraphs which isn't necessarily helpful. I don't think it adds to the conversation. So again, we agree with your assessment this may not be necessary. If we do decide to go through this path, we would have further edits to offer on the bottom paragraph as it stands now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The issue here is that it repeats statements with the same degree of ambiguity that we have been suffering through for the last eight years. Without clearing up the ambiguity. Some of us believing that the road to enhancing cooperation is well underway, while others believing that it is yet to begin. And without going further in this, so, you know, we remain -- this statement is very symbolic of the fact that some see EC, enhanced cooperation, as a government-only issue and see equal footing as only being among governments while others of us persist in seeing enhanced cooperation as something that is among all stakeholder groups and that equal footing is among governments and with all stakeholders. It's not an issue of India being equal to Google. It's rather that the governmental stakeholder group is equal to the other stakeholder groups. And so the statement by persistent -- we get nowhere by repeating the same ambiguities without dealing with some clarification of it. And so that's why I see either quoting just one paragraph without the full context or repeating the same language without some clarification as not moving us forward but leaving us where we've been stuck for a long time. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLO AFONSO: You got my name right.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That was my aim.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Okay, I think that first, saying that the Tunis Agenda is not being implemented is a diagnosis, not a recommendation, so on the basis of this, we should strike out several of the similar expressions.

Secondly, a practical suggestion. Every paragraph which is completely striked out we should leave for later and handle only the paragraphs which have very little -- relatively little possible conflicts. So we gain time. That's my suggestion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Very useful. Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. I just want to briefly speak in favor of the position of Sweden and the United States. I think the paragraphs in principle are redundant, and if we were to have them in, they currently are paraphrases of the Tunis Agenda and would need considerable amount of work in order to accurately reflect what the Tunis Agenda says, even assuming that those of us in this room can agree what it says. Thanks.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Maybe if you go to the first option on this. There are three options. I think I was going to say that at least it should be acceptable to us because this is a very good -- very short paragraph that is called for the continuing of full implementation which has to be recognized and this recognition is required here to start even if we are going to agree to something so we should start from here. IGF is on the way or further implementation is required, so I could -- we could support that at least without referring to a paragraph from the Tunis Agenda, if that could be the clarification. But it should be understood by all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Very constructive. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to all. I think we need to get into the report with some background of what we are doing, and I did hear inputs earlier that our report should be intelligible to somebody who begins reading it, what it is about. And if you go to our mandate in the UNGA, it says establish a work group on enhanced cooperation to examine mandate of -- this is regarding enhanced cooperation as contained in Tunis Agenda. And that's the name of the mandate. And I'm not sure how can the report start without clearly saying what they are starting on. And that's the mandate given and it's customary in all reports, which I have had the limited knowledge of in U.N. system, to start listing what they are going to do and then go on and do that. And therefore, it's obvious that we need to refer to the Tunis Agenda -- I mean, some of the Tunis Agenda speaks of enhanced cooperation and if need be all the (indiscernible) paragraphs referring to enhanced cooperation comes -- can be mentioned because that's where we start from and we have been given a mandate to do that. The mandate is very precise. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. Very good point. I think what you have said to me sounded as if we are to write an introductory point, and I'm ready to do that, with your approval. And I am ready to include as many paragraphs from the Tunis Agenda as you wish. I have no problem with that. So if this is the wish, to include as many articles -- paragraphs in the introductory part, I'm ready. So -- and having said that, I have heard some remarks that this really belongs to the background, to the introductory part. Is it agreeable to you that we proceed in this way? We mentioned all the relevant parts you think are relevant in the introduction and leave the recommendations for the recommendations. That is how to fully implement. It is acceptable? Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. It would be well articulated. It's important that we have some brief introductory remark, and I fully agree with your remark in that regard. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening carefully to the colleagues in the room and you, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that we have to avoid repetition, but sometimes we need some basis to start our work. I consider this paragraph, I mean, paragraph 69 of Tunis Agenda, as a launching site of our recommendations. With repealing debt, in fact, we are showing infrastructure, we are trying to build the next building on that. I think that's the starting point, in fact. Yes, we can leave out the reference to 69 paragraph, but to start to enable governments, it's a recommendation. If we start with that language, then just to repeat what -- I mean, with the -- recalling the -- recalling or reference the paragraph 69 our debt. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I might have expressed myself incorrectly. I intend to include in the introductory part as a starting point. You've pointed out rightly, that we have to build on something, and that is my idea, it should be in the introductory part. To give a framework where we are going, what are we doing, why we came together. I can identify United Kingdom.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to take the floor to add my voice to those who have said that perhaps this -- there is an element of redundancy in this paragraph and to support your proposal that the jumping off point as expressed by Iran might most dutifully go into the introduction. If we continue with this paragraph here, like the United States, I think we would be looking to renegotiate some of this text. So your proposal seems to me to be a good way forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I really would like to ask you to let us have this part as an introductory part. Alongside of all others, what you think should be in the introductory part, to give a good background what we are doing here. I really would like to have your approval and to move forward. This is not the final, let me put it that way. We are going to discuss the whole report on Friday. You will have the opportunity of doing all the changes you may wish. But I would like to start on some kind of agreement to kick off our meeting in a way that we have some agreement. You still insist having the floor, Japan?

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to -- just to present a view -- we agreed to your proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I, of course, support your proposal, but I just wanted to raise one point because yesterday in the format that we were having some delegations expressed unconformity with bringing the Tunis Agenda to the recommendations and now it seems there's the contrary proposal but there are obviously, as going the way you suggested is perfectly fine for us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Let me ask Russia if the solution I proposed is acceptable to you, to have it in the introductory part? With the wording you proposed.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I still would think that we need a recommendation for that. Because if this particular part was included in the questionnaire and it was the position after the questionnaire about the implementation because the whole thing is about implementation of enhanced cooperation. This is about our output of the working group regarding the implementation of the enhanced cooperation of the Tunis Agenda.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take the floor again, but I would like to refer to one of your questions. What is the harm to have this paragraph in the recommendations. While -- as distinguished delegates of Saudi Arabia referred to, while we believe that the enhanced cooperation is not yet implemented so we -- in that regard, therefore we think that the government needs to be enabled. That could be a -- a recommendation. Although it is in the -- one of the paragraph of Tunis Agenda. But not yet implemented, therefore, we need to be implemented. This is one of the recommendations. And, I mean, the most important. And in fact, to avoid the different interpretations, while we have it in front of us, we heard different interpretations from the very simple language we can see in that paragraph. Therefore, still we think that we need it in the recommendation, as I said, as a launching site. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. If I recall our mandate, the mandate specifically states that we should give recommendations how to fully implement. So there's no assumption that it has been implemented fully. On the contrary, I think the assumption that it has not been implemented fully. So that's what we are here for.

Anyway, I think I'll leave it at that. We shall come back to this question. So let's go to the next one.

So I can see on the screen a lot of square brackets and braces and different colors, and what is the difference between the blue and the pink and the red?

I don't ask it in a physical sense but I -- because I do know that they have different frequencies, but I -- oh, good. "Status" -- approved. Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it approved?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, that's what I can see here. And in what way?

Can someone give me an explanation what is the final text?

I cannot see the convener of the group.

Oh, yes.

Maria, can you give me some explanation? I can see the remark that this is approved. I see surprise on your face.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So can I turn to Japan?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

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

Japan, please?

>>JAPAN: Okay. We think implementation -- for implementation of enhanced cooperation under Tunis Agenda, we have to keep the multistakeholderism, keep the multistakeholder approach, maintain the multistakeholder approach. It's essential in its basic way to implement Tunis Agenda, so we put this recommendation -- this proposal to the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

So is my reading correct? The recommendation starts "with regard to enhanced cooperation, all stakeholders in their respective roles are to continue taking an open and bottom-up approach" -- "multistakeholder approach, as appropriate, in order to let the Internet continue to evolve in the future and serve as a medium to which anyone can gain access from anywhere in the world"?

Yes, Sam.

>>SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Just a little further explanation as I was scribing.

That text was approved in its current state including square brackets. So the square brackets remain in there.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, I see. That was the good news.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Tell me the bad one.

Okay. So who is going to tell me the good news?

So those parts of the text which are not in square brackets are agreeable. It's already something.

I need proposals.

Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, this is a very general recommendation. It doesn't make any difference to enhanced cooperation, so -- and even if you include "bottom-up multistakeholder approach," what is the bottom-up? If we are, I mean I think the recommendation to implement enhanced cooperation fully, as in Tunis Agenda -- the word "bottom-up stakeholder" does not appear in Tunis Agenda, so this is a new wording. What is bottom-up?

I think let us focus on a precise recommendation on how to implement enhanced cooperation. The multistakeholder model is very clear in Tunis Agenda as regards that fact, so will "implement the enhanced cooperation" take into account the model agreed in 2005. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So what is your proposal? I want final text.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah. My proposal is this is a very general --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no, no. I want text.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yeah. We will back to you with the text. We have a recommendation down from Saudi, so when you like, we can discuss it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I need help. Joy?

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

A couple of options, by way of assistance.

One is, if you take out the words in square brackets, the sentence actually still makes grammatical sense, and that may be an option, indicating consensus on some parts.

And the other thing is that I don't consider that a general recommendation, per se, shouldn't be included if it's not other -- if there's no substantive objection to the wording. It's a recommendation, a recommendation on the list, and therefore, open to inclusion.

So those are my suggestions.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: To me, it's still not clear. It should be --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: What I'm saying is if you take out the words in square brackets, then the sentence still makes grammatical sense and is a recommendation nonetheless, and the words that are not in square brackets, as I understand it, are agreed. Yes?

So --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Would you tell me --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I'm just saying that for the purposes of considering the consensus on the remainder, it's still possible.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you read out the text you think should appear --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: So it would say, "With regard to enhanced cooperation, all stakeholders in their respective roles are continuing" -- "are to continue taking an open" -- sorry, "to continue" -- I can't see where the square brackets begins before "bottom-up." Ah. "Are to continue taking a "--

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- something "as appropriate in order to let the Internet evolve."

So what I'm really saying is there's really only one minor part of it and perhaps that would be the part to focus on.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Sweden, then Iran.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, maybe a clarification of what the text in italics means, if that means that that text has been agreed or not agreed or what's the status of that.

And then a comment on the -- on the draft recommendation itself and the substance.

We think that this draft recommendation do attempt to answer the question how to fully implement the mandate as contained in the Tunis Agenda.

So that's a very important distinction here between what we were discussing -- the recommendation that we were discussing before that did not answer in any way or didn't give any indication on how the mandate should be implemented and this recommendation that does give an indication. It gives an

indication through the two phrases that are square bracketed, "in a multistakeholder" -- "through a multistakeholder approach" and "through an open and bottom-up approach."

And our understanding of "bottom-up" in this regard is that it's not only governments that should decide upon how to develop policy, on how to implement the Tunis Agenda, but they should do so together with those stakeholders that are directly affected by these policies and by those decisions which might be industry, might be civil society, might be technical community, might be other stakeholders.

So for us, it's quite clear what "bottom-up" means. But again, I mean, it answers to the questions -- or tries at least to give some indication on the question how to implement the mandate and that's what's important. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the Japanese distinguished delegation for their proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I think before going to the first paragraph, I think we have to look at the whole proposal by the Japanese delegation.

I think we can merge all three paragraphs in one. Then that will be easier to work on it and to have a compromise.

We have no problems with the stakeholders to be improved in their respective roles. No doubt about it. But since we are talking about the language in these three paragraphs, all are talking about the improvement and promoting their roles of the stakeholders, but in different languages.

Since we are going to work on a concise report, and precise, therefore I suggest to merge these three paragraphs in one, first. Then I think it will be easier to -- to have agreement and consensus on the whole language in the proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I ask Japan, is it agreeable for you that we take all three together?

>>JAPAN: Thank you. Regarding the proposal, I think we can accept Iran's proposal to make a concise recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Japan.

Well, that is the approach I expect from you. Very good. We are making progress, at least. Very slight progress.

So what is the suggestion how to merge, and what would be acceptable language?

Would you like to come back a bit later on that?

Yes, Iran.

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

We leave it to the Japanese delegation to come up with a --

[Laughter]

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: -- language on that, and then I think we can work on that later on and we proceed with the other recommendations.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I -- can I encourage you to sit down together, in order to avoid any further discussions on plenary, to come to a kind of agreement on the language which is acceptable to all and come back to us after lunch with that?

Is it acceptable, Japan and Iran? Can you do that?

We are very -- you are very close.

>>JAPAN: Yes, yes. Yeah, it's acceptable for us.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Good.

Okay. Let's go further. Who else wanted to take the floor? But probably on this issue, I don't think we really need -- you still insist, Sam? Okay. Editorial thing?

>>SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Yeah. Just an editorial matter so people don't think that the italicized text has got some hidden meaning.

It was just added when we were going through trying to figure out whether something was a statement or recommendation. It showed active verbs and surrounding text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Sam, can I ask you eventually, if Iran and Japan agrees, to assist them eventually? Do you mind if someone assists you in your report just for -- for technical -- I don't mean anything else but technical part.

Okay. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Wait, wait, wait. Where are we?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are on Draft Recommendation 3, which I can see some green letters saying that is a statement. If it's a statement, where it should come to? What should I do with that? Give me some guidance.

It should be in a chapeau or...

Okay. Thank you. You gave me additional work. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can see that below, we don't have text. Everything has been...

Okay. Iran, you wanted to take the floor on that?

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

I think we agreed that we work on recommendations and to leave out the statements.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: This is what you mandated the first day the small groups. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for reminding me.

Now, we have a recommendation in square brackets: "Using the IGF for open public debate, consultation, discussion and recommendation with the broader Internet governance community. Further recommends that the IGF should consider the work of other Internet policy efforts, such as the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, the global multistakeholder meeting on the future of Internet governance, Net Mundial, and the WSIS+10 review process as inputs to its efforts."

Isn't this for the other working group which has finished its work on the improvements? That was also in square brackets.

So Avri, you were the proponent of this.

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

Yes, it was basically what was left after many other things were crossed out.

Was there no other recommendation before that that had actually gotten the approval? I think not. I think that everything got struck out before that.

So basically this one was about Tunis Agenda. It was about the relationship of IGF and enhancing cooperation and such, enhanced cooperation, and therefore it felt really necessary to include a recommendation that the IGF should continue to be a platform that contributes to the work of enhanced cooperation.

Although, of course, I think we ended up taking out most of the words that said "enhanced cooperation" because they were considered much too risky, but I don't know what else to say about it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Those of you who were attending the last IGF in Bali might have experienced something very positive and very new. We had a lot of bilateral and multilateral consultations during the meeting itself, but this was kind of -- I wouldn't call it a side event but it was just an excellent opportunity to sort out issues. Personally, I had the opportunity to discuss this with the Brazilian delegation to the IGF and they were making consultations on the upcoming event in Sao Paulo, and I believe it was very useful -- well, it was useful for me. I hope it was useful for them. They asked advice. I tried to give some advice. I can read the program and it is in the program.

So I'm really proud of that.

Having said that, I -- that was really the first time I found out that the recommendations of the previous working group are about to be implemented. They are being implemented, and that was one of the things we have recommended, and I'm -- I was really glad.

The other thing, what I really want to emphasize is that these recommendations were taken very seriously by the MAG -- that is, the Multistakeholder Advisory Group -- and the acting chair of the MAG, Mr. Markus Kummer, and policy issues were included and very high on the agenda of the IGF itself, and we have had extremely interesting discussions, debates, on these issues, and I don't really have to recall the participation of the American delegation who were very kind to answer some of the questions which were raised at that time.

So I think it is something which may and should be reflected, and as I've heard yesterday, we are talking about two complementary processes. Separate but complementary. So I can see no harm to include something along these lines, especially if it includes the CSTD itself.

So these are my quick reactions to this recommendation, but I'm open to your suggestions.

Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Avri, for the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, listening very carefully to your remarks and reading the Tunis Agenda, I think somehow we are trying to repeat that.

As you mentioned very well, in the last IGF meeting all this work has been done somehow.

So I'm looking forward the fruits of having this paragraph in the recommendations while such work at the moment is done by the IGF. I think that's again, we can have the justification made for the first paragraph we heard from the room. We have almost the same language -- I mean the starting language of the paragraph in the Tunis Agenda. What is the benefit of having that? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Firstly, a process by rather the IGF-related language has not been put together in some set in the working group. Yesterday there was some thought to that

regard, whether we are not moving it in a single set so that we don't need to come to that discussion again and again and deal with one part which talks about the IGF.

Second issue is that the -- the mandate -- U.N. mandate clearly gives us conditions on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation mandate. To have this line saying that this IGF fully implements or helps fully implement enhanced cooperation mandate, the doubt about things which we think are missing to me does not go -- I mean, if they are both there, then I can still think about it. But having this as a recommendation to fully implement enhanced cooperation seems a difficult thing for me to accept.

Thirdly, as the Chair did qualify all this flows from the (indiscernible) that there are two distinct yet complementary processes. So if just before that when we start the IGF discussion as the idea this is our understanding that as for UNGA resolution so-and-so enhanced cooperation and IGF are two distinct and complementary processes. And have these things under that then it does protect the kind of, you know, possible misunderstanding that I've been referring to. So I'm coming back to report that particular sentence from the UNGA resolutions on top of all other text on the IGF and in that manner the IGF text is fine for me to go in. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. To me this text seems to convey how to implement, that is, it offers a platform. Nothing else. Sweden -- or United States first and then Sweden.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to remind colleagues that we had submitted two recommendations yesterday that attempted to consolidate the various IGF recommendations and one was in A, which captures, I think, some of this sentiment, and one was in B, which we can deal with later. But -- so I just remind to offer it up for consideration.

And just secondly, I would agree with you, Chair, that while the IGF and enhanced cooperation may be distinct processes, they are indeed complementary and so therefore, I think they do address the how, as you said. And in the consolidated recommendation draft that we offered it says fostering, which I think is a -- also a similar concept. Thank you.

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

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with -- with your interpretation that this is a recommendation that tries to capture one platform where we -- through which we can implement the Tunis Agenda, and we see great value in that. Also, what it does is it helps us avoiding the duplication of work, which is in everybody's interest, that the IGF is informed about what the CSTD is doing and the other way around as well, of course. That is in everyone's interest. So we can use our resources in the best possible way. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My intervention was covered by our distinguished colleague Parminder. Just wanted to add a little. Will Tunis Agenda by establishing the enhanced cooperation -- IGF after the enhanced cooperation process, I mean for so that an essential element of the IGF mandate is to provide a multistakeholder policy dialogue to the enhanced cooperation process.

