

**Fourth Meeting Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation**

**25-27 September 2017**

**Geneva, Switzerland**

**DAY 2**

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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Fourth meeting - Day Two

26 September 2017

Geneva, Switzerland

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Good morning, colleagues. I'd like to welcome you back to the meeting. I hope you have had time to consider with some more statements the work we have been doing so far, particularly the inputs that are before us. I hope we will have today fruitful discussion that will assist us in preparing for the report. As I have suggested to you in our first session yesterday, I think it is about time that we should work without prejudice to discussions. I think they are important and help us to further refine the ideas and would be very helpful when we get in a drafting mode.

I think it's very important that from now on, we will work -- think about how everything we discuss will fit into the working group report.

So with that, I will suggest we could resume from where we left yesterday. We have -- all the new contribution documents were presented, and we are starting discussion on the content of those documents.

I will now then turn to the contributions submitted by United Kingdom for discussion of the recommendations contained therein. You have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone.

As we said yesterday, our proposals are slightly amended version of the proposals that were made in May. We listened very carefully to the comments that were made. They had a good degree of consensus, but there were a number of very useful comments. So what I suggest is I will go through them one by one. And as far as I can remember, I'll explain the changes we made since May .

So the first recommendation or proposed recommendation is about consultation and engagement. I think that this recommendation was almost agreed in May, although there was a suggestion that we should add at the end the phrase "in developing international Internet-related public policy." So we have added that phrase at the end. We hope now that this proposal can achieve consensus from the group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you, U.K., for reminding us of the previous discussion in that regard.

May I seek views from other participants on that proposal? Does it reflect, in your view, the discussion we had? Can it be incorporated as part of our outcome?

Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yes, Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everybody.

My comments are along the lines of what I earlier commented but I'm forced again to do it because we are seeking whether there is a general agreement. And I think I should need to, therefore, also again put it on record.

The problem with this language is that this language is okay if we have a language about actual implementation of enhanced cooperation. This talks about qualities and not implementation.

We need to know in each of these desired characteristics what is the method in which we can implement it. And that method is missing. And, therefore, we need -- we are okay with this if it follows actual method of implementing enhanced cooperation. That's my view and would probably apply to a lot of these points here. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder, for your comments. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, I have a similar view. I think we agree, Chairman, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. And I agree there are several useful and, in fact, excellent recommendations here. And also as the U.S. mentioned, some of theirs, I think, fit in that category. But that's in the context of also having a section which summarizes areas where there is differing views.

I also wanted to comment a little bit on -- what came up about, if I may -- or you don't think that's appropriate? The earlier points in the U.K. contribution? No, okay. No problem.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: At this point, I would like to focus on the recommendations themselves. Maybe if there are any further comments, we can come up to that. And I just concur with what you said. I think we are looking to separate blocks. Then we need to see the text as a whole. But I think we have this caveat in our minds that everything we're doing is -- should be seen in its context, in the larger context, as we look into the text as a whole. So thank you for your comments.

I have Saudi Arabia followed by Russian Federation, United States.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. We thank our colleague from the U.K. for the refined recommendation. However, if we look at the mandate and the point we raised yesterday, what we look at are mechanisms. By saying "enhanced cooperation process should follow and promote best practice in consultation," but how and where? How government on equal footing will do this if they lack the mechanisms to ensure that there is engagement, there is a reachout? These are the issues around the contribution that we see by U.K., is how and where. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. That was very clear point.

Russian Federation, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We are actually -- Good morning, everyone. Sorry.

We're actually on the same position, well, as others already told. We need to address implementation. "Implementation" is the active word, and it should give the answer on how to implement. And actually it's in the mandate of the working group in the para 65 of the Resolution 70/125 that in respect to the process towards implementation of enhanced cooperation envisaged in the Tunis Agenda. And if we address enhanced cooperation, we should address para 69, 70, and 71 of the Tunis Agenda.

And here we do not see the answer on the question how we should implement, especially in the content of these listed paragraphs. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone.

It's early and maybe I haven't had enough coffee, but my brain isn't going to be able to process all the context and contingencies and connections with other proposals if we do that on every recommendation.

I think right now we should just look at them, do we basically agree with the premise and then, if so, let's move it over into a different bucket and then we can look at everything within a context. And certainly nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, we always understand that.

But right now we just have to look at the merits of the proposal. Does it make sense? Do we basically agree with the premise? And if so, let's move it over and, you know, kind of make progress on developing a report. Otherwise, we're just going to spin our wheels all day again. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.S. I certainly agree, we are looking at the actual text of the proposals. But I think we had some useful comments in regard to the need to put it in the proper context and also to look at means of implementation of what is there. I think those are useful comments that may assist us in further stages. I would not encourage prolonged discussion on this because you want to move to the other section. But I think those comments were quite helpful.

I have Canada and Iran. Canada, please.

>>CANADA: Good morning, Chair. And good morning, colleagues. I'm happy to see you here again today.

Certainly for Canada, this proposal by U.K. is something that we would support as a valid recommendation to be included in our report.

I'm just a little bit concerned in terms of the comments we've heard from our colleague Parminder, from Saudi Arabia, from the Russian Federation, that we are still very much in two distinct groups and there seems to be very little overlapping space.

For us, as is described in the U.K.'s contribution, enhanced cooperation is a tool to allow us to make public policy on international Internet-related issues. For this other group, it seems that enhanced cooperation is a new body, a new mechanism. But nothing is new about it. It's a process that has been there for some time and it is being implemented already in many different fora.

So if we are -- if we are not able to reconcile this, I'm sorry, but maybe we just end our discussion now and we have a report that says, well, here are the contributions. We were not able to agree on the fundamentals and that's the end of it. Because if we're going to have to go through every single point of the U.K. recommendations and it always comes down to, yeah, enhanced cooperation, what they say here is nice but it's not an actual process so we don't like it and we can't agree to it, well, we're going around in circles.

So, once again, I certainly want to reiterate Canada's support for this proposal. And it is our understanding that enhanced cooperation is a process and that there's nothing in the Tunis Agenda or the WSIS+10 Resolution 70/125 that calls on us to create a new body or a new mechanism. So unless we can go over that hump, I think we're going to be going in circles a lot again in the next two days. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

I'm going to propose something, and I want to be quite strict about that. I think we are moving to a stage we want to discuss recommended text before us. I will not allow comments that will bring back to this plenary the discussion about the context or about the ultimate objective. We are going to focus on the recommendations.

I have closed the list after Iran. I do not intend to give the floor -- I want -- I see there will be some discussion around that.

If you have focused, focused comments on the recommendation, I will give you the floor. Otherwise, if you want to make general comments, this is not the time to do it. I want to be very strict about that. Otherwise, we will not get anywhere. I want to finish the list of recommendations coming from -- containing new contributions. But I do not want to engage in discussion about the theology about what we are doing, if you agree with me.

So I will offer the floor to Iran. I see other plates. If you have focused comments on the text before us, please do it, make your comments. Otherwise, please refrain from making comments linking with other parts of our work for an appropriate moment. This is not the time.

Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, colleagues.

In the same way, Mr. Chairman, just seeking more clarification on that recommendation, that -- how we are going to relate it, many elements to the international Internet-related public policy because we have

many elements in this regard and how we are going to the current process to consider these elements. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran.

As I said before, some comments made the point that we need to see it in proper context and also to link it with implementation. We are not doing it now. We are looking at the language that is before us. We'll deal with this as they should come in the course of the discussions around enhanced cooperation.

I see -- in the order I have European Union, Belarus, and Lea.

European Union, you have the floor, sir.

>> EUROPEAN UNION: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to everyone.

I would like to make several remarks regarding this recommendation. I just want to make aware all the people that we also submitted a similar recommendation to this one. We appreciate the work done by U.K. by retuning and refining this recommendation. In particular, we support the part which is referring to the -- the part which is saying to all stakeholders as the European Union is supporting the multistakeholder model.

And on top of that, I would like to remind colleagues that also we discussed a similar recommendation from Jimson's proposal where we had also unanimity there.

So I believe this is going to the right direction. This is getting the maximum consensus of what we have here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Belarus?

>>BELARUS: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, colleagues.

I would like to propose some -- not a general remark but some very concrete suggestions on the language. So probably if we will change it a little bit, it could be acceptable probably to the audience.

So if we rephrase it as, "Enhanced cooperation should be aimed at promotion of best practices in consultation and engagement until the end." So probably we will avoid any links with the model, the possible model of realization, but describe the principle of what we understand of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Belarus.

Can I maybe ask you just to read out the language as you see it fit? Thank you.

>>BELARUS: Of course. "Enhanced cooperation should be aimed at promotion of best practice in consultation and engagement until the end of the program."

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. That's clear. Thank you very much.

Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone.

First of all, thanks to the colleagues from the U.K. for putting forward this proposal. As I understand it, we're just commenting on Recommendation 1 of this proposal?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>LEA KASPAR: Okay, thank you.

This is just to express support for this -- for this recommendation. I do think it is important, and I can't see any grounds for objecting to this proposal and would like to see it in the final report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba, please, I give you the floor to speak to this specific proposal, please.

>>CUBA: That's right, Chairman. I think I agree with you that we should not open back the philosophy and the concept of enhanced cooperation. But what we're discussing here is the one in the box there, the number 1 there in the box?

And that's also a principle thing. That's an opinion that they have. Some other delegations have a different opinion of what enhanced cooperation is. And this does not --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry, Juan. I would like to hear your comments.

[ Multiple speakers ]

>>CUBA: Sorry, sorry. Let me finish. I'm only taking less than everybody here. We're taking half an hour for one paragraph. In this way, we only can --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please, please, Juan. We are not discussing the methodology. I am chairing the meeting. I will do -- please. I want to have your comments --

>>CUBA: My comment is --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: -- that can be acceptable.

>>CUBA: -- that kind of principle and opinions, as I say, are very valuable but somebody else can have another opinion. So you can have it. In that case, you can have opinions -- very wide opinions or simply don't have opinion and do really recommendation of things to do, of things to do, not this is like that or this is like that.

Otherwise, I can -- we tried in our recommendation, in our submittals to be concrete, to be short, not to do --

[ Multiple speakers ]

Otherwise, we can do that for the next meeting and put you -- a lot of concept, philosophy concept of what is enhanced cooperation. There are books written about enhanced cooperation. We can have it here right now.

But I don't think that does not go to the mandate they have, that they gave to us, that they gave to us. They say from paragraph 64 of the resolution from General Assembly says enhanced cooperation that we are talking here, because they are -- it is from paragraph 69 to 71. That's the scope that they gave us.

And then in paragraph 65, they say, we urge CSTD to create a working group to see how to further implement that, enhanced cooperation, enhanced cooperation as it was defined in the previous paragraph by them. That is paragraph 69 to 71 from Tunis Agenda.

The rest is the philosophy opinion. I respect all those opinions, but that is not what we're doing here. That is very interesting. Books -- I sent you yesterday the link to the WSIS+10 book, plus the explanation by the U.K. representative, David Hinton, who coined the term enhanced cooperation. You see here that was a term for the situation that they have there in their attempts. Somebody else now are doing a different interpretation. Canada just do some interpretation --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Juan, Juan, please.

>>CUBA: That is not what we have to do here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I want to respect all the views. But I must say you are out of line with what I have proposed. You are lacking respect for the chair, for the way I'm chairing the meeting.

I want to focus on the recommendations. You are contradictory because you say you don't want to discuss the philosophy and you say you start bringing all the issues again. Help me. Help me. Otherwise, we cannot complete our job.

I want to revisit the recommendation from U.K. I want to revisit the proposal from you. We will not get there if each and every time we start discussing the whole package. Please, please, help me. Help me very much. I would appreciate it.

Can you move down to the second recommendation, please. And have a focused discussion. Otherwise, we'll not get anywhere.

Please, U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. First, if I can quickly respond to a couple of the comments that were made. We're surprised there was such a debate. Because this recommendation was agreed in May, apart from the addition of in developing international Internet-related public policy. So we just note there seems to be some change in people's minds since May. I don't know. Perhaps the situation has developed.



We ask how and where. And the short answer is in different ways and everywhere.

Consultation and engagement needs to be flexible depending on the circumstances. Because different issues will have different stakeholders involved. And you need to take a different approach to make sure you get it right each time. So we cannot impose one size on every situation.

And where?

Well, everywhere. We think this is a recommendation which should be taken up in every situation where public policy -- international public policy is discussed.

So thanks for the comments. Thanks also to Belarus for the drafting suggestion, which is interesting. And we'll have a look at it. But we're heartened at least that we heard no objection in principle to this proposal. So we hope that gives us a positive way to move forward.

The second proposal we have, there's been some more changes since our discussion in May that we had, I think, mainly three suggestions on this. It was suggested that we should say, "Stakeholders should consider making." So we've made that change. I think it was my colleague from Cuba who suggested that. So we've made that change.

We were also asked to add the phrase "In developing international Internet-related public policy" at the end. So we've added that phrase at the end.

Our original proposal used the word "evidence." And there was some debate in May about what do we mean by "evidence"? And that was quite a problematic word. It was suggested to us that we change that to "factual information and statistics." So thank you for that suggestion. We've made that change. And we hope now that, with those three changes, this proposal is much better understood and can have the support of the room.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., for introducing the recommendation and recalling some of the background discussion we had before.

One thing that maybe I should have said from the beginning, we are not here in a drafting mode. We're not drafting a final wording of things that will make it to the report. We are, on the basis of recommendations, collecting ideas, reactions that will assist us if you -- that could be upon the chair. That could be a collective work to put the text together. So we are not drafting anything. We are reviewing ideas and making clear that we can get the best understanding of how these -- the concepts should feed into the report in another form. So I want to make it very clear. Because I see that maybe part of the reactions that we're having seem to indicate, reflect a concern that we are on a final mode. This is not the case.

We are collecting views. But it is important for us to -- in order to be able to come to these outcomes, to have a better understanding of what the plenary thinks about the concept. And the concerns that

were expressed, those are very clear to me, that everything that is -- that that kind of recommendation that do not address directly what some participants think the core mandate should be put in a proper context and should be linked to implementation. I think this covers many of the recommendations here. You may wish to make the same points in each and every one. But I think the point is taken that we would need to see it in the overall document in its proper context. And we've linked to implementation. With this, I invite comments on the second recommendation. I see Parminder, Richard Hill, United States.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I find myself in a difficult situation. And my comment is for all these statements. I take understood and take seriously the chair's observation made earlier that we shouldn't be talking about other issues.

But right now the distinguished U.K. delegate insisted and said that, well, these were agreed last time. I'm afraid that if I stay silent, it will be said that they also agreed in the second reading. So I have a problem with that. In final days it is going to be said these were agreed. And I don't know what the meaning of "agreed" is here. So that makes us -- because we represent certain interests to speak up and say, no, there is an issue. And then we say that this is the issue. We're told that this is a matter statement and don't make those statements. But I want to say I don't agree for that to be included. If that is all that's expected to be said, I will say, no, I don't want it to be included. I don't want to say that, because the fact is what I'm saying. And that statement, therefore, should be taken at its value that we -- and it should not be -- the word should not be used that these are being agreed to. And it was just used right now that it was agreed to last time. No, I didn't agree to it. I'm not agreed to them now. I take the Chair's advice that, if you want to talk about that idea and it is a problem, the idea is stated. And, if you don't, you don't state it. That's fine. We're not talking about agreeing to these things. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. I think I said exactly what I tried to say. Nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. We need to see everything in its proper context, the links between the different sections of the documents. The point is taken.

Anyway, the plenary, all of you will have the opportunity to consider the final package and make a final decision. So it's nothing -- should not be considered at this point that for each and every word we say that we need a full agreement. That's not the case for the kind of exercise we engage now. Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I think that's right. From my point of view, we're agreeing that this is a candidate that is very promising. And then we will refine the language.

So I think you said we don't want to actually get into wordsmithing here.

But I will mention the concerns I have with the words, not with concept. I think that "should consider" is far too weak. Basically, that's nothing. You should think about making information available. Well, you know, wow. So I would like "must" or "shall." We can find some compromise there, I think. But I think the language has to be stronger, and that applies to several of the other ones.

And then the other thing is that we know there's specific areas where we're stymied by the lack of information, in particular the cost of international Internet connectivity, which is largely done on a barter basis. So I would like to put some examples in there. That's one. And I'm sure we can think of other ones. For example, at the end, "for example" or "in particular," something like that. And then list a few areas that we can work on that language in another time. So with those changes, I'd be happy to support this.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list United States followed by Canada, Cuba and Russian Federation. U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, the United States strongly supports this recommendation. I think we have to look no farther than just the amazing work that's done by a lot of the U.N. agencies here in Geneva. Some are in the room including ITU and UNESCO. And I know the products they produce related to data is just invaluable to researchers, to policy makers, to the international communities and, certainly, when looking at international Internet public policy issues. So I think this is entirely relevant and really important to the work we're doing here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. Yes, Canada very much supports fact-based decision-making. Therefore, it's really fundamental for us to see a recommendation like this included in our report.

And just a question for you, Chair, but for anybody else as well. So, if we have disagreement on this, does it mean that we might end up reading the report saying stakeholders should consider -- that some participants agreed that stakeholders should consider making factual information and statistics available and other members did not agree with this? I think that would look very odd and unusual. But I'm putting that question out there for us to ponder as we move forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

As I have said before, we are not now in a drafting mode. We're going to get to how we want to reflect ideas on the report. The only thing is we are aiming at having a group report. I think the relevant part of the report would be the areas in which we can say the WGEC recommends or agrees that -- as a group. The report can contain, in my view, other areas in which opinions are not unanimous. But that also not be the relevant part. The relevant part that that might be done for documentation of the process but not for the purpose of complying with the mandate we're given. Maybe we can -- we'll come back to this. We'll come back to this. Thank you for raising that. We'll come back to that. I have on my list Cuba, followed by Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and India. Cuba, please.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair, I think this paragraph should clarify what statistic are we talking about? Are we talking about mortality rate? Are we talking about economic statistic? What kind of statistics? I think it has to be more specific in the -- when they say the statistics that's going to be open. It's old statistic, military budget, what kind of statistic? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. I wouldn't ask, but it's a good opportunity to say the words. It's an interesting discussion we have now. And, you know, that we are not in the drafting mode. We're just trying to find some kind of wording considerable for everyone. However, it's -- if we start to make the right wording and changing for these particular paragraphs, it should have very important stuff in. It should have the answer on the -- certain mechanism of implementation of enhanced cooperation. And we do not want to be understood incorrectly.

We are not against these statistics. We are in favor of statistics. We do not oppose multistakeholder participation or inclusiveness. But we need to understand how the international level should be addressed. If we agree that on high-level characteristic that international level should be addressed, then it should be addressed. I do not see anything about it. And it's just zero addressed on these particular cases.

About the sovereign right of states on the public policy issues, we don't see any words about it. It's not addressed at all. And we also do not see the ways how it's addressed the para 69, 70, and 71 of the Tunis Agenda, which actually formed the understanding of enhanced cooperation in terms of the Resolution 70/125. And we don't see anything about governments. Things like that. We don't see it. And if we try -- if it is the intention in the audience to change this wording coming to be addressed, then it's fine for us. But, without it, we cannot say that this is the answer of our mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russian Federation. I think you have made this point before and we take on board that we need to link this discussion to the implementation, that we need to put it in the proper context. I think this is clear. We don't need to repeat it each and every time in that kind of -- that's taken on board. That's taken on board.

But one thing we cannot do is, when discuss each and every concept, to bring back and try to discuss collectively all the packages. Let's try to look at each piece as it comes, and then we'll see how the overall package will fit. But I thank you. Because your point is very well taken. I think it's very relevant, and it is taken. It is taken down. I have Saudi Arabia, and I have India next.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I mean, along the line what Russia and colleagues said, I mean, in order to qualify this for inclusion, we knew that enhanced cooperation is to enable governments. So stakeholders should make available factual information and statistics to government in order to enable them to develop the proper international public policy. So we need all of the stakeholders to make available information to government and develop international public policy. So we like the word of "to enable government to develop international public policy." Maybe by this modification, this will be directly with 69 and 70. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your suggestion. I have India and Lea and Zambia.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just need clarification for this particular proposal by U.K. The first is that, as we understand the multistakeholder model, all the stakeholders would be participating in providing

inputs to the governments. But, in this particular proposal, my question would be that what will be the process that is being suggested for making this input available? Secondly, what kind of factual information and statistics needs to be provided?

And, thirdly, what kind of impact is it likely to have on the governments and public policy making?  
Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India. I am sure the U.K. has taken note. I will revert to Paul as soon as we finalize the round of speakers.

I think the second question you ask is the same that was asked by Cuba that we need to have clarity on what kind of information would be requested.

I have on my list then India, Zambia, Lea Kaspar, Iran. And after that I'm closing the list and reverting to U.K. So, Zambia, you have the floor, sir.

>>REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And would like to appreciate the guidance that you have given us. I think, if we proceed in the manner of focusing on the recommendations and giving our proposals in terms of how we want the text to look, I'm sure we'll make a lot of progress today.

Just a comment on paragraph number 2. In the context of the area observation, I think there was a question of what kind of statistics we're talking about here. I thought perhaps it would read better if we dropped the part of the statistics and just talked about factual information. Because we believe, when we talk about information, it includes statistics as well. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for your suggestion. Last on my list are Lea followed by Iran, and then I will revert to Paul. Lea, you have the floor.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. So, in this particular recommendation, I think, as I understand it and in terms of how it addresses our mandate, I think it's pretty clear that this goes to addressing an obstacle that was addressed or identified in previous meetings towards enhanced cooperation, which is the need for greater information sharing and improving information flow. That's at least how I understood it. And, if anything, I think we could consider maybe this goes along with the recommendation that Richard made is making it even stronger or more specific, more concrete.

And I agree with the colleague from India in that I think that that would contribute to making this maybe more practical. I don't have any specific language, but I understand we're not talking language at the moment. But I would like to perhaps see this a little more fleshed out. It seems that, for any stakeholder engaging in enhanced cooperation, factual information is an absolute prerequisite for meaningful participation and engagement. But I would add that this information needs to be organized in a certain way. So, if we could think about that and think about how this could also then, not only contribute to information sharing, but also greater coordination. So that's -- that would be something that I think would improve this even further.

Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Mm-hmm. Thank you, Lea. Yes, we are not in our drafting mode. But should not be impeded in case you think you have some additional proposal. I think that would be useful in a later stage when you come to that. So Iran followed by United Kingdom.

>>IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chairman, I have some concern when I look at -- to the para 68 of the Tunis Agenda and how could we find -- realize relations between this para and the recommendation of the U.K. I would appreciate if the distinguished U.K. could clarify how we should translate the para 68 that says that the policy authority for the Internet-related public policy issues is a sovereign right of the states. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to U.K. But I'd like just to recall one of the main parameters for our work, I would say. I think the biggest thing is we are not changing the Tunis Agenda. We are not changing WSIS+10. So everything that is in Tunis Agenda, everything that comes from the WSIS+10 document, everything we do here should be aligned with what is there. So we are not changing anything. We are not changing what is there in relation to the sovereign right of states. That is something that is there. We do not have a mandate to change. In case we do anything that would go against anything -- not only that part, any part, that would be, I think, a failure on our part. So I think this should give us some comfort. I think the test would be if the idea is proposed, I can align and support and strengthen what is there. Otherwise, I don't think that should be considered at all. I think that's just for -- I have seen many of you making that kind of comments, whether that is -- we take into account these -- this is the framework we are working in. And we are going to reaffirm -- intend to reaffirm it up front in the document. So this should not be a concern to us that we are changing anything in that regard.

Richard, do you have a point of order before I take -- No?

>> (off microphone).

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Please go ahead and then I turn to Paul. Just to allow Paul the opportunity to speak on everything that has been said before. Please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. No, I wanted to fully agree with you, Chairman, and reinforce your point. To me it is self-evident that all of this is within the Tunis Agenda. So we don't have to say again and again "role of governments," et cetera, because this is understood. We are talking about multistakeholder models within the Tunis Agenda. Okay. We might have different interpretations of that, but that's that. So we don't have to say all the time "respective roles" or anything like that. We understand that. That is part of this package.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I turn then to the U.K. for comments in regard to things -- points that were made.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, everyone, for the comments that were made. We noted in particular four questions raised about the text which I'd like to come back on. Cuba asked what statistics are we talking about, and thank you for raising that question. It's a good question.

I think the answer is in the proposal. I think we are talking about statistics which support meaningful participation and engagement in the development of international Internet-related public policy. So there will be different statistics, different facts in different context. But we are looking for statistics which enable that and support that participation and engagement.

We could add the word "relevant" for example, although I don't want to start a whole debate about what is relevant and what isn't relevant.

But I think it's a very good point, what statistics do we mean. I think the answer is statistics which support that participation.

India asked about what process are we talking about, what process do we need. And, again, I think we will need different kinds of processes depending on the issue. So if we are talking about an issue of eHealth, we will have a certain group of stakeholders and governments and we will need to find processes for that situation. If we're talking about infrastructure, then it's a different situation with different stakeholders and we may need different processes.

If we're talking about a newly emerging technology and the implications it might have, again, we need a different process for that to make sure that everyone can participate and engage in a meaningful way, whether it's child online protection, whether it's connectivity.

We cannot, we think, choose just one process to fit every possible policy issue. We need some flexibility.

The key point for us is that whatever process it is, it should support meaningful participation and engagement.

Zambia suggested we could drop the word "statistics" because they are a subset of factual information. Again, it's a good point and thank you. That's certainly something that the group might consider.

I think maybe it's helpful to have statistics because it's a specific kind of factual information. It might be useful to keep it there. But we're quite open to that suggestion if the rest of the group is content with it.

