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(Please stand by for the meeting to begin.)

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

May I ask you to be in your places and to enjoy the lively discussion instead of enjoying the rain outside. I hope that the interpreters are ready to serve us.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Chairman, the interpreters are there.

>> CHAIR: Put on your headphones and we can continue working.

So now let me come back to the discussion we had this morning. We had a very positive and productive discussion with India and some other countries during the lunch break about their concerns and about the lack of opportunity to have a lively discussion. We agreed with India on the following proposal as a compromise, if I may call it. It is very difficult to be equally unhappy. India proposes inclusion of a reference to Paragraph 65 under "recalling" a). Let me read on Paragraph 65. Actually, I was reluctantly agreeing with the proposal because it concerns developing countries. I will read for you the text of Paragraph 65. "We underline the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet governance which should reflect their interests as well as in development of capacity building."

India also proposes that we make a reference to "relevant paragraphs" in the beginning of the text as it stands now in Opinion 6, so as to be clear that there are other paragraphs that could be considered relevant.

So may I ask your indulgence to agree with me that this mutually acceptable agreement between the Secretariat, Chairman of Working Group 3, and the Forum and the Indian administration be properly reflected in the text of the Opinion 6? Are there any requests for let's say feelings of disagreement with what I am proposing? Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like you to repeat the proposals in dictation speed in order for us to clearly understand the changes proposed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So two things. So now in the Opinion 6 where we have lists of appropriate paragraphs, we add Paragraph 65, called Paragraph 65. I will read for you what the meaning of Paragraph 65 is, as it is. "We underline the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet Governance which should reflect their interests, as well as in development and capacity building." That is the full text of Paragraph 65 as agreed.

So we are just, I am just quoting this for you so you will know what I am asking you to agree to. Adding reference to expressly to, in addition to other paragraphs, to add the Paragraph 65. And I have read for you what the meaning of Paragraph 65 is. That is what I am asking you to agree with me to take on board and to insert into the text of Opinion 6.

So this is the part, this is the part which is reflected in Opinion 6 and I can take it for granted from you now that there is no one -- you have the floor. Is there a mistake or you are asking the floor?

I'm sorry. So I repeat. I take for granted that you agree with me that the proposal we have to the text of inserting reference 65 explicitly in the list of other numbers already available in Opinion 6 be added and that this will be the only change in the text in Opinion 6 to be considered as adopted at the level of the Working Group 3.

There is a second thing that the Secretariat has reminded me. We are shifting the text, the place of the relevant paragraphs so that they come to the beginning and then they start listing the ones which we have agreed in addition to the 65 which we have already agreed to draft insert this. ISOC.

>> ISOC: Thank you, I give the floor to Sweden first. I come after. Thank you.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that you are proposing to change "recalling a)" in the document. I ask you again to call out recalling A as it is to be in Opinion 6. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry. So do you have the current text? I am going to read to you now the text as it will read in dictation speed. Perhaps it will be helpful. I think the proposal of Sweden is a correct one. So I am doing this now.

"Recalling a)" should read as the following: Relevant is the new word "paragraphs," of the Tunis Agenda including paragraphs and then I list 35, 37, 55, 60, new Paragraph 65, and we continue with the ones which were already in the draft, 68, 69, 70, 71 and 83. And then we continue with the text as it is related to the enhanced cooperation and the roles of all relevant stakeholders. In actual terms we are having the word "relevant" at the beginning before paragraphs and injecting, inserting number 65.

Would you be comfortable with this proposal? ISOC, please.

>> ISOC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We made it clear when we started the discussion we are happy to accept the paragraph as it is. If we are inserting other paragraph, I would like to add Paragraph 36 which was, I think, a major outcome of the Tunis Summit as the recognizes the academic and technical communities as relevant subgroups of the other stakeholder groups. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to take a little bit of your time to read dictation speed for you what 36 is saying. We recognize the valuable contribution by the academic and technical communities within those stakeholder groups mentioned in paragraph 35 to the evolution, functioning and development of the Internet. And as I can see in our own Draft Opinion already, paragraph 35 is listed. So now I am asking the floor for opinion whether you would bear with me, not to make my life more difficult than it is and to continue with the new proposals for the support of ISOC.

Iran, followed by Brazil and Portugal.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I withdraw and give it to Brazil and Portugal and come after, please.

>> CHAIR: Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was told that there is no point of order in this meeting, in the proceedings. However, I would like to signal and recall that the amendments that derives from the proposal was extensively discussed in the morning session. It entailed discussions over lunch. So the proposal you are offering to us, Mr. Chair, reflects a lot of work that was invested.

I would like to differentiate these from other contributions that would come at this session. I don't think it would be the appropriate time to do so. This is my comment and again, recognize there is no point of order. But however, I think we have to differentiate. Otherwise we will be starting, reopening the discussions. I think we have singled out one element that should be further discussed. This is the offer you have put before us, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Meaningful suggestion. And Portugal, please.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you. Well, I think that the Paragraph 36 is not a new proposal. I think it is a mistake because it refers to the technical and academic communities who, by the way, invented the Internet. So I think that they are more than relevant to be here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is exactly my anxiety. That's why I went two times to listen to the colleagues. There is no reason to disagree with Portugal or anybody. The problem is, when you open to one paragraph, you can open to another paragraph. All of them in one way or another are relevant. But to what extent you can open that? Chairman, I have a firm proposal for your Distinguished Colleagues for considerations. Taking into account that the risk which might occur that opening to Paragraph 36 and another paragraph which we have discussed at the IEG, I suggest the following. We do not refer to any paragraph at all. We start the sentence recalling relevant paragraphs of Tunis Agenda.

This has no risk. If any paragraph, 36, 35, 61, 65 and others are relevant, they are relevant. Otherwise, you have heard that people have some difficulty to discuss and some people says it is a new proposal. Some others say it is not a new proposal. We don't disagree with any of these colleagues. The problem is that you would have an open-ended discussions. So may you request kindly to put our suggestion, our proposal to the views and consideration of Distinguished Colleagues. Perhaps we could resolve the matter because we do not lose, Chairman, anything. This says recalling relevant paragraphs of Tunis Agenda.

Those people who need to take up the issue and further discuss it in future will refer to the Tunis Agenda and to discuss the relevant paragraph of that. In fact, this is already in the text. So it is nothing to be added, but you delete the first part and start recalling relevant paragraphs, Chairman. I think that would be more practical. Otherwise you may have hours of discussions, as nobody is wrong; everybody is right. The problem is that we need to arrive at consensus. That is the difficulty. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Also very wise suggestion. Now, I am having the request from three sources: From Chile, ISOC and USA. Before I give you the floor I should like you to reflect in your own time of the latest proposal of Iran, whether we can get away from all the numbers and keep the text starting with the relevant paragraphs. Chile followed by ISOC and USA.

>> CHILE: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to say that we agree entirely with what has been said by our colleague from Brazil. Before lunch we had a special meeting because we had the proposal from India. The proposal from India was discussed. We reached consensus in the course of that meeting. What is happening now is a new proposal coming in on the basis of what remained pending. I think we are opening up the Pandora's box for the possible inclusion of more paragraphs. That is going to lead us into a labyrinth I don't think we will ever get out of. Yes, we worked especially on the Indian proposal over lunch. That one, yes. But no further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. USA and then ISOC, please.

>> USA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United States shares many of the concerns echoed by our colleagues that we might engage in an endless battle of cherry picking our favorite paragraphs from the Tunis Agenda. To that end we would support the suggestion made by our colleague from Iran and I believe originally made by our colleagues from India this morning that we remove all references to the Tunis Agenda paragraphs and mention all relevant organizations.

>> CHAIR: ISOC.

>> ISOC: We would also like to support the suggestion by Iran. Our Distinguished Colleague correctly stated that this text was the result of lengthy negotiations and outcome of carefully balanced text and by singling out individual paragraphs. It gives a very selective quoting of the Tunis Agenda. So we are actually safer when we refer to all relevant paragraphs without highlighting individual numbers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Before I give the floor to IEG, Mexico, U.K., Mexico, Canada, I would invite you to insist on the floor only if you are not supporting my proposal to take out all the numbering and to retain the "recalling a)" as proposed by Iran as I have read relevant paragraphs without any numbering.

So U.K. and Saudi Arabia.

>> U.K.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The U.K. would like to support the Delegates in removing the numbered paragraphs and leaving the text as relevant paragraphs, preventing the additional text, paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda related to relevance and advancing the interests of all relevant stakeholders.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That is exactly in the spirit of my intent and what I intended to do, but that is perhaps not easy.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been discussed in the Informal Expert Group and we see that we have to keep those paragraphs or at least some of them. Let's say, for instance, Paragraph Number 35. As enhanced cooperation has to be agreed upon are in terms of concept that has been reflected in the Tunis Agenda. In English, for instance, enhanced cooperation may be understood differently than in other languages. And this is reflected in the Paragraph 68 and 69.

