

<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>10. How can the role of developing countries be made more effective in global Internet governance?</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus member, Australia ian.peter@ianpeter.com</p>	<p>by a willingness of more powerful voices to give them a role</p>

Yes	<p>Nnenna Nwakanma NNNENA.ORG/ACSIS/Africa IGF Rue des Jardins 22 BP 1764 ABJ 22 Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire</p>	By enhancing IGF at national levels. Global makes no sense when national does not exist
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>	Must necessarily establish the national platforms on Internet governance. This is the obligatory way.

Yes	Russia, Coordination Center for Russian Top-Level Domains, 8, Zoologicheskaya Str., Moscow, 123242, Russia; info@cctld.ru	While it is commonly recognized that developing nations must have their voice heard in global Internet governance fora, it is hard to concoct any other activities to complement the existing ones, which can be classified into awareness-raising and educational. Specifically, the IGF and its local scions form the prime vehicle to raise awareness and “spread the word”, while the European Summer School for Internet Governance, the Latin American School for Internet Governance and the likes help bolster human capacity and level of expertise. Such efforts are in need for greater coordination, though, and more exercise and funding should be made available from the private sector, international organizations, such as OECD, IBRD, etc., and “I” organizations, such as ISOC, ICANN, etc., to replicate and localize this practice and make it ubiquitous and affordable throughout the developing countries. Such concerted and consistent actions would undoubtedly increase effectiveness of the developing countries’ participation in global Internet governance. As well, it would be appropriate to review international development organizations’ record to date in regard to delivery of technical aid to put forward model respective projects in developing countries on the one hand, to bolster the said countries capacity in respect to articulation of their concrete needs on the other hand, and to secure organizational arrangements to have them shape local, country-specific projects in the area of ICT and Internet development
Yes	Sweden, Netnod, Franzégatan 5, 112 51 Stockholm, info@netnod.se	By helping them and other countries that need to transform their whole, or partial, society. They can both look at good and bad examples from similar countries have done earlier, and by exchanging information with other countries being in the same situation at the same point in time. So that they do believe they are not alone, and they are not the first ones that do whatever they do.
Yes	Bangladesh The Forum for Development, Journalism and Communication Studies (FOCUS) focus_bangladesh@yahoo.com	Due to lack of adequate expertise developing countries felt severe problems in making Internet governance properly. Training and advises from developed world inclusive of cooperation among neighbouring countries can be a suitable way to address the issue

Yes	<p>Russia Russian Association for Electronic Communications Presnenskaya embankment, 12, Federation Tower West, floor 46, Moscow, 123100 www.raec.ru info@raec.ru</p>	<p>While it is commonly recognized that developing nations must have their voice heard in global Internet governance fora, it is hard to concoct any other activities to complement the existing ones, which can be classified into awareness-raising and educational. Specifically, the IGF and its local scions form the prime vehicle to raise awareness and “spread the word”, while the European Summer School for Internet Governance, the Latin American School for Internet Governance and the likes help bolster human capacity and level of expertise. Such efforts are in need for greater coordination, though, and more exercise and funding should be made available from the private sector, international organizations, such as OECD, IBRD, etc., and “I” organizations, such as ISOC, ICANN, etc., to replicate and localize this practice and make it ubiquitous and affordable throughout the developing countries. Such concerted and consistent actions would undoubtedly increase effectiveness of the developing countries’ participation in global Internet governance. As well, it would be appropriate to review international development organizations’ record to date in regard to delivery of technical aid to put forward model respective projects in developing countries on the one hand, to bolster the said countries capacity in respect to articulation of their concrete needs on the other hand, and to secure organizational arrangements to have them shape local, country-specific projects in the area of ICT and Internet development</p>
Yes	<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>This is an important question but we find it to be outside the scope of the Enhanced Cooperation working group and thus we choose not to answer it here.</p>

