

<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>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?</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus member, Australia ian.peter@ianpeter.com</p>	<p>those in power do not want to give it up -some parts of technical community,US Government, large corporations with powerful roles in Internet. Means must be expored to ensure that these powers do co-operate meaningfully</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Nnenna Nwakanma NNNENA.ORG/ACSIS/Africa IGF Rue des Jardins 22 BP 1764 ABJ 22 Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire</p>	<p>Physical participation, grounded understanding, sustained participation, youth and next generation involvement etc</p> <p>I believe in open and remote participation. With enough bandwidth, many more can participate. We also need to relieve the IG of its unneeded bureaucratic and admin hassles.</p> <p>We need to teach (yes, as a course) Internet Governance. The sphere can be scary. You dont wake up and engage!</p>

Yes	<p>Country: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO</p> <p>Organization: CENTRE AFRICAIN D'ECHANGE CULTUREL</p> <p>Adress: CAMPUS NUMERIQUE FRANCOPHONE DE KINSHASA.44, AVENUE DE L'HOPITAL</p> <p>email: cafec3m@yahoo.fr/b.schombe@gmail.com</p>	<p>In my humble experience, it is indispensable that UN agencies are responsible in each country. In the case of my country, whatever effort we provide, the government is not listening to us despite the sub regional and regional instruments ratified by the Ministry in charge of ICT. I had to resort to UNDP officials to explain and provide clarification to employees of the Minister on the importance of Internet governance. The concept itself is still not understood by most of the cabinet ministers who are more political.</p> <p>To remedy this situation, the CAFEC proposed a training seminar on Internet governance. The seminar participants will be: members of government, senators, deputies of, universities, the entities of the civil society, the National Police ...</p> <p>This seminar will take place in four phases to allow us to reach the players in the 11 provinces of the DRC.</p> <p>The seminar will be supervised by DiploFoundation.</p>
-----	---	---

Yes	Russia, Coordination Center for Russian Top-Level Domains, 8, Zoologicheskaya Str., Moscow, 123242, Russia; info@cctld.ru	<p>Citing the list of barriers for all the stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global IG seems to be a daunting exercise by its scope; however, there exist some common obstacles worth referring to in the context of the present document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-wise, there still exists a major barrier formed by insufficient capacity of stakeholders to engage in IG in accordance with the Geneva principles of multilateralism, transparency and democracy ; • Conceptually, the stakeholders have so far fallen short of visualizing their respective roles – though regularly repeated as a main rationale for each stakeholder group's actions, the mantra of multistakeholderism is construed in different, and sometimes, polar, ways; • Clearly, in many parts of the world, civil society and user community remain nascent, thus not being capable of playing their respective roles. This upsets the balance of forces between different stakeholders and, in tandem with some governments' strive to reaffirm their mandate of a "more-equal-than-other" stakeholder, results in the former groups abandonment of the IG arena. Academia, likewise have underperformed in some countries, which further aggravates the situation. The above once again proves an urgent need for a consistent global capacity-building program for these lagging constituencies. <p>Last but not least, there often exists the language barrier which impedes both their awareness of local needs and their formulation on the national level.</p>
Yes	Sweden, Netnod, Franzégatan 5, 112 51 Stockholm, info@netnod.se	<p>A few barriers of course exists. Governments are used to be able to have a final say. It must also for governments be possible to move forward although their interest (based on regulation) is not implemented. That might have impact on the local legislative process.</p> <p>It must also, as a 2nd example, be possible for all stakeholder groups to participate in all processes on equal footing. Today that is for example not possible in the ITU.</p>

Yes	<p>Bangladesh</p> <p>The Forum for Development, Journalism and Communication Studies (FOCUS)</p> <p>focus_bangladesh@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Finance, expertises, infrastructure and law are the major flaws.</p>
Yes	<p>Russia</p> <p>Russian Association for Electronic Communications</p> <p>Presnenskaya embankment, 12, Federation Tower West, floor 46, Moscow, 123100</p> <p>www.raec.ru</p> <p>info@raec.ru</p>	<p>Citing the list of barriers for all the stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global IG seems to be a daunting exercise by its scope; however, there exist some common obstacles worth referring to in the context of the present document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-wise, there still exists a major barrier formed by insufficient capacity of stakeholders to engage in IG in accordance with the Geneva principles of multilateralism, transparency and democracy ; • Conceptually, the stakeholders have so far fallen short of visualizing their respective roles – though regularly repeated as a main rationale for each stakeholder group's actions, the mantra of multistakeholderism is construed in different, and sometimes, polar, ways; • Clearly, in many parts of the world, civil society and user community remain nascent, thus not being capable of playing their respective roles. This upsets the balance of forces between different stakeholders and, in tandem with some governments' strive to reaffirm their mandate of a "more-equal-than-other" stakeholder, results in the former groups abandonment of the IG arena. Academia, likewise have underperformed in some countries, which further aggravates the situation. The above once again proves an urgent need for a consistent global capacity-building program for these lagging constituencies. <p>Last but not least, there often exists the language barrier which impedes both their awareness of local needs and their formulation on the national level.</p>

