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>> All the contributions we have received are supportive of these opinions. However, some of the contributions have noticed that there is some overlap between Opinion 3 and Opinion 4. Now, in order to resolve the issue of whether we will be ending up with one opinion or two, I would like to propose a slightly different order of agenda for today. To begin with, I would like to call upon all contributors to present their contributions briefly and in summary. I would then like to open the topic of whether or not to combine Opinions 3 and four or whether to keep them separate. Once we have reached agreement on that, we will either be discussing a single unified opinion or we will take Opinion 3 and then Opinion 4 and their related contributions.

As we have very limited time, I would appeal to all speakers in your presentations, in your interventions. Please summarize your comments and try and make them as brief and succinct as possible. With this, if there are no objections to the agenda for today, I would like to move on to the contributions we have received. As I see none, I would like to call upon the following delegations that have contributions on these related opinions to make their contributions. First off, I would like to call upon the delegation of the USA to make their contributions. USA, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good morning, everyone. I'd like to reiterate what was introduced yesterday by the United States which is that the U.S. is prepared to endorse Opinions 3 and 4 as presented in the Annex to the Secretary General's report and agreed to by the IEG. While not perfect, the U.S. finds Opinions 3 and 4 as generally consistent with encouraging the rapid adoption of IPv6, the importance of capacity building and support for the multistakeholder approach to IP address allocation and policy.

>> INTERPRETER: Could you slow down. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES: Which could be time used sharing and the migration of IPv6. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, USA. Next up I'd like to call upon the delegation of Turkey to make their presentation. Turkey, you have the floor.

>> TURKEY: Thank you, chairs. IPv4 through IPv6 requires technical by all relevant stakeholders. IPv6 ‑‑ deployment in a timely manner are really important for all Member States and sector members ‑‑ the level of the use of IPv6 contents developed under IPv6 needs to enhance accordingly. Therefore, proposes ‑‑ included in the draft opinion as Secretary General can assist Member States and sector members on this issue. I will propose the streets requests Secretary General implementation of relevant activities of ITU to support capacity building of Member States for IPv4, IPv6 and also we think that since the draft opinion and force have many things in common proposed the merging of the draft Opinion 3 and 4 into one document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Turkey.

Next up I'd like to call upon RIPP NCC to call upon their contribution. RIPE NCC, you have the floor.

>> RIPE NCC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak to our comments on these opinions. We respect the effort and the compromise that went into drafting these two opinions on a very important you for the global Internet community and one that is obviously very close to the interests, activities of the regional Internet registries. We believe that the two opinions address two quite different and distinct areas of concern and interest for Member States and other members of the global Internet community. And we look forward to discussing further the issues raised by them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Next up, we have ISOC? ISOC, you have the floor.

>> ISOC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As our contribution was introduced yesterday, I'd like to point out the fact that for Opinions 3 and 4 and IP addressing that we have always been a strong advocate for the deployment of IPv6 and the support for the community‑driven process to discuss the policies and practices within regions and want to encourage everyone to become involved in that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Annex the up we have Australia. Australia? You have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank You, Chair. Australia recognizes the importance of the transition from IPv4 to IPv6 that is the focus of draft Opinions 3 and 4. As draft Opinion 3 notes, this is an important issue for ITU Member States and sector members. Australia supports Opinion 3's emphasis on the importance of capacity building in the effective deployment of IPv6. Australia also supports Opinion 4's emphasis on the importance of IPv6 adoption and the role the public sector can play.

In our country, the Australian government has a strategy to have all government agencies IPv6 ready by the end of 2013. At the end of last year, the majority of agencies reported that they were already IPv6‑enabled. This entails a significant investment, but it is important in order to drive demand for IPv6 content, services and equipment across Australia more broadly.

While we had proposed changes to the two opinions because of their similarity, in recognition of the consensus achieved by the IEG, Australia supports adoption of Draft Opinions 3 and 4 in their current form. So we would like to withdraw our earlier suggestion of merging the two documents. Thank You, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Australia. I believe your final comment has actually jumped my next comment somewhat. As such, I was going to appeal to the contributors to try and adopt the current forms to avoid any opening up of the text the because of the very delicate and precise work that was carried out in the IEG. But thank you very much, Australia, for your consensus approach.

I believe right now we have only one contribute or that has proposed the merging of the two. If Turkey wishes, I would give them the floor, or I can open up the floor for comments to discuss whether or not to merge Opinions 3 and 4 together. Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good morning. Sabah al‑na or noor, both of them. Australia, although they were right to some extent that they are overlapping, but take into account of the prevailing situation and the very limited time available to all of us, they were very, very collaborative. This is a good sign that everybody working together. WPTF 13 would put a record of the mutual collaboration between all parties, member or non‑member of the ITU and so on.

Chairman, I think although there might be some overlapping, time is of essence. And I believe that it might be appropriate that we leave these two opinions separate, knowing that there might be some overlapping, but this overlapping is harmless, and proceeding with the two opinions as a separate opinion and perhaps requesting all distinguished colleagues to join the consensus that we retain the two opinions as a separate opinion without merging them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran, for your words of support.

Before we move on, I'd like to ask if there are any other comments on the topic of merging Opinions 3 and 4 or keeping them separate? UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank You, Chair, and good morning, colleagues.

The UK would prefer to keep the current two opinions separate. These were reached from the experts group. They're not perfect by any means, but they are a good compromise. And so we would prefer that the draft opinions are kept separate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UK.

As I do not have any more requests for the floor, I would like to ask Turkey if they insist on their contribution of merging Opinions 3 and 4. Turkey, you have the floor.

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Actually, as I see from the floor and also I received some other comments when I was having coffee outside of this conference room. As far as I see, most of the Member States are in favor not to merge those two opinions and keep them separately, so Turkey will not insist on merging. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Turkey, thank you very much for your spirit of compromise.

With that, I believe we have reached consensus that we will keep Opinions 3 and 4 separate. If there are no objections or requests for the floor, I propose we move on to looking at the contributions to Opinion 3. As I see none, we will proceed now with Opinion 3.

On Opinion 3 which is supporting capacity building for the deployment of IPv6, we have a proposal from Turkey to add "requests the BDT director to ensure effective implementation." I would like to open up the floor for comments.

My apologies. Turkey, if you could provide some clarification or input on your contribution? Turkey?

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, but not Secretary General, it should be Secretary General, not the director of BDT, so I want to correct it. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Sorry about that, Turkey.

So, moving on, I would like to open up the floor for comments on this. The full text reads "requests the Secretary General to ensure effective implementation of relevant programmes and activities of ITU to support capacity building of Member States for IPv4 to IPv6 transition."

Do I have any requests for the floor Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. While the comment of our distinguished colleague from Turkey is a valid comment, but I wonder whether we really need to add that one for the following reasons: We have several resolutions of WTDC, WTSA and plenipotentiary, all of them in the term that they have either the ‑‑ or they invite – Secretary-General. And I'm sure the Secretary General has already taken all necessary actions that is possible. And I'm sure that he will not ‑‑ continue to do as such in the future. So I wonder whether we really need at this stage to add this paragraph to the text. Perhaps all previous resolutions already addressing the matter. And, in fact, the resolution of WTSA or WTDC or plenipot have their own weight and own power, therefore, perhaps, Chairman, perhaps at this stage we may not need to add anything. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran.

Do I have any other requests for the floor? As I see none, I would call upon Turkey, if you could explain the rationale and the intent behind this contribution so that we could better understand its potential benefit and impact to the opinion. Turkey, you have the floor.

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The rationale behind this proposal was to increase the level of IPv6 contents on the IPv6 needs to be enhanced, you know, accordingly. You know, transition from IPv4 to IPv6 requires technical operation and management capability nationwide, harmonize the Fort by all stakeholders. So IPv6 addresses deployments in a timely manner are very important for all Member States and sector members. That was the rationale behind. We wanted to recast Secretary General to ensure relevant capacity by IPv6 transition because we believe that we also know that there are some similar sentences in some other documents. But we wanted to emphasize it once more because we believe the importance of transition from IPv4 to IPv6. That was the rationale behind our proposal. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Turkey.

I'd like to note that basically first off, this additional request is contained in WTDC10, resolution 63, plenipotentiary 10, resolution 180 and WTSA12, resolution 64.

We also note that this may fall under the D sector more than any others. But I believe that is a point of some specificity here. With those comments, I would ask the floor if there is any strong objection to adopting this additional text. As I see none ‑‑ USA, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I wouldn't articulate this as strong objection, but just following up on your previous comments. It is the view of the United States that if we do contain such text, we think it would be most appropriate to ask the Director of the Development Bureau rather than the Secretary General, unless there can be maybe some additional comments with respect to how this would go beyond the development sector, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Burkina Faso, you have the floor.

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chairman. For our part, we also would like to stress the fact that in the last part of Res Opinion 3, capacity building implicit rather than explicit, and that is how we understand the proposal of Turkey to request the Secretary-General or the director of BDT. We do agree we do need an explicit mention of capacity building in this last part. This was missing before. It wasn't really explicit. We don't have a specific proposal, but we would like to see something that makes this capacity building explicit so that Member States can have ownership, also, of this capacity building offered by ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Burkina Faso, Czech Republic, you have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning to everybody.

