

**ECOSOC General Debate and Informal Consultations  
on the implementation of the World Summit on the Information  
Compilation of Various informal Civil Society reports**

**Genava, July 2006**

CONGO Introduction note 4 July.

CONGO is now back to post WSIS issues after some over-loaded working weeks in June in Geneva due to the 1st session of the newly established Human Rights Council (19-30 June) and the preparation of the CS Forum to the ECOSOC High Level Segment on Employment and Decent Work, organised by CONGO on 29-30 June (find attached for your information the outcome document with the recommendations of the Civil Society Forum, which are now circulated to the ECOSOC Member States).

As you may know, the ECOSOC substantive session will address during its July 2006 session the "review of the mandate, agenda and composition of the Commission of Science and Technology for Development (CSTD), including considering the strengthening of the Commission, taking into account the multi-stakeholder approach" (paragraph 105, Tunis Agenda).

As one of the outcome of the ECOSOC informal consultation process on the future role of the CSTD in the follow-up to WSIS (13 February and 16 May), it was agreed that a working group would be convened to explore various options on the CSTD review. We have been informed yesterday that this working group would be convened in Geneva, parallel to the Plenary meeting of the ECOSOC substantive session, from 11 July onwards (possibly until 13 July 2006), and that it will be open to all NGOs in ECOSOC consultative status, as well as to a certain number of other WSIS accredited NGOs (see below). This will take place just after the examination by ECOSOC of the SG report on "modalities of the inter-agency coordination of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes including recommendation on the follow-up process" and the report of the 9<sup>th</sup> CSTD session (May 2006). The ECOSOC decision regarding the CSTD review might be adopted at the very end of the ECOSOC session on the basis of the draft negotiated in the working group.

**Calendar:**

10 July: consideration by ECOSOC of the SG report on inter-agency coordination of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes including recommendation on the follow-up process and of the report of the 9<sup>th</sup> session of the CSTD.

11 July onwards (depending on the progress of the discussions, possibly until 13 July): meetings of the open ended working group on the review of the CSTD.

Action on all outstanding draft proposals (dates depending on the progresses of the discussions).

---

**CONGO Monday 10 July**

ECOSOC held today afternoon its general debate on the implementation of the WSIS outcomes, in particular as regards the review of the mandate, agenda and composition of the CSTD.

As you may know, ECOSOC will now hold some informal discussion in working groups with the view to finalise a resolution on the review of the CSTD. The first meeting of this working group will take place this afternoon at 3:00 at the UN. The ECOSOC Chair might present a non paper including some proposals for this

resolution. NGOs with ECOSOC consultative status will be allowed to attend and participate, as well as WSIS accredited entities which have expressed the wish to participate. The private sector was invited to join the discussions.

Find enclosed and below a summary of this discussion :

## **ECOSOC General Debate on implementation of the World Summit on the Information**

### **Society outcomes including recommendation on the follow-up process Agenda items 6 and 13 (b), 10 July 2006**

The general discussion was based on the UN SG Report entitled "[Implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society](#)" and the [report of the UN CTSD on its 9<sup>th</sup> session](#) (May 2006). ECOSOC Chair Ali El Achani clarified the scope of the meeting is to implement paragraph 105 of the Tunis Agenda which entitles ECOSOC to "oversee the system wide follow-up to the Geneva and Tunis outcomes of WSIS" and which ask it at its current session to "review the mandate, agenda and composition of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, including considering the strengthening of the Commission, taking into account the multi-stakeholder approach".

Patrizio Civili, Assistant Secretary-General of the UN DESA, introduced the UN SG report, stressing the complex interrelated nature for multi-stakeholder implementation and follow-up processes. Both should be fully integrated and coordinated, in relation to the MDG agenda, involving all non governmental stakeholders and civil society. ECOSOC and the CSTD should be considered in this framework, as well as the General Assembly for its review of WSIS in 2015. He also referred to the recent establishment of UN GIS, within the CEB and of the inaugural meeting of Global Alliance for ICT and Development. He said the GAID would be a valuable source of input to ECOSOC on multi-stakeholder debate and contribute to the UN CSTD.

Dr. Jamaludin Jarjis, Minister of Science, Technology and Innovation of Malaysia, reported on the outcomes and the discussion held during the first inaugural meeting of the UN GAID, held on 19-20 June in Kuala-Lumpur. Dirk J. Bruinsma, Deputy SG of UNCTAD, reported on Action Line Facilitation meetings in which UNCTAD has been involved so far, as well as in the role of UNCTAD serving as Secretariat for the UN CSTD. He lastly stressed the impact of science and technology, not only limited to ICT, on economic and social development.