So, I mean, they are two distinct but complementary in their work. So both of them are important to each other. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Iran. You want to take the floor?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take the floor again. While emphasizing in my previous comments on -- on this paragraph, Mr. Chairman, I propose to have all -- all paragraphs related to IGF in one part. Now, we have -- in part A and part B, I think we have to have altogether and to work on it as a single part, not in separate parts. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see that you are volunteering again.

(Laughter)

I really appreciate. That is the attitude I expect from all of you. Can I ask you that I have -- after you have come to conclusion with Japan on the text, please get together with the proponents of these IGF paragraphs and yes, I know that you are willing to do that, in spite of your lunch break and I really -- you are a good friend. And that's how friends should behave. Thank you. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Certainly it seems reasonable that at the end of the day the IGF-related statements will be sorted into a similar section. However, insofar as they may relate and, you know, while we never got to the next two that are there in order and I have offered rewrites of them so they look more like recommendations, I think that if they pertain to enhanced cooperation, they should at least be referred to in the particular sections, even if there are forward references, backward references, however you want to do it.

Now, in terms of the complementarity of Tunis Agenda and enhanced cooperation, we are -- we're here, as people keep pointing out, looking at the Tunis Agenda and its implementation. The -- the U.N. General Assembly's additional notion of them being separate is indeed different than what is contained in the Tunis Agenda, as we've talked about several times in terms of needing to take enhanced cooperation within a context, not just simple as that. But even if we accept that they are complementary, that does not mean separate but equal. That does -- does not include a continuing notion that they have to be totally divorced from each other. And in fact, the only progress we have seen towards enhancing cooperation has been when the IGF, using its bully pulpit and whatever, has actually convinced other organizations that they really needed to increase the sharing among stakeholders and the moving away from any notions of unistakeholderism to a multistakeholderism. We have seen that in various organizations that deal with issues that over the last years, based upon dialogue that occurred in the IGF, those entities have opened up more and more and more to government and other -- other stakeholders. We've seen even a little bit of it in the ITU where based upon the IGF's words and pressure there's been a little opening made for more multistakeholderism within that organization. So I think it's very important for us to keep track of the fact that at the core of moving forward with enhanced cooperation, the progress we have seen has emanated from the IGF and that needs to be recognized and furthered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. As you were speaking it came to my mind that in 1924, '25 there were two guys who provided two interpretations of the quantum mechanicals. One was called Schroedinger and the other was called Heisenberg. Schroedinger provided the wave mechanics; Schroedinger [sic], the particle approach. And they seemed to -- complementary. They seemed to be different. And there was a guy who came along. His name may sound familiar to you, (saying name), who happened to be one of the fathers of the computing machines. And he just showed that the two things are equivalent. And -- but it took some time. So we are patient as well. And -- but hopefully by the end of the week we are going to show the equivalent. Having said that, India and then Ellen.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, I would also like to first support the proposal of Iran that we should put together at least on each, like in group A. If we are dealing with the IGF issues in group B, of course that's separate. So here together for (indiscernible) we see the next paragraph, it is again the bottom-up (indiscernible) approach and all that. So that will be very constructive. We have really clear two or three paragraphs consolidated from all the proponents who have given. So that would be the first thing to go further. And then I discuss the paragraph where we are having the discussion like recommend using IGF as a platform for open and public debate. Consultation, discussion, and recommendation is also part of it. Maybe not -- I'm not very clear because what I could understand from the mandate of IGF from the Tunis Agenda, of course it is discussion, consultation, but for the recommendation, maybe it is applicable by home and how it is universally may be applied or the recommendation this decision or not, then of course. So then I wanted also to understand here that what was all the -- was conveyed that the IGF has likened this thing to several organizations to open up for other stakeholders and for governments also equally has been done or not. That is also something to be assisted, that if that has been able to include the government and how far it was really done. And the other thing on the complementarity, what we understand complementarity means, IGF and enhanced cooperation process leads to complementary. So we should not always support to strengthen one process and weakening the other. At the cost of if it is a complementary there should be a balanced group, balanced (indiscernible) so that it can survive or it could be sustainable. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I just forgot to mention to Avri that I'm happy to -- that you volunteered as well. In the exercise of just making the IGF related, the recommendations concise as possible and I would invite anyone who is interested in the making more concise recommendations to join this group.

I believe we have Ellen and then Phil. And with that, I would like to finish the discussion on the IGF issues. So that would be a voluntary working group or voluntary ad hoc group or whatever you may call it. We'll come up with a unified language. Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I was going to suggest that at the bottom of this page is, I think, the U.S.'s attempt at doing that consolidation. It seems like we've started another path and have someone else take a crack at it. But we do have that, which I think is at the bottom of this document which might be worth a few minutes of discussion before we start -- send off further drafting. If I understood the -- Liesyl correctly, that was an attempt to consolidate all of the IGF paragraphs into one place.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Thank you, Ellen. Very useful. Let me ask the U.S., would you like us to discuss this consultation now or you would like to have this separate consultation before?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Ellen. I am happy for -- I really am happy to discuss it now and get input or I'm also happy to join the extra group over I think the lunch hour and put it in -- offer it for that process. I mean, the attempt was to capture the -- at least four of the recommendations that were already in here. So I guess I posited it as a starting point for this kind of consolidation that my distinguished colleague from Iran mentioned. So I leave it to your guidance, but that was the objective.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think it would be a good idea to have your parliamentary discussions allowing the distinguished delegate from Iran to have his sandwich in between two discussions and you come back to the plenary after lunch, right? With a kind of consolidated proposal for recommendations on the IGF issues. Is it acceptable?

>>UNITED STATES: Just if I understand you then we'll table it now for after sandwich but before 3:00 and for a small group to bring?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Absolutely. That was the idea.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you. Happy to join that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I am happy to see the agreement from Iran. Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the confidence in me by you.

[LAUGHTER]

Mr. Chairman, I think regarding the small -- let's call it a small group on the IGF, I think we have to be very clear on how we have to proceed. I agree with the Indian delegation that we have to be concentrated on the -- on the part of, you know -- the part which those two processes supplement each other, then to go for enhancing or improving. I think that's the best way to get out of all these recommendations what is very related to the whole process, Mr. Chairman. If it's agreeable with the, I mean, others, I think that's the way forward.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: But to me it's clear -- to me it's clear that the reason we are here is to give recommendations how to fully implement enhanced cooperation and we have to indicate ways and means. And if we find that IGF is one of the good places to do it -- and I stress my words, one of the good places to do it -- let's do it. I mean, let's take on board everything which makes some progress in our work, okay? So I think we share the same view, and I believe U.S. also shares this view. It's up to interpretation, of course. So Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Just following up on your statement, I recall the presentation that we had on Monday afternoon from our Japanese colleague showing the role of the IGF and the events that had gone on in the IGF over the last eight years, and I think there is some value in your words in the

fact that the IGF is one area where there has been some work and there has been a coming together in activity and perhaps in making that recommendation the information that was presented on Monday afternoon could feed into that debate to make sure that the activity that has started in the IGF is fully reflected as captured in that presentation. Thank you.

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

>>INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I wanted to take the floor to just ask if we are going to have preliminary comment on the U.S. proposal that Constance was suggested. So then I would suggest in case we are going to have at least some clean version of two, three paragraphs so better to start discussion after that rather than having preliminary comment on the U.S. proposal because when I could go through at least the first paragraph, I could not see the language of the recommendation clearly. At least the first sentence was something that IGF supports something. So that was one thing.

And the other comment from Peter, perhaps, maybe -- Phil, yeah -- that IGF, what was presented by the professor from Japan, how IGF has evolved like from 2008 to 2012 or 2013, that participation from other stakeholders, including government, but here, to my understanding, the thing is that IGF is not going to deal with one or two or three particular (indiscernible) Internet-related public policy issues. It is all discussions of whole lot of like (indiscernible) issues or maybe 100 issues, so it is not a mechanism to deal with one or two or three particular public policy issues. It is a discussion but to deal with, to resolve such issues, to decide, to recommend, have a way forward or something with their involvement.

So that is why maybe we have problem in understanding. Even if the growth of IGF involvement of all the stakeholders including governments is a good opportunity -- we are not against it. Even India has a good participation. But how far it is going to actually give a direction or involving all stakeholders and the government to make a decision on our particular issues, public policy issues.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think you have -- are absolutely right, you are absolutely right about the point that IGF is not a platform where decisions are being taken. However, it's a platform where recommendations can be made, and it is a platform which is being used more intensively lately by governments as well.

I can see participation from China, and from the government level I could see participation from India from the government level, I could see Russia participating also from the government level, and I'm very glad to see that.

I'm not talking about other -- other countries which have already participated.

And so I find it also as an option to be considered in our work, and as I always tell to you, our work here is how to fully implement enhanced cooperation.

Constance?

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

I'd like to echo some of the points that were made earlier.

From my perspective, it came out very clearly from the questionnaire, the responses to the questionnaire, that the IGF is now seen as an integral part of enhanced cooperation. The IGF has tremendously evolved. We had the MAG and open consultations here in Geneva last week, and we see that there is still room for evolution of the IGF, and when you say that we need to consider the IGF as an option, I -- I would strongly support that view.

We should think of the IGF as an important piece of the puzzle we are trying to compose here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. A couple of points.

One is that -- just to pick up on this procedural question of considering the IGF recommendations together, I think I would prefer that we dealt with all of those recommendations together because there are some extremely useful recommendations from other participants, from other stakeholder groups, and I think it might be useful if those were collated together, as you've suggested, rather than dealt with here, because there were also some suggestions in relation- -- in recommendations in Group B that also related to the IGF. So I feel as if we're going to have to re-cover this ground in any event and I'm not sure it's useful to continue it at this point.

I'm just looking at two of the recommendations that have been put forward.

And in relation to the substantive discussion, I think that the -- it's -- I'm grateful to Constance for recording the responses to the questionnaire because we had tremendous submissions -- many, many submissions -- from very diverse stakeholder groups, and very strong submissions from civil society, about the IGF as a multistakeholder forum where all stakeholders participate equally.

And of course it is true that governments are free to go and organize themselves as they wish equally among each other about how they might then come to multistakeholder forums, but in those multistakeholder forums, all stakeholders -- civil society, technical, academic, and governments and business -- are side by side as equal partners, and I think this is a critical component into framing our recommendations not only in relation to the IGF but throughout this -- overall recommendations from this working group, and therefore, I think that's also why it's vital that we look at these IGF recommendations as a whole. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Russia?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Actually, we recognize IGF and recognize it as a very important mechanism but it's only one of the mechanisms of enhanced cooperation, of the process for enhanced cooperation, and actually, as I understand, there is a lot of output from (indiscernible) delegation in some IGF -- (audio cutting in and out) -- the working group of the small working group of Iran, the Group IGF recommendation -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I think that there's an agreement on each side -- (audio cutting in and out) -- are proposing also to have -- (audio cutting in and out) -- I'm glad to see some kind of consensus on this issue.

Marilyn, you wanted to take the floor?

>>MARILYN CADE: I did, Chair, only briefly, and my comments perhaps will follow or build on comments that you made -- (audio cutting in and out) -- Constance.

When we started, when we had our first IGF, it was perhaps not really clear that so rapidly different stakeholder groups, including governments, would begin to find the significant value in meeting not just -- I think as Joy said, side by side -- but also taking advantage of the opportunity to meet among themselves. The -- some of the enhancements to the IGF have already included the addition of a high-level group on day zero. The -- I think the chairman mentioned the fact that there are huge, now, opportunities or growing opportunities for bilateral and multilateral discussions of government-to-government just as there are, by the way, between the technical community or the business community or civil society on day zero.

During this last MAG meeting, we also talked -- and all of the discussions in the multistakeholder advisory committee are transcribed, so this is available to everyone to see, but we also talked about the continued, I think, I would say, enhancement of government-to-government discussions and examinations, and even sharing best practices during the time of the IGF.

I know not all of you personally are attending, but many of your country people are actively engaged not only in the IGF but in national and regional IGFs that are held in your own country.

I was privileged to actually attend the Russian IGF a few -- a couple of years ago, and I've been in the -- in several of the African IGFs.

So I think as the small group comes together, Chair, I'd welcome the opportunity to join it, and I appreciate Russia's comment that the IGF is one of -- one of the -- sorry, say it again.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: One of the mechanisms.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you. One of the many mechanisms that we can look at. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

I have to echo that, that the IGF can be extremely frustrating in the sense that it's in a very beautiful place and you leave your hotel at 8:00, you come back to your hotel at 10:00, and you can't see anything.

So that's my personal thing.

Avri, Sweden, Saudi Arabia, and I propose to leave it to the small working group to work on the issue of the IGF.

Oh, yes, I identify you, Richard, at the end.

Okay.

So Avri.

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

Just a quick clarification and I will really try to make it quick.

In terms of this small little group, I would like to understand whether all the offered recommendations are fair content for this upcoming discussion without any exclusionary constraints or whether -- because I wasn't quite sure when the clarification was given to Iran, as the leader of this small convocation, whether we would have issues that were excluded or whether any recommendations that had been put forward were fair game. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I would imagine that all recommendations which have been put forward are on the table, and probably I encourage you to regroup them to be concise, and I'm sure you will -- you will come to a conclusion very soon.

Sweden, Saudi Arabia, Iran.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, we would like to support the interpretation made by the Russian Federation that the IGF is one of the mechanisms in which the process of enhanced cooperation is taking place. Not the only one, but one.

Furthermore, we think it's important to clarify that in our understanding, enhanced cooperation is not only about decision-making by governments, it's something much broader.

And finally, to comment on the -- how we should group the recommendations that have bearing on the IGF in this working group, we think that we are not making recommendations on the IGF. That's not the task of this group. We are, rather, making recommendations on how to implement enhanced cooperation. And we have identified five categories of issues or questions on how to implement enhanced cooperation, and the IGF can be a tool for that. That means that for Group A, the implementation of the Tunis Agenda, the IGF can be a tool for that. When we're discussing B, about public policy issues and possible mechanisms, it might also be relevant to mention the IGF in that

context, because again, that might be one mechanism for enhanced cooperation or a tool for the implementation, and so on.

So we support the work of the smaller group and are happy to take part in that, but when we -- further down the line, when we're going to classify the different recommendations that might say something about the IGF, it's important that we don't cluster all of them together because they're not actually recommendations on the IGF, they are recommendations on how to implement enhanced cooperation and how to use IGF for that.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden, for that.

I assume that the intention is to -- as a first step, to group recommendations pertaining to the same issues into one, and in case the small group finds it useful, to eventually size it down to -- even further, but I don't really want to prejudge the outcome of this consultation, so this is up to the participants, and most importantly, up to the proponent how the work is going to evolve.

So I can identify Saudi Arabia.

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

Well, as in Tunis Agenda, the Internet governance will be pursued on two distinct tracks: The enhanced cooperation process, which has been facilitated in multilateral decision-making by governments on international-related public policy issues; and the other track is Internet governance to provide a multistakeholder open dialogue on a broad Internet governance matter, which is clearly what India just told us, and we do want to make improvements in IGF and to recognize enhanced cooperation. I mean or to implement enhanced cooperation and to, I mean, (indiscernible) the IGF. Plus the process should be, I mean, implemented equally with two distinct, I mean, terms of reference, two distinct activities to each other, but they are complementary. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I think we have consensus on that. Iran?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman -- (audio cutting in and out) -- IGF -- (audio cutting in and out) -- consider all the recommendations -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's (indiscernible).

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I'm still, I mean, uncomfortable with statements that IGF is a mechanism of enhanced cooperation. I think IGF is really important. Some very -- (audio cutting in and out) -- and that role and responsibility is defined in 35, the same term. So it is about public policy decision-making and we need to be able to either say that, yes, it is needed and this is the form, or we

say it's not needed but (indiscernible) and consultative processes is not what policy decision-making is, and that was clarified by not one but three UNGA resolutions, and I think we should respect a statement which was made in three UNGA resolutions. It's like, for example, in a country we say that we need to have a policy on more equitable and quality education and we set up waves and waves of consultations and then we keep on doing it for years, but never come back to writing policy or making policy, and that part is what this working group has been given the task of. That is the part which has been missing. And I think we are just spending time on something which is not central to the task of this group -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: That the IGF platform and with current enhanced cooperation are possible. -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>MARILYN CADE: Just because I'm now being called Ms. P. Sector, right?

[Laughter]

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I'm struck by and I think we're all acknowledging, you know, we have -- I usually like to say we have a range of views, but I think in this case I will say we have two kinds - two different sets of views.

I'm going to just -- we're not going to bridge those. I made a comment yesterday in the small group that I was hoping we could build a bridge across that -- that gap, but I think we need to figure out to progress the work, assuming that there are two views, and -- and yet we need to be as close together as we can.

I'm not suggesting this is going to change colleagues' minds, but I just want you -- we have quoted before and read the Tunis Agenda. We have different interpretations of it. For some of us, when we read all of the subparagraphs under 72, we see references to -- I will just read (c) -- "interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview."

I see also that we should be identifying emerging issues and bringing them to the attention of relevant bodies, which I assume to mean intergovernmental organizations.

It's clear we're not going to reach agreement on that, but Chair, I'd very much like to propose that as we progress the work, perhaps we -- I just need to develop recommendations that are in -- that reflect each of those different views that are held in the room, and then we will have a range of recommendations to come back to and try to -- try to bridge.

I think right now, we're just repeating positions to each other. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, my sense and probably my approach is very positive because I can -- I can feel some kind of consensus.

It may be wishful thinking. I don't know. But I really feel some kind of convergence of views, rather than divergence, and I really appreciate it and I can feel a real, real cooperation here in the room. And I encourage you to continue in this way.

So on this issue, Richard will be the last speaker and I would like to continue with the following recommendation.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I actually have four separate comments but they're quite brief.

From the process point of view, I think Marilyn Cade had an excellent suggestion, and as you know, I've been somewhat involved in these discussions for some years and that was the usual way out, to simply recognize there are points of view which are not fully reconciled at this stage and we simply capture the two points of view.

That could be a way forward.

In terms of the relation to the IGF and the enhanced cooperation, I think it's important to remember that at the time the Tunis Agenda was crafted, indeed, these were viewed as separate processes. Now, that doesn't mean they still have to be viewed as separate processes, so I think it is perfectly valid that some people believe that the IGF is a way to enhance cooperation, but that was not the original intent.

