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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon. At the end of the morning session we stopped in the third submission. However, our distinguished colleague from Sri Lanka presented the submission from the telecommunication regulatory in Sri Lanka. We can open the floor for that and start looking at the third submission from Malawi Council for the Handicapped. Any quick comments? In the order of 10 in the compilation document?

Okay. Thank you very much.

We would like to present the Malawi Council to present their submission.

We will show the summary of responses on the screen for the third item. With that, we'll move to the fourth submission it's university De Barcelona. I'd like to thank the people that submitted. They are not participating, so as shown in the screen, this is the summary of the response. With that, I would move to the submission, My Mind Spot, the United States. We have interesting comments. Maybe we can take care of that.

With that, I move to the 6th submission, from RI2, Pakistan. They are not present. As I said, we try our best to present the submission in the screen at least. Then we will go to the submissions that the representatives are present to make the presentation.

The seventh submission is from the National Telecommunication corporation of Sudan.

It is a summary, a challenging of people with disabilities and good practices and the gaps addressing these challenges. Unfortunately, they are not present. I would move to the next submission. It's from the Minister of Telecommunication. It's from the Minister of Telecommunication. My apologies. I'm trying to read the response from the director of communication, Society of Communication of Ecuador. I believe they are participating remotely.

With that, we'll check if they are available online and we'll come back to this response and give the chance for Ecuador to present this submission.

The next one is from person with disabilities in Sudan. We don't have a colleague from Sudan present. Is there any remote participants, Edraak?

Our colleague from Edraak organisation was connected this morning. We'll see if it is connected again this afternoon session. We'll give him a chance to present this submission.

The next input is from the Telecommunication Regulatory Commission of Sri Lanka. We have already presented this submission.

The next is from TURKSAT. As I remember, they are not even participating remotely. So we try our best to have the responses presented on the screen.

The next submission is from University of Sri Lanka Jayewardenepura. Again, I would like to thank all the submitters. I know the difficulties of being present to present these documents, so maybe sometimes the difficulties of the connection. It's a very valuable contribution and it can be accessed in the ITU publicly, which is open to all.

The next submission is from Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia. Which one is that?

As I note, they are participating remotely. I know they are trying to connect with Georgia, but are they ready now or we could move?

Okay. Whenever he is ready, just let me know. I will continue with the list. I know Ecuador is trying to connect also. Please whenever Georgia or Ecuador is ready, just let us know and we'll continue with the next submission.

The 14th response came from the Telecenter Foundation in Syria. They were connected this morning with us. Maybe they will come join later on remotely.

The next response is from PJSC Rostelcom, Russian Federation. We are displaying that on the screen. I would move to the next response. MyRight from Sweden: Summary was not provided; however, we again thank them for their response and the submission can be accessed through the ITU open consultation under the Council Working Group. The next response is from federal telecommunication institution in Mexico. They provided a summary. Sorry, I skipped two responses. The 17th submission is Albanian Disability Rights Foundation. Shown on the screen, this is the response to the open consultation.

I would move to the next response. It came from Radio Research & Development institute.

>> Russia: I'm not speaking on behalf of Russia. I'm speak on behalf of the Radio Research Institute, which is a development institute, which is an academic organisation. And I will provide a short introduction of the presentation on behalf of my colleague, who prepared this. This presentation is devoted to examples of good practices implemented by two out of three biggest mobile operators in Russia, is Beline and MTS, and the biggest long distance network and Internet provider open stock company Rostelcom. They provide more than 50 percent of the telecom in Russia, and they are private. It's a mixed company. The Russian government owns a little bit more than 50 percent shares of Rostelcom. It's a good private/government corporation in this case. It describes a few examples out of being in Russia: It includes tools for people with specific needs, for people with impaired hearing, special tariffs, and other people who are few years only for mobile Internet access, for conditions specified in presentation. And that is more than 50% cheaper than usual ones.

The company operators of MTS programme which is called provide free Internet and for disability and that named Internet for all ages. Also, similar free Internet computer course for senior persons with lack of ICT knowledge and for instructors also, provided by Rostlcom, and it has a different name, it's called Alphabet of Internet. Also, some information concerning state or government project, Internet for small towns and villages which, according to that project in Russia, they should built 215,000 kilometer of fiber optic in the future. Not to all people and especially you have a special tariff less than one Euro for Line 10 megabits per second for people with disabilities.

In summary, it says that all projects for access to Internet for people with disabilities result of private business and state bodies. We mentioned some of them. Projects for people with disabilities and specific need have some singularity. Each product distributed over the whole country provides special tool and methods and specific terminals cost high for this type of projects. And government sometimes subsidize. Reliability of Internet service by geographical error, especially in the rural areas, and you know our country is the biggest in the world and we have area where population level is very, very low and there should be special technique and special services and special technology applied for that to make it at least not too expensive. It's very difficult to have economic profit for that, but our programme includes providing Internet to majority of population.

In some cases, as I mentioned before, support from state is one of the key elements. Cooperation between private business and state government provides implementation of such social projects. Those who are interested even for some contact points may go to Internet and check what does it mean.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for presenting this response by the Radio Research & Development Institute. Any quick comments? I heard that Ecuador is now able to join in presenting the response, which is reflected in Item 8. So I would like to request from representative of Minister of Telecommunication and Information Society in Ecuador to present their submission.

>>

>> Unfortunately, there seems to be an issue with their audio connection. So if we could please join in through their phone.

>> CHAIR: He could join. Are they ready or we have ‑‑ so if you can contact with them, just let us know. I will continue with the next response Number 19 from the Federal Communications Institute, Mexico.

>> Hello. Good afternoon. I'm a director of information of the Communication Institute. I would like to tell you about the Mexican state had developed actions to promote the communication information and communication technology, accessibility for person with disabilities, and people with specific needs. Mexico established in its constitution and law the rights of users are now access for persons with disabilities which is in line with Article 9 and Article 21 of the rights of persons with disabilities.

This law empowered telecommunication institute to establish guidelines of access of persons with disabilities. These guidelines will be released in next months. The IFDS alliance on the telecommunication entities to fulfill the rights of users with disabilities such as accessibility features, to know the contracts, mechanism to access ‑‑ services with accommodation for person with disabilities, staff training for help person with specific needs, accessibility features in web pages, like (?) and access for people with disabilities to new systems and information technology and communications including Internet.

For developing these guidelines, we use the following methodology. First, we have an expert analysis; two, we search a student and analyzed Internet reports; third, we did a comparative exercise between 175 resolution, connect 2020 agenda, and broadcasting and telecommunication law. Then we researched and analyzed a focal of local accessibility laws, and the most important thing, we had meetings with Association of People with Disabilities.