Yes	Country: United States Organization: Internet Governance Project Address: Syracuse University School of Information Studies Syracuse, NY 13244 USA E-mail: press@internetgovernance.org	<p>Again we are forced to challenge the premise underlying the question. The phrase “Fully participate” and the phrase “in their respective roles” are contradictory requirements. Either people fully participate, or they are confined to arbitrary “roles” assigned to them by governments.</p>
Yes	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>In order for stakeholders, particularly those from developing countries, to be able to participate effectively and regularly in global Internet governance processes, there needs to be a considerable development and improvement in a number of key areas including:</p> <p>Agenda Relevance</p> <p>Since the beginning of Internet governance discussions there was little participation from the developing world. One of the main reasons was that the Internet governance debate focused on issues, which were often not a priority for them. For developing countries the challenge was (and still is in many cases) to achieve universal and affordable Internet access and thus to have an inclusive role in the DNS industry development. .</p> <p>The question becomes then how to engage stakeholders from developing countries in the broader Internet governance agenda. One of the possible solutions for this is to promote debate and discussions regionally and nationally, perhaps through the existent regional and national IGF initiatives plus the promotion of domestic multi-stakeholder dialogue. Another is to relate Internet governance issues to local development; such as through the increasing relevance of the country code top-level domain (ccTLD) Registry to the promotion of local private and public sector content and applications.</p> <p>Language and Remote Participation</p> <p>Despite the fact that there have been tremendous efforts to produce</p>

		<p>materials in the different languages of the developing world there is still a challenge in making those materials available to stakeholders in developing economies. Another important barrier is the lack of resources for stakeholders in the developing world to attend and participate actively in the various fora that discuss global Internet governance issues. There should be an increased promotion and creation of remote participation mechanisms to reach out to those individuals and organizations that may contribute to the global debate.</p> <p>Capacity Building</p> <p>Given the complexity of the subjects surrounding the Internet governance debate, a clear understanding is sometimes required before stakeholders in the developing world can make effective contributions. Capacity building initiatives, such as thorough education and outreach in the subjects related to Internet governance, should be promoted in developing countries.</p> <p>ICANN is involved, within its own remit, in encouraging participation in meetings through a Fellowship Programme [3] that has sponsored hundreds of individuals (many young) to take part in special sessions at ICANN meetings.</p> <p>[3]: http://www.icann.org/en/about/participate/fellowships</p>
Yes	South-South Opportunity jrtnchekoua@gmail.com B.P 33 Yaoundé Cameroon"	<p>The new models have emerged from the digital transformation is no exception: like the business model, they are the product of social construction. Then, the digital will he bring out a unique world organization of individual cooperation or, conversely, new patterns of domination in an equally spectacular scale.</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>It is important to recognize that barriers, real and imagined, will always remain, but that is not a fault of the global Internet governance system. Not all stakeholders are willing or interested in engaging with the greater stakeholder community. However those that do wish to engage have become more and more creative in their methods. As was noted earlier, work is needed to improve remote participation for all events, not just global ones.</p> <p>For example, ARIN is meeting this challenge by holding both regional and sub-regional events in new locations each year, many of which offer remote participation capability; funding opportunities to attend ARIN meetings; and funding opportunities to attend global 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>	<p>In order to complement discussions at scheduled meetings, there is a need for online discussion forums in which people can freely participate whenever they wish. Mechanisms for sharing authorized records, summaries, and objective analysis of past discussions will be required as well.</p>

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	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.
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>The following barriers could be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absence of global consensus on the role of governments in the global Internet governance. To overcome this barrier, the dialogue should be continued and building international framework for cooperation among governments should be fostered; - Digital divide and differing levels of socio-economic development. To overcome this barrier, the identified factors should be taken into account to elaborate non-discriminatory formats of cooperation; - Non-transparent procedures of Internet governance, including management of critical resources in the framework of the ICANN activities. To overcome this barrier, openness and transparency of the identified procedures need to be enhanced.
-----	--	---

Yes	<p>RIPE NCC Singel 258 1016AB Amsterdam The Netherlands</p> <p>Email: externalrelations@ripe.net</p>	<p>Barriers remain in terms of willingness and ability of all stakeholders to fully engage across traditional stakeholder divisions. In terms of willingness to engage, it is vital the Internet community communicates the benefits of multi-stakeholder cooperation and provides specific examples of models or initiatives that illustrate the effectiveness of enhanced cooperation.</p> <p>In terms of ability to engage, our response to the previous question considered some of the challenges for developing country stakeholders and possible remedies. Enhanced cooperation emphasises the importance of all stakeholders having the opportunity to engage in Internet governance processes, and all stakeholders have a responsibility to make this ideal a reality.</p> <p>The RIPE NCC, like many of our industry partners, has responded to this challenge with programmes to fund attendance and participation at regional and global IGF events, by providing high-quality remote participation options for all our public events, and by staging regular sub-regional events around our service region.</p>
Yes	<p>Ellen Blackler Vice President, Global Public Policy The Walt Disney Company 425 Third Street, Suite 1100 Washington DC 20024 United States</p>	<p>Financial resources, adequate staff and an understanding of which issues are being discussed where are issues for all stakeholders. Ways to improve information available and meaningful remote participation opportunities should continue to be explored.</p>

