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

Several paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda including, among others, paragraphs 58 to 61, paragraph 65 and paragraphs 68 to 71 are the primary sources for understanding the proposed significance, purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation. Paragraph 60, for example, recognizes "that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms". However, the most important text dealing with "enhanced cooperation" as originally envisioned is contained in paragraphs 68 to 71.
The purpose and scope of "enhanced cooperation" are clearly laid out in Paragraphs 69 and 70. Accordingly, enhanced cooperation would have a very clear and precise focus, which is to "to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, but not in the day-today technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy issues" (paragraph 69), including "the development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources".
It is important, in our view, to highlight some key expressions that permeate texts associated to "enhanced cooperation". First of all, "public policy issues" – which, in itself, point to responsibilities clearly associated to governments. Second,
"enable" – indicating that enhanced cooperation has a particular focus, which is to provide tools for governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities. Finally, "governments" are singled out in both paragraphs 68 and 69.

In Brazil´s perspective, however, the significance, purpose and scope of "enhanced cooperation" cannot be taken out of the larger context provided by the Tunis Agenda related to the need to ensure 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" as per paragraph 29 and others. Therefore, "enhanced cooperation", as an integral part of Internet Governance, should evolve taking into account the multistakeholder dimension. This is clearly stated in paragraph 68: "We also recognize the need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders".

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.

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.

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

Any attempt to draw a list of relevant international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet risks becoming quickly outdated, as the Internet is characterized by stark dynamism and continuous innovation, which increases the difficulty of anticipating "emerging issues". For the sake of having a reference, we would like to quote below a very comprehensive (although certainly non-exhaustive) list of relevant public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.
• Administration of the root zone files and system
• Interconnection costs
• Internet stability, security and cybercrime
• Allocation of domain names
• IP addressing
• Intellectual property rights (IPR)
• Freedom of Expression
• Data protection and privacy rights
• Consumer rights
• Multilingualism
• Trade and e-commerce
• Applicable jurisdiction, cross border coordination
• Internet service providers (ISPs) and third party liabilities
• Harmonization of national policies and regulations
• Affordable and universal access

- Cultural diversity
- Technical standards, and technology choices
- Multilingualization of the Internet including Internationalized (multilingual) Domain Names
- International Internet Connectivity
- Management of critical resources
- Security, safety, continuity, sustainability, and robustness of the Internet
- Combating cybercrime
- Dealing effectively with spam
- Issues pertaining to the use and misuse of the Internet
- Availability, affordability, reliability, and quality of service
- Capacity building for Internet governance
- Developmental aspects of the Internet
- Respect for privacy and the protection of personal information and data
- Protecting children and young people from abuse and exploitation
- Cloud computing
- Cross border Internet flows
- Tax allocation among different jurisdictions with regard to global e-commerce
- Economics of personal data
- Net neutrality
- Search neutrality
- Media convergence and next generation networks
- Access to knowledge and free information flows
- Accessibility policies for the disabled
- Development of local content, local application, local e-services, and local/ domestic Internet businesses
- Protection of vulnerable populations
- E-government.

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

Governments have the responsibility to put in place public policies that will create an enabling environment for Internet to flourish and develop.
 The development of such policies should, however, be done in consultation with all stakeholders. An appropriate framework is therefore required to ensure that the roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders are fully exercised in offering their strengths, voicing their demands and providing relevant inputs and expertise for policy development.
The importance of the multistakeholder dimension in the development of public policies cannot be overstated as in some cases actions taken by other stakeholders may prove to be more effective to achieve goals set in public policies than the mere issuance of regulation by governments. In every case, stakeholders must be involved, as appropriate, in ensuring the implementation of public policies thus developed.

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?

The full implementation of "enhanced cooperation" requires (i) devising ways to improve and expand existing mechanisms (in existing fora) that explore the "enhanced cooperation" dimension, and (ii) developing a platform which, on the one hand, would enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, and on the other hand, would be respectful of the multistakeholder model.
Although retaining its focus on the need to address particular needs experienced by governments, the structure of such new platform itself should emerge from the multistakeholder debate.

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

The framework/mechanisms for enhanced cooperation must ensure there will be adequate avenues for all stakeholders to input, as appropriate, into the processes of public policy development. Any such framework/mechanism should duly take into account all stakeholders´ contributions and address, as appropriate, their needs and demands.

On the other hand, the outputs of enhanced cooperation (public policy pertaining to the Internet) should, as stated before, provide an enabling environment that would allow stakeholders to fully carry out their roles and responsibilities.

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

At this point Brazil does not consider it would be productive to work around ideas regarding the most appropriate mechanism to fully implement enhanced cooperation for a number of reasons:
(i) the discussion of any new 'suitable framework or mechanisms, where justified, thus spurring the ongoing and active evolution of the current arrangements in order to synergize the efforts in this regard' must be preceded by the assessment of those "current arrangements" in line with proposal outlined in answer to question 2;
(ii) the discussion of any "suitable framework or mechanisms" should be guided by the purpose of addressing perceived needs or filling gaps and should only be undertaken when there some comfortable margin of support for these ideas. In other words, Brazil proposes first to deepen discussion on WHAT we want before discussing HOW to achieve what we want.
Notwithstanding, Brazil would like to offer some preliminary comments. First of all, we consider that discussions could be divided into two groups of issues, as per paragraphs 69 and 70: (i) international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in general; and (ii) public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. While public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources might be treated separately, a single convergent space or platform is needed, in our view, for dealing with the diverse kinds of 'international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet' in general. Even though many of these issues may have some aspects that come under some existing international bodies, including those of the UN, most Internet-related matters are required to be dealt in a holistic and cross-cutting manner because of their inter-relatedness, in addition to possible specialized treatment by these other bodies. With regard to issues that are already being dealt with by other institutions, the new "framework of mechanism" could add Internet-related policy perspectives to the issues, as well as coordinate and ensure coherence among the work of different institutions dealing with different aspects of the issues. It should be able to help ensure the required coordination and coherence, as appropriate, among national level policies and practices, given the inherently global nature of the Internet.
Brazil considers, on the other hand, much more substantial progress is needed with regard to enhancing cooperation, on an equal footing, towards the development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical internet resources.
Brazil notes the various models contained in the WGIG Report.