Yes	<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>This is a very important question. Though ICANN addresses just a part of the Internet governance landscape, we have been working recently, along with other partners (such as ISOC and the Regional Internet Registries) in capacity building, in relation to the Domain Name System in Africa and the Middle East. In both regions ICANN has helped promote Internet security (especially DNSSEC) and the use of IPv6. Regional Strategies have been developed in a bottom-up approach and are being implemented in the Africa, the Middle East and Latin America to ensure wider participation from developing countries in the ICANN model.</p> <p>We recognize, that in addition to developing a DNS industry, that more work needs to be done to enable stakeholders (including governments) to play their rightful role in the ICANN model. Through such involvement (which we recognize we have a role in supporting) developing countries may be better able to ensure that global Internet policies take account of their needs and aspirations.</p>
Yes	<p>South-South Opportunity jrtnchekoua@gmail.com B.P 33 Yaoundé Cameroon"</p>	<p>Disruptive technologies that will change our lives and our economies raises fears that widespread automation is increasing unemployment and widening the gap between the skilled and those who have not received sufficient training to fully experience this change.</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>Holding the IGF in developing countries has been a catalyst to engaging developing countries into global Internet governance discussions, however it is not just about attending meetings. Effectiveness also involves listening to the stakeholders and developing community-based bottom up organizations that can help identify and address issues. Focusing on key regional issues is necessary given the breadth of Internet governance topics. By forming alliances with other like-minded countries, and attending different events on behalf of those alliances, countries can gain more coverage and reduce the burden of participation.</p> <p>Another key component of effective global Internet governance is sharing of information. Additional steps should be taken to improve and encourage remote participation when holding global Internet governance fora. ARIN has found this to be a very good tool for improving inclusiveness in addition to holding regional and sub-regional meetings.</p>
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>	(Left intentionally blank)
Yes	<p>Country:Japan Organization:KEIDANREN Address:1-3-2,OTEMACHI CHIYODA-KU,TOKYO 100-8188 E-mail:joho@keidanren.or.jp</p>	It is necessary for stakeholders including business, civil societies and others in different countries to collaborate across borders with counterpart stakeholders.

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	.
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	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.
Yes	United States, Imagining the Internet, CB 2850, Elon University, 27244, andersj@elon.edu	no time

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>Developing countries could play more effective role in global Internet governance through more active participation within the ITU and broader participation in other relevant organizations, promoting their countries' interests, making the environment more attractive for investment into national and regional broadband infrastructure, development of local content and services. The participation could be enhanced through both direct presence of government representatives and remote participation systems.</p>
Yes	<p>RIPE NCC Singel 258 1016AB Amsterdam The Netherlands</p> <p>Email: externalrelations@ripe.net</p>	<p>The voice of developing countries in Internet governance is clearly linked to increased levels of participation from developing country stakeholders. This presents numerous logistical, geographic and economic challenges, but the experience of the RIR communities offers some useful approaches to consider.</p> <p>Recognising that any global structure is limited in its ability to engage all stakeholders, priority needs to be placed on fostering the bottom-up development of regional and national structures that can focus the specific concerns of stakeholders in those areas.</p> <p>At the same time, limited resources may prevent developing country stakeholders from engaging with the full range of governance-related organisations, instead focusing on one specific forum. Facilitating inter-organisational dialogue and feedback is key to ensuring that concerns raised in one organisational context are not ignored by policy-makers working in other organisations. The RIPE NCC's engagement in ITU discussions has been driven, to some extent, by this principle.</p>

Yes	Ellen Blackler Vice President, Global Public Policy The Walt Disney Company 425 Third Street, Suite 1100 Washington DC 20024 United States	We look forward to hearing from stakeholders from developing countries about how their participation in the dialogue on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet can best be promoted. We are aware of the constraints some governments have identified in terms of financial resources, staff, and knowledge and look forward to better understanding how these barriers can be overcome.
Yes	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	The physical participation in global Internet governance activities and events is costly and impacts on the human and financial resources in developing countries. The IGF and ICANN both recognise this critical problem. Their effectiveness as global fora and processes rely on successfully addressing it. There are solutions such as fellowship programmes, ICANN's establishment of regional support centres, and remote hubbing for engaging in IGF workshops that can contribute but more needs to be done: this is a key challenge for all stakeholders. Establishing closer linkages between the global IGF and the national and regional IGFs has also the potential for more successfully engaging developing countries in global Internet governance.
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	Developing countries have taken recourse to the ITU because they feel that they are not otherwise represented in the existing global Internet governance arrangements, which are dominated by developed countries and by companies and organisations based in those countries. This points to the need for reforms such as those advocated above. However that alone will not be enough. Developing countries are excluded at so many different levels, and they self-exclude, so addressing this problem is not at all trivial. The way in which Internet governance for development (IG4D) has been conceived and addressed in the IGF and in other global spaces is not helpful. It is narrow, and top down, and often does not go beyond affordable access issues. Clarifying the role of governments in Internet governance (see questions 5, 6, 7 and 11) is the first step. Developing country governments must be involved in this discussion otherwise they will not buy into its outcomes. Another necessary step is to foster more engagement with Internet governance issues at the national level in developing countries. In the way that developing countries have made an impact on global issues such as trade justice for, example, so too they could in Internet governance. The issues are debated at national level by the labour movement, local business, social