This is why we think that we have to keep the text as is in line with what is the Delegate of Brazil has suggested.

Knowing that we have not difficulty at all in accepting the Indian proposal. I thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Sweden, followed by IEG-URAX.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the proposal of Iran and United States that we have reference only to the relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda and we think this is a better solution. It will avoid picking different paragraphs and starting a debate on whether a paragraph should be there or not. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: IEG-URAX, and I have a request for the floor from -- please request the floor only if you disagree with the proposal from Iran. IEG-URAX, please.

>> IEG URAXS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do support the proposal from Iran and that was agreed to by the U.S. and the U.K. But this point that I would like to make came up at the IEG meetings. There are no irrelevant stakeholders. So to use the word relevant stakeholders is a bit redundant. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I am not going to go into substance now, please. Bahrain followed by Mexico.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My concern is mirrored somewhat by the comments made by my colleague from Saudi Arabia in that there is the potential that if we don't specify which Articles are most relevant or most applicable to the direction we are trying to go to or, sorry, the direction we are trying to go in, it could reopen all the discussions that were discussed in the IEG. And this opinion in particular was the result of extremely lengthy discussions. I would, the preference of the Delegation of Bahrain would be to either keep the text as is, although we do not have any particular issue with the proposal as raised by India. In fact, are sympathetic to the plight of developing countries that would like to emphasize the need for attention to their development. As such, Mr. Chairman, we would prefer to keep the text as is or with the modification from India. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. Mexico. And this is the last speaker and then I'm going to conclude.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chairman. I simply wanted to see whether I could get a little bit of clarification and then be able to support the Iranian proposal. I just would like to try a new text. We understand it, no new text would be added. We just accept the general proposal from Iran. If I have understood correctly, if I have, then we are prepared to agree. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I am seeing now a request for the floor from one of the biggest contributors. I could not refuse their own right. Japan, please. And they are the last.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We just briefly, we Japan would like to support the proposal by Iran. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now we have two camps. One camp is agreeing to the text and agreeing to the addition of Paragraph 65 which I will read once again for you. It reads: We recognize the need for further -- "We underline the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet Governance which would reflect their interests as well as in development of capacity building."

This is the option which initially there was no would be wishing to contest. And then we have got the proposal from Iran that we make no reference to any number. So now this was the last instance opportunity, the last solution to take out all the references. But once again I should prefer from listening to what you have said on the basis of my own experience, I believe it would be pertinent and nobody would be objecting about adding 65 paragraph about the need to maximize the participation of developing countries. And that's it. We don't add anything else to the numbers which are there.

May I suggest in order not to waste any more time on this that we agree with the Indian proposal, that we have recording A starting with the relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda and we add in addition number 65 which is of direct reference to developing countries.

May I ask you kindly to be indulgent with me and agree to these proposals so that we go to substantial issues of Opinion 5? Can I take it for granted that we approve of Opinion 6 now at this level?

Thank you very much then.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Opinion 6 is approved. Now we go to Opinion Number 5. So I don't want to waste your time in introducing and interpreting the meaning of Opinion 5 from the mouth of the Chairman. You are intelligent enough. You had enough time to read this and discuss it, colleagues. You have your own opinion already. I would like to go straight to the substance.

I should like to call upon the following Delegations that have contributed to Opinion 5 to present them. I now give the numbers so that they get prepared. We will start with Russia followed by USA, Turkey, RIPE NCC, ISOC and Australia.

Then I will give the floor to India because they have submitted also a proposal in this instance.

First Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Without any preamble, I will just tell you where we've made additions to the work of the Expert Group. In Roman i which says they have rights and responsibilities for international Internet related public policy issues at the end, at the end there of Roman i we want to add "which may include establishing and implementing public policy including international policy on matters of Internet Governance, ensuring security of the national segment of the Internet as well as regulating within their territory the activities of operating agencies providing Internet access or carrying Internet traffic."

The proposal continues. "Establishing policies aimed at meeting public requirements with respect to Internet access and use. And taking necessary regulatory measures to build confidence and security in the provision of international telecommunications services and ensuring implementation of these measures by operating agencies."

Now, to develop this line of reasoning further, on the rights of states with respect to Internet Governance, we propose adding into Draft Opinion 5 a new, a section inviting Member States, a new section invites Member States. And the purpose of this is to set out the priority public policy measures for Member States as regards using information and communication infrastructure.

So this is the new proposal. The new invites Member States A, to undertake the development and application by governments, the private sector and Civil Society of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs, that shape the evolution and use of information and communication infrastructure, including the Internet."

B, "to exercise their rights on Internet Governance to manage distribution, assignment and development of Internet numbering, naming, addressing and identification resources and to support the operation and development of the basic information and communication infrastructure including the Internet at the national level."

C, "to establish and implement public policy including international policy on matters of Internet Governance and to regulate the national information and communication infrastructure, including the Internet as well as activities within their territory of operating agencies providing Internet access for carrying Internet traffic."

D, "to endeavor to establish policies aimed at meeting public requirements with respect to Internet access and use and at assisting, including through international cooperation, administrations and operating agencies in supporting the operation and development of the information and communication infrastructure including the Internet."

And the last, subparagraph E, "to ensure within the framework of the ITU that administrations and operating agencies cooperate in ensuring the integrity, reliable operation and security of the national information and communication infrastructure, including the Internet."

That is all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. In order not to waste time I give the floor now to USA. Ladies and gentlemen, whatever you have heard, whatever you have in mind, take a note and afterwards you want to take the floor, try to once you have the floor to express your opinions after the presentations. USA, please.

>>USA: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues. The United States of America is a firm believer in the multistakeholder approach. The openness and dynamism depends on the multistakeholder approach where all stakeholders work together and make consensus-based decisions about the technology and policies that enable the Internet. To foster the continued open and innovative growth of the Internet the United States believes we must preserve and expand the involvement of all stakeholders in guiding and crafting Internet policy. As we have stated of all opinions, the U.S. is prepared to accept this opinion as written. We believe that this topic is ripe for discussion and we welcome the exchange of ideas with all parties today and in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, USA. Turkey, please.

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In Draft Opinion 5 we have only a minor, our proposal is only a minor change. We added organizations, the words an organizations. It is only a small change. So now we can read the paragraph C as follows: To focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing countries stakeholders in the initiative entities, decisions and organizations involved in various aspects of Internet Governance. Of course, we changed the place just to make the organization in accordance with each other. That is the only, that is the only change that we have proposed. We didn't want the organizations to be exempted. That is the rationale behind our minor change. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Turkey. We have properly underlined what the substance of the proposal is. RIPE NCC please.

>> RIPE NCC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The RIPE NCC proposal was actually made on behalf of all five of the Regional Internet Registries. I would like to my colleague from LACNIC to make a few remarks about our submission. Andres.

>> CHAIR: Just a minute. AFRINIC, please, give them the floor on technical stuff.

>> AFRINIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Please, we speak on behalf of the five Regional Internet Registries. If I may, I will do that in my mother tongue in Spanish.

As my colleague Paul Wilson said yesterday in his presentation, the Regional Internet Registries was set up on the basis of policy development involving multistakeholder, the multistakeholder approach basically, identifying the characteristics which we thought were essential. This, for this model to be successful as open to all interested party. We wanted to see a transparent decision which took into account the roles and responsibilities, the specific roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder group. We wanted to see a bottom-up process for all those involved in the process. We support Opinion 5 in its current text, particularly when it refers to deepening and expanding multistakeholder approaches and coordination between governments, private sector, Civil Society and nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations. Opinion 5 does not refer to the technical Internet community as being a stakeholder in the list but we would like to see it added and included as far as possible because obviously it is an interest group and we are a member of it. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So the next speaker is ISOC.

>> ISOC: Mr. Chairman, the Internet society also attaches great importance to the multistakeholder model. We consider the recognition of this model by the Tunis Summit as a major outcome not just of the Summit but the whole international organization. The governments recognize the value of multistakeholder cooperation.

We would be happy to go along with the opinion as it is, but we would also like to support what our colleagues from the NRO suggested. As far as I understand, they have been a reference to Paragraph 36 in the academic and technical communities in an earlier draft. We would be happy if that could be reinserted.

But we are happy otherwise to go along with the opinion as it is. Thank you.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia supports the current multistakeholder model of Internet Governance which has played a major role in the success of the Internet to date. Australia considers that the best way of responding to the continual nature of change in this sector is through the multistakeholder process, recognizing the varied and valuable contributions that all stakeholders can make to Internet Governance and for reasons I outlined in earlier interest venges Australia supports the adoption of Opinion 5 unaltered. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Lastly, the freshly inspired contribution from India made available on the website this morning. So I will give the floor to India to present it.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Firstly we wish to thank you for the very constructive approach you have taken in draft Opinion 6 earlier and we are deeply indebted to you on the approach you've taken.

