

**UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

**Amendments/additional recommendations to document
"Compilation of recommendations contained in contributions from WGEC
members and Observers to the two guiding questions agreed during the first
meeting of the WGEC"**

Submitted by

TIMEA SUTO

ICC BASIS

DISCLAIMER: The views presented here are the contributors' and do not necessarily reflect the views and position of the United Nations or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

**UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

**Compilation of recommendations contained in contributions from WGEC
members and observers to the two questions agreed during the first
meeting of the WGEC**

26 January 2017

DISCLAIMER: The views presented here are the contributors' and do not necessarily reflect the views and position of the United Nations or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Contents

I. PROPOSALS OF RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSING SPECIFIC EXISTENT INSTITUTIONS/PROCESSES/FORA.....	5
RECOMMENDATION 1. RICHARD HILL, APIG	5
RECOMMENDATION 2. RICHARD HILL, APIG	5
RECOMMENDATION 3. RICHARD HILL, APIG	5
RECOMMENDATION 4. RICHARD HILL, APIG	5
RECOMMENDATION 5. RICHARD HILL, APIG	6
RECOMMENDATION 6. RICHARD HILL, APIG	6
RECOMMENDATION 7. RICHARD HILL, APIG	6
RECOMMENDATION 8. RICHARD HILL, APIG	6
RECOMMENDATION 9. RICHARD HILL, APIG	6
RECOMMENDATION 10. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 11. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 12. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 13. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 14. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 15. RICHARD HILL, APIG	7
RECOMMENDATION 16. PARMINDER JEET SINGH, IT FOR CHANGE, AND RICHARD HILL, APIG	8
RECOMMENDATION 17. ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	8
RECOMMENDATION 18. ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	8
RECOMMENDATION 19. ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	8
RECOMMENDATION 20. ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	8
RECOMMENDATION 21. PARMINDER JEET SINGH, IT FOR CHANGE	8
RECOMMENDATION 22. TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS	9
RECOMMENDATION 23. UNESCO	9
RECOMMENDATION 24. UNESCO	9
RECOMMENDATION 25. CONSTANCE BOMMELAER, ISOC	10
RECOMMENDATION 26. INDIA.....	10
RECOMMENDATION 27. CANADA.....	10
II. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE PREVIOUS WGEC WORKING GROUP	11
RECOMMENDATION 28. RICHARD HILL, APIG	11
RECOMMENDATION 29. RICHARD HILL, APIG	11
RECOMMENDATION 30. TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS	11
III. RECOMMENDATIONS OF PRIORITY OF FOCUS AREAS FOR FUTURE WORK	12
RECOMMENDATION 31. RICHARD HILL, APIG	12
RECOMMENDATION 32. EUROPEAN UNION	12
RECOMMENDATION 33. CONSTANCE BOMMELAER, ISOC	13
RECOMMENDATION 34. NICK ASHTON HART, TECHNICAL COMMUNITY.....	13
RECOMMENDATION 35. INDIA.....	13
RECOMMENDATION 36. IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF).....	13
RECOMMENDATION 37. PAKISTAN	14
RECOMMENDATION 38. ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL GROUP, PAKISTAN.....	14
RECOMMENDATION 39. HUNGARY	14
RECOMMENDATION 40. RUSSIAN FEDERATION	15
RECOMMENDATION 41. UNITED KINGDOM.....	15

RECOMMENDATION 42.	PROF. EM. WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER, UNIVERSITY OF AARHUS.....	15
--------------------	--	----

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSING ON COORDINATION ASPECTS16

RECOMMENDATION 43.	ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 44.	ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 45.	JIMSON OLUFUYE, AFICTA.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 46.	JIMSON OLUFUYE, AFICTA.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 47.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 48.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 49.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 50.	JANVIER NNGOULAYE, UNIVERSITY OF YAOUNDÉ.....	17
RECOMMENDATION 51.	NICK ASHTON HART, TECHNICAL COMMUNITY.....	17
RECOMMENDATION 52.	INDIA.....	17
RECOMMENDATION 53.	BILL GRAHAM, CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE INNOVATION (CIGI)	18
RECOMMENDATION 54.	RÉSEAUX IP EUROPÉENS NETWORK COORDINATION CENTRE (RIPE NCC)	18
RECOMMENDATION 55.	PROF. EM. WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER, UNIVERSITY OF AARHUS.....	18

V. RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSED TO NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS19

RECOMMENDATION 56.	ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN, APC.....	19
RECOMMENDATION 57.	JIMSON OLUFUYE, AFICTA.....	19
RECOMMENDATION 58.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	19
RECOMMENDATION 59.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	19
RECOMMENDATION 60.	UNESCO.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 61.	NICK ASHTON HART, TECHNICAL COMMUNITY.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 62.	NICK ASHTON HART, TECHNICAL COMMUNITY.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 63.	NICK ASHTON HART, TECHNICAL COMMUNITY.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 64.	INDIA.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 65.	INDIA.....	20
RECOMMENDATION 66.	IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF).....	20

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE CREATION OF NEW INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS/INSTRUMENTS.....22

