



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

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

Proposals of Draft Recommendations

Rolling Document

Abstract

This rolling document consolidates the draft recommendations proposals received by the Chair of the WGEC and the CSTD Secretariat. The proposals are presented according to the temporary draft framework proposed by the Chair of the WGEC on 14 November 2013.¹ The Chair proposed to categorize the draft recommendations according to the five groups identified in the "*Analysis of the Responses to the Questionnaire of the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development, Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC)*" document presented in the second meeting of the WGEC held on 6-8 November 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland. The five groups are the following:²

- a. Implementation of the Tunis Agenda (Questions 2 and 3);
- b. Public policy issue and possible mechanisms (Questions 4, 8 and 9);
- c. Role of stakeholders (Questions 5, 6, 7, 14 and 17);
- d. Developing countries (Questions 10 and 15);
- e. Barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation (Questions 11, 12, 13 and 16).

¹ The message sent by the Chair of the WGEC is available in Annex 1 of this document.

² The Questionnaire of the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development, Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) is available in Annex 2 of this document.

Table of Contents

GROUP A: Implementation of the Tunis Agenda (Questions 2 and 3).....	5
1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)	5
2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014).....	5
3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of by a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)	6
GROUP B: Public policy issue and possible mechanisms (Questions 4, 8 and 9)	7
1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)	7
2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014).....	7
3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)	7
GROUP C: Role of stakeholders (Questions 5, 6, 7, 14 and 17)	8
1. Draft recommendations submitted by Mr. Jimson Olufuye (27 November 2013)	8
2. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)	8
3. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014).....	8
4. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)	9
GROUP D: Developing countries (Questions 10 and 15).....	10
1. Draft recommendations submitted by the United States of America (9 November 2013)	10
2. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)	10
3. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014).....	10
4. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)	11
GROUP E: Barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation (Questions 11, 12, 13 and 16)	12
1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)	12
2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014).....	13

3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)	13
Recommendations which could not be categorized	14
1. Draft recommendations from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and United Kingdom submitted by Mr. Per Linner (08 November 2013):	14
2. Draft recommendations submitted by India (25 November 2013)	14
3. Recommendations submitted by Mr. Carlos Alonso (08 November 2013).....	18
ANNEX 1: Message from the Chair of the WGEC to the WGEC mailing list regarding the submission of draft recommendations.....	20
ANNEX 2: Questionnaire of the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development (WGEC)	21

GROUP A: Implementation of the Tunis Agenda (Questions 2 and 3)

1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)

- Recalls paragraphs 69 of the Tunis Agenda, in which the purpose of Enhanced Cooperation is considered as enabling governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to Internet, but not to get into day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact the international public policy issues;
(1)

2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014)

- (1) With regard to the implementation of the Tunis Agenda, all stakeholders are to continue taking an open and bottom-up multi-stakeholder approach in order to let the Internet continue to evolve in the future and serve as a medium to which anyone can gain access from anywhere in the world.
- (2) Furthermore, in order to implement the Tunis Agenda, all stakeholders are to encourage as many stakeholders as possible to participate from a wide range of fields, take advantage of the ability of the stakeholders, and promote further international cooperation as well as the collaboration between the stakeholders through a number of global forums.
- (3) Because the Internet is a basis of social and economic activities, and characterized by its borderless nature, it has strong capabilities and potentials. In addition, it is essential to develop the global economy, to encourage innovation, to develop society, and to solve global issues by utilizing the Internet. Therefore, for the implementation of the Tunis Agenda, all stakeholders should maintain the speed of this growth and development of the Internet and prevent the interruption of the advanced use of the Internet by ensuring the free flow of information and establishing an environment for the safe utilization and application of ICT through international cooperation.

3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of by a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)³

- Recognizes the IGF for its work in meeting its Tunis Agenda defined role in fostering Enhanced Cooperation
- Acknowledges that the Tunis Agenda, if it is to continue as a reference point for all stakeholders, should be considered as a living document which needs to be updated to reflect the roles and responsibilities of all participants;
- Acknowledges that Enhanced Cooperation is well underway as intended in Tunis Agenda paragraphs 67 through 75;
- Acknowledges that new mechanisms spring into existence organically as they are needed and that there is no need to create new single or centralized mechanisms in a top down manner;
- Encourages those making public policy to engage more fully in the IGF and to bring to the IGF their questions on internet related matters within their mandates;
- The IGF should be used as a platform for open public debate, consultation, discussion and recommendation with the broader internet governance community. It should accept the work of other Internet policy efforts, such as the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, the Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance (NetMundial) and the WSIS+10 review process, as inputs to its efforts.
- Despite the importance of other Internet policy efforts, the IGF, a bottom-up UN-linked Internet policy effort, open to all stakeholders should remain central in the effort of Enhanced Cooperation.
- As the purpose of enhancing cooperation is improving and democratising the governance of the internet, at all levels, therefore its implementation is continuous, and needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis throughout the Internet governance ecosystem.

