

Timestamp

9/3/2013 11:19:06

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?

Yes

Please enter your contact details:

United States of America

1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?

Government

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**1) Significance**

The significance of enhanced cooperation in the context of the Tunis Agenda was the recognition by the global community of a shared commitment to multi-stakeholder Internet governance.

Paragraph 29, the first paragraph on Internet governance in the Tunis Agenda, states that, "the international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent, and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations." This statement clearly acknowledges that due to the distributed nature of the Internet, no single institution, arrangement, or instrument is able to manage the entirety of its policy demands and infrastructure. Instead, a variety of stakeholders contribute to Internet governance, which as paragraph 31 states, "...is an essential element for a people-centered, inclusive, development-oriented and non-discriminatory Information Society."

2) Purpose

The purpose of enhanced cooperation is to improve and strengthen the cooperation between and within existing institutions and organizations. As paragraph 37 of the Tunis Agenda states, "We seek to improve the coordination of the activities of international and intergovernmental organizations and other institutions concerned with Internet governance and the exchange of information among themselves. A multistakeholder approach should be adopted, as far as possible, at all levels."

The purpose of enhanced cooperation was not to create new Internet governance bodies or to transfer responsibilities of any Internet stakeholder to other parties (as have been proposed by some). Rather, the purpose of enhanced cooperation is quite the opposite: the Tunis Agenda, in paragraph 55, "recognize[d] that the existing arrangements for Internet governance have worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust, dynamic, and geographically diverse medium that it is today, with the private sector taking the lead in day-to-day operations, and with innovation and value creation at the edges."

The global community recognized that these existing arrangements could be improved through more robust, or enhanced, cooperation. In the 8 years since the Tunis Agenda was adopted, such enhanced – and multi-stakeholder – cooperation has led to considerable improvements. Internet governance is more inclusive, globally representative, and responsible to the needs of all stakeholders today than it was in 2005.

3) Scope

Within the framework of the Tunis Agenda, particularly paragraphs 68-72, enhanced

cooperation is described in reference to public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues.

The United Nations Secretary-General's 2011 Report, Enhanced Cooperation on public policy issues pertaining to the Internet (A/66/77-E/2011/103), which was based upon consultations with international organizations, civil society, and private sector entities stated that, "despite the multiplicity of positions regarding exactly how enhanced cooperation should be pursued, there seemed to be a convergence of opinion that Internet governance involved many dimensions and layers of cooperation with diverse forms of stakeholder consultation suited to different types of policy innovation and a need for consistency with due legal process." Given this broad construct, enhanced cooperation is interdisciplinary in nature and inclusive of many cooperative and collaborative measures, programs, and/or initiatives undertaken by any combination of stakeholders to achieve either discrete or broad objectives that meet the goals of the WSIS.

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.

Enhanced cooperation is evolutionary and has been implemented on a broad, global scale. Much like the goals and objectives of the WSIS, enhanced cooperation is an on-going endeavor. 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.

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

The most important international public policy issue pertaining to the Internet is to ensure its future as an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable cyberspace.

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

Enhanced cooperation, as outlined in the WSIS Outcomes (including the Tunis Agenda), includes all stakeholders and, as noted above, can be used to address policy issues. Given the diversity of issues, it may be counterproductive to narrowly prescribe set roles and responsibilities to the respective stakeholders, including governments. The important thing about roles and responsibilities in implementing enhanced cooperation is that it requires collaboration amongst the stakeholders – and certainly active and robust consultation even in actions that are considered the purview of government in public policy making – in order to realize the goal of an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable cyberspace. Further, that collaboration needs to occur in an inclusive, global way, utilizing existing multi-stakeholder institutions and other cooperative venues for engagement and in a flexible way to ensure that any one effort takes all considerations into account and encourages broader and more creative problem solving.

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?

As noted in the United Nations Secretary General's Report, Progress made in the implementation and follow-up to the World Summit on the Information Society outcomes at the regional and international levels (A/64/64-E/2009/10), "the [enhanced cooperation] process was begun in 2006 by the Special Advisor to the Secretary-General for Internet governance."