#### Strengthening of the UN CSTD

The **G77 (South Africa)** supported the strengthening of the CSTD membership, mandate and working methods to take up the WSIS follow-up in addition to its existing mandate. The **EU (Finland)** stressed the distinction between follow-up within ECOSOC and interagency coordination within the UNGIS. Membership should better reflect its new tasks and its secretariat should be reinforced by benefiting from help from other agencies. **Chile** and **Egypt** called for an extension of membership and a strengthening of the CSTD secretariat. The EU and Switzerland supported the strengthening of the linkages between implementation of WSIS and of other UN Conferences and Summits. **Russia** underlined the new CSTD mandate should not be at the expense of the existing mandate. **El Salvador** reminded the strengthening of the CSTD should be based both on WSIS and on the outcomes of the UN World Summit.

**G77** supported an extension of the annual session to ten working days, including 4 days for WSIS follow-up and 2 days for multi-stakeholder inputs.

The **USA** highlighted that the mandate of the CSTD has not been decided yet, and that the CSTD should have a limited role in the WSIS follow-up with the view to facilitate reporting on WSIS implementation to ECOSOC and the GA, while keeping

the operational role and policy dialogue outside of its competence. The CSTD mandate should keep its technical nature, made up of scientific experts representing States. WSIS follow-up activities could be dealt with in one day. Database and information should not lead to duplication of activities. Existing resources and similar membership should be preserved.

**UNESCO** said it was vital for the new CSTD mandate to take into account UNESCO's particular mandate in science, in order to avoid any overlap.

*Articulation between implementation and the system wide follow-up by ECOSOC and CSTD*

**G77** suggested the CSTD should review progresses on implementation of action lines at the international, regional and national level; make policy guidance recommendations to ECOSOC; promote dialogue and build partnerships; operationalize paragraph 60 of the UN World Summit (September 2005). The CSTD should adopt a two year follow-up cycle including a review session (drawing on the ALF and UNGIS outcomes among others) and a policy session (discuss obstacles and solutions, based on the results of the review session). **Egypt** also supported the organisation work based on a review session and a policy session in development orientation. **Chile** added that the biannual PoA should follow WSIS action lines. **Switzerland** and **Chile** supported that the CSTD mandate should be extended to include review of implementation, policy recommendation to ECOSOC and promotion of dialogue and partnership. **Switzerland** stressed the working methods should follow the recommendations of GA Resolution 57/270B, and be articulated around a two year work programme.

*Participation of civil society and the private sector*

**G77** underlined the intergovernmental nature of the CSTD; ECOSOC modalities for civil society involvement should therefore be observed in the multi-stakeholder participation in the CSTD. The participation should be open to NGOs and to the private sector. **Argentina** stressed the importance of having multi-stakeholder components in the CSTD. The **EU** supported the engagement of non state actors should be further developed within the CSTD with the view to recognise the unique multi-stakeholder character of WSIS. **Russia** noted that participation of NGOs and the private sector should be determined in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Council. **Switzerland** stressed that the participation of civil society and the private sector should also be ensured in the intersessional panels and in electronic spaces for dialogue. Two working days should be devoted to multi-stakeholder dialogue. The **US** vision of the multi-stakeholder approach is based on increased number of parallel events and participation sponsorship. The role of all stakeholders should be clearly defined and the private sector should be incorporated into the CSTD.

The **EU** said the GAID could not be the substitute for effective multi-stakeholder participation for implementation and follow-up. Lastly, **Switzerland** added the GAID should concentrate itself in the integration of ICT in the UN development agenda without participating in operational activities.

The **Conference of NGOs** stressed that, with the view to continue the involvement of all actors in the work of the Commission at the same level of mobilization and contribution as during WSIS, we consider as necessary that future practices of the CSTD should draw upon the multi-stakeholder interactions and contributions as experienced during the WSIS process. A formal arrangement should be established so that CS entities accredited to WSIS and willing to contribute to the WSIS follow-up benefit from a fast-track inclusion in the work of the CSTD. Lastly, while being a significant actor feeding into the CSTD, the Global Alliance should not be considered as the only multi-stakeholder process of the CSTD, but only as one of them :

-----

CONGO Tuesday 11 July

This draft resolution was compiled by the Chair of ECOSOC at this afternoon's informal working group meeting. The working group might be functioning until it finalizes a text each afternoon from 3 to 6 (but not on this upcoming Friday).