³ This is based on the original set of bullets submitted by a group of WGEC members and observers during the second WGEC meetings. It has been updated to conform to the temporary draft framework suggested by the Chair of the WGEC.

GROUP B: Public policy issue and possible mechanisms (Questions 4, 8 and 9)

1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)

- Notes the importance to consider the international character of decision-making processes regarding core functions of Internet, which is needed to develop international internet public policies, harmonize national laws, and facilitate international agreements, treaties and conventions; (9)
- Calls upon ITU to establish the framework, which should take on the responsibility of the coordination of an inclusive intergovernmental process based on equal rights and responsibilities, which would allow full implementation of a model with multi-stakeholder participation when addressing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet; (10)
- Encourages Summits in the WSIS format as the highest level of Enhanced Cooperation implementation; (11)

2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014)

- (1) All stakeholders should respect the roles that the existing mechanisms based on a multi-stakeholder approach have played in addressing Internet-related public policy issues.
- (2) Because Internet-related international public policy issues have been discussed extensively in the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) with the participation of multi-stakeholders, it will be effective to continuously take advantage of IGF.

3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)

- Encourages the IGF to cover all issues of Internet governance that are of concern to stakeholders and to form ongoing Issue Discussion Groups within the IGF to make recommendations on these issues to the larger IGF community and those making public policy;

- Encourages the IGF to follow the recommendations of the CSTD WG on IGF Improvements including its mandate to give advice to the functional Internet governance and management organizations;

GROUP C: Role of stakeholders (Questions 5, 6, 7, 14 and 17)

1. Draft recommendations submitted by Mr. Jimson Olufuye (27 November 2013)

1. That the mandate of the UN Commission for Science and Technology for Development be enhanced to coordinate International Public Policy issues pertaining to the Internet in a collaborative multi-stakeholder framework that include governments, private sector, civil society, technical and academic communities on equal footing.

2. That International institutions already addressing International Public Policy issues pertaining to the Internet strengthen their awareness and capacity building programmes particularly in the developing and least developed countries and across all sectors including government, private sector organization, civil society, technical and academic communities.

2. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)

- Encourages Members to further clarify the role of each stakeholder, and especially governments, in multi-stakeholder implementation mechanisms; (8)

3. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014)

(1) In consideration of the fact that Internet-related public policy issues have been addressed with a multi-stakeholder approach, all stakeholders should be covered and dealt with when the role of stakeholders is discussed.

(2) Furthermore, in order to make the discussion by multi-stakeholders more beneficial, all stakeholders should clearly recognize their roles, opinions they represent, and positions, and share their understanding on these issues.

(3) With regard to the role of governments, all governments should increase the transparency of the process of their decision-making, implementation of necessary measures, evaluation of the results, and possible improvements in such measures to deal with Internet-related public policy issues. In the meantime, all governments should act properly in order to make various stakeholders participate and cooperate, to collect and reflect their opinions and to utilize their knowledge, experience and technology, in the above-mentioned process.

(4) With regard to the role of other stakeholders, all other stakeholders should participate in the discussion, express their opinions and endeavor to resolve issues with their knowledge, experience and technology, cooperating with governments, in the above-mentioned process. In addition, all other stakeholders are expected to contribute through their activities to the further advancement of the Internet, social and economic development through this advancement, and capacity development for Internet utilization.

4. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)

- Encourages the rethinking of the stakeholder roles that were defined by governments unilaterally in the Tunis Agenda, noting that these roles were originally defined by governments in December 2003, Geneva Declaration of Principles and have not had the benefit of multistakeholder review;
- Affirms that the internet belongs to everyone: everyone can use it and everyone can improve it: this also applies to its governance;
- In general the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in internet governance cannot be fixed. They will vary depending on the issue, process or task at hand.
- Governments have special responsibilities under international human rights law as bearers of duties to respect, protect and promote human rights. They also have the responsibility to protect and promote the public interest, which requires them to:
 - i. Consult widely and be participative in the development of local internet policy;
 - ii. Faithfully represent the diversity of civil society views, even when these may differ from their own;
 - iii. Respect the role and responsibility of civil society to challenge governments, including in international fora;
 - iv. Convene and support inclusive multi-stakeholder internet governance processes at national level;
 - v. Bring sufficient political will to bear so that cooperation emerging from these processes does not stagnate;

vi. Establish transparency and accountability mechanisms to enable public scrutiny of their decisions and positions on internet governance.

vii. Take steps to ensure that businesses meet human rights standards (for example, in line with the United Nations guidelines on human rights and business).