We are of the opinion that the opinion as it is quite good and quite sufficient. And therefore we do not wish to change the wording. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Czech Republic. UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank You, Chair. Just like to concur with my Czech Republic colleague. We prefer that there be no change in the text. If there is, then we would concur with the U.S. that we should instruct the director of BDT. This is clearly a development capacity building issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UK.

As has been noted in Working Group 1 and in various discussions and comments, this text was the result of lengthy debates, lengthy negotiations, lengthy discussions in the IEG. So I understand that many Member States would prefer or many delegates would prefer to keep the text as is.

In the spirit of compromise, I would ask Turkey if they would accept having the text added to the report of the session and the chairman's report with one change, which is that requests the Director of the BDT to ensure effective implementation. Turkey, you have the floor.

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. For the sake of compromise, we accept your proposal. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Turkey.

Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We don't have any difficulty with the thrust of your proposal, but the text and wording need to be worked out and that is something to be done outside the meeting. In the report we could not say that request the director of BDT. So we have to do it in different manner and different language but in essence we agree with your proposal, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Your comments will be noted and will be taken into consideration.

I note that under Opinion 3, we do not have any further contributions. As such, I move that we accept and ratify Opinion 3 in this Working Group.

[Applause.]

Thank you very much. I very much appreciate the spirit of compromise I'm seeing today.

Moving forward, we now have Opinion 4. And Opinion 4 is the support of IPv6 adoption and transition from IPv4. Côte d'Ivoire, are you requesting the floor? Okay. I note that under Opinion 4, we don't have any specific proposals as the relevant proposals were concerned on the merging, which we have already reached consensus on. Therefore, I would like to ask if there are any comments on Opinion 4. I see no requests for the floor ‑‑ no. RIPE NCC, you have the floor.

>> RIPE NCC: Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to speak to our submission on this topic. Opinion 4 touches on various issues for the global Internet community which are related to IPv4 address space exhaustion. Our opinion provides further information on these issues, and we hope the delegates and others will find this useful.

While we're content to support the text as it stands, the RIRs have some concerns about the possibility for misinterpretation of certain points made in the opinion. As an example, point G is of the view section refers to legacy addresses which may not be subject to current policies of the RIRs. In fact, all legacy space is subject to RIR policy in its respective region. And this has been a subject which many of the RIRs have discussed in detail with law enforcement in our respective regions. RIR representatives would be more than happy to meet with any Member States or others to explain in more detail how these policies operate and apply in the five regions.

The concerns raised in this opinion are genuine, and the opinion itself identifies the way forward. Particularly the multistakeholder, bottom up processes facilitated by the RIRs are open to all interested parties, and governments with concerns in these areas can and should contribute to these processes as encouraged in the opinion's final paragraph. The RIRs look forward to working with governments along with all other Internet stakeholders to meet the challenges of an evolving IP addressing landscape. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, RIPE, your comments are noted. Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: It is true that RIPE NCC has provided clarification with respect to the legacy so on so forth. I don't think that RIPE NCC proposed any modification to Opinion 4, however his opinions could be properly reflected in the report of the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran, for your comments. Do I have any other comments on Opinion 4? I see none.

As I believe all the comments have been supportive, with some notes to be taken into account in the minutes and reports of the meeting, I would move that we accept and ratify Opinion 4 in this Working Group.

[Applause.]

I'm sure everyone wants an early coffee break. I think this is good we started this so early in the morning. But thank you very much, everyone, for the spirit of compromise and for the consensus we are reaching today.

Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes. First of all congratulations to you and thanks to all distinguished colleagues attending your meeting and the spirit of collaboration and cooperation they have demonstrated or manifested.

Chairman, because there are other issues that are important issues in Room Popov with respect to the WSIS+10 review, perhaps it would be appreciated Secretariat to inform us about the remaining part of the day what we do, whether we continue the agenda we had and whether we continue to have Opinion 5 and 6 after the coffee break, or that will be in the afternoon, Chairman, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. We will do so. I'm requesting this clarification from the Secretariat now.

In the meantime, I would like to ask APNIC. APNIC, you have the floor?

>> APNIC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Representing the five RIRs and the NRO, we'd like to acknowledge very much your efforts to reach consensus on these two opinions. Importantly today, of course, but also given that recognizing that your work dated back to the inception ‑‑

>> INTERPRETER: Microphone, please. The speaker uses microphone, please, thank you.

[Silence.]

>> APNIC: Importantly today, of course, recognizing your efforts but also those that your efforts that date back to the inception of the opinions of the third meeting of the IEG. From the RIR community, I'd like to express a very positive note in the sense that WTPF has produced two opinions in support of something that will allow the Internet to expand at current rates and grow much further and faster than that.

IPv6 is essential to the Internet of tomorrow, and I am extremely glad that the WTPF has recognized the importance with these two opinions.

We can't agree more that capacity building is an essential development for the deployment of IPv6 and we see the ITU as an important partner in this. It is very clear that the ITU, particularly the development sector that APNIC is an important since 1993, particularly in ministries and regulators to help transition from IPv6 to 4 and also the IPv6 in their respective countries. We look forward to continue to work together to create capacity for this.

So thank you, again, I think this is a very good result. And we hope we can continue to work together to give IPv6 the support and the momentum that it needs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, APNIC, and especially thank you for your positive words and comments.

Next I would like to give the floor to ICANN. ICANN, you have the floor.

>> ICANN: Yes, thank you very much. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. And thank you very much and thank you for this opportunity just to say a few brief words.

First of all, congratulations on adopting these opinions. Your hard work and the Expert Group has clearly paid off. And I think it's to a great credit of yourself and other colleagues that we have got to this point.

ICANN had put in an information document at the end of April which just sort of reflected on the role of the RIRs in this process and also the contribution that ICANN makes to some of the policy making process. Mr. Chehadé, our CEO had the opportunity, question he was very grateful for, to make some of the points in the opening of the WTPF on yesterday morning. And we're very grateful for that opportunity. And we would just like to commend this process and wish you well, Mr. Chairman, in the further evolution of this important topic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, ICANN, for your kind words and your support. As such, as we have now adopted Opinion 3 and Opinion 4. We will move now to close this session. With respect to the comments.

With respect to the comments raised by Iran, I will note that Working Group 3 will start in half an hour at 10:40. With that, this session is closed.

(gavel.)

[Applause.]

(on break).

**START OF WOKRING GROUP 3**

>> May I ask the translators that all the languages are ready? Could I have a confirmation on this?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, they are, Chairman. The interpreters are there.

>> MR PETKO KANTCHEV (CHAIR): Then we can start.

[Gavel.]

Very good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Distinguished Delegates.

So my colleagues from Working Parties 1 and 2 have set up probably a positive President have given us much more time to discuss the issues which we have in the agenda for Working Group 3. So we will try to make the best use of this time.

And I think that before we start discussing the issues in substance, it will be a good idea to share with you what my intent will be.

First, of course, I should like to welcome all the participants and delegates to Working Group 3. Also, I would like to thank very much Mr. Malcolm Johnson, elected to be with us and to listen carefully what we do and to whisper to us what we could do better.

This Working Group will discuss first, in my own intents, that we start discussing, of course, the agenda is to discuss Opinion 5 and 6. You know their names. I wouldn't like to read them again.

We will process on related contributions as well as the new Draft Opinion on the multistakeholder framework for Internet Governance.

You have the agenda in front of you. It has already been adopted by the plenary. There are minor changes only in the timing.

As many of you would know, the opinions which are attached to the Secretary General's report, in particular Opinions 5 and 6 of interest to this Working Group were approved unanimously without any exception by the Informal Experts Group of 108 experts after significant negotiations and forwarded for further discussion here on the Policy Forum.

As we have seen during the course of the World Telecommunications Policy Forum, there is general consensus on the consensus achieved at the level of the Independent Experts Group. I think it will be very constructive to take up and continue with the same spirit in mind and have a similar, constructive, pragmatic spirit in our own work.

A compromise which you have achieved in IEG was very delicate, difficult as the very issues on the Internet is. But we should not shy away from those issues. We shall continue working on them, discussing them and finding best possible way to make sure that the Internet will continue to grow in a secure, robust and fruitful, stimulating environment for further growth and applications.

So, now, I would like to share with you how we would structure our own works in Working Group 3. I would suggest that we will first focus on Draft Opinion 6, supporting operationalizing the enhanced cooperation process. I'm sorry. Some words in English are very difficult to pronounce for a non‑English speaker.

Here we have to underline that almost all contributions received are supporting that we retain Opinion 6 as it is. In addition to this, you may remember the statements made yesterday by high‑level officials. And the notion I've got from this, from yesterday, before yesterday, apart from Russia, that all of them, they would like to see Opinions 1 to 6 as they stand approved.

So, I believe that we can address the Opinion 5 first. I'm sorry. Opinion 6, as I said, first. And then we will discuss Opinion 5 on the supporting multistakeholderism on Internet Governance. Of course I will call upon all contributors to present their tone contributions, and you can discuss the changes to see if there is disagreement on the way forward.