Yes	<p>Mark Carvell Head, Global Internet Governance Policy Creative Economy, Internet and International Department for Culture, Media & Sport 100 Parliament Street London SW1A 2BQ United Kingdom mark.carvell@culture.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>The ten years since the WSIS have seen substantial progress in creating the kind of multi-stakeholder eco-system that facilitates active participation by stakeholders. The IGF established by the WSIS and the replication of that open, equitable, focussed and fully participatory forum at the national and regional levels has accelerated the progress towards a dynamic knowledge economy that serves the interests of all countries and communities. There is still progress to be made to overcome the constraints of traditional governance structures that still persist such as the costs of physical participation and the pressure on resources. There is also more progress to be made in making these processes multi-lingual and user-friendly – and generally increasing the level of awareness of the benefits and opportunities for active engagement. The CSTD has a role for reviewing progress in outreach and stakeholder participation (including from governments) from least developed economies and small island states for whom the impact of the knowledge economy has highly transformative potential.</p>
-----	--	--

Yes	<p>ORGANISATIONAL ENDORSEMENTS:</p> <p>Association for Progressive Communications (APC) Global Valeria Betancourt <valeriab@apc.org></p> <p>Bytes for All, Pakistan Pakistan Shahzad Ahmad <shahzad@bytesforall.pk></p> <p>Centre for Community Informatics Research. Development an</p>	<p>As noted in questions 2a and 2b above, enhanced cooperation was largely a role taken by governments who required it, through which they hoped to address the over-arching issue of WSIS, namely internationalization of Internet oversight. But as question 3 notes, that has not happened. The apparent problem is that two separate objectives – the principal aims of either of the power poles – have been conflated. If these two objectives (in question 4 above) are treated separately, then there may become the possibility to find some common ground.</p> <p>Specifically, the US and its allies have feared, and have acted to stop, what they see as the threat of totalitarian control of the Internet. But it is possible to switch from this negative characterization, to a positive outlook: the US and its allies have been centrally concerned with freedom of expression, for our new global communications medium, the Internet. The other governmental power pole has been concerned, from the beginning of WSIS, and even well before, that oversight for the Internet move from the US, to a global arrangement. Both objectives are laudable, and reconcilable.</p> <p>The way forward, as suggested in question 8, is to treat those two objectives separately. In fact, continuing to conflate them – so that there can be no action on one, without impact on the other – assures deadlock. Separating them creates a freedom of maneuver that may permit to find ways forward, between the two, so-far implacable camps.</p> <p>Related to this, the bi-polar opposition between groups of states has come to be mirrored among (what have become) the states' frontline troops: the stakeholders. Multi-stakeholderism has been used as a point of distinction between the Internet governance model favoured by the US and its allies from those of the countries who have been calling for internationalisation of policy oversight. Thus multi-stakeholderism, perhaps the most important innovation of WSIS, which formally acknowledges governance roles for multiple stakeholders, has been co-opted into this struggle between the two governmental power poles.</p> <p>But this is a false dichotomy. Whilst it is fundamental that public policy</p>
-----	--	--

issues be determined through democratic means, and in the Westphalian ideal conception of democracy, this would fall to elected governments, we have found that even supposed governmental defenders of democracy abuse their state power – as the Snowden episode, and before it the Manning episode, and even the Wikileaks story, have revealed (not least through the treatment of the individuals themselves). In truth no government has fully lived up to its fundamental democratic responsibilities, and then within that to the new promise of multi-stakeholderism at the national or the global level.

On one conception, real multi-stakeholderism offers to formalize government consultation with its constituencies, as governments formulate policy. Among other purposes, this offers a safeguard against the abuses of state power, when ‘the people’ may otherwise be forgotten. This – real multi-stakeholderism – means consulting widely, certainly beyond the usual suspects who may frequent UN meetings. Thence, the people of a democracy may be empowered, with voices speaking from all corners, and providing a bulwark against the ever-present temptations, for those temporarily entrusted with governmental power, to abuse that power. On another conception (or in the longer term), multi-stakeholderism promises a more significant rebalancing of power between states and other networks of individuals.

On either conception civil society – instead of being used as pawns in a global power tussle – may instead use the new regime, to assume a rightful place in democracy.

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)</p> <p>Organization: GodlyGlobal.org</p> <p>Address: GodlyGlobal.org c/o Norbert Bollow, Weidlistrasse 18, CH-8624 Grüt</p> <p>Email: nb@GodlyGlobal.org</p>	<p>One major barrier relates to agenda-setting. Too many of those with power over the agenda in regard to the discourse at the IGF and other Internet governance institutions are strongly influenced by careerist motivations. These motivations go strongly against allowing discussion topics which are outside the set of topics on which the Internet governance careerists can competently participate in the discussions, and these motivations further go strongly against allowing discussion topics which can only result in embarrassments for proponents of the neo-liberal agenda. Examples of this agenda-setting problem are the rejections of the workshop proposals on the topics “the roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies” and “regulating global Internet businesses - need for global frameworks” for the 2013 IGF.</p> <p>In the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1 , this agenda setting problem is addressed by ensuring that no-one has the power to suppress discussion topics.</p> <p>Another major barrier is that many stakeholders cannot afford the expenses of international travel, which in many Internet governance is effectively a requirement to fully participate. Even though for example in regard to IGF meetings a lot of effort is invested towards facilitating remote participation, the reality is that this does not work as well as is sometimes claimed, and even when it works, the remote participants have no chance to participate in the various informal discussions e.g. in corridors which are often the most important part.</p> <p>In the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1 , this problem is addressed by creating a discourse that is conducted in its entirety via the Internet. This is possible for the tasks and roles envisioned for the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, but it will not be possible for all governance fora and institutions. In regard to those fora and institutions where international travel is necessary for everyone outside the host country in order to be able to fully participate, travel funding must be made available that allows significant numbers of civil society and small business entity representative to participate without having to worry about the travel</p>
-----	--	--

