1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?
Non-Government

If non-government, please indicate:
Civil society

If non-government, please indicate if you are:
Technical and academic community

There is no such thing as a technical and academic stakeholder category. There are technical and academic people in every category. Thinking otherwise is the main barrier to the enhanced cooperation concept as it distributes people by capacities rather than uniting them by responsibilities.

2. What do you think is the significance, purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda? a) Significance b) Purpose c) Scope

I am afraid I have no idea about what significance, purpose, and scope may be referring to here. All I know in here are the three following points:
2.1. This is a questionnaire, not an academic exam. Having published this text for comments, the introductory sentence above was rebuked by the following remark: “Always helpful when people pay such close attention to what the proceeding is about”. That remark was contextually pertinent, and probably one of the main reason for the lack of general interest in enhanced cooperation “as per the Tunis Agenda”. To explain this, here is the response I sent: “I did not think that I would have to comment on this second degree remark to the second degree. But you are right to emphasize its importance (we are so used to the confused bureaucracy of the IGF process, when compared with the IETF for example, that we just note it and do not fight it each time). “The questionnaire is... a questionnaire, not an academic exam. It is to be self-contained. In this circumstance, proceedings are of no interest except to be pedantic. Now, I must admit that it was in fact a way for me to mention that the main blocking factor of enhanced cooperations is the proceeding. We want actions, not reactions. “I, therefore, thank you for emphasizing the sentence. I will use this exchange to make it more explicit, as it is a key point: academics, technicians, proceedings, etc. do not constitute a stakeholder category but they do resort as consultants, experts, documentation, etc. to the four (regalian, civil, private, international) authoritative categories.”
2.2. There is a fundamental change in the way humanity understands itself and the universe. UNESCO and ITU have agreed to call the “Information Society” the result of this change. We might summarize it as follows: geometry implies that one can consider everything, from the inside as a subject, from the outside as an object, and (in the case of non-commutative geometry) from the “timeside” as a project.
• From Aristotle to Copernicus we have based ourselves on subjective philosophy.
• With Newton, objective science completed it until the end of the 19th century.
• Then we began uncovering mechanics, reality, society, time, etc. as a holist complex
network intricacy.

It started with Henri Poincaré’s non-resolution of the n-body problem in 1889. Gödel’s incompleteness theorem shows that man cannot scale and control the reality’s networked laws that constrain his projects without a more fundamental 4D and holist approach than the Aristotelian linear 3D+time logic. There are three ways for him to do it:

• communication: sharing all the data to symbiotically immerse in reality.
• information: discovering new metadata on architectonic pre-fundamentality.
• intellition: uncovering syllodata (data between data) that interlink the reality’s network and comprehending their principles, parameters, and protocols. For a century, much has been covered in these three areas, from intuition, through reason, to reflection. It results in an unlimited, fractal network of quantum agorics (*), making the Universe itself a referent model of enhanced cooperation.

(*) Agorics: “Everything may combine in the demonstration or the result of everything”. It is the polylectic generalization of the monolectic cybernetics and of the dialectic logics.

2.3. There are only two proactive enhanced cooperation related Tunis points.

#71: it gave the UN Secretary-General responsibility to initiate an enhanced cooperation trend, in involving all relevant organizations by the end of the first quarter of 2006, and all stakeholders in their respective roles, proceeding as quickly as possible and being responsive to innovation.

The UN Secretary did not fulfill that mission.

Relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders, proceeding as quickly as possible and responsive to innovation. The same relevant organizations shall be requested to provide annual performance reports.

The relevant organizations did not significantly engage in specific enhanced cooperations and there is no broadly advertised website where any EC report could be published. This action point has, therefore, failed.

And # 89: We are determined to improve international, regional and national connectivity and affordable access to ICTs and information through an enhanced international cooperation of all stakeholders that promotes technology exchange and technology transfer, ... I observed a civil society pseudo-symmetric (the involved forces were asymmetric but the IETF normative context granted some tactical symmetry) enhanced cooperation between:

• international organization: OSI TC37/TC42
• Civil society: IUCG@IETF
• OpenStand upholders: IETF, Unicode (http://open-stand.org, RFC 6852)
• Remote influence of governments (USA, UK, GAC)

This concerned the “multilingualization” dubbed “internationalization” – i.e. another word for e-colonization (langtags, IDNA2008). It exemplifies how specialized enhanced cooperation initiatives can self-constitute, behave, and bring innovation in spite of the lack of any UN General Secretary initiated momentum. This results from the self-organizing criticality (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-organized_criticality) of the internet architectural principles:

• robustness (RFC 1122),
• permanent adaptation (RFC 1958)
• simplicity (RFC 3439)
• and subsidiarity (as exemplified by RFC 5895).