RECOMMENDATION 67.	PARMINDER JEET SINGH, IT FOR CHANGE.....	22
RECOMMENDATION 68.	PARMINDER JEET SINGH, IT FOR CHANGE.....	22
RECOMMENDATION 69.	EUROPEAN UNION.....	22
RECOMMENDATION 70.	INDIA.....	23
RECOMMENDATION 71.	IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF).....	23
RECOMMENDATION 72.	CUBA.....	23
RECOMMENDATION 73.	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.....	24
RECOMMENDATION 74.	DENIC (GERMAN ccTLD REGISTRY, .DE).....	24
RECOMMENDATION 75.	SAUDI ARABIA.....	24

VII. SUGGESTIONS REGARDING CHARACTERISTICS OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....25

RECOMMENDATION 76.	TIMEA SUTO, ICC BASIS.....	25
RECOMMENDATION 77.	NIGEL HICKSON, ICANN.....	25
RECOMMENDATION 78.	IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF).....	25

RECOMMENDATION 79.	MEXICO.....	26
RECOMMENDATION 80.	SWITZERLAND	26
RECOMMENDATION 81.	TURKEY	26
RECOMMENDATION 82.	UNITED KINGDOM.....	26
RECOMMENDATION 83.	UNITED KINGDOM.....	27
RECOMMENDATION 84.	UNITED KINGDOM.....	27
RECOMMENDATION 85.	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	28
RECOMMENDATION 86.	BILL GRAHAM, CIGI	29
RECOMMENDATION 87.	DENIC (GERMAN CCTLD REGISTRY, .DE)	30
RECOMMENDATION 88.	RÉSEAUX IP EUROPÉENS NETWORK COORDINATION CENTRE (RIPE NCC)	30

I. Proposals of recommendations addressing specific existent institutions/processes/fora

Recommendation 1. Richard Hill, APIG

It is proposed to recommend that ICANN provide to all governments the same treatment that it has given to the USA.

It is proposed to recommend that ICANN exchange letters with any country that so requests, stating that it will not take any action to re-delegate the country's ccTLD without first obtaining express written approval from the government of the country in question.

It is proposed to recommend that ICANN delegate to any country that so requests up to three additional ccTLDs, with names of the form "ccXYZ", where "cc" is the two-letter country code, and "XYZ" are strings chosen by the country, for example "gov", "mil", "edu", or "01", "02", "03". Thus, if "rt" were a valid country code (which it is not), the corresponding country could request delegation of "rtgov" or "rt01"m etc.

Recommendation 2. Richard Hill, APIG

2. Since the right of the public to correspond by telecommunications is guaranteed by Article 33 of the ITU Constitution (within the limits outlined in Article 34), it is proposed to recommend that IETF, ITU, OHCHR, and UNESCO be mandated jointly to study the issue of takedown, filtering, and blocking, which includes technical, legal, and ethical aspects.

Recommendation 3. Richard Hill, APIG

4. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that IETF, ISOC, ITU, and OHCHR be mandated to study the issues of privacy, encryption and prevention of inappropriate mass surveillance, which include technical, user education, and legal aspects.

Recommendation 4. Richard Hill, APIG

5. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that ITU, UNCITRAL and UNESCO be mandated to study issues related to IoT (including security of IoT devices, use of data from IoT devices, decisions made by IoT devices, etc.), which include technical, legal, and ethical aspects (for a partial list of such aspects, see Recommendation ITU-T Y.3001: Future networks: Objectives and design goals¹). The studies should take into account

¹ <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Y.3001-201105-I>

Recommendation ITU-T Y.3013: Socio-economic assessment of future networks by tussle analysis².

Recommendation 5. Richard Hill, APIG

6. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that IETF, ISOC, ITU, UNCITRAL, and UNCTAD be mandated to study the issue of externalities arising from lack of security, which has technical, economic, and legal aspects. In particular, UNCITRAL should be mandated to develop a model law on the matter.

Recommendation 6. Richard Hill, APIG

7. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that UNESCO and UNICTRAL be mandated to study the ethical issues of networked automation, including driverless cars, which include ethical and legal aspects.

Recommendation 7. Richard Hill, APIG

8. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that ILO and UNCTAD be mandated to study the issues of induced job destruction, wealth concentration, and the impact of algorithms on social justice and that UNCTAD compile, and coordinate the studies made by other agencies such as OECD, World Bank, IMF.

Recommendation 8. Richard Hill, APIG

9.1 Consequently, it is proposed that UNCTAD be mandated to study the economic and market issues related to platform dominance, and to facilitate the exchange of information on national experiences, and that the ILO be mandated to study the worker protection issues related to platform dominance and the so-called “sharing economy”.

Recommendation 9. Richard Hill, APIG

9.2 Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the UN HCHR be mandated to study the potential effects of platform dominance on elections and democracy.

² <http://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Y.3013-201408-I/en>

Recommendation 10. Richard Hill, APIG

10. Consequently, it is proposed to recommend that UNCTAD and WIPO be mandated to study the issues related to embedded software, which include economic and legal issues.

Recommendation 11. Richard Hill, APIG

To recommend that the USA make a binding agreement with other states to the effect that it would not exercise its jurisdiction over ICANN in ways that would violate the principles of equal footing and equal roles and responsibilities of all governments.

Recommendation 12. Richard Hill, APIG

to recommend that concerned states consider the matter and consider inviting the USA to convene a treaty negotiation on this matter.

Recommendation 13. Richard Hill, APIG

to recommend that the USA make a binding agreement with other states to the effect that it would not exercise its jurisdiction over Verisign (or any future operator of the authoritative root zone file) in ways that would violate the principles of equal footing and equal roles and responsibilities of all governments.

