

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

**Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation**

**Contributions from WGEC members and observers to the guiding  
questions agreed during the first meeting of the Working Group**

**Synthesis document**

20 January 2017

## Summary

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	4
<b>2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	5
<b>3. TRACK I: DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ENHANCED COOPERATION</b> .	7
A. “to enable governments” §69 .....	7
A.1 Intergovernmental Format.....	7
A.1.1. Multistakeholder Inputs .....	8
A.2 Multistakeholder Format §69 And §71 .....	8
B. “on an equal footing” §69.....	8
B.1. Funding .....	9
B.1.1 Developing Countries .....	9
B.1.2. All Stakeholders .....	9
B.2 Gender Equality And People with Disabilities.....	9
C. Scope of Enhanced Cooperation .....	10
C.1 “International Public Policy Issues Pertaining to the Internet” §69 .....	10
C.1.1 Binding .....	10
C.1.1.1 International Legal Frameworks.....	10
C.1.2 Non-Binding.....	10
C.2 “But not in the Day-To-Day Technical and Operational Matters, that do not Impact on International Public Policy Issues” §69.....	11
D. “Globally Applicable Principles on Public Policy Issues” §70 .....	11
D.1. The Netmundial Multistakeholder Statement.....	11
E. “to be responsive to innovation” §71 .....	12
F. Transparency and “to provide annual performance reports” §71 .....	12
<b>4. TRACK 2: INSTITUTIONS, DOCUMENTS, EVENTS (IGF), TOPICS, PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ENHANCED COOPERATION</b> .....	13
A. Institutions and Internet Governance Agents .....	13
A.1. Internet Cooperation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) .....	13
A.1.1. ICANN Within the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation.....	13
A.1.1.1. Governmental Advisory Committee/GAC .....	13
A.1.2. ICANN Outside the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation .....	13
A.1.3. IANA Transition as an Example of Enhanced Cooperation .....	14
A.1.4. IANA Transition is not an Example of Enhanced Cooperation .....	14
A.1.5. Jurisdiction of ICANN and “equal footing” .....	14
A.2. International Telecommunications Union (ITU).....	14
A.2.1. ITU as One of the Fields Within the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation .....	14
A.3. A New UN Body for Internet-Related Public Policy Issues .....	14
B. The Role of IGF in regard to Enhanced Cooperation .....	15
B.1. IGF as an Essential Element of Enhanced Cooperation .....	15
B.2. IGF as not Relevant For Enhanced Cooperation .....	15
C. Documents .....	15
C.1. The Netmundial Multistakeholder Statement.....	15
C.2. UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.....	15
C.3. WGEC and Commission on Science and Technology for Development’s database for mapping of international Internet public policy issues .....	16
D. INDEX of Topics, Principles and Possible Characteristics for Enhanced Cooperation	

.....	16
D.1. Open Data .....	16
D.2. Human Rights.....	16
D.3. Network Neutrality .....	16
D.4. Cybersecurity .....	16
D.5. Transparency.....	16
D.6. Inclusiveness.....	17
D.7. Responsive to Innovation .....	17
D.8. Evidence-Based Policymaking .....	17
D.9. Sustainable.....	17
D.10. Consensus-Based .....	17
<b>ANNEX I – Participants of Public Consultation .....</b>	<b>18</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report represents an attempt to systematize the contributions submitted in the context of the [public consultation](#) conducted by the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) established under the aegis of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology pursuant to UNGA resolution 70/125. Altogether, twenty-seven (27) WGEC members and ten (10) observers took part in the consultation (see Annex I), amounting to one hundred and sixty (160) pages, approximatively.

Two questions were addressed as per a decision made by the WGEC at its 30 September 2016 meeting:

- 1) What are the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation?
- 2) Taking into consideration the work of the previous WGEC and the Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraphs 69-71, what kind of recommendations should we consider?

It was also decided at the WGEC's inaugural meeting that the answers submitted by different stakeholders should guide the discussions of the Working Group's next gathering, due to take place in Geneva on 26-27 January 2017. The full texts of all contributions have been made available to the meeting's participants.