Again, supposedly that you would be written supporting Opinion 5 and 6 pending outcomes of discussions here, we can address the contributions from Brazil, supported by Russia. You can address this, what the outcome of our own discussions on this subject will be yet remains to be seen.

As your own Chairman, I'll try to summarize at the end what the best option, the best way of action would be.

So we have two opinions and the Policy Forum is not so generous as we were at the IEG. We had much more time there. We had much more informal settings where we can discuss during the meeting, outside the meeting, we can split into groups, we can come back and all this. Here, we are more formal. We don't have this rich possibility of time available with us.

In addition to this, this session, as the previous one of the Forum and the next one, are broadcasted via Internet, webcasted. And they are translated into six languages. And perhaps Mr. Malcolm Johnson would not like to share with us what the actual cost per minute is, but I know it's substantial, so we better take our own time in the most productive way.

So, please, I would ask all of you respectfully to make your comments and interventions in a very concise and very brief manner. I'm not going to set up minutes. I would leave this to your own conscience and your own good will.

So if this is okay with you, unless somebody's asking for the floor with the proposed way forward I have just shared with you, let's go straight to the business and we start with Opinion 6.

So I can take it from the all right. Kenya and then Bhutan, please.

So, now, may I have one button pressed, please? So I have given the floor first, I believe? So nobody else is asking for the floor? Great.

So now I have a new wish from India, is it? India, you have the floor, sir.

>> INDIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just I would like to congratulate you on the Chairmancy and the great work you have done as the Chairman in Informal Expert Groups. In fact, Mr. Chairman, India also submitted two contributions. I will be grateful if you can also take into account while in the documents that we discussed now or today. It is not coming in the items. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India. Indeed, I am informed, I have a print of all your own contributions. I'm prepared to take them in token. But since you're the last comer, you have the last minute to speak. So excuse me, I'll respect the order in the way in which the contributions formally were submitted to the Policy Forum. You'll discuss them. And then you'll have an opportunity to voice your own concerns and proposals. Is this okay with you, sir? I think you agree with this.

So, now, if this is the case, I still have request for the floor from Russia. Russia, please. You have the floor, sir.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I'd like to say that despite the fact that on the informal experts group, it was felt that a great deal of time was made available for the discussion of our opinion and we had Russia, and Brazil and United States of America participating in that work, in spite of what has been said, there was actually not enough time, therefore we adopted this opinion as it stood. Nevertheless, we do have draft opinion No. 5, which has new elements in it. And I would now like to read it out. This is on Draft Opinion No. 5. Draft Opinion ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Could I ask you for your own understanding? At this point in time we consider opinion No. 6. We will come to opinion No. 5, you will have the opportunity to speak. Would this be acceptable to you, sir?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Okay.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

>> I thought it's in row, 5 and then 6.

>> CHAIR: No. Maybe I was not explicit and clear. We discuss now opinion No. 6. As soon as we finish Opinion No. 6, we will come to Opinion No. 5. Thank you.

So, I would now like to respect divisions of having contributions from five sources, from United States of America, from Turkey, from RIPE NCC from ISOC and Australia. Then we'll discuss the contributions from India which we got yesterday.

So this is order in which I am going to give the floor, and I would like first to give the floor to USA to rise their own points concerning Opinion 6. You have the floor, U.S. delegation.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good morning to all colleagues. The United States of America would first like to congratulate Mr. Petko Kantchev as the Chairman of Working Group 3. We would like to thank him as the Chair of the informal experts group in advance of this. Petko was a worthy guy through long and often difficult negotiations ‑‑ guide.

Those negotiations resulted in six draft opinions including this opinion on supporting operationalizing the enhanced cooperation process. The U.S. is prepared to accept this opinion as written. We do this not because we think it is perfect but because we respect the manner in which it was written and the delicate compromises that it represents.

The issue of enhanced cooperation is one of major interest to the United States. We are following very closely the work of the UN Secretary-General echo sack and CSTD as these bodies work to fulfill their mandates, therein. Thank you very much. And we work forward to a very positive and productive discussion this morning.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the nice, brief and concise, constructive proposals.

Now I shall give the floor to Turkey. Turkey's delegation, please.

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Turkey considers that in most part requires more discussions for further developments as it seems in measure; therefore, Turkey proposes inclusion of the following that I'm going to read now.

Member States and sector members to promote and encourage international cooperation among all stakeholders in their respective role for the issues related to network robustness and to work in collaborative manner to increase users' trust to Internet. That's all. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Turkey. So then I will defer to RIPE NCC, please.

>> RIPE NCC: Thank you, Chairman, to speak to Opinion 6. My comments will be quite brief. The RIRs have been active supporters of the concept of enhanced cooperation and our submission highlights some of the many ways in which the RIRs and their communities working with other stakeholders are already operationalizing enhanced cooperation through a range of initiatives and activities. It's also important to stress that such cooperation is not the final goal but, rather, the benefits that can be created by this cooperation. And this is something we would like to focus on. Some of these benefits have included already human capacity building, more informed public policy making and the facilitation of infrastructural development. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The short presentation is very much appreciated.

Now the next one in the list I have is ISOC. You have to be particularly attentive to what ISOC is saying because to certain extent, they voice the voice of the end user. So ISOC, you have the floor.

>> ISOC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like my voice to also congratulate you on your election and I also would like to thank you for your hard and excellent work as a Chairman of the Expert Group who has done the preparatory work.

ISOC attaches great importance to the concept of enhanced cooperation. And in our submission, we explain what we have done since 2005. We are happy to accept this opinion as it is. While not perfect, I think it constitutes an acceptable compromise. And we support the usage as the way of proceeding on Opinions 5 and 6. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, sir.

The last of the list of formal contributors, that is Australia. And then I intend to give the floor to India. Australia, please. You have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to join with others in congratulating and appreciating the work that you did in guiding the consensus in the informal Expert Group. It was a significant achievement.

For the reasons that we gave earlier in Working Group 2, Australia would like to announce that we have withdrawn our original proposal to suggest a merging of Opinion 5 and 6 and would now support their adoption in their current form. Thank you.

[Applause.]

>> CHAIR: Although I did not clap hands, I would like to congratulate you on your own wise decision not to see the proposal anymore. So it facilitates to a great extent our own task. And we appreciate this. But nevertheless, at least in the report of this meeting of the Working Group 3, it will reflect your good will to continue forward in a constructive way.

India, please.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we take the floor for the first time, we also wish to join the other colleagues in the room extending you congratulations and also for stating this meeting so far so well.

Chairman, we are coming in with certain amendments. I must explain the rationale for our amendments. It's only appropriate that we did so.

Firstly, there is ‑‑ there are references to various paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda in the Draft Opinion 6. In our opinion, I think if the approach is to list reference to paragraphs and delineate them, some of them, at least, we would like to also make references to some more paragraphs which in our opinion would form an integral part of the operationalization, operationalizing the enhanced cooperation process. It is with that objective in mind we have proposed addition of some paragraph numbers along with the list that already exists in the existing Draft Opinion.

Second one, Chairman, is with regard to the nature of enhanced cooperation, that means we do have a debate on and off, but the debate exists. Are we talking of enhanced cooperation, which is existing already, or we're talking of the cooperation that's in future? I think opinions are very well known in this, particularly in one of the paragraphs, they're making a reference to enhanced cooperation in the future because they're all here to discuss about the future cooperation.

While acknowledging that there is cooperation existing, it is with this twin objectives my delegation has proposed those two amendments to the Draft Opinion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, India. We have posted on the website the proposals from India?

>> Yesterday night. No, it's posted for the morning.

>> CHAIR: It was posted this morning. So it was a good present for the morning coffee, then. I'm sorry, but although the spirit of your own proposal is rather interesting and constructive, I do not know how the feeling of the delegates will be, taking into account that it's coming rather, rather late in the last minute. So let's first hear what the floor would react, what kind of feedback we will hear from the floor, and then, perhaps, we will try to settle the things into one way or the other.

So does some delegation or member here wishing to express, to speak? I can see one request already from Iran. And then is there somebody else? Only Iran. Iran, you have the floor, sir.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you, Chairman, because you're meeting now.

We have been together with all distinguished colleagues in the three meetings of informal Expert Group. Opinion 6 dealing with one of the most critical, sensitive, delicate and complex issues which has been subject to various meetings, even during the process. PrepCom 1, PrepCom 2, PrepCom 3 and so forth. What we did at the IEG, we tried to reach consensus on what is possible to do. No doubt, this meeting, WPTF 13 would not resolve the issue of enhanced cooperation, however it address the you but not resolve this. This is subject to the CSTD, subject to the other entities. And in the agenda of the 31st of May, there is a meeting of CSTD working group dealing with this important issue. However, that does not prevent us to make some comments.

Now, with respect to the two proposals that you have received, one, putting more reference to the paragraphs of Tunis Agenda, we did our piece. To include, in our view, relevant paragraphs. But if there are other paragraphs which could easily, Chairman, emphasize, easily, without any objections of anybody, to reach consensus, that could be done, could be done.

Now, talking of whether we are dealing with the existing enhanced cooperation or with the future enhanced cooperation, Chairman, I would advise that we would not embark on that very complex issue.