Recommendation 14. Richard Hill, APIG

to recommend that the USA, Japan, the Netherlands, and Sweden make a binding agreement with other states to the effect that they would not exercise their jurisdiction or operational control over any root server in ways that would violate the principles of equal footing and equal roles and responsibilities of all governments.

Recommendation 15. Richard Hill, APIG

It is proposed to recommend that the USA agree to transpose into its national law the WIPO recommendations cited above regarding protection of country names, so that they could be enforced in the US courts that have jurisdiction over ICANN.

Recommendation 16. Parminder Jeet Singh, IT for Change, and Richard Hill, APIG

Below are some options, and there could be others, that are available for ICANN to transit from US jurisdiction.

1. ICANN can get incorporated under international law;
2. ICANN can move core internet operators among multiple jurisdictions,
3. ICANN can institute a fundamental bylaw that its global governance processes will brook no interference from US jurisdiction. If any such interference is encountered, parameters of which can be clearly pre-defined, a process of shifting of ICANN to another jurisdiction will automatically set in.
4. The US government can give ICANN jurisdictional immunity under the [United States International Organisations Immunities Act](#)

Recommendation 17. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

- How the IGF, the primary UN-based forum for discussion of internet-related public policy, can be a more effective platform for enhanced cooperation among governments? It is already an effective platform for other stakeholder groups.

Recommendation 18. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

- How resolutions relating to internet policy from the Human Rights Council and General Assembly, as well as recommendations from human rights treaty bodies and Special Procedures, can inform policy processes elsewhere in the UN system.

Recommendation 19. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

- How bodies such as the ITU, UNESCO and UNDP and others who play a role in the WSIS follow up make linkages with the implementation and follow up of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Recommendation 20. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

- How to meet their obligations under the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and contribute to the achievement of the SDGs; How they can interact more effectively with intergovernmental processes and how they can include developing country stakeholders in their work.

Recommendation 21. Parminder Jeet Singh, IT for Change

3.2 The Technical Oversight and Advisory Board will advice on public policy perspectives to various technical standards bodies, and in this regard be the link between public policy bodies and these standards bodies.

Recommendation 22. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

[\[propose rephrasing:\]](#)

[Existing, well-established processes for enhanced cooperation initiated since WSIS through outreach to relevant UN agencies as well as multistakeholder and technical organizations, including all stakeholders \(such as those identified by WGEC1 and those that emerged since\). These initiatives \(IGF and national and regional initiatives?\)](#) should be recognized by the WGEC2 and widely shared across all stakeholders and geographies with the aim of encouraging all stakeholders to partake in and further shape and develop these processes.

[Alternative language:](#)

[22. a. In order to raise awareness among all stakeholders and encourage their participation in these processes, actions such as, but not limited to the below suggestions, could be considered:](#)

- Continue to foster national IGF initiatives and promote the contributions they are willing to make into to regional IGF initiatives as well as into the annual global IGF.
- Stakeholders [should continue](#) working together to raise awareness across all relevant actors about the important Internet governance processes and forums at the national, regional and global levels.
- [Foster mutual reinforcement of efforts by continuing to connect national and regional stakeholders at IGF initiatives, ICANN global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, as well as business community meetings such as ICC events and others.](#)
- [Fellowship and ambassador programmes sponsored by many stakeholders to help support developing country governments and other stakeholders with travel costs as well as youth outreach programmes to encourage awareness and participation of local or regional youth when in developing countries help fuel future participation. There is a need to continue building on and raising awareness of these opportunities](#)
- [Remote participation opportunities, webcasting, transcripts, and translation are extremely important today and need to be ensured where possible.](#)
-

Recommendation 23. UNESCO

- Recommendations for improving the IGF, particularly to ensure sustainable funding;

Recommendation 24. UNESCO

- Recommendations for how enhanced cooperation can contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the creation of inclusive Knowledge Societies;

Comment [TSO1]: This excerpt refers to the numerous examples of enhanced cooperation mechanisms already in place around the world, not just the IGF and national and regional initiatives. To reflect this context and incorporate the other ideas reflected in our contribution we propose the changes marked here.

We also propose merging this segment with our recommendation no.30 below, as they relate to the same idea [see comment at recommendation no. 30 for further details]

Our recommendations under points 47-49 below and the ones cited as “alternative language” here were mentioned together in our original contribution. We would like to keep these ideas under a single recommendation as part of a non-exhaustive list of possible actions to raise awareness and promote participation in existing enhanced cooperation mechanisms. This list could either be included with this recommendation as point 22.a or as a separate recommendation under section IV below.

Recommendation 25. Constance Bommelaer, ISOC

Strengthening the IGF model, at both the global and regional and national level, would therefore also enhance cooperation.

Recommendation 26.India

(viii) There is a need to empower Government Advisory Committee (GAC) of ICANN to play a meaningful and substantial role in international public policy issues relating to management of critical internet resources and security in the use of ICTs.

(ix) An institutional mechanism need to be created for Government Advisory Committee (GAC) to report to ECOSOC through CSTD WG on an annual basis on the public policy issues relating to internet.

Recommendation 27.Canada

The last WGEC had intended to look at barriers for participation in Enhanced Cooperation. In our view, this remains a problem and a report explaining these barriers and how to overcome them would be a successful outcome.