... human resource development and training, thus increasing the capacity of developing countries to innovate and to participate fully in, and contribute to, the Information Society. The difficulties I met in the area of multilingualization and cultural protection from blunt over-technicalization show the limits of the limited civil society/private sector led enhanced cooperation attempts without a formal involvement of Governments and International organizations.

3. To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented? Please use the space below to explain and to provide examples to support your answer.

In the area that I know (namely, OpenUse, i.e. the capacity to adequately use information, communication, and intellition technologies in conformance with the WSIS people centered esthetic), some ECs (enhanced cooperations) exist that are inherited from the past and have not been updated yet to multistakeholderism.

Two typical examples are:

• The world normalization process which involves three stakeholders’ categories (regalian
domain, private sector, and international organizations) and has not been open to Free R&D (open-accesses at no cost).

- ICANN is a not very transparent enhanced cooperation formula where civil society (@larges) is de facto controlled through the T&L contributions management.

One should also mention the pre-alternative to the formalization of enhanced cooperations, which is counterwars. In this case, a counterwar usually is an asymmetric action engaged by one single or a coalition of stakeholders, from one or several categories, against a strategy engaged by one or a coalition of other stakeholders who:

- either do not want to engage in an open enhanced cooperation process
- or try to inadequately coordinate or dominate an existing cooperation process.

The purpose of a counterwar is, therefore, precautionary. Its legitimacy results from the risk of further conflicts that might result from such issues as growing political opposition, scientific or environmental implications of technical choices, ethical-technical divergences on the targeted social aesthetic, utilization of norms for e-colonization, etc.

It is noteworthy that as long as a counterwar remains on both sides within the limits of the proportionality principle, it can resolve into an enhanced cooperation agreement that other stakeholders from every category can then join and stabilize. However, we only have a very limited experience of these limits in the WSIS multistakeholderist context. It might be worth investigating them in areas such as naming, addressing, tariffs, and cultural exception. The internet would then be used as its own test-bed in societal (and not only technical) limited experimentations.

4. What are the relevant international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet?

There are no specific issues. This is like asking what are the relevant international public policy issues pertaining to Ford cars? Or to Paraguayan railways. I mean by this that dealing with the “Internet” (moreover with an upper case “I”) is a local, corporate, ministry, or national circumstantial issue.

The WSIS concerns are wider. They concern the “information society” and the “digisphere” (i.e. the societal reality of the networked computer assisted human brainware world), not only the Internet. IGF is a misnomer.

I am not playing with words here. The reason why enhanced cooperation cannot develop is due to the wish to use a probably correct theory (enhanced cooperation, dynamic coalitions, IGF, multistakeholderism, etc.) in perpetrating a layer violation. The internet architecture, as every other networking architecture, taught us that layer violations lead to immediate failures.

The internet is only a tool. The layer violation results from a confusion between uncoupled concepts such as the “internet”, the “web” and the “information society”. They belong to different layers. For example: managing the Internet DNS, and influencing the ICANN market monopoly on its ICANN/NTIA CLASS “IN” is not the IGF’s business. The IGF is to host and encourage discussions on digital naming within the information society in order to foster concerted innovations of every nature in that area.

5. What are the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation?

There is no predetermined general role or responsibility for any stakeholder other than to be its own self and respect others along with the subsidiarity mechanism.

The human society has not changed. It is its context that is extending. This implies new tasks; they are not conceptually different from other tasks that result from other issues such as demography or global warming. Each culture may experiment in its own way to fulfill its new obligations. Up to now, our less tight calendar allowed us to have the time to experiment and, therefore, to be able to confront solutions and copy the most successful “models”.

Since the “future shock” that Alvin Toffler identified in 1970 as “too much change in too short a period of time”, we had to use world summits to confront ideas “from the future” rather than mainly scrutinizing experiences and statistics from the past. This is a new way of deciding.

This has also changed the way we are to implement our decisions because we usually have no one else to copy: all of us must learn on the move.

This is why we had to come to subsidiarity and mutual help in case someone or everyone fails. We agreed that we wanted to go fast. Therefore, it is up to the first one who is ready. We
hoped that the UN General Secretary would give the momentum. He did not, or at least not enough. Therefore, it is up to any of those who are ready in their own area to start an “enhanced cooperation” with his/her/its neighbors in that area. This may lead to something that the WSIS did not foresee and that blocks its process: conflicts between enhanced cooperations; as in Dubai for the ITU December meeting on the World Telecommunications Treaty. The IGF is the place to settle such conflicts. This is mutual help toward subsidiarity based on good will capacity.