One of the colleagues in the CSTD Working Group asked we have to define what is enhanced cooperation. I send him an email, "please don't do that. We would not like to define what is enhanced cooperation." Enhanced cooperation is enhanced cooperation. Two words. Cooperation. And enhanced. That's all. We can define that.

What I suggest, Chairman ‑‑ now, coming to the proposal of Turkey that would like to have something inviting Member States and sector members, it is risky to do that. Why? Because of the title of the opinion talking enhanced cooperation with stakeholders. Stakeholders is not Member States. And sector members associate academia. It involves everybody. All people. Individual, private, governmental, nongovernmental, everybody. So let us at least stick to the main theme that the stakeholders is inclusive of everybody.

If we put state member and sector member, we have sort of departure from that. I'm sorry you asked to be concise but I have to explain to the colleagues. So we have some departure on that. We may not achieve our objectives. So let us remain general and refer to the stakeholders in general.

Distinguished colleagues need to note and consider that. The most important part of this opinion is in the operative part. In fact, is not operative as such, sorry, like a resolution, but, in fact, it is of the view. That is the driving operational aspects of that. And in that, with a lot of effort, we achieved a consensus to refer to paragraph 69, which almost cover everything that everyone wants to say.

I did want to open and read paragraph 69, but paragraph 69 covering everything. Chairman, at this state, I do not refer to the Distinguished Delegate Brazilian comment, I am just limiting myself to No. 6. What I suggest, Chairman, we would not touch Opinion 6 as it is. However, comments, views, opinions, enforcement could be properly crafted in the appropriate language and put it in the report of the meeting. And for that, we have one. And if you allow me, I want to say what we have to suggest. However, our proposal to you is that because of the very delicacy and very complex issue, we take the Opinion 6 exactly as it is, but include our comments. I don't see any difference between the opinion and the reports of the Chairman and the report of the meeting. Exactly have the same thing. There is no difference. There is no difference of power or value or weight and so on. So people read everything.

What we are doing here, Chairman, is entirely different from opinion 1, 2, 3 and 4. We have talked about enhanced cooperation. Enhanced cooperation is something live and living and needs to be continued and requires a better understanding. Some of the difficulty arises from the lack of understanding, lack of cooperations.

However, we did our best in 2010 by inclusion in the resolution 101, 102, 133, a paragraph dealing with enhanced cooperation. And for the first time, all colleagues coming at the meeting and participating is a good example of total inclusiveness, enhanced cooperation have already put on track. Now we have to move it. But we can do everything at this meeting. You can have more paragraphs but doesn't change the meeting.

Instead of that, Chairman, we need to get into the pragmatic and practical and pragmatic approach what we have to do, Chairman.

Our proposals could be included in the report of the Chairman. And I'm sure that one of your colleagues will take note of that. That yesterday, we heard from Mr. Fadi Chehadé that no single organisation, no single individual or entity or government can do this job. He has said that we have to do it together. And I refer to Mr. Fadi Chehadé and the entire 16 Directors of the Internet ‑‑ of the ICANN, sorry ‑‑ 16 directors of the ICANN, plus five advisory group.

Now I or my message is let us do it together. Currently we are not doing that together. Now let us do it together in the sense that let us give more opportunity, more chance to the government of the Member States to have a more positive, constructive, active role in the management of the issue but not day‑to‑day, in the overall management. Enforce the role of the government, Chairman. Currently the government has advisory role, that's all. That's all. Maximal. And the representative of the ‑‑ has nonvoting capacity in the meeting. So we have to reinforce that. We can't have any opinion now. But let us put in the minutes of the meetings, in the report of this meeting that the distinguished Director of the ICANN. And ICANN entities and all other people take that into account, give more role to the governments starting from GAC, instead of advisory group, advisory capacity, give them more role. That is the beginning of what Mr. Chehadé said. We have to do it and say it together. Chairman I have not gone beyond that. I have not proposed any addition to the opinion. We just suggest you something to put in the report that this lets do it together must be operationalized, must be implemented in practice, must be go beyond the words. That is the message. Muchas gracias.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Indeed it was not only you impressed by the statements made by Mr. Chehadé yesterday. Actually after the IGF meeting in Baku, we are seeing a very positive wind, very good wind in synchronized direction of mutual cooperation. Perhaps we have to focus and see after the Opinions 5 and 6 how this tendency would be continued and encouraged. That is my suggestion to you.

But I agree with your own proposal to put all the substantial parts of the proposals already addressed to us and reflect them into the report. In case of need, the Secretariat, we would approach appropriate and contributors to have a harmonized language in the report.

So now having said that, I shall come back to the proposal from Turkey. If you were key proposes ‑‑ I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I did not discharge my duties up to expectations. I forgot to see the floor. UK followed by India, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chair. And we congratulate your appointment as Chair of this Working Group. And also for your excellent work in Chairing the very difficult discussions that took place in the IEG. Of which you were a tough Chair but certainly a very fair Chair. And so we wish you well in the work for today.

As I said, the IEG was a difficult discussion, and in particular it was a difficult discussion on enhanced cooperation. And certainly the UK has had to compromise quite a lot to get to the proposal that's on the table. It's a finely balanced compromise. We think we can support that. We will be very reluctant to see any changes going into a text that was quite so filially balanced. I would like to make the note as others have before, that enhanced cooperation is happening.

And that is something that we should be seeking to promote and encourage. And we're very pleased that there is a direct reference to the CSTD review in Draft Opinion 6, that when you're doing something, it is always useful to see how effectively you are doing it and how you might be able to improve it. And in particular, I would note that under the Tunis Agenda, Article 83, it talked about the effective cooperation between the various stakeholders as being a very important feature.

And I would note that the thing about enhanced cooperation that I would take away, without trying to define what enhanced cooperation is, is that it is about doing it together.

I would like to express a certain amount of concern about any discussion in this Forum that starts to talk about specific organizations, particularly with the CSTD review underway; but I would note that this is not the right Forum to start talking about ICANN and the organization of ICANN. I think that that is a useful discussion to be had, but elsewhere.

Then turning to the proposals that have come in front of us. And I'd note that everybody, including me, has their favorite quotations from WSIS. And it's very easy to end up with a very long list of paragraphs to cites making it very difficult for the reader to get a proper understanding of what we're about.

So I would note that the list that we've got. Again, that was a compromised list, is probably adequate as it stands. I am concerned that by cherry picking certain paragraphs that are very specific and adding them to enhanced cooperation, start adding that specificity to this opinion, and I don't think that that is helpful. So I would prefer not to keep it open ‑‑ I'm sorry. Not to reopen that list. If we do, then the UK would want to come back with further proposals on that.

The other point I would make on the proposal by Turkey is, again, this is a very specific issue that is being put forward in a text that is supposed to be of wide reaching significance. So, again, I don't think it is relevant to put it here. It starts to limit the coverage of a Draft Opinion on enhanced cooperation to make specific references to one particular area that might be covered.

Thank You, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom.

Now I would like to give the floor to India, but IEG, ICANN.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I think it is more important that we clarify what we said a little while ago. Firstly to our amendment to the word "in the future" we are not inventing this word and we have no intentions to do so in this Forum because we are not under any illusion that we are going to redefine either WSIS or other processes which are mandated by the UN General Assembly. So to the limited extent that we truly reflect what is said in the WSIS para 69, I would draw the attention of the distinguished colleagues in the room to you, Mr. Chairman, that it says that, if I may allow to read, it says "be further recognized the need for enhanced cooperation in the future." The word is very much there. So all that we are doing is we're trying to bring in that particular aspect into the text.

Secondly, entirely my delegation entirely endorses the view which has been expressed a little while ago that the deliberations in this room are ‑‑ should focus on what, particularly with the ITU being the lead and to this world, WTPF that we limit our discussions without having to enter into detailed debate on whether the definition of enhanced cooperation, or for that matter, any other aspect in this, because it is, number one, time consuming, number two, as we acknowledge, there are already UN General Assembly mandated processes. One of them is the most important one as we see it is the Working Group which has been truly reflected in the Draft Opinion. So I think we would be restrained to make any amendments or suggestions on those fronts.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, once again, we would like to suggest a way out, if that is a possibility, with regard to ‑‑ as someone used the word cherry picking, I think that is precisely what is happening in the Draft Opinion as we see it with references to few paragraphs. We do respect the IEG's recommendations in the form of a Draft Opinion. If that were to be fine and then no discussion to take place, then perhaps we're all with the heads of delegations sitting here may as well be wasting our time. Perhaps I think the sentiment of my delegation is that if certain paragraphs are not in discussion, we might start the very first paragraph by saying "recalling all relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda related to enhanced cooperation and the roles of all relevant stakeholders." I think that could be perhaps a way out, which does not in any way sort of cause any ill feelings, I'm sure. Those who believe that a few paragraphs of this should be reflected in the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India. I'll give the floor to the IEG, ICANN. And then I'll try to ‑‑ I'll make efforts to summarize somehow.

>> ICANN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good morning to you. I'd like to just briefly say that ICANN is an open environment. We recognize the contribution that governments make within ICANN, within the Government Advisory Committee. And certainly the Distinguished Delegate of Iran was a very much welcome guest. Well more than a guest, of course, at our recent meeting in Beijing.

