

<p>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?</p>	<p>Please enter your contact details:</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus member, Australia ian.peter@ianpeter.com</p>	<p>not at all</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Nnenna Nwakanma NNNENA.ORG/ACSIS/Africa IGF Rue des Jardins 22 BP 1764 ABJ 22 Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire</p>	<p>To a certain level, in certain instances. The lack of a political leadership figure (Markus Kummer) on the global IGF has not helped in mobilizing some high-level engagement.</p> <p>In Africa, the Africa Internet Governance Forum, does not have enough secretariat capacity to mobilize, engage and motivate African stakeholders.</p> <p>In summary, the global may have made efforts, but the lower you descend, the more enhanced cooperation is endangered.</p>

Yes	<p>Country: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO</p> <p>Organization: CENTRE AFRICAIN D'ECHANGE CULTUREL</p> <p>Adress: CAMPUS NUMERIQUE FRANCOPHONE DE KINSHASA.44, AVENUE DE L'HOPITAL</p> <p>email: cafec3m@yahoo.fr/b.schombe@gmail.com</p>	<p>Preparatory meetings during the two phases of WSIS had worked well for so led to the 2003 Action Plan and the Tunis Agenda 2005. Which logically should facilitate further consultations at the national and regional level in the forum of Internet governance. The biggest job to do is to develop indicators and reliable statistics by country and by sub-region.</p>
Yes	<p>Russia, Coordination Center for Russian Top-Level Domains, 8, Zoologicheskaya Str., Moscow, 123242, Russia; info@cctld.ru</p>	<p>3. In the light of the above, the progress in fostering enhanced cooperation can be construed in different and somewhat conflicting ways. On the one hand there has been a substantial progress made in mapping and promoting cooperation between various stakeholders: specifically, in Russia, the government, the business community, the technical community and the civil society now have a far more distinct understanding of their respective mandates and roles, and ways to jointly promote sound policies to ensure a more robust IG ecosystem is in place. Meanwhile, a number of national governments consistently promote various options which suggest creation of a new, central body under the auspices of the UN, to control the Internet development issues, which, from our perspective, appears a fairly controversial stance, that does not meet the spirit of the Tunis Agenda, nor does it match best IG practices and, consequently, if implemented, will effectively derail the enhanced cooperation process. This stance rests upon Governments lacking trust in, and recognition of, civil society and business partners capable to collaborate on equal footing</p>

Yes	Sweden, Netnod, Franzéngatan 5, 112 51 Stockholm, info@netnod.se	<p>Enhanced cooperation has successfully been implemented in the IGF process, both globally and locally. Specifically the local cooperation has been quite successful where it has been implemented. Either in the form of local IGF meetings or more open processes where exchange of information can happen so that more informed decisions can be made.</p> <p>For example, in the US and Europe there are local IGF meetings where important issues are discussed. In the US the US IGF and in Europe Euro-DIG.</p> <p>Other example is the open process "reference group, internet governance" that the regulator PTS in Sweden runs which in practice only is a mailing list. Which work due to the fact all stakeholder groups in Sweden already meet at various local conferences and meetings such as "Internetdagarna" hosted by the Swedish ccTLD registry .SE.</p>
Yes	Bangladesh The Forum for Development, Journalism and Communication Studies (FOCUS) focus_bangladesh@yahoo.com	To some extent the cooperation is still remain among civil societies, we must board the commoners for ensuring the its positive usages.
Yes	Russia Russian Association for Electronic Communications Presnenskaya embankment, 12, Federation Tower West, floor 46, Moscow, 123100 www.raec.ru info@raec.ru	For now enhanced cooperation has been implemented mostly at an intergovernmental level. World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) held in Dubai in December 2012 has shown that policy-making decisions about Internet governance are still the prerogative of national governments. This means that the important role of private and public sectors is underestimated and limited to the opinion instead of direct influence.

<p>Yes</p>	<p>Country: United States Organization: Internet Governance Project Address: Syracuse University School of Information Studies Syracuse, NY 13244 USA E-mail: press@internetgovernance.org</p>	<p>The Internet Governance Forum has not been allowed to implement enhanced cooperation. Indeed, in the early years several representatives of States actively tried to prevent the IGF from even discussing it. But that is logical since EC was conceived as a process for States only, and the IGF is a multistakeholder institution where States, civil society and the private sector have fairly equal status.</p> <p>Within ICANN, the growing empowerment of the GAC, and the GAC's repeated claims that governments can override bottom-up multistakeholder policy development by claiming that they have the final word on "public policy issues," constitutes a strong taste of what enhanced cooperation actually means in practice. Fortunately, however, enhanced cooperation in ICANN has not involved the development of "globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical internet resources." Instead it has involved only GAC interventions on specific domain name-related policy issues.</p> <p>Overall, then, very little has been done to implement enhanced cooperation as defined above. But this is a good thing. If EC means elevating States into positions of policy makers for the global Internet, to the exclusion of the private sector and civil society, we hope that it is never implemented.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers Los Angeles, CA, USA 12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300 Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536 USA Phone: +1 310 301 5800 FAX: +1 310 823 8649 baher.esmat@icann.org</p>	<p>Enhanced Cooperation is an ongoing effort undertaken by relevant stakeholders in the Internet space in response to the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society. The past few years have witnessed substantial development in the global Internet governance landscape. The evolution of the IGF in its global, regional, and national form is one fundamental manifestation of this development. Governments, inter-governmental organizations, private sector, Internet related organizations, and civil society have partnered in implementing initiatives and processes that fall within the scope of enhanced cooperation. ICANN has been part of such efforts, and this section will shed some light on a couple of examples in that regard.</p> <p>The current healthy status of regional and national IGFs (where real issues of public policy substance are being discussed) is a testament to the foresight of the Tunis Agenda in this regard.</p> <p>One area of significant achievement, which fits firmly within the context of enhanced cooperation, has been the introduction of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) as top-level domains. This has truly been a multi-stakeholder cooperative effort</p>

		<p>involving all stakeholders from around the globe. To date, communities of 23 countries around the world have been enjoying use of their country code top-level domains in their native languages and scripts.</p> <p>In 2009, and within the framework of fostering working relationships with international inter-governmental organizations, ICANN and UNESCO signed a cooperation agreement to strengthen partnership and work together on promoting the use of IDNs. A year later, the two organizations signed a letter of intent in which they identified specific activities to pursue. Following that letter, UNESCO has been a key contributor to ICANN's IDN policy development process. It supported the work of the Cyrillic working group under the IDN Variant Issues Project. This is a project that aims to identify issues that need to be solved to facilitate the delegation of IDN Variant TLDs. UNESCO has also contributed to the work of the country-code Name Supporting Organization's (ccNSO) study group on country and territory names concerned with the issue of using complete country and territory names in top-level domain names. UNESCO, through consultation with its Member States, has helped the group develop a typology of country and territory names.</p> <p>Another example of enhanced cooperation is the Affirmation of Commitments (AOC) signed in 2009. The main impact of the AOC on ICANN has been the establishment of a series of accountability mechanisms conducted by multi-stakeholder, community-led, review teams. One important review team has been the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT). The first ATRT review process was concluded in 2011 with 27 recommendations to enhance mechanisms throughout ICANN, including the governance and performance of the Board, the role and effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), public input and public policy processes, and review mechanisms for Board decisions. All ATRT recommendations were completed and included into ICANN's standard operating procedures to improve accountability and transparency in the identified areas. As this is an ongoing process, early this year, the second ATRT (ATRT2) has commenced its activities and will deliver its final recommendations by end of 2013.</p>
Yes	<p>South-South Opportunity jrtnchekoua@gmail.com B.P 33 Yaoundé Cameroon"</p>	<p>Encourage the government, at the same time, the development of industry information services ("tele") and calls for proposals for the first motorways expérimentations. Les information "prophesied an economic and social revolution . the state should participate in the development of the Internet in creating accessible information products, documentation and communication through this network.</p>

