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?	Please enter your contact details:	17. What are the national capacities to be developed and modalities to be considered for national governments to develop Internet-related public policy with participation of all stakeholders?
Yes	Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus member, Australia ian.peter@ianpeter.com	no comment
Yes	Nnenna Nwakanma NNNENA.ORG/ACSIS/Africa IGF Rue des Jardins 22 BP 1764 ABJ 22 Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire	Government officials need education. In Africa, I had actually started brainstorming on a project that is available on https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tgJqH7V_PgX7ypvHUkysH-Ab2xAEULG4DlOH82g43DA/edit

Yes	Country: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO Organization: CENTRE AFRICAIN D'ECHANGE CULTUREL Adress: CAMPUS NUMERIQUE FRANCOPHONE DE KINSHASA.44, AVENUE DE L'HOPITAL email: cafec3m@yahoo.fr/b.schombe@gmail.com	I need to dig deeper.
Yes	Russia, Coordination Center for Russian Top-Level Domains, 8, Zoologicheskaya Str., Moscow, 123242, Russia; info@cctld.ru	To ensure a maximum possible degree of development of the national government's capacities with regard to development Internet-related public policies it would be appropriate to consider: encouragement of creation and an IG academic research network and development of exchange programs with a special emphasis on basic and advanced training in IG for (senior) policy makers; development of special IG classes as a part of the university and high-school curricula; promotion and widespread of IGF as a platform for a nationwide dialogue on critical IG issues; engaging civil society organizations to mobilize support of such initiatives on a grass-root level by running awareness-raising campaigns; and to crown all this, tasking a reputable international organization to collect and review best practices and create a readily available multilingual free data pool under its auspices for all the nations to use. The modalities of the process should imply good faith, all-inclusiveness, commitment, and collaboration.
Yes	Sweden, Netnod, Franzéngatan 5, 112 51 Stockholm, info@netnod.se	A combination of supporting local meetings where the issues are discussed with more ongoing exchange of information and public discussions on potential changes related to for example local legislation in the context.

Yes	Bangladesh The Forum for Development, Journalism and Communication Studies (FOCUS) focus_bangladesh@yahoo.com	Use of local resource and experites are enough for this activities.
Yes	Russia Russian Association for Electronic Communications Presnenskaya embankment, 12, Federation Tower West, floor 46, Moscow, 123100 www.raec.ru info@raec.ru	To ensure a maximum possible degree of development of the national government's capacities with regard to development Internet-related public policies it would be appropriate to consider: encouragement of creation and an IG academic research network and development of exchange programs with a special emphasis on basic and advanced training in IG for (senior) policy makers; development of special IG classes as a part of the university and high-school curricula; promotion and widespread of IGF as a platform for a nationwide dialogue on critical IG issues; engaging civil society organizations to mobilize support of such initiatives on a grass-root level by running awareness-raising campaigns; and to crown all this, tasking a reputable international organization to collect and review best practices and create a readily available multilingual free data pool under its auspices for all the nations to use. The modalities of the process should imply good faith, all-inclusiveness, commitment, and collaboration.
Yes	Country: United States Organization: Internet Governance Project Address: Syracuse University School of Information Studies Syracuse, NY 13244 USA E-mail: press@internetgovernance.org	As a question that addresses national level polocy making, we find it to be outside the scope of the Enhanced Cooperation working group and thus we choose not to answer it here.

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	Open, inclusive, structured and accountable consultation processes should be developed at the national level to ensure that the multi-stakeholder models become the standard for addressing public policy issues related to the Internet. The nature of the Internet, as well as its perpetual and rapid development continues to demonstrate that top-down regulatory and policy approaches encounters clear limits in the ability to capture the fast moving reality of this global network, and the subsequent endorsement and adoption by the stakeholders. As in the cases of Brazil [6], India [7], Sweden, more countries are establishing multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms that allow for a broader assessment and development of Internet policies. In a trend of innovation of national and global governance model, similar capacities for developing national multi-stakeholder bodies, should be a consistent part of the UN activities for development, as their effectiveness goes beyond the realm of Internet public policy. Specialized UN Agencies and Programmes such as the UNDP's Democratic Governance should embrace the multi-stakeholder model as part of its activities in relation to institution and governance building at national level. [6]: http://cgi.br/ [7]: http://www.iigc.in/
Yes	South-South Opportunity jrtnchekoua@gmail.com B.P 33 Yaoundé Cameroon"	The areas of public regulation concerning network architecture, operators, content control and the same terms of public access, that is to say the public places, offering free Internet access or paying. These public policies are analyzed as a social construct, a product of acting, compromises and alliances between many stakeholders in a business ecosystem. Their contradictions undermine the effectiveness of all these policies are to be applied by local officials with divergent interests. This paper introduces a series of empirical studies on several Chinese cities that illuminate sets of players leaving the emergence of new urban forms and emphasize the important role of the trajectories of uses and users in the co-construction of this ecosystem.