Now, with regard to the contributions made for Draft Opinion 5, if I may say so has three parts. First is reference to a list of paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda. But going by the immediate experience of having to go through a detailed discussions on referencing paragraphs, we think, rather our Delegation will not pursue that contribution. Leaving it to two only, the second contribution refers to paragraph 37 under recognizing, shown as A, "recognizing a)". We have a slight difficulty with the way it is phrased. The emphasis has been shifted. The original emphasis is on improving coordination of activities of international and governmental organizations and institutions concerned with Internet Governance. By phrasing it by bringing the second line first, I think the impact has shifted to a different location. We would request if this emphasis as reflected in the Tunis Agenda is restored and secondly, under the same paragraph under the recognizing, we would like to see reference to paring 61, elaborated as we have done for 37, 35, 55 and 69. The reason is as follows. It is only fair that we explain the reason. In the entire Draft Opinion that has been presented, while we are talking of the process by which we would like to take forward this multistakeholderism in Internet Governance, but the principles which are cardinal to the entire process, which are reflected in paragraph 61, which is as heard mentioned in the earlier interventions also relates to having a transparent, democratic and multilateral process with the participation of governments. I think it is all listed, governments, private sector, Civil Society and international organizations. It is important that we recognize these three cardinal principles should form part and parcel of our deliberations as we advance the cause of multistakeholderism. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India. So to my knowledge we have exhausted now the proposals submitted to the Forum. So we have heard, I repeat once again, the contributions from USA, RIPE NCC, ISOC, Australia, Russia and India.

So now first may I ask you kindly to bear with me, and if you feel the need to take the floor, be straightforward and express your opinions about the proposals which you have studied already and which are in front of you today. Request for the floor in Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: If you treat the contributions would be by would be, I think the wise positions of ISOC saying that although they agree with the proposals of RIPE NCC, but they are also comfortable with the current situations. Therefore, we take for granted that they are flexible and agree with the current situation without changing that. This is point number one.

Now, point number two, our Distinguished Colleague from India mentioned that in the recognizing A we have shifted the order of the paragraph. In their view, which may be right, they say that they may make change the objectives. My question is that whatever we do here, do we replace the decisions or agreements by head of the States? The answer is no. So paragraph 37 as it is is already valid. I don't think that we make any major departure from that by putting emphasis here and there, although they may be right, but I also think that if in fact I would be at any meeting I would always refer to the Tunis Agenda but not to the outcome of this, the first instance.

So remains the third proposal of India. The first agreement, we agree not to refer to specific paragraphs. The second argument is that perhaps they may consider that the Tunis Agenda paragraph 37 prevails in all situations from the hierarchical point of view. So there is a hierarchy. Now the decision, this is not a decision. Now the outcome of this WTPF would not replace that paragraph of the Tunis Agenda.

So remains the third proposal of India. You can put that in the discussion, plus the proposal of distinguish Delegations of the Russian Federation. You are limited to two only there. Thank you.

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

>> INDIA: Thank you very much, Chair. We just are responding to comments made by the Distinguished Colleague from Iran. Let me assure you through you, Mr. Chair, that we are under no illusion that anything that we decide here would make any changes to the Tunis Agenda because that is certainly agreed upon at the level of heads of state and government. That having been said, I think it is sometimes, we have to be fair to the process. If you are referring to what Tunis Agenda is actually saying, it should state as it is stated. Any presentation, if we go under the interpretation, that is not the intent, I guess, in this Forum. What we are trying to do, for example, when we refer to 34, 35 as well as various other paragraphs, we have not attempted this flipping of the lights. We have no difficulty if it is done, the import of the sentence or the paragraph is not disturbed. But in this case we see that such a thing is happening. That is the reason why we have come in to make this contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, if you didn't feel that there is a need for that, you would have submitted it. I take it for granted that you have given the necessary thought about that. So the issue is whether the proposals submitted would be accepted here on this collective level. Because what should prevail again is the collectivism of all the Delegations, all the experts being together with us.

Are there any more requests for the floor? Or I can direct the thing straightaway to one proposal after the other?

First of all, then I will take it that I can proceed in the way in which I wish to. That means that, let us consider the proposal of Turkey once again in order to clear the situation, the matter.

Turkey proposes the following change in the Draft Opinion. I will read it: In paragraph C, inviting Member States and other stakeholders, Turkey proposes additional word "organizations" after the words institutions which can be read as follows: Full text of C is now in dictation speed. To focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing country stakeholders in the initiatives, entities, institutions and now we add something, and organizations involved in various aspects of Internet Governance."

That is the substance of the proposal. So is there someone feeling uncomfortable with the proposal of Turkey? Or is there someone expressing their own support for this proposal? Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, we are not opposing to any proposal. We seek clarifications. We request the Distinguished Delegate of Turkey to clarify what they mean by organizations. Organizational organizations? Regional organizations? What type of organizations? Recognized organizations? Telecommunications organizations? What organizations, Chairman? If we have that clarification I don't think that we have difficulty. But first we have to see what they mean by organizations and whether or not this has already been covered in the opinion. If that is the case, we have two clarifications. First, what they mean by organizations and second, whether this issue has not been covered elsewhere within the opinion or inside the opinion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I am getting the message that unless Turkey would be able to provide us with the definition of the term organizations, it would be difficult to proceed further with that proposal. Now, may I ask kindly the Delegation of Turkey to provide us with the definition of what the meaning of organization is?

>> TURKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are actually going to provide the definition of organization afterwards, but here, you know, I ask the same question in a different manner. What institution, what is the definition of institution or what is the definition of entities and initiatives? Every term, we have to define each word if we go in that way because, you know, organizations means there are, of course, so many organizations.

Also there are so many institutions, regional institutions, governmental institutions, we may count on all of them. Furthermore, if I need to answer Iran's question, sir, we cannot go in that way because we have to define each word otherwise. But when I say organization, pane people understands. Actually at the moment I don't need to make any definition for that text, but if needed, if it is requested, we are going to prepare a definition statement. But we should carry on with each word. When you say initiatives, entities, institutions, there is no definitions of those words. But we know that there are some entities which are called organizes. We didn't want those entities to be out of that statement. So that is the rationale behind our proposal. I declared it when I was just submitting our proposal. I think that is going to be satisfactory for everyone. If there is anyone, other Member States, we are going to prepare the definition of organization if it is so much needed. We can of course do. But we cannot go in that way.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, sorry, Distinguished Delegate of Turkey. I don't want to go into detail on this. You tried to provide us with an answer to my question. I think we've got the impression what do you mean by this.

So I am seeing the request from Turkmenistan and Iran. Before I give to them the floor and to the others, my consultation with the Secretariat is that in order not to waste time will there be any opposition amongst you to include the proposal of Turkey and to inject the word "and organizations" in the text as it is or not? And once you take the floor, please try to answer my question. Iran?

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps I was not clear. I have not asked Distinguished Delegate of Turkey to define what is an organization. I said what type of organization is referred to? You remember that in Plenipotentiary 2010 we had this same discussion. We put "relevant organizations" and I introduced a footnote. Are we going to say relevant organizations with or without footnote or just organization? "Organization" is very broad and very general, Chairman. I have not asked to define the organization. I said whether we refer to relevant organizations with footnote as contained in the Resolution 101, 102, and 103, or without footnote. That is all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Turkmenistan, please.

>> TURKEY: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, you said not Turkey? Are Turkey and Turkmenistan -- they are two different countries. One is in central Asia; and one is in some parts Europe and some parts on the Asia, sir. Turkmenistan and Turkey are not the same country. Actually, you know, Bulgaria is a neighboring country of Turkey. You should know it.

But if you mean Turkey, then I am going to answer. Did you mean Turkey or Turkmenistan?

>> CHAIR: I don't mean anything, but the screen is telling me Turkmenistan. So then what I am going to do as your Chairman? I see request for the floor from Turkmenistan and once I give -- sorry for that electronic.

(Overlapping speakers.)

>> CHAIR: Apologies, the technical staff tells me there is a mistake and they are correcting it now. Actually it is Turkey.

I can see once again Turkmenistan. What is this?

(Laughter.)

>> CHAIR: Is it actually Turkmenistan?

>> TURKEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. At the moment also I want to thank you Mr. -- he made a very good clarification. I understood what he means and actually we mean relevant organizations because that takes place in many other documents of ITU. So we meant relevant organizations, and that, and not the others. Thank you very much. I think that is going to satisfy us and anybody. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Turkey, my dear neighbor. May I propose the following? I don't want to waste any more time. So we say relevant organizations and that is the only thing which is going to be inserted into the text as proposed by Turkey, instead of organizations and relevant organizations.

Is there somebody against this substantially? If there is nobody, then let's proceed further with other issues. Ghana? No, Colombia and Ghana. We will try to report afterwards.