Yes	<p>USA</p> <p>American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) 3635 Concorde Parkway, Suite 200 Chantilly, Virginia, 20151</p> <p>chandley@arin.net</p>	<p>In assessing the success of the Tunis Agenda's call for enhanced cooperation, ARIN would reference the many activities and organizations both in and outside of our region. As we expand our outreach, we continue to see greater involvement from the community in our policy development process, resulting in increased collaboration with governments, civil society and business. Following are some examples of ARIN's efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment of the ARIN Government Working Group to encourage discussion between stakeholder groups with the ARIN community. • ARIN participation in various multi-stakeholder national IGF activities, as well the Global IGF • ARIN participation in global inter-governmental organizations including the OECD through the Internet Technical Advisory Committee and the International Telecommunication Union • ARIN participation in regional multi-stakeholder organizations such as Caribbean Association of National Telecommunications Organizations (CANTO) • ARIN participation in regional, inter-governmental organizations such as the Caribbean Telecommunications Union and CITEL
Yes	<p>Country: JAPAN Organization: Japan Network Information Center (JPNIC) Address: 4F Urbannet Kanda bldg. 3-6-2 Uchi-Kanda, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 101-0047 JAPAN Email: secretariat@nic.ad.jp</p>	<p>In our view, the Internet Governance Forum, or IGF, is the core process for enhanced cooperation. It successfully increased dialogues among the Internet stakeholders including governments and various stakeholders and has been clarifying the issues on the Internet, which will help governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.</p>

Yes	Country:Japan Organization:KEIDANREN Address:1-3-2,OTEMACHI CHIYODA-KU,TOKYO 100-8188 E-mail:joho@keidanren.or.jp	Progresses in the developing Internet communication infrastructure can be seen in many regions.
Yes	Country: Japan Organization: Japan Registry Services Co., Ltd. Address: CFB East 13F, 3-8-1 Nishi-Kanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-0065 JAPAN E-mail: hotta@jprs.co.jp	The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is the forum where participants share the information and exchange their opinions relevant to the international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. Various stakeholders including governments participate in the IGF activities. Sharing issues and actions to solve them are employed in a bottom-up manner. We appreciate these actions as a worthy progress of implementing enhanced cooperation.

Yes	Government Offices of Sweden Ministry for Foreign Affairs Department for International Law, Human Rights and Treaty Law Carl Fredrik Wettermark SE-103 39 Stockholm Sweden carl-fredrik.wettermark@gov.se	<p>Sweden believes that enhanced cooperation is already present in many different forums. Enhanced cooperation is manifest in the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) and its bottom-up, multistakeholder approach, where stakeholders from all countries have the possibility to engage on equal footing in discussions on issues related to Internet Governance. Concrete multistakeholder enhanced cooperation include ICANN and its Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), IETF, Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), ISOC as well as many different local and regional IGFs.</p> <p>Enhanced cooperation, although not with a fully multistakeholder approach, also exist in organizations such as for example OECD, UNESCO, ITU etc. In some of these forums, openness, transparency and inclusiveness can be improved upon.</p>
-----	---	--

Yes

United States,
Imagining the Internet,
CB 2850, Elon University, 27244,
andersj@elon.edu

As the Internet has proliferated and the power of such connectedness has been revealed skirmishes over control over processes have accelerated and the best intentions of many in position to effect political control have been turned inward in such a way that it is becoming a threat to the continuing positive evolution and human impact of connectivity. As always in the history of innovation of human tools, they can be used for both good and evil. Accurately perceived threats, the quest for control/power and basic greed are leveraging possibly unstoppable influences in a gradually more negative way. Fortunately up to this point in its history the people in leadership of the key organizations of the Internet - including the people active in ISOC, IETF, IAB, WSIS, WGIG, IGF and other important spaces have mostly been working successfully in concert for positive evolution. The good people are beginning to tire of the uphill battle, however, and many of the best have no economic means to travel to participate in the face-to-face global discussions. The largest impediment to enhanced cooperation is economic and time constraints that prevent many brilliant people from being able to become consistent and valuable participants in the collective intelligence that is moving enhanced cooperation forward. While there are some initiatives to try to remedy the situation a better solution must be agreed upon. Establishing permanent regional locations between which extremely high-quality global teleconferencing can be achieved with simultaneous communication between hubs would allow for global meetings that require very little travel, less expense and widen the circle to involve more people. Massive Open Online Courses utilizing Adaptive Learning that bring the knowledge of Internet governance to more capable people and assist in their training to participate in the regional locations would help expand the circle of positive collective intelligence.

Yes	<p>Igor Milashevskiy, i.milashevskiy@minsvyaz.ru Alexander Grishchenko, a.grichenko@minsvyaz.ru</p> <p>Russian Federation Ministry of Telecom and Mass Communications (Mincomsvyaz of Russia) 7, Tverskaya str., Moscow, 125375, Russian Federation Email: office@minsvy</p>	<p>Considering the enhanced cooperation related to collaboration between governments, we assume that the process has not been implemented yet to the full extent. Noting the significance of the multilateral format of collaboration implemented in the frameworks of the Internet Governance Forum, Russia considers it necessary to clarify the roles and responsibilities of governments. Cooperation among governments on the Internet-related international public policy issues should be done in the framework of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) as the specialized UN agency in the field of international telecommunications. Currently, the ITU has established the Working Group with its mandate (defined by the ITU Council Resolution 1334) and the membership of the ITU Member-States only. A mechanism for consultations with other stakeholders has been established. For further implementation of the enhanced cooperation, the specified formats should be strengthened and improved, and all governments should actively contribute to the work of the Working Group. We consider Summits in the WSIS format as the highest level of the enhanced cooperation implementation.</p>
-----	--	---

Yes	RIPE NCC Singel 258 1016AB Amsterdam The Netherlands Email: externalrelations@ripe.net	<p>The Tunis Agenda's call for enhanced cooperation marked a major turning point in how Internet stakeholders interact. For the RIPE NCC, this has included many specific developments and changes to how our organisation and its community interact with peers in other stakeholder groups, including government. Some examples of this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- RIPE Cooperation Working Group (to discuss public policy-related issues in the open RIPE community context)- RIPE NCC Roundtable Meetings (to inform public sector stakeholders on issues relevant to the RIPE NCC's areas of authority)- RIPE NCC participation in inter-governmental organisations, including the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU)- Active engagement with and support for multi-stakeholder Internet governance events, including the global Internet Governance Forum, the Arab IGF, EuroDIG and various national forums- Cooperative capacity-building initiatives with law enforcement agencies throughout the RIPE NCC service region (Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia) <p>At the same time, we would like to highlight and commend the willingness that we have seen from many in government, law enforcement, business and civil society to engage with the open RIPE community processes. This reciprocity is a fundamental characteristic of enhanced cooperation, and essential to its efficacy.</p>
-----	--	---

Yes

Ellen Blackler
Vice President, Global Public Policy
The Walt Disney Company
425 Third Street, Suite 1100
Washington DC 20024
United States

A range of enhanced cooperation efforts have been ongoing. Some have taken the form of increased efforts to incorporate non-governmental stakeholders' views into bodies previously limited to governments. For example, the ITU has made efforts to increase non-government participation in some of its proceedings. As part of its preparations for the WTPF it created an Informal Experts Group to assist in the development of the Opinions to be adopted at the WTPF. Similarly, it created the Children's Online Protection initiative which includes non-government partners in order to promote Internet safety and protections for children online. The COP initiative advances the understanding of the benefits and threats to children online, and is a strong demonstration of the improved understanding that can be achieved by working in a full partnership with industry and other non-governmental stakeholders. An example of this cooperative effort is the Global Youth Summit being held in Costa Rica in September 2013 where, among other activities, Disney will provide training and training materials to 200-300 young adults from around the world on delivering online safety programming to children so that these young adults can in turn provide online safety education to children in their home countries. Another example of tangible outcomes resulting from COP is the creation of resources for industry, parents, children and educators looking to understand best practices for promoting the safety of children online. These resources are important capacity building tools which can be particularly valuable to the newly connected looking to implement state of art policies that will protect children while promoting the use of ICT.

Other efforts have grown up around particular issues of high concern. For example, in response to ongoing frustrations with the way domain name registration data is collected, validated and disclosed, ICANN established an Expert Working Group (the Expert Working Group on gTLD Director Services) to resolve long controversial issues through a cooperative, multi-stakeholder process. ICANN established the working group by seeking expert volunteers from across the ecosystem and forming a working group with broad representation in terms of both geography and expertise. The group itself incorporated opportunities for input from outside the group as its work progressed. There is no doubt this process can be continuously improved to allow for even greater collaboration, and we continue to be concerned with the length of time it will likely be until improvements to registration data issues are realized, however, this effort serves as an excellent example of how all parties can cooperate to solve problems with practical solutions using existing organizations.