And, finally, Lea talked about how are we going to share these statistics, how are people going to know about this factual information. And, again, that's a very good point. Actually, I think in Jimson's recommendations, there is something about better information sharing, better awareness raising that we would certainly support.

I think perhaps that's a different recommendation, though. We need a separate recommendation about sharing information and raising awareness. It's a very good point.

Again, thank you for all those questions for clarification and suggestions. Again, we did not hear any objection in principle to this proposal. And we hope that maybe with a bit more thought, we will be able to achieve consensus on this.

I could go on now to talk about our third -- yes, thank you, Chair. You're nodding so I will.

So the third proposal is about transparency, inclusiveness, and collaboration. We made two main changes since May. One of them -- I think our original suggestion was "stakeholders should consider," and colleagues here suggested instead we use the word "bodies." So we've changed that to "bodies."

Our original proposal also talked about scrutiny. And, again, this led to some debate; and there was uncertainty what did we mean exactly by "scrutiny." So we've taken out the word "scrutiny" and talked about opening up policy making to input from stakeholders.

So those are the two main pieces of feedback we got in May. And we've tried now to refine this proposal so that it can carry support from the room. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So I would now invite comments on this proposal. Just to avoid some maybe reaffirmations of points that were made, I'd like to recall the basic understandings we have. We are here considering and reaffirming the overall context of the WSIS outcome document, particularly Tunis Agenda. We are aware that these should be seen in context of the full text as we get to it in due time. And there was a concern that I think would also maybe apply here in regard to implementation. So I think those are three elements that have permeated discussion before, and I still have it here, just for the sake of maybe trying not to repeat those points that are taken note of by the chair.

I have Richard Hill followed by Cuba, Russian Federation.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, I think this is a very good recommendation. Again, I think it should be strengthened. I don't think it's enough to say "should consider how they can promote." I think we should say something like "shall be transparent, inclusive, and foster collaboration by opening up" or something like that. But that's wordsmithing.

I also think even though we are in the context of Internet governance, it's better to qualify "bodies" so it's clear we're not talking about all bodies. So I'd say something like "bodies involved in Internet governance" or something like that. But we can work that out later. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. First, let me react to the comment in paragraph 2. I think that if we are talking about statistics, it has to be what he said. That is, it has to be specified. Then the wording has to be changed because, otherwise -- I don't know if you recall paragraph 70 of the WSIS+10, it's a very wide paragraph about statistics. So I don't know why revisit this here. It's already there. Okay.

But if you want to come back to a statistics, then make it more specific. I think what the U.K. representative said can do it. But then it have to be changed, statistic for minimum participation,



whatever, put it in the way. Even though I think this is already covered in paragraph 70 of WSIS+10. That's my opinion, but okay. You can do it.

And now in paragraph 3, again, it has to be more specific. What we're talking about "bodies"? If I'm going to explain to this somebody there in capital, what bodies are we talking about? Are we talking about international organizations? Are we talking about -- I don't know. What are we talking about? What bodies, you know? This is something -- we need to be specific if we are here. Otherwise, it's already covered either in Tunis Agenda or in WSIS+10. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Russian Federation followed by Saudi Arabia and the U.S.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We've got the question rather than comment to U.K. of the earth of the proposal. Regarding the statistics, thank you for explanations that it's kind of all statistics which can be used for meaningful participation. We think it's not enough details and clear enough for us.

Are you proposing something new statistics? Because we have quite a lot of statistics, for example, a partnership measuring ICT4Development. We also have WSIS stock-taking statistics which was actually the tasks from UNGA to ITU to make such statistics and it's in open source and used quite extensively. And also -- the WSIS stock-taking was recognized clearly in ISOC resolutions.

So do you think it's not enough and you are proposing something new? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I am sure the U.K. has taken note. We will refer to him at the end of our round of comments.

Saudi Arabia followed by the U.S. and Lea.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. As we said before, I mean, these are views or, like, how will this promote transparency. We have already original text in the Tunis Agenda about the transparency of Internet governance. So we already have an agreed text by a higher body. Why do we need to reinvent the wheel and try to redraft to what was agreed before?

We have specific issue as we said before. Let's focus on the core mandate. We can take it as it was agreed from Tunis Agenda and just paste it and not to waste time on discussing issues that already agreed by head of states in the Tunis Agenda or agreed by us in UNGA resolution. And we have an issue that such a recommendation to be general and we leave it to the subjects that we will discuss later. Then we will discuss such an important subject that would say no, this is not our mandate or we will not discuss this here or there. We need to make specific recommendations to the issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list U.S. followed by Lea, and after that I am closing the list and reverting to Paul.

U.S., please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I think unquestionably transparency, inclusiveness, collaboration, and participation from all stakeholders are in keeping with the spirit of the Tunis Agenda and important to further implementing enhanced cooperation. So we support this proposal.

I do agree with some of the comments that I think we could, you know, provide some technical edits to make this a little bit more specific. I think something like "institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policy."

I also think maybe looking at just opening up "processes," maybe not even specifying policy-making processes because there's a lot of processes that can help in this area. But we can address those when we get to editing. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. Another important recommendation here from the U.K. First of all, I'd like to appreciate the effort to improve this from the previous version that we've seen in the May -- in our May meeting. I think at that time we only had to open up and now it's complemented by reference to transparency -- transparency, inclusiveness and collaboration which reflects the high-level characteristics. So that's good.

I do agree that here -- I think there's a little bit -- it sounds a bit odd to me, and my suggestion would actually be to flip the way that this is -- that this is framed. I think this goes along the lines of what Richard was saying, but I could be wrong.

My suggestion would be to say that bodies should open up their policy-making processes by taking practical steps to increase transparency, inclusiveness, and collaboration. In that way, the focus is on slightly different and goes more closely to the point of what we're trying to say here.

And to the point that Cuba and I think someone else made about making this more specific, I think the benefit of this specific recommendation as it stands at the moment is the fact that is forum agnostic. And as we move forward in our negotiation on what specific mechanism -- and I know there isn't agreement on that, whether there is need for new one, existing ones, I think there's an elegance in keeping the recommendation forum agnostic. And I think in keeping it that way, it would allow each body that deals with international Internet-related public policy to figure out what the best way to increase transparency, inclusiveness, and collaboration in their particular context would look like. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have hesitation to close the list. I just want to make sure we get all comments before reverting to Paul. So I see India would like to take the floor, Switzerland as well. India followed by Switzerland, Carlos Afonso. Okay.

Anyone else? So India, Switzerland, Carlos Afonso, and then we will revert to Paul.

India, please, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just want to make a small comment on the proposal again. It seems to be very generic to me. Perhaps we need to get into specifics about how the transparency or collaboration needs to be worked out. Maybe we need to flesh it out a bit more.

I know we are not talking -- we are not wording it right now. We are not getting to the text, but perhaps we can come back with suggestions about how to reword this particular one. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Hello, good morning, and thank you for giving me the floor. I just wanted to state our support for the Recommendation Number 2. At least we could perhaps work on the wording, of course, but on the idea which we think is very indirectly connected with capacity-building which is very important for us.

And on Recommendation 3, I guess -- and this is perhaps a question also to our U.K. colleagues. With "bodies," we are referring to relevant organizations within enhanced cooperation, all relevant organizations that should work in the process of enhanced cooperation.

So just to request clarification on that because that kind of wording, "relevant organizations," is what is being used in the Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much for your comments.

Carlos Afonso and then we revert to United Kingdom.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: My comment is on Recommendation Number 3. Can I do it?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: It's interesting because it relates very closely to goal number 16 of the sustainable development goals. And there are two targets which are practically what we are trying to say there. Target 16.6 says, "Develop effective, accountable, and transparent institutions at all levels." And target 16.7 says, "Ensure responsive, inclusive participatory and representative decision-making at all levels."

So we're very in tune with the SDGs here. Thank you very much for bringing attention to this. I think it is one of the -- maybe part of our background and we're operating the SDGs. It's also obligatory and, I would say exciting for us, working within the U.N. to consider. May I then revert to United Kingdom for comments?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. First going back to number two -- and Russia asked a question about the statistics proposal. And they asked whether we are proposing there should be new statistics and new factual information. And the answer is, yes, of course. Of course we do. When we think about just how quickly technology is changing and we think about how the expansion of all kinds of communications that has happened over the last 10 years, I can't imagine how quickly it's going to

change in the next 10 years. And we need to make sure that, as statistics are up to date and relevant, and organizations like the partnership for measuring ICTs need to be constantly reviewing their statistical work that they do to make sure it's up to date. So "yes" is the short answer to that question. Coming then to number three -- and, again, thank you to everyone for their contributions on this. Again, we are heartened that we did not hear any objections in principle to this one.

We're also pleased that the alignment with the sustainable development goals is there as well. We think that's very helpful.

A number of specific questions were raised. Both Switzerland, the U.S. and Cuba all talked about this idea of which bodies are we talking about. And it's a very good point. We could say, for example, institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policy should consider how they can promote transparency, et cetera.

That will make it much more specific. And I think that language was used in another contribution from another member of the group. So "institutions and processes dealing with international Internet-related public policy" instead of "bodies." That's a suggestion which perhaps answers that point.

Saudi Arabia asked about or mentioned the ideas of transparency and inclusiveness are already included in the WSIS outcomes, which is true. But we think this is specific now to enhanced cooperation. So we think it's important that we recognize that those ideas are part of enhanced cooperation. And, in fact, of course, they are included in the high-level characteristics that we discussed at different times in this group.

I really like the suggestion from Lea about just turning it around flipping the sentence around, which makes it more specific. So that's perhaps something that we could look at.

Finally, India made the comment again that this is quite a generic recommendation. I think that's true. And we're open to consider new language to make it more specific.

But we do think that, having a recommendation in this area which can be applied to different circumstances, different stakeholders at different times means that it will be more useful and more generally applicable. If we have something which is just focused on one particular issue or one particular group of stakeholders, it may not be useful for very long because things change so quickly in this environment.

So we do need to keep an idea that our recommendations are generally applicable to stakeholders in a range of different policy areas. And that's why we've kept it at a more general level. But, again, thank you very much to all those who made comments on number three.

If you wish, Chair, I can go on to present a fourth proposal.

So number four is about participation of stakeholders in developing countries and particularly focused on the kinds of challenges faced by developing countries.

Again, we presented this in May. And there were two main changes that we've made in response to feedback.

In our original proposal we talked about linguistic diversity almost as if it was a challenge or a constraint. And we were quite rightly corrected that linguistic diversity is a strength. It's not a challenge. So we've changed that drafting now to talk about the kind of language barriers that many developing countries and other countries can face.

And then, again, a change that we've made to other proposals. Instead of talking about enhanced cooperation processes, we've used the language directly from Tunis and talked about the development of international Internet-related public policy. So we brought that language directly in line with Tunis to make it much, much clearer, again, in response to comments in May. So those are the main two changes we've made to proposal number four. And we hope we can have a similar degree of consensus on this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., for introducing that recommendation.

Just before seeking the views of participants in regard to that proposal, may I just seek your views with regard to time management? We should break for coffee now. But, again, as yesterday, since we have started a little bit late, I would suggest that we could skip and just move ahead. I'm very much concerned about the time. But I think we are getting good dynamics. I fear that might be broken if we break for coffee. So, with your indulgence, I suggest that we could move on. And thank you.

So now I will open the floor for comments just again repeating we are working in the context of WSIS outcome document. WSIS+10. We understand that everything that is being said is not in final drafting format. It will be subject to further revision in the context of the other portions of any draft report we'll be able to put. And there is this concern about how this will be linked to implementation. I think this is also a comment that applies to all those points. So just seeking to avoid that kind of comment intervention.

So, with this, may I seek the views of colleagues? Well, I think we may have consensus here -- or -- I'm afraid to use that word "consensus," but let's say for the moment I don't see any reaction. I understand, with all those caveats, we can consider it in a later stage in the context of the final text. So thank you for this.

May I turn to the U.K. for presentation then of recommendation number five?

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. So 5th proposal is about ensuring a balance of stakeholder representatives. When we discussed this in May, a question was raised about what multistakeholder forums do we mean? So we've tried to change the language slightly. To be clear, we need multistakeholder forums that are involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy. I think that is the main question raised on this proposal in May. So, with that change, we hope it can have support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And thank you for providing that background.

I have on my list Iran, followed by Lea, and Russian Federation. Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>>IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Most international forums related to Internet policy is intergovernment. What does it mean on this paragraph the "balance of the stakeholders"? Do we talk about the representative of the governments or a balance of stakeholders between their representatives of governments and other stakeholders? What does it mean? I would appreciate if you clarify that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We will revert to U.K. after we hear other colleagues. And you're right, because this paragraph focused on multistakeholder forum. So I think there might be some further clarification regard to the point you raised.

Lea Kaspar.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. This is an interesting one. I actually have a negative reaction to "balancing stakeholders." I don't really know what that means.

I do wonder whether it would be helpful to think about balancing perspectives rather than stakeholders to have a -- to ensure to have a balance of stakeholder perspectives. It's just -- there's a lot that's been written about this in kind of how to create balance in multistakeholder forums. There's actually a really good paper on this by, I think, Jeremy Malcolm who has written about this which I'd like to maybe refer the U.K. delegation to. I'll stop there. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation followed by Saudi Arabia and U.S.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. And sorry for being slow with the reaction. But we want to make the comments on the recommendation number four.

We just are thinking about that proposal by U.K. and also others with the wording. And we actually would like to proposal the addition for the text.

And we think, to the sake of balance, it's better this text to look like this.

"Institutions that are dealing with Internet governance should come with practical steps in order to implement mechanisms, enable governments on equal footing to obtain Internet-related public policy issues supporting the participation of stakeholders from developing countries taking into account language barriers and capacity constraints faced by least developed countries." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I ask you to repeat the proposal in slower speed so we can -- we're not in a drafting mode, just to make clear we have the exact precisely what you mean.

>>IRAN: Institutions that are dealing with Internet governance should come with practical steps in order to implement mechanisms enabling governments on equal footing to pertain Internet-related public policy issues supporting the participation of stakeholders from developing countries taking into account language barriers and the capacity constraints like it's in the text. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And I also would like, if you can send to the list so we have it. Thank you very much. We're not reopening discussion on this, recommendation four. But I'm sure U.K. has taken on board also these suggestions.

I have next on my list with regard to recommendation five, I think, Saudi Arabia, U.S., Constance, I saw. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I know we thank our colleague from the U.K. again for the recommendation.

In number five, the multistakeholder forums that are involved in the development of international policy, can we know examples of what forums that are involved? And how to balance stakeholder representatives and who will develop those international public policy? Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think in general we support this proposal. Just to respond to the intervention by my Saudi colleague. Just looking at Tunis Agenda and the mandate for the IGF, which it calls a multistakeholder policy forum, the mandate of which is to, A, discuss public policy issues pertaining to Internet governance. Within this the IGF would certainly be an example of one of those fora. I also wonder about the word "balance." I think there might be a way to say something like meaningful participation of all stakeholders or something like that. I think we can get to that when we're editing. But overall I agree with the principle of this proposal.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, ISOC.

>>ISOC: Thank you very much. The Internet Society will also support this draft recommendation as we would support the previous ones, 1, 2, 4. With regards to how to improve the language of recommendation five, I think there's language actually in the Tunis Agenda. If you look at the language around the IGF, notably, it talks about, I think, geographical and gender balance. But perhaps it's a good idea to go and check the language.

With regards to the recommendation that was made by Russia to address the specifics of how we do that, it was my understanding that in a previous recommendation, perhaps one or two, we were already discussing this. In any case, with this modification, the Internet Society would definitely support this recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Switzerland.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you for giving me the floor again.

We think that this recommendation is very important. It touches upon one of the key aspects for multistakeholder fora to work properly. And this is the question of balanced stakeholder representation. Well, as a matter of wording, I'm not sure whether "representatives" would be the right way of saying it. I think it would be more proper to talk about representation. But balanced stakeholder representation. But I think, more importantly, apart from this means of a balanced stakeholder representation, which is intended to accomplish a goal. And that goal I think is not completely explicit in this recommendation. I would understand, I would see that it is implied. That the goal is that the process, the multistakeholder process is responsive to the needs of all stakeholders. And that's why we call for balanced representation of those stakeholders to make sure that their needs are addressed, are respected, that they have a fair say and a fair part of the decision and in those fora. So I think that would be a positive, if we spelled that out, that the underlying goal is that the processes are responsive to the needs of all stakeholders. And maybe going a bit beyond that, we could include some mention that in the end what we are pursuing with that is that what is served is a global public interest and not the interests of -- the special interests of specific stakeholder groups.

So this would lead me even to a further thought, which is that, apart from a balanced representation that helps addressing the needs of all stakeholders in order to pursue the global public interest, that we include some mention that, for this to happen, you not only need some silos of different stakeholder groups. You also need good cooperation methods that really make these multistakeholder fora work. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just before turning to the U.K., just make sure we have -- collect all views, I see Parminder, you wish to take the floor on this. I guess that's the case. And then Cuba. And after that, yes, Marilyn Cade. Anyone else? After that I will revert to United Kingdom for final comments.

Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Although we agreed methodologically to go into general issues around what some of us find is the core issue, but still I think there would be need for some boundaries to what we may keep on going to because -- and in that regard, I want to point out that the UNGA has clearly said that enhanced cooperation is distinct from IGF. And we are giving recommendations for enhanced cooperation. That means those are distinct from recommendations for IGF and other multistakeholder forums. So we need to have some limit to how far we can go from the central issues, and IGF was given as an example of that kind of forum.

I was part of the IGF improvements working group. We did a lot of work on that. I think there's a big report out there on that. And unless issues directly related to the development of public policy here and not to the discussion policy -- or discussion of policy here, we shouldn't be going into those levels at this stage. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba.



>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. I think this para 4 and 5 are problematic, and you more than everybody knows the reason. You were the chair of the negotiation of this in WSIS+10 in which it was ratified in paragraph 59 of the WSIS+10. After long negotiation, it was ratified. You can see the text of paragraph 59, that it was ratified, paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda of the role and responsibility.

So here we are revisiting that and assigning new roles and responsibility when that already was settled. So I think that you mentioned that we should not revisit here Tunis Agenda or WSIS+10. So paragraph 4 or 5, unless it's redrafted to very specific things, it goes against that. And that is very problematic.

I don't want to comment this now because nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. But I think that in the end, we have to check everything we do here against those base documents because we are not in a position to renegotiate those two basic documents. You remember how difficult that was during a period of months. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have then next on my list Marilyn Cade. I see Canada. Yes, Marilyn Cade, Canada, and after that I revert to U.K.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chair. And greetings to all colleagues, as this is the first time I have spoken.

In general I really wanted to just make two comments. One is I appreciate the fact that we are, I think, being quite calm and professional in how we are negotiating this. And I really -- I think that's a good thing because there are many differences still that lie ahead of us.

But I just had a comment that I might seek clarification on. While in general I can generally support the -- this recommendation, I have a concern about the use of the words "balanced representation" when juxtaposed against the words "open and inclusive." "Balanced representation" might, for instance, mean that we count heads within each group. And I think we would find that as the world around us is significantly changing, as digitization is advancing the incorporation of the access to ICTs and the Internet into all aspects of the world, that there are new industries even and sectors that need to be included and multiple parts of government.

So I have a little bit of concern about the use "balanced." And I think we need to, perhaps, think at another time what do we mean by "open and inclusive" and how does balanced support and how does the word "representation," does that mean only one person from an industry sector or one person from a government from a region would be allowed to represent everyone else? So not -- in general I support it. I just think there's some language that might come with some interpretations worth understanding.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. I didn't come in on the previous recommendation. But for both of these, I would voice Canada's support. Obviously in our view, enhanced cooperation has been taking place, is taking place in many foras. And the best way to ensure that it's functioning in delivering

its mandate to help us make international Internet-related public policy is to ensure they are there, that everybody is at the table, able to participate and not limited by language constraints or just capacity to show up at the meeting. So I think these would be important points to make in our report. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. And thank you all those who have intervened.

I should add before I revert to Paul a few comments on my own. I must say I'd like to add my thoughts to those that asked for clarification in regard to the framework we are providing for this. I understand the focus of this paragraph is to make a call for balanced representation or balance of perspectives with a view to make sure all stakeholders can fully participate in their respective roles and responsibilities because I think this is the overall agreed framework we have coming from this agenda. So this is something aimed to get to that principle.

But my concern is in regard to the framework because we are saying this should be -- take place in the context of multistakeholder forums that are involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy. So I would tend to think that in -- for many in the room, those are contradictory terms in themselves because "multistakeholder forums" and IGF is the most evident example. Maybe we could even mention ICANN. But I think the prevailing -- I would say maybe the majority of opinions I have seen is that those are not bodies that are legitimately involved in the development of international Internet-related public policy.

So I'd like to -- maybe when you respond, Paul, just try to address how we can -- I think the intent is very good to ensure the full participation that is called for in Tunis Agenda. I think we should reinforce that call and put some more substance to that. I think that's very legitimate from the perspective of implementing enhanced cooperation.

But this framework, how can this framework be seen as something that has inherent logic in these terms? Thank you.

Paul, you have the floor. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And, again, thank you for all the very interesting as well as useful comments that we've heard on this Recommendation Number 5.

First of all, Iran asked if we were talking about a balance of governments in some way. And the answer is no, we're not. We're not talking about intergovernmental bodies here. This recommendation is only about multistakeholder ones.

But then that leads to the question that you have raised that some people might argue that multistakeholder forums do not make Internet-related international public policy.

We may have differences of view in the room on that, but I do not think it should affect this proposal because this proposal talks about multistakeholder forums that are involved in the development of that policy, not making it but involved in it. So I think that's covered in the proposal. I hope so.

Saudi Arabia asked for an example. I can give two examples. I think this group is one example. We are multistakeholder, and our colleague from Hungary went to a lot of trouble to make sure that there was a balance here when he set up this group, that there was a balance of different stakeholders.

A second example would be when we had the review process for WSIS, the ten-year review. There was a discussion at the U.N. General Assembly of stakeholders. There was a whole day of discussion with stakeholders in the preparation for the WSIS+10 review. Again, the secretariat made efforts to ensure that there was a balance in that multistakeholder discussion at the U.N. in New York. So that's two examples at least.

Lea started the discussion about what we mean by balance of stakeholders and suggested a balance of perspectives might be a different way of looking at it. And then ISOC also talked about, well, what kind of balance do we mean? Do we mean geographical balance? Do we mean gender balance?

Of course, once we get into that, there's a real danger that we will have to come up with a very long list of different kinds of balance when, in fact, of course, it all depends on the circumstances. It depends on the context. And for different issues, there will be a different balance of views. You may have an issue where one group of stakeholders all has a very similar opinion. You may have a different issue where that group of stakeholders has many different opinions. And you need to take that into account when you consider what a proper balance is.

So I think it's very difficult for us to define exactly what that balance should be for every possible issue and every possible circumstance. We just can't do that, and it's not helpful to try.

So perhaps we should change the drafting here. So rather than say, "should seek to ensure a balance," we could say "should consider how best to ensure a balance." And it's a change that we made after our meeting in May to some of the other recommendations, to add the word "should consider how" to do something because we recognize that the answer will be different in different circumstances and we need that flexibility in order to be most effective.

So we would, again, thank colleagues who raised this as an issue. I think perhaps the drafting "should consider" is perhaps one way around it. But it's clearly something that I think all of us in the room feel it's an important issue that we should try to address. Perhaps with that change, we may be able to do so.

That's my comments in response to the questions on Proposal Number 5. I could give the floor back to you now, Chair, or I could go on to Proposal Number 6.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, just before moving to 6, I'd just like to repeat that maybe we can relate this call for a balance of stakeholder representatives or representation of perspectives, we can maybe hear resultant language coming from Tunis Agenda referring to fulfillment of -- full participation in differing roles and responsibilities. I think in line with what has been proposed by Switzerland, that the goal would be to have a good representation of the needs and the perspectives on the basis of their roles

and responsibilities. Maybe we can rely also and use that language then. Maybe that would be an addition coming from the floor.

I wanted to move to another item. I myself made something that may have elicit some comment. So I turn to Cuba. But after that, I would propose we move to another recommendation.

But, Cuba, please, you have the floor.

>>CUBA: Thank you. I want to thank the representative of the U.K. for his explanation. But I think that the word "involved" is not enough because I just opened -- I'm sorry because I don't know exactly. I open the Merriam-Webster definition of "involved," and it says in section 4 because the other doesn't relate, "having a part in something," "included in something" and, B, "actively participating in something." If you put "involved" in the development of international Internet-related public policy, you are saying that multistakeholder forums are participating in that. So maybe -- I know what you want to say. Maybe the word is not "involved." Maybe "related" or -- I don't know. You have to put a word that really aligns with what is already agreed in WSIS+10 and Tunis, not to enhance the role or change the role for multistakeholder because it is very clearly that the development of public policy issues is a sovereign right of states, okay? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I think this is also a very helpful comment. Thank you.

May I turn then to the U.K. Switzerland? Last word from Switzerland before I turn to the U.K.

Yes, please. Go ahead.

>>SWITZERLAND: I'm sorry to taking back the floor again. But I just was a little bit unclear on the reaction of our U.K. colleagues on the suggestions we made before regarding the underlying goal that we think that is lying under this recommendation. And this is that we want -- and these processes are responsive to the needs of all stakeholders and also whether they would agree that this is to ensure that what is pursued is the global public interest in contrast to specific special interests.