Ambassador Janis Karklins accepted this afternoon to facilitate the discussion on this text.

It is clear that the most contentious part of this text will be paragraph 9 on multi-stakeholder participation... There is quite a broad support for a fast track accreditation process for WSIS accredited CS entities, even though some States still have some reservations or questions.

I draw your attention to paragraph 7 and 8 regarding modalities for interaction and the use of electronic devices.

-----  
CONGO Wednesday 12 July

We are currently going during the WG meeting through a first reading of this text, starting by operational paragraph 1. Other WG meetings will take place tomorrow Thursday, and then will continue on next Monday and Tuesday. Ambassador Karklins would like to see the discussions finished on Tuesday.

NGOs are allowed to be in the Room and to take the floor. Ambassador Karklins made it clear at the beginning of the meeting that his intention is to **keep the meeting open ended** and no delegation opposed.

Contributions can be made on the basis of this attached text.

-----  
CONGO Thursday 13 July

Note that alternate paragraph 9 was proposed yesterday by Charles Geiger, to better accommodate the participation of private sector entities in the CSTD. PS cannot be included in ECOSOC modalities for consultative relationship with NGOs based on 1996/31, so that the previous wording was legally not satisfactory.

To keep you up dated, we have been informed at the end of today's informal consultation that South Africa on behalf of G77 had asked Karklins that NGO observers would not participate in the next meetings, scheduled on next Monday and Tuesday. We understood however that this question had actually not yet been discussed within G77, but that it might be addressed tomorrow morning. We will keep you posted tomorrow...

-----  
FM: Thursday 13 July

Current negotiations in Geneva are quite crucial for Implementation and Follow-Up ( except Internet Governance ).

All Observers, including Ecosoc accredited ones, may be expelled from the room if the South African representative persists. The story unfold as follows, as we are facing two serious procedural problems. The first problem concerns the current procedure of the "informal consultation", that were first started by the Chair of ECOSOC himself, Ali Achani for a short session on Monday, he announced there will be a non-paper as a basis for future "informal consultations", and then Achani decided that the following "informal consultations" will be chaired by Karklins.

During the informal sessions on Monday, and mostly on Tuesday ,Wednesday, and

Thursday, Civil Society was allowed to speak and to propose language. At that time, the Civil Society that took the floor was DAPSI, the African Diaspora, with Pape Diouf, CONGO with Philippe, and me. On Tuesday, when Karklins took the chair, he asked all governments if none objected to his proposal that the discussions be open-ended, meaning also open to Civil Society observers. No Government, including China, objected.

Business is not present, which alarmed very much the United States delegation, but the CCBI turned now into the BASIS (Business Action to Support the Information Society) ( nice acronym; ) sent judiciously a written contribution, reassuring the US delegation which might have otherwise opposed Civil Society presence.

The "informal discussions" proceeded with exactly the same open procedure as during the Friends of the Chair sessions during WSIS. They are just informal negotiations. Then at the end of the session on Thursday, we were stunned to learn that South Africa ( who happens to represent the G77, so there is some confusion as to whether South Africa was speaking for itself or for G77 ) has requested Civil Society to be expelled from the next informal sessions on Monday and Tuesday on the ground that, according to ECOSOC rules of procedures, observers cannot be present during negotiations. The delegate from South Africa:

Henri Raubenheimer G77/ZA representative  
<http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2003/issue1/0103p23.html>  
<http://www.iisd.ca/ffd/pc3/wed1710.html>

just stepping fresh into the discussions at this stage, is based in New York. Since it is an informal meeting, ECOSOC rules of procedures does not apply. However, according to rules outlined by the chair, if a government objects to the presence of Civil Society, then Civil Society must leave the room. However, it is clear that the government that is requesting the Civil Society to leave cannot take cover of asking for the application of ECOSOC rules, this government must endorse its full political responsibility of its willful intent to expel Civil Society. As it is clear that there absolutely no consensus in the G77 on this matter, that has not been discussed yet within the G77, South Africa would have to endorse alone its decision.

At the end of session on Thursday, with the friendly advice of the representative of an East African state, after getting lost, I finally reached the G77 office. and I met the South African representative and was able to explain to him the situation. The discussion was calm but tense. He said to me that the G77 will discuss this question on Friday.