>> ?: Sorry, I'm not from Colombia, but I have a seat here. I'm from Congo, Brazzaville ... (indiscernible).

(Laughter.)

>> REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO: I just would like to say something. I think if we say relevant organization we come back to relevant entities and relevant institution because it is the same thing. We cannot go for relevant organization as we have so many entities which can be ICT or not. If we want to go for relevant organization, that should be before -- just let me read the sentence as it is and try to add the relevant words.

-- on how to improve the participation of the developing country stakeholders in the incentive and relevant entities, institutions and organizations involved in various aspect of Internet Governance. If we add relevant word before those three words, that will have sense.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Congo, Brazzaville. Thank you.

>> GHANA: Chairman, I suppose if we are to go by the amendment as proposed, then we can insert organizations.

We can insert organization after entities and it is qualified by the fact that organizations and institutions involved in various aspects of Internet Governance. So the qualification is already there. So we do not need to bring the word "relevant" again. This is semantics, but I think it resolves the issue that we have at hand.

If you will allow me to add, to focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing countries stakeholders in the initiatives, entities, organizations and institutions involved in various aspects of Internet Governance."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Great contribution and I appreciate it very much. Mexico is the last speaker.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. Just one point. The word "organizations" appears in various places in the text. In the recognizing section, for example. The proposal is just to modify the last paragraph, is it? Or are we actually making the same modification throughout the text every time the word organizations arises? Because as I say, it comes up in various contexts in different paragraphs. It is only in the last paragraph at the moment that we are suggesting that we add the word" relevant," as I understand it. I'm checking that we are not adding "relevant" everywhere else that" organizes" come up.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I have heard the wisdom of what this gathering is and I will try to summarize. So may we take it that the proposal from Ghana would be in the core of the thing which we are going to consider to approve? And I will read it for you once again. "To focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing countries stakeholders in the initiatives, entities, organizations and institutions involved in various aspects of Internet Governance."

That is the only place where we are going to insert the term "organizations."

Can I ask you for your indulgence to agree with me that we adopt this proposal? Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman. After clarification we support the proposal and we support the Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So once again, my plea to all of you is, can I take it for granted? Can I have your own confidence and support to approve this opinion with this amendment as I have read it?

Thank you very much. So we consider it done, approved.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: So now in order not to waste time and still we have a mood for discussion, we are going to go to more substantial subjects of discussion. Let me tell you now what I propose to do. I have got caught in wrong step in basketball. Some of you tell me I am making dribble.

We have approved the proposal concerning Turkey, but we did not approve yet the Opinion 5. I'm sorry for that. Wrong impression.

We come back to our friends from Russia. Russia proposes the addition of new text in the "recognizing" part and also five new points under new "invites Member States." Russia's addition touches upon a very important topic, the role of governments in the multistakeholder model. Indeed, this has come up at many Forums and one that should be discussed and not just pushed away. We should not shy away from discussing sensitive issues and multiple views on subjects, especially in the Forums such as World Telecommunications/ICT Policy Forum which encourages free and open debate and exchange of views. However, the text that Russia has proposed is more appropriate to be discussed under the role of governments in the multistakeholder model. Brazil has made a contribution on it and Russia has expressed its support for it. Then in order to save some time, and to be more efficient, could I request agreement of Russia to consider Opinion 5 as it is and discussion the Russian contribution to be discussed together with the substance of Brazilian contribution separately? Shall I repeat it once again? I'm asking kindly the Russian administration to kindly agree that the points that they are making in Opinion 5 be considered afterwards together with the points which have been pushed forward and submitted by the administration of Brazil on the role of governments in Internet Governance.

So I am in the hands of Russia now. I am expecting agreement from them or at least a statement to their agreement to their own position. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We would like to discuss them at the same time and it is okay with the Brazilian proposal. Just as preamble to what we are going to discuss is that that way we will have to discuss the government role. It is just, it started in the 16th century with the enclosures and eventually people said sheep ate the man. At least that way we see the trend. It is obvious that the State started somehow to, you know, manage the Internet within their territories. The expression domestic law towards Internet issues was not invented in Russia. We know that this expression is coming from other countries. We see that the enclosures have started to take place in different countries. We see with this we can really put in danger the overall comprehensive universal network which Internet is. And this is the message that we would like to deliver to everybody. Okay? Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. You are very kind to agree to my proposal and we take very seriously into account the ideas which you have in your own contribution.

Portugal followed by Iran, please.

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, I also submit this to India. They kindly clarified the situation that the paragraph in "recognizing a)", the way it has been drafted in connection with paragraph 37, it is something that the English called transgression of the text. So if in the view of India is of more clarity and paragraph 37, to facilitate you may ask the Distinguished Delegates here whether they have any difficulty to agree this clarity which has been provided by India which is fully in line with paragraph 37. It means we take it as to be coherent with the paragraph 37. And not having any transgression. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, but first I would like to hear the other speaker, Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry to come back to first paragraph, but I have to be coherent. And in Opinion 6 I asked for the insertion of Paragraph 36 of Tunis Agenda. And I am not sure whether you propose that in this opinion again this paragraph should be deleted or not. So if that is not the case I think we are talking about multistakeholderism. Again I don't understand why the academic and technical communities are not mentioned. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry, I have a very powerful tool. That is my hammer. And in Opinion 6 we have concluded and it is approved. I am not reopening the Agenda again to discuss about those issues. So opinion 6 is not anymore to be discussed at the level of this Working Group. You have the Plenary. You may wish to do so afterwards.

That is my reply to you.

Now, is there a request, more request for the floor? Or I can try to guide somehow the meeting further. Portugal is asking for the floor. You have the floor.

>> PORTUGAL: Mr. Chairman, I am not opening Opinion 6. I am talking about Opinion 5. But my point is to be coherent with what I said regarding Opinion 6. It is about the insertion of Paragraph 36 of the Tunis Agenda. So I said that I wanted to be coherent with what I said previously. I am not opening anything. I am talking about Opinion 5. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So sometimes we, the people who are on the floor -- not on the floor, but up here we are more blessed with services. The Secretariat is reminding me and this is indeed true that India clearly stated during the presentation of their proposal concerning Opinion 5 that they would not pursue any longer point number would be of their proposal, the additional of following first preamble of the paragraph and then recalling numbers and numbers and numbers. They said that this they are not pressing anymore. So therefore we ignore that. We don't have complications based on the proposal from India.

Is this helping a little bit Portugal to position themselves better in the situation? We are not listing here the numbers. It is very clear. India said that the adding the first preamble of the paragraph and so much, there are dozens of them in the Tunis Agenda. They do not insist on this and we are not inserting them in Opinion Number 5.

It is not under discussion now.

So before we will get the words cleared up on Draft Opinion 5 I will get clarification and position from the administration of India about their own proposals 2 and 3 concerning Draft Opinion 5.

So India, you have the floor. What is your position on this? Are you still insisting on your own proposal?

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for offering the floor. As we mentioned earlier, while the paragraphs reflected in the Draft Opinion 5 have taken a sort of fairly straightforward approach of stating as it is reflected in the Tunis Agenda, except in this paragraph. That is number one.

Number two, here emphasis is on not stakeholders per se. It is emphasis as listed in Tunis Agenda, is on improving coordination of activities of international and intergovernmental organizations. So I think that we might consider maintaining the same sanctity of what has been agreed in the entire 37 of the Tunis Agenda. It is not an amendment or major contribution from our side to the extent that it is a new idea, no, it is not. It is merely reflecting what is said in the Tunis Agenda.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, India. Ladies and gentlemen, what India is doing in item 2 of their own proposal is that they are highlighting not only highlighting but qualifying and highlighting the text of paragraph 37. And I shall read for you before you make up your own minds. Paragraph 37 reads: We seek to improve the coordination of the activities of national and international organizations and other institutions concerned with Internet Governance and the exchange of information amongst themselves. A multistakeholder approach would be adopted as far as possible at all levels.

That is, I'm citing, quoting for you paragraph 37. So now do you have difficulties to support the proposal from India? Iran followed by USA, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In fact, no difficulty at all. What India said in "recalling," we talk about paragraph 34 and we quote the paragraph. In recognizing, we talk about paragraph 37, but we slightly change the text of paragraph 37 and put it in different order. What India proposes, put it in exact order as it is in paragraph 37. So I think there is a logic behind that. It is totally coherent with the method and way in which the paragraph in recording has been drafted. I think the logic behind that, I don't think there is difficulty. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. USA followed by U.K.

>> USA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United States has no problems with, and we support India's proposal on being true to the text in paragraph 37. However, to that end we would suggest a change. Actually we would call into question the use of the word "suggests" in the second paragraph. Paragraph 37, the second sentence reads: A multistakeholder approach should be adopted as far as possible at all levels.