And in addition to that, whether there's mention of these thoughts in the text would be amenable to them and also whether a stronger mention that what is also needed is a good cooperation between the stakeholders, not just the balance of representation between them. So I would very much appreciate a reaction on that because, otherwise, I think that this recommendation really stands only on one leg and there are some important elements missing. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Switzerland. My understanding is that the U.K. is taking on board all the comments that were made and he will revisit the proposal, and we'll have the opportunity to address it in the wider context so that we can have the form of more elaborate draft.

I turn to the U.K. in case you wish to address specific comments that were made here right now. It's up to you. Otherwise, the understanding is that these will be put into your revised proposal. You may, if you wish to respond to the comments made in regard to Recommendation 5. And then I will ask you to move to Recommendation 6, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for the three additional comments we've had.

Quickly to respond to Switzerland, what's the underlying goal here? I think for us we want to avoid a situation where we have multistakeholder forums which are unbalanced and I have seen this too many times myself. For example, I have been to a multistakeholder discussion or forum and I have been the only government in the room. And for me, that's not balance. Or there have been other discussions where there's no one from civil society speaking or present. Again, that's not balance. We need -- that's something we need to try to avoid, and we need to raise awareness of that as an issue. And that's the ultimate intention, I think, behind this recommendation.

Thank you, Chair, for your point about looking again at the Tunis Agenda. We will do that. That's very helpful.

And thank you, Cuba. This word "involved," again, I think -- maybe Juan and I can talk about this outside the room. But we are not talking about making public policy. We are talking about developing it. So it's "involved in developing public policy" which is different than making. And I think that goes some way to address the concern that he's raised, but we can talk about that further perhaps.

Now I'll move on to Number 6.

Number 6 is about supporting sustainable development. It hasn't changed very much since May.

In May we had the words "particularly" including capacity-building, education, and skills. We used the word "particularly." And I think that caused some comment. So now we have just changed it to "including." So "capacity-building, education, and skills are examples among others." We're not saying particularly those things. But that's a small change, really. I think that this recommendation had some very good support in May, and we hope it still does now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. I thank you for this. I would also like to remind colleagues that, when we're discussing high-level principles that should guide enhanced cooperation efforts, there are a number of concepts that are contained here like the principle of sustainable development. Yeah, sustainable development is -- was one of the elements we identified. We should find a way to make it to the report in an appropriate fora. We have not at this stage decided how. So I think also I would like you to look into that recommendation with that view that that's something that we accepted to incorporate the concept. We're looking for a way to reflect it on paper. And the proposal seeks to provide some way to do it.

I have on my list Iran followed by Richard Hill and U.S.

Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you for distinguished representative of U.K. for raising this recommendation. That's a good recommendation. But I think we need to consider the other elements in this recommendation. When we talk about international Internet-related public

policy sustainable development, when we talk about sustainable development, we should consider three elements -- capacity-building, transfer of technology, and providing financial.

But here, if you're not going to consider that providing the financial but as reflected in the Tunis Agenda, whatever could help bridge the digital divide between the countries is the transfer of technology.

So we need to amend -- make amendment in this recommendation and add the transfer of technology for helping to bridge the digital divide between the countries inside of capacity-building. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. Richard Hill followed by the U.S.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I like this recommendation. But I would prefer if there were more focus on the number one issue, which I think is affordable access. I note that that's covered in point seven, but I think it's so important that it should come here also. So instead of including capacity-building, I would simply add including affordable access, capacity-building, education, and skills. That would be my proposal. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, we support this proposal. I think it was in many contributions to this meeting. We've discussed it I think at every meeting we've had so far there's been a conversation about these topics. And there seems to be a general consensus that something like this is needed in this document. We welcome the U.K.'s contribution on this. And I think it would be a helpful addition to proceed on.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation?

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

We also would like to add our voice to the number of elements here. We think that security in use of ICT is also important point.

Because it's the stopping barrier sometimes for development. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Yes, I would find it very hard to oppose such a -- I would say a virtuous proposal. I mean, everything in there sounds very good.

I would be concerned about adding stuff to it. I think that, for instance, the proposal of Iran or Russian Federation, perhaps if they want to make something more concrete in terms of a separate recommendation, we can look at it. But I would be weary about changing this. Because, as it is right now, to me it is clear that this is something that we need to do. This is part of our goal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any other views before I revert to the U.K.? Saudi Arabia, please.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I think one of the main aspects or area that international public policy issues should be resolved is continuity, safety, and protection of the Internet and the international network. So we need to capture this in this representation in order that, as we said before, to deal with our mandate. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. With those comments, I'd like to revert to U.K. for your final comments on that, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And, again, it's good just to see there's no objection in principle to having the recommendation of this kind. And, indeed, there's, I think, strong support for it. We note there are differences of view in terms of what specific things we might list here. At the moment we have capacity-building, education, and skills.

For the U.K. we think those three are particularly important priorities for sustainable development.

If we are going to add things to it, I think we might get into a long perhaps difficult debate. It might be easier just to take those out and not start a list at all. But we're open to suggestions on that. And thank you to everyone for their support and their comments.

I propose to go on to number seven.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. Just before I do that, we're not in a drafting mode. In case we were, we'll just bracket the new proposals for addition because it's something we should revisit at some point or even when we come to the final wording. But I think for the moment, that, I don't think, should prolong discussion on those topics right now.

I would invite the U.K. to introduce recommendation number seven.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Chair. So number seven is about an enabling environment for investment. From our point of view, this is absolutely critical for many of the other recommendations. We know there is a digital divide. We have a clear set of sustainable development goals. In order to bridge the divide and achieve those goals, we need to encourage investment. It's fundamental. And we need to make sure that enhanced cooperation helps in that process as well.

We made a very similar proposal in May. It's changed very slightly. I think it's more grammar, actually, than substance. So I won't go through the exact changes that we made. But I would propose to the room that we should be able to support a recommendation on investment. This is such a critical area. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. We'll now open the floor for comments. Parminder, you want to take the floor on this? Please go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

In this case, it is a suggestion to improve the language by adding, "The development of international Internet-related public policy should promote public investments and enabling environment for private investment." And the rest can continue. So just an insertion of "public investment and." Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Are there any further comments?

Yes. ICC-BASIS, Timea.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone. I would like to note that we appreciate the proposals made by the government of the U.K. along with the useful discussions on these. As noted by some, we've seen overlap from other proposals, including our own. So it's helpful if this discussion is orienting us to where we want to and where on common ground at least exists on this. We have not indicated support for each, to spare the time of this group. But I have no objections to the list so far.

We would like to speak in strong support of the inclusion of this recognition of the importance of promoting enabling environments as enabling environments for investment are essential for reaping the benefits of the Internet and ICTs as well as for the achievement of the SDGs. Business is a critical actor in innovation and technology development and building and developing ICTs and infrastructure deployment for ICTs. This requires that the right legal policy and regulatory frameworks are inclusive and inclusive multistakeholder approaches are in place to promote investment in ICTs and infrastructure and foster entrepreneurship and innovation. At the heart of enabling environment is the participation of all stakeholders in policy-making processes, which directly links to our discussion on enhanced cooperation here, which is why I think this proposition is especially important to note. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Peru.

>>PERU: Thank you, Chair. I've been reading the document presented by Great Britain. And it's quite interesting and well-done. And, especially, I want to refer to the last two points from number 5 to 10 where the issues that are repeated are international related public policy and this and the other.

And in no -- none of these points, though, mention international law. And I think that it is inherent to the idea of an international policy that development of specific international law related to cyberspace. And I believe that, even though, perhaps, it would not be a good idea to add to these paragraphs, perhaps we could save this idea to have a special article added later on. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Peru. I would certainly encourage you maybe to propose language in that regard. We can look at it in due time when we consider the -- our overall work. I think that might be a useful addition. But I'd like to look at language maybe coming from it. So thank you.

Yes, ISOC.

>>ISOC: Thank you very much. The Internet Society would also support this draft recommendation. Perhaps one suggestion to clarify and strengthen slightly the language towards the end to enter that the Internet remains an open and interoperable environment that facilitates innovation. I think there's a



technical reality and dimension here that it would be useful to reflect if we, indeed, want to reach the goal of openness leading to business opportunities, social development, and so on and so forth.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I thank you for all those comments. I'd like to revert then to United Kingdom for your comments.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Thank you to everyone for your comments again. It's good to hear strong support for this. Thank you to Parminder for the suggested language. I think we could live with that suggestion. It separates public investment from private investment. I'm not sure, though, that it captures the fact that so often these days it's public/private investments that we need. Particularly in terms of infrastructure projects. Separating private investment from public investment is not always helpful because some of these very large projects require cooperation and partnership between the public and private sector in order to make them happen.

So I do worry about separating them in this way. But, in principle, if it's an important point, then we can live with that.

That's my main comment. And thank you to everyone for their contributions to this. I can go on to the next one or --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just before you do that, I see there are some follow-up points to be made both by Nick Ashton-Hart and by Parminder. I'd like to give them the floor. So for us to have the benefit of discussing all points, please, Nick, go ahead, followed by Parminder.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you very much. Good morning to all. This is the first time I've taken the floor. I'd like to second -- I support the proposal. I'd like to second the point that the U.K. just made and give a practical example of this. The easy cable which connects East Africa, not only the countries on the coastline but also those interior, has dramatically lowered broadband costs for all of those countries and greatly reduced latency of communications and allowed some countries to stop relying on satellite communications. Rwanda, for example.

That is a private/public partnership between telecom operators, the World Bank, and those countries concerned. And it simply would not have happened were it not been that cooperative. It's been so successful that it's in the process of being expanded and connected around the Horn of Africa both directions to further improve its capacity -- and this is not the only example of a case like this. I hope that's helpful. Thanks.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I can, of course, give scores and scores of examples of private/public investment which has been made and changed things and improved things. I won't get into those examples at this stage.

Responding to the point, the clarification made by U.K. delegate, I'm not separating it. Actually, it's meant as not mentioned here. When you say public policy should promote an enabling environment for investment, that only means private investment. Because public policy does not promote an enabling environment for public investments. It makes public investments. So I'm not separating it in the sense it's not already there, and I'm making a separation.

Right now the paragraph only talks about private investments. I'm adding public investments to it.

And, as for partnerships, actually, the second part of it clearly says including fostering cooperation and partnership. If you mention both of them, this phrase would apply to the partnership between the two and would still meet the objectives of the clarification which U.K. offered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this is very clear to your point. Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: Sorry. I may be confused. I have a comment for eight. We're still on seven?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So, with this, I revert then again to United Kingdom, if you wish to make additional comments in regard to seven. Otherwise, I invite you to move to recommendation eight.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I think what Parminder just said is very helpful. And I understand better the point he's making. Rather than dividing public and private, perhaps we could say "promote investment and promote an enabling environment for investments." Perhaps something like that. But I'm sure we can solve that.

Moving on to number eight then, again, we've not made many changes to this. The main thing is to add something in the middle here about fostering cooperation to ensure that the Internet remains open. That's the main change we've made. But in general we think it's important that one of our recommendations talks about the critical importance for innovation and the need for international Internet-related public policy to continue to support that innovation.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'd like also just remind that one of the high-level principles we had in principle agreed was that enhanced cooperation efforts should be responsive to innovation. So maybe if we can have unanimity on the kind of language that could be a kind of elaboration of this principle we have agreed upon.

It's already hard to see how everything you are doing would fit into the text. Maybe that would be the appropriate way or we can deal with it in another way.

May I invite comments to paragraph 8? I have on my list Richard Hill. Nick, do you also want to take the floor? No. Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I want to comment on innovation. Of course, we're all in favor of innovation but within limits. For example, things like Silk Road is not the type of innovation that we would support.

Now, The Internet Society has actually talked about that in their policy brief on the Internet and variants. They talk about innovation without requiring permission but then they qualify that any person or organization can set up a new service that abides by the existing standards and best practices and make it available, blah, blah. So I think maybe we could put something like that here at the end that facilitates innovation, comma, abiding by standards and best practices or something like that. We could work that out off line. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for this suggestion.

I have India.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I have two comments to make. First is that the Proposal Number 7 and Proposal Number 8 are very similar. So perhaps there is a scope to flop the two. Maybe we can do "Development of international Internet-related public policy should promote an enabling environment for innovation and for investment, including fostering cooperation and partnerships to promote."

The second comment is that in Proposal Number 7, we have made specific reference to promote investments and infrastructure and increase affordable connectivity in developing countries.

By making specific reference to investments and infrastructure and connectivity, we are limiting, in my view, the scope of the partnership and the enabling environment for the investment. So perhaps we can -- it would be a good idea to make it more generic in this particular case so that we can talk about collaboration and promoting an enabling environment for innovation in general and for investment in general rather than in these specific areas. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you very much. I think this is very clear, your point. Thank you.

Are there any further comments in regard to Recommendation Number 8? Otherwise, I will then turn to the United Kingdom for your comments.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Again, good to see general support for this. We could combine them as India has suggested. They are similar in some ways. I think from our point of view they are two very large and very important topics. And for that reason, it justifies having two separate recommendations on them. But that may be something that others in the room would like to think about as we go forward.

I'll move on to Number 9. This has changed quite a bit since last time. We got lots of feedback on this recommendation in May which is about existing work in existing forums. I think one comment was that our previous proposal was very detailed. And another comment that we heard was that we need to be careful about the word "duplication."

In May we proposed a recommendation about avoiding duplication. And I think it was Parminder who said that we need to be careful with this concept of duplication because sometimes different bodies can look at different aspects of the same thing. So we listened to that comment.

And instead of talking about avoiding duplication, we now talk about taking into account existing work so we get that fuller picture as well as improving existing international forums. So that's a much more -- perhaps a much more positive way of looking at this particular proposal, to make sure that enhanced cooperation doesn't happen in a silo in isolation but that it does take account of all the existing work going on and it tries to improve the existing international forums which exist. And that's what we propose now. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K., for this. I would open the floor, but I'd like to seek a clarification of my own because I think there are two parts that are very clear that, as you have said, we want to take on board and be aware of what is taking place elsewhere. So to take account of existing work I think is very much in line with that.

But when you refer to develop and improve international existing forums, I think it's also a very appropriate goal. But my concern here would be how to develop and improve existing international forums from outside because I don't think this was the intent because that would lead to some kind of new body that I think you're not supporting. Or would it be done by the forums themselves? So maybe I think we need some more language to give clarity on the present because, otherwise, I think it could be interpreted in different ways. Sometimes we need that kind of ambiguity in international text, but I don't think that was your purpose to do that.

So I would like to get some other views, and then I revert to you if maybe you could elaborate a little more on the intent and work maybe around the language.

Are there any views in regard to that proposal, that recommendation? Saudi Arabia, yes, you have the floor.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I'm building on your intervention that ambiguity on the text, do you mean the same process in 69 that will enable government to develop international public policy issues? Is the process you are looking at? This is one.

And why are we only limited to existing work and existing forums? I mean, we might have a new forum or a new mechanism that will make enhanced cooperation go further and develop further. So this is a question for our colleague from the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I don't see -- India, do you want to take the floor on this? No, okay. So, yes, Latvia, you have the floor.

>>LATVIA: Good morning. And thank you for the floor. I would like to say that as an outspoken supporter of efficient, effective United Nations system looking for synergies and avoiding as far as possible overlaps and insulation, Latvia would like to fully support this recommendation of the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will now then turn to -- just before doing that, Lea Kaspar.

>>LEA KASPAR: Just in the nick of time. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes.

>>LEA KASPAR: Just a quick one. And thank you for the reminder from where this came from in terms of the duplication, trying to avoid duplication of efforts.

I wonder -- and I realize now we don't have any specific recommendation in the U.K. proposal that would perhaps address the need for greater coordination. I don't know whether that's going too far into recommendations. Maybe that's a question to the U.K. whether that was something that was envisaged as part of this recommendation or not. If not, I think -- in order to improve what Latvia was just saying, in order to kind of find synergies, there needs to be some sort of process to do that, have to think about how we coordinate better. In previous meetings, I think we have had recommendations and in other people's recommendations that we could look at in how to actually do that. And I think one of your paragraphs, Chair, in the outline document you presented yesterday went in that direction as well.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Yes, I will revert to United Kingdom for documents, please.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. And thank you for the support that's been in the room for this as well as the comments. Saudi asked about why doesn't it talk about new forums. Well, we are having a discussion about new mechanisms, new forums in addition to this recommendation. This recommendation is about existing ones. It's not about new ones. So I think the question of new ones has been addressed in other people's proposals and discussed in other parts of the meeting.

And Lea mentioned about improving, I think, understanding of how things fit together. Again, we're very open to have a discussion about our recommendation in that area. But that's not the particular recommendation that we're talking about at the moment.

I think you make a very good point, Chair. And, thank you, about making the language clearer. And perhaps it's not very clear when we say enhanced cooperation -- the process towards enhanced cooperation should improve existing forums. That's maybe not the best language. So we could say something along the lines of existing forums should consider how to strengthen and improve something like that. So they do it themselves. That's part of this enhanced cooperation process, is the existing forums will consider how they can strengthen and improve. So perhaps with a change like that, we can improve the drafting for Number 9. So thank you for that suggestion.

I could move on now to the final one, Number 10. This has not changed a great deal. The main change is the word "including." Before we had the word "particularly." Again, we think "including" is a better word here because it just gives some examples. It's not exclusive.

Apart from that, we haven't changed this very much. But we do think we need something about newly emerging topics. We know that there are many new kinds of technology coming down the road, and we need to be thinking as early as possible about possible implications, policy implications there. And so

being aware of that and prepared for that is something that we think should be part of the enhanced cooperation process. We suggest having this recommendation in order to cover that important point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. May I draw the attention of the plenary also that that language here I think not intentionally but it addresses issues that were extensively discussed in the intersessional period. I recall there was very substantive and interesting points made in regard to the need to have some language addressing the need to consider new technologies. I recall, for example, with regard to artificial intelligence, there was quite a lot of exchange in that regard. So I think that might assist us in dealing with that issue.

So I would invite comments from colleagues then on language proposed for Recommendation 10. Are there any comments?

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I mean, we have seen it slightly off the mandate. Current work is already being done in this area, like ITU. They are reviewing the ITRs and the multistakeholder mechanisms. All members of ITU, governments, private sector, academia can come to the council working group on ITR and have a discussion on what new trends or emerging issues need to be within this international treaty. So this work is being already done. And we see it slightly out of the mandate of our working group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Well, I have Parminder on the list. But with all due respect, I would say it's not outside the mandate. I think we are -- enhanced cooperation covers -- is so broad and comprehensive. Certainly we would be mandated to make recommendations on new issues that may emerge and provide -- from the perspective of assisting the implementation of enhanced cooperation, I think we should be -- and I'm not sure that what has been done by ITU covers the full range of issues that would be covered by the new issues. But I'd like to hear other colleagues, of course, as well and then revert to U.K.

I have on my list Parminder, U.S., and Richard Hill.

Parminder, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I completely agree with the chair that, yes, emerging issues are perhaps an even more important category of issues than the issues we have presently because that's the basis which issues in this area are emerging.

And I understand probably Saudi Arabia's problem, it less be about the fact of the issues side but on the side of what are the processes about these issues we are talking.

Now, in this point, it says how best to build cooperation. Now, we are not very clear whether this is the mandate of enhanced cooperation. The enhanced cooperation mandate is to develop public policies regarding.

Now, if we are talking about how best to develop public policies regarding emerging topics, that would I think put it squarely in our remit.

So the stake -- instead of "stakeholders" at the start, I think the last part is "ways which allows all stakeholders to participate." That's important. So I think instead of "stakeholders" in the start, it should be -- it should be considered how best to develop public policies and then it carries on. So we're talking about public policy development. But the real focus on which I think it's easier for all of us to agree is the thing which the chair has highlighted, that emerging topics are very important. Emerging technologies are very important. That's the main thing that should be said rather than the other things which are probably causing more confusion and probably can be corrected without damage to this central aspect. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

U.S.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair.

Just on the question whether this is within the mandate of enhanced cooperation, I draw everyone's attention to paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda which does say, "The process towards enhanced cooperation will involve all stakeholders in their respective roles, will proceed as quickly as possible, and will be responsive to innovation."

And I believe, you know, that this was envisioned that it would be responsive to innovation. Emerging technologies and things of that nature would certainly fall within that path. And I think it's an important topic, so we would support its inclusion in the report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I wanted to reinforce your point. I think this is clearly within the scope of the group. Whether or not it's the right language, I won't comment. But the idea is in scope. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. Yes, Switzerland just before I turn to U.K.

Switzerland, you have the floor.

>>SWITZERLAND: Thank you for giving me the floor again. Perhaps I'm too cornered to be seen sometimes. But I think the U.S. delegate said exactly what I was intending to say. So thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you Japan.

>>JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we have to focus on the enhanced cooperation and we -- I think we shouldn't discuss new technologies, for example, AI. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Japan.

I think in line with what has been said before, I think the purpose of having some language here would be that this should be directly linked to the ultimate objective of us; that is, to provide recommendation how to further implement the enhanced cooperation. So to the extent we can make the link between what we are doing here and the ultimate objective also take into account as it was read out that the conceptual framework of enhanced cooperation already provides it to be responsive to innovation. So I think it would be in line, if we can make the link, to bring on board some language in that regard.

But I will refer to the United Kingdom for comments in regard to all the points that were made. You have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I don't have many comments to add. Thank you for the contributions that were made. Certainly, we would agree with Richard Hill and others that this is within our mandate and is specifically mentioned in Tunis.

I'm pleased to see that it has significant support around the room.

I was going to make a final comment, really, about all of our 10 recommendations and again to thank everyone for their comments. In listening to the discussion this morning, there's really good and strong support for the thrust of our suggestions. We've had some suggestions for fine tuning. And we're grateful for those.

We understand that we're not this morning doing final drafting work. But we think that there is here a very full agenda for us to reach compromise and consensus which could have beneficial effect on Internet discussions in the future.

We're also pleased that many of the suggestions that we made are also echoed or even repeated in contributions from other members of the group.

And, when we come on to talk about the other contributions as well, we'll be very happy to see the different connections that there are between many of the recommendations on these topics.

So it's good to see that I think we've done a really good job of work this morning. We've made progress. And it shows that there is a broad area of consensus where we hope we will be able to make consensus recommendations. So thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, UK. I'd like just to echo a point made. We are not now in a drafting mode. We are collecting views in regard to recommendations that are made. And then we should at some point -- and I want to propose to you in due time that we should discuss the next steps in regard to preparation of our report. So I would seek your indulgence not to engage now in the discussion of



the next steps. I'd like to -- as we have been doing, we have revisited the document, not extensively. But we have addressed proposals coming from Richard Hill, from Nick Ashton-Hart. Now we have seen U.K.'s document in a more, let's say, extensive manner. Because there were some very specific recommendations contained there. There was an interest on the part of the group to further engage in this. I'd like to move to revisit the contents from the point -- from the very precise perspective of the recommendations that are contained in the document proposed by ICC-BASIS. I recall yesterday there was some discussion with regard to this document that there are no particular recommendations framed as such.

But I'd like to turn to ICC-BASIS for a presentation whether you think the ideas contained there you could frame them in recommendation mode to be considered by plenary now. Otherwise, we'll move to the joint contribution proposed by Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation, Pakistan and Parminder. And we finalized with the proposal from Carlos Afonso.

I heard from Nick. He has a revised text in regard to proposals that were contained in his contribution. So we'd also like to have a look at it before we move to our next stage in that meeting.

So, with your indulgence, I'd like then to invite Timea from ICC-BASIS to comment on your -- but from the perspective of recommendations that would be -- should be examined by this plenary at this point. Thank you.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. Actually, following our discussions yesterday, we went back and took a look, second look at our input document and came up with a list of -- a short list of recommendations that we would like to share with the group. Send that to the secretariat this morning. If we can have some help getting that on the screen, I'd be happy to present in more detail.

Thank you. I apologize for not sending it sooner so all of you could have it on your screens as well.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'm sorry, I was just checking with the secretariat. Is that a point of order, Richard? Yes.

>>RICHARD HILL: Okay, it's fixed now. I take it back.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Okay. So we can go on, Timea. And maybe we should look one by one as we have been doing so far. Thank you.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. So we have made four and four recommendations. The first four are more general ideas that we think could be included either in the chapeau or in the introduction of the report. We will get to that when we discuss that.

The first recommendation we would make has "The working group recognizes enhanced cooperation as a method of operation, an ongoing activity and a culture of cooperation between stakeholders, including relevant organizations, guided by objective of information sharing, creating more awareness and where appropriate, coherence in work programs and continuing collaboration."

This has been an argument we've raised several times before. It's our view that enhanced cooperation is taking place. And this is not necessarily an issue, but rather a general concept that is sort of a working method that includes all stakeholders. So this is just an elaboration on that. And happy to hear views on that from colleagues.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So the language we'll be looking at is the one contained in paragraph one as shown on the screen? I'd like to seek your views and comments in that regard. As it was stated, it represents more like a concept than the final wording. We're not looking at the final wording but rather the concept. Yes, Timea?

>>TIMEA SUTO: I think we have the wrong one on the screen. It's on the top of the page. I'm sorry.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: That's why I was --

>>TIMEA SUTO: Yes. The first page right on the top. Just under "general considerations."

That's the one. Yes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: It gets confusing because that says general consideration. The other one says recommendation. As for method, how many recommendations are you proposing and under which section?

>>TIMEA SUTO: Eight in total. Four under -- to go under the general considerations. Not in the concrete recommendation section, but in the chapeau section. Or we can go and discuss the four recommendations that are --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think right now we're in the mood for recommendation, not framework. I would suggest you move to recommendations.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Okay. So under concrete recommendations, that would come into answering the questions of how these general considerations could be looked at.