		<p>Similarly, we believe the IGF, the IETF and the W3C are enhanced cooperation in action. The IGF has been a vital forum for promoting dialogue around issues that affect the advancement of the Information Society. Since its inception we have seen the IGF help advance the thinking of and relationships between thought leaders in the Internet community on the norms and operating principles related to the Internet. For example, we have seen a deeper understanding of how fundamental human rights can be advanced or constrained using the Internet, which has led to all stakeholders - industry, governments and NGOS – reviewing their practices and policies to determine how they affect fundamental rights, an idea that we barely present at the first IGF. Similarly, we have seen an emerging consensus of the importance of locally relevant content to the growth of the Information Society which has led to the availability of non-English domain names and a more thorough examination of how the creation of locally relevant content can be encouraged, evidenced by the number of panels examining the issue at the 2013 IGF.</p> <p>In addition, the UN organizations tasked with acting as facilitators for the Action Lines identified in the Tunis Agenda have put considerable effort into convening parties in order to make progress on the Action Lines, and document that progress as well as generate ideas for further actions. (Much of that documentation of these enhanced cooperation efforts can be found at (http://www.itu.int/wsis/index.html.)</p>
Yes	<p>Mark Carvell Head, Global Internet Governance Policy Creative Economy, Internet and International Department for Culture, Media & Sport 100 Parliament Street London SW1A 2BQ United Kingdom mark.carvell@culture.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>The WSIS in 2005 was an important milestone in the creation of a new multi-stakeholder ecosystem for the global information economy. Prior to 2005, many of the organisations and innovators involved in the development of the Internet worked in isolation from policymakers, civil society and user groups. Since then the global information economy has been transformed by greater openness, inclusivity and communication amongst stakeholders; and greater awareness of technical and economic achievements and opportunities, and of sources of expertise and best practice. Interaction amongst stakeholders (e.g. at the IGF) provides a catalyst for stakeholder cooperation and action which in turn create new opportunities and address challenges such as the growth of cybercrime.</p>

Yes

ORGANISATIONAL ENDORSEMENTS:

Association for Progressive Communications
(APC)
Global
Valeria Betancourt <valeriab@apc.org>

Bytes for All, Pakistan
Pakistan
Shahzad Ahmad <shahzad@bytesforall.pk>

Centre for Community Informatics Research.
Development an

It follows that for any public policy issue related to Internet governance that lacks at least one transparent, accountable, multilateral process, involving all stakeholders, for the development of globally-applicable principles to enable that issue to be addressed in a coordinated manner, or any framework or mechanisms to support such a process, the enhanced cooperation mandate is yet to be implemented. As the Tunis Agenda does not necessarily specify that a single or central process or mechanism is required, and indeed there is none yet, some point to a variety of independent efforts to coordinate policy development across a number of issue areas and fora as evidence of the implementation of the mandate. But the degree of such implementation currently varies.

For example, the progress made at ICANN with respect to issues of critical Internet resources, involving the role of the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) and the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) may be seen as a movement towards fulfilling the enhanced cooperation mandate in that context. Less evidence of such can be seen in the work of WIPO on intellectual property enforcement, that of UNCTAD on cross-border consumer protection, that of the UN Human Rights Council on the human rights impacts of government surveillance, or that of the World Wide Web Consortium on online behavioural advertising. There are other issues still for which there is no institution with a clear responsibility to implement the enhanced cooperation mandate: for example, there is no global body that deals comprehensively with data protection and privacy rights, and similar gaps exist in many other areas of a social, economic, political and cultural nature (see question 4).

Indeed while the IGF has developed, across now seven annual sessions, enhanced cooperation has not really got off the ground. There was a session in New York the end of 2010, seeking wider input. And CSTD has held various meetings on the subject. But enhanced cooperation – as conceived in the grand bargain of WSIS – has so far not been taken to serious steps. Meanwhile the tensions that led to the enhanced cooperation bargain are still very much in play, as illustrated by the impasse at the ITU's World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) in 2012 between governments seeking to assert greater control over the Internet, and those opposing international treaties as a method of such control. We can agree with both camps: that the enhanced cooperation mandate has not been adequately implemented, but also that going for an intergovernmental treaty is not

		the right way to begin implementing the EC imperative.
Yes	Malaysia Consumers International Lot 5-1 Wisma WIM, Jalan Wan Kadir 3, Taman Tun Dr Ismail, WP 60000, Malaysia jeremy@ciroap.org	We associate ourselves with the Best Bits submission, except for the additional answer to question 8 below.
Yes	Country: Switzerland Organization: Digitale Gesellschaft Schweiz Address: Digitale Gesellschaft, c/o Swiss Privacy Foundation, CH-5620 Bremgarten AG E-mail: office (at) digitale-gesellschaft.ch	Governments have not yet been enabled to carry out their roles and responsibilities in regard to the protection of human rights in regard to Internet communication. Hence the enhanced cooperation mandate of the Tunis Agenda has not been implemented yet.

Yes	<p>(a young international NGO with seat in Switzerland) Organization: GodlyGlobal.org Address: GodlyGlobal.org c/o Norbert Bollow, Weidlistrasse 18, CH-8624 Grüt Email: nb@GodlyGlobal.org</p>	<p>The needed kind of enhanced cooperation, as per the demand of the Tunis Agenda, has not yet been implemented.</p> <p>Oversight of ICANN and IANA is still unilaterally US-based, and these institutions are still unilaterally subject to US law.</p> <p>Or consider for example the issue of the protection of communications privacy for communications via the Internet. There are no effective institutions that would allow concerned governments to cooperate in protecting their citizens and residents from trans-border surveillance by foreign intelligence services.</p>
-----	---	--

Yes	<p>Anja Kovacs, Project Director Internet Democracy Project C14E Munirka DDA Flats New Delhi 110067 India</p> <p>anja@internetdemocracy.in</p>	<p>While progress has been made in some areas over the past decade (for example, with respect to issues of critical Internet resources at ICANN, involving the role of the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) and the Government Advisory Committee (GAC)), there are still numerous Internet-related public policy issues that require to be addressed at the global level and that do not have adequate processes involving all stakeholders in place.</p> <p>In fact, over the last three years or so, we have witnessed a strong drive towards a monopolisation of Internet-related public policy making by governments. In some cases, this is asserted both nationally and globally. In other cases, this is mostly evident at the national level, with policies that undermine users' rights being implemented in a growing number of countries; even in the latter situation, however, this has negative effects for global Internet governance, as it undermines the credibility of the governments in question when they claim to seek to stall greater government control in Internet governance globally.</p> <p>This gains particular significance as the two camps that are, thus, seen to be emerging broadly align with those countries that already have control over the Internet (or are closely aligned with those that have), on the one hand, and those that do not, on the other. The resulting situation has increasingly posed an important obstacle for the further evolution of multistakeholderism and of enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders.</p> <p>It is at times difficult to escape the impression that civil society in particular have become pawns in a governments' game (we wrote about this in more detail here: http://beta.internetdemocracy.in/2013/07/pawns-in-a-governments-game/). As a consequence, more or less across the board, governments are not drawing, while discharging their duties, on the input and expertise of global civil society to the extent that the enhanced cooperation mandate requires. This has important negative consequences for Internet users around the world, as greater cooperation among all stakeholders is required to ensure that governments discharge of their duties in ways that protect the rights of not only their own citizens, but of users world wide.</p>
-----	--	--

<p>Yes</p>	<p>Country: India Organization: SFLC.IN Address: 2nd Floor, K-9, Birbal Road, Jangpura Extension, New Delhi -110 014, India. E-mail : mishi@softwarefreedom.org</p>	<p>Although there have been attempts at implementing enhanced co-operation in various organisations, these have been limited and the experience varied. Although the ITU has sent messages that it wants to involve the civil society in the deliberations, in reality the ITU has often made it difficult for the civil society to engage in a meaningful way in deliberations. The WCIT 2012 in Dubai was a case in point where it was difficult for representatives of civil society organisations to even attend many meetings, if they were not part of national delegations. ICANN has tried to involve most stakeholders including Governments in its decision making process. Although GAC in ICANN has Government and inter-governmental organisation participation, the ICANN board does not have a balanced representation from various stakeholder groups. However W3c has representation from civil society, academia, academic institutions and private bodies in its decision making process. Thus, there is a need to involve more stakeholder organisations representing all sections of the people, across geographies and across economic and other boundaries in decision making process in all inter-governmental and international organisations.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>LACNIC Latin American and Caribbean Regional Addresses Registry Rambla República de México 6215, Montevideo, Uruguay. comunicaciones@lacnic.net</p>	<p>It was implemented with significant interactions. Globally, the establishment of the IGF and the evolution experienced by other existing public fora (that become more open) should be mentioned. From the LACNIC regional perspective, there are several examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LACNIC's leadership role in the LACIGF, a truly multistakeholder example of enhanced cooperation. - LACNIC's Government Working Group, regularly debating and cooperating, online and face to face with more than 100 Government Officers. - The increased importance of non-governmental members at CITELE (OAS) with LACNIC's leadership in related matters. - The development and follow up of "eLAC strategy" with the recognition of the Internet Technical Community as a relevant stakeholder with LACNIC's representation. - LACNIC's participation in inter-governmental organizations and the cooperation with CICTE at OAS, the International Telecommunication Union, the Summit of the Americas, Mercosur, Comtelca, etc. - Constant efforts to inform and debate with our own community about Internet Governance Active engagement and also to create and support technical training programs, capacity building and other development initiatives (such as the Frida Program within the Seed Alliance).