expense. Of course, appropriate checks and balance need to be put in place to ensure that this funding goes to stakeholders who are able to contribute an independent perspective of their own, and not to sock puppets, astroturf groups, and the like.

A third major barrier is the necessary time investment for gaining a sufficiently deep understanding of the issues at stake and the pertinent viewpoints and solutions strategies. Governments have a responsibility to ensure that the various significant viewpoints and ideas which exist among their societies will be appropriately represented. Governments therefore need to find out what these viewpoints and ideas are, and then tender contracts for representation of these viewpoints and ideas in the relevant international fora. These contracts should be awarded to NGOs with relevant expertise in view of these NGOs having already started engaging in developing those viewpoints and ideas, and each of the contracts should fund not only the time that is spent directly on representing a certain viewpoints and set of ideas in the international fora, but the entirety of the required effort for effective engagement.

Yes	<p>Anja Kovacs, Project Director Internet Democracy Project C14E Munirka DDA Flats New Delhi 110067 India</p> <p>anja@internetdemocracy.in</p>	<p>For civil society (especially, though not solely, for those from the Global South), there are two particularly significant barriers to effective participation. The first one concerns procedural matters: avenues for participation all too often remain either extremely limited or absent, and where they are made available, their exact nature, modalities and significance often remain unclear until the very last moment (the Independent Experts Group that was put together in preparation for the ITU's WTPF, while a welcome initiative as such, provides a good recent illustration of such shortcomings). For developing country civil society, which frequently has to manage with limited resources both in terms of money and people, ill-defined and/or last-minute processes make effective planning and, thus, participation impossible (we believe that the same is true of many developing country governments).</p> <p>The issue is exacerbated by the fact that most Internet governance meetings take place in the developed world, as a consequence of which the financial investment to attend is indeed considerable, and this brings us to a second issue: that of funding to enable participation. Unless more funding is made available to enable participation in at least key events in a process, multistakeholderism – be it under the mantle of enhanced cooperation or otherwise – will be stillborn. Remote participation, while valuable, cannot replace all in-person attendance at key meetings in an Internet governance processes for those who aim to follow such processes closely.</p> <p>While a wide-range of governments and international institutions now pay extensive lip service to multistakeholderism, until the above issues are resolved, effective participation of global civil society will remain impossible.</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>As the name itself signifies there will be a constant tussle between stakeholders in policy issues as their stakes are often different and sometimes colluding. Hence, the objective should be to have greater transparency in processes and to have better representation from all stakeholder groups and to strive for informed decision-making.</p> <p>There also exist barriers due to economic, geographical and political differences. However, these issues can be resolved to a great extent by building a sense of trust based on transparency and open discussions.</p> <p>There should be more direct stakeholder participation from the developing countries in international fora discussing Internet policy issues. Issues of protection of Human Rights over Internet, access, local language usage and education should be debated and addressed and this would further boost the stakeholder participation across the globe.</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>A distinction between barriers in terms of willingness and ability is of stakeholders to full engage with other Internet stakeholders is important.</p> <p>In terms of willingness to engage, there has been a lot of improvement from the developing countries stakeholder, not only by Governments.</p> <p>In terms of ability to engage, resources, knowledge and language barriers, are still a challenge for developing country stakeholders.</p> <p>Enhanced cooperation emphasizes the importance of all stakeholders having the opportunity to engage in Internet governance processes, but all stakeholders have a responsibility to make this a reality. As noted before “increasing the availability of information, multilingualism, transparency and full remote participation at the multi-stakeholder processes such as the IGF but also for the Public International fora” is not a task that needs to be done but developing countries only.</p> <p>LACNIC has been fully committed since its creation to help the regional community with that challenge, not only to their own processes but also to other discussions. The training, capacity building, development oriented efforts described above are just a little example of that commitment.</p>

Yes	<p>United States Center for Democracy & Technology 1634 I Street NW #1100 Washington, DC 20006 mshears@cdt.org</p>	<p>Some of the greatest barriers to participation in global Internet governance exist in the organizations and institutions – at national, regional, and global levels – that are not yet open to full multistakeholder participation and are not transparent in their policy development and policy decision-making.</p> <p>Other barriers include: 1) the difficulty of agreeing how international Internet-related public policy issues should be addressed and in what fora; 2) the difficulty of agreeing which international Internet-related public policy issues should be the focus of enhanced cooperation and which are already adequately addressed; and 3) the lack of support among some actors for full stakeholder involvement in enhanced cooperation.</p> <p>Barriers to participation could be overcome through, among others, 1) a commitment from governments and international organizations to implementing open and inclusive policy development processes; 2) a recognition of the need to facilitate the participation of all stakeholders in Internet governance discussions and enhanced cooperation; 3) a commitment to contribute to and participate in existing Internet governance related fora and organizations; and 4) a willingness to work with stakeholders and actors with diverse views to identify common points of interest and/or concern in areas of international Internet-related public policy.</p>
-----	--	--