II. Recommendations on the follow-up to the previous WGEC working group

Recommendation 28. Richard Hill, APIG

0. We concur with the findings of the document E/CN.16/2015/CRP.2, Mapping of international Internet public policy issues, 17 April 2015, and propose to recommend that all the recommendations for further study in the cited document be endorsed.

Recommendation 29. Richard Hill, APIG

Many sections of the cited document identify areas where further study would be appropriate, in particular 2.7 Net neutrality; 2.8 Cloud; 2.10 Internet of Things (IoT); 3.1 Cybersecurity; 3.2 Cybercrime; 3.4 Cyber conflict; 3.6 Encryption; 3.7 Spam; 4.1 Freedom of expression; 4.2 Privacy and data protection; 5.3 Copyright; 5.5 Labour law; 5.6 Intermediaries

Recommendation 30. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

[\[propose to delete\]](#)

~~Based on the inputs to its questionnaire and the mapping exercise, the WGEC1 considered recommendations under five broad topics. This general outline could be maintained and recommendations discussed on the following topics:~~

- ~~— Implementation of the Tunis Agenda~~
- ~~— Public policy issues and possible mechanisms~~
- ~~— Role of stakeholders~~
- ~~— Developing countries~~
- ~~— Barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation~~

~~Recommendations aligning with the above-mentioned principles should be supported through examples from the database developed by WGEC1 for the mapping of international Internet public policy issues.~~

Comment [TSO2]: This excerpt was meant to underline the idea that there are many, well-established enhanced cooperation mechanisms in existence throughout the world, many of which have been ably identified through the efforts of the WGEC1, and that these examples should be used to inform and support recommendations made by WGEC2.

As this idea was incorporated into our revised recommendation no. 22 above, repeating it here is superfluous. Therefore we would like to request that this recommendation be deleted.

III. Recommendations of priority of focus areas for future work

Recommendation 31. Richard Hill, APIG

We have identified some additional areas where further studies would be appropriate:

We submit specific proposals regarding the following international Internet public policy issues that require more study than is taking place at present:

1. The economic and social value of data and its processing
2. Takedown, filtering and blocking
3. Intermediary liability
4. Privacy, encryption and prevention of inappropriate mass surveillance
5. How to deal with the Internet of Things (IoT)
6. Externalities arising from lack of security and how to internalize such externalities
7. Ethical issues of networked automation, including driverless cars
8. How to deal with the job destruction and wealth concentration induced by ICTs in general and the Internet in particular
9. How to deal with platform dominance
10. How to deal with the increasing importance of embedded software

Recommendation 32. European Union

We suggest that WGEC recommendations could include:

- Promote best practice in **consultation and engagement**, including how stakeholders can reach out proactively to one another in an informative and easily understandable way
- Consider how stakeholders can **make information and evidence available** in an open, accessible and timely way in order to support meaningful participation and engagement
- Develop principles on how stakeholders can **open up their policy-making processes** to input and scrutiny from other stakeholders
- Make practical suggestions for enabling **participation of stakeholders from developing countries**, taking into account cultural and linguistic diversity and the capacity constraints faced by least developed countries
- Consider how stakeholder representatives are chosen, including best practice in ensuring a **balance of stakeholder representatives** in multi-stakeholder forums
- Support **sustainable development**, particularly in terms of capacity-building, education and skills, in order to help bridge the digital divide
- Promote an **enabling environment for investment**, in particular promoting cooperation and partnership between governments, the private sector and other stakeholders which promotes investment in infrastructure and increases affordable connectivity in developing countries
- Promote an **enabling environment for innovation**, in particular ensuring that the Internet remains an open environment which facilitates innovation and encouraging cooperation between stakeholders to this end

- Avoid **duplicating existing work** but instead seek to develop existing forums, including building understanding of multi-stakeholder enhanced cooperation processes in the full range of existing international organisations
- Consider how best to **build cooperation on emerging topics**, particularly new issues presented by newly emerging technology, in a way which allows all stakeholders to participate.

Recommendation 33. Constance Bommelaer, ISOC

We see three priority areas to create an enabling environment for access:

- Expanding Infrastructure
- Fostering Skills and Entrepreneurship
- Supportive Governance.

All stakeholders have a role in shaping this environment, and facilitating multistakeholder dialogues and mechanisms at the national and regional levels is essential to ensure that the right policies are adopted.

Recommendation 34. Nick Ashton Hart, technical community

We should identify areas where greater cooperation would be of general socioeconomic value, especially to developing and least-developed countries, and prioritize cooperation that is most likely to be effective in practical terms. Examples: efforts to combat transboundary crime online.

Recommendation 35. India

(xi) With regard to the relevant international Public policy issues which may be considered by the WGEC, we propose that issues related to Internet Infrastructure and management of critical Internet resources, use of Internet including spam, network security and cybercrime, issues related to developmental aspects of Internet Governance, in particular capacity building in developing countries and issues relating to interconnection costs, meaningful participation in global policy development, data access and jurisdiction, trade and e commerce, cloud computing, big data mining and analytics, artificial intelligence and next generation networks may be included.

Recommendation 36. Iran (Islamic Republic of)

The WGEC should pave the way to materialize the access to technology by developing countries in order to play their role on equal basis.