		<p>It is important to stand out that the increased cooperative efforts have been achieved by a reciprocal willingness to interact from the different actors.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>United States Center for Democracy & Technology 1634 I Street NW #1100 Washington, DC 20006 mshears@cdt.org</p>	<p>Enhanced cooperation is not a binary event that either has or has not happened – it is an on-going process that occurs in a diversity of forms and on a diversity of issues. For example, the exchange of ideas, resources, and views that form a core component of enhanced cooperation occurs at the annual IGF, and at national and regional IGFs throughout the year. These fora discuss the gamut of Internet governance matters, including specific international Internet-related public policy matters. Key technical policy issues, including the allocation and management of Internet resources and the development of voluntary technical standards, are addressed in technically oriented multistakeholder organizations such as ICANN, the Regional Internet Registries, and the IETF. And at the national and regional level, countries such as Kenya, Brazil, Sweden, the UK, and elsewhere, are increasingly turning to the kinds of multistakeholder policy-making processes called for in enhanced cooperation when issues of governance and the Internet are discussed.</p> <p>Together the above form an important part of the evolving landscape of international Internet public policy development, one which is increasingly shaped by the concept of enhanced cooperation.</p>

Yes

While there are examples that one could point to of progress in enhanced cooperation, for example at the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN or at the Internet Governance Forum, overall, enhanced cooperation has not been implemented. To take one internet-related public policy, one cannot consider the manner in which decisions that impact online privacy globally are made to meet the WSIS criteria of transparency, accountability, multilateralism, and coordination. In fact, the recent revelations of mass surveillance should serve as a wakeup call that the current system is failing.

But perhaps focusing on the concept of enhanced cooperation is not the most effective discourse to address the shortcomings of the status quo. Governments absolutely need to find a mechanism for meaningful and concrete contributions to decision making on internet-related public policy issues, but the same needs to be said for civil society. Civil society faces the same barriers in participating in major internet-related policy making venues that many governments, particularly those in the global south, often to a more acute degree. Moreover, the Snowden revelations highlight a valuable lesson, which is when there is a lack of transparency, opportunities for abuse arise. Therefore, a concerted effort should be made to amplify the role of civil society to strengthen and promote transparency and guard against abuse within the system. As we note under question 7, however, the role of civil society goes beyond providing a check on government and corporate power.

Therefore, it may make more sense to consider what the conditions are necessary for enhanced cooperation to begin to be implemented. Or to put it differently, what is the culture under which enhanced cooperation could thrive. A good start would be to ensure that all institutions making decisions on internet-related public policy issues are open to all interested parties; transparent in the decisionmaking processes; respectful of the equal participation of all stakeholder groups; bottom up in engaging those directly affected; diverse and multilingual; and build capacity for actors and stakeholders to meaningfully participate. Adopting this culture of enhanced cooperation is an important preceding factor to encouraging the flourishing of enhanced cooperation on a number of internet-related public policy issues and across many institutions.

<p>Yes</p>	<p>Brazil</p> <p>Center for Technology and Society of Fundação Getulio Vargas Praia de Botafogo, 190, 13 andar Rio de Janeiro - RJ</p> <p>joana.varon@fgv.br marilia.maciel@fgv.br</p>	<p>Enhanced Cooperation, as mandated by the Tunis Agenda, has not yet been fully implemented. According to paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda the process towards enhanced cooperation should be started immediately by the UN Secretary-General, involving all relevant organizations. It mentions that "relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders (...) and shall be requested to provide annual performance reports". This aspect of enhanced cooperation has been implemented to some extent. Although procedures for participation need to be improved in order to include all stakeholders, many organizations have started to pursue tasks in the implementation of WSIS action lines, such as ITU, UNESCO, UNDP, WIPO and UN DESA, and have reported such tasks, as can be seen in the annual report of the SG on WSIS implementation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, this should be just the beginning of a much wider process, with the purpose to "initiate, and reinforce a transparent, democratic, and multilateral process" for internet governance. This purpose is far from being achieved. This interpretation seems to be consistent with the language in paragraphs 96 to 98 of the 2008 SG report on the progress made on the implementation of WSIS (A/63/72 - E/2008/48): "In light of the continuing differences of views on the interpretation of the Tunis Agenda, he took as a starting point the reporting requirement contained in paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda, which states that "relevant organizations shall be requested to provide annual performance reports". Thus, it can be concluded that the activities and reports from organizations are just a starting point, a little part of the implementation of EC. Enhanced cooperation should involve a wider set of actors and go beyond existing organizations from the UN system.</p> <p>Unfortunately, even though CSTD has held a series of meetings on EC, a clear institutional framework for policy making on internet public policies in a multistakeholder format that ensures participation on equal footing has not yet been proposed.</p> <p>Nowadays, addressing this issue is more urgent than ever. While no solution is reached, alternative and controversial arrangements will tend to appear. This was something evident during the World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT), where a set of ITU Member States were advocating for a traditional multilateral, States-based approach to internet governance, which could undermine the global and transborder nature of the web. Internet issues need a sui</p>
------------	--	---

generis approach to craft innovative institutional arrangement for governance. This represents a real challenge in the field of International Relations in which Governments used to be the only players on international policy making scenario, but it is also an opportunity for creative and innovative solutions.

Yes	<p>Japan, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications Kasumigaseki 2-1-2, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8926, JAPAN m3.ichikawa@soumu.go.jp</p>	<p>The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) has been held since 2006, and with the participation of stakeholders from many countries, and information has been shared and opinions have been exchanged on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. As a result, the cooperation required in solving challenges concerning international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet has been making progress.</p> <p>Furthermore, international organizations, such as the ITU, UNESCO, ICANN, and WIPO, have promoted cooperation between stakeholders and have conducted activities for capacity building.</p> <p>Considering the above, our understanding is that enhanced cooperation has been implemented to a substantial extent.</p>
Yes	<p>Cote d'Ivoire, DIGILEXIS – SPR, 28 BP 1485 Abidjan 28 kichango@gmail.com</p>	<p>It follows that for any public policy issue related to Internet governance that lacks at least one transparent, accountable, multilateral process, involving all stakeholders, for the development of globally-applicable principles to enable that issue to be addressed in a coordinated manner, or any framework or mechanisms to support such a process, the enhanced cooperation mandate is yet to be implemented. Yet varying degrees of enhanced cooperation may be instantiated here and there in the IG institutional environment.</p> <p>For example, the progress made at ICANN with respect to issues of critical Internet resources, involving the role of the Framework of Commitments (FoC) and the Government Advisory Council (GAC) may be seen as a movement towards fulfilling the enhanced cooperation mandate in that context. Less evidence of such can be seen in the work of WIPO on intellectual property enforcement, that of UNCTAD on cross-border consumer protection, that of the UN Human Rights Council on the human rights impacts of government surveillance, or that of the World Wide Web Consortium on online behavioral advertising. There are other issues still for which there is no institution with a clear responsibility to implement the enhanced cooperation mandate: for example, there is no global body that deals comprehensively with data protection and privacy rights, and similar gaps exist in many other areas of a social, economic, political and cultural nature (see question 4).</p> <p>Indeed while the IGF has developed, across now seven annual sessions, enhanced cooperation has not really got off the ground. There was a session in New York the end of 2010, seeking wider input. And CSTD has held various meetings on the subject. But enhanced cooperation – as conceived in the grand bargain of WSIS – has so far not been taken to serious steps. Meanwhile the tensions that led to the</p>

enhanced cooperation bargain are still very much in play, as illustrated by the impasse at the ITU's World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) in 2012 between governments seeking to assert greater control over the Internet, and those opposing international treaties as a method of such control. We can agree with both camps: that the enhanced cooperation mandate has not been adequately implemented, but also that going for an intergovernmental treaty is not the right way to begin implementing the EC imperative.