Yes	<p>As a member of civil society, we will limit our response to the particular barriers that we face. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Exclusion from participating in global internet governance debates, or from participating as independent actors: While we welcome governments forming multistakeholder delegations to global internet governance fora, being part of a national delegation does not substitute for independent civil society participation. *Barriers to full participation, on equal footing with other stakeholder groups: Without addressing the issue of decision-making, civil society is often limited in our ability to participate fully in meetings. For example, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> **We often do not enjoy speaking rights or the ability to contribute documents; **We are sometimes not permitted to view the all relevant documents, which limits our ability to make informed contributions; **Modalities of participation are often unclear so it is difficult to participate fully, or make the decision to participate at all; *Limited resources: Civil society has limited resources, both financial and human, to fully participate in internet governance at the global level. To compound this problem, lack of information about or notice of meetings can make it difficult to make an informed decision about which meetings to attend. *Linguistic barriers often prevent a diverse representation of civil society from participating internet governance at the global level. <p>Proposed solutions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Outline clear modalities, with the default being that civil society can attend and participate on equal footing with other stakeholders. *Provide advance notice for all meetings *Make available travel fellowships *Schedule meetings far in advance and in places that are not exorbitantly expensive *Publish all relevant material, with no password requirements *Use multilingual content and translation/interpretation whenever possible *Remote participation
-----	--

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>In order to enable all stakeholders to participate in international conferences to have crucial discussions over global Internet governance, it is required to promote ICT-employed remote participation, to introduce audio streaming and captioning, to implement language support (e.g., multilingual interpretation), to release conference materials and minutes, and to provide opportunities for inviting comments from all stakeholders.</p>
Yes	<p>Cote d'Ivoire, DIGILEXIS – SPR, 28 BP 1485 Abidjan 28 kichango@gmail.com</p>	<p>We have already mentioned and elaborated on the language barrier and the need for effective multilingualism.</p> <p>It is also critical that every stakeholder group from all regions feel that they are fairly accounted for, and that reporting and accountability mechanisms are held to the highest international standards.</p> <p>Work should continuously be done to raise awareness about IG issues, especially in developing countries, to build capacity and enable ownership of the issues at grassroots level. Left to its own devices, no government can be fully trusted to live up to its fundamental democratic responsibilities and to fully open up its policies and actions to the new promise of multi-stakeholder governance at the national or the global level. The international environment should enable the empowerment of non-state and social network of actors so that they can speak out and be heard whenever the circumstances demand it.</p>

Yes	France, INTLNET, 120 chemin des Crouzettes, Saint-Vincent de Barbeyrargues, France 34730, info@intlnet.org	<p>The main difficulty is to get real in a new world for all. How can you want at the same time someone to be innovative and pragmatically correct? The problem is the same everywhere: political correctness is the key to money. The only solution, therefore, is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either to abide by political correctness and not to move and innovate • Or to dramatically reduce the cost/time to market. <p>Richard Stallman took a major step ahead with FLOSS. We now need to go deeper than Linux into the digisphere itself, which means a real enhanced cooperation effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For civil society it goes with network neutrality and providers' reliability. • For governments it goes with sovereignty. • For international organizations with connectivity at all of the layers from hardware to brain (semantic layers). • For business it goes with the banalization of the network/cloud trust. <p>Network non-neutrality in different usages, layer violations, tariff disparities, etc. has a huge cost that Civil Society engineers cannot overcome without talking together. This in turn has a cost due to the lack of a lead user social network. A "lead user" is a user who is interested in and technically capable of adapting what he/she uses to suit his/her own needs.</p> <p>This is what I attempted with the IUCG@IETF for the fringe to fringe layers over the end to end, and the IUTF for the Intelligent Use fringe to fringe layers and above.</p> <p>Some help would be welcome. However, the problem is to get it free from obligations to other stakeholders.</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>Among the various stakeholder groups identified in the Tunis Agenda, it is only governments who are unable to participate in their role in Internet governance. There is no effective mechanism for them to undertake that role, which is the development of international Internet-related public policy in consultation with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Enhanced cooperation was intended to provide this mechanism and the process toward implementing enhanced cooperation was to begin by 1Q 2006.</p> <p>So far, implementation of enhanced cooperation has been successfully blocked by a collaboration of interests (regretably including a number of governments) who believe that the multistakeholder model excludes governments, who erroneously claim that governments want to control the Internet, and who want to restrict any meaningful government participation. All these principles are clearly contrary to the WSIS outcomes.</p> <p>Those governments supporting implementation of the WSIS outcomes have finally reached the point of creation of the WGEC, whose purpose is to make recommendations on how to fully implement the mandate of the WSIS regarding enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda.</p> <p>The barrier to implementation of enhanced cooperation may be overcome if the WGEC makes recommendations truly in line with the intent and spirit of WSIS.</p>
-----	---	---

Yes	United States of America	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
-----	--------------------------	--