		<p>justice groups etc. and this both pressurises governments and informs governments (not always in the desired way) at the global level. Critical thinking needs to be applied at national and regional level, with involvement of non-governmental stakeholders for more effective developing country representation at global level. And vice versa. Global Internet governance processes need to report and feed into national processes. In short, making developing countries (government and other stakeholders) play a more effective role in global Internet governance requires mechanisms at national and regional level as well as a process of democratisation at the global level.</p>
Yes	<p>Malaysia Consumers International Lot 5-1 Wisma WIM, Jalan Wan Kadir 3, Taman Tun Dr Ismail, WP 60000, Malaysia jeremy@ciroap.org</p>	<p>We associate ourselves with the Best Bits submission, except for the additional answer to question 8 above.</p>
Yes	<p>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</p>	<p>(no answer)</p>

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>First of all it needs to be made clearer to everyone that the specific needs of poor people in regard to being able to use the Internet fully (for example, not everyone is able to get a credit card or equivalent means for conducting financial transactions via the Internet), and how the Internet can be part of strategies to overcome poverty, are centrally important topics in the context of Internet governance discourses.</p> <p>For example, the so-called Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) which fulfills the role of program committee for the IGF has in regard to the 2013 IGF in Indonesia rejected a workshop proposal on the topic “The roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies” on the basis that too many MAG members considered that topic to be unrelated to Internet governance. That rejection is absolutely ridiculous. How can Internet governance pursue the objective of “Sustainable Human, Economic and Social Development” (as spelled out explicitly as the main theme of the 2012 IGF meeting), if the roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies cannot be discussed?</p> <p>Hence it seems that in actual reality too many of those who are currently directing the Internet governance discourse interpret “sustainable development” in a way that does not involve actually thinking about the problems related to poverty. Those problems are however the primary issues that developing country governments need to prioritize, both in order to fulfill their human rights obligations and in order to fulfill the expectations of their electorate.</p> <p>Then, once the specific concerns and needs of developing countries have been given their rightful place on the agendas of Internet governance discourses, the work of developing strategies for addressing those concerns and needs should begin in earnest. This can be done for example in the context of the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1 .</p> <p>At that time it will start making sense for developing country governments to give participation in Internet governance discourses the kind of high priority that is necessary for effective engagement.</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>It is often argued, or implied, that the limited participation of developing country governments and civil society is mainly due to a lack of capacity. While capacity building efforts can indeed be very helpful (and not for developing country actors alone), we believe that this is not the primary reason why such countries do not get involved more closely in Internet governance.</p> <p>Instead, as illustrated by debates during the WTPF, we believe that one of the main reasons is the fact that Internet governance processes at present are not sufficiently tailored to deal with the priorities of these governments and are not sufficiently clear about their aims, purpose, and intended outcomes. Where faced with limited resources, both governments and civil society from developing countries will prefer to allocate such resources to processes in which there at least seems a reasonable chance of a likely benefit to their own priorities and work.</p> <p>Though some argue that it will be difficult for developing countries governments and civil society to participate in a more distributed structure of Internet governance due to resource requirements to be able to do so effectively, we therefore believe the reverse is true. A paucity of resources means that developing country representatives from any stakeholder group often are reluctant to tie into existing processes as it is not clear enough to them how participation will benefit their own priorities and work precisely because existing processes tend to address a hotchpotch of issues.</p> <p>A distributed structure of Internet governance with well-defined aims and purposes will resolve this problem as it will make it much more obvious to developing country actors (as well as others) which processes are worth their time. If the participation of developing countries' governments and civil society in Internet governance is to be increased, it will only happen by offering them avenues of participation that have immediate and clear value, with this value outweighing any costs (it is notable that other actors that have been notoriously absent from Internet governance processes, such as representatives from small and medium enterprises, might benefit in the same way).</p> <p>For additional improvements required, please see our answer to question 11.</p>
-----	--	---