Yes

France, INTLNET, 120 chemin des Crouzettes,
Saint-Vincent de Barbeyrargues, France
34730, info@intlnet.org

In the area that I know (namely, OpenUse, i.e. the capacity to adequately use information, communication, and intelligence 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, ethitechnical divergences on the targeted social esthetic, 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.

Yes

Saudi Arabia, Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC)
PO Box 75606, Riyadh 11588, Saudi Arabia
MAJED ALMAZYED, mmazyed@citc.gov.sa

Art. 61 envisages a suitable framework or mechanisms with the participation of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations in their respective roles. Art. 68 recognizes the need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders.

Art. 71 states that the UN Secretary-General is to start a process towards enhanced cooperation by the end of 1Q 2006. Since no process or organization exists in which all governments develop Internet-related international public policy in consultation with all stakeholders, we must conclude that this part of the enhanced cooperation process has not been implemented.

On the other hand, Art. 71 also states that relevant organizations should start a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders and that these organizations provide annual performance reports. Indeed, some reports have been requested and provided, so this part of the process has begun. However, most reports deal with increasing cooperation among various stakeholder bodies, which does not constitute enhanced cooperation since it does not represent a process aimed at enabling governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities. Thus it is questionable whether this reporting has been meaningful to any significant extent in operationalizing enhanced cooperation.

The closest implementation of an organization that exists is the ITU Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy.

Yes

United States of America

Therefore, we note that much progress has been made to bring Internet issues to the global, multi-stakeholder community for consideration, deliberation, and action where most appropriate to the specific issue. Specific (but non-exhaustive) examples include:

1) the creation and eight annual meetings of the Internet Governance Forum, which have contributed greatly to global, multi-stakeholder dialogue and have catalyzed the proliferation of national and regional IGFs around the world;

2) Even prior to the WSIS, cooperative measures were underway, including the creation and evolution of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), a large, open, international community of network designers, operators, vendors, and researchers concerned with the evolution of the Internet architecture and the smooth operation of the Internet. The IETF develops and promotes Internet standards to meet its mission of making the Internet work better. Membership is open to individuals around the world.

3) In 2009, the United States executed the Affirmation of Commitments with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). This agreement provides a model of enhanced cooperation by establishing mechanisms and timelines for the multi-stakeholder review of ICANN's performance of its core tasks. What had once been a unique role for the U.S. government has been expanded to include the participation of the international – and multi-stakeholder – community through review processes.

4) In 2010, ICANN and UNESCO signed a memorandum of understanding to support the introduction of top-level Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) in order to offer new opportunities and benefits for Internet users around the world by allowing them to establish and use domains in their native languages and scripts. Currently there are 32 country code TLD IDNs in the root zone files, representing 22 countries and territories and 15 languages. In the coming years there is the potential for more than 100 IDN generic top level domains to be added based on the current applications into the ICANN new gTLD Program.

5) The publication of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Internet Policy-Making Principles and the extension of their implementation more globally;

6) The work of the OECD to review (with a view to updating) its 2002 Guidelines for the Security of Information Systems and Networks with global, multi-stakeholder input;

7) The work of APEC-TEL's steering groups and task forces to implement projects

and workshops that promote collaboration between APEC economies, the private sector, and the broader international community, to improve telecommunications and information infrastructure in the Asia-Pacific region

8) The creation and growth of the global Forum for Incident Response Security Teams (FIRST), an international confederation of trusted (government, industry, academic, and other) computer incident response teams who cooperatively handle security incidents and promote incident prevention programs that aims to foster cooperation and coordination in incident prevention, to stimulate rapid reaction to incidents and promote information sharing among members and the community at large;

9) The creation of the Anti-Phishing Working Group (APWG) in 2003, a global industry, law enforcement, and government coalition focused on unifying the global response to cyber crime through development of data resources, data standards and model response systems and protocols for private and public sectors. APWG has more than 2000 institutions worldwide advising: national governments; global governance bodies like ICANN; hemispheric and global trade groups; and multilateral treaty organizations such as the European Commission, Council of Europe's Convention on Cybercrime, United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Organization of American States.

10) The work of the UN component agencies to facilitate the implementation of the WSIS Action Lines, including UNESCO, the ITU, and UNCTAD. particularly in their multi-stakeholder forums for review and implementation such as the UNESCO WSIS+10 Review event in February 2013, the ITU's WSIS Action Line Forum in May, 2013, and the on-going work of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development residing in UNCTAD. In particular, enhanced cooperation is realized when these events are undertaken with an effort to broaden the participation by stakeholders, such as was evidenced by UNESCO's multi-stakeholder communiqué in February 2013 and to some extent the ITU's opening of the World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) and the World Telecommunications Policy Forum (Forum) proceedings to the multi-stakeholder community.

11) The Broadband Commission for Digital Development established by the ITU and UNESCO has worked to create social and economic value in developing countries through the power of broadband infrastructure and services. In addition, the Commission comprises a high-powered community, including top CEO and industry

leaders, senior policy-makers and government representatives, international agencies, academia, and other organizations concerned with development.

12) On 12 March 2008, the UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs (ECOSOC) invited ten organizations to provide an annual performance report on the steps they had undertaken towards enhanced cooperation on Internet-related public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. A summary of the responses has been incorporated into the report of the UN Secretary-General on progress made in the implementation of and follow-up to the World Summit on the Information Society outcomes at the regional and international levels. On 23 December 2008, the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs wrote to the same group of ten institutions, with a further request for their recommendations on how the process towards enhanced cooperation should be pursued. The ten institutions are: a. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN); b. International Telecommunication Union (ITU); c. World Wide Web Consortium (W3C); d. Council of Europe; e. Internet Society (ISOC); f. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); g. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); h. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO); i. Number Resource Organization (NRO); j. Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). A full report on progress made on enhanced cooperation can be found at: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un-dpadm/unpan039046.pdf>

13) In December 2010, the UN Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), on behalf of the Secretary-General, held another set of open consultations on enhanced cooperation on public policy issues pertaining to the Internet over a four-month period from September to December 2010. The UN Secretary General's report concluded, "Contributors generally agreed that cooperation is already taking place in many respects, although it could be enhanced in some areas; that specific issues of concern could be identified and discussed; that progress has not necessarily been the same on all issues since the holding of the World Summit on the Information Society in 2005; and that existing cooperation mechanisms should be used to the extent that they were helpful." A report detailing the outcome of enhanced cooperation from these meetings can be found at: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan045826.pdf>

14) The CSTD has also undertaken a series of serious initiatives to implement enhanced cooperation. Its first step, as instructed by UNGA resolution (A/RES/66/184) was to convene a one-day open, inclusive and interactive to identify a shared understanding of enhanced cooperation, along with the actions that have

been taken thus far. Moreover, the UNGA established this working group for the purposes of discussing how we can continue enhancing cooperation in the future.