Yes	United States, Intel, 12 Poet Drive, Matawan NJ, 07747, Mike.s.chartier@intel.com	<p>The structure of some international organizations restricts participation of some stakeholders, especially at the decision phase. For instance most decisions and some meetings of the ITU are restricted to Administrations. So it is important that such organizations cooperate and work together with other organizations with different participation models in order to develop positions, rules, and norms that reflect the broadest consensus.</p> <p>Key to cooperation in any relationship is mutual respect. As mentioned earlier, Intel believes that day-to-day technical and operational matters require the vibrant responsiveness of the private sector and support a standard-setting process that is global, consensus based, transparent, and industry-led. Voluntary standards are a fundamental requirement upon which the ICT industry has thrived. The ITU has many unique roles as the United Nation's specialized agency for telecommunications, including the renegotiation of several important treaties such as the Radio Regulations. Moreover the ITU-D plays an important role in assisting developing countries. However recently there have been proposals for the ITU-T to assert "pre-eminence" for the standards they develop or even make some standards mandatory, and this has led to unnecessary friction between standard bodies which should be avoided in the future. In order maintain cooperation it is critical that telecommunications standards developed by the ITU-T remain voluntary in nature and not be given superior status over standards developed in other international bodies such as the IETF.</p>
-----	---	--

Yes	<p>Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet) www.kictanet.or.ke, and the Internet Society (ISOC) Kenya Chapter http://isoc.or.ke/</p> <p>Contacts: Mwenda Kivuva (Kivuva@transworldafrica.com) Meshack Emakunat (memakunat@yahoo.com) Grace Githaiga (ggithaiga@hotmail.com) (M</p>	<p>i. IG is not binding. ii. Governments wield a lot of power in implementation of policies at the national level. iii. Some stakeholders see themselves as outsiders and feel that they would rather participate from the sidelines. iv. The national foreign policies concerning the internet and ICT in general act as a barrier in internet governance. v. Issues of user connectivity and accessibility and diversity, access to infrastructure -in this case connectivity of marginalized areas and people in the developing nations presents a barrier. Despite efforts by governments to want to meet the concerns of these people, there is lack of address relating to the vital issues pertaining to public policies that affect their economic activities. In this case governments can integrate e-agricultural strategies in their National ICT policies in order to steer development in the marginalized areas in developing nations. It is understood that 70% of these people are dependent on agriculture as the economic activity (or only one economic activity like mining). vi. Cultural diversity may also act as a barrier to having an effective IGF since it is understood that ICT is a generational thing that negatively affects the old generation. The old tend to shun the developments (internet) as it brings up a culture that spares no morals among the current generation. However through ICTs we can still have filters that will prevent illegal and harmful content. vii. Net neutrality in that when we want diversity in the internet we may as well think of creating content in all languages in order to enhance the richness and value of the internet for all-as was once suggested in Vilnius 2010. The idea of multilingualism is important in making the internet a relevant and useful world resource.</p>
-----	--	--

Yes	Switzerland, Federal Office of Communications OFCOM, 44 rue de l'Avenir, CH-2501 Biel/Bienne, Switzerland ir@bakom.admin.ch	Since the institutional Internet Governance ecosystem is very complex with a large number of institutions and processes dealing with issues related to Internet Governance, all stakeholders, especially those from developing countries need to be able to overview this ecosystem, to digest and analyse the information provided through various channels and to have a clear strategy that allows them to prioritize their involvement and activities. Furthermore, transparency, accountability and inclusiveness of the relevant processes and institutions are key to reduce the barriers for all stakeholders to fully participate. The availability of key information in multiple languages is another key factor for reducing barriers. And finally, it is important to pursue trust-building processes between stakeholders in order to create an inviting and enabling atmosphere for all stakeholders.
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	In many developing countries, non-governmental stakeholders still face high hurdles – political, economic – as far as their participation in the Internet Governance is concerned. Under 10, some suggestions have been made in order to lower the barriers for them.