The Government Advisory Committee is an open committee. We invite all governments to participate in it. Currently around 124 do, as Mr. Chehadé made clear in his opening remarks. And of course others are most welcome.

In terms, sir, of what is put in the report, of course that's in the hands of members here. But I would have thought that in light of what the UK Distinguished Delegate said, I'll put my teeth in. I don't think we should be too specific in the report about individual organizations. There's many organizations here that have a local Internet government and I don't think ICANN is unique in any way in that regard.

But certainly, Mr. Chairman, we welcome the spirit of cooperation that you've engendered in this group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

So new request from the floor for Tunisia. Tunisia has the floor. Tunisia you don't want any more the floor? So I give the floor to IEG CDT.

>> CDT: Thank You, Chair. My name is Matthew Shears, I'm with the Center for Democracy and Technology. But I'm speaking here on behalf of four members of the informal Expert Group, the civil society backgrounds. They are Nana McAlma, Eva Gloria, Debra Brown and myself.

Chairman, first of all we'd like to thank you and congratulate you on the excellent leadership that you demonstrated in guidance in the IEG itself. It was greatly appreciated. I'm going to draw on a couple of comments we made in information document 6 and I would urge the members to consider having a look at that.

First of all, with regard to opinion 5, sorry, Opinion 6, we believe that considerable effort was put into the drafting, the negotiations, the discussions. I personally was in the Working Group on this opinion. And as the eloquent member from Iran mentioned, it was a very difficult and well‑discussed opinion. And we very much, in that respect, consider that this opinion should be moved forward as is.

And the same is true of Opinion 5, but we'll come back to that.

And we'd also like to note that in support of the comments from the United Kingdom, that we would not be comfortable with picking and choosing among additional paragraphs to be referred to in the text. Indeed, in the current text, it talks about "other relevant paragraphs" and I think that's probably sufficient to note and may cover what other members wish to see referred to.

And in addition to that, with regards to the second proposal about enhanced cooperation in the future, the paragraph itself does actually refer to "and state as outlined in paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda." So, again, I believe that the concept of "in the future" and indeed in the current, this particular issue is well taken care of. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I'm looking carefully this time at the screen, in my screen, I see no more requests for the floor.

So then I'll try to pick up the essence of what has been said in front of us.

I did not hear any support for the proposal originated from India. So may I ask the delegation from India for opinion whether they would be kind enough not to insist anymore on their own proposal; and B, happily living with the text as it stands. May I get from you your own position on this matter? India, please.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't think we share the same opinion, that there is no support. But there are a couple of delegations which have difficulties.

As I suggested in para ‑‑ with regard to the selection of the paragraphs, we believe that there are, indeed, paragraphs, in our opinion, which I'm sure if you wish to go into the merits of this paragraph, we can discuss otherwise and see whether it merits its consideration or not.

As I suggested earlier, Mr. Chairman, that it would be only fair that if there are delegations who have interest in other paragraphs, a way out exists. Not making any reference to any number. And perhaps it could be considered that we will make a general reference by saying "all relevant paragraphs." Because there's some numbers that have already been listed there, we do recognize there are other relevant paragraphs. Then we don't see why difficulties are there for other delegations if they believe and it is reflected there are other paragraphs and they could not be numbered. So I think we believe that I think it is important to my delegation that these references are there. Failing which, then we could look at this way out as you said so. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India. I have Iran and then I'll try to summarize.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Let us fully understand the proposal of the Distinguished Delegate of India.

Chairman, our distinguished colleague from India proposed that we put at the beginning of paragraph "recalling relevant paragraphs of Tunis Agenda." But we read the text. It has already that element. It start with some specific paragraphs and then says "and other relevant paragraphs of Tunis Agenda." So what is proposed is already there. Whether it is the beginning of a sentence or at the end of the sentence doesn't matter. Due to the fact that in the IEG, we were not in a position to cite all of the paragraphs one by one, but we introduced this general portion of the recalling "and other relevant paragraphs of Tunis Agenda." That means it includes the views of Distinguished Delegation of India, that these are not the only paragraphs. Other relevant paragraphs are also applicable here.

So I think the point is already covered. Perhaps they may kindly look at the paragraph again and read it very carefully to see whether they want to put this "all relevant paragraphs" at the beginning or "all relevant paragraphs" in the middle of the sentence. But the issue is covered. We have to read the entire recalling a together. We have no opposition to that. But we want to see whether with this reading, still they would like to introduce this at the beginning or not. But let them kindly to comment on that. It is not opposition to their proposal. And only is whether we need that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Then I'll be straightforward. So I'm asking now all the delegations here, all delegates and distinguished experts, colleagues in this room. Is there any support from the room for the proposal from India? I don't see anyone. So then, India, perhaps you would be kind with me and with everybody else, we will take into account your own proposal. I'll put it in my report in appropriate wording, synchronizes you, agreed with you, and we shall not spend any more time on this you because we have other items to discuss. Could you bear with me this proposal, India?

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We need time to reflect on your proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, then. How much time you need?

>> INDIA: Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite unlike any discussion that we have seen in the past in any Forum in the United Nations that a view is taken in a matter in this manner. We agree that there is broader urgency in winding up of this meeting, but it should not preclude the principles that we would like to see in this Draft Opinion are ignored.

Let me reiterate why we are referring to para 29, since that is the intention of you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that the principles which govern this Internet Governance, as reflected in para 29, if I may quote from the text, "the international management of Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic and with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations." For us, this principle is very dear. Where when we are talking about three very key elements. And an absence of this or direct reference to this would, in our view, be not a welcome outcome.

There are reasons, Mr. Chairman, why we think that certain paragraphs are reflected, why others are ignored or not included. As I said, we do respect IEG's recommendations. But I guess that is not end of all.

So with this limited intervention, Mr. Chairman, we would need time to reflect on what you said. But we would maintain our position at this point in time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My proposal would be the following. So that in particular with your own proposal about the listing of paragraphs, additional reference the following paragraphs of Tunis Agenda in the first paragraph, I'll put your proposal as it stands in my report. And I will report afterwards the plenary about that. And then perhaps the plenary would decide. And by the way, by this way you'll have your own time to think it over and to come back in a constructive way for the follow-up. Because I do not want to continue keeping the discussion on Opinion 5 at my level. Is this acceptable to you? Iran first, then India.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. It is the request of the Distinguished Delegate of India is very legitimate. Let them a little bit of time. We would not like to press them. Perhaps after some reflection, they may agree with your proposals. But please, kindly, leave them some time because you have to go with the other proposal and then you have to go Opinion 5 and then you come back. I don't think that it is finished by 12:30 everything in your committee. You are not as lucky as the two other groups. So leave them some time. I'm sure that they will fully reflect on that.

We have some sympathy, Chairman, some sympathy for reflection of what they have said to be included in the report. We leave it to them to craft a suitable sentence to fully reflect their views and then come back to that.

So I support them that they need more time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, then not spending too much time on this organizational matters, what I would suggest that I would kindly ask the delegation of India to consider this matter once again and come back to us with your own decision after the lunch break. So that we do not continue discussing this matter now. Like this, they will have time to consult with other delegates. They will have the possibility to talk to Capital and whatever they deem appropriate. But I would like to move progress for that.

So now India followed by Mali.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree with your approach, which is you will reflect in your report our amendments and take it up in the plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Mali, do you still have on the floor or not anymore? No? That was a mistake. Or no mistake. Mali, you have the floor, please.

>> Mali: It's okay. Thank you. I don't need the floor.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So now I have to move back to the issue brought up and proposed by Turkey in their own contribution.

I shall read for you what I have retained. Turkey proposes inclusion of the following paragraph, "invites Member States and sector members to promote and encourage international cooperation among all stakeholders in their respective role for the issues related to the network robustness and to work in collaborative manner to increase uses trust to Internet" that is the text they are proposing.

So my question to you, all of you: Do you agree with this addition in the text of Opinion we are discussing now? You have the possibility to speak. Mali, please. I'm sorry. There is a mistake, most probably.

Dear delegates, be careful with the button. So once you press the button, that means for me that you are requesting the floor. And I'm putting on your name. So be careful with this.

So I repeat my question again. Do you agree with this addition proposed by Turkey? UK, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chairman. In my previous intervention, I noted that this amendment proposed by Turkey goes into a very specific area, network robustness. And this particular opinion is very much broader because it's talking about enhanced cooperation.

Now, yes, there is certainly a potential requirements and need for activities under network robustness using an enhanced cooperation to ensure partnership and doing things together. But I am very concerned that by putting in a very specific issue into this paper, we detract from the very much wider remit of this particular opinion, an opinion which is about supporting the operationalizing the enhanced cooperation process. So I would be reluctant to see this proposal being put into the draft. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Then I'll give the floor to Czech Republic followed by Canada and then Ghana.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also have sympathy for the Turkish proposal. Nevertheless, we agree with UK. And not all levels of this intervention but also the first one that mentioned the multistakeholder approach, as there are many, many parts that should be done by more than only sector members and Member States. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

So as other delegations have already commented this morning, Canada also believes that these draft opinions that we consider in Working Group 3 are the result of good work within the IEG and represent a fine balance of the views that are represented in this room. And so for this reason, we are supportive of not making further amendments to these opinions. And on Opinion 6, which is currently under discussion, we also believe that quoting particular paragraphs from the Tunis Agenda on the Information Society does run the risk of detracting from the effect of the whole of that document and will become, I think, more and more difficult as we try to select particular paragraphs from the Tunis Agenda.