Yes

United States, Intel, 12 Poet Drive, Matawan NJ, 07747, Mike.s.chartier@intel.com

3. To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented?

First, it is important to recognize that enhancing cooperation among all stakeholders is an ongoing goal rather than an end state. We have seen dramatic enhancement of cooperation among stakeholders well in advance of and in furtherance to the Tunis Agenda. The tremendous progress in this area over the past 10 to 15 years, and much of the momentum and initiative, has been driven by the private sector. Some examples are:

- Creation of AFNOG – 1999
- Creation of LacNic – 1999
- Establishment of AP-STAR - 2000
 - o APOPS
 - o APTLD
 - o APNIC
 - o APRICOT
 - o APIX
 - o APIA
- CCTLD Operator Communities
 - o LACTLD
 - o AFTLD
 - o APTLD
- IXP Operator Associations
 - o Euro IX
 - o Lac IX
 - o AF IX
- Creation of FIRST - 1999
- Adoption of the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime – 2001
- Creation of the G8 24-7 Cybercrime Network –
- Creation of FrNOG - 2002
- Creation of the Anti Phishing Working Group – 2003
- Establishment of SANOG - 2003
- Creation of the Messaging and Anti Abuse Working Group - 2004
- Creation of AfriNIC – 2005
- Creation of the IGF – 2005
- Creation of ENISA – 2005
- Creation of Global Internet Freedom Consortium - 2006
- ITU IMPACT

- Creation of the Security and Prosperity Steering Group in APEC TEL – 2006
- Creation of AusNOG - 2007
- Creation of the OECD Internet Policymaking Principles - 2011
- Establishment of the UN Broadband Commission - 2010
- Deployment of DNSSEC at the Root Zone – 2010
- ITU Child Online Protection Initiative – (TBD)
- ICANN
 - o United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 2009
 - o ICANN and UNESCO Letter of Intent 2010
 - o Russian Association of Networks and Services 2008
 - o Lomonosov Moscow State University Institute for Information Security Issues 2008
 - o Inter-American Telecommunications Commission of the Organization of American States
 - o African Telecommunications Union (ATU) Announcement 2007
 - o United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA) Announcement 2007
 - o Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization (CTO)
 - o Pacific Islands Telecommunications Association (PITA) Announcement (2007)
- Creation of SGNOC - 2011
- Establishment of CaribNOG – 2012
- AIS – Africa Internet Summit – 2012
- AFNOG
- AfriNIC
- AfricaCERT
- AfREN
- AyiTIC Internet for Development– 2013
- Proliferation of regional IGFs
 - 12 in 2011
 - 9 in 2012
 - 9 in 2013
- Proliferation of national IGFs
 - 23 in 2011
 - 16 in 2012
 - 18 in 2013
- Other IGF related initiatives
 - 2 in 2011

- 2 in 2012
- 4 in 2013
- 90 ISOC Chapters around the world
- Alliance for Affordable Internet
- Internet.Org

As shown above, many of the existing bodies such as OECD, UNESCO, ICANN, ISOC, and the ITU have undertaken initiatives to improve participation and cooperation between stakeholders. Moreover in the private sector companies and associations are coordinating key stakeholders, including governments, for capacity building and knowledge sharing

Yes	<p>Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet) www.kictanet.or.ke, and the Internet Society (ISO) Kenya Chapter http://isoc.or.ke/</p> <p>Contacts: Mwenda Kivuva (Kivuva@transworldafrica.com) Meshack Emakunat (memakunat@yahoo.com) Grace Githaiga (ggithaiga@hotmail.com (M</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IGF contains aspects of enhanced cooperation where different stakeholders coalesce. But since the outcomes of IGF are not binding, many stakeholders do not take it seriously thus do not participate with the force and intensity as is seen in binding groupings like the UN General assembly where members take very tough stances. • Since there is no formal setting where the stakeholders are mandated to participate, then enhanced cooperation has not been implemented, and there is no deliberate effort to encourage stakeholders to come together. • Enhanced cooperation is implemented directly and indirectly by the different stakeholders in the national ICT policies.
Yes	<p>Switzerland, Federal Office of Communications OFCOM, 44 rue de l'Avenir, CH-2501 Biel/Bienne, Switzerland ir@bakom.admin.ch</p>	<p>Enhanced cooperation is an ongoing process that has no end. In many internet-related public policy issues, cooperation between governments but also with relevant other stakeholders has significantly increased since 2005. However, the degree of implementation of the process of enhanced cooperation varies from Internet-related public policy issue to Internet-related public policy issue.</p>

<p>Yes</p>	<p>Finland, Government and other parties include the multi-stakeholder WSIS working group which acts also as steering committee for the Finnish Internet Forum Mervi.Kultamaa@FORMIN.FI</p>	<p>Even though some governments and rare civil society entities persist in claiming that EC has not happened, because UNSG did not start the process towards it “during the first quarter of 2006”, it has in fact been successfully implemented both in its broad and narrow sense.</p> <p>On the basis of reports from ten relevant organizations, UNSG noted (E/2009/82) that all had made efforts to reach out to other stakeholders. Most had interpreted EC as a process to facilitate and contribute to multi-stakeholder dialogue, through formal or informal cooperative arrangements.</p> <p>In his 2011 report, UNSG noted that “cooperation on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet had been enhanced to varying degrees in many organizations and across a wide spectrum of areas”, although there still was “room for for continued dialogue, in particular among States, given their rights and responsibilities in international public policymaking”.</p> <p>A couple of examples of ever-intensifying EC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been a remarkable development in relations between ICANN and ITU. The ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in 2010 resolved to explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between ITU and relevant organizations (including, but not limited to ICANN, the RIRs, the IETF, ISOC and W3C, on the basis of reciprocity basis) involved in the development of IP-based networks and the future Internet. - The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of ICANN has become more representative, gained more stature and assumed a more operational role. It now has more than 120 states as members, including China and Russia, and its member countries cover more than 95% of the Internet user population of the planet. -The Internet Governance Forum has proven to be a successful venue for all stakeholders to come together and discuss Internet public policy issues. See reply to question 9.
------------	---	--

Yes	France, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 38 Cours Albert 1er 75008 Paris, aha@iccwbo.org	<p>Enhanced cooperation is not a mandate; it is a method of operation and a culture of cooperation between stakeholders, including relevant organizations. There are many examples of enhanced cooperation that can be drawn from the initiatives of ICANN, the ITU, ISOC, UNESCO, the OECD, and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, to name a few. It is also happening in the context of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), which brings together different stakeholders—nationally, regionally and globally—to discuss policy matters in an open setting, and among a wide range of organizations and stakeholders.</p> <p>Specifically, we could like to draw attention to the OECD’s ground-breaking work in developing Internet Policy Principles, which was undertaken in a multistakeholder context, as well as its efforts to develop new approaches to on-line privacy and cybersecurity by convening multistakeholder experts groups. APEC has also made important contributions to this space with its development of the Cross-Border Privacy Regulation system and engagement with the EU in implementing the concept of interoperability, a process that has entailed input from numerous stakeholders. Similarly, APEC has endeavoured to set forth principles for both developed and emerging economies alike for the development of a healthy digital ecosystem through its Digital Prosperity Checklist.</p> <p>The Internet, and thus issues relevant to the Internet touch a wide range of forums, and stakeholders. As a result, cooperation among different institutions, partnerships, and enhancing operations enables the different interests, those impacted by an issue, and stakeholders, to discuss policy matters openly.</p>
Yes	Czech Republic, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, Na Frantisku 32, 110 15 Prague 1, novakovam@mpo.cz	Being donors, we perceive that the cooperation has been improving, e.g. through general discussion and information and experience exchange. Good example is the recently held WTPF.
Yes	Russian Federation, The council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (the Upper Chamber) 103426, Moscow, Bolshaya Dmitrovka str., 26 rugattarov@council.gov.ru	The international scandal connected with disclosure of personal data in different countries in favor of the specific country, showed that there is a need to improve international relations to create common cyber-policy. Of course, we are talking about complex, delicate and sometimes contradictory process that must take place under the influence of many factors, but the way I see, this process is the natural extension of the Internet and associated technologies. We are to make a safe environment, which can unite national interests, legal rules and practical international arrangements.