GROUP D: Developing countries (Questions 10 and 15)

1. Draft recommendations submitted by the United States of America (9 November 2013)

- "International Internet organizations should continue to evolve to meet the needs and facilitate the participation of all stakeholders (including particularly those from developing countries) in their collaborative mechanisms and stakeholders from all groups are encouraged to engage in those Internet institutions to further realize the benefits of their participation. Where participation may be hampered by lack of awareness, educational opportunity, political priority or financial resources, the Internet governance community should endeavor to help find ways to enable such participation."

2. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)

- Notes the importance that Internet should remain an open and un-fragmented global resource with fair and truly international governance, which should be able to engender trust, equal capabilities for economic development and confidence for everyone; (2)

- Invites all governments in particular those of developing countries to play more effective role in international Internet governance, promoting their countries interests, making the environment more attractive for investment into national broadband infrastructure and development of local content/services; (3)

- Notes the importance to eliminate all formal and informal barriers to the participation of governments in particular those of developing countries - in international public policy issues pertaining to internet, to ensure equal possibility for economic development and capacity building of international telecommunication networks including Internet infrastructure in developing countries; (4)

3. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014)

(1) All stakeholders endeavor to conduct international cooperation in the following items to enable developing countries to cope with Internet-related public policy issues and make social and economic development through the Internet utilization.

1) To formulate and develop the ICT market, to promote market competition, and to expand businesses and services using ICT.

2) To ensure access to the Internet through developing ICT infrastructure and providing ICT services at affordable prices.

3) To promote the utilization and application of ICT for social and economic development and solution of issues.

4) To establish an environment for the safe utilization and application of ICT, including the securement of security, implementation of anti-spam measures, protection of privacy, and online children protection.

5) To promote the protection of intellectual property rights.

6) To promote the development of local contents, to expand distribution of local contents, and to establish an environment for usage of local contents, and to formulate and develop the market for local contents.

(2) Toward the sustainable development of developing countries, all stakeholders are to focus on international cooperation in capacity building, technical cooperation, best-practice sharing, and cooperation towards literacy improvement and awareness-raising activities.

4. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)

- No new multilateral arrangements are required to support Enhanced Cooperation in developing countries;
- Encourage the efforts of various existing mechanisms to understand internet governance and to make public policy in light of, and taking into account, its multi-stakeholder nature;
- Encourage all governments to commit to the IGF, and to use the IGF process as an opportunity not just to engage with all other stakeholders, but as an opportunity to work with each other on an equal footing;

- Encourage the UN and the global internet community to identify mechanisms that can facilitate the collection of financial contributions to support the participation/engagement of stakeholder from developing countries, in the perspective of ensuring that developing countries have equal leadership with developed countries in development of internet policy globally.
- Encourage governments of developing countries to foster engagement with Internet governance issues at the national and regional levels.
- Encourage the IGF and other Internet policy groups to continue to work on reducing the capacity gap (at the levels of knowledge, expertise and financial resources) for developing countries which may be necessary for their engagement in global Internet governance.
- Enable developing countries, including both governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, to play a more effective role in global Internet governance by developing mechanisms at national and regional level and by democratisation at all level including the global level.

GROUP E: Barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation (Questions 11, 12, 13 and 16)

1. Draft recommendations submitted by the Russian Federation (12 December 2013)

- Notes the importance of further internationalization of the oversight management of critical Internet resources in the direction of the environment, which ensures equality amongst citizens of all countries, represented by their governments' participation on an equal footing; (5)
- Recommends, that the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) should be allowed to elaborate and produce consolidated views and/or recommendations, which should become the tangible results of broad multi-stakeholders' open discussions as a complementary mechanism towards the process of full implementation of Enhanced Cooperation; (6)
- Encourages Members to develop innovative procedures and mechanisms to address emerging issues in the field of Internet governance that are relevant to public policy, through multi-stakeholder processes, procedures and mechanisms, that will reinforce the existing Internet governance arrangements to improve the legitimacy, effectiveness and sustainability; (7)

2. Draft recommendations submitted by Japan (7 February 2014)

(1) All stakeholders are to recognize and endeavor to eliminate barriers to participation in enhanced cooperation, from the viewpoints of eliminating not only regional gaps but also various disparities, including economic gaps, geographical divides, generation gaps, handicaps, and gender differences.