Then I want to come back to the -- the question of bottom-up.

Sweden gave us a very clear definition, which is in fact commonly used, but it's not universally accepted. There are other views of what constitutes bottom-up.

So if you use the term "bottom-up," you will be introducing, again, some creative ambiguity and scope for interpretation after the fact.

And also, I do wish to make the point which I think everybody acknowledges that not everything is bottom-up and that's not a problem. People agree, for example, national Parliaments are not bottom-up. The European Union is not bottom-up. Multilateral trade discussions are not bottom-up and so forth. But that's fine. We're not saying everything has to be bottom-up.

Now, the final point is that as many people have pointed out, there's been a great deal of discussion in many forums, including in particular the IGF since 2005, but it's important to remember that the reason there was a call for enhanced cooperation and the IGF, for both mechanisms, back in 2005, is that in the preparatory process for the Tunis Agenda, certain issues had been identified, and those are contained in the WGIG report. So the WGIG report actually identifies very clearly the issues that were supposed to be resolved and since they could not be resolved in the Tunis Agenda it was agreed to continue discussions through those two mechanisms, enhanced and the -- and the IGF.

Now, what were those issues? In essence, they were the management of domain names and addresses and in particular the asymmetric role of one government, the cost of connectivity for developing countries which developing countries view as too high, and spam security including privacy.

Now, Chairman, unfortunately while there has been a lot of discussion since 2005, basically there's been no change. The issue of domain names and addresses is exactly the same. The cost of connectivity for developing countries, they're still complaining.

Now, what were those issues? In that sense they were the management of domain names and addresses and in particular the asymmetric role of one government, the cost of connectivity for developing countries which developing countries view as too high, and spam security including privacy. Now Chairman, unfortunately, while there has been a lot of discussion since 2005, basically there's been no change. The issue of domain names and addresses is exactly the same. The cost of connectivity for developing countries, they're still complaining, and in terms of spam and security, we're not much better off. And privacy, actually we're worse off because a certain number of countries, not just one, let's be clear about it, a certain number of countries are practicing mass surveillance. So in terms of results, I don't think anybody can really say we've made much progress. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, (indiscernible), for your optimistic remarks.

Okay. Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. I was just wondering if this is the (indiscernible) speaker slaughter -- sorry, it might be useful if I would do this (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, it very much depends whether it's going to be an optimistic view.

(Laughter)

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I'm sure there are many optimistic viewers among us, I'm sure.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't really want to get depressed. You know me, that I'm always optimistic and I'm still optimistic. So if anyone is asking for the floor from observer, this is the time to do it. Otherwise I would like to proceed with the recommendations. We have still half an hour and we have a lot of things to cover. And we are going to cover all of this.

I can see no flags, so let's go to the next one. So by the way, just to remind you that you know your voluntary tasks and you will come back with a great result after lunch. Yes. I was referring to your voluntary offers, and I'm really looking forward to the results.

>>(Speaker off mic.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I would like to have it by 3:00 and you come back and you give me a five -- two- to five-minute presentation, where you are, and we will just upload you. Yes, you're on.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it's good to start to work on the IGF matter. Quarter to 2:00, then we have almost 1 hour and 15 minutes to work on it, to be ready for plenary, because I need some time to work on the Japanese proposal too.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I really appreciate your efforts. Thank you. It's very kind of you. The next one.

We are recommendation number 4. I would like to ask Saudi Arabia to tell us where we are.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Well yesterday, I mean, as the mandate was to separate the recommendation and the statement, we did some separation. We offered some languages to the statement and the Chair accepted. So the language is really -- if you want me to read it into the statement, I mean --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, this is the time.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay. So under A1, just above A2, yeah. Just above A2, yeah. Above A2. At the end of A1. So we put our recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: In between.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: In between. Between A2. Yes, here. A new line. So this would read, "Recognizes that the process for enhanced cooperation as mandated by Tunis Agenda has not been implemented." We will go for A3, the second part of A3, which is a statement. No, this is a recommendation. Then go to A3, second part. Second paragraph of A3. The second paragraph, yeah. It will say, "Recognizes that globally applicable principles and international public policy issues have not been developed. I will remit "Recognizes that globally applicable principles in international public policy issues have not been developed." Can you -- okay. And then A5. Yes, yeah. "Recognizes that article 71 of the Tunis Agenda has not been fully implemented." A6. Okay, "International public policy shall be developed in a manner that encourages innovation, openness, and multistakeholder participation and the respect of all. The intent of such policy is to develop universal coordinated and consistent patterns to resolve Internet issues to protect -- to resolve -- to resolving Internet issues, to protect -- yes -- against unilateral control of Internet resources, and to ensure that decisions are made by governments on equal footing for the benefit of mankind and not for the benefit of a few." "On equal footing for the benefit of mankind and not for the benefit of a few."

So Mr. Chairman, this was done with the understanding there will be a mini chapeau or a background that will be an introduction to the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Your last statement refers to a chapeau. Would you like to include --

>>SAUDI ARABIA: No, it is a recommendation. I mean, short of a recommendation, if someone read it, it wouldn't be very clear what do we mean. With the understanding that we would put a mini chapeau or an introduction, that would explain the recommendation as we agreed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Am I right you're suggesting to do more work for me? Thank you. Well, another question to me, in case our -- this is the recommendation you're suggesting or proposing, can we delete the parts which have been indicated as statements or you'd like to retain them as statements? I'm not sure what to do.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, it is up to you, Mr. Chairman. If you would like to delete the statements, I mean, you can delete the statements.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Probably for the sake of brevity of the report it is more advisable to be as concise as we can. Thank you.

Okay. So we have heard three rephrased text recommendations from Saudi Arabia. I open the floor for discussion. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Chair, I'm going to have to myself spend more time both looking at this on the screen and thinking about it. But I believe to me a good amount of the language in this does come across as a statement rather than a recommendation. I will give more consideration to that, but I think there's a lot of implications in it that we're going to need to spend more time thinking about as well. I welcome receiving the reworded document, but it's difficult for me to make a detailed comment about it until there's an opportunity to take a stronger -- a longer look at it. But it does -- much of it does come across to me as a statement, rather than a recommendation. That's not to say that with rewording and further consideration some parts of it might not reemerge as a recommendation. But at this point, I think it's -- there needs to be more opportunity to study it. Thank you.

>>(Speaker off mic.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sorry. So the -- thank you for your comments and naturally the text is available on Google docs. You will have an opportunity to consult it during lunch break. I don't expect you to rush. We will have plenty of time to rush on Friday evening. Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks also to Saudi Arabia for their work and for their -- for their endeavor to -- to shorten the text and to make it -- make it clear.

We would like to echo the previous speaker. We also believe that some of these texts are -- do not qualify as recommendations. In order for a text to qualify as a recommendation, we think it needs to -- to give an indication about that something should be done or that -- or about how something should be done or -- and we do not see that A1, for instance, do that.

Regarding A2, we have problems with that because we do not see the need for a new mechanism or a new framework under the U.N. umbrella for enhanced cooperation. So we cannot accept that recommendation.

And in terms of -- yeah, I think I've stopped there for now. But we might have some more comments on the -- on the other text as well. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Anyone else on this? Well, I can see that on these recommendations we still have some work to do to be able to come to a consensus. But I think we have some material to think about. So I encourage you during the lunch break to go through, to give your proposals to engage you think should be amended, how to do it and what to do. Anyone on this issue? So let's go further.

Okay. I think this is from Parminder. Would you like to give some remarks about it, Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I think it stands on its own and it's up to the room to talk about it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So I can see that in the first paragraph it is indicated as a statement. Next paragraph. It's a recommendation. What is the status? It has been accepted? It has been accepted? It has been discussed. It hasn't even been discussed. Oh. You are really depressing me. And before lunch. Oh my.

Okay. So let's discuss it. "So implementation of the relevant mandate from the Tunis Agenda requires setting up a platform/body which will enable governments on an equal footing to fulfill their roles in terms of international Internet-related public policies. Such a platform should be designed in a manner that there are adequate formal processes of engagement with all stakeholders in the processes of developing the required international public policies. Such a platform therefore should be innovative, open, and transparent involving processes of deep engagement with all stakeholders but without compromising on the basic democratic principle whereby legitimate representatives alone can have decision-making power for public policy issues." I can see some words that requires setting up a platform but they are -- can I have some clarification about it? What you have in mind?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes, it comes later on in the series, I mean, it belongs to the group B of recommendations to clarify what it means. And this is group in which talks about basic directions on which the Tunis mandate of enhanced cooperation has been implemented and it's (audio cutting in and out) in the (indiscernible) accommodations (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder, with all my respect, I would like to have the (indiscernible).

(No audio)

Thank you for the time being. Of course we are going to treat all of them.

Okay. So we have this recommendation. You have told them that they hadn't been discussed yet and I'm just open to discussions. And I would like to have your reaction. Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I have some thoughts and I think they're actually also relevant to the previous set of recommendations we just heard from. One of the things I struggle with is if you look at the spreadsheet that we created as a result of the mapping exercise, in virtually every one of the areas there are specific forums and mechanisms discussed. And they cover the range -- kind of wherever you fall on the spectrum of views. Some of them are really government only mechanisms for governments to do the kind of international cooperation they do all over the world and every issue we can imagine. And some of them are multistakeholder forums where government is treated like any other participant. So kind of no matter where you fall on this spectrum of view of what enhanced cooperation means, there are clear examples in almost every single area of where things are happening. So I have trouble reconciling the facts that we went out and sought with a kind of wholesale statement or recommendation that there --

(No audio)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Ellen.

I'm just thinking about on Monday to check that this is a space that enhanced cooperation -- we should -- -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>UNITED STATES: -- on this paragraph here, for the time being. Similar to what Ellen just said, and understanding your comments, Mr. Chairman, I think it has been established that there are several different bodies in which governments have equal footing to implement or create public policy -- (audio cutting in and out) -- and the fact that there are many different bodies, I think, is an asset. I think it mirrors the distributed nature of the Internet and the complex nature of the Internet and the many issues which surround it.

That's why the multistakeholder approach is so valuable and so vital.

It's hard to imagine an effective single body to deal with all these issues. I have a real hard time wrapping my brain around that. Excuse me. And I don't see -- moreover, I don't see how such a body would not privilege governments at the expense of other stakeholders, in that goes completely in conflict with the multistakeholder emphasis that works throughout the Tunis Agenda -- (audio cutting in and out) -- upon technical matters which is also in conflict with many of the relevant paragraphs as well. Thank you. I'll leave my comment there.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States.

I'm reminded that probably (indiscernible) talk a little louder. (indiscernible) doesn't apply to you, it may apply to me.

In fact, my wife usually reminds me -- (audio cutting in and out) -- I'd like to ask you to follow that advice.

(indiscernible) Saudi Arabia and then Jimson. Yes.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: (indiscernible) mechanism -- (audio cutting in and out) -- question. What -- (audio cutting in and out) --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Jimson?

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair. I just want to actually more clarification from the -- (audio cutting in and out) -- I won't -- (audio cutting in and out) -- multistakeholder (indiscernible) ecosystem -- (audio cutting in and out) --

[Scribing suspended to try to rectify audio issue]

There is a different role for government in the same way the principles for global Internet (indiscernible) so the exact replica of that body is being part of that. It makes it easy to understand what is being spoken of rather than the (indiscernible) or not but should help understanding of the proposal.

And Jim asked about what kind of body it is, but I think that would be covered in my earlier submission. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I can see the flags but I think we are going to break for lunch. We lost the audio and I find it extremely important to have this scribed. I think we are going to break now.

I would like to have you be back by 3:00. I encourage you to have private consultations, go through the document, what we have in front of us, think about the new submissions -- or the modified submissions, sorry, and I really appreciate your cooperation. I can feel it now. And I hope to continue this way. Thank you.

>>IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for our group, we need the help of the Secretariat to provide us with all reference to IGF in the document. Thank you.

[Lunch Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Good afternoon. Welcome back. I hope you had a very good lunch and a very fruitful discussion. I understand that there were small groups discussing issues, and with good results.

I would like to thank Iran, Japan, the U.S., and all those who participated -- Saudi Arabia, I believe -- participated in these discussions, and hopefully we can move forward.

So I would like to have, first of all from Japan, about the results, and then from the U.S. the results of the consultations and discussions and the report, of course. I also ask to show it on the screen.

Please, Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I already provided the revised recommendation and cooperated with Iran to the CSTD secretariat, so maybe CSTD secretariat will provide the revised recommendation to all members. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sorry. It's on the screen.

>>JAPAN: Okay. Thank you.

Taking account of the proposal from Iran, I shortened the three recommendations into the one recommendation --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>JAPAN: -- and I extracted the essence, basic principles, from the three recommendations, so I'd like to insist that "to maintain multistakeholder approach and encourage as many shareholders as possible to

participate from a wide range of fields, and promote further international cooperation and collaboration between the stakeholders, and to facilitate the inclusive access to -- on the development of the Internet by ensuring the free flow of information and stable, secure -- stable and secure functioning of the Internet in order to implement the enhanced cooperation."

And I think free flow of information and stable and secure functioning of the Internet should be achieved to develop the Internet and accessibility for all stakeholders. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'll let you have a look at the text, and in case you have comments, please give us the comments but basically, I think according to the discussions we have this morning and the results we have been presented now, I think we can agree and approve.

Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Just a clarification, maybe.

So this is a recommendation on how to implement the Tunis Agenda?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That's my understanding.

Okay. Everybody happy?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Saudi Arabia?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Hello. Ah. Should it be under A or what?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Under A?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. It will replace, I believe, the three recommendations you have submitted and this is a kind of concise, retaining the essence of the three recommendations.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Okay.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: But I mean, this is a very general recommendation. I mean as we know, enhanced cooperation is to enable government on equal footing. We don't see this kind of recommendation here. This is a very general one, so I'm not sure. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden, you want to take the floor again?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, we had a question. Maybe we would have to study this text a little bit further because it was the first time that we saw it, and I think we can agree to the main -- to the spirit of this recommendation, and I think that hopefully we can agree to it more or less as it is, but we -- we would like to maybe have some more time to consider it and we had an initial reflection and that's up on the third sentence or after the second comma, "promote further international cooperation as well as the collaboration between the stakeholders," because we think that maybe we should have -- instead of "as well as," we should have "and collaboration between stakeholders" because we think that international cooperation includes collaboration with stakeholders.

Maybe we could work a little bit on the language, but that's just a minor point that we were -- a minor reflection that we -- that we are making at this point. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I would like to remind you that we are going to review all the recommendations in one go, hopefully during Friday when we are going to have the report, and as part of the report, we are going to review everything.

So you will have an opportunity to get back to the language you want to use, you can get back some amendment in case you think it's appropriate and the -- if you have the approval of the -- of the members of the group.

I would like to call your attention, however, to the amount of work we have to do, and I know perfection is one of the nice qualities of humankind, but we have to be aware of the time limit as well.

Any other comments?

Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. The reason why we are raising this now is that we would not like to be consider to be backtracking at a later stage, so for this reason, we would raise this small concern about making a distinction between international cooperation and the collaboration between stakeholders, so maybe --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: If you can offer me some text, I would be happy --

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. So we would prefer "including," instead of "as well as," or "and." So those two would do the job for us, I think. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So with this amendment, is it acceptable, Phil?

Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Japan, for the sincere cooperation to propose one paragraph out of three. That's a very good improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I have a little doubt about the "inclusive access to the Internet" because maybe some of the contents of Internet is harmful to some societies, insulting. Therefore, "inclusive access" is -- it's a

little -- we have a little concern on that. Therefore, it's -- I have doubt about "inclusive access to the Internet." Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, "inclusive access" is being used in many, many ways. One of these is used for people with disabilities and we have around 1 million -- 1 billion people, which is quite a significant number, and I have the impression that in this particular place, it is used in this sense.

Yes, Iran.

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

Maybe we have to elaborate it a little more because in my interpretation, I think it's talking about the content or I'd like to hear from the room what is their reaction. Do they think differently or -- just to be sure about it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I can't see -- Sweden again. No, no. I'm sorry. We have a rule. One country, one delegate.

>>SWEDEN: We think that this is an important part, but we would also like to hear the other -- if there are any other objections in the room. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, once again, I want to stress that I am involved in issues for access for people with disabilities, and that is the term we are using and that is the term that is being used in the U.N., "inclusive."

Anyone from the members who would like to take the floor? Iran again.

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

Well, we can -- we continue after, "inclusive access to and "development of the Internet by ensuring the free flow of information," so I think it's -- it looks different from what you elaborated because here it's talking the free flow of information.

As I mentioned, some Internet contents is harmful for some societies. They are insulting. And I'm sure you are not -- I mean, the whole Internet Society is not in a position to say that we have to leave or to let this happen to the different societies because each society has its own culture, its own beliefs, and we have to respect all, but some contents does not do that. Therefore, I have a little doubt about it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Maybe if we -- we remove "by ensuring the free flow of information"?

Yeah. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can I suggest you and Japan to sit again and come back with a final version which is acceptable? I fully understand your concerns. Is it okay? I'm sure we are going to have a coffee break sometime.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I promise you we are going to have a coffee break. That is the most I can promise you.

Avri?

>>AVRI DORIA: I just wanted to point out that you find very similar phrases, for example, even in Declaration of Principles 24: "The ability for all to access and contribute information, ideas, and knowledge is essential in an inclusive Information Society." So perhaps we're not including that whole phrase, but indeed, the meaning is the same. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, I'm sure that this is -- this is an issue which can be sorted out in five minutes. You do have now the understanding and you know how to work together, so you will do it in five minutes during the coffee break and you'll still have another 10 minutes to take your coffee. Okay? Australia. Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry, sorry. India. Sorry.

Okay. Go ahead.

>>AUSTRALIA: We just had a point made for us here that in our view, the Tunis -- the whole idea of the Tunis Agenda is that everyone shares in the Internet and the benefits you can gain from it, so thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just two quick comments. One on the proposal which is under consideration on the inclusive access, or we talking of inclusivity? I mean these are two different concepts. Or if you think inclusivity will answer this, let me then -- "inclusive participation of everyone in ensuring" -- but again, later part of the sentence is a little difficult to match the two. So that's -- there's some issue of that, so I will leave it at that.