Yes	<p>Mexico</p> <p>1) Camara Nacional de las Industria Electronica de telecomunicaciones y tecnologias de la informacion (CANIETI) Culiácan No. 71 col. Hipodromo Condesa México D.F.</p> <p>2) Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor (INDAUTOR), Puebla #143, Colonia Roma</p>	<p>INDAUTOR: En el ámbito de su competencia este instituto no cuenta con elementos para responder esta pregunta.</p> <p>CANIETI: A nivel internacional sigue habiendo diferendos como la canalización de la banda d 700 MHz, con dos modelos predominantes, el Americano y el Asiático. México se definió por el asiático por temas de su eficiencia operativa.</p>
Yes	<p>United States of America, United States Council for International Business (USCIB), 1400 K Street, NW, Suite 905, Washington, DC 20005 bwanner@uscib.org</p>	<p>Enhanced cooperation is not a mandate; it is a method of operation and a culture of cooperation between stakeholders, including relevant organizations. There are many examples of enhanced cooperation that have served to promote the development of ICT infrastructure and services in both developed and developing countries alike. And ICT infrastructure and services are critical; studies by the World Bank, the Internet Society (ISOC), McKinsey & Co. and other global economic experts have shown a clear and positive correlation between investment in high-speed networks and the growth of economic activity, productivity, and jobs creation. Examples of enhanced cooperation can be drawn from the initiatives of ICANN, the ITU, ISOC, UNESCO, the OECD, and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, to name a few. Importantly, it is happening in the context of the IGF (Internet Governance Forum), which brings together different stakeholders -- nationally, regionally and globally -- to discuss policy matters in an open setting. (Please see our response to question #9.)</p> <p>Specifically, we could like to draw attention to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The OECD's ground-breaking work in developing Internet Policy Principles (IPP), which was undertaken in a multistakeholder context. A Voluntary Group has been convened to enable multistakeholder dialogue on challenges at the regional, national, and local levels with IPP implementation. This initiative will help to make sound Internet governance principles and their related economic benefits more accessible to non-OECD developing countries; -The OECD also has used a multistakeholder approach in order to update earlier guidelines on on-line privacy and cybersecurity that ultimately will serve as models for both developed and developing countries;

-Soon after its Ministerial Meeting on “The Future of the Internet Economy” in June 2008, the OECD broadened stakeholder involvement in its policy development process by recognizing the technical community (Internet Technical Advisory Committee) as a participant, joining government and business (Business and Industry Advisory Committee) participants;

-APEC has made important contributions to this space with its development of the Cross-Border Privacy Regulation system and engagement with the EU in implementing the concept of interoperability. This process has entailed input from numerous stakeholders and potentially will yield a practical approach to ensuring privacy of cross-border data flows;

-APEC has endeavoured to set forth principles for both developed and emerging economies alike for the development of a healthy digital ecosystem through its Digital Prosperity Checklist;

-APNIC has established relationships with various regional and global organizations aimed at enhancing understanding throughout the Asia Pacific region of the technical operation of the Internet. These partnerships range from the Advanced Science and Technology Institute, Philippines to the Beijing Internet Institute, Dhaka University, to the Internet Service Providers Association of Pakistan, among many others. See <https://www.apnic.net/community/support/memberships-and-partnerships/>;

-As we discuss in Question 8, ICANN has concluded numerous partnership MOUs, particularly with relative newcomer countries to the Internet economy. Notably, in 2007, ICANN concluded an MOU with the African Union expressly aimed at “increasing awareness about Internet Governance issues and working together on the development and growth of the Internet in Africa;” and

-The Internet Society (ISOC) produced a ground-breaking study that quantifies for the first time how IXPs enable Kenya and Nigeria to save millions in telecommunications costs and raise additional revenues in these countries while simultaneously speeding local data exchange, and encouraging the development of locally hosted content and services

Yes	<p>43 civil society organizations, 10 of them with ECOSOC consultive status, and many more individuals.</p> <p>Organizations supporting the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action Aid International (ECOSOC status) 2. Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication, Bangladesh (EC 	.
Yes	<p>INDIA, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations Office 9, RUE DU VALAIS, 1202, GENEVA Mission.india@ties.itu.int</p>	<p>Enhanced Cooperation, as envisaged in Paras 68 and 69 of the Tunis Agenda, has not been realized. This remains a major shortcoming in implementation of WSIS Outcomes related to Enhanced Cooperation, considering that a specific mandate was given by the World Summit for Information Society (WSIS) in 2005 to begin such a process of Enhanced Cooperation in the first quarter of 2006.</p> <p>There is no multilateral, transparent and democratic global platform where governments can, on an equal footing, decide the full range of international public policies related to internet, in a holistic manner. There is also no mechanism for the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues including those pertaining to coordination and management of critical Internet resources. Not establishing an Enhanced Cooperation process has denied the Governments an opportunity to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public-policy issues pertaining to the internet.</p>

<p>Yes</p>	<p>LATVIA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission.un-gen@mfa.gov.lv</p>	<p>Enhanced cooperation is an ongoing process and it has been implemented with variable intensity. There are many excellent examples of the results of enhanced cooperation in different areas. At the same time, one can identify issues where progress could have been more substantive.</p> <p>The organization of an annual multi-stakeholder dialogue at the international level and proliferation of such practices at the regional and national levels around the world should be considered as a successful manifestation of enhanced cooperation. Substantive multi-stakeholder participation at important intergovernmental conferences since 2005 should also be applauded. The evolution of ICANN's relationship with the U.S. government and the increased role of the Government Advisory Committee within ICANN are also major results of enhanced cooperation.</p> <p>At the same time, there has not been sufficient progress in identifying the scope of public policy issues, especially given that there is a public policy component in all important questions pertaining to the Internet. An attempt has been made by the ITU Council to create a list but the document hasn't been discussed and endorsed by other stakeholder groups. Hence, the concept may still have different interpretations by different stakeholder groups.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>BULGARIA, Law and Internet Foundation, bul. Patriarh Evtimii 36, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria info@netlaw.bg</p>	<p>The current status of the implementation with opinions varying on the amount of progress made on this matter since 2005, with some of the view that the process, as highlighted in the Tunis Agenda, is still in its preliminary stages, while others have noted that significant enhanced cooperation is already happening in varying degrees between organizations and through different forums.</p> <p>One of the persons that believes significant enhanced cooperation is happening is Mr. Kummer. According to him, the spreading of the multi-stakeholder approach helps governments reach better decision. For example, in Kenya it has led to a change in the constitution. Kenya has introduced a mandatory requirement for multi-stakeholder processes in all policy area, thus enhancing participatory democracy. This can serve as an example for the impact and of enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation. Another example is that the Internet Society and other Internet organizations have reached out to governments and intergovernmental organizations and encouraged them to become involved in Internet governance processes.</p> <p>According to Intellectual Property Watch the UN system so far has failed to implement important aspects of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) and the so-</p>

		<p>called enhanced cooperation resolution from the 2005 World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) – which organized the WSIS – is the most relevant specialized institution that has continued to violate the multi-stakeholder principle by excluding civil society stakeholders.</p>
Yes	<p>BULGARIA, Department of Administration Modernization, Council of Ministers, 1 Dondukov Blvd.1594 Sofia is.ivanov@government.bg</p>	<p>The process of enhanced cooperation would appear to be at an early stage of its development, with enormous prospects for future advancement.</p>
Yes	<p>Country: Bulgaria Organization: Information Technology and eGovernance Directorate, Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications Address: Sofia, 9 Dyakon Ignatii Str. E-mail: hhrstov@mtitc.government.bg</p>	<p>Admittedly there is lack of common understanding on enhanced cooperation on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. However, there is common understanding that governments have an important role in Internet governance, within the multistakeholder framework established by the Tunis Agenda.</p> <p>A considerable part of enhanced cooperation has been achieved so far at a global level and through international organizations in particular. During years this kind of cooperation has become visible to the public. This cooperation was apparent in existing Internet governance mechanisms, including the Internet Governance Forum, the Governmental Advisory Committee and other mechanisms of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, a variety of other intergovernmental, international and Internet organisations, as well as more informal mechanisms and arrangements. It is suggested that enhanced cooperation could be developed starting from these existing mechanisms already taking place, although there are certain gaps.</p> <p>In greater detail various international fora contribute to it and mainly the IGF where the accomplishments and future developments of enhanced cooperation have been thoroughly discussed (for instance in Baku at the IGF in 2012 see Report of IGF 7, Baku). The problem however, is how to coordinate the efforts made at different</p>

levels and achieve tangible results. Paragraph 80 of the Agenda calls for "the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet" as " means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals." The most difficult coordination is the coordination at a regional and local level in order to find ways to harness the energy and resources of regional and local people and communities. The contribution of the latter is of crucial importance if we wish to establish open and inclusive information society and should be more distinctive and recognizable. A good example of a regional cooperation initiative is the Eurodig – the pan European platform for open and inclusive discussion on Internet governance among European countries. Despite wide promotion and participation in Eurodig and similar platforms a possible avenue toward enhanced cooperation is also the creation of a network of national IGFs which can provide local input and experience. As far as Bulgaria is concerned enhanced cooperation has been implemented to a certain extent. Bulgaria has made progress in ICT in recent years. The international comparative data show that Bulgaria comes nearer the average for the EU usage of ICT. While satisfactory for the country as a whole, the degree of completeness of the ICT network in some of the regions, and notably in the Northwest NUTS 2 Region and in all rural areas, is lagging behind the desired level. According to some national surveys, the share of people who have never used Internet is not satisfactory enough in Bulgaria. The share of young people using computer every day is lagging behind the EU average. The Bulgarian e-government project is taking shape, providing scores of administrative services to both citizens and businesses. As far as Bulgaria is concerned enhanced cooperation has been implemented to a certain extent. Bulgaria has made progress in ICT in recent years. The international comparative data show that Bulgaria doesn't reach the average for the EU usage of ICT. While satisfactory for the country as a whole, the degree of completeness of the ICT network in some of the regions, and notably in the Northwest NUTS 2 Region and in all rural areas, is lagging behind the desired level. According to some national surveys, the share of people who have never used Internet is relatively high in Bulgaria. The share of young people using computer every day is lagging behind the EU average. Against this generally promising background the Bulgarian e-government project is taking shape, providing scores of administrative services to both citizens and businesses.

