

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
1Y	Provide regular training on the issues for relevant government official and policy making bodies		* Who? * How would independent training be ensured? * Assumes they are not trained or are ignorant * To whom? * negotiating texts & Manila Principles are like apples & oranges, but positive agenda good idea	10	6	4			1	6.50	21
2Y	Civil society should develop model negotiating texts (eg. text derived from Manila Principles) and present to trade negotiators	* We definitely need a positive agenda * Don't know Manila Principles - agree if it's based on SDG's, HR instruments constructive * Not a bad start	* Do we want a particularly positive FTA? * Don't they already exist and how could we find resources? * Sounds good on paper but difficult in practice * Names/people change positions/jobs frequently +1 * To do what?	4	12	4	4	1		2.80	25
3Y	Mapping the key trade negotiators for digital rights related discussions, including their bosses, actual political oversersers, and their administrative ecosystem	* CRM system * Support this idea, very doable		3	19			1		5.00	23
4Y	Create platforms to establish a regular dialogue with negotiators. Create civil society institutions (like the Civil Society Coordination Group) to facilitate regular dialogue and make policy recommendations	* We can learn from the Trans-Atlantic Consumer Diague (TACD) model as well * positive agenda needed! * too expensive?	* Virtual platforms? * + clarity / how? * CSO has different interests, it is hard to coordinate * Important to have code of conducts for civil society * Dialogue is not enough if there is no accountability * Who should provide these training sessions? +1	10	10	7				5.56	27
5Y	Create accreditation and training to civil society advising government officials	* Training necessary for written and oral advocacy * folks need training but we cannot wait * and who is fit for purpose and full disclosure of their funders	* Need a more coherent & specific plan * Who would accredit them? * Why only to a limited group? * Funding? * Not clear enough how this would work ; in principles not always clear, or relevant to trade * Need to further elaborate on what is meant by this mechanism * Funding? * - but be open about the weaknesses of multistakeholder processes (see ICANN) * How * Don't understand * Vague	4	10	1	2		6	4.71	23
6Y	In countries that support multistakeholderism work national trade officials/agencies leveraging internet governance principles/openess inclusivity		* - but be open about the weaknesses of multistakeholder processes (see ICANN) * How * Don't understand * Vague	2	7	9			7	3.06	25
7Y	Expand/make better use of expert committees - organise by theme (environment, digital, etc...), broad participation, more open involvement		* Yes, but what does mapping achieve? * Why just these?		8	2			10	4.00	20
8Y	Map workers and industry, and commerce unions, student associations that should be informed and activated with regard trade agreements			1	14	5			4	4.00	24
9Y	Campaign to remove OP from FTAs, e.g. TTIP RCEP. We have not lost. Keep it controversial	* We have a statement "IP out of TAFTA"	* Don't think is possible to succeed on this * Quite a utopic view * Remove IP from TTIP? Really? * Not possible * How? X2 * -or try to limit overspill within the FTAs too late?	6	6	11	2	1	2	2.69	28

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
10Y	Reach out to national governments through internet governance (IG networks & leverage expertise on IG issues to establish relationships with negotiators/trade policy makers on internet and trade issues	* But, do we really want internet issues in trade agreements?	* Did NETmundialwork? * Funding? * Blah	2	11	8	4			2.20	25
11Y	Campaigns => We need to frame the conversation in political terms, not just in technical arguments	* Yes, of course! * Political and human rights terms * Absolutely needed to make our point	* What does this mean? Trade is politics * "Policy" now, then "Political" * Already happening (?) -> improvement needed * Only when there is no legal alternative through procedures and principles * Rather vague	5	9	8	2			3.54	24
12Y	Learn the lessons of civil society inclusion/exclusion in FTAS by sharing with labor unions & environmental NGOs	* This has worked well with TPP negotiations * We need critical mass to make a change * Yes, of course * Expanding network good idea	* Not only unions & environmental civil society but use CS with other backgrounds * Don't they know we are excluded? * Not only with those unions also with teachers, doctors and other unions * How? * Letters from whom?	5	7	6	2		5	3.75	25