Recommendation 37.Pakistan

- E-Governance. Roles, shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs of governments, private sector and civil society, in their respective areas, in Internet-related public policy issues;
- Cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention at international for effective functioning of Internet resources
- Agreements on Technology Transfer
- Strategic Technology Planning
- Regional Backbone Infrastructure
- Capacity Building and Knowledge Sharing to bridge the development divide
- Strengthening Cyber Security
- Development of ICT Infrastructure and ICT Enabled Services
- Development and Adoption of Technical Standards
- Strengthening of cooperation in ICT matters such as promotion of Open Source Software Applications in the member countries and focus on software products and ICT Education
- Deployment of safe and secure ICT infrastructure including data centers & IT parks and sharing of countries experiences
- Capacity Building programs through exchange of technical & skilled human resource, IT Training & Education
- Entrepreneurship, Research and Innovation

Recommendation 38.Asia-Pacific Regional Group, Pakistan

- Recommendations on enhancing/improving e-Governance
- Recommendations on Internet Governance (International Internet Connectivity)
- Recommendations on universal access and connectivity (national, regional and international levels)
- Recommendations on the use of ICTs for socio-economic uplift
- Recommendations on cyber security standards/practices and their adoption
- Recommendations on capacity building programs
- Recommendations on assistance to developing countries including Least Developed for local development and manufacturing of ICT applications, equipment and technologies

Recommendation 39.Hungary

Special attention should be given to capacity-building, skills and education and also policy making in regions that need help and advices.

Recommendation 40. Russian Federation

2.3 It is proposed to concentrate efforts of WGEC-2 first of all at the international public policy issues:

- Infrastructural level
- Content level
- Social-economic development

Recommendation 41. United Kingdom

In our view it is important to avoid a “shopping list” of specific policy issues

Recommendation 42. Prof. em. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus

@ Para 70: This paragraph calls for “the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues”. It would be good if the WGEC would express support to those principles and recommend procedures how those principles should be further implemented.

IV. Recommendations addressing on coordination aspects

Recommendation 43. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

we see the value of mapping of ongoing policy spaces and the creation of a mechanism for information sharing with these spaces to ensure interaction between content and outcomes of discussions at policymaking spaces.

Recommendation 44. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

Enhanced cooperation requires sharing information among stakeholders and between policy spaces. In order for this to happen, information, including working documents, agendas, draft inputs and outputs, and outcomes must be easily accessible to all interested stakeholders

Recommendation 45. Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA

2. That on need basis, government, business, civil society, technical and academic community should evolve and engage on processes of inclusive cooperation on diverse global public policy matters pertaining to the Internet

Recommendation 46. Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA

3. That efforts be made to increase awareness of diverse global public policy matters pertaining to the Internet especially in the developing and least developed nations

Recommendation 47. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

- Foster mutual reinforcement of efforts by continuing to connect national and regional stakeholders at IGF initiatives, ICANN global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, as well as business community meetings such as ICC events and others.

Recommendation 48. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

- Continue to enhance information resources to explain the opportunities and cross-link initiatives so awareness of the different enhanced cooperation activities is increased among all stakeholders.

Recommendation 49. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

- Fellowship and ambassador programmes sponsored by many stakeholders to help support developing country governments and other stakeholders with travel costs as well as youth outreach programmes to encourage awareness and participation of local or regional youth when in developing countries help fuel future participation. There is a need to continue building on and raising awareness of these opportunities.
- Remote participation opportunities, webcasting, transcripts, and translation are extremely important today and need to be ensured where possible.

[propose to merge the above three recommendations:]

In order to raise awareness among all stakeholders and encourage their participation in existing enhanced cooperation processes, actions such as, but not limited to the below suggestions, could be considered:

- Stakeholders should continue working together to raise awareness across all relevant actors about the important Internet governance processes and forums at the national, regional and global levels.
- Foster mutual reinforcement of efforts by continuing to connect national and regional stakeholders at IGF initiatives, ICANN global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, as well as business community meetings such as ICC events and others.
- Fellowship and ambassador programmes sponsored by many stakeholders to help support developing country governments and other stakeholders with travel costs as well as youth outreach programmes to encourage awareness and participation of local or regional youth when in developing countries help fuel future participation. There is a need to continue building on and raising awareness of these opportunities
- Remote participation opportunities, webcasting, transcripts, and translation are extremely important today and need to be ensured where possible.

Comment [TSO3]: These recommendations, together with those identified as “alternative language” under recommendation no. 22 above were mentioned together in our original contribution.

We would like to keep these ideas under one recommendation as a non-exhaustive list of possible actions to raise awareness and promote participation in existing enhanced cooperation mechanisms. This list could either be included above as point 22.a or as a separate recommendation here, as indicated

Recommendation 50. Janvier Ngnoulaye, University of Yaoundé

Development of a Standard Layer Model of the Internet Ecosystem (SLMIE) for enhanced and stabilized cooperation.

Recommendation 51. Nick Ashton Hart, technical community

Are there areas where member-states’ national legal frameworks ought to be interoperable – not harmonized, but interoperable – to facilitate sustainable development and bridging of the digital divide? The answer is clearly yes. We should try and list a few areas, such as safe harbours for platforms, data protection laws (more than 100 countries don’t have any data protection law at all), and consumer protection frameworks.

Recommendation 52. India

The WGEC should encourage all stakeholders to come forward, participate and make their voices be heard in the formulation of public policies pertaining to the internet.