The actions that we are doing with further development, we are working with the executive branch throughout an Accessibility Working Group created by National Digital Strategy. This Accessibility Working Group is integrated by National Council of Development and Inclusion for Persons with Disabilities, and by National Consultation to Prevent Discrimination.

Taking in the account this input of IFT, on December 3 of 2015, issued in the general provision of web accessibility for environment. Today will meet with the working group in order to continue this important job about accessibility. In the afternoon my team will meet with James to talk about a contribution for the first report for telecommunication ICTs in Mexico. The goal of the report is to find out if the accessibility guidelines are efficient to users with disabilities. This meeting is very important for us because it will set up a proposal of indicators for measuring the accessibility in the telecommunication services and ICTs.

Finally, I would like to tell you about the institute in the firm in the initiative developed accessibility mobile devices for people with disabilities. These are for users in order to find mobile devices that adapt to their special needs, describing its function easily. This is the first in Latin America. Also, we are working with the federal government in accessibility issues in the context of Internet Governance Forum to be held in Mexico this year. That's all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Federal Telecommunication Institute for this valuable intervention and explaining the access to telecommunication.

We look forward to hear about the project that is undertaken in Mexico with respect to the guidelines of telecommunications. Maybe we could have a copy of the guidelines once it's established to be shared later on in the group.

With that, I would like to ask the floor for any quick comments. Thank you very much. Our next response, response 20, is from CONADI from Guatemala. We'll try to put the response on the screen.

Thank you very much. The next submission is from Australian Communications Consumer Action Network. So as we presented the response in Item 22, I have comments from Russia. Russia, please.

>> Russia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Even though 21 was not presented; however, we would like to indicate that it's very useful document. It was also mentioned by Richard Hill and it's one of the very good guidelines how we should approach to this problem. It's our view. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Alex, for pointing out this valuable contribution.

So response 22 was already presented this morning. So I would go to 23, Office of Electronic Communications, Poland. The summary of the response is shown on the screen.

Again, I would like to thank all the respondents for their valuable contributions.

The next response is from Nepal, MyRight. Full response is presented on the screen. From MyRight, Nepal.

Thank you very much. The next response is from Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Authority.

>> Rwanda: Thank you, chairman. This is a summary of the contribution that we made. This contribution has been made by Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Authority and National Council in charge of persons with disabilities. So we have decided to put in the summary the recommendations only, the challenges and thinking as a country in the document. What is on the screen is only talking about the recommendation that the government should make in order to improve the access to Internet. Rwanda, the ICT can contribute towards in generating incomes for communities not only among women, but in persons with disabilities, taking the initiative for ICT to be accessible to making significant improvement in regard to this person and to enhance the social economic communication in the communities by enlarging the scope of activities.

The governments have the general obligation towards the access to Internet for persons with disabilities with specific needs. The established framework which we have the authority to drive the advocacy in accessibility agenda for persons with disabilities, but the policy in the regulatory framework to include the people with disability. Effective training. Government inclusive design. The fourth one, effective training programme for inclusion for governments in society.

The government can be used effectively to support all underserved people, including those with disabilities and establish special tell I centers to acquire appropriate equipment. To implement and enforce the Web content accessibility guidelines that are part of a series of web accessibility guidelines. To avail assistive technology software such as screen readers, screen magnifiers and onscreen keyboards as either proprietary or open source product.

Instruction on building government website accessible to the number of people possible, disability or not. Assistive technologies that can persons with disability and specific need.

We found that government in the Civil Society organisation and the person with disabilities should combine effort to address these challenges, fill the gap in the inclusive ICT policies.

I would want to record that as the Secretary General said, we are one of the countries that has made contribution in the accessibility. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rwanda, for contributing to this open consultation. It's a very value you had contribution Rwanda has always been good to contribute to the ITU, and we thank you for the wonderful contribution to the accessibility.

Any quick comments with respect to this submission by Rwanda? Thank you very much, Rwanda.

Our next response is response 26, Egyptian Ministry of Communications and Information Technology. We can put the summary of the submission is on the screen. It's the full response by the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology in Egypt.

Thank you very much.

We move to response 27. It's from the Information and Communication Technology Authority in Turkey. The summary is shown on the screen. I would like to thank Turkey for this submission. I've been told that Ecuador is ready to take the floor. So we go back to submission 8. So I would like to give the floor for Ecuador to present their response.

>> Ecuador: Hello? Hello? Yes.

>> CHAIR: Yes, we can hear you. Please go ahead.

>> Ecuador: Okay. Persons with disabilities and specific needs face challenges in accessing the Internet, like Internet service, Internet service calls, lack of research of assistive software, little or no formal education in instruction, lack of instruction in the use of technology, and support benefits. Lack of appropriate equipment adapted to the type of disability, lack of websites not accessible to navigate basic financial services, recreation, etc. Not accessible on a digital level, lack of investment and injection of capital for infrastructure improvements.

To address these challenges, there should had been a change of reform adopted with web accessibility, public services accessible to people with disabilities, promotion of teleworking projects to link sits Wednesdays the information and ICT to strengthen its use, contents related to accessibility for people with disabilities by means of free of charge means of communication, like webinars, hangouts, including people with disabilities and their families at the workplace and everyday life.

Also, eCommerce is he a tool to promote skills and development and promote employment of people with disabilities.

The project of linking ICT, like Robert said, with children with disabilities in early education, is based on gains that allow improvements of the social and emotional development and strength its autonomy and initiative. The gaps in addressing these challenges are the generation of public policy in universal accessibility. Projects where communication, associations, persons with disabilities participate as active entities generate citizen assembly focused on accessibility work in our community through community labor, which you can improve infrastructure in this process.

Socialized with greater force, a campaign of civic quality and integration from the use of the right words that do not generate infringement working in an inclusive education plan, work with the church for concrete actions to link the community with people with disability, create programs and training opportunities, and access the technology for people with disabilities, link to robotics for the information processes of children with autism, spectrum disorder, and Down syndrome.

The government should generate public policy in universe analyze accessibility, build a culture of ICT accessibility in the country with greater force and strategic alliances, have accessible infrastructure, both physical and web, reduce the cost of assistive technologies, and socialize policies related to this area through forums, lectures, meetings with associations and people from the neighborhood. I would like to mention the institutions from Ecuador are related to disabilities which are the Ministry of Work and the Ministry of Telecommunication and Information Society. We have prepared this presentation and this contribution from Ecuador. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ecuador, for presenting this valuable contribution. So many initiatives and very innovative ones such as linking the ICT, like Robert said, with children with disabilities. I want to thank you for this valuable contribution. I would like to open the floor for any quick comments.

Thank you very much, Ecuador.

Now we go back to response 28, which is submitted by Minister of Digital Affairs in Poland. Summary of the response is shown on the screen.

I would like to thank the Minister of Digital Affairs in Poland for their submission.