The first one would be the development of international public policies related to the Internet should be supported by increased resources to share information in order to explain the opportunities and cross-link initiatives. So awareness of and participation in the different enhanced cooperation activities is increased across all stakeholders.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I seek your views on this. I have Richard Hill followed by Cuba.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Well, everybody always likes to see increased resources until they're asked to actually pay for them. And then they discover they didn't really want those increased resources after all. So I think this has to be made more precise. Exactly which resources are we proposing to increase, for example? Are you going to increase the ITU's budget or ICANN or whatever or IGF for that matter. Which resources would be increased, and what would be the mechanism to pay for those increased resources? OK on the principle, but I think considerable more work is needed to turn this into something that has some meaning.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Cuba followed by Russian Federation.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. My comment is more formal. Not substance.

In the previous recommendations that were made by the U.K., I think in a very disciplined way, they didn't use the term "enhanced cooperation process" or "enhanced cooperation activities." Remember we sort of agreed that in our last meeting in May. And they used "public policy development" in all those. In only one paragraph, 8 -- 9, I think, you made a suggestion to change that. That's why I did not intervene.

So I suggest, in order to avoid these discussions of the concept of what is enhanced cooperation and what is not, instead of putting "enhanced cooperation activity," to put "the development of public international Internet-related public policy." As Paul has placed in his thing to put it here.

And, in order for me to avoid any further interventions in this, I should suggest, please, whatever it comes this enhanced cooperation activities or process, to substitute by that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I think this is a very valid point. So we have in our previous rounds agreed to resort that language that would encompass the concept in an appropriate way. So I would suggest we could consider that when it appears like this, we should automatically replace it. If you could agree.

Russian Federation. I have also U.S. Russian Federation followed by U.S. and Iran.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Thank you for preparing this recommendation. However, we see it as the example of what was recognized in the resolution 70/125, that there are diverse views on how to implement enhanced cooperation. This is a really clear example of it. And this is actually the fact. That's why the mandate of our working group actually made association of the recommendation on how to implement with their certain paragraph of Tunis Agenda, which is 69, 70, 71. We think that this particular recommendation upholds these paragraphs of Tunis Agenda. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.S. followed by Iran.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. U.S. supports the general concept of this recommendation and thinks that it should be included. I think it draws on similar themes that we've already discussed about info sharing, support, participation, things of that nature.

Certainly we can work on some of the wording as we go along. But I think the concepts are similar and important and should be included. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. Thank you, U.S. I think also in a way the discussion we are having illustrates that there are elements in these proposals that we've been addressing before. So I don't see a point in repeating the arguments in regard to information sharing, capacity, fact, good information on which to make decisions.

I think the focus of this paragraph, as I think very appropriately indicated by Richard, would be the call for increased resources. So I think in regard to this paragraph are the ones we should be focusing on. But I leave for colleagues for comments. Iran followed by the gentleman in the back. Yokozawa. Yes, please.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we need more clarification on the using of the increasing of the resources in this recommendation.

Is it related -- is it in any -- is it interrelated to this recommendation to the paragraph 70 Tunis Agenda that says that the concept of the collation and management of the critical Internet resources? Is that something that's related to this paragraph? I would appreciate more clarification on resources. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will revert to ICC-BASIS at the end of round of comments.

So last on my list Saudi Arabia would like to take the floor. But before that I have Mr. Yokozawa. Yes, please, you have the floor, sir.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you very much, Chairman. I am from the private sector. One of the five participants from the business. I strongly support the ICC-BASIS recommendation because, well, for the digital resources very, very limited. We should highly based on this fact. And the -- yes, I agree that the Tunis Agenda has a mandate, especially for the enhanced cooperation. But how we can achieve enhanced cooperation is very, very essential. For example, the limited resource from the private sector is actually -- this is a fact -- limiting participation to, for example, the IGF. Not so many people actually participate in the IGF. Why? Because we need to optimize our effort in the fora. So maybe the enhanced cooperation can only be achieved by a well-structured and well-organized body. So we should rethink about how we can utilize the existing mechanism to achieve the enhanced cooperation and including some of the international organizations and also the regional effort to -- that already has the enhanced cooperation mechanism.

In my case, in the Asia Pacific area, we have a very good coordination in APR IGF or the ICANN in Asia Pacific. They are doing many supporting activities to have not only the Internet governance discussion but also how the cooperation can look like.

So we -- this message to me just describes the housing food and healthy -- utilizing the existing cooperation mechanism in the global or regional scale. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your intervention. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We think Timea for the recommendation. As we said before in the U.K. draft recommendation. I mean, this type of recommendation is trying to deal with features of how we will implement enhanced cooperation and how we will enable government to take up the roles and responsibilities. But by saying that the development of international should support it by increased resources, is this the only thing we'd ask is just increased resources and just to focus on

awareness? I mean, we should try to modify this to the core mandate of 69 and how the development will enable government. And by enabling government, we can see cross-cutting issues and initiatives.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And I think that relates to the discussion we have had before to link these with the ultimate objective of enhanced cooperation, yes, and implementation. I think this point is well-taken.

I have on my list Mr. Noulaye. I'm sorry to mispronounce your name. Thank you.

>>JANVIER NOULAYE: Thank you, Chair, for the floor. I want to highlight the word "resources" inside this recommendation. We need more clarification because, when we talk about Internet resources, we stand by IP addresses, for instance, as numbers or domain name? So I think this word needs more clarification to understand it, to understand the recommendation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I don't see any further requests for the floor for comments or requests for clarification. I'd like to revert them to Timea for your comments.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. Just to reply very quickly, thank you to all the colleagues for the very helpful comments. On the note of resources, I think it's just a very unfortunate coincidence that we use the term "Internet resources" to note an array of issues. In this particular instance, we just want to make sure that the point is coming across we mean -- we all develop -- devote any resources, be that financial or time or any other type of resources, to show share information with others. And the idea of enhanced cooperation as we see it is to make sure that that information floats and we all get -- you know, we are all aware of what the other is doing in terms of enhanced cooperation, in terms of developing international Internet-related public policies. So in sharing those resources or enhancing at least the share of our global resources that we devote to sharing information and communicating with each other and making each other aware of what we are doing, I think that is the point we wanted to take across.

I understand that the wording might be confusing. We're happy to work with colleagues on that. In the same way, thank you to our colleague from Cuba for pointing out we did change on the beginning of our recommendation, "The enhanced cooperation process," we will change it in the end as well to reflect as discussed as the U.K. said as well before, to develop international Internet-related public policies. So that's well taken on board.

And on what resources and how are the specifics of this, we tried to be already specific with this recommendation on how to implement information sharing. I think the idea here was to make sure that the resources that we do devote already to information sharing are at least met or the share that we give to them from our global resources is enhanced.

So with that, I'd like to turn to the second recommendation, if you allow me.

That recommendation has a few subpoints. But they are all made in an effort to find practical examples of what can be done and how enhanced cooperation can be implemented in a sense of involving all stakeholders, so what are the practical steps that could be taken. It's, of course, not a comprehensive list. You know, it could be added or taken away from this as colleagues see fit.

I don't know, Chair, how you would like me to proceed if we go one by one or all of them?

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah, it's quite a long -- well, first of all, I think we could engage on this. I have no problem if the plenary is in agreement.

My initial comment is that certainly it would not make it to the final document as such because it would be rather imbalanced with regard to other sections as we see it. I think we are dealing with topics addressing multiple paragraphs. At this point at least, we are not in a drafting mode but entertain the idea that we would have such a space dedicated to that topic.

So maybe we should focus on the chapeau. And to the extent it's appropriate, you can make comments in regard to items A, B, and C but maybe at this point focus on the main concept that is contained by this paragraph, this recommendation.

If colleagues want to discuss each subparagraph, that would be okay. I would be okay with that. But I would suggest we concentrate on the chapeau and discuss the main concept. Please go ahead.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Okay. Thank you. Proceeding with the chapeau as suggested, the idea here is that continued and collective efforts should be made to facilitate and increase the participation of stakeholders, particularly those that have not been engaged, in cooperative processes and forums at national, regional, and international levels. So just anticipate the question of how, that will be the next five paragraphs and a couple ideas for that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Can I see some reaction? Richard Hill followed by Cuba.

>>RICHARD HILL: Well, I don't have a problem with the substance. But this strikes me now we are really going into what we call in American jargon motherhood and apple pie. That is something that nobody could criticize because, of course, it's obvious. Is there actually any evidence that this is not being done, that efforts are not being made to facilitate and increase the participation of stakeholders, et cetera? And if there's evidence that there's specific areas where this is not happening, then I think we should make a specific recommendation. Otherwise, have something general like this, I don't have a problem with it. I just don't see what the value added is because I presume everybody is already doing this.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Cuba.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

My comment is among more or less the same line, that this seems to be getting into too much detail compared with the recommendation we've just seen by the U.K. that was more general -- even some of those can cover this.

So I would suggest only to keep the chapeau and check if it's not already considered in one of the previous recommendations. But only to keep -- because the rest is some sort of micromanagement. There's nothing wrong. But in order to have same style of the document, we are not going into that level of detail here. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think that was more or less my impression as well.

Canada?

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. I think that this is relevant. I mean, to see it in writing and to just be reminded that these stakeholders need to be invited, brought to the table, I think it would have value. And I can talk about a specific example of which, you know, we're not necessarily proud of but it is a fact.

We had at the ITU a couple of months ago a consultation on accessibility. And we should, as a government, have reached out to our community to say, By the way, this is taking place. We would love to hear your direct input into this, and we didn't do it. Laziness, lack of organization, you name it, I don't know.

But the fact that we could make a recommendation like this to me seems eminently relevant to the work we do, and it's not -- I wouldn't see it as micromanagement. I would see it as a valid reminder of the roles that we as government have in ensuring that our communities are heard and taking into account their views when we get to the point of policy making. So I think that this is -- this is a point that would have some merit in our views. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada.

And I have not heard objections in regard to having it -- it could make it into the document. I think there is concern about, as Cuba said, about the style and to keep some consistency with the way we are addressing other topics. Maybe when we come to drafting mode, we can see how to arrange it in the text. Maybe the main core idea can be put into the report and other parts can come as an annex. I don't know. I'm not anticipating anything, just that we need to think not now, in due time, about how we address it, the language in the report.

I have on my list Mr. Yokozawa and then Saudi Arabia.

>> MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to take in this sentence -- in this proposal the part referring to the national, regional, and international levels and that can be rephrased, item E of this sentence which refers to the national and regional IGF initiatives.

So this is, again, very much important to think about enhanced cooperation. So if we are talking about only in the global scale, it might be some dangerous position in status because if areas, it is achieved some sort of enhanced cooperation in a global level, it looks like achieving. But we may forget some activities, lack of activities in the national and regional level. So I think in Tunis Agenda, it also -- the enhanced cooperation said -- potentially says in all levels, national and regional and global scale. So if you look at this structure in national, regional, and global scale, maybe we may lack some of the element of the enhanced cooperation in regional level or national level.

So I think it is very important for us to formulate the enhanced cooperation for the next ten years or more, that we shouldn't forget this structure and maybe some -- all of the structures in national and regional, APAC and Africa and Latin America and North America and many other regional issues. It is very diverse, and we're changing rapidly in each region. So this is especially important to think about this structure in our report -- coming in the final report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Again, I don't hear any objection or denying the importance of the topic. I think it's just a matter of how to address it in an appropriate way.

I would say from the chair, I think we need to think about the final report. We need some language addressing the participation of stakeholders and the benefit they can -- that participation and all the recommendations can make in regard to increasing their participation, issues of transparency, balance, et cetera, et cetera. But to the extent that this will assist us in the ultimate objective of further implementing enhanced cooperation, so there must be a link.

And in regard to that proposal, I -- as has already been stated, I don't see anything wrong about that. I just see that in regard to the main report, I would be a little bit reluctant because here we are departing from the general approach we have been taking. For example, there are extensive reference to things that have been done within ICANN, within IGF. We have not been doing that in other cases. Again, we are not in a drafting mode, but we are just trying to reflect what we are doing elsewhere. So I think it's just a way in how this would be reflected further.

I don't see a reason maybe to prolong this now. I think this will have to be arranged in the text. It's something I will discuss later on in the meeting. For the moment, I have Saudi Arabia and Richard Hill. And after that I close the list because we have to break for lunch. In case there is a need to pursue this, we will come back to that in the afternoon session. Hopefully we can address the remaining recommendations from ICC-BASIS so we can move to the joint contribution from Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation, Pakistan, and Parminder because I think this would allow us to discuss things from another approach, from another mind-set. I think it's important for the group to have also very extensive discussions, to be fair with all the approaches in the room, so we can at the end of our work have a very -- better understanding on how those different ideas would feed into the report.

So with this, I turn to Saudi Arabia and Richard Hill. I would beg, if you could, be as brief as possible because I'd like to offer Timea the opportunity to respond before we break for lunch.

Saudi Arabia.



>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Briefly, one of the characteristics we've discussed is international nature of enhanced cooperation. And here we see focus on local and regional activities such as IGF. I mean, we should avoid such language at national, regional event.

And one more question: Is this document available online? Was this distributed to us? Because we didn't have a copy of this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I understand it has been sent to the secretariat. Maybe the secretariat can send to the whole group for everyone's knowledge. Thank you.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I just want to make a clarification. If you look both at the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS+10, U.N. resolution, it's extremely clear that enhanced cooperation is one thing and the IGF is a separate thing. These are not at all the same. That's why we're talking about enhanced cooperation. It was decided to create the IGF, and then we have to talk about how to implement enhanced cooperation.

So I would not agree to any text that implies that IGF is a form of enhanced cooperation. I don't think it is. So it could not support any such text.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think the point you made is valid. I would like only to repeat what I said before. I think anything that will make it to the document we should demonstrate the link with the purpose we have; that is, to further implement enhanced cooperation. If we can through language address the value of bringing -- taking cognizance and strengthening something that is being done elsewhere, even at the IGF, to the extent that we will help further implement, I think that can be done. Otherwise, I concur with you, those are different processes as have been recognized by the GA. So we should -- but they are mutually reinforcing. That's the language coming from the GA. So there are -- I think it's valid to look into appropriate links that could be made.

So, Timea, can I request for your comments in light of the points that were made? And then we'll break for lunch.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Right. Thank you. I will be just very brief. I know everybody wants to have a chance to get some lunch before we return to the room. Just want to thank the colleagues for the useful info and for the support that we've got.

As you said, Chair, the principle of this, I think, aligns with our mandate. And thank you for everybody who recognized that. The wording and the details, I think, we can, of course, work together.

Just want to emphasize that our recommendation says "continued and collective efforts." So just to reinforce those efforts are already be taking place. And perhaps if there are gaps, this can be helpful and can be included in the report. With that, I thank you. And I hope to have the chance to return to my other recommendations after lunch.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, we certainly will do so. We will resume from where we are stopping now.

With this, I would like to thank you and call for a break for lunch. And I will urge you please to be back at 3:00 sharp. We don't want to be delayed to start the meeting. Thank you very much. Have a very good lunch.

(Lunch break)

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, colleagues, for coming back from lunch. I'd like to resume the meeting.

So thank you. I propose that we resume from where we left in the morning.

We have been revisiting recommendations as proposed by ICC-BASIS. We have looked into proposal 1 and 2. Now we are moving to recommendation number 3.

In that regard, I would give the floor for Timea to make a presentation. However, I should indicate that, as of now, that I would tend to think that the language proposed here has been addressed by us elsewhere, particularly with regard to high-level principles. And, particularly with regard to high-level principles, I could not discern any new -- really new idea we should be discussing at this point.

So I turn to Timea for your comments. And I'll seek colleagues' comments in that regard. But I think you could probably skip number 3 and move ahead. But first I give the floor to Timea.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. I hope everybody had a really good lunch. Nice to see you back in the room. Recommendation number 3 takes us back, as you said, Chair, to the list of characteristics that we agreed on two meetings ago. Just a suggestion for language on how to frame that in the context of our recommendations. So, just to read out quickly, and then see if colleagues have any comments on this.

Our recommendation would be to frame this as follows: "Enhanced cooperation. A method of operation that exists in some places and can be fostered in others, should be framed as a culture of cooperation between stakeholders including relevant organizations, guided by the objective of information sharing creating more awareness and, where appropriate, coherence in work programs and continuing collaboration. In order to promote the shared understanding of the concept, enhanced cooperation processes" -- or we can already put in an edit here -- "processes towards the development of international Internet public policies could be characterized as transparent, inclusive, collaborative, effective, sustainable, responsive to innovation."

Happy to hear your comments, if there are any. But, as you said, Chair, yes, we discussed this before.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Timea. Again, from the chair, my suggestion would be to skip discussion on this. Besides referring you to the high-level principles we are addressing elsewhere, the first part, upon conceptualizing enhanced cooperation, I think it departs very much from what we have -- from the

framework we have been discussed and proposed actually I think a new concept. I don't think we're in a position to have a discussion on these at this point in time.

But I'd be happy to hear, colleagues, if there's an interesting pursuant discussion here.

I see Richard Hill and Russian Federation.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I support your point of view. This is not a recommendation that we should be considering here. We can come back to this particular formulation when we look at that part of the draft report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Russian Federation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We have more of a question than a comment regarding this list of characteristics which we have. And there is one characteristic missing is international. And it's okay if it's just a basic point of view. But she said it was agreed -- it was agreed with international. That's the question, if it's the same understanding. The question is: Is it the same understanding or not? Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I'll turn to Timea for a quick response. But, in relation to the high-level principles we had previously agreed upon, there were seven, I think, in the list here. Not only international. But also the notion that it should be effective and goal-oriented is also missing. That's why I don't think it would be much useful to prolong discussion here on that. I think we have been addressing these topics elsewhere. And, again, I think in the beginning of the paragraph there is some conceptual difficulties, complexities to be introduced at this point in time. I would like to avoid that. But, Timea, you have the floor.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. And thank you for comments and questions.

As far as I see, yes, we have six here. "Effective" is there under point D. Of course, we don't have international. Happy to include international in there as well.

In terms of the chapeau language or the first sentence, I understand that this is not the point now to discuss this. We're happy to revisit this formulation when we get to that point in our discussions.

And, with that, if I may, I'll go to number four, which is a recommendation that turns on -- again, under inclusion of all stakeholders and international Internet where the public policy matters and their involvement. And our language suggestion for this would be, "Governments are invited to create procedures whereby there is a built-in process of involvement and consultation with all stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues, in particular, entities impacted by the results responsible for the implementation where needed to successfully put the policy into practice."

This is to say not in the decision-making processes necessarily, but in consultation with those stakeholders that are involved in implementation of policies that we would encourage more cooperation and for stakeholders to work together.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I would seek your comments.

I have Cuba followed by Richard Hill. At the moment those are the two speakers. Cuba, please.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Like before, this is a general comment, because I mentioned this earlier.

I think it's very important, whenever you are asking something for governments, to be clear that this for international Internet governance policy creation or whatsoever.

Because to ask governments something about how they internally create their own policies, I think that's a language that will have problems. I'm sure not only with Cuba but with a lot of countries.

I think it's clear. I think I don't need to elaborate about that.

So to be always very clear, whenever you're asking governments to do such and such, it has to be because we're talking here about international Internet public policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Cuba. And we'll, of course, turn to ICC-BASIS to respond.

I would maybe just make a comment and also seeking clarification. Because I have read the paragraph. I think there are two ways to interpret whether it is to governments in their proceedings, internal domestic procedures, or governments working together in the context of international bodies. I think maybe that second scenario was the one imagined that, instead of government, we should maybe say international organizations or dealing with something like that. But I leave for ICC-BASIS to comment.

Because I think we all take note of the objection that any recommendation addressed to what governments should do domestically should be avoided. These would not be accepted as consensus by the group. Maybe there will be a way to address this in the report but not as a consensus recommendation.

So next on my list, as I indicated, Richard Hill, followed by United Kingdom. Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I actually like this recommendation. I would be comfortable with that with the changes that have been suggested to make it clear we're talking about international things.

And then I trust that, since ICC-BASIS actually proposed this, ICC-BASIS would join us in civil society in requesting that WTO fundamentally change the way it's doing business and not discuss the e-commerce agenda as they're doing it now in secret. Thank you, Chairman

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone.

Very briefly, we also can support this recommendation. It's very similar to the first recommendation that we proposed about best practice in consultation and engagement, which received very good support this morning.

We particularly wanted to note the point here, however, about why consultation is so important.

Because very often with public policies, it is the stakeholders who will be most effective who will be able to give governments the most useful information and feedback. And it's often the stakeholders who will be implementing any particular policy or involved in the implementation of any particular policy that need to be most closely involved in the development of that policy. And we really like the way that ICC-BASIS has made this point here. So we can offer our support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon, colleagues.

By reading this, we like the recommendation. But after listening to ICC-BASIS -- and this is not in the decision making policy. This is the other concept, as you mentioned at the beginning.

So, if this will enable government to develop international policy issues with the same understanding, it's fine. But only to engage in discussion and consultation departing from 69 where we need to enable government to develop public policy, international public policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. Yes, I think -- I think we like this -- I don't think. I know we like this type of recommendation. Again, I think this is a little bit what we had discussed yesterday with some of Jimson's text. I see in that -- I regret that we want to specify just internationally. Because, obviously, for the stakeholders to be empowered to take part in discussions on international issue, usually that practice comes by taking part in national processes. So, to me, both are sort of, you know, feeding on each other. So I understand Cuba's point very well. But, if there was a way for us to sort of keep it neutral and then governments, obviously, are able to choose whether they implement this nationally or not, then that's fine. But just making it specifically international, I think would be losing a perfect capacity-building opportunity. And, to me, paragraph 69 is about empowering governments to make public policy. I think we will be much empowered by the input provided by stakeholders. So I think this is quite in line with that recommendation, with that paragraph. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. So, with this, I turn to Timea for your comments.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, colleagues, for the useful comments. We will take this on board and, of course, work with any of those proposals that have the similar message to strengthen those with our language or vice versa. We're happy to work on that. And, with that, I turn to my last proposal, if I may.

Our last proposal goes to the 2030 agenda and reads "The U.N. 2030 agenda should serve as the common contexts and goals that guide stakeholders and frame collective effort. In view of the role of communication and information technology and global interconnectedness and realizing the goals and possibly accelerating progress towards them, enhanced cooperation by all stakeholders should consider the priorities of these goals in aligning effort."

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. That paragraph clearly draws attention to the need to connect our work with the SDGs. So I would seek your views on that. Richard, you have the floor.

>>RICHARD HILL: It's similar to the comment I made previously. I don't have a problem with this. But, again, it strikes me as being excessively motherhood and apple pie. Obviously, we're going to realize the SDGs. That's clear. So I'm not convinced we need to say that. I really don't have any objection, but I don't see what this adds to anything. It's not concrete. It's wishy washy. It doesn't do anything specific.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Iran followed by Cuba. Iran.

>>ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon, colleagues.

I think we have discussed sustainable development and 2030 agenda and other recommendations. I wanted to emphasize that this is a very important issue, and we should consider that.

As mentioned in this recommendation, the outcome of the working group should consider the priority of 2030 agenda. And I believe that the most important priority of the 2030 agenda section is the means of implementation. So we should consider this transfer of technology and also capacity-building, especially related to developing countries. It should be considered. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. If I may just recall, when we were discussing this WSIS+10 reference to 2030 agenda, there was a very interesting debate. And we finally concluded -- I think it's reflected in text -- that the 2030 agenda provides a very important reference for the work. But there was a concern there was a time frame objective and that enhanced cooperation should look a little bit beyond, not only take into account, not have it as the sole reference. Of course, it's an obligatory reference. But that we should look to a framework or setting of a regime that would go beyond the time horizon of the 2030 agenda. So my caution, of course, we're not again in a drafting mode. But I would say that, in line with that, certainly we would need some reference in our report to the importance of the SDGs in the 2030 agenda. The SS -- I think following the same pattern that was adopted by WSIS+10. Of course, we can add -- should add some language and maybe strengthen that. But I think maybe the reference to the agenda also should be in a more general language, introductory language, more than as a recommendation as such. But I seek your views, of course, in that regard.

I have Cuba and Parminder, please.

>>CUBA: Thank you. Chairman. Again, it's about the terms. In the last part there, I don't know what they want. They want the enhanced cooperation or enhanced cooperation as such from the English

language. That's the problem we have with this coinage. Because maybe there is enhanced cooperation, not the enhanced cooperation that we talk about. Or it's the enhanced cooperation that we're here.

If it's the enhanced cooperation of this group, then I suggest to substitute it has been done previously. If she's talking only about cooperation between, please, I beg use another word but not "enhance." Put "improved" or "cooperation." If, you know. My preference is never to use "enhanced cooperation" term. But, if we're going to use it for our meaning, then do not use it for another meaning because it's a bit confusing. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. That was precisely my point. I wanted to say that enhanced cooperation is a technical term. And it's not clear whether they're trying to here define that particular enhanced cooperation or just talking about improved cooperation, which would, therefore, be okay. And, of course, I welcome sustainable development to be one guiding post for the work which comes out of any process of enhanced cooperation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Kenya?

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank the proposer of the language that we have. And I'm sorry I have not contributed to a number of discussions that have gone on before.

But on this particular Number 5, I just wanted to point out that I think the way we look at the U.N -- the Agenda 2030 should be in a very objective and we should be very clear in which context we want to refer to Agenda 2030.

Our understanding is that the Agenda 2030 and the sustainable development goals is the main focus for the international community right now. And we need to be very clear whether we want the process of enhanced cooperation needs to contribute to the implementation of the Agenda 2030 and the sustainable development goals or we would like the Agenda 2030 to guide stakeholders in what we want to do within enhanced cooperation. I think it should be very clear. And in this language, in my view, that clarity doesn't come out.