13Y	Provide incentives like letters of support to government officials that are kind with the public interest		* How would this bring back trust/strengthen participatory processes? * But to what end? * Hard to do	8	7	3			3	6.39	21
14Y	Work/infiltrate UN and associated/trade organizations (based on inputs on orgs today)		* Infiltrate? Really? * Infiltrate is a perjorative term * What? * How?	2	6	5	3	1	7	1.47	24
15Y	Rank trade negotiators	* Will allow to know who they are * There is well done report by CEO about revolving doors	* Based on what criteria? * How? To what end? x2	3	5	3	4	2	10	0.88	27
16R	Funding for travel, capacity building for organizations, etc		* Too vague, from whom? If only... +1 * Who will fund? Ask standards for quality to NGO	16	8	3				7.41	27
17R	Funding to sustain travel to trade rounds - 3 to 5 years commitment (trust relationships)	* Crowdfunding?	* From who? Google? +1 * Ethical concerns (with Google) must be more diverse	17	9	2				7.68	28
18R	Joint civil society travel grants to send delegates to policy making FORA, for meetings between negotiations and at negotiations	* This would require an institutional set up	* From which institution? * Who gets to decide? WTO? * Funding. Who funds? * Ethical concerns (Do you bite the hand that funds you?) * Need to be accompanied by briefings	6	15	2				5.87	23
19R	Fund CSO representatives to go the negotiation rounds		* Need accreditation of civil society. Can't fund anyone * In FTAs, they are not allowed to be there, this is EC who invite oras * Vague	9	12	4			1	6.00	26
20R	Pool CS resources & develop common strategies to ensure effective/efficient engagement	* Have a central hub for all CSOs to dock themselves to?	* How? +1	7	17	1			2	6.20	27
21R	Develop technical knowledge of expertise to analyse the text, come up with positive development oriented proposals	* Already have * Yes, as we do!	* We need access to the docs first... * Clarity for the layperson too! * OK, but to do what?	10	10	6	2			5.00	28

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
22R	A shared calendar to coordinate civil society and allied interests' meetings with negotiators, both in between formal negotiation rounds and at the negotiations	* Build CRM style system * "Minutes" from meeting of negotiators are already public	* Meetings with negotiators sometimes depend on confidentiality	3	16	4				4.78	23
23R	Convergence with other human rights, development and fair trade social movements to strengthen the impact on legislators and raise awareness		* What would this do implication trade always has a negative effect on human rights * Is this a credible approach - we need to be inside not outside	2	4	15	2		1	1.30	24
24R	We need to engage with other organizations working in human rights (Amnesty, Mozilla, etc)	* Also climate, indigent people * PEN International Article 19 * Yes - Mozilla * Broad coalition is strongest coalition * Less directly funded by industry research * It should be sophisticated and up-to-date materials to negotiators	* Who is "we"? +1 * Funding? * Assumes business research is biased * Too vague	4	14				1	6.11	19
25R	Research to challenge business research and reports	* Very, very important * Publicize Joseph Stiglitz articles against market fundamentalism and other idolatries	* Independent research is needed (not necessarily showing a disagreement with industry) * Sometimes governments more rigid than businesses * How? Who pays for it? * Awareness? Raising awareness about raising awareness?	15	4	7			1	6.54	27
26R	Greater awareness - raising of trade issues in all appropriate internet governance venues	* Invite someone from fair trade movement to make presentation * If civil society rep is going to IGF, ensure this issue is prominently addressed	* Such as? IGF? ICANN? ITU? * Awareness is good but not enough. What about the action part? * How? * Does not result in action * Vague	3	15	6	1		1	4.00	26
27R	Build capacity on internet & trade issues through knowledge exchanges between the two networks to create a community of internet & trade researchers	* Lacks institution reform * There is a broader trade coalition	* DC? * Don't need researchers, need advocates * Which networks * Hard to agree on one individual * Not going to have any effect on trade	5	11	6	3			3.60	25
28R	Establish permanent representative of digital rights' CSOs at Geneva to have constant impact on WTO folks		* Funding! X2 +1 * How? * Who would fund - better to work together on this	9	6	3	1	2	1	4.52	22
29R	In Open Trade Network: CSOs, academics, startups/business, institutions, tech, general public united to work towards transparent & participatory standards regarding digital policy made through trade agreements. Organize and coalesce diverse stakeholders behind these principles -- a container for collaboration. Includes: mapping stakeholders, policy working group, fund for participation	* This is "happening" as part of NETMundialInitiative * And other "trade watch" movements -> join them	* Impossible to legitimate that person * Don't need another network * Loss of time * How realistic is this for the trade context? * Not feasible * Do we have any successful models to follow? I doubt NetMundial even came close * Libertarianism? No thanks	6	7	6	3	1		3.04	23