6. How should enhanced cooperation be implemented to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet?

Let us forget the “pertaining to the internet” part. Enhanced cooperation means that there is no latent authority to unite different subsidiaries: this authority is to be concerted. The difficulty that the concept meets is, as usual, that we want to turn principles into universal rules. The world is diverse and the different forms of enhanced cooperation are too. This means that an ethereal “enhanced cooperation” singular is meaningless. An enhanced cooperation spirit is to motivate and embody into a multiplicity of applied and structured enhanced cooperation projects, charters, budgets, rules, voluntaries, servants, etc. We humans are quite used to this, but in here, for the first time, we are also to cooperate with bots, the thousands, millions, billions, and trillions of bots that we have to weld the world’s new anthropobotic (men/women+bots) society together.

NB: In order to best achieve this welding, we agreed at the WSIS that it had to be people centered, while most of its context is legitimately (world’s economy) dollar centered. This certainly is another challenge.

7. How can enhanced cooperation enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities?

The current failure of tree-sided only enhanced cooperations (without enough attention paid to the people and too much to finances) might help clean the world balance sheet. The hope is that some enhanced cooperations will meet with some successes that could progressively autocatalyze the entireworld’s digisphere by network propagation.

8. What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources?

The WSIS area is the information society. The appropriate mechanism, at least one which can be attempted, is to decontaminate its enhanced cooperations from their money virus and inject “some intellitive serum” (the good practice of negentropic intelligent linking). The first candidate could be the naming system, as a positive result would be widely noticed; however, there is also a major risk of hijacking by obscure market forces if it is not quickly sponsored by a global enhanced cooperation, which should include ICANN, but not depend on ICANN.

9. What is the possible relationship between enhanced cooperation and the IGF?

As far as I understand, the IGF is where dynamic coalitions advising enhanced cooperations cross-pollinate. When considering the role it should play, it should be renamed the “inter-governance forum of the information society”.

10. How can the role of developing countries be made more effective in global Internet governance?

They should be made to participate in the enhanced cooperation mechanism. Actually, since that mechanism has been appropriated by the blocking StatUS-Quo disciples, they should
take leadership in the government category new initiatives, allying with Civil Society and the innovative side of small businesses. Developing countries should become internet development countries, providing paperwork-havens to paperless businesses. The main limitation to economic development in the digital area is developed countries’ bureaucracy. Network businesses do not need bureaucracy or a tax haven. They need bureaucracy free virtual zones with an online bank account that they and their own government can trust, and hence an enhanced cooperation with the target of decently supporting independent multinational initiatives (IMI). They are certainly willing to pay taxes for what they get, but not taxes for a bureaucracy that they hate. It would also be great to have low cost digital architectonic BarCamps held in developing countries together with local people rather than in luxury resorts. Maybe more ideas and work than egos and business bias when flying a charter and sleeping on a camp bed?

11. What barriers remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance? How can these barriers best be overcome?

The main difficulty is to get real in a new world for all. How can you want at the same time someone to be innovative and pragmatically correct? The problem is the same everywhere: political correctness is the key to money. The only solution, therefore, is:
• Either to abide by political correctness and not to move and innovate
• Or to dramatically reduce the cost/time to market.

Richard Stallman took a major step ahead with FLOSS. We now need to go deeper than Linux into the digisphere itself, which means a real enhanced cooperation effort.
• For civil society it goes with network neutrality and providers’ reliability.
• For governments it goes with sovereignty.
• For international organizations with connectivity at all of the layers from hardware to brain (semantic layers).
• For business it goes with the banalization of the network/cloud trust.

Network non-neutrality in different usages, layer violations, tariff disparities, etc. has a huge cost that Civil Society engineers cannot overcome without talking together. This in turn has a cost due to the lack of a lead user social network. A “lead user” is a user who is interested in and technically capable of adapting what he/she uses to suit his/her own needs. This is what I attempted with the IUCG@IETF for the fringe to fringe layers over the end to end, and the IUTF for the Intelligent Use fringe to fringe layers and above. Some help would be welcome. However, the problem is to get it free from obligations to other stakeholders.

12. What actions are needed to promote effective participation of all marginalised people in the global information society?