In that context, this document intends to serve as an additional input to the WGEC meeting. It is being submitted to WGEC members by the Chair as a personal contribution to the discussions to take place at the January meeting<sup>1</sup>. Without being an exhaustive document, it intends to provide a quick general overview of the main issues addressed in the contributions received. Although best efforts were made towards achieving a satisfactory synthesis document from both a qualitative and quantitative perspectives, it might contain mistakes and omissions, for which the Chair takes full responsibility. All WGEC members and all observers that have made submissions are therefore kindly invited to indicate any changes that might be necessary in order to better reflect their inputs and/or reference important notions and proposals that might have been inadvertently left out.

---

<sup>1</sup> The WGEC Chair wishes to acknowledge the invaluable contribution made by the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br), namely through Mr. Bruno Bioni, in the preparation of this document

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

No hierarchy of any type was adopted in the preparation of this document, nor any value judgments were applied to the contents of the contributions of the open consultation. The goal was simply to map all proposals, organize them into theme categories in order to identify convergent and divergent ideas and proposals, as well as opinions that can be useful in the context of the WGEC work.

Often did the contributors point out how difficult is the task to come to an agreement regarding the definition of the term “enhanced cooperation”, and how it should be put into operation.<sup>2</sup> Some stakeholders also recalled the historical record that led to the adoption of the text from paragraphs 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda, which would have resulted in a “vague, diplomatic and ambiguous” language.<sup>3</sup>

In this context, some contributions congratulated the methodology adopted for the public consultation due to its focus on gathering inputs on the characteristics of enhanced cooperation, instead of trying to further conceptualize the term.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, it has been argued that it might be easier to approach the issue in practical terms (based on defining concrete characteristics), instead of dealing with the abstract conception of enhanced cooperation.

On the other hand, other submissions criticized the methodology raising the following reasons: **a)** the vague manner in which questions were formulated provided little help in establishing the scope of WGEC and, consequently, for specifying the concept and/or characteristics of the enhanced cooperation<sup>5</sup>; **b)** the main focus of the consultation should have been to list and select existing documents, which have approached the subject and, finally<sup>6</sup>; **c)** the identification of the areas in which enhanced cooperation should take place<sup>7</sup>.

The complexity of the issue, associated to the natural difficulty in coming up with formulations to describe “enhanced cooperation” in an holistic way, compelled the participants of the public consultation to frequently revisit the vocabulary from paragraphs 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda for this purpose.

Simultaneously, however, a considerable share of the proposals tried to avoid such semantic investigation by making more pragmatic suggestions. These proposals range from referral of institutions to listing documents and mechanisms such as the IGF as essential elements of enhanced cooperation.

---

2 See, for example, the submissions from Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; United Kingdom; Richard Hill, APIG; Centre for Internet and Society; RIPE NCC.

3 See submissions from Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus and, similarly, from Timea Suto, ICC Basis.

4 See, for example, the submission from the United Kingdom.

5 See, for example, the submission from the Centre for Communication Governance.

6 See, for example, the submission from Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy.

7 See, for example, the submissions from Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy and Anriette Esterhuysen, APC

The report reflects such trends of the public consultation, and is structured respectively in two main tracks:

- i) **Track I:** summary of the contributions that theoretically addressed the subject of enhanced cooperation, from a semantic analysis of the text from paragraphs 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda. This first part is shaped into six (6) blocks (A to F) that encompass several terms and/or expressions related to such vocabulary, which were the most frequently used in the contributions;
- ii) **Track II:** summary of the contributions that practically addressed the subject of enhanced cooperation, from the referral of institutions, documents and events (IGF) of which enhanced cooperation should be shaped up, and even topics to be promoted by such process.

### 3. TRACK I: DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ENHANCED COOPERATION

In this first part of the report, contributions that sought to understand the subject of enhanced cooperation from the vocabulary on paragraphs 69-71 of the Tunis Agenda were summarized. Overall, six (6) themes were mapped. They encompass several terms and/or expressions related to such vocabulary, which were the most frequently used in the contributions. At the end of each submission, the respective author(s) is/are identified. A brief description of the term was generated and, afterwards, when applicable, opinions that opposed each other were contrasted. In some cases, subdivisions were established to highlight the fact that certain contributions, even when departing from a common point of view, end up in substantially different positions.