I think we need to rework it and look exactly what we want the connection between the work -- the work we are doing and the Agenda 2030. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. Thank you to everybody who has made comments so far to me. This paragraph seems to have a lot of links with, I think it was, bullet 6 this morning in the U.K. proposal about aligning with sustainable development. So I wonder if ICC might work perhaps with the

U.K. to ensure the two -- because I think the ideas there are very, very similar. So I think we could certainly use that in our report and that would be how to perhaps fix this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think this is a very helpful suggestion. I see no other party requesting the floor. So I will revert to Timea, ICC-BASIS, for your comments.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. Just to reiterate that I think the link to the 2030 Agenda and the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs stand as an important common set of priorities for our work. And it's important to note that in our report. And, of course, we're happy to work with colleagues who proposed the same ideas. And thank you for the support in agreeing with us on this. And happy to work on this further.

And with this, I think we've reached my last comments or our last recommendations. So thank you, everybody, for their useful comments and the discussion.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you very much. I would then now invite colleagues to turn to the joint recommendations submitted by Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation, Pakistan, and Parminder as contained in the compilation document prepared for this meeting.

I understand from the previous -- yes, United States. Point of order, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Just a procedural question, Chair. Yesterday we had raised that the U.S. had not been afforded the opportunity at the last meeting to present our contribution. I think it's brief. And with your permission, I think after we go through this round, if we be afforded that opportunity, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes. This is exactly what I intended to do. After we finalize consideration of the recommendation containing the new inputs, we will have opportunity to revisit, if necessary, any other topic that has not yet been addressed by us. I hope we have enough time for that.

Let me turn then to one of the speakers to the proposal. What I'm going to say exactly now is we are focusing on the recommendations. However, I understand that maybe to get to the recommendations, you can provide the appropriate context for the recommendation because I think -- I'm doing this and I don't want to be seen not to be fair to others. But because I think that proposal in a way summarizes the -- and I was very happy to see that those who support the same approaches have come together and made a joint presentation, updated presentation. So I think it captures important things we have been discussing so many times in a very organized way. So I'd like to give you enough time to elaborate and to -- but, please, focusing on the recommendations that you are proposing because that will be the subject and the purpose for this session.

So who would like to take the floor on this? Russian Federation, please, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. So we're really happy to start with the whole contribution because we will come to the recommendation. But we think that just -- make the set of recommendation is really not enough to fulfill our mandate. That's why we think that report of the group is critically important, and we already made this presentation of the contribution. And the



structure of the report should be likened to the actual background and other recommendations. So all should be in one -- in one document.

We think that it's extremely important to have the background with the scope and the focus and the format and the high-level characteristics of the report. So we think that just -- it's enough to say about the report, and then we will go to the recommendations. And let me start with the first.

So this is how we understand the implementation of enhanced cooperation, which require, first, recommendation to invite U.N. General Assembly to consider reasonability to establishing U.N. body or mechanisms for intergovernmental format of continuation of enhanced cooperation in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. So we think that multistakeholder is, of course, a good model and it should be considered.

However, when we come to the enhanced cooperation, we need to fix the role of governments in this process and then to invite other stakeholders to come together, also to join to this process. So this extremely important element is under intergovernmental format now, and we think that reasonability to establish it as U.N. body or mechanism is extremely important.

Second, invite relevant --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I suggest maybe we go one by one.

So here I thank Russian Federation for introducing the proposal and the overall document and particularly the recommendation. I'd like to -- as we all know, this has been object of discussion in plenary. And in my perspective as the chair, it seems to me that we have come to a point where there are differences that are not bridgeable within this group. That's why my proposal yesterday was to recognize the importance of the discussion to indicate even in the body of the report, to document the discussion appropriately in a way and then we can, of course, look into the language, how we should document it. Because I think here we have come to a point where there are maybe differently from issues we have been looking at recently where there seems to be a lot of convergence with minor difficulties, minor nuances. I think here we have very flagrant conflict of opinions. I do not think it would be too much useful to replicate the discussion we have had. I think the arguments are there for the record.

I would look into your reactions, of course, your inputs. You are free to comment, even the arguments you have voiced before. But maybe at this point, I would like also to have your feedback in regard to how that issue should be addressed in the report.

My suggestion is -- I have proposed to you was I think it would be fair on the part of us all to document the discussion in a way that is neutral, that does not indicate prejudgment on the part of the working group, but that provides, let's say, a picture for our colleagues that we will consider this issue again in CSTD, ECOSOC and GA. This would be my proposal to you.

I think by doing this we are not inventing anything. We are following the usual procedure adopted by the U.N. in general in addressing any issue. If you look into any Secretary-General report, you will see

that kind of language when you are addressing issues that are not -- that will not have a unanimous position. But at the same time -- and I don't want it to be interpreted as seen that all issues would have the same status. The focus of the group would be to comply with the mandate to develop recommendations. In my opinion, the areas in which we can have unanimity that will lead to recommendations, this should be very clearly specified. That's the core of the report.

But I think we would -- at the same time, it would be in the interest of all of us to find some way to address that important issue. I think on the part of many participants from day one, it was indicated from their perspective this is the main issue to be addressed in those discussions. So I think out of respect also for the variety of opinions, we should try to find a way to balance it in an appropriate way, in a way that everyone would be comfortable.

The WGIG report provides some clues about doing that. But beyond that, any other report you can find in the U.N. system will give us some ideas we have in the room, people who have been involved with so many discussions. We know there are ways to address it if there is a collective will.

So by saying this, I'd like to open the floor for comments in regard to recommendation proposed by the joint contribution, starting with Richard Hill. And then I have United States, U.K.

For the moment, Richard Hill and United States. You have the floor, Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I fully agree with your proposed way forward on this. I like the principle there. I support the principle proposed by the proponents because they're not actually proposing to create a body. They are simply inviting the UNGA to consider.

I don't particularly -- sorry. I apologize. I don't like your language. I think the language could be improved, but we'll come to that when we look at that paragraph in the report which you already have in the Version 0 non-paper that you presented. So I think at that point we can pick some of this language and see if it can be injected.

And, also, Chairman, I presume you would agree that when we go through the report based on your proposal, we would also have an opportunity to pick pieces from this contribution that touch on the non-recommendation parts of the report and make proposals as to how some of what they propose here, which I think is useful, could be incorporated into the report.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. This is what I intended to do yesterday with you. We are not doing it now. But if you have a look at the document I propose for your consideration, I wouldn't even call it zero draft. It's a minus something draft. But by spelling out what to seem to me to be the two main options, that we will consider it a later stage to be appraised of some of the main topics that we're raising in regard to each position that was developed here. So thank you for this.

United States.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. So I think we've had this conversation this week. We began it yesterday when we were introduced the report. I really don't know if it's the appropriate time in the process to have that conversation again.

We had it. We kind of understand the views at this point. But then we moved to identifying other proposals from other participants and identifying if there's any potential consensus there. I think right now we've identified one issue, that there's not consensus. And we'll have to have a discussion about how to address that.

But we haven't even finished the process of reviewing all the others. And so we don't know what other issues do or don't have potential for consensus.

So my suggestion would be to certainly introduce the -- this document. We can hear the viewpoints that are presented, understanding there's, you know, not consensus on this proposal. We move to hear other proposals, and then we come back to that issue and discuss it. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Thank you for that. I agree with you, maybe it's not the right moment to try to agree on how we will address issues that have no unanimity among us, that we are looking to individual specific recommendations. And then in another stage we will come back to this. I think this is in line with what we have been doing.

Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I mean, as a co-sponsor for this recommendation, when it comes to develop a set of recommendations in order to achieve the mandate, we have different sections or different elements that need to be taken. So examining all sections and ignoring one which is how to enable government on equal footing to development of national policy issues, this is, I would say, unfair, to put things inside and then you put this section outside of the recommendation section.

All elements should be under one section. In issues that we have one view, it's fine. On other issues we have a view or more, we reflect all views equally. So maybe we have an agreement on capacity-building, which is as we said before, it's the features of enhanced cooperation, one of the features, not the core issue of how to develop. But this is -- we see it the main issue we lack ten years. We need a forum or a mechanism for governments to develop such policy. If this would not be part of the recommendation section, I'm not sure how this will achieve our mandate one way or another. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

But I think for clarity -- I cannot fully understand your point. But I think for clarity, we must may be all on the same page in regard to what we can or cannot achieve.

And what is our mandate? Our mandate as a group, the group should produce a report. So the recommendations proposed by the group should be owned by the group. And I think that refers to areas if we are looking for a language in which we say the group agrees or recommends, those areas suppose there is consensus on this.

In other areas, I think it is fair to document the discussion and to refer but we cannot use the same language in regard to ones that have full consensus. This has been done, for example, by the WGIG. As I have read at some point, the WGIG in some cases says "the WGIG agrees," "the WGIG recommends," "the WGIG recognizes." In other cases, it says there are a number of issues were discussed but clearly indicated there is not -- so I take your point that all elements should be under the same treatment but it's impossible. We never -- we can never achieve that. We cannot say there is consensus around something that there is no consensus. And it should be very transparent and honest to say it in a way that addresses everyone's concern.

One point I think you raise is important, that maybe when -- we are not doing it now, but when we look at the structure of the report, it's not necessary to put all the consensus points in one area and separate. Maybe we can revisit the issues and say "in this area, the group recommends," so in this area, so the recommendation would be -- but we are not addressing this now. This is something we should look into the future, in due time.

But I think the points you raise -- and this is my intention here in bringing back this topic. I think we should not replicate the reasons and the arguments pro or against because those have been abundantly made clear. But we should maybe try to discern and to give guidance either to myself or to working group that might address this on how to address it in the context of the report. And I thank you for your inputs on that.

So I have on my list a number of -- I'm not sure in the right order. But I have Parminder. I have Iran. I have Kenya. I have Russian Federation again. I'm sorry, I think previously I had the U.K. You have the floors. U.K. followed by Parminder and Iran.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We really hope that we will not spend this afternoon going backwards to the discussion about the report. We understood that we were now going to discuss the substance of the proposed recommendations that have been contributed to the group. If we go backwards to that discussion, then I'm not sure when people will have the opportunity to present their contributions. Because we would spend the rest of the afternoon on that.

So we really hope that we can come on to the substance. We have a comment on the substance of this first recommendation. So, when we get to the discussion of the substance, we would like to intervene to make a comment on the substance that we really hope we're not going to go back to discussing the report at this stage. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No, I agree with you. I would invite you then to make your comments on the substance. I think this is exactly what -- what I was trying to avoid is to replicate discussions we had before. But, if you have specific comment, please, go ahead.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. On the substance, we heard the point from Russia that a decision about whether or not to create a new body should be made by the U.N. General Assembly because it should be made by governments.

And, yet, the U.N. General Assembly has already decided that this issue should be discussed by a multistakeholder group. So we're not sure how this proposal fits with what the UN General Assembly has asked us to do. Our mandate is to discuss this with the full involvement of all relevant stakeholders. So UNGA has already decided that this issue needs to be addressed by all stakeholders.

How does it fit, then, that we, rather than carry out our mandate, which is to make recommendations, should simply go back to UNGA and say, "Actually, we disagree with what you told us, UNGA. We think you should make this decision."

To our mind, that doesn't make much sense. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have on my list Parminder, Iran, and Kenya. But just one comment here, because I was in New York when we were drafting this. I think what the GA said was to entrust this group, a multistakeholder group, to come up with recommendations. And their recommendations can revert to the GA and say, "GA, we think it's a good idea to create" -- I don't see a contradiction. The GA has not said that everything that will be done until the end of time needs to be multistakeholder. Just entrust the multistakeholder body to come up with recommendations. That's just because I was part of the discussions. We have had many of the discussions had in here we had back in New York. And we worked in many, many days from September, October, November. Twice. I see merit in many of the points that are being raised here.

So I have Parminder followed by Iran and Kenya.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Responding to the point made by U.K., I think whoever was writing this particular sentence was being a little diplomatic and open minded in wording the sentence in this manner. If you go down, it is very clear that there are clearer views about the recommendation being of this kind or that kind in the working group, et cetera. So this was kind of -- I don't want to say decent language but a little bit introducing it in a soft manner. And I think it should be to invite UNGA to establish U.N. body mechanism. And, if that makes the point clearer in some people's mind, actually that's the purpose of this particular recommendation. We can kind of make a language more direct. But that's -- and you can read it along with the recommendations. It goes on to say, even in those parts, this recommendation has been redelegated to leave options open. It leaves options open on the nature of that mechanism. It could be a working group. It could be a committee and so on. It leaves options open of a possible host mechanism. So this is just being drafted in this manner for a better -- keeping things open for a discussion. And, if you wanted -- like this exactly is our viewpoint, that could easily be done. Take it in that spirit and not say that it, as it has been made to look like that. We fail to think about whether it is reasonable or not. And you now find out the reasonability. No, that is not the proposal. The proposal is you think it's reasonable to do it. I understand it looks like that, but the idea of the proposal it is a recommendation that there should be a process started by the UNGA to do it.

So I just -- I'm trying to remove the confusion. So let's respond to how the proponents actually see this proposal as actually to be within that sentence.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

Iran followed by Kenya, Russian Federation and Richard Hill, Iran. Please.

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

Regarding this recommendation, this is a recommendation from a number of members of the group. And, in my view, I think it's not to water down the current mechanism.

But we should consider to some reality that happened in the past.

We had the previous working group, enhanced cooperation, in the past. And, unfortunately, it didn't work. And we do not, at the outcome of the current working group, will be provide other expectation.

So we need to consider the new mechanism for our negotiations in the future.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, with you, that maybe there is no consensus on that recommendation. But, as we are going to provide in the end of the negotiation a report in the U.N. system -- and everybody is familiar with the report and difference between the report decision and resolution.

So we should consider this recommendation as part of the view of the floor members. And some countries like Iran support this recommendation. So we need to consider in the report even if we do not have consensus on that. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Iran. And this brings us to the main aspects maybe to be looked into on how we want to reflect that in the report.

I think the point raised by U.K. -- this is not the right moment maybe to do it. And I'll give the floor for others to express themselves. The only thing that I'd like to not engage in discussing substantive aspect, because I think we have been doing this very extensively.

We could maybe even stop the discussion now because there will be no consensus. Since we are trying to work around the recommendations to further refine, I think we will hear all those who want to intervene. But, as of now, as a chair, I have already concluded what is the outcome of this as refers to recommendations. So I would beg you to be the most straightforward you can in order to allow us to move to other parts of the proposals into other kinds of recommendations. I have on my list Kenya followed by Russian Federation, Richard Hill. I see India also request for the floor. So Kenya, please, you have the floor.

>>REPUBLIC OF KENYA: Thank you, Chair.

I want to start by appreciating the review by my colleague from U.K. The GA has given us a task, and we need to work around that task and provide some recommendations on way forward.

And, in my view, in our consideration of that mandate, we need to be unambiguous in whatever we shall recommend. And, in this case, I want to specifically look at that recommendation, the first bullet.

The way we're talking about inviting the UNGA to consider there the reasonability. In my view, what the GA asked us is to assess the reasonability of such a kind of a mechanism existing.

So, asking or inviting the GA to consider the reasonability, actually, that is very ambiguous just like we are telling the GA to do the work that it gave us to do. We have to be very clear. In fact, from what Parminder said, we need to recommend the establishment of a mechanism. In that case, we have reason around the task. And then we're providing a very direct recommendation that does not leave any doubt on what steps need to be taken or what we really wanted to be done. In that respect, I would support the group that we can rework on that language so that we remove ambiguity that diminishes the work of this working group.

On the issue of consensus or not consensus, I think it takes us back to the beginning not of this meeting but of the whole process when we started to make the (indiscernible) cycle. Why? Because all the issues, most of the issues, if not all, have been proposed by members of this group. They have been discussed to some extent. Some, to a larger extent, some to a lesser extent.

And then, if we are supposed to say there's no consensus on one issue proposed by a certain or a group of members, I think then we should have cleared the threshold for consensus.

And, if we did so, it would be very reasonable for, when we say there's no consensus on an issue, everybody will understand the proposal did not meet the threshold.

But maybe I didn't get to the threshold. I would want to just repeat what I said to that. In our wisdom, we have to be very objective and very fair to all the proposals put across

so that we make a very positive and impactful recommendation to the GA. And we shall be put into history for having moved this process ahead. I thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Kenya. I take your points. But may I comment that, if we remove ambiguity and make a straightforward recommendation, that would not solve the problem. That would lead us to something that I think there's no way to escape the situation which there will be a number of countries in favor -- not countries. I'm sorry. It's the U.N. A number of WGEC participants in favor of and a number of participants against. I don't see a way to address this through language.

And, in regard to consensus, I think it's very clear consensus means. If there is an objection, there's no consensus. So I think we are aiming at a situation and come to language that can be embraced by everyone of those who would make it, let's say, to the category of recommendations. Otherwise, we have to -- in due time, to think on how to address those other issues. But I don't think there is a way to get out of some difficult conversations we are having, just not only here but elsewhere.

I have Russian Federation followed by Richard Hill, India, ISOC. And then I'd like to close the list. Canada.

I would certainly -- Lea. Cuba. Anyone else? Who? U.S.

ICC. European Union. India.

Parminder. No, Parminder. Yes, Parminder.

But, please, let me tell you about something. I will hear -- anything you want to say will be -- all of us will have to hear anything you want to say. But, from my understanding, my best efforts, we'll not be able at this point to come up with language that will -- you can provide some more information pro and against. We can try to work around the language. But I think that will lead us to the same situation we are in now.

I would very strongly to request you to be as brief as possible. Please make a point. There are other aspects of the proposal that are also required to be examined. We have new language coming from Nick, from Peru, on basis of the discussion we had before. The U.S., as indicated. I think there are a number of issues to be addressed. I will give you the floor for a point of order, Constance. But I think there will be lots of time for us to engage in that kind of discussion.

>>CONSTANCE BOMMELAER: I understand your concerns. You want us to save some time. And, personally, I'm ready to put my flag down if we can just acknowledge that there's no consensus on this proposal. If that's something that collectively we can agree to, perhaps you'll see all the flags go down. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I'd be delighted if colleagues could -- as you have heard ISOC, could we conclude by looking to that recommendation that at this point we have the text that is provided, but we decide there's no consensus in here. And we look into a way to reflect it appropriately in our further work. If there is an understanding in that regard, I think we could move to another recommendation.

I see a number of flags up. So I give the floor in the order they appear. I think those who have put their flags down. But then I turn to Russian Federation for your comments.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yeah. Sorry, Chair. I need to just acknowledge that that was already taken. And I -- first I need to say thank you for those the constructive recommendations on the text. If you think that it's a bit weak, we can make it strong. Not a problem, really. When it comes to the proposal for the chair, we would like to support your proposal. We think it's rather wise, you know. And there is a diverse view. We don't say it's consensus or no consensus. It's diverse view, which is already in the mandate and in the resolution. The way we discussed during the morning session, U.K. proposal. And, you know, there is a lot of interesting insights, views. However, when it comes to the mechanism of implementation of enhanced cooperation, U.K. said that it's everywhere and with everyone. We do not agree with this. We oppose. We think it should be some concrete mechanism to be taken. So that's just a diverse view. They should be treated equally in the report. And this is our point of view. And with this we think it's our right and it's in the mandate of the group that all diverse views should be constructively presented. Coming to the next --

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Sorry. There are a few others that wanted to speak. I'll give the floor after that. Richard Hill is next on the list.



>>RICHARD HILL: Chairman, I support the way forward you just proposed. Just a couple comments. Regarding consensus, you said there's no consensus if anybody opposes. That's right, but I would be a little bit more precise. Lack of formal opposition. So I might say I don't really like it. And you'll say are you formally opposing it, and I'll say no. Then that's consensus. Let's be clear. It's only no consensus if I say I formally oppose that. I think it's too early to do that. I think you're right. We're not going to get consensus on this. But I think it's a little early because I don't think this is the right language, as I said before.

Now to the point that Paul made, again, I apologize to the drafters. But I think reasonability does not belong there. I would have suggested to formulate it as to invite the UNGA to consider establishing. The recommendation would have been to invite the UNGA to make a decision. That would fall squarely within the mandate. We're not chartered to make decisions. We're chartered to make recommendations. And we could recommend to the UNGA that they think about making a decision. If you take out reasonability, I think that addresses the concern raised by the U.K., understanding, of course, that's not likely to meet consensus. It's just making it clear. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Next on my list is Canada followed by Cuba, India, and Parminder.

Canada.

>>CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair. My understanding of when we did the WSIS+10 and when we did the WSIS in 2005 is that, in fact, the UNGA has already decided on not creating a new mechanism. So I would find it a bit -- yes, I'm not sure "redundant" is the correct word. But I'm not sure that this is the recommendation that I would be comfortable with us making. The UNGA has already decided on no new mechanism. And I don't see why we would have more authority to say, "No, no, think again, do this again, you didn't do it right the first time."

When UNGA did agree on creating new mechanisms such as the IGF, our resolution -- the mandate indicates that enhanced cooperation already exists and we must make recommendations on how to further implement it so a new mechanism is not going to all of a sudden make enhanced cooperation appear. It is already there. It is up to us to use this mechanism.

And then I guess I have a question, is -- what would this body/mechanism do exactly? I mean, that's not clear at all to me when I see this document. So Canada would not support this recommendation at all. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Canada. And, again, just -- I think this kind of discussion should not prolong. But very respectfully, I think the mandate that was given to the group should not impede us to make -- to make recommendations with regard to anything the GA has not decided to do in the past but why not do in the future in case there was unanimity, which is not the case anyway.

But I think the issue here is the lack of unanimity, the differing views, not a lack of mandate to do it. I think the mandate will allow us to do it.

And the problem about these new mechanisms is that in the view of many participants, proposed by many others, a new mechanism would be a way to further implement enhanced cooperation. So there's no contradiction in making a proposal with what was done before. It's just a matter of have enough support or not. I think it's not -- it's out of scope. That's my view from the chair.

Cuba followed by India, Parminder. And then I would suggest, please, that we could close discussion on this and move to the second recommendation.

>>CUBA: Thank you, Chair. My intervention should be brief because I only want to be on the record supporting this recommendation. And I was wanting to stop there. But the previous intervention, I should say that you're a gentleman because you allow some philosophy around that that is not allowed.

But I agree with you because I think our distinguished colleague is -- you could have some condescenders for her thing. But in any way --

[ Laughter ]

Because to say -- to be -- to bring back here the notion that enhanced cooperation has already been done and all that, that goes back to the first meeting, you know. And I think that's not -- we are already past that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. I would strongly encourage colleagues not to bring in here other agendas. I think that maybe people feel uncomfortable from a gender perspective. I see a number of flags going up.

Let's maybe just follow the discussion. Just for the record, I think the point made by Canada I think was important and she was, I would say, short in her presentation.

Sometimes I feel obliged to be a little more strength in regard to the management of the meeting in case I see some people drifting away a little bit too much from the point on the discussion. And I apologize if my judgment is not always correct.

But could we then finalize the list of speakers for this first recommendation, move to the second one? I had on my list India, Parminder. I see the U.S. has put up the flag, ISOC. But after this, I certainly request you to allow Russian Federation to -- to be very frank, I don't see anything that is being said now that is adding any value with the assessment that we have in regard to the proposal or in regard to the way forward. Let me be very frank about that. I think we are wasting time by allowing ourselves to repeat things that have already been said elsewhere.

I think from -- if you think from the perspective of those who would be tasked to come up with something, we are not adding nothing new.

But, please, India, followed by Parminder, U.S., and ISOC. You have the floor, Madam.

>>INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I just want to put on record that we welcome this proposal which has been made -- joint proposal that has been made by four countries. Just as we welcome the previous

recommendations and the proposals and just as we would welcome the other set of proposals and recommendations which would be put up for discussion, it's only fair that all recommendations here and all joint proposals are given a equal and fair chance for discussion in this group.

Just at the beginning, even before the discussions have started on the details of the proposal, to say that there is no consensus on the proposal, I don't think we can agree to that. So I would request the chair to kindly give this proposal a fair chance for discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, India, for your comments. I think -- well, at least from my standpoint, I make my best to give the same fair opportunity for everyone to discuss their proposal, have their proposal discussed. What I cannot do or anybody in this room can do is to ensure that as a result of the discussion there will be consensus. This is something that is beyond the power of any one of us individually because it refers to the assessment of the group.

In regard to the proposal I made at the beginning of this meeting, I would just like to recall this is the fourth meeting. We have been discussing those issues since last September in this group. And this issue has been discussed extensively in many other fora for many years. So when I make the proposal, it was not something I was jumping on and trying to impose. I was trying to reflect discussions we have had in the same context of this working group and elsewhere, just for the record.

Could I turn to Parminder followed by the U.S. and ISOC.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. We have been discussing a number of proposals since the morning. And in many during those discussions, I dare say that, well, we can discuss these but they are - they have a relationship to some other discussions. And we went along and gave inputs and so on.

None of those proposals are really original. I mean, they have been discussed many, many years earlier than what institution mechanism have been discussed. Transparency of policy making, that has been discussed for, like, 80 years or so, since the U.N. has been formed.

So we went along that, right? So now when that discussion has come to which we were connecting the earlier discussions, it starts under a parallel. And as a promoter of that proposal, we just don't feel like what should we now propose because everybody -- and I'm sorry including the chair saying it's not going to happen, it's not going to happen so many times we feel like, okay, that's a proposal, let's leave it there. That's a problem because then we have been saying earlier and we have been saying repeatedly even, you know, looking like too repetitive, that, listen, these things have a relationship to that. And at that time we were told, well, let's talk about this. We'll come to that. When we come to this, then we say there's not much to discuss here. That's not, in my view, fair play.