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
30R	Distribute ICANN funds proportionally between all current internet governance groups (I-STARS) to facilitate wider participation in internet governance		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How do you make sure that those funds are fairly allocated * Don't trust I-STARS * Why? This is trade not DNS Transparency Objective * Poor ICANN :(* Yes overall, but no to parentheses. Sounds like separation between 2 NGOs will not get inside trade negotiations NGOs represent public of accountable to public 	4	8	5	2	1		3.00	20
31R	From a good-sized working group of NGOs willing to sign confidentiality agreements to get inside trade negotiations (a broader civil society group can establish working principles for inside group, and give a mandate for their work)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Very complicated for many sectors * NGOs should familiarize themselves with the reports + recommendations of Rapporteurs Jean Ziegler, Olivier de Schutter, Juan Pablo Bokoslavskiet and demand implementation * Could also expand to many sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Funded how? * How to get there? * Not holding up our values. Corporation * Who says these NGOs speak for citizens? * No confidentiality agreements, otherwise there's no use * Creates a new club * Why confidentiality agreements? * How much advocacy is needed to achieve this? 	6	6	3	3	5		1.09	23
32G	Release consolidated texts after each negotiating round for public comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * But how achieve that? * Yes * Ensure the Parliaments get the texts at an early date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * But do it at pred-defined times, not discretionary * +1 none above * It's not our decision - so how to do this? - Enforcement * -> Yes! (referring to comment above) * Square bracket text should be released during rounds * Not sure this is feasible * How? * Naive * How 	22	4	2				8.57	26
33G	Make the disclosure of ALL documents on an ongoing basis by all the parties to the trade agreement in question compulsory		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How * Yes, but how - just campaign demand * Too vague * At certain times * Especially weaker parties sometimes rely heavily on secrecy. rightfully so * What purpose would this serve? 	4	10	1	3	1	2	3.42	21
34G	Expose previous employment and networks of negotiators to shed light on the revolving doors with private industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * So people realize how much industry runs policy making process! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Already disclosed in U.S. would this change matter? 	7	7	5	1	1	1	4.29	22
35G	Release negotiating objectives and draft texts for public notice and comment; require negotiator to explain why accept/reject certain comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Notice comment is useful in the U.S. but could be more difficult to access in developing countries - OK as long as U.S. subsidiaries are not part of the constituency * Requiring explanation may avoid arbitrariness (and corruption) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Especially weaker parties need a certain level of secrecy regarding their own positions/redlines * Yes but as is reasonable * If negotiators explain everything will be handicapped in negotiations * When will they have time? * Explaining why some concerns are not taken into account is not enough or sound policy * Yes, if effective 	9	11	1	3			5.42	24
36G	Take the role of the European Ombudsman as a model for other countries to make trade negotiations more transparent (CF. recommendations of the EU Ombudsman on transparency on TTIP)			2	15	3				4.75	20

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
37G	Work through processes relating to the SDGs (exp. 17.10) to place a spotlight on closed nature of Trade Negotiations (*including e.g. WSIS)		* SDG's not mandatory - guilt-tripping * -//-	6	5	13	3			2.59	27
38G	FOIAs for proposals and communications of negotiators = accountability	* I've already did it - it's easy so anyone can do it and it will put a pressure on government * We have already doing that * Important to keep pressing for transparency and put on spot those saying no	* They refuse on strong ground and procedure is long * Not easy to materialize * Yes, but the rule Should be transparency by default (not wait for FOIAs...) * Been there done that +1 * How? * Can have FOIAs political impact? * What is mechanism to force that? - especially weaker parties need secrecy to some extent	1	13	11			4	3.00	29