(2) All stakeholders are to promote providing and sharing of information in meetings, such as IGF, and activities contributing to enhanced cooperation through utilizing and applying various media so that developing countries and a wide range of stakeholders can participate in enhanced cooperation.

(3) In addition, in order to enable developing countries and a wide range of stakeholders to participate in international conferences to have crucial discussions over enhanced cooperation, international organizations concerned are to promote ICT-employed remote participation, to introduce audio streaming and captioning, to implement language support (e.g., multilingual interpretation), to release conference materials and minutes, and to provide opportunities for inviting comments from all stakeholders, within the limit of the existing budget.

3. Draft recommendation submitted by Ms. Avri Doria on behalf of a group of WGEC Members and Observers (Avri Doria, Grace Githaiga, Lea Kaspar, and Joy Liddicoat) (12 February 2014)

- Invites all Internet governance and management organizations to participate in the IGF.

- Reinforces the multistakeholder approach and encourages all stakeholders to engage more in, to work with existing organisations and to explore ways in which stakeholder engagement can be enhanced, including:
 - Bottom-up strategies which use local expertise and focus on telecommunications and internet infrastructure, enabling policies, incentives for the private sector and education for all;
 - Reduce the cost of internet access in developing countries;
 - Capacity-building for marginalized groups to access online spaces, public information and essential services in a safe and inclusive way;
 - Work with marginalized communities to develop local content in their own language, that meet their needs and tell their stories;
 - Capacity-building and campaigns for internet users to understand the barriers to participation by marginalized groups in the information society, including online threats and discrimination;
 - Facilitate participation of marginalized group in IG forums by ensuring their issues are on the agendas of those forums;

- Measuring the inclusion of women in internet governance spaces and taking concrete action if the results indicated unequal participation; and
- Encourages the establishment of regional and national multistakeholder forums and processes for dealing with IG and internet policy issues, and ensuring that these include marginalised voices.

Recommendations which could not be categorized

1. Draft recommendations from Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, and United Kingdom submitted by Mr. Per Linner (08 November 2013):

- Members should explore ways to strengthen participation of all stakeholders from developing countries in existing global internet governance fora including through funding mechanisms and alternative working methods such as remote participation.
- Members should increase efforts to empower stakeholders to participate through capacity building, including but not limited to, training programs, awareness raising, best practice sharing.
- Members should work with developing countries to create a fair and consistent domestic framework that stimulates competition and creates affordable access for all stakeholders.
- The role of governments should include, but not be limited to, to empower internet users, ensure a fair and consistent legal framework that is transparent accountable and equitable and protect human rights online, to foster a robust global internet infrastructure and support multistakeholder processes and partnerships.

2. Draft recommendations submitted by India (25 November 2013)

Draft Structure of Final Report of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) to Commission on Science & Technology for Development (Including Format of Recommendations)⁴

I. INTRODUCTION

⁴ Submitted on 25 November 2013 by Mr. Reddy, Deputy Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of India, Geneva for consideration and comments about the structure of the WGEC final report.

- Introduction of the Report could focus on the mandate of the Working Group (Emanating from the U.N. General Assembly Resolution 67/195, and also drawn from the Opening Presentation of the Chair of the Working Group) to spell out, the following:
 - To make recommendations on how to fully implement the mandate of WSIS regarding Enhanced Cooperation
 - The mandate of WSIS regarding Enhanced Cooperation is contained in Para 69 and 71 of the Tunis Agenda –which the Chair of the Working Group has stressed in his first presentation to the Working Group at its first meeting in May 2013.
 - The Report needs to pay attention to the specific mandate as reflected in the Tunis Agenda regarding Enhanced Cooperation, which is to enable the Governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to internet, but not to get into day-today technical and operational matters that do not impact the international public policy issues.