The greatest contribution to enhanced cooperation by governments is to maximize their participation in existing Internet-related forums and institutions. One prime example is the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN, in which all the world's governments have equal rights and responsibilities for providing advice on issues of public policy related to the domain name systems. Another is the Internet Governance Forum, which convenes annually on a fully multi-stakeholder basis, both in its preparation and its proceedings. Furthermore, government engagement with stakeholders on national and regional bases is important to address issues that may have implications and opportunities in a more local environment that can then be carried into more global venues.

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

Existing Internet organizations have taken steps to improve their outreach to all stakeholders. For example, technical organizations have adapted to provide governments meaningful opportunities to have their views considered. This practice can and should continue. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) hosted a WSIS+10 review event in February, 2013 that included participation from all stakeholders. These various stakeholders worked together to draft the final statement from the event, "Information and Knowledge For All: an expanded vision and a renewed commitment" which represents a true multistakeholder vision. The process employed by UNESCO should be a model for other intergovernmental organizations that address Internet-related issues. Introducing new stakeholders into organizations' processes invites new perspectives and competencies. Given the distributed nature of the Internet, participation from all stakeholders, including government, industry, and civil society, produces more creative and flexible policy solutions than any one party can achieve working alone.

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

The current arrangements associated with these issues are successfully implementing the mandate of enhanced cooperation as articulated in the Tunis Agenda. There is neither one mechanism nor one stakeholder group that can address the multitude of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

ICANN remains the most appropriate mechanism for coordination of the domain name systems and, along with the regional Internet registries (RIRs), is the best mechanism for global allocation of Internet protocol (IP) numbers. These bodies are multi-stakeholder and provide a role for governments to participate on equal footing. The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) have provided for an Internet that is open, interoperable, and innovative. OECD and APEC promote collaboration among members and global stakeholders to share best practices and make recommendations address across a range of Internet/ICT policy and economic issues ; and UNESCO works with stakeholders to address freedom of expression, multilingualism, local content, and building knowledge societies. Several organizations address specifically cybersecurity and cybercrime elements, including the OSCE, ARF, the Council of Europe and the Budapest Convention, the Forum of Incident Response Security Teams (FIRST), the Meridian Process and Conference, the Organization of American States (OAS), and Asia Pacific Computer Emergency Response Team (AP/CERT). There are many mechanisms that are addressing the various Internet issues, as appropriate to their specific participating and interested stakeholder groups, their expertise, and their mission, and this list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive. We encourage all stakeholders to leverage these mechanisms in the fullest way possible.

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

Notwithstanding the Information and communications technologies for development Resolution 67/195 from the United Nations regarding the relationship between enhanced cooperation and the Internet Governance Forum, the IGF is, in fact, one of the best examples of enhanced cooperation effected since Tunis.

The IGF also warrants this status because it fosters enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation, not only in the proceedings of its annual, global forum, but also in the planning and preparation for that forum over the course of the intervening year, including its consultative processes and its incorporation of the regional and national initiatives that occur between the annual IGF. In short, the United States believes that the IGF is the epitome of the multi-stakeholder processes that have made the Internet an engine of economic growth, innovation, and empowerment of individual citizens around the world. The IGF provides the premier and regular opportunity for governments, industry, civil society, and the technical community to address Internet issues in a broad, creative, and collaborative manner.

The CSTD's Working Group on Improvements to the IGF made excellent recommendations for improving the IGF, including increasing participation in the IGF, capturing the outputs from the proceedings, etc., and we look forward to working with the international community to implement those recommendations.

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

It is critical to address the effective role of developing countries in global Internet governance as all nations commit to closing the digital divide. The Internet requires financial investment for infrastructure, education, and other human capacity-building, and its adoption has not been uniform across developing countries. Many have made amazing progress over the last decade to expand ICT investment and mobile phone and Internet services, while others are still behind. Lessons learned from the pace-setters are being shared with countries facing similar situations. Sharing of lessons learned and best practices is on-going and should continue through organizations such as UNESCO, ITU, the UN Commission for Science and Technology for Development, regional and national IGF initiatives, among others, and they could be extended through south-to-south focused forums.