Recommendation 53. Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)

Finding concrete mechanisms to bring all stakeholders together in productive work to anticipate what public policy challenges are likely to arise in the field of Internet Governance.

Recommendation 54. Réseaux IP Européens Network Coordination Centre (RIPE NCC)

Establish information-sharing relationships between governments and network operators for developing strategies to improve network operation in a given location.

Recommendation 55. Prof. em. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus

It would be good if the WGEC recommends to all involved governmental and non-governmental organizations to provide input into an annual „Internet Governance Development Report“.

V. Recommendations addressed to national governments

Recommendation 56. Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

How to strengthen their participation in global internet-related policy processes by convening multistakeholder delegations and bringing more diverse delegations with relevant expertise to internet policymaking spaces, such as members of national human rights institutions and environmental agencies, for example; How to deepen implementation of regional and international agreements on internet-related policy at the national level.

Recommendation 57. Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA

All countries including developing and least developed are encouraged to evolve national multi-stakeholder mechanism to address current and emerging regulatory and policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

Recommendation 58. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

- From a practical point of view, a single national governmental point of contact or ambassador for Internet-related issues would help.

Recommendation 59. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

- Create national-level policy dialogue and consultation processes with all stakeholders, various countries already have different models of this to offer as examples.

[\[propose to merge the above two recommendations:\]](#)

[Governments acting in a multistakeholder environment should contribute according to their mandates and competencies. However, when it comes to implementing policy, it is counterproductive to act alone. Multistakeholder processes create procedures whereby there is automatic consultation with all stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues, in particular entities impacted by the results, responsible for the implementation, or part of what the policy impacts. Whether at the national or international level, any policy issue that impacts stakeholders needs to engage those stakeholders for the appropriate policy. To this end actions such as, but not limited to the following, might prove helpful:](#)

- [Continue to foster national IGF initiatives and promote the contributions they are willing to make into to regional IGF initiatives as well as into the annual global IGF.](#)
- [From a practical point of view, a single national governmental point of contact or ambassador for Internet-related issues would help.](#)
- [Create national-level policy dialogue and consultation processes with all stakeholders, various countries already have different models of this to offer as examples.](#)

Comment [TSO4]: These two excerpts were offered as part of a non-exhaustive list of possible actions that could be taken to achieve the recommendation formulated in our original contribution that any policy issue that impacts stakeholders needs to engage those stakeholders in order to be able to identify the appropriate policy.

Therefore we would like to keep these two recommendations merged into one including the context from our original submission, as reflected here.

Recommendation 60.UNESCO

- Recommendations for how to support Member States in ensuring that their Internet-related laws, policies and regulations involve the participation of all stakeholders and are aligned with international human rights and the principles of openness and accessibility.

Recommendation 61.Nick Ashton Hart, technical community

- Avoid actions that impede or distort basic functions such as addressing and traffic routing.

Recommendation 62.Nick Ashton Hart, technical community

- Avoid actions that might impact upon "transit traffic

Recommendation 63.Nick Ashton Hart, technical community

- Avoid national or international policies that distort private-sector choices about how equipment or services integral to the functioning of the network as a platform are made.

Recommendation 64.India

The working group should look into capacity building programmes for such nations so as to ensure that the next billion users. Hence the working group may look into avenues to increase participation such as fellowships, remote participation etc.

Recommendation 65.India

(xii) The WGEC may also consider on priority ways and means to develop national capacities, particularly in developing countries, through setting up of Centres of Excellence on Internet Governance and related issues, establishment of R&D Centres in the area of Internet related public policy, introduction of formal courses on Internet Governance in premier educational institutions for Industries, academia and civil society and creation of online knowledge Repository Portal on Internet Governance.

Recommendation 66.Iran (Islamic Republic of)

7. To this end, the national efforts of the developing countries for creating, improving, and expanding capacities to allow their involvement in all aspects of the global information society should be facilitated by other governments and institutions. This could be done

through, inter alia, sharing knowledge and experiences, enhancing capacity building, creating an enabling global environment, and transfer of technology.

VI. Recommendations on the creation of new institutional mechanisms/instruments

Recommendation 67.Parminder Jeet Singh, IT for Change

WGEC's recommendations must be in form of suggesting a mechanism(s) that can enable all governments, on an equal footing, to develop the much needed international public policies pertaining to the Internet, and its associated digital phenomenon.

such an institutional mechanism can be only in form of a UN body dedicated to this subject. This would be similar to how there is WHO for health, UNESCO for education, FAO for food and agriculture, UNICEF for child issues, UNDP for development, UN Women for gender, and so on.

an important function of this new mechanism or body will have to be of undertaking extensive research and providing support³, especially to the developing countries, on Internet related public policy issues.

It is therefore most important for the WGEC to recommend a clear mechanism for governments to be able to develop international public policies pertaining to the Internet, in consultation with all stakeholders. We are unable to see what such mechanism can be, in any effective form, other than a new UN agency dedicated to Internet/ digital issues.

This proposed new 'body' would establish appropriate relationships with these other existing bodies, including directing relevant public policy issues to them, receiving their inputs and comments, and itself contributing specific Internet-related perspectives to issues under the purview of these other bodies.