So using the word "should" we believe that's more of a suggestion. We would in that case propose that the language reads in the second sentence of India's proposal, that it states that a multistakeholder approach should be adopted as far as possible at all levels. Again we are keeping India's proposal but replacing the word" suggests" with "states."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, USA. Another English mother tongue speaker is taking the floor. U.K., please.

>> U.K.: Thank you, Chair. We very much support the Indian proposal which we consider does improve the text and we also spotted the discrepancy with what the text actually says in the Tunis Agenda, which is picked up by the U.S. colleagues. So we would strongly recommend using the word "should" instead of "suggests." Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Although USA citizens and U.K. citizens are English mother tongue speakers, I have retained in my memory the following substance. USA did say "it states" while the proposal I have heard from the U.K. is different. So may I ask you kindly to consider the proposal of USA. Instead of "it suggests," I suggest to replace it with "it states" and the text as proposed in the India proposal. Will the U.K. be okay with the proposal of the USA?

>> U.K.: Thank you, Chair. Sorry to delay in responding. Consulting internally. Yes, I do agree with what the U.S. is proposing in terms of correcting the language from "suggests" to" states." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your understanding. India followed by Iran.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we entirely agree with your approach of having to take the help of the native speakers. I think it reflects now correctly the position. We can entirely agree with what has been proposed by our Distinguished Delegate from USA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: We agree with British English, American English, Canadian English and Bulgarian English. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: May I take it that the proposal of India to replace paragraph A with the text which was discussed and amend the in accordance with the USA proposal instead of it suggests to state: It states be adopted in the cortex of that Opinion 5? Can I ask you that you agree with my proposal on this subject?

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Then it is agreed.

So now I have a last issue to resolve. In the India proposal on Draft Opinion 5 in item 3 we have addition of a new paragraph E. So may I ask the indulgence of Honorable Delegation of India taking into account the time advancement? That they agree kindly with me that the whole text be properly quoted and reflected in my report so that we do not go any more on lengthy discussions? But it is up to the Delegation of India to provide me with an answer about my proposal.

India, if you wish you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the constructive approach you have adopted over the last two Draft Opinions. We will surely endorse your approach in this case. If you could kindly reflect the spirit of it in your report. We could then conclude this Draft Opinion and move forward to the other proposals which are pending in the discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, your statement sounds like music in my ears. Thank you very much, India, for your own support, understanding and civilized approach. It will be done as you have asked. I will reflect item number 3 of your proposal in my report with appropriate wording. So now ladies and gentlemen, from what I have heard there is no more outstanding issue in Draft Opinion 5. So I should like to bring to your own attention my own request to approve the text with the amendments already agreed.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Draft Opinion 5 approved as amended. Just a minute, please. A little consultation with the Secretariat now.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Secretariat says coffee time between 10 and 15 minutes. So if this is for my compatriots in Bulgaria, I would say ten minutes. If this is for the compatriots for citizens in Switzerland, it is 15. You take it as you wish, but after 15 minutes, be ready in your place.

(A break was taken.)

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back after the refreshing coffee and tea. Coffee in Bulgarian understanding and tea in British understanding. I hope they can understand it. I who everyone has been exchanging views with colleagues, with friends and other Delegations and that we are in good shape now to start discussing substantial important issues of the role of the government for Internet Governance within a multistakeholder platform or environment.

What is the sense? I should like to give the floor now to Brazil to present their own proposal for the new Draft Opinion. But I should like it very clear that we are not discussing approval of a new opinion. We are discussing, we have the presentations there. Afterwards I will give the floor to Russia once again to express their own expectations and rationale behind their own proposal which they have kindly agreed not to be any more in the context of Opinion 5 but to be considered together with the proposal of Brazil and from there we will see where we can move forward.

Brazil, please, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin by saying that Brazil is a country that fully embraces the multistakeholder approach to Internet Governance. The vibrant multistakeholder organisation as indeed is reflected in the Secretary-General's report to the WTPF which includes a reference to Brazil's ten principles for the governs and use of Internet.

Nonetheless, at the international level our view is that the multistakeholder framework needs to fully engage governments as stakeholders in the decision process. In this context, we believe that better defining the role of government as one of the stakeholders is in fact essential towards ensuring a truly multistakeholder Internet Governance.

Furthermore, we believe that the ITU can and should play an active role in capacity building for developing countries particularly the least developed countries so that they can have an effective part in the existing instances of Internet Governance. In this regard, Brazil presents to this working group of the WTPF in the format of this Draft Opinion on the role of government in the multistakeholder framework for Internet Governance. It is actually an opinion that comes from the discussions at the Informal Experts Group, the IEG, and is the result of joint work of the Drafting Group led by Brazil and includes contributions from several countries. Since back in February there was insufficient time to achieve consensus on this opinion during the final Plenary session of the IEG we would propose that we could do so here at the WTPF. We believe that the WTPF is an appropriate venue to discuss these two central issues to this opinion. Namely, the role of government and capacity building with the support of the ITU.

All those parties we have consulted here in these days of the WTPF seem to agree that these are relevant issues. We are flexible on the issue of language, but we firmly believe it is time to put these two issues on the ITU Agenda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Ladies and gentlemen, I try to be pragmatic and courteous and to give the credits to the efforts which were spent by Mr. Daniel Cavalcanti, the convener of the Draft Opinion and role of governments in the multistakeholder framework in the IEG. He has done a tremendous job, a lot of efforts and he has reported where do we stand. Just I wanted to bring this to your own consideration and to ask you to thank him for that work within the IEG and on this collective level now with p applause, please.

(Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Now I should like to give the floor to Russia. Although their document considering the proposal to Opinion 5 was already presented I should like to ask Russia once again to tell us what is the rationale behind their own proposal and what in their own view should be expected at the international arena so that the paths to the further development of Internet is secure and clean and available for further development. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We have withdrawn our opinion just because we were told that -- I am not nick lay nick roof. That is a big honor for me.

On the grounds that our opinion, the intervention would be discussed together with Brazilian proposal.

In that sense, if not otherwise, we would like to put into the square brackets our opinion in Opinion Number 5 and then let everybody, you know, have some time to think over what is behind our message. It is again what we see is that the Internet Governance is really going astray. We see that each particular country start to to adopt their domestic laws in terms of how to manage Internet and apply Internet within their countries. And that we see that since we have to define the international rules top to bottom, as long as we will be referring to the international rules, that could be adopted. I mean, this is the Forum where we can do it. Then, you know, we will be always out there in the countries referred to what the international rules that we will set here. We are open and flexible to any kind of amendments, changes inside this opinion, but we really believe that this is the Forum and this is the time now to really consider what is the role of the government. It is good to talk about multistakeholderism and so on and so forth but as you see the current situation, the Agenda has been changed so that we are afraid in Russia that it will start with big countries where they will start to apply domestic laws in terms of Internet and then it will go further on and there will be entropy of hundreds of laws, domestic laws in terms of Internet, maybe copying each other, but otherwise we will not have the international rules how to treat Internet.

Second, you know, disclosure or disclaimer is that we were not talking about the content. We were talking about the infrastructure. This is what we would like, of course, out there in the country in Russia at least to control and to be part of. Okay. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. Ladies and gentlemen, you have the floor for very substantive proposals and discussions on the matter of utmost importance. One of the multistakeholders, the government and its role. You have the floor if you are asking for this. I have all the willingness to give you the floor and deliberate on these issues. Requests for the floor?

I have on the screen requests by PAYS-BAS, U.K.

>> NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Chairman. Let me limit myself for this first time to maybe some more channeled statements. Start by saying that we as the stand behind the multistakeholder model and that is a model where governments are not the only decision makers. Possibly not even the main ones. But at the same time of course this multistakeholder model structure is not a fixed structure, that is clear.

But what you see nowadays is that the Internet has become so present in society that probably governments need to step up and get involved too but my preference in such a way, it can continue as it has and its further development is a free and neutral platform to all. That is maybe a general statement that I would express at the moment and.

I do see and understand a bit the concerns of Brazil and also of Russia, but it is quite a complex issue. As I understand, Russia, they are concerned about different legislations in different countries and maybe that would lead to somewhat scattered Internet system.

At the same time we would say that probably that it would be nice to keep everything open and free while at the same time one could say that governments have the sovereign rights to their national message, but it should not affect the Internet. So it is at this point that if you get involved as governments in the global Internet it should be done in such a way that it does not prevent further development. That is probably a very important let's say baseline that should be followed. Thank you.

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

>> U.K.: Thank you, Chair. I would like to express appreciation for the introductory remarks by our Distinguished Colleagues from Brazil and Russia as to the rationale for their proposals. That is very much appreciated.

I would like to seek further clarification from our Distinguished Colleague from Russia with regard to the rationale. As I understood, it was about determining the role of governments in international Internet Governance fora and the landscape, the ecosystem of the Internet in general, if you like.