II. Modus Operandi Adopted by the Working Group

The WGEC adopted a modus operandi, which was in tune with the UN General Assembly resolution (67/195), consisting of a two-step process in accordance with this resolution, i.e. first devising a Questionnaire for seeking, compiling and reviewing inputs from all Member States and all other stakeholders, and secondly to embark on compilation and assessment leading to recommendations on how to fully implement the mandate given to the Working Group. Broad elements of this part of the Report could include:

- The first meeting entirely devoted to finalization of the Questionnaire, apart from deciding on the process to give widest possible outreach to various stakeholders represented in the Working Group, and also by way of publicizing through the website of the UNCTAD/CSTD;
- The second meeting decided on establishing an informal Correspondence Group to compile the list of international public policy issues pertaining to internet, based on inputs received by the Working Group to its Questionnaire from various stakeholders, and to carry out a mapping exercise between international public policy issues (relating to internet) with the existing mechanisms, if any. It was acknowledged that the task of the Correspondence Group would provide a detailed mapping of those international internet public policy issues –categorized into WGEC Categories (i.e. WGIG categories plus those to be added by the WGEC), with the mechanisms already addressing these issues, if any, and identify the adequacy of such mechanisms, with a view to identifying gaps.

- Drawing on the inputs from the Correspondence Group, the WGEC at its third meeting made detailed analysis of the mapping exercise, and presented its recommendations on how to meaningfully address the various gaps. The methodology adopted by the Group to make recommendations on the roles of various stakeholders in the proposed mechanisms/fora can be reflected. In addition, this part of the report can touch on how the Group arrived at recommendations on how to implement the mandate of the Working Group including on ‘enable the Governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to internet’.

Broad Approach & Scope of Areas Considered

- The Group made a clear recognition that, since Internet increasingly impacts so many sectors and social activities, there exist a large number of public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. The number of such issues have only increased since WSIS when some of such issues were identified. Even more new issues are expected to arise in the future, and it is not possible to anticipate and list all possible Internet-related public policy issues.
- We have seen some acknowledgment in the room, at least some delegations have said that there are issues that are to be dealt with by existing mechanisms and then others who said that while there is still no home for many (or some) international public policy issues pertaining to Internet.
- Lastly, when some of the issue may be considered as being dealt or can be dealt by some existing mechanism, many of them may need holistic examination in relation to a host of other Internet-related issues, and this, perhaps, is not being done in an adequate manner.
- The Group can also reflect in this part of the Report on how to handle technical issues as well as the issue the oversight of management of critical Internet resources.

Roles of Various Stakeholders

As there was some discussion on the roles of various stakeholders, and that there was some lack of convergence on Tunis Agenda-defined roles, the Working Group discussed further on this issue.

As a first step, the Group considered in detail the relative roles of various stakeholders as defined in Para 35 of the Tunis Agenda. Apart from looking at the roles of governments, private sector, civil society, and inter-governmental and international organizations, the Group looked at the role of academic and technical communities.

Identification of Mechanisms for Operationalizing Enhanced Cooperation

After categorization of international public policy issues pertaining to internet into WGEC Categories, and also having listed the existing mechanisms, if any, the Group made an assessment on the sufficiency or otherwise of these mechanisms/fora/activities, and also identified gaps where there may be no mechanism for specific issues or for holistic examination of issues. Recommendations on this aspect could include the following dimensions:

- (i) Identification of existing mechanisms/fora, if any, to address each of the WGEC categories of international internet public policy issues;
- (ii) In case there is no specific mechanism, or there are clear shortcomings in existing mechanisms, to deal with a policy issue, then the Group could make a recommendation on how to effectively address such a gap,
- (iii) Assessment of the relative roles of stakeholders in each of the WGEC categories;
- (iv) Recommendations on relative roles of Governments, Private Sector, Civil Society, Inter-governmental and international organizations and academia and technical groups in each of the WGEC Categories could be made. In this process, the Group may also consider making a recommendation on achieving ‘equal footing’ among the Governments.

Recommendations on Improving Participation of various Stakeholders particularly from Developing Countries

The Group may make recommendations on ways to improve participation of developing countries in internet governance.

Relationship of existing/proposed mechanisms with the existing inter-governmental bodies, which are dealing with international public policy issues:

In this part of the Report, the Group may reflect on the relationship of existing/proposed mechanisms with the existing inter-governmental and/or international organizations and also with the bodies/mechanisms that deal with day to day operational issues regarding the Internet. For example, WIPO, ITU, UNESCO, etc, are part of the United Nations are already handling some aspects of international public policy issues pertaining to the internet. As the Working Group already has the benefit of some of these organizations represented in the Group’s proceedings, it

could reflect on such existing relationships, and thus make recommendations on how these existing organizations, which have specific expertise, could help realize enhanced cooperation. Similarly, bodies dealing with critical Internet resources, like ICANN, RIRs, etc. play an important role in running of the Internet, and their relationship to any existing/ proposed mechanism may be laid out.