Now I would move to the next response from the Minister of Transport, Information, Technology and Communications of Bulgaria. So the summary of the response is shown on the screen.

One of the interesting elements mentioned in this submission eliminating the barriers is to have the statistical information shared as an open data for the private sector or the private companies. So if you could use this information to design or provide services and products for the benefit of disabled persons. I see this is an interesting way of ‑‑ from the government as a way of enhancing the abilities of using the ICT for people with disability.

With that, I would like to thank the Ministry of Transport, Information, and Technology of Bulgaria.

I would move to the next submission, submission 30. It's from Atos, United Kingdom. The full submission by Atos is shown on the screen.

>> Andrea Saks: Could you read out, it's a short one, because people who are blind are not going to be able to see it on the screen, please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I will ask the security to read this response.

>> Secretary: I'm reading out loud the submission from Ato; United Kingdom, which is as followed. Following established guidelines such as WCAG 2.0 is important. Normally people aim to meet level AA. This means that many of the major issues of interoperability with assistive technology are removed. I would urge policymakers to examine the practicality of also looking to implement some of the AAA criteria, as these are particularly beneficial for people with cognitive accessibility needs. Please also look at the work of the W3C cognitive accessibility task force to get more information on how we can better make the Internet a place that welcomes people with the widest possible range of needs not just the obvious disabilities that have established ways and means of delivering access. And it has a link. PS: The irony of using a Captcha on this form inquiring about accessibility is exquisite.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And we would like to thank Atos United Kingdom for this contribution. The next response is Estrategia Digital from Mexico. The summary, it's shown on the screen. Mexico, please.

>> Mexico: I would like also to say that it's very interesting that we are making between governments and regulatory of telecommunications, because we have commitment with the people with disabilities. For us is very weightful work, together with the results of this work you can see now with this guidelines, that the federal government has published the guidelines that they felt would be related.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mexico, for this intervention.

>> Just a comment to come back to the Atos response and the comment about the Captcha, and we included a submission form specifically for cases like this. So just to point that out.

>> CHAIR: With that we move to response 32. It's from the United Nations Development Programme, UNDP. The response from UNDP India is shown on the screen.

I would like to move to the Telecommunication Regulatory Authority, which is presented as the follow‑up submission, from Oman.

The next response is Number 35. It's from the Support Center for Students with Disabilities in Colombo, Council for the Blind. We missed submission 34, from the World Health Organization, and they provided the summary, which is on the screen.

Response 35, submitted by Support Center for Students with Disabilities of the University of Colombo, Council of the Blind, Daisy Lanka Foundation in Sri Lanka.

Response 36 submitted by G3ict, inclusive, for possible government actions. As we stated, we are submitting a document describing two specific tips that governments can take to improve access to the Internet for persons with disabilities. First ensure that public sector websites are accessible. Second, help to define and make broadly known the business for a commitment to web accessibility.

The next submission is from Sudan, National Telecommunications Corporation. This represents the full submission by National Telecommunications Corporation in Sudan.

We'll take three more responses, and then we'll have a short break. The next response is 38. It's from PURA, The Gambia. The complete response is shown on the screen. From these valuable responses from different submissions, we could see that most issues related to the skills and knowledge, lack of accessibility, lack of connectivity, and there is some other issues specific in some of the social aspects in the country, I would say. But mostly there's ‑‑ most many common submissions with respect to, for example, the lack of ICT skills, lack of awareness about the utility of ICTs, and the different online platforms.

So with that, I would move to response 39. It's submitted by Microsoft from the United States. This represents the complete submission, which is presented on the screen by Microsoft.

Response 40, Malawi Communications Regulatory Authority. Again, we would like to thank all stakeholders who responded to this open consultation. With that, we would like to have a short coffee break. Maybe 20 minutes. So we'll come back again at five past 4:00. Thank you.

(Break)

>> CHAIR: Response Number 41, committed by the communication. All consumers should be ‑‑

(Interrupted audio)

>> All consumers should be able to benefit from the opportunities and enjoyment that communication services can bring. The Internet can make life easier and reduce costs. People with disabilities, people who are older, or in lower incomes should be assisted to go online and continue to build confidence and skills to use the Internet. Governments need to ensure a clear and more comprehensive policy and take up and user as well as access to the Internet. Where people choose not to go online or while they are still unable to do so confidently, they should not be penalized for using upline equivalent services. Companies should design websites, products, services, that enable users with specific needs to benefit from them and should involve users and testing, also taking into account W3C web accessibility guidelines. Examples of good practice are easy to find and should be replicated by others, with funding from governments where relevant. We would like to thank the communications panel for their submission. Now I will move to the next response. It's from the World Federation. So I would like floor to WFD.

>> MR. KLEEB: Speaking on behalf of the WFD, World Federation of the Deaf. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to present both now and this morning. I will add a few comments to what I've already presented. We've been talking a lot about responsibility of governments. This doesn't mean that governments will now be responsible to pay for everything, but that governments have to include responsibilities of, for example, telephone companies, television broadcasters, and bodies like that. To give you an example, in the United States there is a law that says that all telephone companies have to pay for accessible telephone.

(Audio stopped)

The remaining support costs to society are much larger. So the World Federation of the Deaf would like us to consider accessibility in terms of the responsibility of governments in this light. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Kleeb, for presenting the submission by World Federation of the Deaf. Thanks for clarifying the idea of the government responsibilities with respect to the fund. I would like very quickly to open the floor for any comments. Again, I would like to thank Mr. Kleeb for his earlier contribution this morning and for this presentation.

Now I would like to move to response 43. It's from the chairman of ITU‑T‑JCA‑AHF.

>> Andrea Saks: Because I have presented this earlier today, I won't go into great detail. I will support what Mr. Kleeb has said, that to provide accessibility for persons with disabilities reduces the cost of persons with disabilities being dependent upon society financially. There's one thing I did not mention this morning, and that is specific to ITU. The Council Working Groups have been deciding whether certain NGOs could have reduced membership. What we did have before, NGOs, which are organisations that represented persons with disabilities were allowed to have a special exemption from cost. And I'm understanding now that that's kind of going forward. That's an important factor for persons with disabilities to participate in the standards process. And if it isn't decided, I would like Council Working Groups to look at that very carefully and not to reject that.

I think I wanted to also say that I thought we did ‑‑ we had a wonderful panel for other people other than myself, of course, and I'm very pleased at how many people came today to listen to different people speak and that we had so many responses to persons with disabilities. Thank you for chairing this particular meeting. I think you're doing a terrific job, because it's a lot of work. So thank you, everyone, for supporting the concept that persons with disabilities should, in fact, be included in ICTs, and in the participation of standards and in society in general by having access to telecommunications and other technical aspects of life that all of us who do not have certain problems can enjoy.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Andrea, for your always valuable contribution. Also, I would like to thank you for all the support that you give for us in order to have this successful open consultation.