#### [HOW TO READ THE ITEMS BELOW]

##### A. TERM OR EXPRESSION

**[Description]** *Lorem ipsum idem est, de communibus; et tanti, ut ad eam rem aliquem inclusive, multistakeholder causa, legitime, nec ligula et lorem regimen compage.*

**A.1. [stance 1]** “Lorem ipsum analia”

**A1.1. [subdivision of stance 1]:** *et tanti, ut ad eam*

**Author(s):** “psum idem est”

**A.2. [stance 2]** “*nec ligula et lorem regimen compage*”

**A1.1. [subdivision of stance 2]** *eam rem aliquem inclusive*

**Author(s):** “*rem aliquem inclusive*”

##### A. “to enable governments” §69<sup>8</sup>

According to paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda “enhanced cooperation” should:

“enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles (...)”.

Some contributions support the interpretation that enhanced cooperation is restricted to the intergovernmental scope while others argue that the scope of the term should encompass the participation of all stakeholders involved in Internet governance as well as the information society ecosystem at large.

##### A.1 Intergovernmental Format

Enhanced cooperation should be pursued through an intergovernmental mechanism<sup>9</sup>,

---

<sup>8</sup> This was the single most referenced issue in the universe of contributions. For this reason, it should be clarified that only two contributions (Pakistan and RIPE NCC) were not accounted for in this section, due to their texts not clearly stating the format that enhanced cooperation should adopt, whether intergovernmental or multistakeholder.

<sup>9</sup> Only contributions that expressly argued for an intergovernmental and/or multilateral mechanism were

since it is associated to sovereign States. For this reason, it should be implemented between governments only with a view to creating decision-making spaces for such parties.

**Author(s):** Cuba (see: item A.1.1); ESCWA; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Richard Hill, APIG (see: item A.1.1); Saudi Arabia

### **A.1.1. Multistakeholder Inputs**

Even as a space for articulation between governments, there should be mechanisms that enable access of other stakeholders concerned in Internet governance. In this sense, for example, consultations and other types of tools that facilitate intergovernmental decisions based on inputs received from all stakeholders should be implemented.

**Author(s):** Cuba; ESCWA; Richard Hill, APIG.

### **A.2 Multistakeholder Format §69 And §71**

The decision-making process of enhanced cooperation should necessarily engage all stakeholders<sup>10</sup> involved in Internet governance and, in a broader sense, all of those included in the ecosystem of information society. Only then, the formulation of more effective, inclusive and democratic public policies would be possible. This would be one of the high-level characteristics of enhanced cooperation and, ultimately, one of its core elements.

Furthermore, in this sense, a joint-systematic interpretation of paragraphs 69 and 71 of the Tunis Agenda would be required, in order to retain the notion contained in that last paragraph concerning the need that “enhanced cooperation” should “involve all stakeholders”.<sup>11</sup>

**Author(s):** Anriette Esterhysen, APC; Bulgaria, European Union; Hungary; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; Japan; Mexico; Janvier Ngoulaye, University of Yaoundé; Russian Federation; Switzerland; Turkey; United Kingdom; UNESCO; United States of America; India; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Australia; Centre for Communication Governance<sup>12</sup>; DENIC; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation; Wolfgang Kleinwächter; Nelly Stoyanova, Bulgaria (in her personal capacity); Centre for Internet and Society; Canada

### **B. “on an equal footing” §69**

Several contributions addressed the issue related to "on an equal footing" from various angles, as follows:

---

accounted for.

10 Some contributions that avoided the word multistakeholder, but still chose a term that was clearly favorable to the inclusion of all sectors and/or stakeholders, were allocated to this section.

11 See, for example, contributions from the Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Mexico; Turkey; Centre for Communication Governance; DENIC; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation; Centre for Internet and Society;

12 Even though the Centre for Communication Governance frames enhanced cooperation as a multistakeholder characteristic mechanism, it states that certain tasks would be activities suitably held among governments (e.g., such as negotiations).

## B.1. Funding

Several contributions pointed out the need to create funds and/or other financial resources, so that stakeholders involved in the enhanced cooperation process could hold effective participation.

### B.1.1 Developing Countries

One of the focuses should be developing countries, due to their limited economic and financial capacity to:

**b.1.1)** take part in WGEC meetings (and other EC processes), otherwise these stakeholders would be underrepresented and could lack active voice in structuring the work agenda of the enhanced cooperation.