39G	"Open Meeting" Presumption for trade negotiations - can be closed under strictly defined standards	* Agree but limited. Corporations would have far more access - need defined mechanisms!	* Secrecy should not be used as an excuse. Openness should always be the rule * Impractical, may lead to posturing * How to enforce? * By whom? * Legitimacy issues? * What does "bullying" mean?	4	4	9	3	2	5	1.14	27
40G	Document bullying tactics	* Possibly a way to highlight power differentials and policy issues that are susceptible to the horsetrading * Bullvina/bribery/corruption false promises * What are trade advisory boards? (answered in concerns and weakness - Several different layers of advisory committees)	* Industry reps won't comment on trade advisory boards if their comments are subject to FOIA - some comments may be adverse to important constituencies or customers * What's going to happen after that? * In some instances secrecy is crucial * They should be transparent by default (no need for FOIAs) * Not easy to materialize * Yes within reason * GOOD LUCK!	3	4	6	1	2	10	1.56	26
41G	Make trade advisory boards subject to FOIA, end the special NOA access to text			9	6	13				4.29	28
42B	Mount local legislative campaigns to: 1) subject all proposed text & advisory committee comments to Freedom of Information laws, 2) Release draft text after every round, 3) Set up citizen advisory bodies (like industry advisers)	* I like citizen advisory idea - needs funding		15	7	3				7.40	25
43B	Compile best national and international practices in trade negotiations and then campaign to spread adoption of such practices	* Alternative Trade Mandate it's such initiative but it needs support and digital rights input * Positive agenda * Practices in negotiation (policymaking) or in trade policies? (confusing) * See Report of Several UN Rapporteurs * More than comparison -> capacity building * Follow-up should include possibility to propose revisions to treaties - involve UNCTAD in monitoring	* In "trade negotiations" there may not be practices * How would we build leverage - why would they care * There have been poor success. Some have to get new practices * Loss of time * Definition of civil society? * Yes, but how to achieve this? * What structure funding ->TACs * Don't overburden CSOs please * How? Enforcement + funding? How? * Do CSOs have those capacities? * Must work on showing value of this to govts & trade community * Vague, how? Funding? * -> like TACs	15	7	5				6.85	27
44B	Include civil society organisations not only before & during trade negotiations but also after - e.g. through monitoring & enforcement processes/institutions	* Some New-gen FTAs have trade boards on environment and labour that do this. Need to see how effective they are * Use citizen-state-dispute-settlement		9	14	4				5.93	27

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
45B	Seek national level legislation to ban or put limits on the revolving door problem (of track negotiations often coming from or going to private industry jobs)	* Crucial * The EU is already improving this (Ombudson investigations) * Huge problem!	* Find the right balance to make sure that people can still circulate so that government jobs are not a dead-ends * Is this even possible * Only if it is true for all civil society suffers from bias as well	11	6	3	1		3	6.43	24
46B	Investigate possibilities for binding court & human rights rulings against secret negotiations, including local freedom of information & open government laws (where better than U.S.)	* All venues should be used (including funds) * Will require civil society coordinations * Call it: "Citizen-State Dispute Settlement" (CSDS <i>does not equal</i> ISDS) * Adopt binding treaty or corporate social responsibility	* There are many fora and venues who can cover all. * If there is basis for doing so to and if there is chance of success * And who will care -> showing tactic?	9	5	5	2		3	5.00	24
47B	Use Citizen Utility Boards (CUBs) as they exist in the US as a model to introduce civil society positions into trade negotiations form their very beginning (instead of only at later stage, at ratification)		* To do what, why are they more credible? * Could be difficult to organize * Interesting idea - want to know more. * Don't know what these are CUBS not exact model. But yes to structured participation	1	10	5			7	3.75	23