Any comments? Okay. Our next response is response 44, by the Internet Society. Yes, please.

>> My name is Carl Gonburg. I'm from the Internet Society. First of all, I would like to on behalf of the Internet Society thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this work. I think it's very valuable for everyone to be here today. There is a lot to gain from the additional expertise that we can get from this meeting. And it's very important that we have these kinds of open consultations where all stakeholders are included and can share their experiences and that we can learn from each other. So I would also like to extend a thank you for the other stakeholders that have been contributing and participating today.

We were very pleased with the ability to submit a contribution through the online open consultations. I would just briefly highlight some specific points from that submission. But I think it's important, first of all, to just affirm and recognize that persons with disabilities are facing a number of different challenges. We've heard a couple of them today. But essentially they can range from everything from accessibility to Internet content to affordability of Internet services, affordability of assistive technologies, and also what was highlighted today, a general lack of awareness about how persons with disabilities are using the Internet.

However, this is something that we wanted to highlight in our submission, is that although we have these barriers, there's also several practical solutions out there. And in this regard, it's extra important that we look at the contributions from all stakeholders, because all stakeholders have a very important role to play. For example, we heard about governments, a lot of examples from governments today, examples such as accessibility requirements in public procurement is a good example. We have Civil Society, for example, that can ‑‑ Civil Society that can have processes of including persons with disabilities and the representative organisations into formulating policy recommendations, and also recommendations on good implementations.

We have the technical community, which can provide its expertise and many of the solutions that we hear about. And I think one of the most well referenced one is W3Cs Web Accessibility Initiative. I think we'll hear more about this later on. I think they had a contribution. But in essence, everyone can contribute. And I think that it's a point that we hear about how everyone has a role to play. Our submission was also specifically focused on highlighting the role of local initiatives, because local organisations can be very effective in empowering individuals in their local communities. And the Internet Society has a lot of experience of working with this. We collaborate with many of our chapters in community‑based initiatives. For example, we also have our Beyond the Net funding programme, which provides grants for innovative projects focusing on empowering local communities and individuals in those communities.

So one example of such a project is the Orbit project in Ethiopia which provides basic computer training for visually impaired ,individuals. This project turned out to be very successful, because many of the graduates found employment as a result of the newly acquired IT skills.

We also funded a project in Argentina, which started off as very small local project, but then has expanded and now has a global reach. Tiflolibros was unique because it was the first library for Spanish‑speaking people with visual impairment that was not only free, but had a worldwide accessibility, accessible worldwide. This project has expanded quite a lot. It now includes more than 50,000 books. It's continuing to expand.

Another example, which I think relates quite well to the importance of increasing the general awareness is the work of our Australian chapter, which has been involved in these issues for many, many years. And they developed a disability awareness training tool kit that they are using to train other chapter leaders and training them how to train other people. It creates a chain reaction.

So these are a few examples from our submission that we wanted to highlight. But the point being that there's a lot of practical solutions out there that can be amplified or replicated. A day like this is a good opportunity to share some of those experiences. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Internet Society, for sharing with us your activities with respect to the Internet access for persons with disabilities.

I would like to open the floor for any quick comments.

Next is response 45 from Go ON UK.

>> I see a caption on the screen. Apparently someone has raised its hand. Just noted that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for pointing out that. I would put the response of Go On UK on the screen. We'll go back to the submission from Georgia. It's 13.

>> Guram Keleptrishvili: I'm from the ministry of economic from Georgia. I would like to present my submission. First, I would like to thank organizers for organizing this meeting. One of the main priorities of the government of Georgia is the integration of people with disabilities into societies and the information technology must be available for everyone, including disabled persons. But if we want to reach all the people mentioned, we will need close cooperation with organisations and exchanging experience with other countries.

Today I want to mention some programs when we have in our country in Georgia. As you know, there are some special braille displays for blind and the visually‑impaired persons, which you can connect to the computer by USB cable. This provides braille output with metal pins that move up and down to display the braille character for the reader.

The problem is that. This device is not adopted for Georgia language. There is another problem, for example, for our children. There are many different programs, for example, autism, which are not adapted in Georgian language. We have lack of teachers in ICT. So it means we don't have trainers who can teach persons with disabilities. This is also a real problem for our country.

Now I want to tell about our government. Our government needs to work out indicational methodology for people with disability in ICT. Also, we need to create action plan for developing and providing people with disability with computer technology. I wanted to mention about our country. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Georgia, for presenting your submission. I would like to open the floor for any comments with respect to the submission.

Our next response.

Then King Saud University from Saudi Arabia.

I invite you to look at the submission. We don't have the summary. We have the link for that submission.

The next response is from W3C Web Accessibility Initiative. We were trying to connect with the representative. So I would ask with the assistance of already.

>> Shadi Abou‑Zahra: From the world accessibility initiative. Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. The Worldwide Web Consortium is an international vendor‑neutral body that establishes the core standards for the Worldwide Web. It's been created and continues to be directed by Tim Berners Lee, who is the inventor of Worldwide Web. The initiative of the W3C is a department that focuses on making the Web accessible to people with disabilities. This includes ensuring that the W3C standards include accessibility features, but also we develop guidelines explaining how to design accessible websites and web software. Those guidelines have been mentioned several times, and I think this is important to see how see how these guidelines have been recognized by many organizations and governments internationally in order to provide accessible websites for people with disabilities.

I think we all know importance and the relevance of the Web today as a core part of ICT in our everyday life. That's an important part of accessibility. However, there are many other parts as well that need to come together or that are increasingly coming together. For example, today organizing a trip using custom transportation means may also require accessing information online or accessing geographical information where you currently are right now and how to plan your trip. Television, mobile, radio, all those things are converging together. And it's important to ensure that the standards and the areas of overlap do not create inadvertent fragmentation for people with disabilities, that systems are interoperable that remain interoperable so there is seamless accessibility.

Another fragment that comes is local standards that may conflict with international standards. This is another important aspect to make sure that a local activity and unusual tiffs and regional activities do not create fragmentation that would reduce the market and reduce the uptake of accessibility internationally.

So in our contribution we else mentioned other guidelines that we have, and I think most notably I would like to emphasize the user agent guidelines, which are browser and media players, any software that acts on behalf of the user to access web‑based content and many application mobile apps are, in fact, such miniature browsers. Those guidelines should be equally important to consider in the context of providing an accessible web for everyone.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Shadi from W3C Web Accessibility Initiative for your submission.

I would like to give the floor now and open the comments to Andrea Saks, please.