**Author(s):** Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society, Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; European Union; Hungary; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Time Suto, ICC Basis; Switzerland; Turkey; United Kingdom; United States of America; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Association for Proper Internet Governance; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation.

**b.1.2)** identify other gaps in which some kind of cooperation should be implemented. For example, development of infrastructure for the universalization of Internet access, technology transfer, etc. In other words, besides allocating resources for all stakeholders to take part in the WGEC summits, areas in which those stakeholders should act cooperatively in order to produce more practical and effective results.

**Author(s):** Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; Bulgaria; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC<sup>13</sup>; European Union; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Pakistan; Timea Suto, ICC Basis.

### B.1.2. All Stakeholders

The creation of funds and dedication of other financial resources should be sought to enable effective participation of all Internet governance stakeholders.

Author(s): (see: Track I, item A.2)

## B.2 Gender Equality And People with Disabilities

Another question that shall be considered relates to gender equality and people with disabilities in order to ensure equal participation of stakeholders engaged in enhanced cooperation.

**Author(s):** Bulgaria; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; India; Association for Proper Internet Governance; UNESCO.

---

<sup>13</sup> For instance, this contribution expressly mentions the need for cooperation in public policies for the development of optical fiber in Africa.

## C. Scope of Enhanced Cooperation

### C.1 “International Public Policy Issues Pertaining to the Internet” §69

On the basis of interpretation of the meaning and scope of "international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet", contributors provided a range of views on what should be the desired outcomes of enhanced cooperation. In particular, there is disagreement whether these should be translated into binding or non binding documents and, more specifically, whether they should become “international legal framework”.

#### C.1.1 Binding

Enhanced cooperation should aim at issuing binding documents, as a desired result.<sup>14</sup>

**Author(s):** ESCWA<sup>15</sup>.

##### C.1.1.1 International Legal Frameworks

A group of contributions broadens the scope of enhanced cooperation even further, so that efforts should be made for setting up international legal framework. In other words, enhanced cooperation should aim at issuing documents with predominantly normative feature, going beyond the scope of international public policies.

**Author(s):** Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy;<sup>16</sup> Parminder Singh, IT for Change<sup>17</sup>; Australia<sup>18</sup>.

#### C.1.2 Non-Binding

Enhanced cooperation should aim at issuing recommendations, principles, procedures and programmes of a non-binding nature, which may or may not be internalized by the parties involved. In this sense, for example, non-governmental organizations could adopt guidelines related to the technical aspects of the Internet, and governments, guidelines with a broader and more general approach.

**Author(s):**<sup>19</sup> Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Bulgaria (policy dialogue); Cuba (principles); European Union (recommendations); Hungary (recommendations); Nigel Hickson, ICANN (broad principles and recommendations); Constance Bommelaer, ICC Basis (recommendations); Iran (Islamic Republic of) (recommendations); Japan (recommendations); Mexico (non-binding consults); Russian Federation (recommendations); Switzerland (recommendations); Turkey (recommendations); United Kingdom (recommendations); UNESCO (recommendations); Unites States of America (non-binding recommendations); Pakistan (recommendations); India (recommendations);

---

14 Only contributions that clearly argued for the articulation of binding documents were considered.

15 This contribution argued that enhanced cooperation should use binding documents and non-binding ones described interchangeably, i.e.: recommendations, declarations, joint statements, resolutions and agreements.

16 This contribution argued that one of the goals of enhanced cooperation is precisely a more interoperable legislation. And, in this sense, one of the areas to be explored should be the MLATs (Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties).

17 This contribution argued that enhanced cooperation should employ efforts for setting up a “Framework Convention on Internet”.

18 This contribution described the Australian experience in setting up a legal framework to fight cybercrime.

19 To proceed with such systematization, contributions using or not its own vocabulary from non-binding documents were analyzed (recommendations, principles, etc.) and, in some cases, the express mention to the term “non-binding” was also taken into account.

Iran; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA (recommendations); Centre for Communication Governance; DENIC (recommendations); Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation (recommendations); Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus (recommendations); RIPE NCC (recommendations).

## **C.2 “But not in the Day-To-Day Technical and Operational Matters, that do not Impact on International Public Policy Issues” §69**

Many contributions made efforts aimed at understanding which technical activities and operational matters related to the Internet's day-to-day would not impact on international public policies issues, in order to better establish the boundaries of the scope of enhanced cooperation.