Recommendation 68.Parminder Jeet Singh, IT for Change

Development of a Convention on the Internet. Such a Framework Convention can initially introduce a series of principles, protocols and processes that can then frame further treaties, agreements, etc. on more specific issues. It will also formalise the basic architecture of the global governance of the Internet; *inter alia* recognising and legitimising the existing roles and functions of the various bodies currently involved with managing the technical and logical infrastructure of the Internet, including the ICANN, Regional Internet Registries, Internet technical standards bodies and so on. There will also be a need for the development of institutional mechanisms for crisis response and dispute resolution in relation to the global Internet, and the social activities that depend on it.

Recommendation 69.European Union

³ As UNCTAD provides research and other inputs for developing countries on the issue of international trade.

Recommendations should be technologically neutral while being sufficiently flexible and "future-proof" to withstand technological change and development. Recommendations should also ensure that inclusive and sustainable development goals are incorporated.

Recommendation 70.India

Absence of a suitable forum or a body or a mechanism by which the stakeholders have the opportunity to sit together at the table, exchange views on various aspects of the use of ICTs in a transparent and democratic manner and develop convergence of views on cyber issues. Any attempt at enhanced cooperation therefore needs to take into account these critical factors and deliberate around ways and means to find solutions to the issues of coordination among the various forums dealing with the subject, preferably through the creation of a centralized body under the aegis of UN to guide the activities.

(vii) There is a need to create new institutional mechanism to enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibility in international public policy issues.

Recommendation 71.Iran (Islamic Republic of)

To consider the establishment of a mechanism which will be conducive to the implementation of enhanced cooperation.

Recommendation 72.Cuba

- The end result should be the establishment of a mechanism that allows:
 - that all governments have an equal role and responsibility for international Internet governance. (para.68)
 - the development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders. (para.68)
 - governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. (para.69)
 - the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. (para.70)
- Such a mechanism should not replace any existing organization, but rather be a coordination mechanism that call upon the organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles. (para.70)
- This mechanism should be an intergovernmental mechanism based on the United Nations and with formal links with other stakeholder's organizations.

Recommendation 73. United States of America

Enhanced cooperation must recognize that no single institution, arrangement, or instrument can manage the entirety of the Internet's policy demands and infrastructure.

Recommendation 74. DENIC (German ccTLD Registry, .de)

We expect the WGEC to give recommendations that provide a basis for channelling the various negotiations on Internet related public policy issues into a sustainable and flexible "Framework of Enhanced Cooperation for Internet Governance" (FRECIG), which would allow all stakeholders from government, the business sector, civil society and the technical community - on an equal footing and in their respective roles - to carry out their roles and responsibilities to enhance communication, coordination and collaboration around issues related to the evolution and the use of the Internet. We consider the global Internet Governance Forum (IGF) and the related regional and national IGFs valuable building blocks for such a "Framework of Enhanced Cooperation in Internet Governance".

Recommendation 75. Saudi Arabia

WGEC should concentrate on developing recommendations aiming to operationalizing enhanced cooperation with the creation of the necessary framework and mechanisms in order to enable all governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

VII. Suggestions regarding characteristics of recommendations

Recommendation 76. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

recommendations should be developed considering how different stakeholders, in different parts of the world, facing different issues have implemented and will need to implement enhanced cooperation. Therefore any recommendations should have an indicative, high-level character and avoid going into specifics, so that they could easily be adopted and usefully implemented by all stakeholders everywhere.

[\[propose to delete the above and replace with:\]](#)

- **Recommendations should be general**

[recommendations should be developed considering how different stakeholders, in different parts of the world, facing different issues have implemented and will need to implement enhanced cooperation. Therefore any recommendations should have an indicative, high-level character and avoid going into specifics, so that they could easily be adopted and usefully implemented by all stakeholders everywhere.](#)

- **Recommendations should be inclusive**

[recommendations should be based on commitment to openness, inclusivity and outreach so that they encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in discussions that are critical to the responsible development of the Internet, whether speaking of enhanced cooperation in governmental, intergovernmental, non-governmental, or international organizations.](#)

- **Recommendations should be future-proof**

[recommendations should be developed with a mind-set cognizant of the pace at which technology has developed and changed the Internet Governance landscape. Any recommendations considered should be flexible and dynamic enough make sure to endure in time and respond to this fast-paced environment.](#)

[\[propose adding a new recommendation:\]](#)

Recommendation 77. Timea Suto, ICC Basis

[Recommendations should consider the benefit of the work of the WGEC2 as it contributes to a collective effort to advance the 2030 agenda and the global goals.](#)

~~Recommendation 77.~~ Recommendation 78. Nigel Hickson, ICANN

Rather than crafting specific Recommendations at this stage it is probably better to think of broad principles under which future dialogue could take place.

~~Recommendation 78.~~ Recommendation 79. Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Highlight the need to respect the cultural diversity, local languages, ethical concerns and useful traditions, based on which many societies continue to live and enrich herewith the civilizations across the globe.

Comment [TSO5]: Our original contribution detailed three main characteristics of recommendations, namely that recommendations should be general, inclusive and future-proof.