>> Andrea Saks: Shadi, are you there? It's Andrea. I have something to tell you that I'd like you to think about. It came up today. A gentleman from Australia, who was signing, and I don't know if this is in your remit or not, there are no standards out there to help persons who are deaf or rely on captions. There is no remit or no specific ‑‑ I don't know how to say this. It isn't really a standard, but there is no kind of guideline for how many standards. Only the FCC has done something. I don't know if W3C can take this on. Also, the fact there is a lack of sign language on video. Because that came up today, and because I know you, and pause you're online, I'm going to throw that at you and perhaps we can talk about that or that can be considered at a later date. It doesn't exist right now felt so thank you for letting me take that opportunity to communicate that.

>> Shadi: Very nice to talk to you again and actually see the back of your head on the computer screen. Yes, indeed, I believe there has also been similar activities, maybe in Germany and other countries as well. I'd be very happy to talk with you about this and to see this and see if we can look at this in the realm of techniques to improve the guidance around the Web content accessibility guidelines to ensure ‑‑ to provide more guidance here on how to create best practices in captioning.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Andrea. Thank you very much Shadi. We have comment from the remote participant.

>> Nabil Eid has a question, what are the practical steps to formulate laws and regulations to make public websites and more accessible and how can remove the lack of conformance to W3C guidelines and the poor websites design?

>> CHAIR: You would ask kindly Mr. Shadi, if ‑‑

>> Shadi: Thank you very much. Very important question. It's a very large scope. I think several factors have been mentioned in the discussion today. It's not limited to the Web. The one aspect of awareness on the existence of current standards and technologies to make ICTs, in this case the Web, accessible. And the other is education and training to make sure the developers and designers are aware of what they need to do. Those are equally important. There's also the aspect of accessibility support, so in many languages, for instance, the support for a screen reader technology or other assistive technologies, particularly the aspect of open source technology has been mentioned. So those are all components that are important in order to allow the implementation of accessibility. Policies have often been of these implementations. We provide a lot of resources on our website. I'll read out the address for the captioning. So it's w3.org/wai. You will hopefully find a lot of information there on managing and planning web accessibility, including on developing policies. Please feel free to contact us. I'll also spell out my email address in case you want to contact me directly for further information. It's shadi@w3.org.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Shadi, for your intervention. I have one more comment from ICANN.

>> ICANN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief. This has been very interesting, especially the last few interventions. And I think what Shadi has shown in his excellent presentation and also the written submission that accompanied it, is that we're not particularly short of standards. Perhaps there might be some gaps in some areas, and certainly the excellent work the W3C has done and other bodies and how governments have taken them up in public proceed cower meant, etc., has been excellent. Where it seems to be a lot of the submissions this afternoon and this morning have shown there is a gap is in the take up of in the private sector and the business sector of the guidelines and particularly in relation to videos and that. And so I'm wondering where the W3C sees how the implementation of their standards can be further ingrained in the culture of developing websites, whether it's an issue of education, whether it's an issue of trying to get some sort of guidelines. I mean, there are guidelines but to get some buy‑in internationally.

>> The W3C we focus and a very technical scope and focus on the development of the standards. Of course, we understand the relevance to policymaking and how sometimes standards are taking up in policies. So we have seen or we are seeing, actually, in Europe in particular, there is a move now ‑‑ active discussion about the European Accessibility Act, similar to the Americans With Disabilities Act in the U.S. It tries to move this from public websites only to more generally, not only ICT, but also the built‑in environment and other aspects. Today also procurements and procurement policies have been mentioned and I think the experience of Section 508 in the U.S. has notably contributed to increased accessibility of products and services. Also, I think in the private space, because many vendors will not develop products just for the governments, but they include accessibility in the product in general. So we see some developments in that area in some countries. And I think also the UNCRPD and the conventional rights on persons with disabilities has strengthened this move, but certainly in many other areas of the world there's a lot more need to continue the effort.

Thanks again, Shadi, for your valuable contribution and responses to the comments raised. And I encourage the floor to get in contact with Mr. Shadi with his email address, which was stated earlier.

With that, we would like to move to response Number 48, Inclusive Design Research Center, OCAD University in Canada.

I would read the summary of this submission. There was a growing technology gap for anyone relying to alternative access systems. At the same time, emerging technical innovations and practices can be leveraged to better support universities who cannot use mass‑produced designs. We describe a growing cluster of initiatives that are addressing this technology gap by matching the margin with supply at the margins, pooling resources and supporting the design and development of accessible products, thereby creating more inclusive economies. A specific example in Ontario is described.

Canada, please.

>> Canada: Thank you, chairman. If for further reference at the level of the federal government of Canada, I would just like to point out to website that includes very valuable information on government policy on web accessibility, both in English and French. And the website is www.dbs‑sct.gc.ca. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada.

Now I would like to ‑‑ our last submission is from the Department of Communications and the Arts, Australia.

>> Australia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce this submission on behalf of my colleague who leads the communications accessibility team in the Department of Communications in the Arts. The submission provides an overview of some of the challenges faced in Australia and responses to them. It includes information on Australian activities and some best practice examples. This contribution highlights challenges facing people with a disability in accessing the Internet, such as affordability, Internet bandwidth requirements to some applications, and accessibility of online content. It also emphasizes the importance of shared responsibility for addressing barriers to Internet access for people with a disability among government, industry, and other stakeholders, as well as a need to empower individuals.

Australian submission reflects on domestic actions, such as the Web accessibility national transition strategy, Australia's natural relay service, which won an award last week in Dubai, relevant domestic legislation including the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, and the National Disability Insurance Scheme, the Web guidelines version 2.0 we just heard about, and the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities.

Australia believes that addressing the barriers to Internet access for people with a disability is a shared response, carries not only by government, but also by industry and other stakeholders across all sectors of society. Australia considers that governments some establish strong policy and legal frameworks and robust institutions, open and competitive markets, and essential infrastructure to support the development of solutions. Governments can also bring together stakeholders across the community and encourage cooperation and innovation to develop solutions.

I'd just like to bring one element of this submission to people's attention. It's a recent initiative as part of the government's National Disability Insurance Scheme. It goes to accessibility. The National Disability Insurance Scheme provides Australia N born with a disability before the age of 65 with support of a better life. The scheme provides access to communications devices, both mainstream and assistive technology. It it also informs and empowers people with a disability to choose the technology that best suits their needs. It aims to stimulate innovation and solution development within industry and plays a role in capturing information and collaborating with researchers.

Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Australia, for this valuable contribution in sharing the national experience with respect to many of the programs domestic actions with regard to accessibility. I would like to open the floor for any comments thank you very much. I know that there is a remote request, but I'm not sure is it ready to take the floor?

Okay. We have a submission from from Mohamed Gaafar from Sudan would like to make an intervention.

>> I will read on behalf of Mr. Muhamed Gaafar. Hi, everybody, and thank you very much for the opportunity. I want to talk briefly that there is nothing to be added by all mentioned by the participants. I think we can make it compulsory for the developers and site owners to make their sites accessible, but we can raise awareness of the developers of the Web sites and programmer and people who are working in the field. But know the importance to make Internet accessible to all, then we can make a policy to organize this and create ‑‑ and the creation of acts that will control this issue.