While some contributions simply transcribed this section of the Tunis Agenda, others pointed out the importance of establishing an interpretative guideline regarding this section since it is crucial for the working dynamics of WGEC.

**Author(s):** Janvier Ngoulaye, University of Yaoundé; Richard Hill, APIG; Russian Federation; United States of America; DENIC; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Centre for Internet and Society; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation.

### **C.2.1. “Critical Internet Resources” §70 (see Track II, items A.1 and A.2)**

Technical and operational aspects that would affect the formulation of public policies would be the so-called “critical internet resources”. It would be necessary, therefore, to sort out a joint-systematic interpretation of paragraphs 69 and 70 in order to clarify the scope of enhanced cooperation.

**Author(s):** Parminder Singh, IT for Change.

## **D. “Globally Applicable Principles on Public Policy Issues” §70**

Once the scope of enhanced cooperation is determined, efforts could afterwards be employed in order to set up global principles that would guide the formulation of international public policies pertaining to the Internet, in particular those concerning coordination and management of critical Internet resources.

**Author(s):** Cuba; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; India; Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Russia; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Saudi Arabia; Centre for Internet and Society; DENIC.

### **D.1. The Netmundial Multistakeholder Statement**

WGEC should endorse the NetMundial Internet governance principles or, at least, use them as a starting point.

**Author(s):** Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; DENIC; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus.

## **E. “to be responsive to innovation” §71**

Recommendations for elaboration of international public policies pertaining to Internet issues, as well as the globally applicable principles associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources should be technologically neutral. Therefore, such guidelines would be flexible enough to be responsive to innovation in the future.

**Author(s):** European Union; Turkey; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; United Kingdom; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation.

## **F. Transparency and “to provide annual performance reports” §71**

### **(See Track II, items A.1 and D.5 below)**

One of the high-level characteristics of WGEC should be transparency. Annual performance reports would be the ideal tools for this purpose.

**Author(s):** India; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation;<sup>20</sup> Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Saudi Arabia; Centre for Internet and Society.

---

<sup>20</sup> This contribution argues that the language adopted in paragraph 71 indicates that the essence of enhanced cooperation is the involvement of all stakeholders to improve the mechanisms of Internet governance, consistent with legal process and responsive to innovation.

## **4. TRACK 2: INSTITUTIONS, DOCUMENTS, EVENTS (IGF), TOPICS, PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ENHANCED COOPERATION**

The second part of this document seeks to map the contributions that indicate which institutions, documents and Internet governance summits (IGF) should be essential elements of enhanced cooperation, as well as the topics to be promoted within that scope. At the bottom, there is an index of a series of principles and characteristics mentioned throughout the public consultation, which may also serve as structuring elements for the WGECC.

### **A. Institutions and Internet Governance Agents**

#### **A.1. Internet Cooperation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)**

ICANN and its assigned functions appear frequently in the contributions. Authors disagree, however, whether they should be considered within the scope of enhanced cooperation or not.

##### **A.1.1. ICANN Within the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation**

One part of the contributions lists ICANN as an example of enhanced cooperation and, possibly, as an arena in which globally applicable principles on international public policy pertaining to the Internet could be developed and voiced.

**Author(s):** India; Timea Suto, ICC Basis;<sup>21</sup> Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Centre for Internet and Society.

##### **A.1.1.1. Governmental Advisory Committee/GAC**

Some contributions state that GAC is an example of enhanced cooperation, and, more specifically, that it demonstrates how governments can work on an equal footing in order to make decisions. In that light, GAC would be one space, within ICANN, for the development of globally applicable principles on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

**Author(s):** India; Richard Hill, APIG; DENIC; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus.

##### **A.1.2. ICANN Outside the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation**

One contribution argues that ICANN should not be considered within the scope of enhanced cooperation, due to the fact that it deals with day-to-day technical and operational matters without impact on international public policy issues.

**Author(s):** Parminder Singh, IT for Change;<sup>22</sup>

---

21 It mentions ICANN as an example of enhanced cooperation.

22 According to this submission, such exclusion, however, should only apply to ICANN's activities that do not impact on international public policy issues. It calls therefore for a clear separation of roles addressing public policy issues from those related to day-to-day technical and operational matters.