48B	Enforcement: Test the Legality of Trade Agreements 1) by inter-state complaints mechanisms of the Human Rights Committee Article 41 ICCPR), Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, European Court of Human Rights, American Court of Human Rights 2) by individual complaint procedures of The Human Rights Committee, Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, European Court of H. R. American Ct of H. R. 3) by Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice through government resolution under Article 96 UN Charter - with Americas Curiae briefs from stakeholders		* Too complicated	3	12	2		1		4.44	18
49B	A clear statement of the hierarchy of status of the different legal instruments emanating from the UN eg. UN Charter, International Covenant, recommendations, guidelines. On what basis can the different instruments be trumped by Trade Agreements (a) in law, (b) in practice?	* More legal standards needed or an international move to protect citizens * An Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice would confirm the heirarchy of rights and the "Supremacy Clause" of the UN Charter (Article 103) also Soering v. U.K. (1989) European Court judgment stating privacy of human rights	* Statement from whom? For what? * Many already exist * - but the UN is not a super state or something	6	7	9			4	4.32	26
50B	Make (all) trade agreements ratification contingent on passing the test of a human rights impact assessment (covering not only human rights, but also environment & health assessment).		* But how? * Yes "but" why not during their development? Why at end? * Or "make validity/enforceability contingent..." * The terms "human rights" etc are not agreed upon	6	9	2	2		1	5.00	20
51B	Governments to establish 'red lines' to establish boundaries & increase accountability of negotiations (can be ext. by legislators, citizens, m/stakeholder...) eg: "no data protection in TiSA"	* Broad agenda/priorities can be published before each round if not the ernrite text	* Meaningless * Governments already have negotiating redlines * Utopic * Hasn't happened yet only could it in future? * Sounds a bit totalitarian	1	7	6	3		3	1.76	20

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
52B	Negotiation: Make adoption of trade agreements contingent on participatory elaboration and negotiation, consultation of relevant stakeholders and access to information pursuant to Article 19 ICCPR and full participation pursuant to Article 25 ICCPR		* Unrealistic * How? * Difficult to enforce * Who is "relevant"? How do you design stakeholder selection? * Challenging design care to bring * Or rather "make validity/enforcement ability contingent" * Where/how? x2 * Yes, but how?	3	7	3	1	2	5	2.50	21
53B	As "Plan B," as far as it proves not feasible to push internet-related rules out of trade agreements, build/advocate rules that limit the overspill of trade rules on non-trade areas			3	8	5			7	4.38	23
54B	Make access to internet hard law (in human rights system) i.a. in order to protect net neutrality		* Tangent * How? x2 * Is net neutrality about human rights * How? * Access is already a constitutional right in certain jurisdictions (eg Article 5A Greek Constitution) * Vague, but a good idea in general	1	5	5	3		3	1.43	17
55B	Make process more accountable by building trust. Governments must show they heard civil society by responding publicly to public comment -- did they change policies or not?	* Make process * Confusing statement - they can show they "heard" us like ICJ!	* Nice - How? X2 * Make it stronger, pro-active obligation of state to produce texts and obtain free, prior and informed consent * Vague * Yes, but how? * How? * How to institutionalize this? * Legitimacy concerns - this is too late by then	3	5	12			6	2.75	26
56B	Along the lines of human rights & sustainability assessments... Before negotiations, relevant international organization/UN body should be asked to develop proposals of which areas would benefit from having trade disciplines, and what they should be, if any. If there are, then relevant UN/human rights/labor organization should be part of the negotiations and able to reject provisions in contra to human rights/SDGs			4	5	7	3	1	4	2.00	24
57B	Work on defining a charter of fundamental digital rights that can be integrated in PTAs. E.g. ILO core labor standards or OECD guidelines on tax evasion	* ILO standards and OECD guidelines are not integrated so far * Charter could also be used to challenge PTAs! * Fundamental digital rights are human rights	* Charter of digital right - no (cf V. Cerf) (in response strength comment: ILO standards and OEDC guidelins are not integrated so far) These already exist * Question would be how do we enforce? Will it bind? * See also PEN International Declaration on Digital Rights * OECD very conservative on IP * Rather rely on the already defined human rights, don't weaken the regime! * We already have HR obligations. Their enforcement is the key * I don't know the subject	5	4	12	5	1		1.30	27