Yes	France, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 38 Cours Albert 1er 75008 Paris, aha@iccwbo.org	<p>Some stakeholders are not aware of the processes and forums where they can contribute and have impact at national, regional and international levels. Increased awareness raising at all levels and across stakeholder groups would help to overcome this.</p> <p>-Financial support to cover travel expenses remains an obstacle for some stakeholders, and more should be done to build the IGF trust fund, for example, and maximize existing funding support programmes offered by several stakeholders including the Internet technical community, governments and business, to assist in this regard.</p> <p>Barriers include financial, informational, and operational elements: Financial support to engage in global Internet governance, whether through fellowships and sponsorships, or through other means, for example employer recognition of the importance to engage in Internet governance processes.</p> <p>-Informational – while information may seem available, ease of informational access of issues relevant to a public policy issue are essential and need to be more accessible and easier to understand. Processes need to be easier to participate in particularly for newcomers.</p> <p>-Operational – global Internet governance processes need to continue to operationalize in ways that scale to a global stakeholder constituency, including governments. – recognizing that different stakeholders may lead on different matters/issues and recognizing the issues, processes, and forms of engagement that best enable the respective participation.</p>
Yes	Czech Republic, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, Na Frantisku 32, 110 15 Prague 1, novakovam@mpo.cz	<p>Low infrastructure development</p> <p>Low level of market liberalization</p> <p>Low level of coordination and cooperation 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>To regulate the Internet on global level, we are to understand the cyber-security issues, its relevance and urgency, because there is a clear underestimation of cyber security problems by the developing countries due to their nature, electronic, non-physical phenomena and the low level of internet expansion. In this regard, at the international level we are need to work to raise awareness and competence of the authorized representatives of developing countries, for example, by organizing conferences. This can be good for developed countries, as during the time in which the developing countries are not participating in the international regulation of the Internet, they are comfortable and safe areas for cybercriminals, who can direct an attack towards any other country.</p>
Yes	<p>Mexico 1) Camara Nacional de las Industria Electronica de telecomunicaciones y tecnologias de la informacion (CANIETI) Culiacan No. 71 col. Hipodromo Condesa México D.F. 2) Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor (INDAUTOR), Puebla #143, Colonia Roma</p>	<p>INDAUTOR: En el ámbito de su competencia este Instituto no cuenta con elementos para responder esta pregunta.</p> <p>CANIETI: Las propias legislaciones de los Estados participantes. Peligros sobre la soberanía propia. Se podría hacer el marco internacional en donde los temas espinosos no se toquen, primero donde la mayoría está de acuerdo.</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>Barriers include financial, informational/educational, and operational elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Financial – There needs to be greater support to engage in global Internet governance, whether through fellowships and sponsorships, or through other means, for example employer recognition of the importance to engage in Internet governance processes. Financial support to cover travel expenses remains an obstacle for some stakeholders. More should be done to build the IGF trust fund, for example, to help cover travel costs and broaden participation from emerging economies. In addition, existing funding support programmes offered by several stakeholders including the Internet technical community, governments and business, should be maximized; -Informational – Some stakeholders are not aware of the processes and forums where they can contribute and have an impact at national, regional and international levels. Raising awareness at all levels and across stakeholder groups would help to overcome this. While information may seem available, it is essential to improve ease of access to information on Internet-related public policy issues. Information also needs to be more readily understandable to a newcomer audience that may not yet possess in-depth technical expertise or knowledge of Internet governance policy issues; and -Operational – Global Internet governance processes must continue to operationalize in ways that scale to a global stakeholder constituency, including governments -- recognizing that different stakeholders may lead on different matters/issues, and that different processes and forms of engagement may better enable the respective participation of all relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process.
-----	---	--

Yes	<p>43 civil society organizations, 10 of them with ECOSOC consultative status, and many more individuals.</p> <p>Organizations supporting the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action Aid International (ECOSOC status) 2. Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication, Bangladesh (EC 	.
Yes	<p>INDIA, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations Office 9, RUE DU VALAIS, 1202, GENEVA Mission.india@ties.itu.int</p>	<p>The main barrier to the participation of stakeholders is the absence of a mechanism for global internet governance where they can participate in their respective roles.</p> <p>Second barrier to participation of stakeholders is the nature of selection process of participants who represent these stakeholders. The process of selection of the representatives should be made in a transparent manner and using an inclusive approach.</p>
Yes	<p>LATVIA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission.un-gen@mfa.gov.lv</p>	<p>Acceptance of the Internet multi-stakeholder governance model by some governments remains a serious obstacle to enhanced cooperation. As the Internet develops in an open, dynamic and creative manner (which is not necessarily result of the governmental action), it is unimaginable that the traditional regulatory framework would be able to address and resolve all challenges that are linked with the development and use of the Internet. Political willingness to accept an emerging multi-stakeholder policy making framework is needed for countries to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet</p>

Yes	BULGARIA, Law and Internet Foundation, bul. Patriarh Evtimii 36, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria info@netlaw.bg	Most common barrier for stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance is the economic barrier. Both governments and other stakeholders see the economic development as an obstacle to fully participate.
Yes	BULGARIA, Department of Administration Modernization, Council of Ministers, 1 Dondukov Blvd.1594 Sofia is.ivanov@government.bg	Among the remaining barriers for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance are the old thinking and insufficient partnership between governments and civil society, which could be best overcome by publicizing and making use of existing good practices from those countries that have paved the way in this field.
Yes	Country: Bulgaria Organization: Information Technology and eGovernance Directorate, Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications Address: Sofia, 9 Dyakon Ignatii Str. E-mail: hhrstov@mtitc.government.bg	In its international engagements for internet governance, the European Commission has been one of the key players throughout the World Summit on the Information Society (2002-2005) and actively contributes to many of the action lines that followed it. It is also a member of the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN and, while supporting the principle of bottom-up, consensus-based policy-making for domain names and "Internet numbering resources", it has also consistently pushed for ICANN to strengthen its accountability, independence and transparency framework, so that ICANN can truly be a globally accepted model for multi-stakeholder governance of the Internet. The legal structure and incorporation of ICANN under Californian law poses problems, including conflicts of applicable law and jurisdictions. In addition, legitimate concerns remain as to whether a governmental committee advising a private corporation is an appropriate and effective mechanism to enable governments to exercise their public policy responsibilities. Moreover, the self-regulatory approach as practised by ICANN means that incumbent operators play a potentially inappropriate role (e.g. from the standpoint of competition policy) in setting entry conditions for new competitors.