Secondly, towards the last line, I think you need to give some caveat to implementation of enhanced cooperation. I think we need -- we could perhaps say that for effective implementation or for implementation -- as part of implementation of enhanced cooperation, because it's not giving the impression that this alone is enhanced cooperation. The multistakeholder approach is good and interactions are good, but I think it can only be a part of implementation of enhanced cooperation, so I would request if this phrase can be added in the last -- after the comma -- "Internet," comma -- as part of enhanced cooperation, so it would then qualify.

And then there are perhaps other dimensions of Internet -- enhanced cooperation which we also need to look at. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India, for the remarks.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I think India captured what I was going to say. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. And now we have Richard with a very positive approach.

>>RICHARD HILL: Indeed, chairman.

When I saw this, I thought this discussion might come up.

I think it could be fixed by putting, after "the free flow of information," comma, "in accordance with human rights" would be one variation, or another one would be "in accordance with Paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of the Geneva declaration" which in fact treat exactly the issue that was raised by Iran. Namely, you're not saying that you can free flow everything. You're not saying that you can violate copyright law, for example, or have pedophile images or something like that. So it's clear that you're saying that it's the free flow of information within the accepted norms defined by the human rights treaties and the Geneva Declaration Paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 are the Geneva declaration version of that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. That was indeed positive. Thank you.

Okay. So can we agree that you continue your work and I thank you in advance for coming back to us with the final version and now let me turn to the next item.

I understand the -- there were recommendations related to the IGF and there was also some additional work carried out on this.

So I would like -- do we have the deck? So we have the --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So can someone who has been working on that comment and give us some introduction to the text?

Yes. Iran.

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

The group, whatever we call it, convened at 2:00 and concluded its work in 45 minutes.

First of all, we set some principles to work according to and all participants agreed on.

We -- we reviewed 26 paragraphs, Mr. Chairman, and we came up with nine paragraphs out of those 26, and most was removed -- were removed by the proponents. I would like to thank you all, participants in the groups and proponents of the paragraphs, which worked very sincerely, and thank you all.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So what we have on the screen, I -- so the first bullet that I can see is -- it is rather a statement than a recommendation.

Is my assessment correct? U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry not to respond directly to your question except to say that some of the recommendation aspects of it are incorporated in the consolidated version, so that was the intent of my drafting effort, anyway. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: While you have the mic. Can you walk us through whatever the results, what you achieved and just to facilitate how we should read it.

>>UNITED STATES: I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: (Speaker off mic)

have a clear picture of what we are dealing with here. Am I right, this is the version you have submitted to the Secretariat after your discussions.

>>UNITED STATES: I don't know, actually. I don't believe it is.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Iran, you can help.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In fact, we agreed on nine paragraphs, as I mentioned, out of 26. Some of the paragraphs were not referring to IGF so we took them out. Now we have, as I mentioned, nine paragraphs. I think we need more work on them because we agreed to have finally three to five paragraphs regarding IGF. Therefore, our work is not concluded yet. And we need to merge some of the paragraphs, remaining paragraphs which are nine and to get five out of those nine paragraphs remaining. So if you agree and the room agree, we can continue the work and to have -- because we didn't -- we didn't work on the substance of the paragraphs. We just took those which were repeated and which were not related to the IGF and the IGF matter and the enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. If I get you correctly, you are suggesting to have a longer coffee break.

(Laughter)

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: If you able, yes.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, I sincerely hope that we will have enough time to -- and that we can give you enough time to conclude your work. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I just want to point out one thing. So that last -- the first one there was something basically we reverted back to a statement and was hopefully available to the Secretariat to use as it resided in a chapeau explanatory material.

The second pass we didn't get to was basically reviewing the U.S. statement which incorporated a lot of ours, but we still needed that second pass, and it's close.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Well, good news, I understand that you need additional time, you will have the additional time and I hope you will get back to us today. And I think we can close the discussion on these issues, now, and on the IGF-related proposals and we can get further.

>> (Speaker off mic)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We stopped.

So before lunch we had submissions modified or amended recommendations from Saudi Arabia. We agreed that you will look at the (indiscernible) recommendations and we had also recommendations from Parminder. So I open the floor for your comments of your considerations during the lunch break. Is it still too early? If you need additional time, I have no problem with that, but I would like to proceed. So please take your time. Consider the submissions from Saudi Arabia. You have access on the -- I'm showing you have access on the Google Docs.

>> (Speaker off mic)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: It's up to you. It's up to you. I thought you had already done that, but in case you haven't, because I understand that you were quite busy, well, I mean, if you have the luxury of taking lunch, of course. Well, take your time. Consider it and come back to that later if you wish to. Or in case you think this is the time to do it, we can do it now. Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. Just for clarification, there's a -- something circulated at about quarter to 2:00 which was group A recommendations. Is that the text in which we should look -- be looking for the proposed Saudi Arabian recommendations?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Phil. I have been told by Secretariat that while that is the document you should consider which has been circulated and that is what is projected on the screen and it hasn't been uploaded yet to the Google Docs. So please open your mail. If I'm not mistaken, it's an attachment. Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. As we have previously stated, we have difficulties accepting recommendations that are arguing for the creation of a new framework or a new mechanism and that seems to be the essence of the Saudi Arabian contribution. We see it in A2, but it's also, I think -- what follows after A2 I think is also partly related to this creation of a new mechanism which creates serious problems for us.

And for A1, we think that that is not a recommendation but a statement, and in addition, a statement that we do not associate ourselves with. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Any other comments? Yes.

>> Thank you, Chair. And this is -- in the recent introduction that is E1 and similarly E4 and E6. To us it seems they're more observations saying that something has not happened. It is not lending itself to say what should be done to enhance the cooperation so I need help in understanding how it would qualify as an observation rather than a recommendation. And to our understanding a lot of work has been done, and I do not know how this is not getting recognized. So if you could help me with that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, we are just here to discuss the state of enhanced cooperation. United States and then Mexico.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This will be brief. I share similar concerns that have been raised before we took the floor. I would argue that the statement A1 as written now is not a recommendation. It does seem to be an opinion. One that the United States does not happen to share. And frankly, we also have great difficulty with the idea of creating a new intergovernmental body to deal with these issues, as we've probably stated before and we'll probably have to say it again. But we have great difficulty with that at this time. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Our position on this recommendation is more to the line-up of the previous speaker, that some recommendations are more a vision or a statement and as well as my delegation, as you can see in further contribution from my country here, in the opposite direction of creating a new framework or mechanism. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What is the opposite direction? Shall we do away with some of the U.N. organizations?

>>MEXICO: No, no. What I mean is, we do not favor creating new mechanisms or new frameworks. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. It's very reassuring. Thank you. Russia, please. And then U.K.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: As we discussed before, like IGF is just one of the possible mechanisms in the process towards enhanced cooperation and just one of the puzzles, you know, in the whole -- the process. Also, one of these puzzles and while -- one of the mechanisms should be intergovernmental body or mechanism. And from our point of view, it's quite logical to be under U.N. umbrella like ITU.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri.

>> (Speaker off mic)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We have a rule that members of the group that --

>>AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. In which case, thank you very much, and sorry I disagreed with being called on.

Within the context of the Tunis Agenda, I have trouble agreeing to creating any new internet bodies that are not fully multistakeholder. And what I would like to actually read is a quick quote from an EU communication that says, "A genuine multistakeholder model when necessary intergovernmental discussions are anchored in the multistakeholder context in the full understanding that the Internet is built and maintained by a variety of stakeholders as well as governments." And basically this goes along with the notion that we've been talking about that certainly intergovernmental things need to occur but they cannot be decision-making bodies with regard to the Internet, and in that regard we need to maintain a multistakeholder focus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. You're on.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like just to put a question to those who are against having a framework or mechanisms and it's -- it's how we can implement enhanced cooperation. How come it's possible, if we are not going to have any framework, any mechanism or nothing else? Or maybe they -- they believe that enhanced -- enhanced cooperation is already implemented. Even if we accept that it's partially implemented, how about the rest? It could be implemented fully by the existing mechanisms, it should be done during last decade. Therefore it shows that we need something to implement enhanced cooperation. This is why some of the people or stakeholders, governments believe that we need something to put in place to implement enhanced cooperation, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

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

>>MARILYN CADE: As I said in a IGF consultation, sometimes it's better to be lucky than good-looking so I feel lucky because I'm following you because I want to build on a comment that you made, if that's okay.

You know, I -- I'm not prepared to agree to do mechanisms, but I am fully prepared to look really hard at the gaps and to say to ourselves honestly, so, you know -- because I wouldn't say that enhanced cooperation is fully implemented. I think we're very much in the making progress stage. And I wouldn't even say that we're at the same level of enhanced cooperation on each topic. But I do think that we must first think hard about okay, here are some gaps. We are making -- we've made some progress. Here's some gaps. Where can existing organizations and institutions be strengthened and enhanced, and then I will come to a concern. I don't really -- my experience with committee 5 and the U.N. as an outsider is that it's very difficult to get new mechanisms funded and to get them through the U.N. So I -- I'm not suggesting we debate that here. I would much prefer for myself that we focus more on the gaps, we talk about what we can do in terms of strengthening, enhancing existing institutions and the existing mechanisms such as the IGF and then we park this -- this debate about a new mechanism after we've -- after we've completed that. Because there is a big divide, I think, between some of us about the creation of a whole new U.N.-based mechanism. And I have this concern. I never see people from governments and committee 5, the responsible parties, rushing in to agree to funding new mechanisms.

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

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. I was going to make a similar comment to Marilyn's, and sort of picking up on something that Parminder said before lunch. And it goes back, as you might guess, to the correspondence group output. Parminder made the point before lunch that in some of the responses that we received there were points saying that there were not forums, mechanisms that addressed the particular area of one of the 24 broader issues. And that's quite right. There were those views expressed. There were views expressed but there are other forums and those forums were either governmental, multistakeholder, however you would want to characterize them. As I said on Monday afternoon, what has come out of the correspondence group is not a simple picture of what has gone on since 2008. It is a very detailed description or badly in it's very raw form that is presented to you and I

think further analysis of that, building upon what Marilyn and the distinguished delegate from Iran said a few moments ago, it's not that simple view of you need it, you don't need it. I think there's a -- there's a real sophistication there. And just referring back to something I said this morning, I thought the presentation from the delegate from Japan on Monday identified some of those issues -- not all of them but some of them -- very simply, to give an indication as to the sort of complexity that we are now faced with. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Andres?

>>ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you, Chair.

I was preceded by two other speakers that took a lot of what I was going to suggest, but I still want to have some reactions to the last comment of the delegate of Iran.

I say this is -- this is something that could help us to make some progress.

I said that we can make -- we can maybe have consensus easily in this room that enhanced cooperation hasn't been yet fully implemented, I guess, and this is something that we all can agree on -- with.

We can also have a consensus in some of the gaps that could have been identified by the correspondence group or we could also help to identify.

It will be much harder, but also we can easily agree on if it's possible to find where is the gap in order to create a new mechanism, if it is a new mechanism, or maybe we can agree on how to operate or if there is something where some mechanism that exists currently could be upgraded.

But what we can certainly, for -- as mentioned, what I'm saying now, I really believe it's almost impossible for this group to come up, and especially to come up originally with an idea of creating a new mechanism that's only multilateral when we are reporting with a group which is, in our composition, multistakeholder.

That would be really out of scope. I wouldn't imagine this group to suggest the creation of a multilateral mechanism at all. So this is something what I am -- so, yeah, okay, there is a lot of room. Also, I don't believe -- I can't imagine that we are yet prepared to agree with some new mechanism, but we are open to the possibility of understanding that a new mechanism could be out there, but if this new mechanism -- if this new mechanism is some idea that this group is bringing up to the discussion and it's not yet a discussion and the new mechanism is only a multilateral body, I don't -- I don't see that possible. At least, in the last -- in the next two or three days, so that's something. That's my point. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Andres.

India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

I think we are in a very difficult wicket as a group, because at any given stage we have a starting point and there is a finishing line, but here defining the starting point seems to be very challenging for us.

As -- in our national position, we believe that, you know, enhanced cooperation is something which has been referred to in the Tunis Agenda with a certain purpose, with a certain direction, and the rubric of economic -- enhanced cooperation discussed over the years has been understood to be something by a large number of countries when they look at it, because in that particular sense, even if you referred to any one particular -- that particular paragraph referring to enhanced cooperation talks about certain things on an equal footing.

I mean this is -- this is within the gamut, let me again put it. And then the second step is with observers and other stakeholders, and then we talk about multistakeholderism.

So I think it's a very challenging job that we have on our hands, and this is where I like to take the point made by, you know, Marilyn and Phil, others.

I mean, there are also very important facets of our problems, which is, if there are mechanisms already existing, do we have gaps in them, and if there are gaps, how do we fill them.

So I think this -- that is also a parallel very important task.

But having heard colleagues over -- over 2 1/2 days, I think on different dimensions, it appears that we have a very fundamental problem in seeing the middle ground. There's a serious and very fundamental problem in seeing the middle ground.

And this is where -- I mean, do we make some determination, if not today, at some stage during the course of our discussion tomorrow, whether -- in terms of --

I mean, it is essential that we make recommendations, but at the same time does a recommendation have to be a particular recommendation on which we all agree?

For example, if there is a difference of opinion which is as deep as -- and as I said, as fundamental as exists, then we might even -- we should not shy away from possibly looking at an Option 1 and Option 2 under some of the recommendations, because we are -- there is no middle ground, as we're finding it, on some of the aspects. I'm not saying the entire range of issues that we're discussing.

If that is -- and that is where I think perhaps we can bring in constructiveness in all of us, and not that we are not constructive but I think we're all wedded to certain positions we've been taking and these are all very fundamental national positions or individual stakeholders' positions, so I think it's time that you would kindly guide us in terms of taking a slightly different route of working out --

Let's say there are a group of members who believe that there is a certain understanding of enhanced cooperation and they believe that there is certain gaps and there are some mechanisms which are perhaps not able to deliver all those public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

On the other hand, another group of colleagues who believe that, yes, there are already certain mechanisms which have been again flowing out of Tunis Agenda, they're doing a good job and they're trying to improve upon, and then -- but they themselves will define enhanced cooperation. Can they be defined and finally declared as enhanced cooperation?

I think that's -- I mean we've -- I mean we respect that view. You know, certainly in our national capacity, we are ready to listen to all these opinions, but I think -- as a group, I think we need to recognize this ability and go down the path of reaching more constructive where each position is being reflected at some portions of our work.

If that is something, then we could identify those two, three difficult areas and say that, "Well, this is where we might have a challenge," and we can ask those groups of members to come up with a particular language as an option which they want to recommend and another group of colleagues who want to recommend that as another option. So both are on the table.

In any case, these are only recommendations at the end of it. We are not going to tie down anyone to any one of them, and I think we have a precedence in the U.N. system where, when the working groups are reflecting on such text, they do make options made available to higher organs within the U.N., and this would -- and (indiscernible), you know. I leave it to your very able hands, Chair, with this small reflection on the way we are proceeding, as we have crossed the midline of our discussion. Thank you.

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

Well, basically that was exactly the way I started the whole meeting. I emphasized that there will be recommendations we all have agreement on and there will be items, topics, where there will be divergence of opinions but we are going to reflect that also in the report.

I have no problem with that.

So that was the very outset. We -- we started our work.

My objective, however, is to limit the number or to go down in numbers where we have disagreements. I would like to increase the numbers where we have agreements. And that is my main purpose.

You may be -- you may be -- have a point here that this is an issue where it is not very easy -- and this is an understatement -- to find an agreement. I'm sure. This is -- we have two views, completely different views, and we have to respect that. And probably this will be one of the items.

So having said that -- and your appreciation is very good -- we are going to reflect the difference of opinions. I will have some few minutes to collect some of the other ideas and then probably we shall leave this point at that point, and then according to what you have suggested, we are going to include the topic in a way to reflect the two different opinions.

Anyone from the group who would like to comment on this? Brazil. Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry. I understand Sweden asked for the floor first. I may be wrong.

>>SWEDEN: We can wait, because I think we have spoken much more than Brazil, so we're happy to listen to what Brazil has to say. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Go ahead. Brazil.

>>BRAZIL: Well, thank you for the representative of Sweden.

I think in our opinion, we are in line with the speakers that came before us that I think that the international debate on this matter is not yet mature. I think we cannot yet make a decision on whether the international body is necessary. In principle, we are not against that idea, but I think we need to reach out to the international community, listen to academic specific studies on that matter, in order, really, to build -- slowly build a consensus on this.

So I believe that -- I think it will be impossible to us here to decide on the context of this working group to -- really if the body will be necessary or not.

Just a quick comment, and perhaps food for thought. I have listened to some representatives here that tend to identify an international body with an intergovernmental body. I'd just ask our colleagues for -- maybe to think about the ILO, for example, as a -- I don't know, as a possible model where we have a multistakeholder format with governments, we have employers, we have employees, and, well, they work together on the specific subject of labor.

So maybe this is something to be considered when, you know, thinking about the body. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Brazil.

Now Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, first of all, I think I agree with speakers before me that said that we need to -- to respect that we have different understandings of the concept of enhanced cooperation, and for us, enhanced cooperation is not only about decision-making, it's not only about government-to-government work, it's something much broader than that.

In the same way, we would like to say that our understanding is that the Internet is not an issue, but rather a space, so it's just a reflection of the off-line -- off-line world. And keeping that in mind, we fail to see how one U.N. organization could do the job better than the specialized agencies, for instance.

So if you take the example of IP, protection of intellectual property, would such a body be better tasked with dealing with that than the specialized agency WIPO? Or if you're talking about cybercrime, would such a new body be in a better position dealing with that than -- than INTERPOL?

Those are just some questions that might be worth reflecting upon.

We are still to be convinced that there is a need for such -- such a new organization or mechanism.

Just to also briefly comment on what was said by India just now, we agree that where there are areas of disagreement, that can be reflected in the -- in the report of this meeting if reflected in a balanced -- balanced manner. What we would not like to see are sort of two sets of recommendations or two options of recommendations that we would send to the CSTD or the ECOSOC to consider or choose from, because our understanding is that they would have much less time than we have to discuss these issues, so it would be even more difficult for, let's say, the CSTD or the ECOSOC to have that discussion and that debate.

So we would like to see consensus around the recommendations, and those recommendations that we have no consensus on, those should not be referred to as recommendations or optional recommendations, but the discussion and the areas of disagreement or where we -- where we need to have more discussion, that could definitely be reflected and should be reflected in the report.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. Thank you for your consideration and your remark about the time limitation in the CSTD.