Yes	<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>The major issues in the digital space in developing countries relate to access, content, infrastructure and security. The influence of developing nations in the global internet governance space is limited. The inter-governmental and international organisations need to work towards rectifying this anomaly. These organisations need to work towards a balanced resource allocation based on categorisation of countries. Care should be taken to ensure that there is proper representation of least developed and developing countries in the policy space.</p> <p>Areas for development in the ICT technologies can be identified and higher priorities can be given to developing countries and their partners. This would bridge the digital divide and would result in efficient usage of the development funds.</p> <p>Inter-governmental organisations need to play a more proactive role in protecting the interests of the developing and least developed countries while making Internet public policy on the issues of inter-connection cost, access, cyber security, technology transfer, multilingualism etc.</p>
Yes	<p>LACNIC</p> <p>Latin American and Caribbean Regional Addresses Registry</p> <p>Rambla República de México 6215, Montevideo, Uruguay.</p> <p>comunicaciones@lacnic.net</p>	<p>The voice of developing countries in Internet governance is clearly linked to far greater levels of participation from developing country stakeholders. This presents numerous logistical, geographic and economic challenges, but the experience of the RIR communities offers some useful approaches to explore.</p> <p>Recognising that any global structure is limited in its ability to engage all stakeholders, priority needs to be placed on fostering the bottom-up development of regional and national structures that can focus the specific concerns of stakeholders in those areas.</p> <p>Availability of information, multilingualism, transparency and full remote participation for the multi-stakeholder processes such as the IGF but also for the Public International fora would allow participants from developing countries to build their capacity to engage with the key debates and processes.</p>

Yes	<p>United States Center for Democracy & Technology 1634 I Street NW #1100 Washington, DC 20006 mshears@cdt.org</p>	<p>In many ways participation in global Internet governance has to begin at home. All countries, developed and developing alike, should adopt procedures to allow for and encourage the fullest engagement of stakeholders in policy development processes at the national level, particularly those related to the Internet. The Tunis Agenda's multistakeholder exhortations and recommendations do not solely apply to discussions of governance and Internet policy at the global level. Open, transparent and inclusive policy discussions must start at the national level. These, in turn, will inform and bring greater expertise and effective participation to government and stakeholder engagement in Internet governance at the global level.</p>
Yes		<p>There are a number of measures that can be taken to facilitate more effective participation from stakeholders from developing countries. Given the sheer number and geographical spread of meetings related to internet governance, the logistics of participating in meetings can be difficult in itself. Therefore, greater resources, travel fellowships, specially allocated staff, calendars planned long in advance, multilingual content and translation/interpretation, and better use of remote participation, are just a few measures that would improve the effectiveness of stakeholders in global internet governance. Additionally, outlining clear modalities for participating and expected outcomes of the meeting would help stakeholders determine how to best utilize the resources they have.</p> <p>Furthermore, capacity building programs like South School for Internet Governance, the African School for Internet Governance and the Online Training Programme on Internet Governance and Policy in Middle East and North Africa (MENA) run by the DiploFoundation, Association for Progressive Communications, and others are excellent ways to support the role of developing countries in internet governance. These initiatives, as well as national and regional internet governance fora are important and mutually reinforcing ways to improve the overall effectiveness of global internet governance.</p>

Yes	<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>	—
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 multi-stakeholder approach is important in global Internet governance, and the participation of various stakeholders including developing countries is effective.</p> <p>Furthermore, government in each country should implement international cooperation such as capacity building, technical cooperation, best practice sharing, and cooperation towards literacy improvement and awareness-raising activities, in cooperation with other stakeholders to countries having difficulty in carrying out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.</p>