### **A.1.3. IANA Transition as an Example of Enhanced Cooperation**

Some contributions point out that IANA Transition was a great example of enhanced cooperation.

**Author(s):** Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; India; Japan; Mexico, UNESCO; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; DENIC; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus

### **A.1.4. IANA Transition is not an Example of Enhanced Cooperation**

Other contributions highlight that IANA transition was not an example of enhanced cooperation, as far as the governments have played exclusively an advisory role, instead of being decision makers.

**Author(s):** Richard Hill.

### **A.1.5. Jurisdiction of ICANN and “equal footing”**

Although the IANA stewardship transition process was successfully completed, ICANN is still subjected to the jurisdiction of the United States. For it to become “really global” and for all stakeholders to be on an equal footing, ICANN should not be subjected to the jurisdiction of a single country.

**Author(s):** Richard Hill and Parminder Jeet Singh.

## **A.2. International Telecommunications Union (ITU)**

The International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and its assigned functions appear frequently throughout the contributions. Submissions disagree whether they would be within the scope of enhanced cooperation or not.

### **A.2.1. ITU as One of the Fields Within the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation**

ITU would also be a stakeholder and an arena in which enhanced cooperation should take place, specifically for the development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources.

**Author(s):** Centre for Internet and Society

### **A.2.2. ITU Outside the Scope of Enhanced Cooperation (see item A.3 below, Track II)**

ITU would be a space for predominantly technical discussions. It would not be, therefore, the ideal arena for discussing international public policies that address social and economic aspects pertaining to the Internet.

**Author(s):** *Parminder Singh, IT for Change.*

## **A.3. A New UN Body for Internet-Related Public Policy Issues**

One of the manners to implement enhanced cooperation at an intergovernmental level (Parminder Singh, IT for Changes; Richard Hill, APIG) or in a multistakeholder format (India) would be the creation of a new UN Body to specifically deal with Internet-related public policy issues.

**Author(s):** Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Richard Hill, APIG; India.

## **B. The Role of IGF in regard to Enhanced Cooperation**

The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) was also frequently mentioned throughout the public consultation. Suggestions vary in regard to assessment of the level of IGF's relevance within the scope of enhanced cooperation.

### **B.1. IGF as an Essential Element of Enhanced Cooperation**

IGF should be seen as one of the elements of enhanced cooperation, insofar as it is a platform that yields additional information for Internet-related public policy issues. The forum should be, therefore, one of the WGEC's focus areas.

**Author(s):** Russian Federation; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; UNESCO; Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC;<sup>23</sup> Japan.

### **B.2. IGF as not Relevant For Enhanced Cooperation**

Being a forum that is not mandated to produce recommendations or any other type of outcomes for Internet-related public policy issues, the IGF would have a limited role in relation to what is expected from enhanced cooperation. In this sense, WGEC should concentrate efforts in other spaces in order develop guidelines on international public policies pertaining to the Internet.

**Author(s):** Centre for Internet and Society; ESCWA; Parminder Singh, IT for Change.

## **C. Documents**

Several contributions pointed out the importance of reviewing documents that may serve as a starting point for enhanced cooperation. Submissions referred to specific Internet governance literature and UN statements with a broader scope, among which:

### **C.1. The Netmundial Multistakeholder Statement**

The Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance adopted a universal statement of principles for Internet governance. WGEC could support and, additionally, recommend procedures for the future implementation of these principles. At least, they could inspire WGEC.

**Author(s):** Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; DENIC; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus.

### **C.2. UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**

The efforts of WGEC should not be dissociated from the objectives set out by the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In other words, the formulation of Internet-related public policies should be convergent with the goals provided for the next 15 years, in particular those related to the information and communication technologies (ICT).

**Author(s):** Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Bulgaria; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Mexico; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; United Kingdom; UNESCO; Hungary; Switzerland; Canada

---

<sup>23</sup> This contribution also raises the following reflection: "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".

### **C.3. WGEC and Commission on Science and Technology for Development's database for mapping of international Internet public policy issues**

Some contributions recalled several principles, characteristics and examples of enhanced cooperation that were previously identified by the document on database for mapping of international Internet public policy issues developed under the previous edition of the WGEC.