Because if I looked at, if we look at the proposal for Opinion 5 from Russia, and the section there in their proposal invites Member States, that talks about what states would do in terms of, for example, for them to be Internet numbering and addressing. That does not seem to fit with the rationale that I understood from the introduction this afternoon. So I would like to seek a clarification if I may for that. How the rationale as described fits with that particular proposal which talks about the role of Member States in all these series of Internet related activities described in that proposed text for Opinion 5. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.K. Chile is requesting the floor and they have the floor. Chile, please.

>> CHILE: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with our colleague's view on the value of the multistakeholder model in respect of Internet. We also consider that what our Brazilian colleagues say is correct. We do need to go a little further into strengthening the role of states when it comes to Internet Governance. Governments do have something to say in respect of Internet public policy. There are some elements on which with the current existing model we don't really have the possibility of making our voice heard or our vote taken into account. Sometimes difficult situations arise. For example, the request for domain names, the effect on Argentina and Chile, for example, of the issue of Patagonia. This is technically also a policy issue because it is a matter of sovereignty for us. Because it is part of sovereignty it is not negotiable. For us it is extremely important that there should be a body where governments can actually ensure that the interests of the communities they represent are taken into account.

We represent the people of Patagonia and that goes for both Chile and Argentina. We therefore need to have a body where we can ensure that our rights over our territory can be exercised. This is a clear example of what we need to do to try to improve the way in which governments are represented in both GAC and ICANN. It is a test, if you want. If we don't get positive results the legitimacy of GAC and ICANN when it comes to protecting the rights of peoples. We do after all represent our peoples. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chile. Uruguay and Argentina.

>> URUGUAY: Thank you very much, Chairman. What I want to say would be very similar to what my Distinguished Colleague from Chile has just said. We would also like to put on record the fact that we support what has been said by the Delegation of Brazil. About the objective and substantive issue. It is a question of ensuring that we can make a government participation more effective since they are, after all, representatives of their peoples and the nations worldwide in various bodies, in various organiZations and institutions and entities which participate in the current system of Internet Governance. We therefore agree with Brazil's goal and we agree with the substance of what they said, although we do have a couple of reservations on specific points of the text as submitted. We do trust, however, as the Distinguished Delegate of Brazil indicated, that he will be flexible and that we will be able to work upon the text so as to come up with appropriate and acceptable wording. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chairman. We should also like to express our thanks for these contributions and for this possibility of holding a dialogue. We endorse the view expressed by Brazil and we would also like to take the opportunity to say that we also see many, many good points in the multistakeholder Internet Governance system. However, as the Delegation of Chile said sometimes situations do arise in which countries do not have the necessary amount of representation and do not have a vote to cast.

We as representatives of countries are not trying to say that we should be the only voices heard, but we do insist on being heard because as other people have said, we represent our peoples. The State, after all, holds the leading role in that respect and it is the state government that should decide where its nation is going. Of course, in consultation were other parties and with society, but the leading role lies with the State, with the government. I don't think that is something we should lose sight of.

The capacity building particularly for developing countries is as Brazil mentioned vital when it comes to improving Internet Governance. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I have on the screen requests for the floor from USA, Cuba, Burkina Faso, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain. So USA, please.

>> USA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for managing very well, very skillfully what has been an interesting and productive discussion. I first want to address the comments raised by our colleagues from Brazil and Russia in the positive expert in which they were offered. For our friends from Brazil, they emphasize in their statement an approach to Internet Governance in which the government is one of many stakeholders, but one in which the governments should have the capacity necessary to participate in a meaningful way in Internet Governance institutions and in that underlying intent we are in full agreement. We also believe that the Internet Governance snugs themselves are in full agreement. I would only refer back to the statements made at the beginning of our conference by the representatives from those institutions.

Secondly, there was a call by Brazil for additional joint work and additional discussions on how we can enhance our existing Internet Governance institutions, how we can work together to ensure that countries that may not have another mechanism or face barriers to participation in those institutions, whether it is due to lack of funding or capacity or understanding of the rules and processes if they are unclear, that we work with the existing institutions and we work with those countries to ensure that a true and meaningful participatory role is made available for all countries.

So we appreciate this discussion and we look forward to ongoing discussions. We look forward to welcoming our friends from Brazil in the United States and we will be visiting they will soon to discuss bilateral matters. All of this will be on the table.

Relative to our friends from Russia, they have raised, our colleagues from Russia raise an extremely important question which is the degree to which the Internet as a worldwide network of networks could become Balkanized if we are not careful. We share that concern and it is because of that concern that we support the existing Internet Governance institutions that ensure a common understanding for protocols and the day-to-day operations of the Internet across international boundaries. So again legitimate concerns have been raised by our colleagues. We fully intend to work with them going forward. Going to the concerns raised by our colleagues from Chile and Argentina, I understand that the discussions in Beijing left both our colleagues in Chile and Argentina and to some extent our friends in Brazil with some discomfort about how a decision will be made on some sensitive terms and issues.

If I understand correctly it was ultimately decided that a decision on the subset of proposed objections to particular new GTLD applications would be deferred pending further discussion in the interim between the Beijing and Durbin meetings in 2013. The U.S. government will continue to explore collaboration with our friends from the south as well as with the government advisory Committees and cine to address any remaining and outstanding issues in the period between these two meetings. We look forward to working together on those issues. We do believe that the U.S. government considers the government advisory Committee communique as a milestone in which a number of agreements were referred to and progress was made in the role of the advisory Committee meeting commit was achieved. We look forward to working together to ensure that the Internet remains and continues to grow as a tool for economic entrepreneurship and democratic discourse. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, USA. Cuba, please.

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Chairman. This is the first time we are taking the floor. Therefore we would like to acknowledge the excellent work which you are doing in chairing the meeting. Thank you very much.

We would like to say that the Delegation of Cuba supports the proposal made by Brazil supported by Russia, Chile, Uruguay, Argentina and we acknowledge this positive role as I believe did the Delegation of United States. This is important for the economic and social life in all of our countries.

We believe that a few drafting changes could be made to make the wording more exact, but we believe that the direction in which this submission is going is the right would be because governments do need a place where they can make their voice heard in respect of Internet Governance. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba. You were very brief and could be size. Really you are a great master of speaking on international level thank you for that. Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all with respect to the proposal of Brazil and the Russian Federation, we have first, we appreciate the efforts that they have made, the thought that they have put on the paper. In fact, it is in line with what we are thinking since several years. We have sympathy with respect to the cuts of the proposals and we look forward to putting these proposals in an appropriate manner and form and discuss it further after reflections by the Distinguished Colleagues in an appropriate Forum or appropriate meeting or Congress, so on and so forth.

Coming back to the substance, Chairman, yes, the role of the government in the management or in the multistakeholder is something that now should be operationalized, actualized, goes beyond the words, Chairman. This is years we are talking that government must have equal footing, but it is just on the words. Never we have tried to implement that. It is a time, Chairman, that for the first instance we getting together in an equal basis at this meeting, member or nonmember of ITU as the collegial body getting the friendly atmosphere and we have to put our efforts together and try to implement in what way the role of the government on equal footing in the management, not in the day-to-day management of the Internet but in the overall management should be implemented. This is what we have referred at the beginning of your meeting and Chairman, I request you kindly to advise your secretary after this meeting if they don't have taken note of what the speakers have said, a brief note, they could go to the captioning and try to capture some of the things and put in the report of the meeting. These are the very important part of this meeting, Chairman. This is our interpretation that this WTPF-13 would try to address this long-standing and long delayed issues and we have to embark on that, Chairman. If you would like to continue our collaborations, Chairman, collaborations is mutual. Collaboration is in reciprocity. We should not always expect that one side collaborates and the other side does not collaborate. Both should collaborate with each other. Both should walk towards each other in order to arrive at sort of an agreement. This is not something we could do today but is something we should look for, something we should aim, we should have objectives and we hope that sooner they would arrive at an area that at the next, and next, and subsequent meetings we have a better understanding of the problem of each other and this reciprocity will be observed. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, next is Burkina Faso followed by Bahrain and South Africa.

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chairman. The Delegation of Burkina Faso would like to welcome and support this proposal from Brazil to clarify the role of the government in the multistakeholder Internet Governance model. I think if this work is done ...