As well, we see this opinion as being a broad‑based opinion. And are also concerned that we would try to get into too much detail on any of the organizations or issues that this opinion is aimed to cover. And, as well, Canada would draw attention to the work of the CSTD working group on this issue and the ECOSOC, as well as to work of the Secretary General of the UN on enhanced cooperation.

And there will be means available to have those discussions in further detail. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. Ghana, followed by Iran.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The delegation of Ghana joins other colleagues to thank you for your able chairing of the meeting.

Mr. Chairman, the delegate from Turkey has made a point. We have considered it. However, this point has been taken care of under "considering b" where if you allowed me to read, "however, it is recognized that there are some problems related to network security and spam which should be addressed through cooperation among all stakeholders in their respective roles." The emphasis here has been based on all stakeholders again in this enhanced cooperation. I would therefore pose that the delegate of Turkey would re‑examine his statement under the considering b. Perhaps we may carry a concern in the chairman's support and then move forward. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ghana, for your own very thoughtful intervention.

Iran, please?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. When this issue was discussed in IEG, various suggestions were made what to put in the "invite." And as a result of all discussions was that let's remain inclusive, general. Putting a,f specific, you may fail not to include others. We put all the stakeholders to work. And then please read the rest. On these issues. And these issues is what is an entire opinion, considering, recognizing and everything. So we remain general.

The delegation of Turkey has been very, very collaborative in this meeting and they have been active in all process. Perhaps we leave them some time to formulate an appropriate paragraph to be included in the report of the meeting, your meeting and the chairman's report, to address their specific issues taking into account that invite all the stakeholders to work on these matters is implicitly covers their point. But we leave it to them to find the appropriate paragraphs. And perhaps the Secretariat would also assist them in preparing that paragraph, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So then that's exactly what my intention was based on the reaction from the floor.

So, I'm addressing now the delegation of Turkey, our neighbors. Because maybe not all of you know that we are neighbors, and Turkey. Whether they would kindly agree that the essence of their proposal, the text of which will be done in a very coordinated manner with Secretariat, with the Chairman and themselves, be reflected in the report of this meeting. And then based on that, we move further not changing anymore the text and the opinion as it stands. Will this be acceptable to honorable delegation of Turkey?

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You know, this is the second time that I'm taking to floor. But, you know, in the first time, I have said something that for being connected as the Chairman of this group, now I congratulate, I would like to congratulate you, also. In my first time taking floor, sorry, but I have forgotten that issue. But now at this time, first of all, I want to congratulate you for being elected as the Chairman of this group.

Secondly, now I'm going to as to all the issues that's been raised by all the Distinguished Delegates of different Member States. The white spots of the current document it's just all stakeholders to work on these issues. At the moment, we have just developed that statement and made it more appropriate and more developed in wise part for this specific document.

Actually, when we look at ‑‑ and also the distinguished delegate from Ghana also mentioned the b part, considering part of the document. Let me read it. "That the Internet as available has provided inter alia been bits to business and wider society. However it is recognized that there are problems related to network security and spam which would be addressed through cooperation among all stakeholders in their speak five roles."

You see this is more sharper than the statement that we propose because we have substance, actually some words, you see, instead of security, we put robustness. And we deleted the word spam also in our proposal.

So as you see, I think no harm to add this statement to the document, actually. But when we see the reactions from the Distinguished Delegates, they do not ‑‑ maybe they are causative and they do not want to add any other statements to the current text, I respect but maybe we can reconsider the issue, but the statement that we propose is still exists in the main text in considering part of b.

So maybe everyone may reconsider and that's going to be a good way to improve the "invite" part of the document. It may be reconsidered by all the delegates on that aspect. And if, still, there is a high objection to our proposal adding that statement to the document, we will not be resisting.

Will you please ask, Mr. Chairman, will you please ask the floor if there is a high reaction, high objection after those explanations? Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. But I did not hear from you the reply to my question. Will you agree with my proposal or not? Could I hear from you clear answer?

>> TURKEY: Mr. Chairman, as I understood, you proposed me to work, to cooperate with the Secretariat to improve our statements, right?

>> CHAIR: So then I repeat my proposal. My proposal was the following: That based on your contribution, we would work the text, if that is your preference to keep the text as it is or slightly amended text, and we reflect that this text in my report of this meeting. But we do not change the original text of opinion. That was the essence of my proposal. Do you agree with this proposal?

>> TURKEY: Mr. Chairman, now I understood you do not want to change the main text but to put our proposal in your report. As far as I see from the floor, I think that will be acceptable for our side. Okay. We accept your proposal. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the demonstrating once again that good neighbors could live in peace all the time.

So now, can I take it that based on that, I can conclude the following: Opinion 6 is almost adopted, but we have to direct this to the plenary because, still, they have particular opinion of the delegation of India. So unless India would like to have their own decision passed before I announce the end of the discussion, the result of the end of discussion Opinion 6 of this Working Group, then perhaps that would be the way in which we can move further. Now I can request from the floor from IEG and from Chile. IEG and then Chile, please.

>> IEG: Thank you, Chairman. Not exactly to the point you were making. I wanted to come in at the end of the discussion to make a somewhat different point.

I note that there have been agreements to include certain items in the report when there was not agreement to include them in the main text. And indeed that is a common way of handling such issues in ITU.

I would just suggest that perhaps in some way ‑‑ and I would leave that up to the respected Chairman and the Secretariat to sort that out ‑‑ the report could also mention that there had been information documents which were of course not introduced or discussed. So I'm saying that the report should be factually correct and simply make reference to the fact that there were some information documents which were not introduced nor discussed. And I leave that in your hands. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I have no problem with that. And this was my intent. But I have no intent to consider information documents at the meeting. So we will consider only the real documents.

Chile, please.

>> CHILE: Thank you very much, Chairman. First of all, I would like to express our thanks for the work which has been done by you. We'd like to thank you for your leadership. And we do select to express our gratitude for the leadership of the IEG. However, we would like to highlight something that the way in which this has taken place has caught our attention very much. Not all countries had the opportunity to be represented in the group of experts. We've made considerable efforts to come here, however. And that effort has been made because we wanted to hold a discussion and a dialogue and this is very relevant for all countries. That's why the way in which this debate is taking place is rather worrying us because it seems to be shutting off any possibility of dialogue, any possibility of considering new or other ways of interpreting very important issues. So we seem to be saying is we support or we don't support. We think it's perfectly valid for countries to have another opinion other than the one of the IEG and to dialogue and discuss matters so far, we seem just to be saying the opinions of the IEG have to be taken as final. They're very valuable. I'm not saying they're not. But they shouldn't be binding. We've come here to discuss extraordinarily important issues, especially for developing countries. We do not feel that we have a fair representation in the multistakeholder model of Internet Governance, and we would like this setting to be a setting for real discussion, a place where everybody can express their opinion even if it's an opinion that dissents from the majority one. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chile.

Let us be informed once again that in the IEG, we had the exceptional measures to open the possibility for discussions and inputs coming from all the corners of the world. Not only from ITU Member States and ITU members, sector members. We have got contributions and they have got participation from many, many organizations involved in the Internet business. There were no limitations. The Council of ITU has allowed that this transparency, it has happened. All the documents pertaining to Internet, they were opened, without any possible protection to everybody in the world. So that it seems to me unfair to hear the criticism that the IEG was a place where not everyone had the possibility to participate and contribute. It is not in real terms factual. In real terms, actually, everyone had the possibility to submit comments and to discuss them in a free, transparent manner.

Having said that, as you see the procedure here, not such that we come and we say now: Are we ready to approve this document? And let's approve it and then we call the business and drink coffee. No. We discuss. And we are open to discuss. And the intent is to discuss the issues of substance further. Please understand me. We should discuss and we will discuss the essential matters. And if there is an omission, if there's a discovery of something which is important and not taken into account in the right manner, if there is support for that, then what we have to do is we have to move forward and to take into account to improve the text.

My perception is that until now, there is no support for proposal made in formal manner. And if this is the case of the collectivism here in this meeting, I do not think that it will be appropriate. We will continue discussing and trying to impose one delegate or one Member State opinion. We shall strive to agree on what is of common sense because Internet belongs to everyone. It was created in the United States of America, but now it is used by ‑‑ and I believe belong to everyone because it is becoming a basic commodity of life. And we shall never forget this.

That is the thing that we shall have in front of us. And in everything we discuss, in everything we agree, we have to subordinate our own, let's say, conclusions to this fact that whatever we do should be of service to the end user. That is my perception.