Yes	Cote d'Ivoire, DIGILEXIS – SPR, 28 BP 1485 Abidjan 28 kichango@gmail.com	<p>Developing countries have taken recourse to the ITU because they feel that they are not otherwise represented in the existing global Internet governance arrangements, which are dominated by developed countries and by companies and organizations based in those countries. This points to the need for reforms such as those advocated above.</p> <p>However that alone will not be enough. Developing countries are excluded at so many different levels, and they self-exclude, so addressing this problem is not at all trivial. The way in which Internet governance for development (IG4D) has been conceived and addressed in the IGF and in other global spaces is not helpful. It is narrow, and top down, and often does not go beyond affordable access issues. Clarifying the role of governments in Internet governance (see questions 5, 6, 7 and 11) is the first step. Developing country governments must be involved in this discussion otherwise they will not buy into its outcomes.</p> <p>Another necessary step is to foster more engagement with Internet governance issues at the national level in developing countries. In the way that developing countries have made an impact on global issues such as trade justice, for example, so too they could in Internet governance. The challenge here is to bring internet issues to fore in a way that manifests their relevance and potential impact in people's life. Critical thinking needs to be applied at national and regional level, with involvement of non-governmental stakeholders for more effective developing country representation at global level, and vice versa. Global Internet governance processes need to report and feed into national processes. In short, making developing countries (government and other stakeholders) play a more effective role in global Internet governance requires mechanisms at national and regional level as well as a process of democratization at the global level.</p>
-----	--	---

Yes	France, INTLNET, 120 chemin des Crouzettes, Saint-Vincent de Barbeyrargues, France 34730, info@intlnet.org	<p>They should be made to participate in the enhanced cooperation mechanism. Actually, since that mechanism has been appropriated by the blocking StatUS-Quo disciples, they should take leadership in the government category new initiatives, allying with Civil Society and the innovative side of small businesses. Developing countries should become internet development countries, providing paperwork-havens to paperless businesses. The main limitation to economic development in the digital area is developed countries' bureaucracy. Network businesses do not need bureaucracy or a tax haven. They need bureaucracy free virtual zones with an online bank account that they and their own government can trust, and hence an enhanced cooperation with the target of decently supporting independent multinational initiatives (IMI). They are certainly willing to pay taxes for what they get, but not taxes for a bureaucracy that they hate.</p> <p>It would also be great to have low cost digital architectonic BarCamps hold in developing countries together with local people rather than in luxury resorts. Maybe more ideas and work than egos and business bias when flying a charter and sleeping on a camp bed?</p>
-----	--	---

Yes	<p>Saudi Arabia, Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) PO Box 75606, Riyadh 11588, Saudi Arabia MAJED ALMAZYED, mmazyed@citc.gov.sa</p>	<p>One of the many reasons for enhanced cooperation is to enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities on an equal footing. Enhanced cooperation will provide a platform for developing countries to be more effective and to be part of the decisionmaking process in Internet governance.</p> <p>Also, the role of developing countries is in fact one of the public policy issues listed in ITU Council Resolution 1305 and reflected in the response to Q4. It boils down to three critical factors and it is the implementation that will likely be the primary focus of the public policy formulation and debate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity building via training, education and technical support. 2. Financial support for capacity building, internal development related to the Internet and participation in Internet governance (including remote participation). 3. The willingness of the developed countries to cede part of their control and allow developing countries to participate in a balanced manner. <p>The response to Q6 has suggested UN funding, remote participation and balanced representation for the vice-chairs, committee chairs and committee members in the enhanced cooperation Body.</p>
Yes	United States of America	<p>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.</p> <p>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,</p>

		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.
Yes	United States, Intel, 12 Poet Drive, Matawan NJ, 07747, Mike.s.chartier@intel.com	Developing countries should be encouraged to participate in existing initiatives, organizations and forums through outreach, education, and sponsorship to relevant meeting and conferences. Regional organizations and events are also a good way for developing countries to find common ground and develop positions that have the weight and influence of multiple Administrations.
Yes	Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet) www.kictanet.or.ke, and the Internet Society (ISOC) Kenya Chapter http://isoc.or.ke/ Contacts: Mwenda Kivuva (Kivuva@transworldafrica.com) Meshack Emakunat (memakunat@yahoo.com) Grace Githaiga (ggithaiga@hotmail.com (M	Encourage participation of developing countries, build capacity and awareness, and increase sponsorships in international meetings and events relating to IG. Building capacity will ensure future engagements with developing countries are more engaging and meaningful. It is not fair that the USA and western companies dominate the internet governance. A multi-stakeholder (governments and other players) should have an oversight in organizations such as ICANN. Companies from the developing countries should be encouraged to participate in such forums.