Persons with disabilities have a right to access to information and services over the Web. All people must be aware and the importance of this then the policies and acts will be the guide to accessibility contents. He would also like to add that the training of persons with disabilities and using the technologies and assistive technologies in their general life in addition to use for Internet access.

>> CHAIR: I would like to thank Mr. Gaafar for his intervention and contribution. I'm not sure of the remote assistance would like to add something.

>> I have second comment from Mr. Eric Kofmel.

>> CHAIR: Could you clarify from which entity?

>> He's the president of Autistic Minority International. Hi, my name is Eric Kofmel. I am the president of autistic minority international, run by and for autistic persons. Since autism has been mentioned in a number of different submissions, we would like to stress that the accessibility needs of autistic persons should not be generalized. Autism is a spectrum condition and needs are different from individual to individual, depending on where on the autism spectrum we are. Some of us are so‑called computer geeks or in other words who may be web developers themselves, while others have an intellectual disability or cognitive impairment. In development of Internet access policies, it is important to involve autistic adults themselves, not just the parents of autistic children. For some of us, the first hurdle in accessing the Internet is to access the necessary hardware and software and services. The vast amount of information and specific details can be overwhelming. Sales should be given sufficient time to explain to us at our own speed or alternatively electronic stories that specialize in selling to persons with disabilities should be subsidized. A possibility is also to attach such specialized access providers and stories to assisting support centers for persons with disabilities. For example, those that already advise on assistive technology products: Commercial materials and packaging should be easily understandable. Particularly for those autistic persons who do not speak, it is important that customer service hot lines be accessible by text not just by phone. Browser plug‑inches should be made available and add‑ons and extensions making the user experience more accessible should be encouraged. Government portals and websites need to become fully accessible encourage them to be more client with legislation and guidelines as well. Governments should liaise with to get them to adhere to website accessibility. In EU countries, these standards would be over and above the Internet accessibility requirements resulting from any final text approved with regard to the European Accessibility Act. Again, all of this should be done in close cooperation with organizations of persons with disabilities, including organizations run by and for autistic persons.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Kofmel for your inputs. And I would like to ask the floor if there is any quick comments with respect to comments made by Mr. Eric Kofmel which was read by the remote assistant? We came to the end of the responses. Unless we have one more remote participant? We are going to the next item on agenda. I would like to ask if there are any general comments with respect to the responses in general. I would like to open the floor.

>> Chairman: I would like to thank all those that provided responses and many of them are very interesting and very useful. During our intervention before last coffee break, I think you made a very valuable statement saying there are a lot of commonalities in the responses and a lot of proposals which are common for most of responses.

It might be good to develop some kind of summary that would include those proposals that are common for majority. I understand that it's a difficult task, and may require some time. However, to my mind, council may try to develop it for not the following meeting of Working Group of Council on Internet in autumn to not lose the experience we gain in these proposals we obtain from these contributions. And then it could be used by many parent organizations, by many interested, but by all interested party or all multistakeholders.

And I would invite you and others to support that idea. That might provide us with a very useful experience and proposals from these open consultations. Thank you. Thank you very much, Russia Federation for the comments and proposal to look into the proposal that has commonality with respect to some of the some and trying to and the summary reflecting the similarities. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: In order to help you, I may inform you that I discussed already that issue with Mr. Malor. In practice, he is not objecting to do so with assistance of others from other bureaus. Seems to be ready to do it for the meeting of Internet Working Group of Council in autumn. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I think we could ask the secretariat to work in something with respect to the summary. Before coming up with a conclusion in this regard, I would like to take first United Kingdom. Then I will go to Andrea.

>> United Kingdom: Thank you, chair. We just wanted to again thank all those who have made contributions to the discussion today. It's been really amazing, fruitful, interesting set of contributions and ideas. Perhaps of all the consultations council work group has done, the generating ideas and interests from all different stakeholders. We have learned a great deal from that. It's true there have been some common themes. What has really struck us today is just the variety of experience from different countries, developing countries, and developed countries, from different perspectives, from different stakeholder perspectives, some of the different issues and different ways of addressing challenges. Many examples of different kinds of good practice.

I think given that variety that we've heard today, we would be cautious about trying to reduce this to some kind of a summary. Perhaps that's an idea that we can discuss later in the Council Working Group. We think it's important that we don't lose that variety of experience and those different voices that we've heard today, because for us that's been one of the most valuable aspects of the meeting today. Again, we really express our gratitude to all those who have put in so much, so much energy into a really interesting and fruitful discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Andrea Saks, please.

>> Andrea Saks: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In principle, I support as the JCA chairman as the Russian suggestion, and I also agree the British suggestion that it shouldn't be just a summary. I think it should go to every single Council Working Group, because accessibility impacts the work of all of them, the building, the financial, and I think a report coming out of that, and a chart of similarities could be included in that. I'm happy to help on that from the JCA. That's what I do is coordinate the work between different groups.

So I think that we should ‑‑ I think that we should really capture what has been said here by the different groups and the comments, because I think we all can benefit. I learned a lot as well, even though I've been doing this most of my life. And I think everybody who contributed to that ought to be congratulated. There was one person who wasn't on, and I just wanted to make a comment for him, and that is My Blind Spot. He made a negative comment about links and stuff. But what this person was able to do, being in the United States, going blind five or six years ago, was able to make all the tools that he was an accountant that were used for his job accessibility to other blind people so they could use that. That kind of impact really changes the dynamic of people. I think that all the suggestions that were good or negative really ought to be captured in some kind of a synopsis.

Thank you. I wasn't going to let that get in my way. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I just wanted to also bring to your attention the comment that we wanted to put in later, if you want that later about the deadline for ITU‑D question 7 for the competition. I just wanted to remind you of that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Andrea. Internet Society?

>> Internet society: Thank you, chair. I just wanted to second what the UK said and was also mentioned by Miss Saks. I think it's important ‑‑ it's good to focus on or to look at commonalities. But I think there is a risk of only focusing on commonalities that we miss out on the diversity. And I really think that that's an important contribution when we have such diverse set of stakeholders that we not lose track of the importance of that diversity. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Internet Society. United States.

>> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First, we would like to also express our congratulations to this group on such a fruitful conversation. We certainly learned a lot, and we're very impressed by the depth of the contributions, by the excellent panel this morning, as well as the diversity of responses that this open consultation received. We agree with the United Kingdom's assessment that this was certainly the most successful we've had to date.