And please bear with me. I don't want to dwell on these issues. This is not a dictatorship from the Chair. I'm asking in an open manner for opinions to be expressed by the floor. And if there is no support for a proposal, then, excuse me, it's not up to the Chair to say "no, we've got this proposal, we inject it." I would like to see something which is a product of the common wisdom of the support of everybody here. This is a consensus‑based document building up. That is what I think is important to be drawn and to be reminded once again.

Now, I am seeing the floors requested from Mexico, India and Argentina. Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chairman. I'd like to take this opportunity, if I might, to congratulate you on being elected and also to congratulate you for the excellent work which has been carried out thus far.

We also, to a certain extent, share a concern which was expressed a moment ago by the Distinguished Delegate of Chile. Perhaps some of the comments which have been made do seem to indicate that there shouldn't be any discussion of what has already been agreed in the Informal Expert Group. I think the a and's comments is we were unable to physically participate in the meeting of the IEG. The meeting may have been open to everyone. There may have been an open issue. But not all of us were physically able to take it up. We're dealing with an issue of such critical importance as this, one in which really is critical to everyone, I think we should have a debate opened up a detailed debate open up. And if there's no consensus, there is no consensus. Once again could we thank you for your leadership. And I do think we'll be able to have a good quality final text provided we deal with the important issues. And there is a real serious debate on them first. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. India followed by Argentina, please.

>> INDIA: Thank You, Chair, for giving me the floor again, since a very important aspect of our discussions has been raised by the Distinguished Delegate of Chile, we have decided to take the floor again.

We entirely agree with your approach that provide scope for deliberations and discussions. But in the last two days, I must say that there have been discussions, but we regret to see that any amendments on any possible it was quite possible there was consensus in the room have never been attempted.

Secondly, while as we said earlier the respect we have for the IEG's opinions, however, we'd like to reiterate once again, Mr. Chair, that if we have this nature where you have senior delegations coming all the way from the capitals and we have the ‑‑ in the form of ‑‑ I think that is a bit unfair.

We do agree there has been sufficient opportunity being provided, but I think there is no serious effort made as we see to discuss the merits of the amendments being proposed on the table. So I think this is something we wish to state very clearly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chairman. We do congratulate you on your election. We are sure under your leadership, we will be able to reach a successful conclusion in our meeting. We do offer our support to the comments that were made initially by the Distinguished Delegate of Chile and endorsed by Mexico.

For many of our administrations, it is extremely difficult to physically participate in all bodies and all meetings. And that has been the case with the IEG. However, we appreciate the work it's done. And we think this should be a good opportunity to sit down and have a discussion about the proposals that have come out of the IEG. These are issues that need debate. And if people think that there are points which are worth including and integrating into the excellent work done by the members of the IEG, then I think it is worth discussing them here. And I think, indeed, we should discuss them here.

We appreciate everyone wanting to approve everything by consensus, that's very laudable. But where a debate is necessary, I think we need to have one. And if there are points which need to be incorporated in some of the opinions submitted to us, then they should be because they are of great importance and relevance to many of us participating here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. Just to remind you that even this meeting now is webcasted. That ITU has organized during every meeting of IEG that you could have remote participation. You could listen to all the deliberations, you can express your own opinion. It will be taken into account. So, please, let us not say that once you come to a meeting, you ignore everything else. There was a possibility. And we have to take this into account.

My function as a Chair now is to give you all the possibility to discuss matters and to agree. To agree. So that my intent is to capture what would make sense of everything which you're saying, what would be supported by you. And then by not, improving the text. But I have not seen at this point in time based upon the deliberations that there was a very clear missing point in the text submitted for your own attention.

Anyway, so we have the opportunity for India to consider the things once again and to come back with their own proposal if they want this afternoon, if they want in my report to be submitted tomorrow to the plenary. I have no problem with that. That's my function. I am the Chairman. I have to reflect what has been discussed here.

And please do not criticize us that we are not allowing to express your opinion. No, you have the floor. Please go ahead and express yourself. IEG followed by Iran, please.

>> IEG PAYPAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a great pleasure and honour to be here and be able to speak. I also would like to congratulate you on your Chairmanship here and also the very effective work that you did in the IEG.

PayPal respects the right of Member States to make discussions and continue the discussion, we think that's very helpful. As you have mentioned the IEG were open to all and we and many others spent a great deal of time discussing, making contributions, et cetera. We understand that not everyone can attend all of the meetings. We respect that. But a number of people, including PayPal, participated in all the meetings. We made contributions. PayPal, in fact, included a Draft Opinion. We did that in a spirit of openness, transparency and a truly multistakeholder model was palpable throughout those discussions. And in order to obtain a consensus and in that spirit, PayPal withdrew our opinion at the last meeting of the IEG, noting that we might resubmit as a contribution to the WTPF. We did do that. It is here as an information document. We believe doing so will bring more visibility to an issue that we think is critical and would benefit from broader discussion, particularly among governments.

However, that contribution just being an information document, it will not be discussed in this Forum. We are not asking that it be considered.

However, again, if that document and other contributions from non‑member ‑‑ non‑ITU‑IEG members are returning here, we are returning to a less equitable model, in our opinion. We believe it would be unfortunate, as we attempt to enhance with respect to governance. We are very supportive to open debate, but that debate shall allow all stakeholders to participate on an equal basis. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So based on the last comments, I would like to say the following. Most probably there is something which needs to be reconsidered in the practices, in the working methods which are coming up perhaps in the plenipotentiary conference or the council, but at this point in time, we have given rules and we have to respect them. We have a mandate within which mandate we are operating. Iran followed by Australia and then Haiti, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, let us take the point, the issues point by point.

First of all, nobody criticized you. Please do not interpret that. The statement by Distinguished Delegate of Chile, Mexico, Argentina. They have not criticized you. They have explained the situations and you explained to that. IEG, there was webcasting, remote participation, so on, so forth. There’s no criticism. Let us not to divide now. We are continue. We continue to be together. This is the first meeting that everybody participated on equal footing and should continue like that without having any polarization, any division. We have not been treated, been treated so on.

Number two. With respect to the issue information document, Mr. Chairman, you could prepare the text take into account the views Mr. Richard Kim, who is a very top expert on the matter, the gentleman from PayPal, who was very, very active in the IEG. And one take he took 46 times the floor.

[Laughter]

46 times. We are very welcome and we are benefited of his good advice.

However, you could prepare a sentence, Chairman, saying that "with respect to Opinion 6, maybe other opinions, as well, some of the issues were reflected or included in the information document that need to be taken into account in further pursuit of the matter. If it is enhanced cooperation, you put enhanced cooperation, and so forth. So we would not forget that. That is very valuable information from PayPal, from IPEG and all. We really appreciate them. They put a lot of effort that we appreciate. This is the first time that we listen to each other freely without any discrimination and so on, so forth. We most welcome all of them. But put a sentence saying that there are issues reflected in the information document need to be taken into account in the report of the Chairman. Need to be taken into account in further pursue answer of the matters and so on, so forth. With them you prepare that.

Now, with respect to the you that you have. You said that agree on Opinion 6. You said that almost. You could say provisionally. However, if people still believe that there is a Rule that you add something, we need to have some little discussion with few people to see to what extent. Let me explain the position of Distinguished Delegate of Turkey. They want to put something in the "invite" statement for sector members for the robustness. Chairman, we can't do that, we are not talking about robustness. We are talking about security. We are talking spam. And you know very well because you treated that in WCIT. So we don't want to have this whole opinion limited and concise to robustness. It means security, it means spam and so forth.

Moreover, we would not like this to only state member and sector members. The enhanced cooperation is not sector members and state members, it is everybody. If it was only sector members, the state members would have resolved the issue maybe many years ago or they have not resolve it at all. Because we have others involved, so let us take that one.

So I think you may need to engage with few people during the lunch break, sorry to break your lunch in not having lunch at all, an issue, so on, so forth, then to have discussions with colleagues, ask them which area they want to add? The proposal of Distinguished Delegate of Turkey, I think that would undermine the very objectives of this opinion by limiting that to only robustness. Robustness is not security. Robustness is robustness. And even in the (audio lost).

Member, nonmember, private and so on, so forth. Let us a group of friends, a group of people collaborating with each other. That is the beginning and we have to continue on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. This is very wise and welcome suggestion. At least from my moment. Australia, followed by Haiti and then IGA APIC.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank You, Chair, I would just like to first of all acknowledge the legitimacy of some of the concerns being raised by countries such as Chile. Like Chile, Australia did not participate in the IEG process, in part for reasons of physical distance. So in common with some countries when the draft opinions came out, we looked at them on their merits. And we came up with quite a range of suggestions for change. And they are reflected in Australia's contribution.

In coming to this meeting, we have actually been persuaded, not with great difficulty, to simply abandon those proposals for change. And in some cases they were quite extensive. And I just wanted to voice the reason why Australia came to that conclusion. And it is very much, we think, about the desirability, as much as possible, emerging from this Forum with some consensus views. Because we fear that in Dubai, the consensus that the ITU had been famous for was perhaps not as apparent as we would have liked.

So we think that we have been persuaded that it is quite important to try and take these documents forward as much as possible in their current form. And it is for that reason that Australia has basically walked away from quite extensive proposals for change, which in some instances would have been greater and would have absorbed a great deal of time for this meeting.