Moreover, existing Internet institutions have made many efforts to engage developing countries, for example, to increase participation in the IGF and the IGF's Multistakeholder Advisory Group, ICANN, and other bodies. These efforts are having results further progress in

inevitable. Such efforts may include locating more meetings in developing countries, making translation services available during meetings, enabling remote participation in meetings, providing scholarships for travel and exchanges programs, and providing advanced training and capacity building. These opportunities are and should be made available to all interested stakeholder groups in developing countries – governments, industry, civil society, and technical community alike through concerted efforts by philanthropic private companies and foundations, international development banks, and national organizations such as the U.S. Agency for International Development. In addition, governments from developing countries can become more involved in global Internet governance by participating more regularly in the multi-stakeholder mechanisms such as the IGF and other Internet institutions, consulting with all stakeholders to deepen their expertise and understanding of the global Internet community, and ensuring that local needs and priorities are being addressed. The CSTD's Working Group on Improvements to the IGF made excellent recommendations for improving the IGF, including increasing developing country participation in the IGF, as we look forward to working with the international community to implement those recommendations.

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?

While much progress has been made in outreach and engagement by Internet institutions and in the level of engagement by stakeholders around the world, barriers remain to participation in global Internet governance. At the most basic level, there are many stakeholders that do not have access to proximate education and training opportunities. Further, many are simply not aware of the venues and forums that exist for Internet governance. Targeted education and awareness programs can be very helpful in this regard and should be fostered. For many of those that are aware of venues and forums for engagement, financial barriers to participation often remain. While some educational programs exist and some funding for participation is available, additional educational efforts and funding to support engagement in global Internet governance for stakeholders around the world, both in person and through remote participation, would help overcome this barrier.

As noted in responses to previous questions, the major multi-stakeholder organizations involved with Internet governance – namely ISOC, the IETF, W3C, and ICANN – are constantly making efforts to achieve full participation from all interested stakeholders around the globe. ISOC, for example, has been taking steps to help countries become more informed about the IETF and to help facilitate greater developing country participation. Their IETF fellowships have funded over 450 engineers from developing countries to attend the IETF and, since 2012, ISOC has sponsored a program that brought over 40 government representatives to attend IETF meetings around the world. These are the types of initiatives that must continue.

Mindful that most countries now have broadband capabilities in urban centers, and many international organizations such as the World Bank, other IDBs, UN offices, and private companies operate in-country video conferencing capabilities, the potential exists for doing more topic-focused and more frequent virtual sessions for developing country stakeholders who request them. This could be undertaken at a regional level to address commonly-shared Internet governance issues that require attention, featuring countries with greater experience and success stories to share them.

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

As noted in our response to question 11, targeted awareness programs and additional funding to support engagement can help remove barriers to participation in global Internet governance, and those actions can also be targeted to promote the effective participation of marginalized people in the global information society. Consideration should be given to hosting specific events that engage rural populations, those with limited language and literacy, women and youth, and those with disabilities. These events could focus on solutions that have overcome barriers for these populations, such as case studies, training and education programs, and access to affordable broadband in rural and peri-urban communities. Further, while much progress has been made to achieve affordable access to the Internet, more needs to be done to promote participation by all people in the information society.

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

The very reason for the WSIS, as articulated in Paragraph 1 of the Declaration of Principles, was the global community's "common desire and commitment to build a people-centered, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society, where everyone can create, access, utilize and share information and knowledge, enabling individual, communities and peoples to achieve their full potential in promoting their sustainable development and improving their quality of life, premised on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and respecting fully and upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Everything that followed was written in the context of development, and enhanced cooperation is but a part of that.

By itself, the concept of enhanced cooperation does not directly address global, social, and economic development. However, enhanced cooperation was meant to describe improvements to the cooperation between existing Internet institutions and organizations. This cooperation makes for a better managed Internet, and one that has been able to reach over two billion people worldwide – and more every day – thereby generating ever-increasing returns in global, social, and economic development.

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

A logical starting place on the path to promoting the development of local language content is for in-country initiatives to scan and digitize local content on key historical and educational materials. This is supported by international standards for and expanding inventory of languages. There are also a number of commercial language translation tools becoming available that have the potential for translating international content into local content. Where donor and international development agencies undertake application and content development, localization of the application and content should be standard and expanded, rather than relying on broad based use of European languages such as English, German, French, and Spanish.