On Russia's proposal, we think it is a very ‑‑ it is very important to be able to capture what we learned here for others. But like the previous few interventions, we question whether a high level summary by the secretariat is the best way to achieve it. We think that the contributors themselves are likely in the best position to be able to summarize their views and so would prefer, perhaps, the summaries like the table that was provided here could serve as a helpful reference point for those who wished to learn more, such as the other Council Working Groups, and how to provide some guidance to the contributor so those are a little bit more concise. We would welcome further discussion on this in the meeting later this week as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Russia Federation.

>> Russia federation: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I was not clear enough. I'm not saying that we should forget about all contributions and all this table which is on screen and published. Everything is maintained. But there are many common things indicated. This report, relatively short report, for example, common standards. There are a lot of contribution common standard. I think it would be very good to say about that. Then in this report it should be also a statement that there was diversity of approaches that could be looked into in details and put reference to that table like that at least. Personally, I was going through all those documents, if you could imagine. It took a lot of time. Sometimes for some people it is not ‑‑ it would not be necessary to look all these documents. For example, they want to see what kind of standards for web design better to apply. That's my reason. It's not something to forget. I'm not proposing to forget anything. I'm proposing to help people who has no time to go through all documents to start to analyze situation in general and then go into details, like we are doing in many cases. Thank you very much.

Finally, let's try. We will see. If it's not good enough, then it's not good enough. Then we'll forget it.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Saudi Arabia?

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon to all colleagues. We also in our turn like to thank all the contributors to this consultation. We are very much encouraged by all the interest gathered. We learned a lot. And whether we summarize it or not, I think it's a very valuable input we have from different parts of the world, from developing and developed countries, different backgrounds and different experiences.

As Andrea Saks always reminded us of the importance of the participation of the disabled in all our activities, the barriers usually are financial. And we all experience that. We all worry about the budget of the union. But I was wondering if we explore the idea of the private sector helping us out with this. We have many manufacturers who provide many equipments and make lots of money out of special equipments and so on and so forth. So if the ITU as one example can encourage those manufacturers to become Sector Members and contribute to our work and to help us out in this regard, as we know the budgets of the union and the member states are always limited. So I wanted to throw this idea just for to reflect on it for the future. But we would like in summary, Mr. Chairman, to thank all the contributors to this consultation. We are very much encouraged and would take it forward for future meetings in ITU for us in general. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Canada, please.

>> Canada: Thank you, chairman. Like Saudi Arabia, we would very much like to first and foremost congratulate all the stakeholders, more than 48 that participated, our panelists this morning, also our gratitude for the intervention he is.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of a summary, I was reflecting on the interventions this morning of Mr. Kleeb who, among other things, pointed out to the importance of not necessarily working for people with disability, but working with them. So to that effect, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about we summarizing, it is imperative that that "we" includes all the stakeholders and particularly those that made the effort to contribute and participate in this meeting. Thank you.

Thank you, Canada. Costa Rica?

>> Costa Rica: First of all, I would like to congratulate all of those stakeholders for the wealth and depth of the contributions. I understand the reflection he is of our colleague from Russia, as well as the U.K. Instead of talking about a summary of all the contributions, what we need is an organised so we could organize by categories and that may help to better understand and better record all the contributions without losing any of the richness that have been put together, because now we have a list of stakeholders with their views. If we can just identify, as Andrea suggested, that she can help and she's got a lot of experience on this, we can identify categories that may help us better work in the future.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Costa Rica, for this proposal. I would suggest that we have listened to the proposal by Russia. I see Russia having a shorter version, but listening to the other interventions, that the idea of losing aspects of that rich contribution coming. So I see maybe Costa Rica's proposal is one way to tackle this matter with respect to having an organised document, the same as the compiled document, but maybe organised in a way without changing or amending or summarizing the inputs, but to have it structured in a way that helps the reader to maybe get the information faster than the way it's represented in the combined document.

But I would ask maybe to come to the Council Working Group and maybe give some ideas in doing that meeting in regards to this matter.

So our last comment, we have one remote participant we would like to intervene. So I would like to ask the remote assistant to.

>> On behalf of Mr. Nabil Eid from the Telecenter Foundation. He has a few points. First point: The governments can play vital role through collaboration of governments, policymakers, NGOs, and the manufacturing industry to help solve skill gap issues. Second point: Organize and promote ICT skills, training, and offer competitive compensation, flexible work programs and strong benefit programs to people with disabilities. Third point, support local community training programs, provide localized info on resources, funding and support to train people with disabilities.

Fourth point: U.N. should emphasize on the need of standard on approach disability for all nations with ratified CRPD as mandatory resolution, also global effort concerted U.N. and governments to set standard approach visibility for natural, regional, and international level.

Fifth point: Governments and businesses should work together to improve access to technology, ICT accessibility, and make their websites more accessible, making all public businesses' websites open for all. Sixth point: There are different structures within countries, but most be focused upon combinations of one or more of the following to success the role of ICT accessibility and national accessible policies and development disabilities through attitude barriers in relation to understanding the benefits and possibilities of ICTs as policy and diffuse the responsibility for policy implementation.

Seventh point: I think national web accessibility policy in collaboration with national, regional, and global specialists are working groups to support networks and online networks. Intersect with international standards of web accessibility. Eighth point: Promote university accessibility including accessibility appraisals. Ninth point: Provide training programs incorporating access consultancy and raising awareness and etiquette. Tenth point: Encourage handling legal matters to accessibility. Eleventh point: Get an accessibility champion to head companies with authority for accessible web design. And finally, awareness and providing developers' community web standard accessibility guideline. Most developers have no idea how to implement.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr. Nabil Eid, for your comments and also for their earlier submission to the open consultation.

With that, we come to the conclusion of Item 4, discussion of responses. And I would like to extend my personal thanks to all stakeholders who made the responses and participated in the work of the open consultation.

Now we move to Item 5 in the agenda. Any other business? Earlier in the meeting we had comments from our distinguished colleague from U.K. with respect to proposals coming from stakeholders in regards to future topics for open consultation. That's one of the items under any other businesses. Maybe we start with that request. So the floor is open now for any comment with respect to proposals for topics for open consultation coming from the stakeholders or that the stakeholders would like to see the Council Working Group conduct such investigation in these topics. ICANN?

>> ICANN: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Nigel Hicks in ICANN. Thank you for the opportunity to take part in this open consultation. I think already we have seen the value of the decision that was taken at the 2014 plenipotentiary. I was wondering whether it would be opportune, and perhaps it's in order to understand what suggestions the governments already made, because if we're going to have a previous discussion on what issues we might discuss in this consultation next time around, it would be just good to know in a very high level for what is being proposed. I take your advice on this.

>> CHAIR: Based on the previous discussion and the open consultations, to give the opportunity for stakeholders participating to give them or to have the chance to hear from them in topics that seems important for them, that the council group might take this under consideration.