To keep it simple. “Perfection is achieved, not when there is nothing more to add, but when there is nothing left to take away.” — Antoine de Saint-Exupery

In our area, this is taught to us by the internet success. Its architecture is documented by four RFCs that apply principles that belong to every enhanced (human, economic, technical, network, etc.) cooperation:
• RFC 1122. Robustness principle. "Be liberal in what you accept, and conservative in what you send", striving for the "least user surprise".
• RFC 1958. "The principle of constant change is perhaps the only principle of the Internet that should survive indefinitely". "It is also generally felt that end-to-end functions can best be realised by end-to-end protocols. [] Everything else should be done at the fringes". (our intelligent use of the internet IS something else).
• RFC 3439. Principle of simplicity: "to be successful we must drive our architectures and designs toward the simplest possible solutions".
• RFC 5895. Principle of subsidiarity: "As unusual as this may be for a document concerning Internet protocols, it is necessary to describe [] an operation that is to be applied to user input in order to prepare that user input for use in an "on the network" protocol". The dividing line between "user interface" and "protocol" is clear. The protocol part [] explicitly does not deal
with the user interface.
The more we make sure that marginalized people’s needs (this begins with multilingualization, i.e. every language treated the same as English, and multilingual domain names) can be addressed by subsidiarity will give the momentum, architecture, architectonic and technical ethic to promote and, more than that, to permit the participation of all the marginalized people with their necessary active involvement for them to document their needs. Full social e-empowerment (access, site, domain name) should be free (like Wikipedia) and paid by commercial e-empowerment. The Internet today is like a city where you should pay to walk the street and enter the shops. This is not a real enhanced cooperation among businesses and consumers, and probably not that good for commerce.

13. How can enhanced cooperation address key issues toward global, social and economic development?

Cooperation embodiment into cooperations’ projects is the only form of societal concerted life that humanity has known for millenaries. Its “enhancement” is only a way to mention its global context, complexity extension, and resulting need for computer assisted facilitation. Let us be candid. This questionnaire shows that the WSIS has turned into a virtual bureaucracy that wants to help people cooperate. If we want to help them, we need to inform them as to what is possible, teach them for free (ex. MOOCs), and reduce the old constraints that are inadequate for their new business. If the information society is a progress, this means that it needs fewer social constraints than before. So let permit people adapt the constraints that they wish to keep and forget the others. Let us not add the our ones on top of their old ones.

14. What is the role of various stakeholders in promoting the development of local language content?

Languages, first of all, are interbrain protocols. Up to now, these protocols were used between HSS-NSPs (Homo Sapiens Sapiens versions of Natural Semantic Processors). They are progressively also being used by evolutive DAB-ASP (Digital Algorithmic Bots versions of Artificial Semantic Processors). As such, they become “mecalanguages”. The question that needs answering, therefore, is who is going to lead the linguistic evolution: people or semantic processor designers, developers, and their sponsors? When one considers the attention paid by IETF dominants to the Unicode consortium (not to the tables), Raymond Kurzweil’s current job description which is “to bring natural language understanding to Google”, and what I had to fight for at the IETF to protect languages and cultures from protocol limitations, the priority is to claim for a Linguistic Exception as an extension of the WTO French required Cultural Exception.

15. What are the international internet-related public policy issues that are of special relevance to developing countries?

There are two different issues involved in this question. 
· One is economic: it should be addressed according to the principle of subsidiarity to be the most efficient (efficient and resilient) by each of the countries, at least as much as by the World Bank and the IMF.
· The other is mental: one of the characteristics of our time is that we are to think in tune with the whole information society as we perceive it. To do that we are to be practically permitted to think freely in terms of our personal context that will be adapted to our local/societal environment.

This is why the information society is to be people centric. This is out of effillience again. However, this time one may understand that this portmanteau word also concatenates Aristotle’s word “philia”: efficacy, philia, resilience. Philia is a key relational/network related concept. It is "wanting for someone what one thinks good, for his sake and not for one's own, and being inclined, so far as one can, to do such things for him" (Aristotle).

This means that eventually working for other’s good leads to a better return through the agoric network of reality. This is an “OpenCapa” attitude that we should work on: capacity building is
for everyone by everyone, at the individual level. Your coach may belong to a financially
developing or to an intellectually underdeveloping community.

16. What are the key issues to be addressed to promote the affordability of the Internet,
in particular in developing countries and least developed countries?

Help people in every country to share and deploy digiliteracy. The digisphere is the way
people (individual, families, structures, cities, States) accommodate digital facilitation in their
own life. Personal empowerment is a whole, which only now includes an additional way to
grasp at reality.

17. What are the national capacities to be developed and modalities to be considered
for national governments to develop Internet-related public policy with participation of
all stakeholders?