-----

Friday 14 July.

No informal consultations meeting today, however I met again the G77/ZA delegate, this time with Philippe, on Friday morning, in the G77 offices, but no further progress was made.

On Friday night, long past 6 PM, after the end of the closed G77 meeting , few friendly delegates told Ana Laurinda and me that this question was not discussed during this G77 meeting, that they were late, and did not finish their agenda.

We are therefore still in the fog. Most G77 delegates from Latin America strongly supports Civil Society presence so if South Africa want to pursue its stance, I guess it would have to do it alone.

The content of the current discussions on the non-paper concerns the procedures to be followed by the reformed CSTD for WSIS. One crucial question is whether the reformed

CSTD will follow procedures followed at WSIS, or those of ECOSOC, where precisely Civil Society cannot attend negotiations ( what we have been doing during WSIS ! ).

So if we are expelled from current discussions, it is a very bad omen for the content

of the non-paper and future CS involvement at the CSTD concerning WSIS follow-up. ITU, UNESCO and other internal agencies representatives being there are going to take note....

All these very difficult negotiations underline the need of the continuing role of the CSB, otherwise Civil Society stands to lose, during the follow-up phase; all the gains being made on procedural issues during the first two phases of WSIS. Renate should be there on Monday to reinforce the CS in current negotiations, and to discuss what could be done at the CSB level.

In this context, I contacted Adama Samassékou, here is the text ( translated from French )

-----  
Following various conversations, H.E Adama Samassékou, President of the WSIS PrepCom of the Geneva phase authorizes to communicate that, on one side, in his vision, when it was created, the Civil Society Bureau had been formed for the overall WSIS process which naturally include implementation and follow-up, and on the other side, this global vision also comprised the formation of national or regional Civil Society Bureaus, antennas of the Geneva Bureau, to deal with procedural issues for implementation at national and regional levels.

In General all Civil Society efforts aiming at fully assuming its role within implementation and follow-up, are receiving all but his encouragements.

---

FM: Monday 17 July

The session started with full suspense. Karklins told us that South Africa/G77 was still maintaining its position. Karklins started the meeting with a very vague sentence alluding that those who are attending "are allowed to stay there according to rules of procedures".

Then some states asked for clarification, and Karklins asked a secretary of ECOSOC to explain the rules of procedure. She came five minutes later. She said that observers could be allowed to stay in ECOSOC sessions if attending governments allow it. The situation is quite diverse and she quoted examples of CS participation.

Then Australia took the floor supporting the presence of CS, but at least being silent observers. EU supported Australia, US supported Australia.

Then Chile intervened calling for a more active participation of Civil Society, suggesting a preliminary statement. Mexico supported.

Then the South African/G77 delegate intervened , he thanked the chair for the clarification, and rather surprisingly, he said he always supported Civil Society presence.

Morocco asked what was the exact status of the talks. Karklins answered they were informal consultation towards negotiations. Then South African/G77 intervened again asking what was then the meaning of a "closed" meeting on the schedules ? ( the argument he told us repeatedly during our conversations is that the meeting was "closed" ). The ECOSOC secretary answered it was simply an indication to the press, :-) ! meaning that the Press was not allowed in closed meetings. No more objection from South Africa !

This ended the procedural controversy to the advantage of CS, but we lost the right to make short suggestions during the discussion, which is still a big loss.

Renate made a general statement (and she left some time after as she had to chair other conferences, while Alejandra staid. Being not able to make any short suggestion is very frustrating. I went to a library upstairs to make printouts of language propositions that I distributed to delegates. It is disappointing to say that unless you explain orally each strong points to each person, there is little impact.

Tomorrow, since the paragraph being studied is the paragraph on Multi-Stakeholders I will ask in my preliminary statement that CS be allowed to make short interventions ( less than 3 minutes ) whenever appropriate during the discussion. I told the South African delegate about this idea, and this time, he said nothing, which would also help regain what we have lost in terms of informal procedural practices.

An unexpected gain is that US proposed a new formulation of paragraph 4 c that quoted "established rules of ECOSOC and WSIS" ( I had lobbied very hard the previous to get WSIS added to ECOSOC, EU and Switzerland supported it) This paragraph is almost agreed.

The big point that has NOT been addressed in my language suggestions so far is how the multi-stakeholder approach could be reflected in the reformed CSTD commission. A multi-stakeholder advisory group like for the IGF ?