I'm sure we don't really want to repeat the experience we had last year, leaving the meeting at half past 3:00 in the morning.

And referring to ECOSOC, I recall that we had an ECOSOC session last year. ECOSOC had its meeting in Geneva, it was a full-week meeting, and the issue we have been dealing with was treated in one hour -- I repeat, one hour -- with a report from the CSTD, the secretariat, and some other comments, and that was the end of the story.

So, yes, I think we are going to provide a balanced report. Whatever we agree on will be considered as recommendations, and other topics will be dealt with as topics on their own with the different opinions and options which will be reflected in a balanced way.

Having said that, I give the floor to observers in case there's -- oh. You want to take the floor, Parminder? Go ahead.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: No, no. Go ahead.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Yeah. Building on the proposals from India and subsequent comments, I think, Chair, that we have reached a point where I can see that almost every paragraph has some difference and it -- it's kind of -- it runs through. And I think we would be more constructive if we organize a little better along the lines which India suggested.

On Sweden's comment whether -- I mean the divergences -- I'm not sure. The chair seems to suggest that the divergences should be shown along -- along the text and whether that would be preferable

because CSTD and ECOSOC has -- have less time, and I think the way we are progressing and if you show differences all over the place, there's less possibility for them to understand what the difference really is.

As we go through the paragraphs, as I said, it's split difference. People have a paragraph on IGF. They do agree that IGF is doing good things but they're wondering whether this is the model, and then that's the confusion.

Similarly, people agree there are gaps, but then does it mean that it needs a new approach.

I would think that taking the approach which WGIG took of finally giving clear of models is what would make the bodies to whom the recommendation is being sent clearly see what it is. Because if we have differences spread through the sheet, they will not be able to really make out, and if we have a clear set of model -- model -- just two options, at least within those options there could be constructive energy put and some growth during these five days of this particular meeting, some contribution which is original which would come to the fore, because right now I'm not really sure whether we have right now contributed anything original or we are -- (off microphone) -- I would prefer that we have kind of two sets of options which are internally coherent, there is constructive work done within people on those two sides to produce a more coherent, understandable set of recommendations, so at least we would be contributing something positive and original here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder. I will naturally consider your suggestions, and probably the group as well.

U.K. and then Australia.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. I just wanted to add my voice to some of the others. I think we all really recognize that there are different views on -- coming out in this room about enhanced cooperation and whether or how or how well it has been implemented. But I think that -- and I completely agree that we would expect the report to reflect those differences in a balanced way. I think it is important that our recommendations are based on concerns because indeed that's the understanding in which I've been participating in this group. I thought that was what we had agreed on Monday. But I think one of the things that is coming out very clearly is that we -- consensus is possible. The work that we have done in previous meetings and the work of the correspondence group and the contribution from our colleagues in Japan that Phil referred to demonstrate, I think, that it is possible for us to come up with recommendations that aren't focused on something we know isn't likely to achieve consensus. So in this short time available to us, which is more time than we will have in May when the CSTD meets to consider our report, I think it behooves us to focus on those areas where we think we might find consensus. And I think that is possible. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Australia.

>>AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Very interesting debate that we're having. And I think I accord, or Australia accords, with the views that we've heard expressed from Sweden and Mexico and the U.S. and now from my colleague from the United Kingdom.

Just to reemphasize that it was our understanding coming out from the earlier debate that only those recommendations on which we could find consensus would be included. And like Sweden, we would very much not want to see divergent and conflicting recommendations included in parallel in the report.

However, I do actually think that there's some room for hope. There's definitely signs of some small areas of consensus emerging, and I think we could usefully focus on some of those. Yes, I think we're all in agreement that there are gaps in enhanced cooperation. It's not perfect. But nor do we agree that it is not being implemented at all. And it may not be implemented fully, but implementation has been happening. Nor do -- and I think I need to state this in a plenary because I've only said it repeatedly in the smaller groups so sorry for repeating myself. Australia does not see the need for the establishment of a new entity to deal with Internet governance issues but rather we think we should look at how we might be able to improve the current system of Internet governance. It may not be perfect, but we would be very reluctant to see management of the Internet departing from a model that is supporting innovation and widespread participation in a multi-shareholder fashion and has supported strong economic development. Let's look at how we can improve the current system of enhanced cooperation. Surely -- and I think Phil had a very good point on this -- this is a logical first step before we jump ahead to creating a new body. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Australia. Anyone else on this issue? Richard, you asked for the floor. You didn't --

>> (Speaker off mic).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, Anja. Okay. Anja Kovacs.

>>ANJA KOVACS: Mr. Chair, Anja from the Internet Democracy Project in India. I understand an auction might not be followed but I want to respond as well to the proposal to possibly integrate what was -- were called two auctions that are on the table as being reflected in the report. I just wanted to point out that though perhaps not in section A, which we are discussing now, there is in fact a third option on the table which was introduced by Civil Society yesterday evening in one of the subgroups. So if that rule is indeed followed, I would like to request that the third option also be given appropriate consideration in the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you enlighten me about the third option?

>> ANJA KOVACS: It was the additional text that was proposed by Joy Liddicoat yesterday for section B which shows in the report, a proposal made by the Internet Democracy Project. And the text was discussed yesterday evening in the subgroup on group B, and the Secretariat had also provided a copy of that proposal on the table.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you. Well, it seems to me that we have come to a stage where we can stop this discussion. I can see some kind of agreement on disagreement. It's something.

(Laughter)

Yeah. I mean, I can see clearly where we are. It's always something. You can reflect it somewhere, in a report. So it's not upsetting. The upsetting thing, if you don't move forward. And we have moved forward. We identified the gist. We have a fundamental difference, and we are going to reflect it in the report. Where in the report, I'm not really sure, and in what way, I'm still not sure. But during the last two days we are going to find a way. Right now just a quick thought about what we called Conclusion, probably it may be a kind of concluding remark where we give some intentions of further work.

Okay. Sweden, you asked the floor, if I understand. And Richard changed his mind.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. It was not my intention to interrupt you. I just wanted to draw the meeting's attention to that we have a not -- we have only done a first read-out or read-through of category A and B. And we hope that it will be easier to find consensus on group C, D, and E. And we would hope that maybe later today we can discuss those because those categories also deserve a first reading before -- before Friday evening. Thank you.

(Laughter)

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

(Laughter)

You didn't mention Saturday morning.

(Laughter)

Anyway, so yes, that is my intention, to conclude on the two first categories and to proceed eventually to start with category C.

I give the floor to Richard, and hopefully he's going to support in a very optimistic way.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, indeed, Chairman. I haven't changed my mind. It was just you said what I was planning to say so there was no reason for me to say it. But now I want to build on your comment, which is indeed there is some agreement in the room that at this stage there's a divergence of views and I would venture to say there might also be agreement in the room to continue discussions and not sort of walk away and no longer discuss. So perhaps you could phrase something along the lines or it was also agreed that further discussion should continue in appropriate forums, et cetera, et cetera. The language would have to be crafted, but that might be something everybody could agree on as a recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Okay. I just wonder where we are now.

>> (Speaker off mic)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: To continue and to conclude the discussions we had now, so it seems to me that there are about two diverging views. I would really encourage those who have -- who are like-minded to get together to come up with some conserved text for the options because I need text. Options meaning reflecting the two opinions. Well, one opinion on this on a different topic -- on a topic and the other option -- probably this isn't the right word to use, not "options" but the two opinions. I'm sorry to be -- not to be precise. So I start again. On topics we have discussed -- we have discussed right now, it seems to me that there are two distinct opinions. So I would like to have those who have opinion A to come together, have a text on that, and to have -- have opinion B, also provide me some text in order it can be reflected in my report.

Okay. And I think we can proceed now to draft recommendations submitted by Mexico. Can anyone tell me where we are with these? What is the status? Has it been discussed? Not in small groups, nowhere? Okay. So this is the first read? As I read it, this is just a continuation of the previous topic or just the same topic but from a different view. Is my assessment correct? Yes, India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just reflect on the proposal from Mexico. There are three or four very fundamental issues in this for which I think we are searching -- we're searching for answers when we're looking at global principles. Now, created through international dialogue and negotiation. So the platforms, written dialogues that take place, I think need to go to the (indiscernible). And also, I'm sure we are here talking about global principles on Internet governance or global principles on Internet public policy issues. So I think there's -- I would say there is a gap here and our colleagues from Mexico consider strengthening the language here or as I see it make it a little more comprehensive, then it would be able to find some traction. And the later part of this, of course, that's where the dispute lies. But the issue part of it, we can support it because this is precisely what we're all trying to look at, to find effective cooperation mechanisms. And if we answer these two questions, again just to recap, global principles on one, and then second is platforms on which we'll have international dialogue and negotiations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India. Mexico, you'd like to take the floor?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, in responding to our colleague here and we are talking about public policy issues and the mechanisms are the ones that we have been talking. We have IGF, we have some others that we can take example, and that's why we do not consider the reason for a new body, and that's basically our thought, is very straightforward. We are talking about what is already exists. In a way to -- we're aiming at fixing those mechanisms. That's really very straightforward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we find the spirit of this recommendation interesting and however, we think that maybe an improvement of the language could be to -- to identify and utilize existing effective cooperation mechanisms. That kind of change in the first part of the sentence would make us feel more comfortable with the rest. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I need text to be able to move forward on this. Can anyone offer me text? Sweden, please.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So our suggestion would be to identify and utilize existing effective cooperation mechanisms. So you would strike out, find and receive. I think we are after the same thing here, but maybe this new wording would bring some more clarity to the text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Anyone else offering some text? Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I'm just seeking a clarification from Mexico and/or Sweden. What existing mechanisms with global Internet-related principles can be related to international dialogue around IGF that (indiscernible) taking place where that happens in existing opinions that were issued.

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

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Parminder, I'm sorry, but can you repeat your question? I'm sorry.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: (Speaker off mic) they said their existing part is added, but effective cooperation mechanisms, we are global principles and I understand they're Internet-related Global Public Policy principles created through international dialogue. ICANN mention -- ICANN (indiscernible) at IGF and negotiation, but that negotiation, what kind of global mechanism is being pointed to existing mechanism where such negotiation takes place. Thank you.

>>MEXICO: For example, we have ITU is one we are talking, without being comprehensive, we have ICANN's plan, we have -- whatever, we can probably check the result of the (indiscernible) that we have a comprehensive set (indiscernible) for the mechanisms and some except for IGF, it doesn't apply negotiation as such but some of us, we do have.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Like previous speakers, we have questions and perhaps concerns about the word "negotiation" in this context. It -- although it doesn't say it, it implies to us or it brings forth to mind negotiation between states rather than in multistakeholder cooperation where we believe these principles should be created and applied. Perhaps alternative phrasing would be stakeholders apply global principles created through multistakeholder dialogue, then cut the and negotiation. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Phil?

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Looking at the responses to the correspondence group, UNESCO was one such organization where they came out with a resolution on Internet issues at its 37th session, so I would suspect there was some negotiation there.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Do you want the floor, Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

I think we agree with the previous speakers. The essence of this is that we would like to utilize existing mechanisms for effective cooperation in the best way. If -- if there is also an additional benefit in having global principles that are developed in the multistakeholder -- through multistakeholder dialogue, that is an additional question, and we think the addition made by the United States here is of great value because if such global principles were to be developed, we would strongly advocate that they should be developed through multistakeholder dialogue. If you want to use the word "negotiation" or not, well, that's up for interpretation. Maybe for some delegations, it has some -- it would be interpreted as something that would be intergovernmental. That we would object to, although we see negotiations on different international public policy issues taking place in various foras. UNESCO was one of them. I think that UNGA itself, third committee, second committee -- first committee, maybe -- is another one.

And we also note, of course, with great interest the initiative by Brazil, for instance, to host a -- a more sort of ad hoc meeting this spring that also deals with these issues.

So -- but we support the proposal -- proposed addition here by the United States. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Without prejudice, I would like to stop now the discussion. We are going to resume, but I am -- I would encourage you to take some food and beverages with you. We may have a little longer meeting today, and as long as -- as far as I know, you can buy it right now, and probably you will -- won't have the opportunity to buy it later.

So on this tone, I would like you to come back, the latest, 10 to 5:00. Take your coffee. Those who I asked -- I have asked to consolidate -- that is, Japan and Iran -- the proposal to provide the final text are kindly requested to do so, and I encourage you to continue the discussion on these issues and also give me some advice how to include the different opinions in the report.

So we will be back 10 to 5:00. Hopefully by 5:00. Thank you.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Welcome back. Did you manage to buy some extra food for yourselves?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. That's very reassuring.

So before we had our 10-minute coffee break about half an hour ago I asked you to -- from Japan and Iran to kind of finalize the recommendations, and I expected it would take about five minutes, so I

believe you need another five minutes to do that, so in the meantime you just give me the signal when you are ready and we will take you on board.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: She's just preparing the USB for the video.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: So just a few minutes.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. The Internet is very complex and complicated, and the SMTP even more complicated.

So I ask for your indulgence for a couple of seconds and we are going to have the recommendation.

You have it on the screen. I would like to ask you to read it attentively.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I -- yeah?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Go ahead.

>>JAPAN: Okay. I cooperated with Iran and revised the recommendation. We made -- revised the recommendation. We crossed out the "by ensuring the free flow of information and a stable and secure functioning of the Internet," and I take the opinion from Sweden, "and/or including collaboration between stakeholders."

But I didn't -- I don't remember the last part of the "full implementation of enhanced cooperation."

Some colleague pointed out this is a part of enhanced cooperation but I don't remember the exact explanation so I couldn't amend this part. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Chris, I can see you. Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just -- maybe -- it may be me, but it doesn't -- it doesn't make sense to me.

I understand "international cooperation and/or including collaboration between stakeholders and facilitate the inclusive access to the development of the Internet," but "for implementation of enhanced cooperation" implies that the only reason for developing the Internet is for the implementation of enhanced cooperation, which is demonstrably not true, so I'm slightly confused by the text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it confusing enough to include it in the recommendations?

[Laughter]

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Chris, for the remarks.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thanks. I think maybe what I'd like to do is focus on the concepts and then think about the reorganization of the words, because I think Chris, that's what you're pointing out is that we just need to reorganize the words. It's the concepts we need to see if we have agreement on, and I would say for myself, I do agree with the concepts, and reorganization of the words so that the modifier is in the right place, et cetera, I would be happy to help on that and I'm going to enlist Chris to help on it now.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Let me suggest to leave it as-is and we are going through all the recommendations and if we'd like to increase the confusion -- sorry, increase the --

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: -- clarity, then we are going to modify it.

Is it acceptable?

Thank you.

So I suggest to proceed.

Before the coffee break, I think we discussed a draft recommendation submitted by Mexico with some brackets.

Do we still have the brackets? We still have the brackets, it seems to me.

Can we remove some of the brackets? I would like to remove in pairs. I mean opening and closing.

So I'm turning to the group to give me some text or approval or suggestion. It's only quarter past or 20 past 5:00, so we anticipate to stay relatively late. I urge you to give me some text.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I hope that I'm helping now. There is two views here, so I'm afraid no one will give you text. There is two views on this, I mean, issue. Either we have a new body or we don't have a new body, so I don't know how we will fix this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Ellen, please.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Thank you. I had read this to talk about leveraging existing mechanisms independent of what your view was on a new mechanism.

So we -- maybe if we eliminated the last clause about implying the consideration of a new international body or forum, it would read like independent of the creation of a new mechanism, we would want to leverage existing mechanisms.

Maybe I was just reading it differently than others.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you give us the clean text you would think would --

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I would suggest that we eliminate everything from the last comma on.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That is, "without implying the consolidation of a new international body or forum"?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: Correct.

I guess maybe I'm also misunderstanding. I thought -- are those supposed to be brackets but instead are parentheses? At the beginning?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, that should be bracket- -- parentheses.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: So that language is -- would stay in.

So it would say "recommends to identify and utilize existing effective cooperation mechanisms in which stakeholders apply global principles created through multistakeholder dialogue."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Full stop.

Is it agreeable in this form?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: And I can't get my microphone off, so I'm -- -- (off microphone).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Anyone from the members?

Could we agree on that as a recommendation as-is?

Can you remove the brackets?

Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the colleagues that improved this recommendation.

Regarding the last part, well, at this stage in order to have consensus of the -- of this part, we accept the deletion of the second part of the sentence but it will be our position throughout all the other recommendations that are put on the table. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Mexico, for the constructive approach.

Can I conclude on that?

Thank you.

Draft recommendation submitted by Sweden.

Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Yes.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Obviously I'm not going to express a position. That's not my role.

I do think, however, that the people may want to think a little bit more carefully about that paragraph because as I read it -- and it may not be the intend -- as I read it, that would exclude processes that are not multistakeholder and there are such. Depending on how you look at it, WIPO is not multistakeholder, but for sure the international trade agreements, so the WTO and the multilateral trade agreements, are definitely non-multistakeholder. So I don't think the intent was to exclude that. So maybe it needs some fine-tuning to make it clear that this is perhaps the privileged mechanism but is not excluding other mechanisms.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. Yes, Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, but it doesn't seek to be an exclusive recommendation. It merely recommends to identify and utilize existing mechanisms. It doesn't say that's the only thing you should do, so I'm not sure that it's necessary to make the point that non-multistakeholder mechanisms are also fine. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, any other native English speaker about the language?

It seems to me U.K. has left us.

For the time being, I suggest to leave it as-is and let's move to the Swedish recommendation.

Would you like to comment on that, Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, we do believe that maybe the essence of this recommendation might have been captured, if not in full, at least to the most part by the Japanese/Iranian contribution. We are interested in hearing the opinion of the room on that, but if that's the case, then maybe we don't need it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

What is the opinion in the room about the recommendation? Has it been captured by the previously discussed Japanese/Iranian proposal?

Shall we leave it as-is or shall we delete?

Anyone asking for the floor? Yes, Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: To come back on this, if there is one word or element that we could break out from here, it's maybe that the Tunis Agenda should be implemented.

I have this idea that maybe that's what's needed in the beginning of the Japanese/Iranian text in order to make it flow better, but -- yeah. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm afraid I didn't get the meaning.

So you want us to move this before the Japanese or you want to include it in the Japanese contribution?