Some people -- Constance said, can we just say no consensus. Maybe. I can think about it. So in this context, let me clarify what is the consensus we are trying to seek here, accepting that there is no consensus on these five or six proposals. The consensus we are seeking is at a metalevel. We are trying to seek whether there is a possibility of building an agreement that this set can go in recommendations in parallel to another set. Now, this is a different kind of consensus we are seeking. And we need views

on whether this can happen because that's our condition to possibly have some other aspects being discussed.

Now, it was the original demand of developing countries to have such kind of institutional mechanism. It was their demand to have WGIG in the first phase. Then they thought of having WGIG again. So we know who was seeking this.

Now, it is, in my view, a compromise from developing countries' side saying they want institutional mechanism and that's what enhanced cooperation is and they want this working group to be set up and so on. To say that, okay, we're ready at this point to say we'll have a box of institutional recommendations about such new mechanism and another box which reflects the position that existing mechanisms are doing well but let's be a little concrete because that gives a set of things for other people to do, that's the compromise we are ready to work on.

So when we put these things on the screen now, the consensus we are seeking is whether within the area of recommendation and not as an annex we can have two different boxes, one having this set which, again, the language we are ready to talk around, work around, and another set which starts by saying that existing mechanisms are doing well and that's always what was meant by enhanced cooperation and so on.

The last point, we have been talking of WGIG report. WGIG report has four identities within recommendations. It is under the recommendations part, so it is possible. We need to kind of get a little more sophisticated and say, not just recommendations is like full consensus. Everything is a background report.

No. The WGIG took a more sophisticated approach. We need to take that.

Within recommendations, there is a recommendation which says that we discussed things and we reached two kind of possible models for consideration. For me that is a recommendation, though that recommendation has two models. We are proposing that this is one model and other people can give it. We are seeking consensus on putting this in that form. If we will have comment on that, we are ready to talk. If people are ready to give consensus on this, we are fine. We agree there may not be consensus.

And in our view, if we do not address the principle element on which the UNGA has asked our opinion, the principle element being whether to paraphrase it, whether we need a new mechanism or not. I mean, we think we need a new mechanism. But as Canada said, they already think we don't need a new mechanism. That's fine. We are ready to accept that they asked us whether we need a mechanism or not. We need to have a central part of the report address this question, and we can arrange things around it.

Now, if this part doesn't go in the report, I don't see myself -- and I think many other countries -- agreeing to other parts of the report. So, therefore, the consensus we are seeking is whether this can go

within recommendations but as one of the two divergent sets of emerging opinions. Thank you so much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder. And I see we are going in circles here, because I initially made the proposal exactly as you said to not only look at the language but also to think about how we would reflect in the report.

But a number of interventions draw my attention to the fact that by doing so we would be departing from the process we are following.

Now we are looking to the language. We are trying to get input. And in a later stage, we'll see how the report as a whole will fit together. So I will not offend anyone who wants to speak to this, but this is not the right moment now. I take your point. We are parking this. We are coming back to this. Also in light of the fact you want to see a report full fledged with many sections, we have been looking at pieces that will fit into the report.

I think it's not appropriate when you look at one particular piece to try to have the full picture of what will be the final end of our work. So I take your point. I initially thought that would be appropriate to do so, but I realize that we would be departing from what we are doing. And we'll be losing time in regard to allowing the same fair opportunity for all recommendations necessary to be discussed here. So your point is taken on board. We'll come back to this.

But I suggest then that we could have the final interventions on that point. U.S., ISOC, and I see European Union and ICC-BASIS. And with your indulgence, I'm closing the list after that because I want really to move ahead. And I feel we are going in circles. I must be very clear about that.

U.S., please, you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, procedurally I think we agree with Canada. This was presented at WSIS+10. It was discussed at WSIS+10. And the decision from WSIS+10 was no new mechanisms and organizations -- or organizations. And it wasn't for lack of a conversation.

And I disagree that this is the key task that WSIS+10 gave us. I think if you read the text of the document and the comments made about Internet governance and the participation and then gets to enhanced cooperation, I don't think that you can read that language and come the intention is to go create a new organization, bring a proposal.

Certainly we have recommendations and nothing is off the table and we're willing to discuss, but I just don't think that's a fair assessment of the document.

But on the substance of this proposal, you know, we disagree with the proposal because it would exclude the participation of all stakeholders on international Internet-related conversations. This would violate a longstanding U.S. position on this. But I think it would also violate repeated support from the international community, including the United Nations, including this body and others that have

supported that participation of all stakeholders in those conversations. So for that reason, this is not just something we could support. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. ISOC.

>>ISOC: Thank you very much. I promise to be very brief. I would just note that we spent about a decade discussing what "enhanced cooperation" meant. And I think at WSIS+10 one of the benefits in 2005 was to simply agree that we disagreed. And going into these discussions, the understanding I had when we started the day was that we would really try to focus on a constructive approach and focus on issues and an approach we could all agree to. This is why I would really support the chair's approach, which would be we acknowledge on this specific issue we don't have consensus and we really try to move on, on aspects where we can elaborate a little further and make progress. Thank you very much.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: European Union.

>>EUROPEAN UNION: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like also to say something on the practical aspects of this proposal. And it is if we put the ball back to the General Assembly, as it is more or less what I see is happening, it seems to me that we lose -- what was just said by the U.S. colleague, that we lose the interventions, I mean, that is debated in this working group and with a composition that also captures the multistakeholder model, which for us is an imperative. So in this sense, we lose this in a sense and we put back the same questions with the same unresolved, if I can say, opinions and differences to the U.N. assembly. And I think we don't give a good service in this case.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. ICC-BASIS.

>>TIMEA SUTO: Thank you. I would like to express our opposition, not just on the idea of the creation of a new mechanism but in this instance we also specifically cannot support the recommendation that the UNGA be called upon to seek an intergovernmental format for enhanced cooperation.

We respectfully submit this goes against our view of what this working group has been asked by the UNGA as well as the spirit of the UNGA asking a multistakeholder body to deliver it on this question.

Implementation efforts of enhanced cooperation already taking place involves stakeholders, and it's not limited to IGOs as documented by the rapping effort that was done by the previous iteration of this working group.

And future information to be added to existing ones that would be recommended by this group should also include all stakeholders. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn now to Russian Federation for introduction of the second recommendation. I'm trying it to avoid some kind of (indiscernible) statements. But sometimes it's a bit strident to me. And I'm coming from a country that fully supports the multistakeholder approach. But at the same time, we work at the U.N. and we value the U.N. in its proceedings. We think the U.N. has been serving the world community for us.

So I don't think that we should take away all the possibilities associated with U.N. doing things. I think it's not in line with what we are doing elsewhere. So I think we are -- this working group represents an opening towards the multistakeholder approach in making sure that the decision that would be made by the U.N. will reflect appropriately and will take on board stakeholders' views in a way that is compatible with the spirit of the Tunis Agenda, that different stakeholders have different roles and responsibilities.

So I don't -- I'm not sure that what the GA has asked us is to devise that everything that will be done, that every recommendation should encompass the nature in every aspect of the multistakeholder approach. I think those are different dimensions of what we should be doing.

But, again, I do not want to open a discussion on this. I think it's mind-setting under which we're operating. I'd like to turn to Russian Federation for introduction of the second recommendation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

But I need to point just very shortly regarding what was taken in before. Multistakeholder model is the value of the WSIS process, which we all agree is a consensus document about multistakeholders and the model accepted. We do not accept only the position of one member of this group to another who accept or not accept multistakeholder model. We accept, of course -- because it's the value of the WSIS format and the WSIS process. However, the -- multistakeholders are not the concept which exist in vacuum. It's reflects roles and responsibility. And, when it comes to the public policy issues respectively, it's the government's separate role according to this multistakeholder model.

That's why we point it out. We have, really, the problem of finding that in what part of U.N. there was a decision -- resolution regarding there is no need for intergovernmental format of enhanced cooperation. We really have the problem of finding -- and, if Canada has this information, please come to us and say that this is the power of this kind of resolution that's saying that this is already taken and decided. Because how it was taken in WSIS+10 and the decision, it is a problem. And there is some points that were not addressed. And it's para 55 of the resolution 70/125 that a lot of cross-cutting public policy issues that were not adequately addressed. So this was the point stated in the resolution by UNGA. That's why this group is settled also. Because we need to understand the mechanism.

So, coming to the point 2 of the recommendation -- so we're recommended to invite relevant U.N. agencies, intergovernmental and international regional -- and regional organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with Internet and create -- to create and support an environment that's facilitated development of public policy principles. So we think this is how we understand the para 71. It should be the rule for relevant international organizations and also original organizations. We think it's -- they will create the rich understanding of the whole point. So this is important for them to start to make some kind of public policy principle. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECO: Thank you. I invite comments on second recommendation. I have on my list Richard Hill followed by United States.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I can support this recommendation. With your indulgence, Chair -- I know you didn't want to open the box, but you opened the box. I wanted to support your comments regarding not intergovernmental forums. Again, I think the first bullet needs significant texts. As I understand it, what it's saying is there are certain things which require international public policy decisions. And then those decisions, according to the Tunis Agenda in the multistakeholder model are, in the end, made by governments, obviously, after consultation with all the stakeholders. And I would through you, Chairman, I would perhaps ask verification by the European Union in which they favor multistakeholder models as to why then they're proposing that spam be negotiated in the World Trade Organization without any form of multistakeholder involvement. But perhaps we could take that offline if they don't want to answer that publicly. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I would strongly support that you discuss that offline.

May I turn to the U.S. for your comments, please.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. I think for this proposal, this is paragraph 70 in the Tunis Agenda. I think we've discussed in the past that we're not renegotiating Tunis and so -- but we would include it in a preamble in some ways. So I would encourage that we follow that track of including Tunis language as it was agreed in Tunis in the preamble and not get into trying to reedit it, reinterpret it for this purpose. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you.

I have Peru and Parminder.

>>PERU: Yes. I want to say Peru supports the position set forth by Russia and the countries that presented this proposal and also what Richard said a little while ago. And, Chair, you mentioned before that we are not necessarily revising the Tunis Agenda. And that is something that I would like to reiterate. We're not revising the Tunis Agenda. We are doing our job,

which is recommending. So, unfortunately, some of these recommendations might not be of the convenience of many countries. But that's the way it is. You know? This is not going to be of the convenience of all.

But that's why we are sitting here, and we have to try to find a way to express not only our opinions but everybody's opinions. Because that is precisely the essence of our contribution. We have to let know the international community the differences there are, the growing differences there are. And that we are only going to be able to convey that if we allow everyone's opinion to come forth. Those that are of consensus and those who are not. I, for one, Peru, will support Russia's position and what we have heard a little while ago. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you,



Peru. I have on my list Parminder, followed by Switzerland, the U.K. ICC-BASIS. So Parminder followed by Switzerland and U.K. And I have Pakistan and I revert to Russian Federation for comments with regard to Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Yeah, I take from the comments, including from the distinguished delegate from the U.S., that yes, I think in the next reiteration of this set, we should become a little more precise on what is that we want and how -- not what -- how should we seek those organizations responsible for the tasks essential to the Internet to create and support the environment that facilitates the development of public policy principles. I, with some other colleagues here are working in the jurisdiction group in ICANN that connects to that kind of thing. And I do understand and I accept and I agree that rather than just restate language from Tunis Agenda, the job is to implement that language. And we should be getting more specific at this stage to say we want this to be done. So you're going to do that in the next stage.

As for the concern that we shouldn't be repeating language which were already agreed -- and I now agree that, yes, we should go one more level of detail. And that we will do. But the fact is that much of the language which I saw in the morning and then in the proposal of U.K.s had language which was already agreed on transparency, on stakeholder participation, on IGF -- almost every element has things already set in Tunis. And that should also apply to all those general principles. WSIS+10, NETmundial, other places. Let's not start also doing that kind of same transparency. You should be more also transparent. That's also of no use if this is not useful to just repeat from Tunis Agenda. But, yes, we'll get into more detail. And that I think is good input.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Switzerland followed by U.K. and Pakistan.

>> Thank you, Chair. I'm really sorry for not being here for most of the time as I had other pressing engagements. And perhaps I realize that it's not going in the direction where perhaps even our very elaborate and tangible input are being considered.

And maybe this is not the right forum. Because we can go back to General Assembly and take a suitable decision. And I will just remind everyone that General Assembly is not a consensus forum and certainly not a multistakeholder forum.

I took the floor just to put this on the record that we support this proposal. And nothing in our mandate prevents us from putting something on the paper as, Chair, you mentioned. I just want to put this on the record that we can certainly do it. There is no doubt about it that there is no consensus.

But, at the same time, I think everybody would consider that these proposals are made by a number of the members here. It is important that they are reflected in some manner. There are various proposals how to reflect that. And I think, if there is any progress towards that, we will certainly be engaging with that. Thank you

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Pakistan. And I apologize to the U.K. because I mixed up my order here. I had Switzerland, U.K. But, since we switched it with Switzerland, I gave the floor.

Just before turning to U.K. and in regard to repeating language from Tunis Agenda, I'd like just to draw your attention that the language proposed here is not exactly the one contained in the Tunis Agenda. Paragraph 70 is framed in the context of the development of globally applicable principles: Specifically, it refers to development of globally applicable principles. And then it says in this regard we call upon the organizations responsible. So I think the idea here is to approach this in the broader context. And also we're not referring to organizations in general. There is language specifying U.N. agencies and government international and regional. There are differences in regard to paragraph 70, just to draw your attention that that might help us in the discussion in future consideration of this proposal.

May I turn to the U.K. followed by Lea and Saudi Arabia and then I turn to Russian Federation. U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, the U.K., as I think everyone knows, does not support new mechanisms or a new body. But we do believe that, of course, existing U.N. and other international and intergovernmental organizations have important roles to play. And we would note perhaps there is some connection between the second bullet point here and our own proposal, recommendation number 9, which is about strengthening and improving existing international forums. And possibly there is even some common ground here.

It may not be a lot of common ground, but perhaps it's enough common ground to stop us from sinking and having no report at all. Because there is consensus around the importance of international organizations and the need to strengthen. And we need to try to capture that consensus. I'm making that comment in an attempt to try to find where we might come together.

I also have a quick process question as to how we are approaching this. I see there are 10 bullet points here, I think. And then I don't think they're all separate recommendations. They seem to be part of the same recommendations. So just a question: Are we going to go through them one by one, or do we need to speed up a little bit? Or what's your thinking as chair about how we go through all of these. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yeah. I would certainly support that we move as fast as we can. And, if we could take some perhaps in block. But, for example, in regard to 1 and 2, you see there a very substantial difference in regard to the scope and to the ideas since paragraph 1 would refer to the creation of a new body. Paragraph 2 refers to the role of international organizations. So I feel some difficulty.

I suggest we could take one by one and move as quickly as possible. Maybe when you make a comments -- and these comments address more than one paragraphs, following paragraphs, you can indicate that so we do not need to have repetition as we go along, But for the moment being I would suggest this. And I hope we can go faster as we move down the text.

I have on my list Lea and Saudi Arabia. No, not any more. And after Lea Kaspar, I move to Russian Federation for your comments. And then you can move to recommendation number 3. Lea.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. I like to take this opportunity to thank the proposers of this proposal. This is the first time I'm coming to you on it

on this particular recommendation. I thought that I actually agree with the U.K., and that was where my comment was going to go. In fact, I was noting in reviewing it that there is a sense or at least an intention there that I think some other recommendations reflect as well, which has to do with improving existing mechanisms including U.N. agencies and other regional and intergovernmental organizations. We might disagree on how that would be implemented. And for -- from my perspective at least, an environment that facilitates development of principles that should guide Internet-related public policies should be an open, inclusive, and transparent environment. And I would, you know, be happy to work on language to make this more specific to go in that direction. I don't know if that's the intention of the proposers. But perhaps we could work on some language there. And I'll stop there. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just before turning to Russia, anyone would like to take the floor on this. Parminder, yes, go ahead.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And also to remind the group that I was one of the proposers, five or six proposers. So we would have to come in and comment on just some of the points which would get raised in regard to this proposal.

So since, U.K. and Europe have constructively commented on this part, I thought I'd like to clarify that. In a way U.K. is right that all proposals are connected. I think it makes actually more sense than non-connected proposals.

But here the point is it is for existing organizations. That's true. But the point is that existing organizations should contribute to make an environment which enables point number one mechanism to do its work. So it's in relation to a new mechanism and the possibility of the new mechanism to develop its public policy role that other organizations can help.

And I agree with the chair that in original Tunis Agenda this was referring to the technical organizations. And here this is expanded. Things can be corrected. But, generally, the environment is being made to enable the mechanisms in one to carry out its role. And I think this point also gets highlighted in a subsequent point here that this is a larger ecology. Because we all understand that Internet policies are cross-cutting policies. And they involve many organizations. And it's trying to create a kind of ecology which will help the new mechanism to operate efficiently. So that's the purpose of this point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I turn to Russian Federation -- I think the point raised by Parminder, this is a joint contribution, I will allow any of the proponents or all the proponents to make final comments.

But as from the beginning, I understand you are taking the lead in making the introduction. So may I invite your comments in regard to the points that were raised, and then I ask you to move to the third bullet point for recommendation.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I would like to say thank you, Parminder, for this very good explanation actually. Yeah, we -- it was not our intention to duplicate the text from the Tunis Agenda because we make the broad approach. And the main idea is cross-cutting public policy issue which should be adequately addressed. And we think that if there is the possibility to work on the language that gets broader support, we are, of course, ready to do that.

When it comes to the third bullet, it's about the report basically. We believe that report will be produced as a result of the work of the second group of enhanced cooperation. And our recommendation is for governments and all stakeholders to use this report for continuation of enhanced cooperation. That's why we think the collection of the diverse views will be very helpful because it's the different points of views of other member states and also stakeholders on this point. And this is the complicated issues. And this report should be a really useful one for the further discussion. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Russia. And I -- I'd say I will open the floor for discussion. But I'd say that without elaborating the content or even prejudging the content of the report, I think this is quite something obvious, that we want our work to be relevant, that it would be taken up by those that are involved in some way in this effort towards enhanced cooperation.

So I'd say that in due time you'd see if we want to include some call in that regard, it would seem to me rather obvious that that would be the case. I don't see too many issues associated here. But, anyway, I'll open the floor because sometimes I'm surprised. I don't see issues and then there are some issues that keep appearing.

I have on my list Richard Hill followed by United Kingdom, Peru -- no Peru.

Richard Hill, please.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I would hope that we could reach consensus, unanimity, on the redrafted version of this. My only comment was editorial really. I think it's customary to invite governments rather than to recommend. We could recommend to invite governments or something like that. That's just a language question.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. U.K.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We also hope that all stakeholders will use our report, and we can support that. We also support the idea here that enhanced cooperation should be something that continues because we believe it has already started and it needs to continue and it's good to see that word here.

But we want people to be able to use our report. And that's why it's so important that we reach consensus recommendations. Only if we have recommendations which are fully agreed will we have any impact. We can only be effective if we make recommendations which have been agreed by consensus.

Having non-consensus report doesn't help anybody except maybe academics or people doing Ph.D.s in the future. We think this is not an academic exercise. We would like a report which makes strong, effective recommendations which have authority because they have been agreed by consensus which governments and all other stakeholders can then take on and follow. So we certainly support this proposal that everyone should use our report, but then that's why we need to make it a consensus report. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: No, I was just going to say: Are we going to reopen the discussion on what should or should not be in the report? Can we, Chairman -- perhaps you could ask people to refrain. I think we have already been through that discussion. I'm happy to keep discussing it, but I don't think we're getting anywhere. And we should maybe save that for when we see what you are proposing in the report, and then we can complain about what's in it. Let's not do that now.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, Canada and Peter Major.

>>CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman. Just to fully support what was said by the U.K. I think the strength of our report and its value will come from the recommendations we will put in it. So would very much support this proposal in that context. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Peter.

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Benedicto.

I just want to record that the earlier working group on the improvements to IGF produced a report which was attached to the resolution of the CSTD and later on, it was endorsed by the ECOSOC and forwarded to the UNGA. And it was also made available on the CSTD Web site. So probably if we manage to have a report -- and I'm really optimistic about it at this point -- then probably we are going to proceed in the same way. And I think it is fair to reflect this kind of procedure, what we are going to follow. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Again, we are not discussing now the report, the final outline of the report. We are aiming at fulfilling the mandate that the group should prepare a report, should submit a report that should be the group's report.

My understanding -- and I think there are differing views here, and we will sort this out as we go along. The report should certainly focus on the recommendations. That was our mandate, and I don't envision recommendations that do not have full support of all members. However, nothing impedes the report to address and document areas in which there was no consensus. So it's up to the group to decide on how it wants to proceed.

The group can do anything, can go either way, can restrict itself to areas of full consensus, can document. There are many, many precedents for doing that. It would be no innovation. It would not harm the core mandate and to fulfill the mandate we have.

But, again, this is something we are not discussing now. We are -- in due time I want -- even before we close this meeting, probably by tomorrow, we'll have to dedicate some more time to the discussion of the outline of the report and follow up to our discussions. So just let's park this and let's continue to look into the recommendations so we can make sure we can collect all views that will enable us in a further stage to devise how all those pieces will fit together in the end.

Richard, you want to comment.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes, just a couple of points. There will be a report because the UNGA didn't give us the option. The U.N. General Assembly said we will produce a report. So the only question is what is the content of the report? It might just be one line saying we couldn't do anything, but there will be a report.

And the second point, I believe it's constant practice, in fact, in reports to capture the discussions and differing views. And on this point, I have the exact opposite view of U.K. and Canada. I think that a report which only says motherhood and apple pie is wonderful is totally useless because we all know that motherhood and apple pie is wonderful.

So the report will have value if it says, well, some people think that, let's say, Swiss cheese is wonderful and other people think that French cheese is wonderful. Now, that's something useful because now you are finding out that people have different views and then if you want to find out why those people think that, there will be some annexes or URLs or whatever. We don't need to put 20,000 pages in the report but just point out some people think something. And if you want to find out why, go off and look here. That's the value of such report, not just repeating platitudes that we already have agreed. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Please, let's not prolong discussion here. Just back to reviewing one aspect, I think even when we are referring to concepts that have been agreed before, we can do it in a way that provides some more guidance, some more language and some more focus. And that would be helpful from the perspective of further implementing enhanced cooperation even if this would not touch on what is the core mandate.

I hope -- my best ambition for this is, I must say, not overemphasized ambition, but I would say I think that if we could document appropriately the areas we see convergence in a sense that this will help and be helpful in the process, even if it provides a modest contribution, not refrain from doing that. And if we can document also areas of disagreement or in which there's no unanimity in a way that everyone can accept, I think it would also be in the benefit of all of us. That might probably what I would aim at as an outcome of this. But, again, we will discuss this in due time.

ISOC, do you want to comment on that?

>>ISOC: Thank you very much. I agree with your judgment and appreciation, Mr. Chair. As we noted at the beginning of the afternoon, I think we're all in agreement that over the past decade there has been some different understandings of what "enhanced cooperation" means and that any value, any output that we're able to agree on with this group would certainly be a step forward. So in terms of how we present the output of this working group, certainly it would be the view of The Internet Society that we should emphasize areas of consensus. If there's a reference to some issues that have been discussed, they can be noted, of course, but emphasis should really be given under areas where we are able to build consensus. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I then invite Russian Federation to introduce the other recommendation. In my view, the next four recommendations -- it's up to you -- maybe you want to address them separately or together. I think the four of them provide a description of any body/mechanism. Maybe they could be taken together, if you wish.

The fifth refers to the relation with the IGF; the sixth to emerging issues. So I think that would be slightly different from the four. But as regarding the four next bullets, maybe I suggest you could take them as a block, if you wish. But it's up to you. Please, go ahead. Saudi Arabia.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I mean exactly as you said. Our preference is to take them one by one to have a fair discussion of your point. As you said, this is a description of how we see the establishment of a mechanism would happen. I mean, we're saying, According to the Tunis Agenda mandate for enhanced cooperation, it is urgently required to create a body or a mechanism to enable government to carry out their roles and responsibilities with respect to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I will open the floor for comments. Just again reminding that there has been extensive discussion on this. So I would certainly consider that there is no consensus in that regard. But I stand maybe to be corrected, surprised by you. Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah. I just want to stress one point here, which I think is very important and should allow more people to support this if we don't get unanimity. Previous proposals were always creating-a-body proposals. And I can understand why people are a little reluctant because that's complicated and so on. Whereas, here the proponents have made a big step by always using "body/mechanism." A mechanism could be something that's inside an existing body. I believe even later on they give some examples of that.

One proposal that has been made, for example, is simply to have one or two days at the CSTD devoted to these issues. So that's a mechanism, not a body. So I just wanted to stress that.

And I'm very comfortable with what's proposed here, precisely because it's flexible. It could be a body. It could be mechanism. And basically they're calling for further discussion of this and then eventually somebody will decide what to do.

Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Just for the sake of clarity, may I request the proponents what would be the basic difference between Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 4? Would that refer to the same kind of body/mechanism to be set up by the GA? Because here you are not mentioning the GA. You have just -- maybe there can be some clarity in regard to the difference, if there is any, between one or the other.

Who will -- Saudi or Parminder? Whoever you wish, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yeah, Thank you, Chair. I think -- so this proposal, since it's a proposal made by many members, put together -- putting all the points together where there was agreement so there are some overlaps as you would see them in the second one also but no contradictions. And that's more important.

But I can understand people who would ask this question. And my understanding, they both refer to the same new mechanism. So the idea is for the UNGA to do that.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I would then say we don't need to discuss simply paragraph 4. Maybe we can move to paragraph 5, if you can agree. Would you like to introduce the next paragraph?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: If there is no more comment, I will go to the next paragraph, which is -- I mean, this will form a body, a mechanism could be under a U.N. organization as a committee or a standing open working group with support from the U.N. secretariat. Maybe this could be like WGEC to be under ECOSOC or directly under UNGA.