Yes	Switzerland, Federal Office of Communications OFCOM, 44 rue de l'Avenir, CH-2501 Biel/Bienne, Switzerland ir@bakom.admin.ch	All stakeholders from developing countries should be encouraged to participate in organisations and processes relevant for Internet Governance and should be supported in their participation. A central role would be incumbent on capacity-building initiatives specifically centred on the needs of developing countries, amongst others. In all relevant processes, a special focus should be placed on the needs of stakeholders from developing countries.
Yes	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>There are good examples of capacity building by ICANN, ISOC, Diplo Foundation, ICANN Summer Schools/Studienkreisen etc. These efforts need to be continued, coordinated and funded, and they should benefit all stakeholder groups in developing countries. An one-stop-shop track for capacity building should be developed at IGF for the benefit of participants who are not able to attend several Internet governance meetings annually.</p> <p>Multi-stakeholder cooperation on Internet matters within each developing country should be encouraged, financially if necessary.</p> <p>Participation of all stakeholders from developing countries at Internet Governance-related meetings should be encouraged and – especially as far civil society is concerned - financially assisted through trust funds and other financing mechanisms.</p>
Yes	France, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 38 Cours Albert 1er 75008 Paris, aha@iccwbo.org	<p>Over the years we have seen significant progress in terms of developing country governments and developing country stakeholders actively participating in global Internet governance processes. It is important to recognize this progress because it is also indicative of the efforts made to make this happen. We believe that there are several ways to continue to build on this progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Awareness raising about the IG global processes and forums at the national and regional levels for governments and all stakeholders. Continue to use the national and regional IGF initiatives, meetings of all stakeholders, for example ICANN global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, business community meetings such as ICC events, WITSA events and many others --Create brief supporting information resources to explain the opportunities; some of this exists, but we need to continue to ensure distribution. -There are many fellowship and ambassador programmes sponsored by many stakeholders to help support developing country governments and other stakeholders with travel costs. Continue to build on these opportunities and awareness of them. -Remote participation opportunities, webcasting, audiocast and transcripts, and translation where possible <p>As access to the Internet has occurred globally and in particular in emerging regions, and as</p>

		<p>the Internet has become increasingly important to local and regional economies, the engagement of stakeholders in policies impacting national and regional frameworks has increased. More work needs to occur, and more opportunities created to enable all stakeholders, regardless of region, to engage in global Internet governance. Additionally, national and regional initiatives reflect the priorities of regions – such priorities are critical contributions to the overall global Internet governance evolution. In all regions, in particular emerging regions, there are increasing numbers of national and regional IGF initiatives, dialogues on public policy issues, and identification of priorities and challenges. The emerging regions' views are critical – that is where the next billion users impact the global Internet.</p>
Yes	<p>Czech Republic, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, Na Frantisku 32, 110 15 Prague 1, novakovam@mpo.cz</p>	<p>Through effective application of the multistakeholder approach at national level.</p>
Yes	<p>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</p>	<p>The path of participation in the international regulation of Internet of today is clear enough, and consists of three main steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To join an ongoing dialogue on the issue of cyber-security; -To develop national legislation of cyber security for internal safety, to create effective cooperation mechanisms; -To ratify existing conventions for cyber security, as the Internet is not limited by national boundaries and the key to its regulation is joint action.

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: Mediante el establecimiento de normas que regulen el uso de los contenidos de internet, de tal suerte que se respeten los contenidos protegidos por derecho de autor y se restrinja el acceso a contenidos ilícitos y nocivos.</p> <p>CANIETI: Se requiere que su nivel de penetración de Banda Ancha sea aceptable, es decir, un peso específico en el mercado y como stakeholder, lo cual es complicado, no es fácil el tema de este balance.</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>The views of emerging regions are critical. The next billion Internet users likely will come from developing countries and they will play important roles in driving and shaping the development of the Information Society and the digital economy.</p> <p>Over the years, there has been significant progress in involving more developing country governments and stakeholders in global Internet governance processes.</p> <p>There are increasing numbers of national and regional IGF initiatives in developing countries, dialogues on public policy issues, and identification of priorities and challenges. These priorities are important contributions to the overall global Internet governance evolution. But more opportunities should be created to enable all stakeholders, regardless of region, to engage in global Internet governance through the various forums that contribute.</p> <p>The following are aimed at continuing to build on this progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Raising awareness about the global Internet governance processes and forums at the national and regional levels for governments and stakeholders. This may be done by continuing to use the national and regional IGF initiatives and stakeholder meetings, such as ICANN's global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, business meetings (USCIB events), WITSA events and many others; -Creating informational resources to explain the global Internet governance process and opportunities for engagement. This should be complemented by more effective distribution; -There are fellowship and ambassador programs sponsored by many stakeholders aimed at providing travel support to developing country governments and other stakeholders to raise awareness and enable broader developing country participation in the global Internet