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

Brazil considers that "enhanced cooperation' and IGF are two distinct processes, both as per the Tunis Agenda wording and (more importantly) in the light of the experience accumulated since 2005. Brazil acknowledges and values the role of IGF, inter alia, as the main "locus" for agenda setting in the existing Internet Governance regime, allowing for in-depth discussion of relevant issues pertaining to the Internet among all interested stakeholders. However, both entities are completely different in nature and purpose. Enhanced cooperation is meant to be a "policy making space" while IGF is a "policy dialogue space". It can be argued that IGF

discussions could provide the basis for further discussions under "enhanced cooperation" and we take note that some parties consider that IGF itself provides a platform for enhanced cooperation. However, it must be recognized that IGF could not – and should not – replace enhanced cooperation as envisaged in Tunis (and as required today in our assessment) since it lacks the "focus-oriented", purposeful approach that lies at the origin of EC.

However, a mutually beneficial relationship between the two should be fostered. IGF should contribute to the policy development/ making processes undertaken under "enhanced cooperation" and the outcomes of enhanced cooperation could serve as the basis for further reflection under the IGF, with a view to continuously improving the working of the overall Internet Governance architecture as a whole.

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

Participation of developing countries in relevant fora, institutions, organizations and processes must be enhanced. Ways should be devised to address developing countries' barriers to further engage in international discussions due to financial constraints, lack of personnel and capacity building.

One benefit of a possible new framework/mechanism that would enable the discussion of relevant Internet-related matters in a holistic and cross-cutting manner would be to provide additional support for developed countries with limited ability to mobilize human or financial resources to participate in a multitude of IG-related fora worldwide.

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?

Some of the same difficulties and hurdles experienced by developing countries are also applicable to other stakeholders, particularly from developing countries. Fragmentation of policy spaces, among other factors, greatly undermines the ability of such under-resourced groups to engage with global Internet governance, because they are unable to be present in all places.

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

There are many actions and initiatives that could be undertaken by the Government and other stakeholders with a view to improving the effective participation of all marginalized people in the global information society and promoting digital inclusion. Governments should cooperate towards the achievement of those objectives by investing in infrastructure; implementing legislation providing incentives for investments in infrastructure and the adoption of business models for Internet expansion; and devising policies that lead to prices adjusted to local income. Furthermore, government can foster the establishment of agreements involving civil society and business and academic communities to promote access.

However, Brazil considers that the WGEC should not focus on this subject in the light of its mandate and time constraints.

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

Appropriate public polices are key to development. In that context, the potential of Internet as one of the main drivers of economic growth cannot be overstressed. Due to the fact that Internet is not confined to national borders, many of the Internet-related public policies required for national social and economic development may need to be discussed and anchored at the global (or regional) level.

Any new mechanism for "enhanced cooperation" as part of the overall Internet Governance architecture must put a strong emphasis on pursuing the "development-oriented" dimension of the Information Society, as per paragraph 31 of the Tunis Agenda.

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

All stakeholders, in their respective responsibilities, have important roles to play in that regard. The government, in particular, could act as catalyzer of actions aiming at the development of local language content.
However, as in the case of question 12 above, Brazil considers that this issue, notwithstanding its importance, should not be focused by the WGEC in the light of its mandate and time constraints. Particular emphasis on this issue (which, as per the answer to question 4 is one in a list of many other important public policy issues to be addressed) would not lead to a balanced outcome.

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

As it was done in regard to question 4, a non-exhaustive and non-prioritized list of public policy issues of relevance to developing countries is provided below for the sake of reference:
• Interconnection charges/ regimes
• Multilingualism
• Applicable jurisdiction, cross border coordination
• Competition policy, liberalization, privatization and regulations
• Affordable and universal Access
• Acesso to innovation
• Prevalence of human rights, including freedom of expression and privacy
• Incentives to local technologies and local content
• Development of local technology
• Cloud computing
• Tax allocation among different jurisdictions with regard to global e-commerce
• Net neutrality
• Search neutrality
• Media convergence
• Regulation of global Internet businesses
• Access to knowledge and free information flows
• Accessibility policies for the disabled
• Development of, and protection to, local content, local application, local e-services, and local/ domestic Internet businesses
• Protection of vulnerable populations (children, women, traditional communities etc)
• Internet and health systems, education systems, governance systems and so on.

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?

The discussion on affordability of the Internet entails a number of international Internet-related public policy issues including, among others: global interconnection charges, global net neutrality, competition policies, technology standards and technology choices, regional Internet Exchange Points, infrastructure, regional programs, capacity building; development of local technology;and public policies that ensure accessible prices

Brazil considers, however, that WGEC should not put emphasis on this issue in the light of its mandate and time constraints.

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 could be encouraged to develop an institutional multistakehoder framework for oversight and management of Internet at the national level. In the case of Brazil, the experience of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee must be mentioned as a good

practice that enables relevant participation of all stakeholders. Implementation of e-government tools and fostering the development of local technologies and local content are also important initiatives.

Although attaching the utmost importance to this topic, Brazil considers that the ways and means national governments will choose to develop domestic Internet-related public polices are outside the mandate of the WGEC.

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

No response.