Unless some one has a better idea, ( PLEASE DO PROPOSE SOMETHING ASAP ) this what I am going to propose tomorrow. However with the high proportion of diplomats here who never attended the WSIS, the prospects are dim for a MAG.

At the pace the negotiations are going, I don't see how the negotiations could end up tomorrow on Tuesday. I must leave tomorrow night Geneva.

-----  
FM : Tuesday 18 July

Hello

This Tuesday session was most disappointing. Its began with the surprising appearance of Achani who came to communicate the delegates its "worry" of seeing so many paragraphs still in brackets, and the slow progress of negotiations. We were then expecting Karklins to give CS the floor, as its happened yesterday and as promised ( unless the promise was made only for one day ... ;-( ! ), but there was no such sign from the chair, and so the "intergovernmental" negotiation began.

Karklins went directly to the paragraphs on reporting OP11bis, OP12 hoping to get a quick agreement on those seemingly easy ones. Unfortunately it was not case, as the G77/South African delegate begun to ask questions to which Renate knew all the answers ! This person did not seem to be well informed as a career diplomat should be ( all the more he reminded Karklins later, that he chaired an ECOSOC session once... ) Khan ( Global Alliance ) who happened to be on table row with Karklins was even asked to provide explanations. This bogged down the debate, while the two proposals that I was making concerning a direct report for the sake of collecting information ( not for as sign of being under the control of ) from specialized agencies, and direct report contributions to CSTD by other stakeholders were left aside.

Since CS was kept silent, despite some calm and dignified handling with the "Société Civile" official plastic signs, there was no way to underline those two issues.

( This report is from the top of my head, as I am just arriving in Paris, from Geneva, so the chronology might not be 100% accurate, my remembrance is good only to some aspects, while the rest got fuzzy )

Then we went to OP3 again word smithing ( responsibility, mechanisms ) and to OP4. The G77/ZA delegate went to discuss about his proposition of having the word "monitor". Canada, staunchly opposed. G77/ZA stood firm in a deadlock. The EU proposed "examine" Then G77/ZA proposed "oversee" but It was claimed that "oversee" was the task of ECOSOC,

not of one its functional commission operating at "a lower level". There was a deadlock, and then the apex of the grotesque was slowly reached.

The discussion degenerated. At loss, trying to help ( and possibly to show the vanity of this semantic discussion ) some delegates from South American countries began to raise the question of how the verb "monitor" could be translated in Spanish, and could only be translated as "control", and quoting the Royal dictionary, claim the verb did not exist, but only the name. The delegate from Spain ( who never spoke ever since and probably never will speak ever again, since in the EU ) said the Spanish language could vary from country to country and the verb could exist...

The South American delegates did request the translators to intervene in the discussion, but they were not allowed by the chair to give their opinions...

At that moment, Karklins, for once losing his reserve, made an informal statement saying

that no matter what the exact terms be chosen, it would not change anything in the way the bureaucracy would handle things.

Meanwhile I handled a note to one of the secretary to be passed to the chair asking when the CS statement was scheduled. No answer. Then we went mostly to OP4 c) and the hell was raised again about the question if the list of stakeholders would appear there or elsewhere, and what should the list should comprise. In my written language proposal, I suggested that the digital solidarity fund should be at least mentioned. ( nothing concerning financial resources to bridge the digital divide is ever mentioned in this text so far... ) .

Then G77/ZA asked what was the meaning of "multistakeholders groups and platforms". At that point, Karklins decided to ask CS (Renate ) if no state objected ( none did ) .

Renate was then allowed to provide some explanations that satisfied seemingly G77/ZA.

Then at about 17H30, we went into OP10.

This time Karklins did again give CS the right to make some observations. I was able to speak, quoting briefly, my written proposal that CS should be given the same flexibility as the Private sector, in order to allow CS entity, new to the WSIS, but not eligible to the ECOSOC status, to have the possibility of being invited, then I proposed very briefly three additional paragraphs one about Think Tanks and another one about a much needed fund to help

CS people ( in particular from developing countries ) to participate to ECOSOC sessions, and the last one on the need of a multi-stakeholder advisory group to embody the multi-stakeholder approach. In fact, I had ready a written proposal, a "CS non paper" that describes the function of a **Sub-Commission for multi-stakeholder approach**

This CS non paper was drafted by a helping hand in the staff of an international organization that wish to remain anonymous. Although I had barely the time to read it, and just very slightly

modified, I found the content as an excellent rationale for a language proposal that I elaborated by using almost the same language as for the WGIG creation. ( see attached rtf and openoffice format ). CONGO (Philippe, Renate) read it also quickly, as well as a DAPSI representative (can't remember his name, he is a friend of Pape Diouf ) .