Relationship with Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

The Group may also make recommendations on ways to improve cooperation between mechanisms that are part of ‘Enhanced Cooperation’ and the Internet Governance Forum (IGF). This part of the report could help describe the complementary nature of the two distinct processes (Enhanced Cooperation and IGF). Such recognition would help both the processes to continue to complement each other and also work side-by-side within their mandates, to deal with issues that are covered in the Tunis Agenda in a holistic manner.

3. Recommendations submitted by Mr. Carlos Alonso (08 November 2013)

A few comments on these processes: Regarding the IGF, I recall its mandate proposed in the Tunis agenda:

- a) Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet.
- b) Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body.
- c) Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview.
- d) Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities.
- e) Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.
- f) Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries.
- g) Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations.

- h) Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise.
- i) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.
- j) Discuss, inter alia, issues relating to critical Internet resources.
- k) Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.
- l) Publish its proceedings.

Considering all these 12 items, we see that the IGF is far from its mandate. First of all, these items show that the IGF should be a process-oriented forum, not an event-oriented forum.

Secondly, there is clear reference to recommendations which should be made by the forum (e.g, items e, g, h, and i), which have been ignored by the UN. There are the usual justifications: lack of resources and so on.

But the fact remains: the IGF has not been carrying out significant components of its mandate. And its logistical committee, the MAG, is built on the basis of representation but not on expertise to take on this challenge.

We need to rethink the IGF if we wish it to be or become a central instance of effective enhanced cooperation. Or just drop it and think of other ways to advance this process.

Finally, regarding the current WGEC process, it seems we are sort of trying to redo the Tunis Agenda in terms of recommendations for multistakeholder action. And we start by collecting hundreds of issues for many of which we do not have the necessary expertise to propose meaningful recommendations -- again, this is a group based on representation, not on expertise.

The way out for me is to focus, focus, focus on a very small set of basic issues and try to build proposals for cooperation among nations around these issues. Otherwise, at the end of this process we will end up with recommendations that will very poorly mimic the Tunis Agenda itself.

ANNEX 1: Message from the Chair of the WGEC to the WGEC mailing list regarding the submission of draft recommendations.

From: Peter Major <pmajor@BLUEWIN.CH>
To: WGEC@LIST.UNICC.ORG
Date: 14.11.2013 15:21
Subject: Follow-up to our meeting
Sent by: UN CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation <WGEC@LIST.UNICC.ORG>

Dear WGEC Members,

I would like to thank you for your excellent cooperation during our 2nd Meeting and express my appreciation for the promising outcome. Special thanks to Phil Rushton for volunteering as coordinator of the Correspondence Group(CG) of the WGEC and thanks to Joy Liddicoat for volunteering as co-coordinator. Let me take this opportunity to encourage all of you to contribute to the work of the CG. My report on the meeting will be posted shortly on the CSTD website. It will contain in its Annex the agreed terms of reference of the CG.

In order facilitate the work of the WGEC and make best use of our time until our next meeting in February I propose a temporary draft framework based on the 5 main groups outlined in the Summary Document of the responses to our questionnaire:

- a. Implementation of the Tunis Agenda (Questions 2 and 3);
- b. Public policy issue and possible mechanisms (Questions 4, 8 and 9);
- c. Role of stakeholders (Questions 5, 6, 7, 14 and 17);
- d. Developing countries (Questions 10 and 15);
- e. Barriers for participation in enhanced cooperation (Questions 11, 12, 13 and 16).

I'll ask the Secretariat to create a rolling document following this structure and make it available to the WGEC with the draft recommendations which have been already submitted with indication of the source. In case you submit a draft recommendation please indicate the group (a. ,b., c., d. or c.) you think it belongs to. I would like to ask you to submit your drafts in electronic form.

Best regards,

Peter

ANNEX 2: Questionnaire of the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development (WGEC)

Timestamp

The information solicited through this questionnaire will only be used in aggregate form, unless otherwise authorised by the respondent. Do you authorise us to cite/share your views individually?

Please enter your contact details:

1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?

If non-government, please indicate:

If non-government, please indicate if you are:

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

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.

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

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

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?

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

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?

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

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

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?

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

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

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

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

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?

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?

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