(Lost audio.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Before South Africa has received -- requested input from Brazil on this.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: -- the role of government in line with the world association. No one, it is really just about trying to place governments within the role of Internet Governance. So I think we would support the proposals that have been put forward as a basis for a good discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. We support the multistakeholder model and support also what the Distinguished Colleague from the Netherlands said earlier. However, we also understand the concerns of Brazil, especially perhaps in light of what took place back in Beijing, but it is a matter for, within the framework of the multistakeholder model and it should have its course and perhaps not be discussed to detail here. There is no question that the government has a role. There is also, today we have taken the decision on Opinion six on enhanced cooperation and WTPF has a mandate to discuss this further. It is an important issue to consider further with respect. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Next speaker is India followed by Brazil and China.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this point in time our Delegation would like to make a general comment. To begin with, we note with great interest the proposals that are coming in our efforts to define the role of governments in the multistakeholderism process. It is indeed a situation where we are, we need to deliberate on the roles of various actors, various stakeholders at appropriate Forums. On to that extent I think we would certainly examine the proposals that have been presented to in this Forum. Having said this, Mr. Chairman, it would be useful to recollect the process that has been set in motion in New York as well as in other places with regard to the way forward on taking the global Internet Governance issues. As some colleagues earlier mentioned in the room that it is a United Nations General Assembly mandated process of Working Group on enhanced cooperation to work under the CSTD. I think there are certain mandates which are also going to be discussed which I'm sure would, the discussion that we will have today in this Forum will greatly enhance and enrich us to be able to better appreciate the specific roles of each of the stakeholders and I think the role of the governments has been well captured in paragraph 35 where the policy for Internet Governance policy issues has been acknowledged and where states have a sovereign right. They have the rights and responsibilities for international Internet related public policy issues. In that light, I think we do see a lot of merit in the debating and discussing on the two important proposals that we have in front of us. We would continue to reflect on them and we will try to add value to our discussions during the course of our proceedings. Thank you.

>> BRAZIL: It is important (audio difficulty) -- of the proposal because the role and responsibilities of government as well as those of every other stakeholder is clearly stated at the Tunis Agenda. So this is not something that we should discuss whether the governments have a role or not. The proposal aims at giving concrete role for these roles to be provided in meaningful way. The reading we make of the Tunis Agenda allows us to identify in WTPF to assist governments in that regard to enhance capacity, to offer training, to have more meaningful participation. Of course, we are not aiming through this opinion to suggest that we should hear in ITU discussion the overall framework for Internet Governance. This is not the case, of course. We are fully aware of the process that was initiated at the United Nations and the CSTD, enhanced cooperation. Brazil is a member of the Working Group on enhanced are. We intend to participate with all partners and other stakeholders to have an overall discussion, meaningful discussion on the overall structure -- the overall Internet Governance architecture as we have today. It is agreed that one of the first events would be to make an inventory of the existing institutions, processes, fora in order to try to identify possible gaps, possible overlaps, things that could be adjusted to the benefit of the system as a whole. So we are fully aware that the discussion of the framework does not belong here. What we seek through the opinion we have tabled is, as my colleague has said, to reassess the importance of the role of government as one of the stakeholders and in this, through the discussion to a certificate the roles ITU could play, build on the basis of its capacity, the technical capabilities to's equip government to participate fully in a meaningful way in the Internet governs related issues.

I have been participating in other fora, in IGF and other important and important venues we value very much. And I have been hearing calls not only from governments but from Civil Society from private sector that they would be pleased to have more meaningful government participation in discussions, formal participations to the benefit of the exercise as a whole. This is the meaning of our proposal to discuss the idea that this would be legitimate way to reinforce the capacity of governments, not to expend their work but rather to give concrete tools for this to be fully exerted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree with and support Brazil's proposal to conduct studies on how to ensure the involvement of governments in Internet Governance within a multistakeholder framework. Taken as a whole, for governments to give further play to the role in Internet Governance, it is very important, very significant to the role to be played by the governed of various countries in Internet Governance. So Brazil's proposal to conduct discussions on how governments should play their roles in Internet Governance within the multistakeholder framework, we support and agree with their proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In answering the question which was asked by the U.K., if I'm not mistaken, on a national level we cannot provide the infrastructure that belongs to the Internet and the international networks of communication. IP addresses numbering and the names are used both for providing the workability of national networks of communication. And it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish which network you are really managing. That's why our message was: Let's set up the rules in which government in this multistakeholder model should play the role. With our limits and responsibilities. To some extent one can apply excessive kind of governmental power. One could be more so. That is, we just call for setting the rules. Now, the second issue is, that is not my copyright. That was only thinking that the world before Internet and the world after the Internet is like the world before Gutenberg who invented printing and the world afterward. At the very top level, the very top level, mankind is divided into the governments and states. We are not divided on the basis of ICANN or ISOC or whatever. The government reflects the strategies, so on and so forth. That's why we think it is important that we need to discuss it right now, set of the rules, agree on how we can do that. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia.

So, more requests from the floor? Finland, please.

>> FINLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly I would like to note that we appreciate Brazil's efforts to try to build bridges between different views in this sensitive issue. We are in line with Brazil in the general ideas that governments should better engage in the existing institution. And we also endorse the remark for more capacity building in these issues. In fact, the European Commission has made an initiative in this regard. However, we have serious concerns regarding the content of the present proposal and I would like to in this context note that the role of vary from organization to organization at the international level. If there are open issues or if the government's role is not sufficient in a particular organization, we strongly feel that we can solve the issue from here, from the outside, but we should rather tackle it inside the organization, be it ICANN or any other organization we talk about.

So given the complexity of the issue, Finland would prefer to continue this discussion in other fora. We simply don't have time to do it here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Finland. Mexico, followed by Bahrain, Iran, Czech Republic. These are the requests for the floor which I have on the screen. New one is for Japan.

So Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chairman. We acknowledge the value of the contributions which have been made. Particularly those which have been made by the Russian Federation and Brazil. Mexico believes that we need to guarantee wide participation of all parties involved in the multistakeholder model on the basis of the responsibilities and functions of each party. We need to continue to see the Internet develop effectively, guaranteeing security, continuity and confidence worldwide as well as providing mechanisms which will make it easier for developing countries in particular to participate in the development of the Internet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mexico. Bahrain, please. And I have on the list after Japan, United Kingdom followed by IEG-URAXS.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To begin with I would like to point out something that was raised by my colleague from Iran which is the title of this proposal. I believe that it perhaps might be misleading somewhat. I echo the sentiments raised by the colleague from Iran that we are not defining the role of governments but talking about operationalizing the role of governments. This is built on the sentiment, perhaps, or the position of different Delegations that the role of governments as outlined in the Tunis Agenda, particularly as per Article 35, has not been put into practice. And I note the comments raised by my esteemed Delegate from Finland that many organizations have differing role of governments. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the problem. When we look at the Tunis Agenda, which we are using as the basis for many of these discussions involving the multistakeholder model, we note that governments are responsible for the public Internet policy. The international Internet-related public policy. And that intergovernmental organizations as per Article 35 development are responsible for facilitating that. And yet we note with some concern as has been mentioned by the Delegates of Argentina and Chile, that this does not seal to be the case. So, therefore, I think that there is something that needs to be discussed here. And the Kingdom of Bahrain supports the general thrust of the proposal made by Brazil. We agree that practices the wording needs to be looked at. And perhaps aimed in certain places. However, operationalizing it is an important process and going back to the comment by my he is teamed colleague from Finland that we are outside of these organizations, well, this is the WTPF right now. This is an open Forum where we have many of those organizations here. I think this is an excellent place for all of us to come together and discuss it. Wasn't that the point before coming to Geneva? Therefore, I would submit that, I would request the floor to carefully consider the Brazilian proposal. If there are statements or sentences in there which are objectionable, to highlight them so that we may discuss them in a frank and open manner and reach consensus, which as we have seen with the spirit of yesterday and today has been fantastic. I hope that we can continue that to the conclusion of this Forum.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain. Iran, please, followed by Czech Republic.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize to come in again but after the intervention of the Distinguished Delegate of Finland I have to make this clarification. We have not decided today at 5:30 to resolve this, but we have to send a message that gives everybody an equal right, sitting together, putting their thoughts together to reflect and to send this signal to outside whatever Forum is responsible or would be responsible. It would not be one single, as Mr. ... said that. It is aggressive to everybody, but including those ICANNs and so on and so forth and we need to address the issue and I once again fully support the last statement made by the Distinguished Delegate of Bahrain. We have to take that on board and we have to operationalize that and take it more serious, but not at this meeting, but we have to send a strong mess ac outside this meeting or Forum to the main issue which has been raised in the document of Brazil and Russia. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Before I give the floor to Czech Republic, I have the request for the floor as follows: Japan, U.K., IEG-URAXS, and Germany. These are the requests I see on the floor. I don't see the others. We will proceed this way. Czech Republic, please.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be quite brief. We are very grateful for Brazil's explanation and we understand now the aim of the Brazil proposal. At the national level we have the experience that minimum amount of government, governance supported the expansion of the Internet and so we agree with the Tunisia proposal to continue to study and discuss this matter, but we are not ready to accept any further amendments to this opinion. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan thinks this issue careful live because this issue is really a difficult issue to reach an agreement at this state. I remember that we had this discussion, it was difficult issue. We think we have a different view concerning the role of the government within the Internet Governance issue. So I hesitate discussing this issue, the details of this issue in this, at this stage, at this WTPF. I would like to remind you that we, this WTPF could reach six opinions, especially Opinions 3 and 4 mentioned the IPv 3 and 4 issues and we preceded this issue. We looked at Opinion 55 and 6 has already been covered in a sense with these issues made by Brazil and the Russian Federation. Please look carefully, Opinion 5 mentions Member States to play a role, the part of the, part of the Opinion 5 and Opinion six also mentions concerning the network issue. We also invite all stakeholders to work on this issue. So at this stage we had better stop discussing the more details. Opinion 5 and 6 is enough to start after the week of meeting. We would like to provide a lot of the, to seek cooperation through Opinion 5 and 6 as well as opinion 3 and 4.