>>SWEDEN: The idea was just that I think we needed to do some more work on the Japanese/Iranian recommendation. We left it, but it's unfinished, and there was some colleagues in the room that said that it needed further clarity, and my interpret- -- and possibly this text could help provide such clarity, so maybe we could just put it in brackets, move it up to the -- as a reference when we are discussing -- when we are revisiting the Japanese/Iranian recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Good point.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. So we agreed to revisit in the second reading the Japanese/Iranian proposal just to -- for the rewording or order of the words, and eventually considering the Swedish proposal to include some parts in that.

Yes, Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just wanted to say that it's Japanese proposal, it's not Japanese/Iranian proposal. Thank you.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, Jafar, we wanted to recognize your efforts, and you are too shy.

Anyway, so Recommendation Number 8, we are still at the stage where we need some further consideration.

>>UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, thank you -- the first paragraph, these are actually two separate recommendations. They've been -- they appear to be as one, but they're not.

We believe that the top paragraph has been subsumed in the IGF-related recommendations. I would, however, like the opportunity to introduce the second paragraph as a proposed recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So do I get you right that the first one we have in front of us is to be included in the kind of consolidated IGF recommendation, whereas the second one is a separate issue?

>>UNITED STATES: That's correct.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So you want to go ahead, introduce the second one?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>UNITED STATES: Okay. Well, it's a contribution to the discussion of the IGF-related recommendation. That is correct.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>UNITED STATES: So the second recommendation -- and reading it now, I understand there may be some criticism that the first sentence is more of a statement than a recommendation. Acknowledging that, I'll read it anyway but I understand that that may be -- need to be struck.

But "The Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation believes that existing multistakeholder institutions have contributed significantly to enhanced cooperation and deserve credit for the Internet's global growth and dynamism. This distributed multistakeholder system should remain the cornerstone of the Internet governance ecosystem. The Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation recommends that multistakeholder organizations continue to evolve alongside changing technologies to meet the needs of all stakeholders and to address emerging opportunities and challenges."

Mr. Chairman, this recommendation was written hopefully in the spirit of first recognizing all the -- the contribution that the multistakeholder organizations have made to the success of the Internet, but realizing that not everyone is perfectly satisfied with these organizations and recognizing that they -- they can change but should remain the heart of the system which we enjoy now.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, United States. Just to reflect on your first remark, the first sentence seems to me to be a statement rather than --

Do you agree if we separate?

Okay. Let me ask you if you agree that we discuss the second sentence and the following one as a recommendation.

Do you feel comfortable? Okay.

So I suggest to discuss the recommendation itself.

Can I take it that you are comfortable with this text as the recommendation?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

Well, again, this is one of the recommendations which we have two views on it, so unfortunately we can't agree.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Mr. Chairman, Sweden supports this draft recommendation. It contains the very important observation that the Internet governance ecosystem has benefitted from a distributed multistakeholder system and that that should continue. That is crucial for the continuing development of the Internet.

We would be interested in hearing a little bit more, maybe from those that have problems with the recommendation like this, why that is. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Parminder.

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

Though I still believe that we are split in the middle and, as Saudi Arabia said, there are two views and it's difficult to reconcile that, but since we didn't ask a direct -- ask for a direct engagement about this particular recommendation, or proposed recommendation, I would -- I would like to understand from those who oppose it what really do they mean by "existing multistakeholder institutions" and "the distributed multistakeholder system," because I need to know what I would help recommend -- understand it before I can help recommend it and I really don't understand what that means. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Would you like to answer?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman.

Do I understand the question to be: What are existing multistakeholder organizations?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>UNITED STATES: I think many of them are represented in the room here. They are the multistakeholder organizations that contribute to the Internet's technical functions, among others.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I suspected that to be the case and my problem is that I do not have really any issue about them doing what they are doing and keep on evolving as the recommendation mentions, but the problem is that enhanced cooperation does not talk those institutions. They talk about public policy issues, the kind which has been troubling the world over the last one year primarily, but also for a long time.

There are a huge number of issues. There are privacy issues, their net neutrality issues, there are access issues, there are intermediary liability issues. There's privacy and new data -- the economics of new data. All issues have nothing to do with these so-called existing multistakeholder institutions, which I'm happy to support, but that's not the question and that's the point here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Is the microphone working? Yeah.

Two things.

One is, if there's no disagreement about existing multistakeholder organizations that are functioning well, then that seems to be a point of consensus so that could easily be recorded.

And when I think of the issues of public policy issues and multistakeholder systems, for looking at those, I just refer the group back to the correspondence group's work on existing mechanisms and particularly issues in relation to privacy where, for example, the United Nations Human Rights Council and other standards-creating bodies are working currently on new norms that are emerging in relation to privacy, surveillance, and other issues.

So I can't see anything in this recommendation that would be inconsistent with those, and I'm not minimizing in any way the significance and seriousness of those issues, but I think it's very -- I strongly support the statement in relation to the distributed multistakeholder system remaining the cornerstone of the Internet governance ecosystem. I think that's a critical recommendation in this context. Thanks.

I just don't want that confusion between those organizations which are working on standards setting in which governments already are participating on an equal footing. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Well, after I listen to Parminder, I think he said all that I was going to say. I mean existing mechanisms only address technical issues. There is no equal footing for government in these existing mechanisms, so I mean, that's it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Well, as we discuss, obviously we need to reflect on the reality on the ground, and the reality is that we do have some mechanisms in place wherein governments have equal footing when it comes to some of the public issues, Internet public issues.

In that way, maybe to gain a middle ground, may I suggest that maybe the first part of this sentence, maybe if it's removed, then we can focus on the second one and maybe there could be consensus on that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Any support for this last proposal? Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: I can support it with the clarification which the U.S. provided that we are talking about a particular kind of multistakeholder organization whereby I would add after my negotiations, "dealing with critical Internet resource management, continues to evolve a long fate" and that's what I imagine was meant by this phrase and if this clarified then this second part is acceptable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm unclear why we would seek to limit the evolution of multistakeholder organizations or any of those organizations that deal with critical Internet resources. Surely the goal of multi-shareholder organizations continue to evolve is a laudable goal across all sorts of Internet governance issues rather than just critical Internet resources.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Joy. Oh, you didn't ask for the floor? Okay. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: This question that I did ask for, what are these multistakeholder organizations and I got a response that they're the ones who are dealing with critical Internet resources. But I'm happy to hear what any other organization which is multistakeholder modeling critical Internet resources whereby we can perhaps recommend that they keep on evolving, but I cannot recommend an organization keeps evolving without understanding which organizations are we talking about. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Baher.

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. I, too, shared the same concern that, you know, Chris talked to. I mean, I think we've heard from Joy and others about efforts undertaken by a number of organizations on privacy, on human right issues. The mapping exercise showed some effort by UNESCO, particularly on Internet public policy issues through a multistakeholder process. So I'm too unclear why we want to restrict this to the critical Internet resources. Thanks.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I believe we haven't reflected the proposal correctly from Jimson. Jimson suggested at least to bracket the first part, that is the distributed, am I right? And we haven't reflected the proposal from Parminder. Am I right?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes, my proposal was after multistakeholder organizations in the last part, put a comma, and say "dealing with critical Internet resource management," comma, and then it carries on. And it should be bracketed because it seems there's no consensus on it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Management. Yep, and bracketed. So here we are. Wait. First I turn to the members of the group to comment. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Mr. Chairman, we do not think that it's correct to limit this recommendation to those multistakeholder organizations dealing with critical Internet resource management. We think there are other examples as well. One is the Internet engineering task force that deals with standard setting, for instance. We have ISOC which I think is dealing with education, capacity building, and so on and so forth. I think we -- we also do see quite a lot of more normative discussions taking place in some multistakeholder settings where we have the IGF, of course. We have also processes such as the WSIS forum, for instance. So we think that it cannot be limited to only critical Internet resources. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: I think in all honesty that there are a lot of organizations doing a lot of other things. For example, WIPO is doing some things in that regard, so that would be quite unrealistic on the other

hand. So if we were scientifically to look at what we have right now, it would not be okay to just restrict -- to restrict to just technical. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder, do have you a reaction to that?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Thank you, Chair, for giving me the opportunity. I think we need some clarity here because if UNESCO or WIPO are multistakeholder but yet three things in the confusion which is avoidable because then we have some concepts which seem to mean anything, which is problematic because if they are multistakeholder, then I'm going to have to revise my thinking of what is meant here. But then we are writing concepts which the meaning of it is not either shared or is not shared across the document even. However, to Sweden's additions about IETF, I think we can add technical standards there and that set would be completed. And I understand that's one set which multistakeholder organization is doing good work and they should carry on to evolve. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I'm going to go in a different direction and suggest instead of the bracketed language that we think of the word of "cornerstone" and in the interest of coming to agreement, does it make sense to change it to "critical component" so that it would say "the WGEC recommends that multistakeholder organizations continue to" -- or what happened to the language that was there. Hold on. This distributed -- so I would say going back to the U.S.'s original proposal, "This distributed multistakeholder system should remain a critical component of the Internet governance system," and then keep the second sentence. So it's a little bit different direction than we were headed a minute ago, but may be something we can agree on.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: There are a number of -- there are a number of organizations, multistakeholder-based organizations, within the Internet governance arena which are not dealing specifically with CIR management. One that immediately springs to mind -- or a number that originally spring to mind are the regional ccTLD organizations which are, as organizations, not involved with CIR. So it seems to me, I don't understand the reason to make the distinction. If -- if the fear is that this is an encouragement for there to be a setup with more multistakeholder organizations and some reason that's a bad thing, then I suppose you could change it to say that the WGEC recommends that "existing multistakeholder organizations continue to evolve alongside changing technologies," but I genuinely don't understand why it's necessary to limit it's a CIR and in fact now limit it to CIR but extent that to include standards bodies and if we think of something else extend it again by definition. If Parminder or somebody can explain the problem I'll happily listen, but I don't understand what the fear is.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Usually I think at the U.N. the solution here is to enter earlier. So would you like -- would it be acceptable to use strict U.N. language? And now I give the floor to Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: I was thinking perhaps you want to go a bit further because as Joy and others have pointed out, there are organizations that are not multistakeholder that deal with these issues, the

Human Rights Council was mentioned, WIPO was mentioned, and we can keep going. For me, what you want to say is take out the -- "WGEC recommends that multistakeholder" -- take out multistakeholder. "WGEC recommends that organizations" -- and then you generalize. You take out the other square brackets. "Continue to evolve," et cetera, because I think it's fair to say that you want all of them to evolve, not just the existing ones.

And the second point, the first sentence hinges on the question of whether people like or don't like the current multistakeholder system, and I believe Sweden asked for some examples of that. My latest academic paper actually summarizes the arguments for and against with quite a lot of references. It's 45 pages. It's on my Web site. If anybody is interested you can see both sides of that debate in that paper.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Richard. As always you contribute to consensus. I'm better understanding. So here we are. I can see a lot of square brackets and simple brackets.

So in my reading, "This distributed multistakeholder system should remain a critical component of the Internet governance ecosystem. The working group of enhanced cooperation recommends that organizations continue to evolve alongside changing technologies to meet the needs of all stakeholders and to address emerging opportunities and challenges." I believe this was quite general. It makes no harm. If I take a medication, usually my first question, what harm does it make? Will it be acceptable in this reading? Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I think that could be acceptable to us, but maybe just for clarity, if you could show the clean text as you proposed would be good. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Delete "the cornerstone." Comma. You don't need the comma. Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A simple question. Where is enhanced cooperation here? What is the relation between enhanced cooperation and what we have in this paragraph? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Are you asking me or asking the floor?

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: The floor because it's not your proposal. Thank you.

(Laughter)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, even drafting this recommendation is an example of enhanced cooperation.

(Laughter)

But I believe that some of us could respond to your question. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you. I believe this recommendation would come under the category on how to implement the Tunis Agenda, right? So this is one of the means to implement the Tunis Agenda, and through that to implement enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: India, please.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Just a -- I'm equally confused after the amendment on two aspects. One, what is the distributed multistakeholder system, and how wide is this -- I mean, we're talking the entire Internet governance ecosystem. I think the terminology which I think would create difficulty for us to capture to begin with. And then I do take the point that it should not create an exclusive -- exclusivity when we want to change technology. It should not -- so from that point if you -- the amendments that were done in the second part of the paragraph seem to be fine but still if these two are linked, it's a bigger challenge for us -- for me at least, for my delegation, to see that -- the correlation that we are trying to draw, number one. If some more clarity can be given, then I think we can look at it in a more comprehensive manner. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen, your flag is on.

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: (Speaker off mic).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Iran. Don't be shy.

(Laughter)

No, I'm talking to everyone now. Don't be shy. Just take the floor in case you think you can improve the text and resolve the ambiguity. Jimson.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Inasmuch as I do not have any issue with the two parts of the sentence, perhaps if for us to arrive at the first (indiscernible), maybe the second part is already accepted so we can identify that yes, we have a consensus on that, then maybe we can do the first part later. So we can break the two in the -- this sentence into two. The first sentence out of it and the second part -- the second part I guess would be a little different and you can pick that (indiscernible).

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to be bold and brave as you suggested but I'm not sure I'm going to succeed in -- I'll succeed at being bold and brave but perhaps not in improving it.

First of all, I have to agree with some people that have difficulty with the word -- the metaphorical use of "ecosystem." And I think it probably is sufficient to say it should remain a critical component of Internet governance.

Now, in terms of what this has to do with enhanced cooperation, certainly it would not bother me and I think it would be an improvement here to say this distributed multistakeholder system should remain a critical compo -- yeah, should remain a critical component of Internet governance contributing to enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you say it in a dictation mode?

>>AVRI DORIA: Certainly. At least I think I can and without stumbling over the words. Remains the same, "the distributed multistakeholder system should remain a critical component of Internet governance." So remove "the. "Contributing to enhanced cooperation."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Richard, I can see you. Don't worry. Anyone from the members? Okay, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I think I can maybe help with the first bit. Some people were saying they don't really understand what the distributed multistakeholder system comprises or doesn't comprise, and I think we could be precise there and say something that everybody would agree with and say "the existing multistakeholder institutions should remain a critical component." As far as I know, nobody actually has disputed that. So the existing -- and that picks up from the initial U.S. text. "The existing multistakeholder institutions should remain a critical component."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Tired? It's only 6:00.

Yes, Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Sorry. Just as to that last addition, I think it creates more confusion, to be honest. And I think -- we have a distributed multistakeholder system, I think that captures the concept, and I think that if we're to make progress -- from a Civil Society perspective it would be really -- it's really critical that all the stakeholders start to really focus on not feeling that conceding points in relation to this statement are somehow shaping their ability to make recommendations and rise to the point of contention, and I think that in the spirit of cooperation it's -- that's really necessary. That's really necessary at this point. And particularly from a Civil Society perspective. You know, we need to not only expect more, we need to see some more constructive movement, I think, on that point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: All right. I fully agree, but I agree more if you could provide me text.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I suggested that we put it back to the original text.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Which didn't fly. By original, what do you mean?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: To the -- I believe we actually had amongst our working group members we seemed to have some consensus, although there was question relating to the distributed multistakeholder system that was asked from the colleague from India, I'm not sure the proposal answers it. They can speak for themselves on that point.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can they use "multistakeholder approach" instead of "distributed multistakeholder system"? Would it be acceptable? Yes, India. I hope you are going to give me a link between the two impasse.

>>INDIA: I'm taking notes in the challenge of the chair, so I have difficulty in fixing this language. But I would want to understand, when you say that -- on one hand you say that it should remain a critical component and then you talk about how it is contributing to the enhanced cooperation. I see there is

kind of an irony there because either you talk of progressively reforming systems which contribute to the enhanced cooperation, that's one way of looking at it, or we say that the -- we cannot -- really we're saying that something exists which contribute to enhanced cooperation, which is not the case, I think. And that's a whole debate now. So the word "remain" is the challenge. So we should say it "should be," for example, that's one option.

But then the second challenge is also to link it with enhanced cooperation. I think how far it is because the institutions we're talking about -- now of course we have moved to the approach that's the chair's proposal to look at multistakeholder approach should be critical to -- should be a critical component of the Internet governance -- of Internet governance, but how it contributes to enhanced cooperation still we're not clear.

So -- because it takes us back to the very -- the definition, the starting point as some believe that we have not started and others believe that we have reached too far to believe that this will achieve something.

So that's the challenge at least we have, Chair.

So one option is to then not link it to the enhanced cooperation, but to -- and then we can simply make it as a statement of fact that finds concurrence in the room that this multistakeholder approach should be a critical component of Internet governance.

That's something we can all take home with -- without much quarrel.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, India.

Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm just getting some feedback per my capital and it goes more or less in the line of what India just said, that the original wording it's okay, but we do believe that if it's to remain, then it doesn't add any value. And we consider that we either should be improving in order to be been maintain as a world or in order to remain as a critical component of Internet governance could give us an idea that we have to improve something in order to guarantee equal footing in a multistakeholder system.

So that's -- that's what is my point. It's basically along the line that it should be improved in order to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

>>MEXICO: Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What time is it in Mexico?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: What time is it in Mexico?

>>MEXICO: It's an early working time, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Right. So I can feel that they are fresh, as opposed to us.

Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Just to say I support your reference to the multistakeholder approach. I think that's useful. Thank you.

I'm not comfortable with the notion -- with the words "should be" because I think it implies that it currently is not a critical component and so some wording to reinforce the current nature of it would be needed, such as adding the words "the multistakeholder approach is and should be," for example.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Joy. Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Mr. President, let's see if we can try and attempt this. "The distributed multistakeholder approach should continue to evolve" -- "should continue to evolve as a critical component of Internet governance contributing to enhanced cooperation in the future."

Will that work? In case there is a question about its contribution currently, then -- and we believe that it's evolving, then I think we should always leave it as a fact that it will then contribute to it in the future with the possibility of the evolution to that end.

So "This multistakeholder approach should continue to evolve as a critical component of Internet governance and contribute to enhanced cooperation in the future."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden. Then Mexico.

Oh, no. No Mexico.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. It seems that we are getting stuck on this one and I'm getting increasingly confused, especially by the -- although that's my normal state of mind, but --

[Laughter]

>>SWEDEN: -- increasingly so.

So I'm just thinking if -- I think it was Jimson that made the proposal that maybe these are actually two recommendations.

The second part, maybe it's something that we could harvest. It seems rather uncontroversial to us.

Whereas the first part of the recommendation, maybe we should square-bracket that for the moment and revisit it at a later stage because we really seem to be a bit stuck here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

I think this is a good suggestion.

Australia and Canada and then I will stop the debate here.