Yes	Bulgaria, Executive Agency Electronic Communication Networks and Information Systems. Bulgaria 1000 "Gurko 6" str. mail@esmis.government.bg	Paragraph 80 of the Agenda calls for "the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet" as "means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals."
Yes	Bulgaria, Council of Ministers, Strategic Development and Coordination Directorate 1 Dondukov Blvd 1594 Sofia y.stoyanov@government.bg, l.kamenova@government.bg	As far as Bulgaria is concerned enhanced cooperation has been implemented to a certain extent. Bulgaria has made progress in ICT in recent years. The international comparative data show that Bulgaria comes nearer the average for the EU usage of ICT. While satisfactory for the country as a whole, the degree of completeness of the ICT network in some of the regions, and notably in the Northwest NUTS 2 Region and in all rural areas, is lagging behind the desired level. According to some national surveys, the share of people who have never used Internet is not satisfactory enough in Bulgaria. The share of young people using computer every day is lagging behind the EU average. The Bulgarian e-government project is taking shape, providing scores of administrative services to both citizens and businesses.
Yes	Bulgaria, Bissera Zankova - Media Adviser to the Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications (MTITC) Sofia, 9 Diakon Ignatii Str. bzankova@gmail.com	Enhanced cooperation may have different meanings. Enhanced cooperation particularly means intensive collaboration and exchange at all levels - global, regional and local. A considerable part of enhanced cooperation has been achieved so far at a global level and through international organizations in particular. During years this kind of cooperation has become visible to the public. Various international fora contribute to it and mainly the IGF where the accomplishments and future developments of enhanced cooperation have been thoroughly discussed (for instance in Baku at the IGF in 2012 see Report of IGF 7 Baku). The problem however, is how to coordinate the efforts made at different levels and achieve tangible results. The most difficult coordination is the coordination at a regional and local level in order to find ways to harness the energy and resources of regional and local people and communities. The contribution of the latter is of crucial importance if we wish to establish open and inclusive information society and should be more distinctive and recognizable. A good example of a regional cooperation initiative is the Eurodig – the pan European platform for open and inclusive discussion on Internet governance among European countries. Despite wide promotion and participation in Eurodig and similar platforms a possible avenue toward enhanced

		<p>cooperation is also the creation of a network of national IGFs which can provide local input and experience. See http://www.ifla.org/events/eurodig</p> <p>The Pan-European dialogue on Internet governance (EuroDIG) is an open platform for informal and inclusive discussion and exchange on public policy issues related to Internet Governance (IG) between stakeholders from all over Europe.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Academy of Sciences (IMI-BAS and LT-BAS) Sofia 1113, Acad. G. Bonchev Block 8 Director@math.bas.bg, Yoshinov@cc.bas.bg</p>	<p>Paragraph 80 of the Agenda calls for "the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet" as " means to support development efforts to achieve internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals."</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski" Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics 5 James Bouchier Blvd. Sofia 1164, Bulgaria krassen@fmi.uni-sofia.bg</p>	<p>This enhanced cooperation is definitely in place. But it is difficult to measure how far is the society in the direction of achieving the Tunis Agenda goals. Latest free democratic movements in many countries organized through Internet are the main achievement and show the great importance of Internet and sharing of knowledge and ideas inside knowledge society, helping people in different regions to improve their life. Different crime and terrorist actions also organized through Internet show one definite weakness of the enhance cooperation and shows directions for improvement in order to guarantee secure life for all citizens and the society as a whole.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy and Energy 8 Slavyanska str., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria ts.tsankova@mee.government.bg</p>	<p>.</p>

Yes

Country: Switzerland
Organization: Internet Society
Address: Galerie Jean-Malbuisson 15
Email: bommelaer@isoc.org

Since the WSIS, stakeholders have achieved tremendous progress in terms of developing their working relationships. Some inter-governmental organisations have made institutional arrangements to allow stakeholders to take part in their decision-making processes. For example, since 2008 the OECD has opened its working processes to the participation of the technical community (ITAC) as well as civil society (CSISAC), in addition to the existing business and industry actors (BIAC). These nongovernmental stakeholders have been invited to provide their expertise and contribute to formal OECD policy instruments on issues such as privacy, cybersecurity, infrastructure development or digital growth. In addition, these stakeholder groups had the opportunity to negotiate on an equal footing with governments for the 2011 OECD High Level Principles on the Future of the Internet Economy.

Many other inter-governmental organisations have taken positive steps to cooperate with non-governmental stakeholders, including the Council for Europe, UNESCO or APEC for example.

Meanwhile, non-governmental stakeholders (business, civil-society, the technical and academic community) have also developed multistakeholder partnerships with governmental and inter-governmental organisations in a view to achieving the WSIS goals. For example, the Internet Society (ISOC) has undertaken the necessary steps to obtain the ECOSOC status, enabling participation in a wide range of UN fora, including ones not traditionally attended by the Internet community (e.g. Human Rights Council). ISOC is working closely with intergovernmental organizations such as CITELE, ATU and APT to provide seminars on a range of issues such as Spam, Open Standards and interconnection and to contribute to the policy development process in the regions. We are learning from colleagues from developing countries and hope that our participation has enhanced the dialogue.

It should also be noted that the IGF provides a key international platform for all stakeholders to share experiences, expertise and concerns on all Internet public policy issues. It is a platform that reinforces cooperation by reducing barriers between different stakeholder groups. Strengthening the IGF Secretariat would therefore play an important role in further enhancing cooperation locally, regionally and internationally.

Yes

Division for the Information Society (DI)
Ministry of External Relations - Brazil
Tel: +55 (61) 2030-6609 - FAX: +55 (61) 2030-6613

We take due note of the view that a number of positive developments have been taking place within institutions, fora, organizations and processes dealing with the Internet which contribute to the purpose of “enabling governments...to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet...”. In that light it is argued by many that enhanced cooperation is already taking place.

Brazil acknowledges and applauds positive developments that have taken or are taking place in different fora, even though it must be recognized that much progress and improvements are needed to allow for “enhanced cooperation” as envisioned by the Tunis Agenda to be fully implemented within those existing fora.

Brazil considers, on the other hand, as we look at the universe of entities dealing with the Internet, that there are lacunae related, at least, to the following aspects: (i) there is no “locus” for decision-making (or at least for the formation of consensus) on some important issues requiring international public policies including “emerging issues” such as the debate between security and privacy; (ii) there is no global platform where governments can, on an equal footing, address the full range of international public policies related to the Internet in a holistic and cross-cutting manner; and (iii) there is no mechanism at the international level with a mandate to oversee the work of organizations dealing with critical Internet resources.

It can therefore be said that the process of “enhanced cooperation”, as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda, has not yet been implemented.

At this point it is important to highlight that Brazil would not like to take a position based exclusively on the denunciation of the historical failure to start the process towards enhanced cooperation by the end of the first quarter of 2006 as per paragraph 71. In other words, we do not intend to take a stand merely based on demand for compliance with the text agreed back in 2005 (even though this remains an important element for consideration). We suggest, rather, that we should collectively engage in the exercise proposed by General Assembly Resolution 67/195 by also taking into full account developments that have taken place since 2005.

That is why Brazil has suggested that as a first step a “mapping” of the activities and initiatives being undertaken by existing institutions, fora, organizations and processes should be drawn. This would allow a clear assessment of what has or has not taken place (towards enhanced cooperation) and to explore possible improvements and remedies. In our view this would also reveal the existence of “gaps” from the point of view of implementing enhanced cooperation.