		<p>Most common barrier for stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance is the economic barrier. Both governments and other stakeholders see the economic development as an obstacle to fully participate.</p> <p>One of the barriers for the stakeholders could be that they do not fully understand their roles, potential influence and governance mechanisms in the global Internet governance.</p> <p>Among the remaining barriers for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance are the old thinking and insufficient partnership between governments and civil society, which could be best overcome by publicizing and making use of existing good practices from those countries that have paved the way in this field. The main barrier is to find the proper way in which UN, UNESCO and other relevant international organizations can play their major role in managing the whole process and ensuring the desired progress will be made.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Executive Agency Electronic Communication Networks and Information Systems.</p> <p>Bulgaria 1000 "Gurko 6" str.</p> <p>mail@esmis.government.bg</p>	<p>Among the remaining barriers for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance are the old thinking and insufficient partnership between governments and civil society, which could be best overcome by publicizing and making use of existing good practices from those countries that have paved the way in this field.</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Council of Ministers, Strategic Development and Coordination Directorate</p> <p>1 Dondukov Blvd 1594 Sofia</p> <p>y.stoyanov@government.bg,</p> <p>l.kamenova@government.bg</p>	<p>On-line commerce erects barriers to both consumers and traders, and especially where transactions must cross one or more State borders. In this case distributors and traders are reluctant to serve clients who reside outside their usual State and / or markets.</p> <p>Warranty service, dearer supply and costly dispute settlement procedures are among the barriers to the on-line commerce between different States.</p>

Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Bissera Zankova - Media Adviser to the Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications (MTITC) Sofia, 9 Diakon Ignatii Str. bzankova@gmail.com</p>	<p>Different groups of stakeholders encounter difficulties in global Internet governance. These barriers vary from one group to another. There are repressive governments for instance, which are not interested at all to contribute to the global efforts put in Internet governance, there are weak governments which lack courage and understanding to participate actively in the process, there are governments that are not committed to the cause and do not feel like being involved in the global mechanism of Internet governance. Civil society's and especially general public's participation is also narrow and has to be pushed forward. Industry may not be motivated always to take part in Internet governance. All these flaws in stakeholders' involvement we think can be removed by enhancing dialogue among the parties. Clear and simple principles of global Internet governance that foster Internet freedom and human rights should also be agreed upon. Another opportunity to be pursued is as some analysts point out to revisit the existing model of multistakeholderism which can be considered transitory and to turn to the large community of Internet users searching for more democratic forms of representation and participation.</p> <p>About the intellectual content of world debate see more at http://www.internetgovernance.org/2013/04/23/wtf-wtpf-the-continuing-battle-over-internet-governance-principles/</p> <p>About India and business challenges see also http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/internet-governance-needs-consensus-says-sibal/article3949194.ece</p>
Yes	<p>Bulgaria, Academy of Sciences (IMI-BAS and LT-BAS) Sofia 1113, Acad. G. Bonchev Block 8 Director@math.bas.bg, Yoshinov@cc.bas.bg</p>	<p>Gaps remained in addressing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, and emphasized the need to address issues such as the digital divide, accessibility, affordability, inclusiveness, dominance and control of the Internet, cyber-security and privacy.</p> <p>The absence of definition and practical guidance on what constitutes an enhanced level of cooperation.</p> <p>Intrinsic, institutional, social and cultural barriers, that may have a negative impact in global Internet governance. It is imperative to understand organizational structures, processes, cultures and organizational change in order to understand, and possibly influence, the path of technology use in governance. Bureaucratic resistance, user resistance and the reluctance of civil servants to engage in innovation</p>

		oversimplify the complexities of institutional change.
Yes	Bulgaria, Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski" Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics 5 James Bouchier Blvd. Sofia 1164, Bulgaria krassen@fmi.uni-sofia.bg	The main barrier is to find the proper way in which UN, UNESCO and other relevant international organizations can play their major role in managing the whole process and ensuring the desired progress will be made.
Yes	Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy and Energy 8 Slavyanska str., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria ts.tsankova@mee.government.bg	One of the barriers for the stakeholders could be that they do not fully understand their roles, potential influence and governance mechanisms in the global Internet governance.

Yes	Country: Switzerland Organization: Internet Society Address: Galerie Jean-Malbuisson 15 Email: bommelaer@isoc.org	<p>Much progress has taken place in the past few years in terms of stakeholders' participation in global governance processes. Internet governance is a constantly evolving process and improvements are implemented incrementally over time.</p> <p>Some of the key challenges include the need for increasing awareness around the existing governance mechanisms. The number of parallel processes and different modes of participation can be unsettling for newcomers, and efforts should be made to make them easier to understand and be involved with.</p> <p>For example, the Internet Society has created a fellowship program for policymakers to participate in meetings of the Internet Engineering Task Force. This has been a very positive experience in order to provide familiarity to the participation processes of such meetings, which are unlike traditional intergovernmental meetings.</p> <p>Given the distributed nature of these mechanisms, participation can sometimes be financially constraining to some stakeholders. Fellowships, sponsorships and remote participation options should be further promoted and maximised to enhance participation.</p>
Yes	Division for the Information Society (DI) Ministry of External Relations - Brazil Tel: +55 (61) 2030-6609 - FAX: +55 (61) 2030-6613	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.