So if everybody wants to discuss again to the detail of the role of the government, then I would like to ask to discuss as well the role of the other relevant stakeholders issue. Because Japan fully supports the multistakeholder approach in this Internet Governance issue. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan. So before I continue further discussion, I am having a growing list of requests. First I need to get permission from very important stakeholder in our own meeting today, the interpreters. Interpreters, how much time will give us more to continue the discussion this evening?

>> INTERPRETER: Our first bid, Chairman, is ten minutes. That is the first bid.

(Laughter.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your constructive approach.

United Kingdom followed by U.K. Germany, Canada, France, this is the end of the list of today. Bear in mind tomorrow morning's session, from the morning until the morning coffee break is ours. We will continue discussing it.

U.K., please.

>> U.K.: Thank you, Chair. I'll try to be brief to help the progress towards the conclusion today. I just want to state first of all that the U.K. does recognize the issue that is raised by Brazil about the importance of ensuring that stakeholders including governments are able to participate fully and meaningfully in Internet Governance fora. There are effort we should recognize by the ICANN, IGF, to try to address that issue. I think there is work to be done in maximizing participation through greater efforts. That is something I'm sure the commission on science and technology for development working group on enhanced cooperation will look at.

So there is a message, I think from this discussion. It is a very helpful and useful discussion that is taking place here, that this is an important issue and we should all, it is incumbent on all of us to try to address that issue and look at how it can be best addressed. There are efforts going object and opportunities, notably with the CSTD working group to address this.

That is my point at this stage. We can certainly look at the Brazil proposals and the text. We very much appreciate their effort in this regard and their openness and flexibility with regard to specific items of text. We will certainly look at that overnight and tomorrow as we proceed with this discussion. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, my plea to you is be concise as the Oxford dictionary. IEG URAXS followed by Costa Rica.

>> IEG URAXS: I will be succinct. Thank you, Chairman. I sympathize with the proposals from Brazil and Russia. I understand that fragmentation of Internet Governance rule is a major concern. That's why we need to take, look to the ITU to take a leadership role in developing a model for Internet Governance that will be adopted in a Forum, international Forum by consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Costa Rica. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also want to thank Brazil and Russia for their proposals. Brazil addresses a very important aspect and it is referring to the role of governments in respect of Internet Governance. I want to recall that Internet Governance is a very broad issue and covers quite a lot of aspects and subjects, and is discussed in very broad range of fora. I can say, government of the federal Republic of Germany is satisfied with the results that have been achieved in the area of Internet Governance are in recent years. By the way, as the Internet evolved during the last years was very successful, and success is also a good example where it demonstrates that Internet Governance could not have been so bad as sometimes presented in some of the comments.

Germany in particular supports the so-called multistakeholder model that has been proved to be an instrument allowing the inclusion of all stakeholders in decision making processes. That doesn't mean that there is no room for improvement, but this has to be done in the relevant organisation, as I said before we have different fora where these issues are discussed. There are various fields where governance issues are raised with participation, clearly with the participation of governments.

One example is the ITU. We have seen here in the WTPF a good example for such an, such an open discussion process. We also have other fora where are decisions on Internet Governance is made. One is ICANN and GAC. In our meetings in Beijing our colleagues referred to this this. In some cases we could not come to a final decision. To be clear, it was the governments that could not come to a common position and this is an unfortunate situation that sometimes happened during international meetings between governments. Also within the ITU sometimes, but this is a question of normal discussions. If we do not come to a consensus view. It is not an indicator for the model. Like Finland, we think it is important to have differentiated view on the role of the governments, since as I was referring to we have different fora and different issues that are tackled and we would like to have a broader discussion on this issue. I think the proposal from Brazil is an important step that should be developed, but probably it would be a bit not enough time to discuss it in a way that it merits. Therefore, we would like to intense if I the discussions during the next time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Costa Rica, please.

>> COSTA RICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I speak in Spanish, please?

Thank you very much, Chairman. The government of Costa Rica would like to identify 100 percent of the multistakeholder model for Internet Governance. We believe that the proposal from Brazil is sufficiently general for it to be discussed in this Forum and with all due respect I say that after the more in depth analysis carried out by the Russian Delegation. I think that the Brazilian Delegation when he spoke last time made things quite clear what we are talking about here.

From Costa Rica's point of view Brazil is an example, an example of consistency in the positions which it has been presenting in various fora. For Costa Rica, national coordination of the type that the Brazilian authorities are carrying out is an example which we should emulate because it has been flexible in its development of legislation over the last few years, but it also has been very successful in the development of the Internet in Brazil. So without wishing to disrupt the meeting in any way, Costa Rica supports the Brazilian proposal and would be only too happy to learn lessons from Brazil's achievements. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I am going to ask once again the stakeholder, what the situation is, will they be constructive in supporting us or say they continue tomorrow? Interpreters, please, your opinion?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, please, sir, if you wish to continue until quarter to, that would be fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So then in this context then, I will give the floor only to Canada and then I will give the floor to France and Chile starting tomorrow morning at 9:30. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Chairman. Like others we would like to thank Brazil for provoking the current discussion that we are having based on the opinion put forward by Brazil. Like others, we would agree that governments do have important roles and responsibilities as a stakeholder within the multistakeholder framework for the Internet. It is also very worthwhile to continue to place importance and priority on capacity building. Some colleagues already have pointed to some of the work that has been undertaken in order to increase meaningful participation in existing organizations. Some have mentioned the ITU, the Internet Governance Forum is another important Forum for discussions and for enabling capacity building in this area. And as well as ICANN and its Governmental Advisory Committee, capacity building is something that is addressed within the Governmental Advisory Committee to a degree. As well as the kinds of plans that were outlined by the CEO Of ICANN to engage stakeholders more broadly.

Within the Internet advisory Committee we have done thing like obtain interpretation and provision of fellowships precisely so that developing countries are better supported in participating and of course, these improvements are always possible and again to reinforce that this is something that is discussed within the GAC and the other organizations that have a role. And this is important to bear in mind and also we would like to acknowledge the progress so far at these meetings. We believe we have six strong opinions on a consensus basis and we should not lose sight of the accomplishments at this point in the meetings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So then I have seen one refusal from the request to take the floor. I have only France still pending. I will give the floor to France. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I should like to thank brads and the Russian Federation for their contribution. More particularly, I would like to refer to the contribution of Brazil and to say that we fully share the dual goal which Brazil has made clear in its intervention, they want to strengthen the role of governments in the role of Internet Governance. And two, the necessary issue of capacity building in respect of Internet Governance for developing countries. As has been stated by several Delegations, I think, the multistakeholder model has played an essential role in the very rapid development of the Internet. I would just like to reiterate our full support for that model.

Nonetheless, we know that the Internet is still evolving and evolving very, very quickly. The multistakeholder model has to take those developments and devolutions into account. Indeed it can and must be improved because there are still problems that we have as Argentina and Chile have indicated. As Germany and I believe Finland have said, we have to take every opportunity to discuss improvements that can be made to the multistakeholder model. Including during this Forum. That is why we would like to thank Brazil for this excellent contribution. We can discuss these issues within ITU because we have a role to play here. We would like to enter our opinion that ITU has played and important role with respect to Internet Governance since 1998. Through work done in the development sector and elsewhere. We also think that this matter should be discussed in all other organisations involved are in Internet and Internet Governance. And of course at the next meeting of the CSTD. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, France. I can see that Chile is requesting once again the floor. Chile, you had the floor already. Be kind to myself and the interpreters and be ready to start tomorrow morning.

I would like to make a couple of proposals before we close today. I would like to ask kindly Brazil and Russia to informally consult to see if they can make progress within the text they are proposing. This is without any Chair, without any Secretariat, just informally over coffee or dinner.

Let us be clear, we have six opinions already adopted. We are not reopening those opinions. That is the platform from which these discussions may be held.

So I thank very much the interpreters for their own patience with us and they are a tremendous support, helping us to understand each other better. I should like to wish you a very successful evening, night, morning perhaps overnight talk or sleeping talk and consideration of what else could be done better and I am looking forward to see you tomorrow morning at 9:30. We will have the session at our own disposal starting from 9:30 until 4:45. Enjoy the evening. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

(The session adjourned at 5:45 p.m. CET.)
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