

Timestamp

8/30/2013 12:46:18

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:

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

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

a) Enhanced cooperation must be seen in the context of the Tunis agenda as a whole, affirming the involvement of all stakeholders and recognizing that the overall current regime for Internet governance has played a crucial part in creating the highly robust, flexible and diverse global space that it is the Internet today.

b) The purpose of enhanced cooperation is to enable all stakeholders to participate more effectively in the internet governance model and to strengthen and deepen cooperation between governments and all other stakeholders with regards to internet public policy issues.

c) As per the Tunis Agenda, enhanced cooperation, like all mechanisms for 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". The current internet governance landscape remains the most suitable framework for discussing internet policy issues and should be continually improved and refined. Therefore, the current scope of enhanced cooperation encompasses deepened multistakeholder participation in existing internet governance forums to arrive at a more global representation of different stakeholder groups, as well as better representation within stakeholder groups. It also includes, for example, capacity building in soft and hard infrastructure, education and training, funding support for improved participation in international policy forums and public private partnerships to deal with policy issues pertaining to the internet.

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.

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.

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.

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

Sweden wants to stress the importance of refraining from delineating internet related issues into rigid structures. It is our view that any set definition of international public policy issues will necessarily be disconnected from the fast-shifting realities of technological innovation.

On a more general level, however, we see a need for increased continuous debate among all stakeholders on a range of issues, including:

- the safeguarding of the open character of the internet;
- promoting net neutrality and limitations of intermediary liabilities;
- protecting and promoting human rights online;
- sharing policies and best practices on improving accessibility and affordability in ICTs, network resilience and reliability;
- protecting privacy and the free flow of information;
- promoting an open and enabling online business and trading environment.

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

The dynamic nature of the Internet stems from a flexible and adaptable nature of both the technology itself and the governance ecosystem surrounding it. The openness of the multistakeholder governing structures and the freedom to innovate and peer-review in the technical communities needs to be maintained. At the same time, there must be a continuous refining and deepening of mechanisms for participation and cooperation. Therefore, just like the list of international public policy issues cannot be narrowly defined due to the rapid pace of innovation in this field, the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders within the Internet governance landscape must not be imposed from the outside, but rather evolve from within the internet governance system itself.

Governments have, however, a particular responsibility to protect and promote human rights online. Civil society should similarly represent voices and opinions from various, often marginalized, groups and also their role in monitoring and reporting on human rights transgressions. Each stakeholder group should strive to sympathetically understand and consider legitimate policy objectives and sensitivities of other stakeholder groups.

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?

Enhanced cooperation should be implemented through iterative improvements in the global inclusiveness and effective participation of the existing mechanisms of Internet governance. Horizontal exchange among stakeholder groups should be encouraged on global, regional, national and local levels.

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

Effective governance of the Internet require that international dialogue on these issues is conducted through inclusive and open multistakeholder consultations, so as to generate the maximum amount of synergies between all stakeholder, resulting in the best possible policy outcomes. Transparency, inclusiveness and a deepened dialogue between stakeholders are crucial to achieving this.

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?

Enhanced cooperation should be implemented through, for instance, better coordination and reporting, for example using the IGF as a common platform for discussions between the forums currently engaged in debating Internet issues, such as the ICANN GAC, IGF, RIRs, the Human Rights Council, the Council of Europe etc. While these forums tend to reach out to slightly different audiences, improved sharing of information is valuable. In this context, we would welcome discussions on possible mechanisms for generating outcomes from IGF meetings.

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

The IGF provides a platform for dialogue between all stakeholders, including between governments, and, is a good example of how efficient enhanced cooperation is taking place, and is a well suited platform to more effectively facilitate interaction and synergies between the forums and organisations that constitute the Internet governance landscape.

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

There is a need for better awareness and knowledge about the current internet governance regime, especially for countries and ministries with little previous experience of multistakeholder policy environments. There is also a need to support nascent civil society actors in this field in order to generate deeper national debates on Internet related issues. Comprehensive training programs at request for officials in newly connected countries should be developed to deepen political understanding of the internet governance system. Financial support mechanisms for supporting the participation of government representatives in ICANN GAC, IGF and other relevant forums should be improved. Internet governance issues should be included as a key part of existing ICT4D-related programmes. The task of promoting a more active participation can, for instance, be addressed by regional organisations.

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?

Major barriers for many stakeholders include financial restraints, lack of government openness and transparency on Internet related issues as well as an acute and delegitimizing lack of policy transparency and effective multistakeholder participation in some international organisations. Stakeholder groups should be able to participate on equal terms in all relevant Internet public policy forums. There needs to be increased efforts to surmount the current impasse between stakeholders concerned over the potential negative impact of increased state influence on freedom of expression and economic growth and those seeking changes to the internet governance landscape. This is particularly important as to avoid fragmentation and regionalization of the Internet.

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

Global initiatives and platforms that focus on closing the digital divide need to be strengthened, both in terms of geographic, demographic, gender and socio-economic differences in Internet use. This should be done through better exchanges of best practices and capacity building that created preconditions for effective competition, resilient and open networks at affordable prices. Discussions on access, however, need to go beyond hard infrastructure and also focus on issues of creating policy and institutions that can safeguard an open, inclusive national Internet. This includes, among other things, increased efforts on human capacity building through improved education and availability of local content.

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

ICT issues generally, and the Internet specifically, should be included as a key development enabler in the discussions on global development goals post-2015. The UNGIS Joint Statement on the Post-2015 Development Agenda could serve as a good starting point for discussions.

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

There is a virtuous circle where infrastructure development, growth of local content and lower access prices, feed each other. Market demand for local language content is driven by improved access, faster networks (for example, through the establishment of national Internet exchange points) and political support for broad, inclusive use of ICTs in the general public. Stakeholder groups should be aware of the “content divide” where much of the world’s content is unavailable to local population. Each stakeholder group can act in their sphere in support to the development of local content; OECD has suggestions for how this can be done (<http://www.oecd.org/sti/ieconomy/50305352.pdf>).

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

The particular relevance of different Internet-related public policy issues vary between countries and over time. Policy issues with an influence on local content development are of great relevance. This includes the development of soft and hard infrastructure, reducing costs for international traffic and assuring the global free flow of information.

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?

Key issues to be addressed by developing and LDC countries include the establishment of economically and socially sound policies and regulations that enable competition on a level market playing field with predictability and accountability, leading to better infrastructure, lower prices and increased international exchange. The fourteen principles agreed in the OECD Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making, are greatly relevant to developing countries and LDC. (<http://www.oecd.org/internet/innovation/48289796.pdf>)

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?

Countries should, through either government or civil society-led processes, seek to establish national dialogue forums and networks for multistakeholder consultations on internet governance issues nationally. National policymaking in this area gains legitimacy and effectiveness through open, democratic and inclusive decision-making processes. Thus, stakeholder groups on a national level can support their respective global participation.

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

The current inclusive and flexible processes in Internet governance should be improved through open, bottom-up and inclusive processes. The governance of the Internet is a shared responsibility that must reflect the distributed character of the underlying technology and the multifaceted socioeconomic space it has generated.