This excerpt is a small part of our reflection on these characteristics. To save space here, we do not wish to copy the full reasoning behind these attributes, rather would like to provide a short summary.

| ~~Recommendation 79.~~Recommendation 80.**Mexico**

The recommendations should have to be flexible and resilient enough to be implemented in different fields at different levels.

| ~~Recommendation 80.~~Recommendation 81.**Switzerland**

WGEC recommendations should be sufficiently broad as to be capable of implementation by diverse organizations and stakeholders according to their different mandates, roles and responsibilities.

| ~~Recommendation 81.~~Recommendation 82.**Turkey**

- Be related to the international public policy issues pertaining to the internet identified by the previous WGEC and the CSTD as listed in the document named “*Mapping of international Internet public policy issues*”, but there should be room for adjustments, additions or deletions of those issues considering the fast pace of changes of the internet.
- Describe how better flow of information among relevant actors can be achieved.
- Describe how governments are enabled on equal footing.
- Describe among who and how enhanced cooperation should be furthered.
- Involve indicators to measure whether the objective of the enhanced cooperation is reached where applicable.
- Not duplicate if a certain issue is covered by an international organization in an effective and appropriate manner.
- Focus on the priority areas to be defined by this working group where no action causes immediate negative effects on enjoyment of internet equally and effectively by all humanity.
- Allow flexibility since a “one-size-fits-all” approach may not be suitable for all countries where different cases may be at stake.
- Take into consideration specific needs of developing countries.
- Involve a mechanism to periodically test the validity of each recommendation made by this group so that recommendations are still relevant in future.
- Address national best practices regarding the internet governance to be mapped to the international level.

| ~~Recommendation 82.~~Recommendation 83.**United Kingdom**

agreement on the characteristics of enhanced cooperation, at a high level, could allow us to make significant progress in identifying shared objectives and finding agreement.

Alt language:

identifying and agreeing a set of high level characteristics of enhanced cooperation will enable us build greater common understanding

| ~~Recommendation 83~~-Recommendation 84.**United Kingdom**

7. Recommendations which as far as possible can be useful to different stakeholders, in different circumstances, facing different issues at different times.
8. The WGEC should develop recommendations that as far as possible can be generally applied by all stakeholders, including governments, the private sector, civil society, the technical community and the academic community.
9. Our recommendations should be flexible and recognise that different stakeholders will have different roles in different issues and situations
10. Our recommendations should as much as possible be “future-proof”.

| ~~Recommendation 84~~-Recommendation 85.**United Kingdom**

- Promote best practice in **consultation and engagement**, including how stakeholders can reach out proactively to one another in an informative and easily understandable way.
- Consider how stakeholders can **make information and evidence available** in an open, accessible and timely way in order to support meaningful participation and engagement.
- Develop principles on how stakeholders can **open up their policy-making processes** to input and scrutiny from other stakeholders.
- Make practical suggestions for enabling **participation of stakeholders from developing countries**, taking into account cultural and linguistic diversity and the capacity constraints faced by least developed countries.
- Consider how stakeholder representatives are chosen, including best practice in ensuring a **balance of stakeholder representatives** in multi-stakeholder forums.

- Support **sustainable development**, particularly in terms of capacity-building, education and skills, in order to help bridge the digital divide.
- Promote an **enabling environment for investment**, in particular promoting cooperation and partnership between governments, the private sector and other stakeholders which promotes investment in infrastructure and increases affordable connectivity in developing countries.
- Promote an **enabling environment for innovation**, in particular ensuring that the Internet remains an open environment which facilitates innovation and encouraging cooperation between stakeholders to this end.
- Avoid **duplicating existing work** but instead seek to develop existing forums, including building understanding of multi-stakeholder enhanced cooperation processes in the full range of existing international organisations.
- Consider how best to **build cooperation on emerging topics**, particularly new issues presented by newly emerging technology, in a way which allows all stakeholders to participate.

~~Recommendation 85.~~ Recommendation 86. **United States of America**

- Proposals from all stakeholders, including both members and non-members of the WGEC, that are likely to garner consensus support of the WGEC and broad acceptance by all stakeholders.
- Recommendations that enhance and support the full involvement of all stakeholders in developing Internet public policy, including at the national and local levels.
- Recommendations focused on tangible and non-binding recommendations that improve processes and institutions that are discussing or developing Internet public policy, including at the national and local levels.
- Examples of enhanced cooperation that have already been implemented by institutions and processes, including procedural and participation improvements and best practices.
- Recommendations that enhance the participation of developing countries, women, persons with disabilities, youth, and unaffiliated users in institutions and processes that are developing Internet public policy.
- The previous work of CSTD working groups (but not with absolute deference to them).

The WGEC should NOT consider:

- Policy issues pertaining to day-to-day technical and operational matters of the Internet.
- Recommendations or proposals that have been repeatedly rejected in other fora and are unlikely to garner consensus support now.

- Recommendations that attempt to promote the role or interest of one stakeholder over other stakeholders.
- Recommendations that attempt to adopt binding recommendations that could undermine the voluntary, bottom-up nature of Internet governance.
- Recommendations that undermine or contradict the principles and spirit embodied in the outcome documents of WSIS or UNGA Resolution 70/125.

~~Recommendation 86.~~ Recommendation 87. **Bill Graham, CIGI**

advance global efforts in the direction of achieving the necessary shared understanding and agreement on a new social compact.

~~Recommendation 87.~~Recommendation 88. **DENIC (German ccTLD Registry, .de)**

publication of best practices as a good instrument to enhance issue-based cooperation among governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

~~Recommendation 88.~~Recommendation 89. **Réseaux IP Européens Network Coordination Centre (RIPE NCC)**

the RIPE NCC would suggest that the Working Group prioritise working on recommendations which are concrete and focus on delivering results related to enhanced cooperation that deliver practical benefits for end users of all kinds