		<p>governance process. We must continue to build on these opportunities and raise awareness about them; and</p> <p>-Ensuring remote participation opportunities, webcasting, audiocast and transcripts, and translation wherever and whenever possible to better ensure participation by non-English speakers.</p>
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	INDIA, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations Office 9, RUE DU VALAIS, 1202, GENEVA Mission.india@ties.itu.int	Paragraph 65 of the Tunis Agenda underlines the need to maximize the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet governance, which should reflect their interests, as well as in the development of capacity building. The developing countries are integral part of the global Internet governance. They would participate, at equal footing in the mechanism explained above.
Yes	LATVIA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission.un-gen@mfa.gov.lv	Developing countries have to define Internet governance as one of the policy priorities and build the necessary capacity to contribute to the international debate. Intergovernmental organizations can play a role in this respect in cooperation with industry organizations.
Yes	BULGARIA, Law and Internet Foundation, bul. Patriarh Evtimii 36, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria info@netlaw.bg	By giving them a voice. The role of developing countries can be more effective in global Internet governance by giving them an equal voice as the other countries. However, before that, they should establish and implement national public policy on matters of Internet governance. They should also take part in forming the international policies on such matters. The rest of the world should recognize their willingness to be part of the global Internet governance. By participating in Internet governance structures, the developing countries have the opportunity to advocate for the participatory models and specific technical policies that will lead to more and cheaper connectivity, secure the free flow of information, and ensure home grown entrepreneurs have a fair playing field in global markets.
Yes	BULGARIA, Department of Administration Modernization, Council of Ministers, 1 Dondukov Blvd.1594 Sofia is.ivanov@government.bg	Apart of the considerable demographic potential that is the basis for speedy education and ICT development, the role of developing countries in global Internet governance could be made more effective through their participation in relevant multilateral cooperation efforts such as WSIS, IGF etc.

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: hhristov@mtitc.government.bg</p>	<p>The role of developing countries can be more effective in global Internet governance by giving them an equal voice as the other countries. However, before that, they should establish and implement national public policy on matters of Internet governance. They should also take part in forming the international policies on such matters. The rest of the world should recognize their willingness to be part of the global Internet governance. By participating in Internet governance structures, the developing countries have the opportunity to advocate for the participatory models and specific technical policies that will lead to more and cheaper connectivity, secure the free flow of information, and ensure home grown entrepreneurs have a fair playing field in global markets.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the developing countries could be strengthened by educational enhancement, domestic Internet penetration and development of ICT sector services. Increasing the number of e-services in public and private sector will dramatically increase the usability of the Internet and effectiveness of the Internet governance.</p> <p>Apart of the considerable demographic potential that is the basis for speedy education and ICT development, the role of developing countries in global Internet governance could be made more effective through their participation in relevant multilateral cooperation efforts such as WSIS, IGF etc.</p> <p>Strong support and motivation is needed for developing countries using different mechanisms of UN, UNESCO and other relevant international organizations.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Executive Agency Electronic Communication Networks and Information Systems. Bulgaria 1000 "Gurko 6" str. mail@esmis.government.bg</p>	<p>Apart of the considerable demographic potential that is the basis for speedy education and ICT development, the role of developing countries in global Internet governance could be made more effective through their participation in relevant multilateral cooperation efforts such as WSIS, IGF etc.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Council of Ministers, Strategic Development and Coordination Directorate 1 Dondukov Blvd 1594 Sofia y.stoyanov@government.bg, l.kamenova@government.bg</p>	<p>Through intensive upfront training of trainers, consultations and financial support.</p>