You are going to suggest to me the Australian method?

[Laughter]

>>AUSTRALIA: Why not.

Actually, the reason why I put my flag up some time ago was actually to comment on a textual change that India had proposed by putting in, I think, "should be" and then Joy made the point of "is and should continue to be," because otherwise, it implies that it isn't.

And I guess that just raises the issue of where there's sort of textual edits being made, sometimes it's good to allow some comments from the observers at the time so that the comment makes a bit of sense.

But that's the point that I was making, that the multistakeholder model approach, whatever term/system we want to use, is a very important component of Internet governance and is a very -- does right now contribute to enhanced cooperation. So that's the point we wanted to make.

But I think that that tweak has -- that Joy suggested has worked quite well to address that issue.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Canada?

>>CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I would echo the same point Australia made, in that I was concerned that we were -- we were almost backing away a bit from the Tunis Agenda itself in suggesting that the multistakeholder approach is not currently a critical component.

So I would certainly agree with Joy's suggestion, in that we specify that it plays that role right now and of course it's open to improvement, but so long as we -- so long as we capture that, I would think that that's something that everyone could agree with.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. So it seems to me that we are not able to capture it right now and here. I suggest to put it in square brackets, if that's okay.

As for the second sentence, are we comfortable with that or shall we put it in square brackets as well?

Virat?

>>VIRAT BHATIA: I was just going to see if adding the word "further" after "contribute" -- I'm sorry, I know you closed this out just as I raised my hand for that -- and "contribute" and -- "contribute further to enhanced cooperation" would mean it is doing something but it could do a lot more in the future.

Could that be a balance we could agree on? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Virat.

I believe at this stage, I will have no comments from the floor. You seem to be a bit exhausted. But you are still fresh to attack the next one.

So I suggest we come back to that later.

As for the second part, is it agreeable?

Okay.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So I have good news for you. We have finished the first reading of Topic A. I can see the joy in your face.

We have a few issues open. And when I say "few," I mean it. I don't see very many issues open, apart from the basic difference of opinions.

So I suggest we go to Group B.

It's beautiful. Yellow, blue, violet.

Okay. Can I have the explanation for the different colors?

Anyway, I can understand the two words "no consensus."

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And if you roll down, I can see -- okay. Go up.

So we have a lot of issues where we have no consensus and it is my feeling that we may stay here quite long but we won't have consensus on these issues.

Shall we have a try with the first one, or you are sure that we -- there is no way?

Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: In the spirit of trying to end the day on a positive note -- not suggesting that we might want to leave now --

[Laughter]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- I do believe there was one recommendation on which the group managed to reach consensus --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- and I'm just wondering whether it might be possible to start with it.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, if we have achieved consensus, then why to reopen it?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: That's true. Okay. Good point.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: I don't think the proposal was to reopen the issue but as the consensus was achieved, Chair, in a smaller group last night rather than in the plenary session --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, I see what you mean. Okay.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: -- we would share it just, dare I say, for information only and quickly cut and paste it into whatever document and then move on to something else?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Right. I'm sorry for my mistake. You have a good point here, and I follow it.

So there was one --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So this is Recommendation Number 20: "All stakeholders are encouraged to further discuss and address the public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in an open, inclusive and democratic and multistakeholder fashion."

Do we need to end -- anyway.

It's still okay.

Okay. I don't really want to push you too far, but I really want to find some points of agreement, and I'm sure we can achieve some points of agreement, so I -- I would like to try the first point, and I would like to have the two divergent opinions, why is it good, why is it unacceptable for others.

So first I would like to have the proponent's view.

Yes. Russia, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, regarding the first one, as we discussed yesterday, the blue one is corresponding to the statement. It was well agreed, and so we also agreed to put this into square brackets, the blue one.

And the first part, from our point of view, is a recommendation. If there is a need to improve the wording, we can leave "to consider" and delete "notes the importance." Just "to consider the international character of decision-making process."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. I turn to the floor, first to the members of the group, to comment.

Sweden. Then Jimson.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We have previously stated that we believe that this text takes the form of a statement rather than a recommendation. If it is that we are encouraging someone to consider the international character of the decision-making process, I guess we need to more -- more clarity on who should consider that, if it's -- if it should be -- were to be rephrased as a recommendation.

But we -- we believe that it's -- rather may be helpful for understanding the context in which the following two recommendations are developed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Jimson. Then Parminder.

>>JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Distinguished Chair.

I was in this community yesterday, or in the -- in this breakout yesterday, and I think we highlighted the blue highlight -- the text with the yellow highlight was agreed to be like maybe notes, a preface or something like that, but I will now look at the blue one, the text highlighted in blue. This could be recommendation. But at that deliberation, exhaustive deliberation, we agreed to no consensus. We came to the point of no consensus. So respectively, my Distinguished Chair, I was thinking like perhaps maybe like is there any change of -- change of opinion on these so that we could possibly move forward more rapidly? Because basically, this -- all this was discussed exhaustively yesterday, unless there is a contrary view now. Thank you.

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

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Just to help perhaps Sweden's question of whether the first part is still a statement and try to convert into a recommendation, hoping to catch the Russian Federation's intention, is "to universally accept the" -- should I -- "to universally accept" instead of "consider the international character of decision-making processes regarding core functions of the Internet, which points to the need for." "Which points to the need for."

That, to me, looks rather more like a recommendation. Thank you.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Parminder, can you rephrase it?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes. "Need for," instead of "needed for." Yeah, "needed for developing" -- i-n-g -- after it and that should complete it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yulia, can I ask you, the blue part is a statement and the yellow one is the recommendation?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: That was agreed yesterday, yes. We agreed that.

However, we need to leave it in the square bracket because it actually says what does it mean more in detail.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I'm a little bit -- I'm sorry. I'm a little bit uncomfortable with now the second sentence -- let me get closer -- the second part of that sentence that endorses this need for developing international Internet public policies, the way that's phrased.

What I was thinking prior to Parminder's last suggestion was the way to make it a more clear recommendation was to preserve all of the original Russian language and perhaps start it out by saying "stakeholders should consider" and then the rest of the original language -- "should consider the international character of decision-making processes regarding core functions of the Internet," et cetera, as an alternative proposal.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So in this form suggested by Ellen, is it acceptable?

Yes, Virat.

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to seek clarification on the term "core functions of the Internet." What does that exactly entail?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Baher?

>>BAHER ESMAT: I just -- before someone comes up with that definition, I just want to add to that. Core functions has been linked to international public policy issues, but wouldn't core functions then be the day-to-day technical and operational matters, which is excluded as per the power that has been often cited? How do you distinguish between core functions and day-to-day and operational matters?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Good point. Sweden, United States, and Parminder.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We are not convinced that the -- there is a need for developing new international Internet public policies, and we are also not sure what does it mean, international Internet public policies, because that's something that for some might be interpreted like that we need a new -- let's say we need to develop new international treaties or code of conducts, or regarding -- with relevance to the functioning of the Internet and we are not sure if there is a need for that, for example.

So we think that it's too broad a concept to use here, "international Internet public policies," so we are not -- we are still not very comfortable with this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I was also in the discussion on Group B yesterday so I just wanted to clarify that the part in blue here was not a statement but also not agreed, so -- but in the spirit of working in small group and bringing it to plenary, I think that's why it was retained in square brackets.

But I'll have to also follow on Sweden's comments and say that we would have difficulty with -- certainly with the -- with a recommendation that included the phrase in square brackets, and if developing international Internet public policies is referring to them, then we would have an issue with the full text which originally was a statement and even if it's trying to be a recommendation now, would still have -- we would have remaining concern. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yeah. Thank you. To that point, which is right that the relevant portions of the Tunis Agenda says that enhanced cooperation would not extent to the technical and operational matters, paragraph 69. And therefore actually particularly is not a bridge in relation to the day-to-day technical and operational matters and it did not speak with public policies, which it spoke of in other areas or spoke of relevant public policy principles which was kind of an arm's length approach. So there was no ad hoc political interference.

So I would suggest replacing WIPO international Internet public policies with the language from 70 which is WIPO -- and I will now speak slowly. "Globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated -- "principles," would be "applicable principles on public policy issues associated with" -- where is it -- "with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. Stop. Thank you. And this is paragraph 70 of Tunis Agenda.

Is my understanding correct that we are reaffirming the paragraph 70 in the Tunis Agenda? Well, it is more relevant if you add Russian Federation's elaborations. Perhaps it does move a few steps forward, but yes, it's largely saying what Tunis Agenda said and nothing was done on it which is our mandate to do something about. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So on one hand we have the Tunis Agenda. On the other hand we have some additional text to it. I turn to you again to consider it. Point of guidance. What harm does it make? U.S.?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I hesitated to come in again, but you asked for a specific question, so I'll indulge. If it is reaffirming paragraph 70, then I would first posit that it's a statement and reiterates our mandate and therefore isn't necessary. If it's insisted, I would say that then you need to use the exact language from the paragraph. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I don't insist. I just ask. And I ask for recommendations. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We, too, question whether there is a need to restate Tunis Agenda. If we were to work on this text, however, we would think that we should add this text, after

"developing" we would add, comma "through multistakeholder processes" comma, and it would continue like that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You still recognize your text?

(Laughter)

Okay. Yes, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sorry. Is it okay? Okay. Go ahead.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. It's the same comment I made before, I just think people should think about it. I don't think you want to exclusively exclude non-multistakeholder processes because then again you exclude WIPO and U.N. Human Rights Council, et cetera, et cetera. So maybe you want to say "through multistakeholder processes, as appropriate."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Avri.

>>AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much. I must confess that I'm getting very, very confused trying to read and parse and understand this. I see things I don't really understand, and please forgive me for my ignorance. First of all, universally accept almost reminds me of an old joke about IPv6.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Tell us the joke.

>>AVRI DORIA: But anyhow. We've been testing the universal deployment and acceptance of IPv6 about 20 years now. Anyway. It's a bad -- it's a techie joke. What can I say. So I don't understand what we mean about universally accept. I think where we defined international character of decision-making processes. I do understand through multistakeholder processes, that's the one part of this I do understand. I'm not quite sure. And then I guess it's in brackets now but the whole notion of harmonizing national laws is so far beyond us that I really don't understand what it's doing there. So reading this, parsing this, is confusing me. And I apologize for my confusion.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Avri. I think for the second part of this, harmonize national laws we have agreed that it's a statement and I would like the Secretariat to separate it from the yellow. So we are just considering the blue box for the time being. Avri, I appreciated the IPv6 joke. I'm not sure Vint Cerf would be very happy with that.

Okay. I think this is the time to have a break. And I suggest another 15-minute break and come back fresh. And let's have a second attempt to consider this, the whole group, in one go. And if we have the conclusion that we don't agree -- or we agree on not agreeing on that, then we shall move to group C. Okay? Thank you.

15. 1-5.

[Break]

[Gavel]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I gave some clear signal to my wife that I will be home by quarter to 9:00. Having said that, it takes me about 15 minutes to walk home.

It also means that we are going to close our meeting at half past 8:00. I am not sure whether it's a relief to you or it's bad news.

What I suggest we do now is to try and go through very quickly on the remaining questions in Group B which I understand had no consensus on. We had one recommendation where we had consensus, and I tried to identify at least one more where we can have consensus.

So probably I won't have consensus in Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 2, are we going to have consensus on that? Baher?

>>BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Chairman. And so I did raise my flag before the break and I wanted, if possible, to go back to the recommendation we were discussing just before the break, because I still -- I still have difficulty trying to understand, you know, what we're trying to achieve here, and my simple suggestion -- I mean, this recommendation is to encourage stakeholders to, you know, develop principles and so forth, so why can't we just say "stakeholders should" -- I'm reading from the existing text -- "stakeholders should consider developing, through multistakeholder processes globally applicable principles on public policy issues" to the end of the sentence.

So I haven't -- I haven't added any text. I just, you know, struck out some of the text that I don't understand. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Baher. I think it's a good try but I don't think it will fly.

Having said that, I would encourage you to think about possible means and ways to have this as a recommendation which is agreeable to all, and this is a general statement for all of the recommendations which have been submitted.

I am all for having more recommendations on a consensual basis.

So I believe if we go one by one on Recommendation 1, I can see there was no consensus in the small group. I doubt that we are going to have consensus in the bigger group.

On Number 2, Recommendation Number 2, "Encourages summits in the WSIS format as the highest level of enhanced cooperation implementation," I can see that there was no consensus. I can see hats saying no.

Okay.

Recommendation 3, no consensus.

Yes, Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Might I very quickly make a statement of explanation, because I think it would be important, maybe, for some.

Some of my thinking is based on the fact that the co-facilitators appointed by the UNGA have not completed their work. The WSIS review is not completed. So for me, until those things are done, I have real trouble considering that we would discuss something like a WSIS summit, but I don't want to miss the opportunity to explain that -- for colleagues that I really have been trying to track other steps that need to be taken and we would -- to me, we would need to see the output of the WSIS review that UNGA directed CSTD to do, and to have an actual discussion about concepts such as that. And I just wanted to make that clarifying statement.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you.

For those of you who are not completely familiar with the U.N. processes, there are consultations going on in New York with the co-chairmanship -- under the co-chairmanship of Finland and Tunisia about the final review and the modalities of the final review of the WSIS+10.

Okay. So I can see Recommendation 3 with a lot of braces, square brackets, and no consensus and I can see no real enthusiasm.

Okay. Let's go further.

Can you scroll up a bit? It's from whom?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, from Avri?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And it was amended by Joy?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Joy, please do comment.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. Just to explain the formatting of the insertions here, it's a little different from some of the other recommendations, so just to explain that in the second line there, it says "We commit to the continued development of a distributed or networked form of governance." There was a discussion of whether it should be "of the Internet" or "over the Internet," and the reference there to the U.S. is a reference to the participant that wanted particular wording there.

And likewise, at the end of that, the reference to Parminder is a reference to a particular wording that he sought at the end of that paragraph.

So that's just by way of explanation of what the particularizations are, if that helps.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And what is the status of this?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Nearly consensus.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Nearly what?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Nearly. Nearly consensus.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I can identify -- no, I cannot.

Anyone who wishes to take the floor on this?

Marilyn, please.

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry. I didn't understand. Joy was saying this has -- nearly has consensus? Or is that --

[Laughter]

>>MARILYN CADE: She's hoping I'm -- she's going to keep me from falling asleep.

[Laughter]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes. I can't believe you could possibly fall asleep at this point, Marilyn.

Yes, I was indicating that the only two points apparent which there were debate that was outstanding were the two points that are noted in the comments, which is on the word "of" or "over" or in relation to the later part, "for which purpose a coordinating body is nevertheless needed."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Can you highlight, please?

Okay. So any comments on that?

Ellen?

>>ELLEN BLACKLER: I'm not seeing it so much as a recommendation.

Are we recommending to the CSTD that they commit? It's reading to me more like a statement, but maybe I'm not seeing it clearly.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I reformulate my question.

Is there any hope to have a consensus on this issue?

Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes. I would -- my problem with this -- with the paragraph is, again, that I don't comprehend what exactly is being spoken in such an elaborate manner about network of actors and so on.

Now, what I can understand is with this -- these amendments, "We commit to continued development of distributed or networked form of governance." That's fine.

"In which networks of institutional actors" -- before "actors," "institutional actors." After "actors," comma, "involving all stakeholder groups" minus "across" -- "groups"-- yeah. Strike out "across." "Work together on making policies around an issue related to the Internet that falls within the specific domain of expertise of those institutional actors."

My point is that it's -- in my mind, I do not understand people who say that I'm an expert in this area and then I'll get in contact with another expert in that area and that network -- I mean that seems to me a free market of governance, which I really do not understand, would then make policies.

I can understand institutional actors with mandates, responsibilities, and expertise, but not actors across the world, free agents forming liaisons with each other and forming policies.

That simply doesn't make sense to me. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Parminder.

Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I was having trouble seeing through the purple. I had to go refresh myself on that. Thank you for letting me do that.

I have a couple of questions.

I don't think it's feasible to -- in the bullet that says "all processes and networks thus initiated should adhere at a very minimum," et cetera, I think the concept of "all" is a bit too broad, and I'll make a comment on why I think that in just a minute.

But even within -- it also says that they are global in nature.

I don't think we can exclude the idea that not everything will necessarily be completely global. There will be solutions or approaches that are going to be regional or cross-regional in nature, and I don't think we could -- we should rule those out, particularly if they may start as regional and then evolve into a more global -- global approach, and if we require they be global from the very beginning in some cases, an initiative will never get off the ground.

And then I would just point to the fourth bullet. I think I understand the point that is trying to be made there, but I would say that if that were the case, we would never make progress.

We can spend a huge amount of time trying to get everybody to agree, and that might block particular solutions or particular approaches that would help to advance a solution in a particular area.

And so I'm going to use eFinance as an example or eHealth as an example.

If we required the policies related to eHealth to be global from the beginning, then we might be denying mobile health applications and the policies around them that would help to significantly advantage the use of healthcare information in developing countries.

So I'm -- I'm not -- I think this is a very aspirational statement and to me it takes us too far to be a full recommendation and that's some of the -- some of my thinking about why.

The first three sentences, I think it would be possible to come up with a statement that is a bit aspirational, with some collaboration from other -- from other colleagues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn.

U.S. Then Mexico.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to mention that at the point in which we were discussing this in Group B yesterday, we acknowledged that it was quite a lot of material to digest, and as I recall, we -- we punted, for lack of a better word, to the plenary, so I'm not sure I would call it almost nearly consensus either, but in the spirit of working with this, I want to also correct the record a little bit. I had suggested that -- not only the change from "over" to "of" in the first sentence, but also "distributed or networked," I would just leave it as "distributed," so take out "or networked." That was the other text, I would say.

We had not agreed on the -- on -- well, any of the newly bracketed language, so I would -- I think that with the addition by Parminder, I also have a concern about that.

I want to echo the comments just made by Marilyn on Number -- Principle Number 4. It's similar to a comment I made yesterday about holding up progress in any one area for participation by all, which isn't always possible, so I would also strike that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Mexico?

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

For us also it was a little -- it was not really almost consensus on this part. It was the later stage of the (indiscernible) yesterday, the facilitation yesterday, but according to some reactions from the capital, we do not understand why "work together" instead of "coordination," and also my capital does not understand why there is a need of a coordinating body to work together. So that's the two reactions that I have from capital. We do not support the last part. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. My positive approach is to -- to this text is to have the proponents work on it a bit more, to take on board the comments we have had up to now, and we have the final comment from the observer, Mr. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I think maybe I can suggest some things that might help, or at least let's give it a try.