With respect to the submission by member states, the presentation of these documents will take place in the Council Working Group meeting, not in the open consultation. So now we would like to have the opportunity to hear what the stakeholders think appropriate with respect to topics. Russia, please.

>> Russian Federation: I'm sorry, but I'm a little bit puzzled. In the resolution states different thing. Resolution by plenipotentiary conference by the member states. I'm not a lawyer, but I usually follow the plenipotentiary conference. I'm sorry; we should not go beyond that.

>. CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. If the plenipotentiary resolution states that proposals must come from the member states, then we would work along with that amendment ‑‑ I mean mandate. However, I don't have the resolution in front of me, but the Council Working Group is the one who decides on the topics. So the decision to conduct an open consultation comes from the Council Working Group itself.

Russia, please.

>> Russian Federation: Not only decides, but from member states, not from open consultations. We are going beyond the resolution. I'm sorry; I never could accept such when we decide is beyond our mandate.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I would like to give the floor back to ICANN and then I will go with the rest.

>> ICANN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Of course, anything we say, of course, doesn't have to be inputted into the formal working group.

For ICANN we are very keen to have an open consultation on what I suppose we might term the enabling environment or the environment for growth and access. I think we've had very good discussions on how access can be improved on the accessibility today. We've discussed access requirements before. But having a discussion on the enabling environment, the sort of policies, the sort of regulations, the sort of generic sort of overall culture that encourages growth and innovation and access, I think, is something that would be well worth discussing in a consultation group.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, ICANN. Australia, please.

>> Australia: Thank you, chairman. Just to say that while member states will make the decision, there's nothing in that, I think, to preclude taking on board the views of stakeholders in coming to that conclusion through the Council Working Group itself. So I don't see any difficulties in getting suggestions while we have stakeholders here in what topics they would see valuable in the group discussion.

Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Australia. Saudi Arabia.

>> Saudi Arabia: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Briefly, our understanding of the mandate is the same, like Russia. We have to remember that this consultation today is on a specific topic. And the participants here, not necessarily representative of all the stakeholders, these are only the people here of those who are interested on the topic and that discussion and the disability. So in brief, Mr. Chairman, we support Russian interpretation of the resolution and the mandate. We think this discussion should go forward in the group itself and not in the consultation meeting now of the.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. Russia, please.

>> Russian Federation: Mr. Chairman, I formally protest to discuss the issue in the meeting. Please contact legal advice and check if it is allowed. I have nothing against discussing proposals of any interested party in the corridor, but we cannot discuss it at this meeting. It was discussed at the plenipotentiary conference. There was a proposal that topics could be discussed at this open consultation meeting, and it was refused. It was refused. Let's not go beyond mandate of this meeting and its official request to you, stop this discussion. Thank you. And I'm ready to listen, ICANN, ready to listen to anyone in corridor, but it should not be in the meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Canada, please ‑‑ sorry, yes, Canada.

>> Canada: Thank you, chairman. I don't think we need to bring lawyers into the meeting. I think that the whole purpose and the wonderful thing of being here together with stakeholders, whether it's a resolution from the plenipotentiary conference or a decision or resolution from council in particular, 1344, results 1, bullet 3. The issue here is that Canada believes that it would be useful to listen to those present and to listen to those listening to us to express their views. I don't see how this would ‑‑ the purpose of our resolution, quite the opposite, it would reaffirm a fundamental value which is engaging the stakeholders in our discussion. It doesn't preclude the fact that tomorrow is a closed session, member states only. But I honestly don't see why we couldn't open this discussion to see what our stakeholders think about these issues. Again, Mr. Chairman, I hope we don't have to bring the lawyers to the discussion.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We already passed 5:30. I might close the meeting. United Kingdom, please.

>> United kingdom:  ‑‑

>> CHAIR: I know the captioners have done a great job and the interpreters, and so we need to maybe conclude in maximum of five minutes, if that's okay.

Okay. I'll have Internet Society, please.

>> Internet Society: Thank you, chair. I just wanted to second the proposal by ICANN. I thought it was a very good proposal and perhaps even specify it even more into capacity building for Internet development to be a very good topic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> United States: Thank you, chair. Thank you to both ICANN and ISOC for their contribution. We, like some of the others, we think it's useful to have stakeholders weigh in on the next stop I can and, in fact, recall at the last consultation that some stakeholders actually put proposals for topics in their contributions and those were discussed and brought into meeting. We think, although governments during the Council Working Group meeting itself ultimately make the decisions, we see no issue in our read of any of the relevant resolutions that would preclude us from discussing with stakeholders as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. We have difficulties to keep listening. At the end we will have a good outcome with respect to this discussion. But I would say for the time being, I encourage stakeholders to reach in their national level and maybe the member states will do the consultations with the topics that the stacks would like to have the Council Working Group undertake. The member states will supplement their inputs, taking into consideration their input received from their stakeholders at the national level.

Maybe this is a way forward for the time being, taking into account that we already at this late hour. With that, I might, if there is no other businesses, I know there was one request from the BDT to forward the ‑‑ let's call it the received responses to the Study Group. Andrea.

>> Andrea Saks: They wanted to point out that for the next meeting for question 7 that is going to be held on the 4th of April, that there is a deadline to the 19th of February. Maybe that's wrong, but there is a deadline to make contributions to that. And also, the contest, which is ‑‑ let me get it up real quick. I lost it. Just a minute. One second. Susan, are you still in the room? I think I'll turn this over to Susan, because Susan knows this better than I do about the contest that's going to be on the 19th.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Andrea. I think the idea is to enrich the discussion at the Study Group under question 7. There is a request to disseminate the received responses to the Study Group 1.

>> Andrea Saks: I found it. It's the launching on the competition of best strategies policy activities developed in ICT accessibility by ITU members. Participants are invited to consider this document and template for action. We can make this available on the Web for everybody to see. The deadline is the 19th of February for the contributions for the rapporteur group meeting in April for question 7. That's what I was supposed to say. So I think I've got it right now.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Andrea. With that, I think it's within the mandate of the Council Working Group to disseminate its output on the activities of the work of the Council Working Group. So I think the secretariat could take care of this request and enrich the discussion at that Study Group by submitting these responses.

With that, I come to the end of Item 5. And before closing our meeting, I would like again to extend my personal thanks to all stakeholders who made responses and participated in the work of the open consultations. And I would like also to encourage member states to consider the received responses and the fruitful discussions of this meeting and their submission to the Council Working Group Internet.

I would like to extend, again, my thanks to the Secretary General and the general secretariat, Mr. Malor, and Mr. Jose Maria for their efficient assistance during the open consultation of the Council Working Group Internet.

Also, I would like to thank the ITU remote participant team, as well as the captioners, Tracy and Lesia, and the interpreters for their tremendous efforts. I would like to see you in the next open consultation. Thank you very much.

(Applause)