We also fear as the intervention from Iran has just indicated that there is the potential to reopen some of the acrimonious debates of Dubai, if we start looking at some of the proposed changes. So I would counsel the meeting to try and walk away from that concern. Thank You, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia, very wise proposals. And we appreciate highly the attitude to which you have demonstrated. That was the common goal to be constructive, to be supportive and to reach the consensus on substantive issues.

So, Haiti, please.

>> HISPASAT S.A.: Thank you, Chairman. I'm not Haiti. I have a suspicion there are gremlins creeping into the country indications somewhere.

I will be extremely brief. As some delegations have already said in speaking before I did.

The considerable amount of group done by the group of experts should and has been acknowledged; however, as other countries like Chile have said, we do, in some cases, need to have a discussion on the proposals which have been forwarded to us by the group of experts. If we simply take the opinions and rubber stamp them without any discussion of what the IEG has done and has said, why exactly are we here? We could have just popped over an email saying, okay, we are in agreement. Very good. End of story.

As our friend, Mr. Arasteh said, Mr. Chairman, we are not criticizing you in these comments. The debate on Opinion 1 concluded when I was out of the room because I had to leave for a moment; and when I came back, the Chairman said "since the opinion was approved by the group of experts, we're not going to have a discussion." All of us have been working in these meetings for many years, Chairman, and we're perfectly well aware that this is not the appropriate procedure to follow or the traditional procedure followed by the ITU. As we said, ITU has always operated on the consensus. And still does so. So it does seem to me that if there are disagreements with what has been said in the opinions by the IEG, then those disagreements should be aired and discussed. I repeat. Nobody is personally criticizing you. Please don't take it as that. That is not the point people are trying to make. And certainly not my point. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So to be honest with you, I prefer that all the criticism will be addressed to me and we progress with the substantial discussions. Not with the procedural matters. Time is very limited. And we better use it in a wise and constructive way. Please, let's discuss substance, not procedures.

Now, may I ask the interpreters to allow us kindly another 10 minutes until 12:40?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So as we said, IEG APIG followed by Bahrain and then India.

>> APIG: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to thank my friend from Iran for the kind words he said about me. On the other hand, I wish he'd counted the number of interventions I made at the fourth IEG meeting. I hope I exceeded my dear friend Bill Smith. If not, I will endeavor to do so here.

For those who may not know, I was with the ITU until December of this year as staff member. And I've been very closely following all of these discussions as ITU staff for some time. But now finally I can say what I think, which is interesting, for some, at least for me. And I think the time has come, really, to be frank with each other. And I support everything that has been said, in particular by Australia and Iran. The discussions in Dubai were very difficult. And there was a failure to reach agreement.

The discussions in the IEG were very frank. And at the fourth IEG, many of the same issues were rehashed again. And it was clear that it would be difficult to reach agreement on all issues.

On the other hand, there was a very good spirit of compromise. And it was possible to reach agreement on many things. And that agreement on many things is reflected in the six consensus opinions. Though on the one hand, it would be a shame to throw away the agreement that was reached through rather painful and extremely long discussions at the IEG; on the other hand, I do have a great deal of sympathy from the people ‑‑ with the people from developing countries who could not fully participate in the IEG and who feel that their views are not fully reflected in the consensus opinions. And I would suggest that the way forward is to continue to do what we've agreed to do so far in this group, to reflect that in the chairman's report.

So I think that it could be productively stated in the chairman's report that a number of countries noted that they had not participated in the IEG, and there was insufficient time here in Geneva to fully accommodate their proposals and possibly revised versions of the opinions. And that further discussion will be needed on many of these topics. And I think that everybody in this room knows that further discussions will be needed and will be taking place. And it will be quite a long time, in my opinion, well past my physical death, in my opinion, before everybody reaches consensus on these very difficult issues, which, let's be frank, are raised by the fact there's new technology. The Internet is new, it's different. And it takes time to understand what the differences are and how to cope with them. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Bahrain followed by India and then I'll try to summarize.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also support the views presented by Mr. Richard Hill. I would like to point out that there have been a number of interventions, perhaps four or five interventions in support of the principle of the being allowed to discuss matters. I've seen no one being denied the floor. And our suggestion is to actually get to the discussion. If there are any views in support of what has been presented or objecting to them, perhaps we should discuss those as opposed to talking about the principles of the matter.

As has been rightly pointed out, this is a suitable Forum to bring any concerns forward. Our proposal is that India is allowed the time during lunch. We certainly sympathize with their proposal. And having read several times the WSIS agenda, we do see that there is value in what is being brought forward. However, we are of the view that things should remain as they are, preferably.

But having said that, I believe we should be allowed the lunch break. And then we can reconvene after that and discuss the matters with views of the different Member States and stakeholders. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. India followed by Russian Federation.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not to take much time, just to reflect on the procedure. I think we would be able to make meaningful progress, in our view, if you could have the text on the screens and let delegations reflect on it rather than asking delegations whether they agree or not. Because it is quite possible that they may not agree with everything, but there could be some aspects of the proposals which delegations might agree. So the best way to do is have the text on the screen and we go para by para or amendment by amendment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry. My modest experience as Chairman of IEG was that once we go to the screen, we need to have many more time available. And we don't have this time.

In addition to this, the text is available to everyone of you in the input documents submitted on the website. And you have them on your computers or in printed form.

Russian Federation, followed by Iran, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I apologize for my false start earlier, but we agreed we would change the order in which we discussed the opinions, but we were hoping that Opinion 6 would be discussed quite quickly. And we're very worried now that Opinion 5, which we wish to address and the Brazilian issue will take a great deal of time. And there won't be enough time as there wasn't enough time in the Expert Group in February.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, very good proposal. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think that we continue to ask you to spend a little bit more time during the lunch break having delegation of Chile, Mexico, Argentina, Turkey, India, Australia if they kindly agree, United Kingdom and a few more people, just 10, 5 plus 5, and sit down to see whether and to what extent, I mean one possibility we could possibly amend the invite. We are not going to open the entire text because of time. You can do that. But if you start, Chairman, stylistic, you can change any sentence. Grammatically you can change that. Semantically you can change that. But the only problem was beginning, proposal of India and the invites. Whether you can import some modifications and the result of that group will be submitted at the beginning of your meeting maybe or at the end, I don't know at what time. You go to opinion 5 and so on, so forth. So still I retain the suggestion, Chairman. Because you're now going to finish within 5 or 6 minutes, so you can have on the other hand all of the Distinguished Delegates, they have rights. They have legitimate rights to discuss and to express their views. And I think the most democratic way that you are talking of Internet in a democratic way to be done, which is in fact the case. This is the most democratic way currently is done if they also include the views of the government formally but not as an advisory. Therefore, please kindly accept our suggestions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have always been full with open mind and good intention. So any one of you, please I repeat, any one of you that has taken the floor, I'm not naming the countries, please present to me after 20 minutes the text of your own proposal. I'll stay here in writing so that I can see it and then I can see what we are going to discuss in the lunch break if necessary. But for this point of time, I intend to stop the discussions. And I would like to tell you that agenda of our own lunch break and the beginning of the very early afternoon session most probably I would be tempted to summarize what the outcome is. We are very close to agreeing of the Opinion 6. And I don't see where Hungary, where our friend Peter My is hiding, because during the IEG, he was having the most difficult task of coordinating and synchronizing the various opinions of conflict in nature. Even if he's not here, I would like on this point of time to thank him and to make his efforts available and appreciated by ‑‑ to all of you. And perhaps I would ask you kindly that at least you clap in light of ‑‑ as a sign of appreciation of the outcome which he has done, although I'm hearing some constructive comments that this ‑‑

[Applause.]

‑‑ okay. Although I'm hearing some comments that the Member States or Sector Members or the participants here at the Forum, they are not having a legitimate right to express their own. No, I don't agree with the statement of that nature. You have the possibility. That's why you're here. Please propose and discuss issues of substance, not of procedure. We have to use the best, in the best way our own time.

So now, the time I have is 36 minutes. So I would appreciate very much that any delegation which was here and they would have sentence to suggest us a text, they come to me and they propose this in a well written form so that we can take it into account. And then I would do gladly and with pleasure, I would introduce these comments in my report.

So do I have three minutes till 12:40. My last call to India is whether India would agree that we consider Opinion No. 6 as approved at least on this level Working Group 3, of course with the reflection of their own proposal in the chairman's report or they would say otherwise. So, India, I would like to hear from you what your opinion on the matter is now.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for give the floor to India again. Since there is a general mood in the room that we should have discussion, we are open for discussions on this para. We will make our submission to you as you proposed during lunchtime. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So you have to know that the discussion will be only in English in a very friendly way around here. I will be pleased to be with you. I'm not so sure whether Mr.‑‑ would be willing to be with us. But he's not as well as the Secretariat. So we will be pleased to see you, all interested parties, to come along. But exactly 13 hours. So we would like to thank very much interpreter for the morning session and to all of you. And I wish you a good appetite. And don't forget. Outside maybe it is still raining. So that you are tempted to attend the meeting. Enjoy the lunch and see you in the afternoon. Thank you.

(Meeting recessed for lunch.)
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