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
58B	An ITAC-like CS/Academics only advisory group to USTR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * If linked to freedom of information * If they could publicize information, yes! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How to replicate for all countries, not just us? * Who selects members? * Expertism is not good * That undermines multistakeholder approaches * Should apply to all government advisory group - not just us * What's the point unless USTR takes above recommendation into consideration? * How? * OK - but with representatives from the civil society too * Already exists: PITAC (2-16) 		9	8	6		2	0.65	25
59B	HR assessment of Trade Agreement to be used in shaming companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Then is EDRi paper on TTIP or TISA * Yes but also non-compatible provisions of FTAs should be excluded - i.e. if they're not compatible with international laws. SDGs - etc then they should be excluded * H.R., health and environmental assessments are necessary as a prerequisite to negotiations * ...Through local legislation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Yes, but why just companies? * Human rights has not a universally agreed upon definition * As if trade has 1 human right effect? Evidence naming and shaming leads to changes in behavior? * Methodologies for this assessment? * Would this keep our less developed states? 	2	12	6		1	3	3.33	24
60B	Balanced membership requirement and functional/expert issue reps (not NEC cleared advisors) in advisory committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * ITACs * Not sure where? But I agree that issue experts should have a seat * Very useful if succeed. Good luck! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Must not carry a non-disclosure agreement requirement * What does "balanced" mean +1 * Not only USTR & ITAC are relevant * Won't work x2 	3	16	5	2		1	3.85	27
61B	Constitutional change of Fast-Track and of the confidentiality rules of ITAC and USTR? (Separation of Powers and FOE issues)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Parliaments cannot emasculate themselves - They are elected to perform in the public interest and not cop-out - Fast-tracking is thoroughly undemocratic as abdication of Parliament to Corporations - * Agree - no fast tracking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * US specific-trade challenges are global +1 * If grounds exist 	13	4	7		3	3	4.44	30
62B	Adoption: Subject ratification of Trade Agreements to public referenda and full advice and consent by Parliaments without fast-tracking		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * US would never be able to join * How would this be brought to action? * Even laws don't have this * Don't know how to get this through sovereign states * Is it possible? * That would mean to give up representative democracy * Representative democracy is "democratic" only if it represents and parliaments cop-out through Fast Track * Unlikely to succeed at trade FOR A 	2	3	3	8	3	1	-1.84	20
63?	Protect internet as public goods (commons) and access to internet as public service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * As long as this is not a bonus effort to the underserved (zero rating) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How? * How x2 * Tried that already * Who focus? 	3	6	6	2		2	2.94	19
64?	Focus on 2 or 3 discrete trade issues to maximize impact and preserve resources		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Different constituencies care about different issues! * But which ones? 	1	7	6	2	1	4	1.47	21

Sheet No.	Statement	Strengths & Opportunities	Concerns & Weaknesses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagreement	Strong Disagreement	Confusing	Score	Total Dots
65?	The negotiations should be conducted, as far as their nature makes it possible, in an open and transparent manner. They should allow for participation by all stake holders in the negotiating countries		* How? * An ideal, not an idea? * Too general -> there are commercial concerns too * Vague * Sure, but how will we make this happen * Vague * Vague -> need more elaboration * Not a recommendation * Don't understand the sentences * -//-.		4	7	2		10	0.77	23
66?	(Possible Global) It is that it lies beyond competence of civil society and academic actors alone to accomplish significant org trade negotiation practices, or to shift internet public policy from trade negotiations to more open participatory	* yes, need expert partners * Yes, that's why we need engage people			2	3		2	15	-1.43	22