Yes	Bulgaria, Bissera Zankova - Media Adviser to the Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications (MTITC) Sofia, 9 Diakon Ignatii Str. bzankova@gmail.com	<p>To make the role of developing countries in global Internet governance more effective and visible is an essential goal in order for enhanced cooperation to become genuine and result oriented process and inclusive and diverse Information society to be accomplished. It is part and parcel of the broader issue of bridging the digital divide. These countries should have the capacity and understanding to participate on an equal footing with other stakeholders. The approach taken on board should be intimately connected with the achievement of the UN and UNESCO's Millenium Goals as a condition for the creation of the necessary level of ICTs, infrastructure, Internet access, capacity and skills of human resources. Principles pertaining to human rights such as affordable and universal access to the Internet for all, respect for multilingualism, content diversity and meaningful dialogue and participation should be guiding in this respect. The implementation of coherent and transparent ICT policy, regular monitoring of application and results, promotion of entrepreneurial culture and concentrating on the establishment of small and medium-size local enterprises, realization of capacity building projects and protecting fundamental human rights principles are crucial in this respect.</p> <p>See Jaqueline A. Morris, Internet Governance and Development, Media 21 at http://www.caricom.org/jsp/projects/Internet%20Governance%20and%20Development%20-%20Jacqueline%20Morris%20%20Media%2021.pdf</p>
Yes	Bulgaria, Academy of Sciences (IMI-BAS and LT-BAS) Sofia 1113, Acad. G. Bonchev Block 8 Director@math.bas.bg, Yoshinov@cc.bas.bg	Using the Internet for ensuring rights-based development, especially enabling wider exercise , of freedom of expression and press freedom, which in turn are critical to combating corruption, ensuring gender-sensitivity, deepening accountability, and promoting socially inclusive development.
Yes	Bulgaria, Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski" Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics 5 James Bouchier Blvd. Sofia 1164, Bulgaria krassen@fmi.uni-sofia.bg	Here we need strong support and motivation for developing countries using different mechanisms of UN, UNESCO and other relevant international organizations.

Yes	Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy and Energy 8 Slavyanska str., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria ts.tsankova@mee.government.bg	The effectiveness of the developing countries could be strengthened by educational enhancement, domestic Internet penetration and development of ICT sector services. Increasing the number of e-services in public and private sector will dramatically increase the usability of the Internet and effectiveness of the Internet governance.
Yes	Country: Switzerland Organization: Internet Society Address: Galerie Jean-Malbuisson 15 Email: bommelaer@isoc.org	<p>The participation of developing countries in global Internet governance is of paramount importance. In ISOC's view, a global Internet requires global participation. Significant progress has been achieved in this regard over the past few years, but more can be done to further include these voices in the governance discussions.</p> <p>National and Regional IGFs offer a valuable platform for local stakeholders to address key local Internet governance issues in a multistakeholder framework. There are many examples of vibrant local IGFs, including in Africa and Latin America, which have proved useful networking platforms to facilitate cooperation between local actors to address local priorities. With the next billion of Internet users mainly coming from developing countries, fostering vibrant multistakeholder cooperation at the local level is essential for the future of the global Internet.</p> <p>For many years, the Internet Society has provided participation fellowships for young technical and/or policy leaders from all over the world to attend the IGF. The program not only funds the fellows' participation, but also provides them with ex-ante and on-site briefings to ensure their meaningful participation.</p> <p>Remote participation opportunities (webcasting, audiocast, transcript and translation where possible) are also very much part of the IGF and constitute an important way for more developing countries to take part in the global governance discussions. Such options should be made broadly available in other conferences and fora.</p> <p>As intergovernmental organizations like CITELE, ATU and APT become more inclusive to non-government stakeholders, there are greater opportunities for developing countries to engage more closely with Internet organizations like ISOC. Through our participation in these groups, ISOC has been able to provide seminars on a range of issues like Spam, Open Standards and interconnection and to contribute to the policy development process in the region. We are learning from colleagues from developing countries and hope that our participation has enhanced the dialogue.</p>

		<p>Generally, the adoption of the multistakeholder approach helps governments reach better decisions, including in developing countries. For example, Kenya has changed its constitution to introduce a mandatory requirement for multistakeholder processes in all policy areas, enhancing participatory democracy. This is an outstanding example of impact and of enhanced multistakeholder cooperation.</p>
Yes	<p>Division for the Information Society (DI) Ministry of External Relations - Brazil Tel: +55 (61) 2030-6609 - FAX: +55 (61) 2030-6613</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>