**Author(s):** Richard Hill, APIG; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Turkey; Centre for Communication Governance; Centre for Internet and Society

### **D. INDEX of Topics, Principles and Possible Characteristics for Enhanced Cooperation**

The different contributions provide a list of terms that include topics, principles and characteristics on which enhanced cooperation should be based. All of them are mentioned below without further elaboration due to the multifaceted character of the contributions.

#### **D.1. Open Data**

**Author(s):** Bulgaria; Mexico.

#### **D.2. Human Rights** <sup>24</sup>

**Author(s):** Association for Proper Internet Governance; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation); Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Richard Hill, APIG; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Bulgaria; European Union; Hungary; Parminder Singh, IT for Change; United Kingdom; UNESCO; Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; Canada

#### **D.3. Network Neutrality**

**Author(s):** Ricard Hill, APIG; Association for Proper Internet Governance.

#### **D.4. Cybersecurity**

**Author(s):** Association for Proper Internet Governance; Australia; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation; India; Pakistan; Switzerland; United States of America

#### **D.5. Transparency**<sup>25</sup>

**Author(s):** Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; Bulgaria; European Union; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Hungary; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Japan; Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Mexico; Richard Hill, APIG; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Switzerland; Turkey; United Kingdom; United States of America; Australia; DENIC;

---

24 In general, it was said that enhanced cooperation should focus on human rights, but only a few contributions were specific about them

25 The term transparency appeared several times in isolation or in conjunction with accountability.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Saudi Arabia; Nelly Stoyanova, Bulgaria (in her personal capacity); RIPE NCC; Canada

#### **D.6. Inclusiveness**

**(see item A e B above)**

**Author(s):** Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; European Union; Richard Hill, APIG; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Hungary; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Mexico; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; Switzerland; Turkey; United Kingdom; UNESCO; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; DENIC; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation; Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus; Nelly Stoyanova, Bulgaria (in her personal capacity); RIPE NCC; Canada

#### **D.7. Responsive to Innovation**

**(see: item E)**

**Author(s):** Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society; European Union; Hungary; Turkey; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; United Kingdom; India; Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Mexico; Pakistan; Switzerland; Centre for Internet and Society; Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA; Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation; Australia; Centre for Internet and Society; Canada

#### **D.8. Evidence-Based Policymaking**

**Author(s):** Bulgaria; European Union; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Hungary; Mexico; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; United Kingdom; Richard Hill, APIG; Canada

#### **D.9. Sustainable**

**(see: item C.2)**

**Author(s):** Nick Ashton-Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy; Bulgaria; Anriette Esterhuysen, APC; European Union; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Mexico; Russia; Timea Suto, ICC Basis; United Kingdom; UNESCO; Hungary; Switzerland; United States of America; Canada

#### **D.10. Consensus-Based**

**(see: item B)**

**Author(s):** ESCWA; European Union; Nigel Hickson, ICANN; Hungary; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Parminder Singh, IT for Change; Mexico; Turkey; United Kingdom; United States of America; Canada

## ANNEX I – Participants of Public Consultation

### 1. WGEC Members

1	Richard Hill, APIG (7)
2	Janvier Ngoulaye, University of Yaoundé
3	UNESCO
4	European Union
5	United Kingdom
6	Hungary
7	Nick Ashton Hart, Geneva Centre for Security Policy
8	Turkey
9	Russian Federation
10	Bulgaria
11	ESCWA
12	Japan
13	Cuba
14	Nigel Hickson, ICANN
15	Parminder Jeet Singh, IT for Change
16	Joint Contribution by Parminder Jeet Singh and Richard Hill
17	United States of America
18	Switzerland
19	Jimson Olufuye, AfICTA
20	Constance Bommelaer, Internet Society
21	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
22	Anriette Esterhuysen, APC
23	Mexico
24	Timea Suto, ICC Basis
25	Canada
26	Pakistan
27	India

### 2. WGEC Observers

1	Nelly Stoyanova, Bulgaria (in her personal capacity)
2	Association for Proper Internet Governance
3	Australia
4	Saudi Arabia
5	Bill Graham, Centre for International Governance Innovation
6	DENIC (German ccTLD Registry)
7	RIPE NCC
8	The Centre for Internet and Society
9	Centre for Communication Governance at the National Law University, Delhi
10	Wolfgang Kleinwächter, University of Aarhus