The first bit in green, I think perhaps everybody could agree if it just said "of Internet governance," because that's the standard term that's being used and so let's not get into whether it's "of" or "over" or whatever.

And for the bit in green at the end from Parminder, which is -- some people are not comfortable with, perhaps a compromise could be "with appropriate coordination," which I think people could live with.

And then if you have the addition -- we have stakeholder groups -- multi- -- "involving all stakeholder groups." I think you need to add -- in the middle, third line -- "all stakeholder groups," again, the point is that not all institutions are fully multistakeholder, so you have to say "as appropriate," I think. "All" -- in the third line. "Involving all stakeholder groups, as appropriate, work together."

And then I think the Australian approach to the four bullets might be the best, because for example, the first bullet excludes Human Rights Council, WIPO, et cetera, et cetera, so I don't think you want to do that.

So maybe if you just drop the four numbered bullets, then you -- it might be easier to find language that everybody could agree.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Number 4. Just strike it.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. I meant all four. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: You meant all of them.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. But you don't want to strike out the first part?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, the chapeau goes too because the chapeau makes no sense if you don't have the bullets.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Joy?

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Thank you. I'm happy to volunteer to work on the wording of this recommendation.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: I Definitely cannot agree to deleting the principles. They're a core part of it, so I think that's not negotiable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: But very happy to work on the wording to take account of the concerns that have been made by members of the working group, and to perhaps reflect on that overnight and provide it in the morning, if that's acceptable.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Your message is well taken. Thank you.

Last, Nigel?

>>ICANN: Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking for ICANN, I think I wouldn't disagree too much with what Richard has said, but the sense of this -- the sense of this recommendation seems quite important, and yet the -- you know, if one reads the beginning of it, and I was always taught that the -- the essence of anything should be in the first few words, then I think, you know, one rather limits the scope of what we're trying to get at with the word "distributed."

Because aren't we talking -- I mean "distributed" has a certain sort of connotation here, but we're also talking about, aren't we, a way -- we're talking about global, regional, national. You mean we're talking about a -- we're talking about a sort of governance structure that's just not at a global level, but could be a regional level, a subregional level, or whatever.

And I think that getting some of that -- getting some of that emphasis into the -- into the text would be - - would be useful. But if it's going to be worked on overnight or whatever, then obviously I'm prepared to input that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Nigel.

I think Saudi Arabia and after that, I would suggest that Joy would take all the inputs and start working as of the end of the meeting. Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have difficulties in accepting this. As I said, I mean stakeholder groups work together on making policies and there are issues (indiscernible) policy authorities (indiscernible) state, so this is, I mean something we cannot accept. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So you have taken note of this remark as well. Hope to have your new text by tomorrow and let's move forward.

Can you scroll down?

Probably you agreed on the break.

[Laughter]

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: That was as far as we got in the discussion, so --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, I understand.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yeah.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: And scroll up a bit.

Can someone explain to me what is the text after the green highlighted break? This is a statement or -- or what? What is it?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Sorry. Mr. Chair, if I could assist, this was a continuation of the previous recommendation --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Oh, I see. Okay. So you would take this --

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: -- so if it's helpful, I can -- however, I'm mindful that it hasn't been discussed in plenary so I wouldn't want to --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. No. Okay. That's okay.

Recommendation 21. Could you increase...

Okay. Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. I have a couple of questions to ask, and, first of all, I think understanding the CSTD in some depth is helpful in terms of understanding whether it's possible for the CSTD to make a -- for the CSTD to establish a permanent standing committee, which I think is what this is calling for.

"Multistakeholder committee will be established under the CSTD."

"Committee will be a permanent body in which all Internet issues not resolved can be referred."

That, I think, is actually calling in its own way for a new body, which is something that as business, I'm not yet prepared to call for any kind of a new body and I've said why. I think certain other things have to happen.

I think there's some interesting concepts, but I also just want to note for colleagues that there is a -- many colleagues in the room know this -- that there's a WSIS+10 review process which is focused right now on the WSIS action lines, and this is suggesting that there would be -- we would decide what to do with issues that are not currently embedded in the WSIS action lines.

Until the WSIS review is completed, the one that is assigned to -- two steps to me. One is the WSIS+10 review that is going on right now with the action lines which will be done and a report will be presented in June of next year, and until the WSIS review that the UNGA established and assigned to CSTD is done, I think this is premature.

I also think that if I look at the last sentence and just look at the following words, "can recommend a variety of venues to take forward Internet governance issue at hand," I think that in fact in our work in looking at gaps and looking at existing institutions and how to improve enhanced cooperation, that we should be including a discussion about venues as well in the discussion we're having here.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I can't agree more with what you have said. Yes, it's premature to prejudge the outcome of the consultations which are going on in New York. It's premature to prejudge the -- the WSIS+10 review.

Having said that, the reason we are here, CSTD has got the mandate to review WSIS. That's why this group has been established.

So the process itself is not clear to me either, but for those who would like to sound CSTD to have a bigger role, the mandate has opportunities for that.

Having said that, I believe that we should really consider that it is premature to prejudge what is going to happen.

Anyone else on this issue? Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: My apologies, but I think I missed part of Marilyn's input, but I don't understand what is being prejudged here, because as the chair said, our job is to give recommendations to the process and the process of WSIS will -- not WSIS -- actually the UNGA will decide, and in that sense, I think we want to give a recommendation of creating a body or not creating a body or suggest to the UNGA that you have a committee or not have a committee. Everything would -- I don't know whether prejudge something, but this is the task given to us to tell them what do you think is a possible mechanism, and in that sense alone, I'm not sure what exactly is being prejudged here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Well, if you read the first sentence, it's talking about WSIS action lines and what is not currently embedded in WSIS action lines, so the -- I'm not sure that we have, you know, been mandated to have a recommendation on that, what is not in the WSIS action lines.

Constance?

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. Without prejudging what will come out of the WSIS review process and specifically the consultations that are currently being conducted by Tunisia and Finland, I think if we look back into the heritage of the WSIS and specifically language of the Tunis Agenda, we see that in Article 72, Paragraph (g), there already is a mandate for the IGF to look at what they call "emerging issues," and if we were in search of a place to review -- address new issues that are not currently in the mandate of specific U.N. agencies or other international bodies, I think we should look at this agreed language within the Tunis Agenda that leaves room for the IGF to address any difficult emerging issues.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Constance. I don't believe we are going to have a consensus on that, so I propose to move forward.

Saudi Arabia, would you like to introduce it or -- I can see that there was no consensus.

I don't believe we are going to create consensus right now. Let's move forward.

Parminder, do you think we are going to have consensus on that?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Yes, very, very hopeful. Thank you.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. On this positive turn, let me ask you if you have a slightly different opinion.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Sorry. Yeah. Instead of "a globally democratic body mechanism for developing public policy principles related to the Internet."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So I could feel a great range of approval for your optimism. However, I can't feel the text being accepted by everyone, so I'm afraid we have to move forward.

And I'm really sorry to say that in this late hour, I would just go through and then I find no consensus which couldn't have been achieved in this smaller group. I have my doubts that we can achieve it right now in here.

So go down. 11. Yeah. Go down. Down.

I still encourage the secretariat to scroll down and when you think we might have consensus, just give me a signal.

Recommendation 14. I can see no signal.

15?

[Cell phone ringing]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: That was a signal, but probably not from the members.

[Laughter]

>>CHAIR MAJOR: 15? No.

16?

Okay. Scroll down.

17?

17, could it fly without the second sentence?

Phil.

>>PHIL RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. It's not necessarily my area of expertise, but I would like to know how you could have international cooperation on national security. Is it just -- am I misreading that wrong or --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: We are INTERPOL, we have Europol, we have (indiscernible), we have a lot of things. Don't we?

Sweden?

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman.

We were going to make a similar remark, or at least -- although we understand that there are ways and means maybe to cooperate when it comes to national security, we do not think that it fits in this context.

So if we were to strike out "national security," I think we could most probably live with the rest of it, but we would not like to see it in here because it -- in our opinion, it doesn't directly relate to the international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the implementation of the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden.

Anyone else on this? United States?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

In the spirit of our acknowledging our situation on our two divergent views, we understand the striking of the last sentence in that spirit, but we feel as though that was the crux of the recommendation, actually, rather than the preceding sentence, and if you start listing all these issues, then I feel like --

I certainly agree with Sweden that national security is something that is not addressed in this context, but I feel like we have to caution with the things that might be included and those that might not.

So unfortunately, I feel as though that would be a little bridge too far.

However, I might recommend that we revisit Recommendation 18 -- 18 --

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay.

>>UNITED STATES: -- as a possible way forward.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I'll try it.

>>UNITED STATES: And I would say with some edits that we might suggest, that if people agree, we'd be happy to try to do that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. I tried hard but it didn't work.

Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I think maybe a compromise could work, which would, I think, recognize reality.

We place the third sentence by something like "recognizing that no single body could address all issues." "All those issues."

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. I can see you but -- Saudi Arabia?

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. Take your seat. Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: I mean Thank you, Chairman.

How would international cooperation solve these issues of international public policy issues? As of Tunis Agenda, I mean there is a need for development of public policy by governments in order to solve those international issues related to the Internet. I wonder how international cooperation will solve that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry, Chair. I now understand my confusion. I was looking at the original submission of 6 under (a) from Mexico, which I was very interested in, and so I didn't really -- I was having difficulty reconciling the language here which went into detail with what I saw in the original 6(a) submitted by Mexico.

I'm interested in this issue of specifying which of the -- of the issues we're not -- we're including some, excluding others. I agree with the concept that no single body could address them, but I'm interested in the thinking about why we would be specifying specific international issues here.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. No consensus so let's go further.

18?

So we have 18 with square brackets. Can someone read it out what is the state now? Victoria, can you do it for us?

>>MEXICO: Yes, Chair. Yesterday it was said something that having these examples of mechanisms were not -- were more related to the day-to-day operation rather than the enhanced cooperation public policy, so some colleagues made some suggestions and perhaps if we delete the -- we can see the part without the strike -- reading the wording, then it could be easier to follow.

Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So shall I ask the secretariat to delete the parts which are struck out?

Okay.

What about the square brackets?

>>MEXICO: We could not reach agreement. There were some suggestions and we left it like that.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I have a feeling that we may achieve some agreement on that. U.S. and then Sweden.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair, and thank to you the Secretariat for making it a little bit clearer, albeit even with remaining brackets. And I had suggested that we might consider edits to it additionally. And it is something we -- given the hour, we would want to take the time to consider with our colleagues at home as well. So if -- if we could table it and take the time for us as well as other colleagues to consider, we would appreciate that indulgence. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We have no problem of revisiting this text a little bit later. Our only minor comment would be that in order not to create confusion about the establishment of new mechanisms we could maybe change the wording in the last part of the sentence, the last sentence, maybe just one sentence. The last part of the text to be, instead of "by establishing better mechanisms," we could use "by enhanced transparency and accountability" or "improved" or "strengthened." But "enhanced," maybe. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So how does it look like? You still want to go back to your Capitol and to consult with them?

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I think that that is a good suggested edit. And again, we may be able to come back to you in short order, given the time, but yes, we will need to check.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: So revisit. On recommendation 19 -- you asked for the floor. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. My eyes are --

>>VIRAT BHATIA: Chairman, nothing substantial except in the line 2, "resources are required to enhance." It reads "enhanced." "Enhance." Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah. Enhancing. But we are going to revisit anyway, with a fresh mind. 19. No consensus, I can see it. Oh! We have an agreement. And we have agreed for the second time I think here in the plenary. IGF. You are coming back with that today or tomorrow.

>>UNITED STATES: Well, I can come back on this one and I have some coordination with colleagues that still have outstanding potential recommendations that we were able to incorporate. And also, noting the desire for recommendation text without statements and noting that the first sort of sentence in the

case of both the consolidated offers that we made could be construed as such, I've tried to make some additional edits. What would you like me to do about that?

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Probably coming back to me tomorrow.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay. I'm happy to do that with the ones that I've been able to coordinate so far.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I would like to see a final text, or (indiscernible) one.

>>UNITED STATES: Okay, sure.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Sweden.

>>SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to go back to recommendation 19, since this is the first time this is being discussed in plenary. So the recommendation, originally it read "respect for human rights should always guide the discussions and development of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet." And the intention with this resolution was to try to capture what we thought would be something that we could characterize as low-hanging fruits because we think that the respect for human rights is an overarching -- that's overarching obligation that we all have. And for that reason it shouldn't be controversial, that when we are dealing with public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, we acknowledge that. We noticed that there was quite a lot of support for this recommendation when we discussed it in the small group. However, there was a proposed amendment from the Russian Federation and that was to also include "and responsibilities." For us the concept of human responsibilities in this context is new. I think we all know about international human rights law, but we are a little bit puzzled about this addition and also a little bit surprised that we cannot reach consensus on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you, Sweden. So Richard, you are going to come up with a new text?

>>RICHARD HILL: No, unfortunately not.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: How come?

>>RICHARD HILL: Because I have to say that I would fully agree with the statement made by Sweden. It seems to me that this -- this is just an obvious assertion. In fact, to it shouldn't say "should always", must always." The universal declaration of human rights is just an enunciation of law that applies to everyone, so I really don't understand why there would be controversy around the statement without the addition because, in fact, human responsibility -- the concept of responsibilities is implicit in human rights. The human rights are always balanced by certain responsibilities so it's there. But also, I'm not sure that it adds anything to say this. This is a fact, that respect for human rights must guide discussions and developments. Not just international public policy, but also national policy. So I can see that it does no harm to add it but also it does no harm not to add it because it is a fact.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I'm not absolutely sure that we are here to give recommendations on national policies. Yulia, do you have anything to add to that.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Well, in this case we propose it to become a statement.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Is it agreeable to have it as a statement.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. We think that it's a recommendation on how we are dealing with international public policy issues. So we think that it's -- it should be retained as a recommendation and we are not discussing any statements. So that will not be sufficient for us. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I would recommend us to take the recommendation out for the implement enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda. And what you have in the Tunis Agenda the human rights, is not reflected and protected there, so we don't see any I guess fullness in adding human rights again in the recommendation. It's covered in Tunis Agenda, so why is the implication? Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. If we have it as a statement, could it fly? Just a reminder, as we have Richard here with us, if my recollection is correct, even in the IDRs we had in the preamble an explicit reference to human rights, and it was an absolutely technical conference. Richard. Oh, sorry, sorry. Joy.

>>JOY LIDDICOAT: Yes, thank you. Just to remind the government members of the working group that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is of course an obligation -- or a commitment that all members states of the U.N. have made. There's nothing controversial in there. In fact, it's something which should unify government members. It's certainly, from Civil Society perspective, we would not be comfortable -- I certainly would not be comfortable with this as a statement only. While a statement may reflect the current scenario, nonetheless respect for human rights is a critical component of guiding discussions on Internet public policy issues, particularly in light of some of the issues raised in the extensive submissions that were made pertaining to human rights in response to the questionnaire and could certainly not agree to it being a perfunctory statement type input. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yes, Constance.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: Thank you, Chair. Just to add to Joy's point, I would like to say that the Tunis Agenda cannot be considered in isolation of the outcome of the first phase of the WSIS which is the Geneva declaration of principles. And there we see very clearly in article 3 that we -- the international community at that occasion reaffirmed its commitment to human rights. So I don't know if this language will find its way through a recommendation or through a statement, but I think it would be critical to find a space in the text for human rights.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Mexico.

>>MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have some -- just to express our support to have a (indiscernible) recommendation. From our view it's a critical guidance for policymakers to bear in mind when discussing policies related to Internet human rights perspective. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Well, I heard pretty strong arguments for it. Any of the members would like to take the floor on this issue? You have the right. Yes, U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Just for the benefit of the plenary, I just wanted to reiterate our support for this recommendation that we averred last night in the small group B. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Thank you. Okay. Now Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, in response to your question, Chairman, indeed, an article -- a provision, rather, was agreed in the preamble with respect to human rights. However, Chairman, there was discussion about that. Indeed some people had stated that it was not necessary because it's obvious. So that discussion about you don't really need it because it's obvious also occurred. But in the end it was agreed to have it because it does no harm. Because we all have to agree that. And with respect to the Geneva declaration, that's correct. But it's articles 3, 4, and 5, from memory. It's not just 3. So the enunciation of the human rights provision is in the 3, 4, and 5 and in the WSIS+10 it looks highly likely that there will be -- of course we're not finished yet, but in the WSIS+10 process it looks like there would be a clause reaffirming human rights. So I -- again, I don't think this is particularly controversial, and I don't understand why it would say "should" because they must. We all know that human rights are mandatory.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: I suggest we leave this open and revisit it tomorrow. Okay. Am I right assuming that IGF-related recommendations will be treated as the --

>>UNITED STATES: Yes. And I was just going to ask the Secretariat, per your request to give you in writing the work that we had done under our Iranian chairmanship earlier, if you could send me the IGF compilation so we can make the appropriate notes and consult with him and send it back to you. I don't know that you sent -- I didn't see it come to the group. Okay. You can send it to all if you want but so I have it I can work off of that one, thank you. To incorporate the consultation I've done with colleagues already. Thank you.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So we can skip the recommendations related to IGF and we can come back to that. Okay.

>>UNITED STATES: There were some that were remanded to plenary, so we should acknowledge those. But I think she marked those appropriately.

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Okay. So we are done. We're beat. Well, we have at least one approved. And we have some promising starts.

I suggest we start group C, at least just to start it and we shall continue it tomorrow morning. Can you bring it up? Okay. Can you increase the -- okay. Iran, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to know that you intend to continue the discussion, and if yes, up to what time because we are so tired and we need to survive. Thank you.

(Laughter)

>>CHAIR MAJOR: Yeah, I think I have to respect human rights.

(Laughter)

But if there's a general wish that we stop here, I'm ready to stop here. I can see consensus.

(Laughter)

Oh, great. Okay. I'm really sorry to be so tough with you, but we have to finish our work. Okay, we stop here. Let me suggest to you to start tomorrow a bit earlier. Can we do that? Can we convene at 9:30? Is it okay with you? No? 9:00? 9:00 is okay? I'm turning to Secretariat who are really, really tired. Is it okay? Okay. We resume tomorrow at 9:00.

I really thank you for your cooperation. Thank you.

[Applause]