Protect e-sovereignty, and for that identify what it is. How do you want to develop national
capacities if one starts trying to impose foreign values, languages, and decisions. The first
thing to do is to respect the HRD 15th article.

18. Are there other comments, or areas of concern, on enhanced cooperation you
would like to submit?

We need to have a 31st article of the Human Rights declaration concerning the cyberspace.
This should be one of the first enhanced cooperations (HR31 Project).
• The right to exist, be secure, and be digiliterate in the cyberspace
• The right to own (author’s rights and intellectual property) in the cyberspace
• The right to freely speak and access legitimate knowledge in the cyberspace
• The right to filter and be protected against disinformation in the cyberspace
• The right to associate in the cyberspace

Zbigniew Brzezinski’s “The grand chessboard” concludes that the world’s stability calls for a
global cooperation of nations coordinated by the pre- eminent USA. Most of the other nations
could share either a direct or an indirect (through regional cooperations) opinion: they have
precisely refused that option through the WSIS multistakeholderist consensus (including the
USA), considering that enhanced cooperation was to be on an equal footing basis and that
stakeholders had to not interfere with the legitimate rights of any other one. However, the
transition to this new world polycracy cannot be carried out quickly and demand transitional
warranties for all. There should be an enhanced cooperation started on the transitional issues:
this certainly belongs to the architectonic debate that I am calling for, since prospective
aspects must be involved. To cooperate on a transition, we first have to spell out where we
want to land together: for the time being, we know two things.
• We agreed on a big change: a people centered world. (no more a money or State cente-
red–Social-State to serve and protect people).
• We obviously have a strong and legitimate consensus for a “satUS-quo+”, i.e. at least, let us
protect what we have today. The win/win constraints are always difficult.

Richard Buckminster Fuller explained that one cannot change people (moreover with a
people centered esthetic in mind), but that one can change their environment and context.
This is why some are tempted by the social engineering of a world more favorable to their
business or agenda.
Actually, there is no need of it: our context is extending itself alone (like the universe is
expanding). Particularly in recent decades but actually since 1889, when Poincaré proved
Newton wrong about the n-body problem, we have carried out a few steps in this opening of
Plato’s cave that we have been striving toward for millenaries. The world is currently buzzing
a lot about the openness of our “personal, public, or peer reality information system
mediation” (Open-PRISM). Enhanced cooperation is basically justified by well assessed
common interests and trust. Trust cannot be taken for granted or imposed by laws, treaties, or
brainwashing. Therefore, we must know about the reality “behind” it all. And what is in it for
each of us. This is intellition, our new technological and societal frontier.
A digital information society is, therefore, built:
• on what you see with your own eyes, as any other society (3D)
• also at the same time (4D when time becomes relative, thanks to Einstein)
• on what you mine with your own mining mediator. This is why you want it protected from any biasing influence through semantic filters, assisted by selected/private reference frames concerning the three (1) data, (2) metadata, and (3) syllodata dimensions documenting your actual or virtual reality (7D).
This permits one to understand why enhanced cooperations can only first develop across multi-stakeholders’ “pre-trusted” areas. An example will explain this better: USA/Europe trade cooperation talks survived Edward Snowden because the different negotiators trust their own data mining system intelligent mediators as being able enough to adequately facilitate their understanding of the secret intents (metadata) of other parties and helping them build punctual objective dynamic coalitions (syllodata) as they see it as advantageous for their own interests, regardless of what side of the big-pond they come from, etc.: the data face is just as fractal as the physical space.
An enhanced cooperation is necessarily like a poker play in an infinity mirror room where you distrust the other players but trust your sight and are harassed by experts and activists from dynamic coalitions. This necessarily calls for “agoric” thinking, which is something only a few people are already accustomed to in the data face side, and still fewer have become familiar with the idea, but it was the basic rationale behind:
• the first international network technology (Tymnet)
• the subsidiarity principle, now accepted as the way the Internet technology supports diversity (RFC 5895).
It is, therefore, likely that the technology metaphor will progressively “pollute” the brain of stakeholders and lead them to accept it better, as experts and activists from dynamic coalitions become familiar with the universal architectonic laws of large ecosystems (that we are learning from nature and banks ignored). The world digital ecosystem should hopefully emerge as a balanced dynamic effilience made of “three thirds”:
• an innovative chaos eroding structures becoming conservative,
• a progressive meshing of new structures in an enhanced cooperation spirit,
• an order of organized enhanced cooperations.
It is up to us to analyze, understand, comprehend, protect and help catalyzing its harmony.