--> Side remarks : Comments and improvements would be most helpful. The content could be used also a stand alone CS non paper that could be written by the CSB. It is clear the CONGO must not present itself only with its mandate with ECOSOC, but as the liaison officer of the CSB, because otherwise we are stuck to ECOSOC rules, while we want to get out of them. If the situation does not improve tomorrow, the CSB should write a strong statement to Achani, ( and/or possibly to G77 )

Renate intervened again latter on, convincingly on the necessity to have all CS included.

EU intervened to include mention of WSIS rules which is a major advance. I am no longer sure but it seems to me that Australia and US also supported. Anyway the US mentioned that the states were not bound, for the reformed CSTD, to ECOSOC rules and were "sovereign" (exact words ) to adopt whatever rules they saw fit, like WSIS rules. Then the session ended.

Karklins announced the schedules of morning meetings of regional groups to prepare the next session on Wednesday afternoon ( it seems now that negotiation is going last, at least, until Friday ) and somehow he mentioned observers, and this was an occasion for the ZA/G77 delegate to launch a pique, with his strong voice "G77 meetings have very strict rules on observers" ( meaning there are none... :-( ! ).

Since I had to catch a train to go back to Paris, I had little time for late afternoon lobbying, except I came to see the US delegate, somewhat surprised by their positive attitude today. Concerning the \_Sub-Commission for multi-stakeholder approach, he said that the US would not oppose it ( the argument of partially mirroring the MAG in the IGF process seems to get traction ). I could not stay any longer in Geneva, I planned to stay until last Friday and I extended until Tuesday night, I some other urgent matters to deal with in Paris, including a contribution to the recourse before the constitutional council against the bad and ugly Copyright law in France was very narrowly adopted by the French parliament, but this is yet another story that is going to be reported soon.

I hope more CS people could come, at least those in Geneva that are accredited to ECOSOC. I hope Jean-Louis in Strasbourg ( 4 hours ride ) from Geneva could come as he said on his post to the plenary, and could come under the banner of whatever CS entity in ECOSOC consultative status that could be kind enough to adopt his NGO on a provisional basis as an umbrella organization, to allow him to speak.

May be, we should seriously, investigate the possibility of an umbrella organization with ECOSOC status.?

Let us keep hope... but we need more actions than prayers, although we may need both...

-----

CONGO : Wednesday 19 July 2006

Please find attached tonight's draft resolution based on today's difficult discussions.

ECOSOC Chair Achani actually had a meeting this morning with coordinators of regional groups on the steps forward. He proposed on this occasion a compromise package regarding the number of members (43 members) and the length of the annual session (5 days, with a review of this practice within 2 years).

The EU proposed the multi-stakeholder approach should be added into this package.

It should also be noted that the EU proposed a new wording for multi-stakeholder approach (paragraph 10 b and c) which reflects some of our concerns regarding the fast track participation procedure for WSIS accredited CS entities. See attached too.

Very few progresses compared with yesterday's draft. , speaking on behalf of G77, is demonstrating a very rigid approach, to which also answer the western countries, and many discussions highlight the difficult nature of these discussions. The question of Mandate was discussed a lot, but we had no time to address the multi-stakeholder approach.

-----

CONGO Friday 21 July

Dear all, there was not much progress in yesterday's afternoon session ( Thursday 20 July ). We did not even come to discuss any further the CS participation and MS issues. Rolling resolution attached.

Karklins finally proposed a break until Tuesday to give delegates a chance to get informally together to find accepted language for consensus, particularly on mandate of the CSTD and on **monitoring**, review and assess progress

---

FM note :

Babelfish translations.

to oversee, to monitor, to control, to review, to assess; to examine, to supervise

french

surveiller, pour surveiller, pour commander, pour passer en revue, pour évaluer, pour examiner, pour diriger

spanish :

supervisar, supervisar, controlar, repasar, determinar, examinar, supervisar

Note : monitorar exists in Spanish !:

<http://www.logosconjugator.org/>

Russian

, , , , , ,  
,

german

beaufsichtigen, überwachen, steuern, wiederholen, festsetzen, überprüfen, überwachen