So what the process will start at the beginning is an evolution of a process. It will start step by step but, however, to be under the U.N. umbrella and will include all governments on equal footing. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, it provides some more clarification on these body or mechanisms. I don't see any fundamental new element in regard to what has been discussed before. But I'd like just to consult colleagues whether there is any element that should deserve some comments. I see none.

Can I then request you to introduce the next paragraph? Parminder. Yes, Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yes, just glad since -- when some members saw the proposal's first line, the question was that we are just telling UNGA again to do what they asked us to do. And now, of course, I think this part of the proposal answers that there is work on detailing which has been done. And our intention is that this is the contribution the group is making to a decision which, of course, belongs to UNGA.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Yes, I also draw the attention that you introduce words like "committee" or "standing open working group." So you are giving some more detail in how the flexibility could be exercised in regard to this new body or mechanism. So I just draw the attention to the plenary for those elements.

May I invite you then to introduce the next paragraph.



>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. The second -- the next recommendation is about the core business of this body/mechanism that will develop and establish international public policy issues and cross-cutting topics. So it will come up with a new trend in the ICT environment and will enable government to develop such policy -- such international policy. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. May I just request you, for clarification and for everyone's benefit, because here you're introducing the notion that this body should develop international perspectives. It is a word that in that context is not too familiar at least to me, together with norms and public policies.

Are you basically referring to the same thing? Or is something in addition to public policy that is being aimed at here?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: We're referring to international policy. But we look at the international perspective, I mean, from an international perspective. It's not going to be, like, an action or policy or a regional. We look at international level where this can be implemented in different regions and different countries.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: So thank you very much. So the intent is just to emphasize the international dimension. Okay. Thank you for this. Parminder would like to provide some more --

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Yeah. Quickly to add to that we also are trying to add -- most U.N. organizations provide mixed norms and public policies, but also do the kind of development of reports and perspectives, which is a different level of when the secretariat does that. It serves as a -- but before public policies all over the world, maybe you're creating those -- you know, thinking around that subject and reports and perspectives. And then they transform into norms and public policy through most processes.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I have on my list Lea followed by U.K. and Carlos Afonso.

>>LEA KASPAR: Thank you, Chair. And, so on this particular proposal and recommendation, I found it interesting as I think it captures something that is important and that we have discussed previously. And that is what I understand is the function of what this body would be doing, which is to say to ensure coordination and coherence in cross-cutting in global issues.

And I would say that that's something that is important. I would like to see -- and I think that there is consensus around -- in the room. Maybe I could be wrong -- on the importance of that latter part of the recommendation. I do not think or haven't been convinced that the way to ensure that would be through a specific body or mechanism. And I don't know if I've gone on record before to say that I will not support any of the proposals without understanding better what those mechanisms or what the body would do and to be convinced that that is the solution to the problem that I think is rightly identified here or at least part of it. So I think, yeah, there is something there to come back to perhaps and to see what there is -- whether there's room for consensus around thinking about how we institutionalize that function.

Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I thank you for your contribution. I think it's very clear you support the notion that the ultimate goal to ensure coordination coherence. However, you're not convinced that the way to do that is through the new body and mechanism. And, just to say that this need to ensure coherence and coordination coherence I think is very much in line with what is requested from us.

Because, as you recall, the WSIS+10 outcome document organizes that there is a need to address cross-cutting issues. And I think coordination and coherence is part of a way of -- the right way to address those issues. So, in a way, it is there. And I think, in my proposal, I tried to suggest that the need for coordination coherence should be part of our consensus as far as we -- I can discern from previous discussion.

So thank you for that. I have U.K. followed by Carlos Afonso. Yes, U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, the U.K. is not able to support these proposals. I won't say that every time, because I think it's understood. I don't want to waste the group's time.

But on this proposal, particularly, we know, of course, there are already quite a large number of U.N. organizations addressing international Internet-related public policy. The ILO is looking at it. UNESCO is looking at it. ITU is looking at it. UNODC, the World Health Organization. Many, many organizations are looking at these policy areas and addressing them.

So it seems to me either you would have to stop those organizations from discussing Internet-related policy or you would have to accept that there will be two -- at least two different sets of public policy. There would be duplication.

It seems to us there are only two options here. Either you stop the ITU and the ILO and UNESCO from discussing Internet-related policy. And, if that is the proposal, I would like to understand how that would happen. Or the other option is we have a duplication. We have the ITU says one thing and this new body says something else. Or UNESCO says one thing and the new body says something else. And, if we have that duplication, how is it helping anybody?

So that's really my question to the proponents of this. Do they want to stop other U.N. organizations discussing these issues? Or do they want to create duplication? I cannot see any other option here.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I give the floor to Carlos Afonso.

>>CARLOS AFONSO: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I recall that Richard said that using body/mechanism may be a good positive step. But, if you read the recommendations throughout, what they are talking about is a body. And I find it strange that they mention here that it's required to create a body. I'll drop mechanism. Because what they want is a

body, clearly, to enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities. There is no sense of urgency in anybody's statements of the Tunis Agenda in due regard.

Perhaps paragraph 61. But it says only that this process should envision creation of a suitable framework or mechanism where it's justified. So that's one problem.

The other -- reading throughout the recommendations, certainly the multi-sectoral collaboration disappears. They only talk about intergovernmental interaction. I don't know what I'm doing here then.

So that's my worry about this is these recommendations.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And I understand the proponents are taking note of all the comments. And I will revert to them after this round of comments. Next on my list are Richard Hill followed by Russian Federation.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yes. I wanted to come back on the comment from the U.K. It's perhaps a drafting issue, which the proponents could fix, or maybe it's my American English not understanding what they really want.

So I didn't read this the way the U.K. read it. I read this as doing various things. Perspectives, norms, and public policies.

Now, a perspective could address exactly the problem that Paul highlighted saying, "Hey guys, how come you're looking at, let's say, spam in several different bodies? And on top of that you want to bring it into WTO? Does that make any sense? So, of course, they couldn't prevent that. But I see this as kind of a liaison function going to different organizations and telling the WTO, for example, and saying, well, do you realize that actually the proposals that you proposed in WTO were already discussed in ITU? Or maybe they shouldn't be or whatever.

So there's a coordination role here. And that's very clear to me, because it says with a view to ensuring coordination and coherence.

And then, on the other hand, there's some areas where maybe nothing is being done or is not being done enough.

And then you want to say, well, maybe somebody should be looking at that and ask the different bodies which one should be doing it or not.

So I would rather see this as a mechanism for reducing duplicate work which is already taking place.

You know? Internet is a hot topic. And so every institution wants to have an Internet thing. Now we have the e-commerce agenda on WTO, and we have the e-commerce agenda on UNCTAD. It will be interesting to see how those differ or overlap.

So it's pretty clear that we have overlaps. And it's pretty clear that we have gaps, or at least I think they're gaps. I saw this as a mechanism for addressing that. So I think maybe with -- you know, if that

was just a misunderstanding on the language, we could fix that. So I didn't see this as saying this new body is going to stop everything or duplicate everything. Quite the contrary. I saw this as just the opposite. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor. So I will turn to Russian Federation. They are the proponents for final -- and Saudi Arabia, of course, in regard -- and Cuba to any comments in regard to the points that were made.

Starting Russian Federation, then Parminder.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

Thank you, Richard. He actually made very good explanation, which also we can also support from just from logical perspective. And, actually, it's the point for the report. Because, you know, sometimes recommendation itself doesn't give much explanation.

As we said before, if we have background information in the report, then it will be much more easier to understand.

And what we proposed was the area and focus area of the enhanced cooperation, which is broad. And it has technical aspects, infrastructural aspects, but also ethical aspects, intellectual property rights and so on. Capacity-building. A lot of aspects. Of course, it's not one organization who can take care of this. And right now, it's more than 10 international organizations taking care of all creations.

So there is no intention, zero intention to block or stop them of doing this. Of course, they need to make what is supposed, according to their mandate and competence to do really. However, we need some coherence and coordinations making their work smarter and more effective. And to avoid duplication is one of the aspects to be more effective in this case.

So this is about -- and, if you go to the next bullet, you will also see more understanding of this issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Parminder. And U.K. would like to have the floor again. Parminder, please.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. And I think U.K. has asked a very, very important question, though we have gone over it. And I tirelessly keep on giving examples of the kind of issues which this group or this mechanism is supposed to address.

So there are a few kinds of them. One, there is a set of issues which are Internet or digital issues, which are completely new. And nobody even comes close to touching it.

Two, most important and central ones are the nature of data. Even economist talks about data being the new oil and some economist says it's not oil but soil, which are both two analogies which tells it's everywhere changing everything. And there's no body which discusses data in its economic, social, cultural aspects. This is a very central question. Not a small question. And nobody discusses about it. That's important.

Internet platforms is one new institutional form, which is very central to reorganization of not only economic but social and political systems.

There are people who say that a factory was a central artifact around which economic processes were organized in the industrial age, it's the Internet platform. Internet platform is a big thing.

OECD and other organizations discuss it in a very Internet-centric manner. But no U.N. body has mandate to discuss this. Europe is doing a lot of consultations on both these issues. I know they're making documents on data issues, on Internet platforms, regional issues, different issues. Nobody touches them.

Second is the fact that Internet involves cross-cutting issues. As the chair rightly pointed out just now that even Tunis Agenda in 2005 recognizes that there were cross-cutting issues which are not adequately addressed by existing organizations. That was 12 years back when Internet was not so evolved. And the word "digital" was really not in currency. We're in 2017. And I think everybody knows that there are huge amount of cross-cutting issues which have not been dealt. And, again, at least you acknowledge the Tunis Agenda has said there are cross-cutting issues which are not addressed.

Now, I keep on referring to the OECD's committee on digital economy. And I will request you to take those comments a little seriously because I keep on cut/pasting the mandate, the kind of issues they deal with. And they deal with issues like labor policy when there is an OECD committee on labor issues. But there are labor issues and artificial intelligence issues which the OECD committee on digital economy discusses. So this does not stop the committee on labor from discussing labor issues. And neither it's called duplication because they understand that a new context like artificial intelligence, labor, and work has a new context. And people have to be discussing it.

And the whole idea is that Internet and digital is a horizontal layer. We all understand that. It cuts across all social economic sectors. It's not a word -- we can't change that phenomenon that it is not vertical but horizontal layer. But it's not less important for being a horizontal layer. And that is the reason that many parts of our proposal talk about having cross connections with other agencies. We have discussed it a lot. We can keep on discussing this matter. But I think to just say that either you're going to stop other agencies to deal with issues which they deal with, or you're duplicating it I think is a kind of thing which we had, I think crossed, a lot earlier. But we already discussed that. But Carlos spoke about this body and mechanism. Of course, we make it very clear that we want to evolve it into a full-fledged organization. And you don't intend it gets out which gets shown in the text if there is a language issue that can be checked. But we're clearly saying that mechanism is a good way to start. But our thinking is that, actually, there should be a body.

And, as to stakeholder consultation, I did mention yesterday at the start that this -- and research and analysis both are two elements of this proposal which needs to be added. And we have -- I have spoken often about OECD's consultative mechanism as the way we should have stakeholder involvement in this body. And the OECD consultative mechanism is considered as a multistakeholder mechanism by ISOC and (indiscernible) and many other people. So, yes, this is our friend. We want stakeholder mechanism involved into this. It should be very formal.

And my proposal is that we should be following the OECD model, which many people think is the best. So that's always intended. And I think that it should address that particular question.

And we would actually would like to write it down in the next phase of developing this proposal. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Parminder.

Could we -- yes, I see the U.K. is seeking the floor. Please, go ahead. U.K., you have the floor.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Russia and Parminder for responding to my question.

If I understand correctly, then, the new body or the new mechanism they are proposing would not make any international Internet-related public policy. It would simply create coordination and coherence among existing bodies. That's what I understood them to say.

So it might be helpful if the text of their recommendations could say clearly this new body or this new mechanism should not make any new Internet public policy. That would help, I think.

If the aim then is only to reduce duplication, and to increase coherence, then the good news is there is already an organization doing that. It's called the United Nations Group on the Internet Society. And I'm just looking at the objectives of UNGIS on their Web site. It says, "UNGIS should complement and add value to existing programs and projects by facilitating synergies and joint efforts so as to maximize coordinated action, coherence, and effectiveness of the support to countries in their efforts towards achieving the WSIS goals agreed upon by the international community."

UNGIS does now this important job of bringing together the different U.N. agencies and trying to improve the coherence in their work on Internet-related and information society related issues.

Now, perhaps one topic we could look at as a group is how UNGIS fulfills that role, whether there are improvements that would be made to make even more coherence. But we don't believe we need yet another mechanism or yet another organization in order to do what UNGIS is already trying to do.

So it would be helpful perhaps if Russia or one of the proponents of this could, first of all, address the question can they add to their proposals that this group should not make additional public duplicate public policy and whether if it is just about coordination and coherence, whether really what they're talking about is UNGIS and the role that it plays. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, U.K. I fear we might get into the discussion I was trying to avoid because I think those points are important and maybe new elements are being brought to the table. But I have some doubts whether what has been said in the last 15, 20 minutes is anything new at all. I think we have had this discussion before. From my recollection, the proponents of that body or institution, they have made clear that coordination would be one of the roles but they envision that in some areas

there will be the development of policy. I think this is understood in light of previous discussions we have had.

Again, I don't see a point in further going back to issues we have been discussing before. I would not stop the discussion. Of course, I have a number of speakers on my list. But I think we are going around - and I don't see any added value to the discussion in relation to see how we'll address those proposals.

I know it's not the right time now, but I would invite everyone one of us, even if we are not doing now to think how this would be reflected in our final report. I think that might be the useful thing to take out of that discussion now, not to have new information. We have had a bank of information in regard to the proposals. I fear we might be engaging again in some repetitive discussion.

I have a number of speakers. I will offer them the floor. I have -- Carlos Afonso, you are seeking the floor? Okay. So one less.

So I have Saudi Arabia, Richard Hill, Parminder, and U.K. Saudi Arabia, would you like to take the floor?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I mean, some of the comment was raised before was said by Richard, Parminder, and Russia.

On the issue of is it development or coordination, it's both. This body will develop. However, it will do also coordination with other U.N. agencies to ensure there is not duplication on methods that are being discussed. It's like UNGA is developing -- or adopting resolution that will go to other U.N. agencies and they will implement this. So this body will have such a policy, and it will be implemented by others, ITU, UNESCO, ILO. So we will have one place to develop international public policy issues. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I think what you are saying is aligned with my recollection of the discussions we have had in previous rounds. Thank you for that Richard Hill followed by Parminder, U.K., and after that I would beg that we close discussion on this and move to the other items that still refers to the description of the same proposal.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Maybe I was not listening carefully. But my understanding of what was proposed differed from Paul's understanding. My understanding is the same as yours and what Saudi now said; namely, that if you find an area where you think there's not enough -- or rather where that mechanism or body finds that there's not enough or missing policy, then they would either develop the policy themselves or invite somebody to do it. So the answer is it's both coordination and policy development.

Then I thought, Chairman -- sorry to contradict you. The discussion I think has given us a new element, which I think is very helpful. U.K. suggests that the U.N -- whatever it's called, GSIS, could be a mechanism that would satisfy this. And Paul read the terms of reference.

From the quick listening to the terms of reference, that did not strike me as being what's being requested here. On the other hand, it struck me that it would be possible to come up with a recommendation that would invite U.N. GSIS to modify its terms of reference to meet the requirement here and that could be an alternative.

But then I would invite the U.K. to actually take that step and to come up with a proposed recommendation whereby that U.N. body would actually meet the requirements that have been set forth here by these proponents, if they wish, of course. It's no obligation to do that.

But if somebody thinks that mechanism is the building block, then they could propose that. As people have done. For example, some people think the UNCSTD is an initial way to achieve some of this and they have come forward with a very specific, concrete proposal. So why not? And that's a very useful element because maybe we could all agree on that, to invite the U.N -- sorry, again, I don't quite remember the acronym, GSIS, whatever it is -- UNGIS, great, thank you -- to invite UNGIS to modify its terms of reference. Maybe we could all agree on that, and that would be a fantastic step forward. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Richard. I think I agree with you that this idea about UNGIS is an offspring of this discussion in a way, and I think this is something we should entertain independently from the discussion we are having to the extent that strengthening UNGIS can help us in further implementing enhanced cooperation.

But I think it's independent from the discussion because I would hand it over to Parminder and later on to Saudi Arabia because I think this falls short of what is the invitation of the proponents. I think that would be sufficient from the perspective of what they intended. I'll give them the floor to speak for themselves.

So I will give the floor to Parminder followed by U.K. and Saudi Arabia. And, please, let's then move on to another agenda -- to another recommendation.

Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Again, to the U.K.'s discussions on this subject, yeah, first of all, I did in describing the kind of work -- public policy work this organization would do first point to areas which are actually not touched by anyone today. Data and Internet platforms were two key examples. So these were not cross-cutting. They were just an independent set of huge number of issues with very important economic, political, and cultural, social significance. That's not even being connected with other organizations.

And as for -- so that's not at all assessment that, oh, well, they would do coordination and no policy because they are cross-cutting because, I mean, I'm sure all of you have great policy experience and hope all the systems work and how horizontal ministries and departments still do policies. I mean, I can give you an example of gender. The gender departments do make policy for women at workplace while the workplace policies are also made by labor department. Indigenous groups' ministries make policies.



Most countries have I.T. departments actually or Internet departments who are making policies which often, you know, interact with health, information systems in health ministry and many systems. They are all making proper policies, and they are just not coordinating. So this body is supposed to make that kind of policy, even in cross-cutting areas apart from the coordination work.

As for UNGIS, as the chair rightly said, this mechanism is a bureaucratic mechanism within the U.N. system and not a political mechanism. And we are looking at a political platform. The difference is very, very clear to all of you much more than it is, perhaps, to me coming from civil society. So we are looking at a political platform which should, therefore, have a connection within this kind of a system. Of course, if you are talking of UNGIS and if Richard is talking about evolution of it, we would also like to talk about multistakeholder participation in UNGIS which you should have noticed is missing, as Carlos noticed has noticed it missing in this particular description, which is really our intention to include.

So there is no stakeholder participation in UNGIS. I don't know where it actually acts. I have been in this area for many years, I have never seen what it has done. Frankly, no disrespect to that organization or group. I think they must be talking about things and then going back and doing things in their own agenda. But I haven't known about this group's actual outputs because that's not the nature of that group, perhaps. So these were my comments on the comments that were made by U.K. for which I thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I turn to the U.K. I don't have a crystal ball, but I think I can guess would be said by Paul.

Please, you have the floor, sir.

>>UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I don't want to start a discussion about topics and gaps. We've had that discussion before. I would -- I have to respond as Parminder said, data, for example, is discussed very often in the ITU. I have been to big data sessions there. The U.N. Human Rights Council has looked at issues here. UNCTAD has looked at data. I think they spent a whole day on it last year. Of course, as well as those -- the IGF looks at these issues and organizations outside the U.N. system looks at these issues. So they are being discussed.

But I understand, I think, now Saudi Arabia told us that this new body or new mechanism will develop policy which just brings me back to my first question, which is how do you either avoid duplication or tell other bodies what they can and can't discuss? And there's no answer to that question yet. And I have to say I'm happy to, you know, discuss these proposals. They're not ones that the U.K. would support, but they would be good to at least understand them because at the moment, it's not clear exactly what would this body do, what relationship will it have with other U.N. bodies, how will it avoid duplication.

If this new body is going to, for example, tell the ITU what they can and can't discuss, how will it do that? The ITU is an organization which has its mandate from its member states. What's the mechanism for telling UNESCO or the ILO what they can and can't discuss?

We really I think need more clarity about exactly what the proposal is. And maybe there's an opportunity in the coming months to maybe refine it, maybe answer some of these questions, and bring a bit more clarity so that we know exactly what the proposal is that's under discussion because at the moment, I'm hearing slightly different answers from different people. And there are just too many questions raised, I think, before we can take this much further forward. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I'd like just before turning to the proponents to hear all the other views and then I turn to you for final comments so that we can move ahead.

I have on my list Mr. Yokozawa who has been waiting patiently. I give him the floor followed by Richard Hill. And then I turn to the proponents for final remarks on that topic. I think then we should move on. Mr. Yokozawa, you have the floor.

>>MAKOTO YOKOZAWA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I very much follow the U.K.'s point that what is discussed here is not the excuse for avoiding the duplication of existing mechanism.

So a good example is in OECD, just as Mr. Parminder Singh has raised. I am somewhat involved in the OECD discussion as a business advisory group. And the CDEP, which is the Committee for Data Economy Process, is not actually a new body, a new mechanism. It is just continuous from the formal committee ICCP, Information and Computing and Communication Policies. And they are talking about the somewhat -- the ICT sector's policies. And what the is the horizontal body in OECD is the Going Digital project. This is not a permanent body. It's a temporary and will be finished with activity maybe in 2019 after giving some report to the policy, to the ministerial.

I think this is a very important point that the -- this enhanced cooperation, the target is not fixed and not scoped clearly, may be subject to change annually and even monthly, a new situation, new environment, a new technology, every month something new is happening. And it is very much subject to the regional environment.

So if we assume some permanent body, permanent mechanism all over the global scale, there is much burden toward the multistakeholder -- every stakeholder including the business. So business can't provide any resource to cope with all of the mechanisms. So it is not efficient, and it is not some excuse to avoid the duplication of the discussion. I think it is very important to think about this situation. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Next is Richard Hill, and then I'll turn to the proponents for their remarks.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Well, maybe I'm simple minded because I didn't find all these problems, questions, gray areas that Paul outlined. I really don't see the problem. For example, the new mechanism or body or whatever it is obviously cannot tell the ITU what to do or not to do because the ITU has its own internal decision-making mechanisms as do all the other organizations.

What it can do is send them a liaison or a recommendation saying, Well, folks, why don't you think about doing this because nobody else is doing it? Or, by the way, why don't you think, for example -- sorry to come back to the same one -- of having a joint activity on spam between ITU and WTO, if you really think that spam also has to be done by the WTO, which I doubt. But anyway, why not? But do it jointly. Don't have the two guys going off in different directions all of a sudden. I don't see a problem.

Now, of course, WTO can still decide to do it any way, even if this body says, Well, think about cooperating and they can still decide not to cooperate. It seems useful -- and I presume all of this would, of course, be public so there would be no secret documents. All this would be public. So everybody would know that this body has said, Well, maybe you two organizations should work together on this same issue and that would also address the duplication problem or lack of duplication raised by our colleague from Japan because I would presume business would not have to go discuss spam both in the WTO and in the ITU. Maybe not. Maybe they like to do that. I don't know.

And where they would do new work is areas where stuff isn't being done. For example, specifically on data, as far as I know, there isn't any work being done at the global level on data protection. And that is something that is sorely needed, including by companies, because let's not forget that the global data -- sorry, the general data protection regulation of the European Union will, according to most people, have extra territorial effects. So I think there's going to be some strange surprises coming forward in the next couple of years when people suddenly realize that a European regulation is affecting businesses, which didn't realize that they had a link to Europe. So I think there is a need to attack that area, and I'm not aware of anybody doing it.

And then I just wanted to say -- to apologize to the U.K. because I was in the ITU last week, and I think I completely misunderstood some of their interventions because some countries actually said very explicitly that they thought that the ITU should have absolutely nothing to do with Internet governance. And I thought the U.K. was one of those, so I apologize because I clearly misunderstood. Because the U.K. has now clearly said that they do see a role for ITU in some aspects of Internet governance. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, let me turn to the proponents for your reaction to the points that were made, and then I suggest we move to the other recommendation. And I think many points that were raised could be taken off line, if you wish. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Very short answer concerning two points. I will speak about (indiscernible) for solving cross-cutting issues because reference to UNGIS, UNGIS is intersecretarial organization established by CAB. No one, not only governments, but also no one is multistakeholder participation there. It is their internal body. They couldn't work under that problem, couldn't coordinate. That's why we propose to have some coordination body to solve cross-cutting issues. ITU do if members allow to do that, provide their (indiscernible) open mandate and under their financial possibilities. Same for UNESCO and other organizations. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. Do any of the proponents wish to take the floor on this? Otherwise -- Parminder. Well, I'd like to ask you both then to coordinate and then immediately you could introduce the next related recommendation.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. I will be very brief. My colleague from the Japanese business community talked about the CDEP was mandated. I closely observed it. I know it's a body which has been -- whose name has been changed to make it CDEP. I can think -- if there is any proposal to change any view and an organization's body to be a digital policy body, I'm open to that proposal. But, of course, there are many areas. I.T.-related bodies are made into digital policy bodies.

Now, that brings us to the point which was raised by U.K. and partly answered by Richard, is about ITU doing it. Now, the problem or the issue with the Internet is Internet is -- you asked -- I mean, we should take our policy cues from how people, society, actually look at the thing we are trying to deal with. They ask people -- you ask people if Internet is just a technical thing.

And most people who have some sophistication don't believe that it is a technology. They don't think of it as a technology. It is a social, political, economic thing. Therefore, we need non-technical body to make Internet-related policies.

And everybody knows ITU is a technical body. It should look at the technical aspects. Although I also remember that all these countries said that the ITU should not make Internet-related policies. So It's not just technical. Technical side is ITU's. People need to accept that Internet is simply a marketplace or place of commerce, which is the role which WTO will play. I know people have very strong feelings that Internet is cultural. It's social. And these are cross-cutting aspects which the body we are talking about should look into. And, as the OECD-P is starting to do work, we should be doing larger work in terms of the digital society. And that's the role we look at. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Can we then move to the next paragraph, next bullet point with regard to the description of the mechanism?