ICANN and the IETF have created the standards and environment for internationalized domain names and international languages to be used on the Internet. All stakeholders can help promote development of the local language content, and indeed many are doing so through both discrete and collaborative educational and assistance programs.

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

In our engagement with developing countries in a number of fora, we understand that developing countries often have different needs. We look forward to hearing from the developing countries on this question as they respond to this survey, which will enrich the dialogue not only in the Working Group but also at the IGF and in many other relevant forums and programs.

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?

To promote widespread affordable access to the Internet, developing countries must enable policy and regulatory environments that are fair, transparent, stable, predictable, and non-discriminatory. Policies should promote competition, support innovation in technologies and services, incorporate education and training programs, and incentivize private sector investment. Further, efforts need to be made to foster an increasingly educated and skilled workforce around the world so that the developing and least developing countries can find ways to become creators and suppliers of Internet services, applications, content, and code, not merely consumers of those provided by others.

In addition, the policy recommendations for encouraging broadband infrastructure development contained in the ITU/UNESCO Broadband Commission for Digital Development report can also contribute to affordable Internet connectivity in developing countries. The

recommendations are for governments to:

- 1) Provide policy leadership for investment, including open consultations on necessary policy and legal frameworks;
- 2) Open telecommunications markets to competition through licensing and taxation reforms, including transparent licensing regimes;
- 3) Enable government services that will stimulate demand for and investment in telecommunications, especially in developing countries;
- 4) Establish a universal service program to support telecommunications infrastructure investment; and
- 5) Encourage efficient and innovative mobile broadband practices for new market entrants and consumers.

These recommendations warrant additional observations. Whereas mobile telephony is most often relied upon for local in-country calls, with the Internet the majority of the traffic is international. Under such circumstances it is more practical to establish in-country Internet Exchange Points (ISPs) to keep local in-country traffic in country, as well as to ensure market pricing for international connectivity. Often international links are held by a single firm or small consortium that gives them favor over their competition, with the prices being higher than would otherwise be required. ISPs would help change the business environment to move more and better services at lower cost to the people who need them most.

Another key consideration is the development of locally relevant content—creating the on-line value that pulls demand onto the expanding Internet. The rapidly evolving market of cloud services, portable, personal devices and advanced software applications will power a new generation of local content as more citizens gain access to the Internet at affordable cost. An additional key issue is the adoption of effective USAFs by the government, and the adoption of newer technologies by the commercial carriers. Combined, these provide an incentive to expand to reach rural populations through less costly solutions; for many countries, often over 50% of their population is rural and marginalized and have the least financial resources to afford access.

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?

National governments can play a key role in maintaining and extending the multi-stakeholder approach: reaching out to stakeholders – industry, civil society, technical experts, and others – to promote stakeholders' engagement in multi-stakeholder processes that tackle Internet-related public policy issues; advocating for policy-making processes to be open, transparent, and accessible to all stakeholders, including those with limited resources.

We offer our own experience in the U.S. as examples of stakeholder participation that could be informative for others, including (but not limited to):

- 1) A formal advisory group process, such as the Department of State's International Telecommunications Advisory Committee (ITAC) is used for multi-stakeholder engagement and input in U.S. policy development and participation in international organizations;
- 2) A multi-stakeholder consultative approach to Presidential action on cybersecurity and the critical infrastructure resulted in an executive order guiding our government agencies' work in this regard. Further, the executive order specifically calls for the development of a framework of cybersecurity practices to reduce cyber risks to critical infrastructure, work collaboratively with industry to develop the framework Cybersecurity Framework ;
- 3) The Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has convened interested stakeholders -- including companies, privacy advocates, consumer groups, and technology experts -- to develop enforceable codes of conduct that specify how principles in the U.S. Consumer Privacy Bill of Rights apply in specific business contexts. Stakeholders engage in an open, transparent, consensus-driven processes to develop these codes of conduct; and
- 4) A multi-stakeholder driven process for preparing and convening the annual Internet Governance Forum – USA (IGF-USA) the national dialogue on Internet governance issues.

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

No other comments. Thank you for the opportunity to respond.