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I just would like to react on the recent comments made by Paul. The issues of why we need such mechanisms was discussed 10 years ago.

If we read paragraph 60 from Tunis Agenda, we further recognize that there are many cross-cutting policy issues that require attention, are not -- are not adequately addressed by current mechanisms. So we have mechanisms in different U.N. agencies they're not coordinated with the development. For example, we go to ITU and we try to develop policy. But we hear from others who are here in the room that we don't have the mandate to develop such policy. So we should make it clear now. Do we have a current mechanism that enabling us as government to go? If yes, please name it and then we can put this on paper as a reference. If not, we don't have, we should develop a body or a mechanism in order to achieve paragraphs 69, 70, and 71. It's very simple.

Now, I'll go to the other recommendation, Mr. Chairman, which is -- I mean, as we discussed, this is a continuation that this body will develop the appropriate relationship with relevant existing policy bodies

either inside or outside the ITU or the U.N. We do not work in isolation. Either we work with technical or non-technical community that those have direct relationship with public policy issues. So we will provide guidance by this body with the cross-cutting themes. And you'll receive their important comments on what policy will be developed. This body will not work in isolation or will not push anyone outside the scope of enhanced cooperation. We have a multistakeholder model agreed by Tunis, but we have different roles and responsibilities.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Again, this paragraph provides more detail on how the mechanisms or body should work or should be envisaged some features. In a way, the issue as a whole has been addressed extensively. In this session and elsewhere, I would seek comments in regard to specific elements that are contained in this paragraph that should deserve further attention from the plenary.

Otherwise, I would suggest we move on. But let me just clear whether there are points to be addressed on -- maybe the language before us has some different approach or some different outline in regard to what was said before that might deserve some new discussion.

Otherwise, I would tend to think that the notions here have already been already an object of discussion among participants.

I see no one requesting for the floor. I assume then, I think as a whole, the proposal has been discussed in -- at least in regard to these four paragraphs. And part of the elements, the arguments that were voiced applied to the whole section. So I would invite Saudi Arabia to introduce the second-to-last paragraph related to relationship with IGF.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We know from UNGA or from Tunis Agenda that Internet governance has two processes, enhanced cooperation and IGF. By this recommendation we'll establish a close relationship by the two processes. So by that I mean they will speak to each other. They will not work in isolation, and they will complement each other. This is ensured.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And this paragraph deals with this. As you have just said, the relationship between IGF and enhanced cooperation, as we know the General Assembly has been repeatedly making calls for the two processes to be complementary, that they are distinct but should be working a mutually reinforcing way.

The issue or -- I don't want to use the problem -- is that this is framed here in the context of the creation of a new body/mechanism which has been opposed by some. So I think the idea of having coordination, interaction between enhanced cooperation, IGF is well-taken on board as part of the background in which we are working. But I think here there is this fundamental element that this is, indeed, a paragraph attached to the creation of a new body/mechanism.

I'm not sure if there is any particular aspect that should be addressed here or if the discussion as a whole is encompassed in that dichotomy that I believe -- think this discussion we're having here

confirms. I do not see, for the moment, any ground for trying to work on common language that would address everyone's concern. But I stand to be corrected.

Are there any views in that regard? I see none, no requests for the floor.

Could I invite you to introduce the next paragraph, it would be the ninth, second-to-last paragraph in your joint proposal.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. This recommendation tried to capture the work that was done by the previous working group on the mapping exercise. And we can use that list of international public policy issues and gaps as a fair list to work on by the body/mechanisms to be developed. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I open the floor for comments. Again here I think that refers to the need to address things related to new issues, emerging issues that are continuously coming up. Again, maybe the difficulty for some will be that this is in this paragraph attached to the creation of new body/mechanisms. The concept of addressing new issues, emerging issues is, I think, we have discussed it before in another context. But here together with this creation of a new body/mechanism, may I seek your views, if any.

Richard Hill.

>>RICHARD HILL: Yeah, I think this is an excellent proposal. I would tweak it slightly because it's not just further revisions of the policy issues, mapping paper, but also the inputs to our group. I think we had many inputs that identified specific areas where more work might be needed. And that could also go to address, to some extent, the point the U.K. made. What exactly would this body do? Where are the gaps? And, Chairman, I just draw attention to my 40-page paper, which identifies a large number of gaps, which, in my opinion, deserve working on. I'm not saying they do. But that's the kind of thing which would go out to the group. And then the group would scratch its head and say, well, yes, we think something needs to be done or it's not necessary.

I'll mention another specific one. I mentioned data protection before. But another specific one, which is abuse of dominant power by platforms. We know the European Commission has taken actions against some companies. And I know national regulators have also done so. And these are documented in the paper.

But we're missing a global body. So who is going to take care of global competition issues? If a company is abusing its market power but not in Europe, nobody is going to do anything about it. But that could be a problem for the whole rest of the world. So that is, to me, clearly an issue where something needs to be done. I don't think it's going to be solved in a short period of time. But, if you don't start looking at that and talking about it, it will never be resolved.

For example, taxation issue is another one. Now that is being tackled by the OECD. I think it's a shame it's being done by the OECD and not a U.N. body. But there was a need to tackle the global taxation issue arising out of the information economy, and steps are being taken in that direction. Again, it would be better, in my opinion, if it were the U.N. But at least somebody is doing something. So I think

that this kind of list would be very helpful to that body/mechanism to look at whether -- well, yes, really there is an issue that needs looking at at the global level or, no, maybe not. Thank you, Chairman.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you for your comments, Richard.

Peter?

>>PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Chairman. I think my recollection is that the mapping paper has been forwarded to the ECOSOC and through ECOSOC to the UNGA in the framework of the WSIS+10 review. And I would like to ask the secretariat to confirm my understanding. Am I right.

>> You are.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I see no further requests for the floor.

May I request Saudi Arabia to introduce the last paragraph in your proposal and -- yes, please, go ahead, sir.

>>SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, Chair. As Mr. Peter Major said, the mapping wasn't to the WSIS+10 but still a valid document can be used to develop that and evolve in the next period of time.

The last contribution is, as you said before, that, if we have flexibility, maybe we could start by committee or an open-ended working group. And this would evolve into a body of mechanisms in UNGA or a specialized U.N. agency such as ITU with their expertise or something would be similar to CSTD, special commission for this purpose. I mean, this would be discussed in future after the decision of UNGA to establish such mechanisms. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I open the floor for comments. I think that relates, to some extent, to second paragraph on the top of the page. That also refers to different ways this new body/mechanism could be organized. And I then provide some examples or ideas on how this could be hosted.

So I would seek comments, if any, on the proposal by -- and always reminding that this is always -- everything is in the context of the proposal creation of a new body/mechanism.

Are there any -- yes, Cuba.

THE COURT: I wanted to say, just finishing this session, that this last paragraph shows the flexibility of this proposal. Because, if some of the arguments against creating a body/mechanism is to create a new thing because of a budget implication, some organization, this gives the opportunity to create this function. If the word "mechanism" is not of a liking, you can say this "function." A function that is clearly identified in the Tunis Agenda and also in the WSIS+10 documents.

So this last paragraph gives the way that this function could be created within an existing structure or agency in United Nations. As Richard said before, there's been some proposal already doing CSTD. But it could be in whatever order existed in United Nations.

And with this I want to urge everybody here, instead of trying to entrench in any position, to try to get the feeling of problem solving what is here.

I was very glad to listen to the proposal of UNGIS. Because I think it's a positive thinking of trying to feel the way. Although, of course, it was mentioned that UNGIS is not for member state. It's only secretariat. But it could -- it's a good way to think in that way because maybe this new thing could be -- because what UNGIS does, it will be needed because all the agencies -- because this is very cross-cutting -- will need to coordinate. So I think to mention or to bring into this conversation the excesses of UNGIS, I think it's a very valuable contribution for this discussion. Because I think it really will have a role in whatever thing is done.

But the clear thing here is that public policies, international public policies related to Internet are needed and are needed to be done in a transparent and coherent way. And I'm really surprised that the countries that are more to be benefited by this are developed countries that rely more on Internet. The developing countries that are not relying on Internet or at the low level for their economy and for the society, it's more resilient. And they really don't need a global clear policy with transparency and clear rules.

I think that developed countries are the ones who most need a process, a clear process with transparency, with due process, rule of law for the Internet.

So I urge you to tackle this problem that we have at hand as a working group. I don't know if you realize the importance of this working group. Because this is a technology that is very important for the world.

And to really -- because of some position now or because I'm telling this and we will have an opportunity to go back to our capitals and think with our seniors. Sometimes I have to defend a position here that maybe my senior doesn't have it. And I have to go back and convince them. That's also my role as an expert, not only toward you but also towards our seniors. And that's a position that everybody here has to do. And we that's supposed to be experts in this field know the importance of this and know that there's a problem. Because I don't want to mention cybersecurity because I know that's a sensitive topic not to mix here. But it's the elephant in the room. This is another thing that is very important in the Internet in general. Now all this artificial intelligence, Internet of things, all that needs some sort of regulation. Or, if the word "regulation" is too strong, at least some policy, some common understanding. If the word "policy" is also so strong, you need some global understanding in order to make those technologies really good for the humankind.

And this was the kind of thing that I wanted to say before, Chairman. Please excuse me for taking this time here. I'm urging because I really feel -- I'm optimistic. Because I don't know if you read -- I sent you yesterday a link to some preface that was made by Nitin Desai, who was the chairman of WGIG. He mentioned a lot of things. But he mentioned that the best thing that the WGIG had was this friendship and coordination and willing of work of all the members.

I can feel that here we have the same rapport. Because, although we have these confrontations, we all have this mutual interest on having this work done.



And I think that we can do it. I'm optimist like Mr. Peter Major that we can do it if we keep this in mind. Maybe we cannot get out of this meeting but at least with some ideas and go back to our capitals and rethink this in a way. I think all the argument -- or I don't know how you say -- all the positions that have been said here are solvable. Because it's understandable that, for budget reason or whatever, the creator of new body or new institution with secretariat, that's something that cannot be tackled right. But there are ways to go around that.

Also the concern for the rest of the stakeholders participation, that was a problem. But it was solve in CSTD, and it can be solved in proper ways. I think if we put our minds together, all these obstacles maybe are more in our minds than in reality. We can work around that. And I'm really optimistic. I think we can do it for the next section of this. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you, Juan. As we come to the end of this document, I would like to acknowledge as you have done that this document -- and I think the importance of discussing it is that it reflects, I think, kind of state-of-the-art on the part of the proponents in regard to maximum flexibility and elements that could be incorporated without, let's say, changing fundamentally their ideas but that could maybe entertain by the group in order to achieve consensus. I recognize the attempt in that regard, and I think it was worthwhile to have engaged in that discussion.

However, from the chair in light of all the mountain of discussions we have had so far, I fear that we can continue to engage in an exercise towards coming to a common understanding, as you have been calling us, to common language. But I don't think that will be the case because I have had very strong -- not me, but we have all heard very strong expressions of opposition to the idea, no matter how we portray it. For some, it is a Frankenstein. We can beautify it, put some lipstick but to some it would still be Frankenstein. That's part of the reality. We cannot change through language something that in reality have very clear opposing camps. So I would certainly encourage further work to be done in that regard. As the chair, I also have the responsibility to call to your attention that we are approaching the end of our exercise. So I think at some point we must recognize very transparently, very fairly that we have done our best in regard -- we have identified issues that it is, I think -- there is unanimous -- might be a unanimous assessment that something should be done to the benefit of our common goal. But in other areas, there are differences that will not be reconciled at this point. Maybe never. I don't know.

So I think this is as far as we can get. We cannot artificially -- we used to say sometimes we cannot artificially create consensus. We cannot artificially prolong discussions. It will be, I think, a loss of time; and we don't have time anyway. So I think there are still a few people who want to intervene. I will give them the floor.

But I would suggest that for the moment, we close discussion on this we'll come back to it when we discuss how this will be reflected in our report. But I don't see there might be any reason for prolonging discussion as of now.

And one thing just before giving the floor -- I have U.S. and Parminder -- I'd like to suggest that if all of you could entertain to stay, like, 15 or 20 minutes more because I think if we could we could have a look at our revised proposal coming from Nick, I think that would allow us to have a first round at least of all,

let's say -- not all the proposals in the new inputs because I take the point by Richard Hill that he has many ideas that were not looked into individually here. And I thank Richard for the flexibility to invite people to bring to the table, those participants who might lead to consensus. But he refrained from proposing each and every individual recommendation should be discussed, and I think it was a very large dose of flexibility. I would like to thank him for that.

But I'd like to propose then to spend, like, 15 or 20 minutes more so we can conclude discussion on other elements. And then I will indicate the way forward for our work tomorrow.

With this, I turn to the U.S. followed by Parminder.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Since we didn't comment on a lot of these latter ones, I would just like to add one point back to our original comment that the U.S. doesn't support this approach because it violates our longstanding position on multistakeholder discussions when it relates to the Internet.

And I would just highlight that, you know, it's interesting that the one entity that's kind of pulled out from that is the multistakeholder one, and then there's other intergovernmental bodies that are discussed. And, you know, having seen this play out a few years now, not only is multistakeholder -- those are not multistakeholder in their discussions, there's a real fight to keep stakeholders out of those discussions that we've seen at UNGA, that we've seen at the ITU, and that, you know, we've seen at CSTD frankly. And so, you know, there's different levels, but there is this fight against having any kind of participation.

And so I think we need to be aware of that as we look at having these discussions that would seem to run counter to what we've agreed to in the WSIS documents and WSIS+10.

As far as next steps, I just kind of have to reiterate, I can't leave the fourth meeting of this working group and take a document back to my capital having not presented my recommendations.

So as much as I'm willing to listen to the others, I believe we should go through any outstanding recommendations that haven't been presented. I don't think there are many, but we do have some.

And I don't know if we be able to get to that in 15 minutes tonight. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Just for clarification, my proposal -- I take on board your wish to refer to your proposals that were presented in previous rounds of discussion, previous meetings. I was proposing that we focus on the proposals that were put to this, submitted to this fourth meeting. We have reviewed the contents of all the proposals. But in regard to Nick's proposal, I think there is some revised text that maybe we could look at it quickly.

And then tomorrow morning, I will allow time for you and any other who wants to refer to their previous proposals. It was just, let's say, try to finalize today the inputs submitted to this meeting.

U.S., yes, follow-up.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. That plan is fine. Just to clarify, we've never had a discussion of our proposals. So these would be new proposals to this group. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Yes, absolutely.

Richard.

>>RICHARD HILL: I'm not quite sure that's correct. If my memory is right, but I may be wrong -- I stand ready to be corrected -- I recall, Chairman, we had a group that identified recommendations which we thought would quickly reach consensus. It turns out they didn't. But I suspect some of the U.S. ones were there. If there weren't, then the point doesn't apply. If they were, I'm not saying they shouldn't be reintroduced, but then perhaps they could be reintroduced with some amendments reflecting the comments that were made that prevented them from reaching consensus in the first round. So I would urge people maybe to present different versions if they'd already been discussed. If not, of course not. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Well, we can easily solve, the secretariat. My memory really isn't helping much at this time. But I think we have a set of recommendations from the U.K., from the U.S., and from European Union that they overlapped. I'm not sure we looked specifically at the U.S. recommendations. Maybe looked at other set of recommendations that also refer to the U.S. but not specifically, but maybe you can provide some clarification.

>>UNITED STATES: I think there was just a structuring problem where a lot of our recommendations were included as one. There was maybe some controversial ones so the whole thing was discarded. We have broken those out. I will try tomorrow to limit ones that have already been discussed and just focus on new proposals. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: I think much of the substance has already been covered by our discussion yesterday and today. So to the extent you could limit to new aspects, that would be very helpful.

So, yes, Mexico -- Parminder. Yes, you have the floor.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Let me first respond to the point which U.S. delegate made about there being exclusion of stakeholders from U.N. processes. He even said that CSTD processes are excluding stakeholders. I clearly didn't understand what that exclusion is. But then among many other processes, I think perhaps should also be mentioned the principle space in which the U.S. and many other countries are trying to take the digital policy to, which is trade. Perhaps WTO and its exclusions should also have been mentioned. I'm making a presentation tomorrow at a public forum on these issues, the WTO public platform.

And the problem is digital policy is now moving into trade areas led by many northern countries, and these spaces are more trans- -- and less transparent than any other space. And negotiating positions in these spaces are not even made available to parliaments much less to all stakeholders. So these exclusions I think are very key. And if there is a new body which deals with Internet policy outside the trade policies, I think, which in any case would be a few times more open than the trade spaces which

are the principle spaces, where the digital policy is being taken by many countries and I must have to include among them is the U.S.

The main reason I asked for this intervention was this thing that when we started to put this proposal on the screen, there was already a lot of emotion that let's not discuss it kind of things. I'm sorry to say, even -- the chair was kind of saying let's not discuss it because it won't get consensus. We went through a long discussion, and it has been very useful.

And I think now in the final closing, you expressed the fact that in his view it will not get consensus and such. I think what is happening is that one kind of strong opinion in the room is being presented. And that's a fact. And I agree with the chair, that's a fact. But it is a strong opinion but which I think people who are holding that opinion have not been very expressive, I think just out of being good and, you know, not being aggressive. But I think it should have been understood that there's a very strong opinion, which is other strong opinion -- and I will use the words that the chair used, being a Frankenstein with lipstick. There's another Frankenstein which is not acceptable with any kind of lipstick which is endorsement of the status quo. We will not sign a report that endorses the status quo is a bigger Frankenstein with any kind of lipstick which will not be signed by many of us. That's not a lesser thing than the Frankenstein which other people are seeing merely in creating a public policy body to look at public policy issues, which is a very normal thing governments and U.N. does. If that's a Frankenstein, status quo is a worse Frankenstein. And we have been saying we will not sign a report which does not address the critical issue of whether or not public policy mechanisms are needed.

And I think this is the time now, we are towards the end of the whole phase -- second phase that this strong opinion is put on the table that unless there is some views clearly put about moving forward, not again saying that there should be more transparency, which is not what we're going to sign on. Unless there is a movement forward, there is no report because any report which has a body but does not say anything on these issues is an endorsement of status quo. And I think we don't know of a bigger Frankenstein in this area than that. Thank you.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. And, Parminder, I didn't mean to use an expression that would be offensive. It just strike me -- and I think you're right. There are different Frankensteins around the room depending on your perspective.

What I meant to say was there are some issues that for some in the group are so, let's say unworkable that would have that kind of reaction very strong, very emotional in regard to that. And that is also part as you have said.

And I think I agree with you. I think we are not doing it now; but when we look at the report, we must make sure, make clear for all of us, that a report must be a piece of a -- a document that is owned by all of us but that satisfies equally or sometimes people say dissatisfies equally everyone. So I think everyone should look at the document and see even if you don't achieve your maximal goal but to see that it is in a balanced way and a way that you can live with that represents the reality, I think, of what took place. I think I actually agree.

And in regard to status quo, I think we are tasked not to simply maintain status quo. I think even those areas in which even Richard has been using the expression "motherhood and apple pie," I think even in those areas that sometimes we are referring to notions that may seem too modest. But I think we can do it in a way that, indeed, leads to some improvement that takes us a step beyond of what we have. So I don't think it would be, let's say, simply maintaining status quo.

But I think, on the other hand, the important issues for members of the group, even if we cannot at the end of the day achieve full consensus, we must make -- collectively agree on a way how to reflect that so everyone will feel that their views, if not accepted by others, at least are reflected in the right perspective. I think that's the objective I would have.

And just if I may just correct one thing you said, I did not say we should not discuss the proposal. I should say that upon discussing the proposal, I made clear I would give the floor to anyone and I did that. I did not stop discussion. I just made a call for not to repeat the same argument we have been expressing in previous rounds because I think that this has taken place. I think this would not be helpful to the process, but I was not saying let's not discuss. But let's not duplicate and repeat things that were said before, just for the record.

But I think the point that I was maybe in that particular aspect taking a different approach as in other areas. But this is in light of the history of the discussion, and I don't want to be seen as someone who is trying to guide the process or impose on you. I'm trying be responsive to the things I have been hearing since last year. Well, I have been working on this for six years now. So there are things I have been hearing a lot in many, many fora. So with this -- but I thank you.

I'd like, if you allow me then, to request Nick -- to give the floor to Nick Ashton-Hart. I understand he has a revised proposal. Maybe the secretariat can put it on screen, the one received from Nick. I think that would capture the essence of his contribution, a recommendation that we have looked into in another stage of our work. I think yesterday. And maybe if we can have a quick look at it and make sure that reflects inputs and comments that were made, I think that might be very useful for us at this stage.

Nick, would you like to speak to your proposal?

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: Thank you, Chair. But I have to say, with seven minutes to go, I'm not sure that this is really equal treatment of proposals question, nor would anyone -- I mean, I know you don't mean anything by it.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: No one left the room.

>>NICK ASHTON-HART: But I'm sure people would like to. Probably people are hungry.

[ Laughter ]

I know I am. And so I just -- I hesitate to say that this is -- that there's really a time to even take more than a comment, let alone really consider this in five to seven minutes. I certainly don't want to be the one standing on the side of people's dinner -- standing in the way of people's dinners.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: As you wish. I think -- as I said, I see no one leaving the room. I think people respected your right to present the proposal. But if you wish -- what -- maybe we could take -- maybe you could introduce the proposal and we can have some -- if there are too many interveners, maybe we can leave it for tomorrow. But maybe there can be some low-hanging fruit for us and we can get out of the room with something positive.

I see, yeah, a number -- I don't think that will fly. U.S., Richard Hill, and Parminder.

>>UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Two quick points. One, I think we had established at the beginning of this we didn't want to get into the habit of long hours because I think it becomes counterproductive as we have seen in past working groups.

But also to Nick's proposal, it's in some ways similar to a U.S. proposal so it might be better for us to discuss -- I know you look at me. It in some way it is similar to a U.S. proposal. It might good for us to look at and bring it back in the morning and see if there's a way to bring the two together.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Richard?

>>RICHARD HILL: No, I agree with Nick here. We should do him justice and look at this proposal with a fresh mind in the morning. It's actually not a simple proposal to understand. And there are implications. And some of you have noticed on the list that Constance put up a proposal, and then I put up a counter proposal. And then Nick has just sent is some additional information, which I'm reading through which is about 53 pages. So I'm not the only one sending long documents around. So I think we should do justice to Nick and defer this until tomorrow.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you. I was not following the list. I didn't -- I was not aware of that kind of interaction. And I think -- I agree with you. In that light gets much more complex than what I was envisaging. Parminder.

>>PARMINDER SINGH: Thank you, Chair. One is a question of the process now. People are making changes in proposals and they're going up. My question is tomorrow morning, if we, as the group that submitted this proposal, now brings the whole proposal again and some changed elements with inputs, would it be discussed?

Because I have a feeling when our proposal comes there's already a feeling of let's not discuss it.

In that background, let me say that Nick's proposal has a huge problem. And I think we should get more straightforward rather than less, as we have been earlier to be good to our proposals and let them discuss. This proposal has nothing to do with enhanced cooperation. It talks about subject matter policy making. What would be the nature of the policies? I think it would be disrespectful to the system to tell them that be sure you don't damage anything else. Why would anybody make a policy which negatively impacts something? First of all, this is a substantive policy making. We're not dealing with substantive policy making. There's a huge list from WGIG with 50 or 80 policies. Richard has contributed new things. None of them have been discussed. this is not institutional system or even

academics about institutional system. It's the nature of the output of institutional system. I think that layer is not being discussed.

Secondly, I can't give an instruction to any system which don't make a policy which I would say don't make a policy which negatively hits women's rights, which negatively hits general prosperity of people. There's nothing in this proposal which merits to be coming out in newer and newer forms and being discussed with more enthusiasm than the core relevant area proposals which we discussed and which we could also in the morning come up with some changes. And I think there is a need for greater parity. Actually, not parity. Looking at relevance. Relevance is as important as correctness. I've been saying this since yesterday. Relevance here is institutional systems, we agree or not. That's different. But relevant is primary, and this is not relevant.

>>CHAIR FONSECA: Thank you Parminder. I think we'll be engaging in the kind of discussion I think we should have when we're discussing the substance of Nick's proposal.

I would then take the point it's not the time to do it now. So we resume tomorrow. I think you made a point about -- because my invitation to allow Nick was I think that was kind of follow-up to his presentation in which it was requested from him to reformulate and bring it back to the group.

However, I should think that we should take the same approach with regard to all the proposals that were submitted. I take the point that Jimson received in a way the same kind of request -- the same applies to Paul and to others. So, when we resume tomorrow, let's -- let me think on how to propose we have a fair treatment. Also take into account that there are other contributions that have not had the chance to have even a first reading as the U.S. and others. So we'll have to make time management adequate to consider that.

I would love if we could have time to revisit and have a second read of everything. But maybe in the light of ensuring fair treatment to all proposals, we should start with those who have not yet had an opportunity to have a first reading yet, and then we move to revised proposals. That's probably what I will propose for tomorrow morning. I thank you for that. So thank you all for this meeting. I agree it was quite helpful to help us to further elaborate on ideas.

Again, I repeat from my perspective, all the discussions we're having I'm trying to figure out how this would feed into the report. And this is something I'd like to invite you to consider tomorrow I think afternoon at some point, especially in regard to the follow-up of our work.

So thank you very much. I wish you a good night. See you tomorrow here. And, please, let's start at 10:00 sharp tomorrow. It's our last day. We'll not have much opportunity -- there's no time to waste. Look forward to seeing you here. Thank you very much. Night.