Yes	USA American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) 3635 Concorde Parkway, Suite 200 Chantilly, Virginia, 20151 chandley@arin.net	National IGFs are good place to start. Through these, governments can become familiar with stakeholder groups that can be affected by Internet public policy. Once the interested parties are identified, governments and stakeholders should reach out, in the spirit of enhanced cooperation, to discuss issues that may be of concern. This can be done through task forces on specific issues, discussions on relevant mailing lists and by submitting proposed policies for comment. These are just a few of the modalities that have proven to be effective for many governments and stakeholder groups.
Yes	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	(Left intentionally blank)
Yes	Country:Japan Organization:KEIDANREN Address:1-3-2,OTEMACHI CHIYODA-KU,TOKYO 100-8188 E-mail:joho@keidanren.or.jp	It is necessary to continuously inform all stakeholders about discussions on Internet governance within the relevant country and share their opinions.
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	Countries should, through either government or civil society-led processes, seek to establish national dialogue forums and networks for multistakeholder consultations on internet governance issues nationally. National policymaking in this area gains legitimacy and effectiveness through open, democratic and inclusive decision-making processes. Thus, stakeholder groups on a national level can support their respective global participation.
Yes	United States, Imagining the Internet, CB 2850, Elon University, 27244, andersj@elon.edu	no time
Yes	Igor Milashevskiy, i.milashevskiy@minsvyaz.ru Alexander Grishchenko, a.grichenko@minsvyaz.ru Russian Federation Ministry of Telecom and Mass Communications (Mincomsvyaz of Russia) 7, Tverskaya str., Moscow, 125375, Russian Federation Email: office@minsvy	Developing Internet-related public policy, national governments should ensure participation of all stakeholders. Various mechanisms may be used for this purpose, such as involvement of experts from relevant organizations during public policy development, open public consultations.

Yes	RIPE NCC Singel 258 1016AB Amsterdam The Netherlands Email: externalrelations@ripe.net	Public sector engagement with and support for national and regional IGF events is an important first step for governments in developing effective Internet-related public policy. Such events provide the chance for all stakeholders affected by national public policy to meet and share perspectives and concerns. It is important, however, that the IGF event serve as the starting point in the development and implementation of forums, structures and mechanisms that can more directly refine and develop public policy. Many national Internet communities have already had great success with such models, including multi-stakeholder task forces and advisory groups.
Yes	Ellen Blackler Vice President, Global Public Policy The Walt Disney Company 425 Third Street, Suite 1100 Washington DC 20024 United States	Governments have a particular responsibility for openness, transparency and a commitment to the rule of law, and should make every effort to include all stakeholders in their decision making. Some national governments have established effective process
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	There are several components in the package of solutions for addressing this issue: i. ensuring national regulatory frameworks serve to drive costs down while attracting investment in service provision, promoting innovation and fostering local entrepreneurship; ii. promoting competition amongst providers; iii. examining the market potential for competitive mobile networks; iv. facilitating the establishment of Internet exchange points linked to regional backbones and broadband networks which significantly reduce transmission costs; v. creating sustainable markets for low cost devices; vi. engaging with industry analysts and policy experts at events such as the Internet Governance Forum.

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	Not answered.
Yes	Malaysia Consumers International Lot 5-1 Wisma WIM, Jalan Wan Kadir 3, Taman Tun Dr Ismail, WP 60000, Malaysia jeremy@ciroap.org	We associate ourselves with the Best Bits submission, except for the additional answer to question 8 above.
Yes	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	(no answer)

| Yes | (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 | National governments needs to participate in fora such as the IGF and the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, see http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1 , and they need to promote the participation of other stakeholders.

In this context, it is important to be mindful of the fact that the necessary time investment for gaining a sufficiently deep understanding of the issues at stake and the pertinent viewpoints and solutions strategies is a significant barrier. Governments have a responsibility to ensure that the various significant viewpoints and ideas which exist among their societies will be appropriately represented. That is not a problem in regard to the viewpoints and interests of major corporations, but it is a problem in regard to all other viewpoints and ideas. Governments therefore need to find out what those other 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 | Anja Kovacs, Project Director
Internet Democracy Project
C14E
Munirka DDA Flats
New Delhi 110067
India

anja@internetdemocracy.in | (Not answered) |

Yes	Country: India Organization: SFLC.IN Address: 2nd Floor, K-9, Birbal Road, Jangpura Extension, New Delhi -110 014, India. E-mail : mishi@softwarefreedom.org	National Governments should hold national and regional consultations with participation from all stakeholders. Such consultations will result in greater deliberation of policy issues and will result in creation of entities that have better understanding of Internet governance issues. The National Governments should also hold consultations with stakeholders prior to any international forum or consultation. Such consultations and deliberations will create a pool of stakeholders who have a good understanding of Internet-related public policy issues. National delegations to international forums should have multi-stakeholder representation.
Yes	LACNIC Latin American and Caribbean Regional Addresses Registry Rambla República de México 6215, Montevideo, Uruguay. comunicaciones@lacnic.net	Public sector engagement with and support for national and regional IGF events is an important first step for governments in developing good Internet-related public policy. Such events provide the chance for all stakeholders affected by national public policy to meet and share perspectives and concerns. It is important, however, that the starting point of an IGF event be used to develop and implement forums, structures and mechanisms that can more directly refine and develop effective public policy. Many national governments have already had great success with such models, including multi-stakeholder task forces and advisory groups. One successful example would be Brazil with its Comité Gestor da Internet.
Yes	United States Center for Democracy & Technology 1634 I Street NW #1100 Washington, DC 20006 mshears@cdt.org	Not answered
Yes		Just as at the international level, the development of internet-related public policy should be the result of processes that are open to all interested parties, transparent in its decision-making processes, respectful of the equal participation of all stakeholder groups, bottom up in engaging those directly affected, diverse and multilingual; and builds capacity for actors and stakeholders to meaningfully participate. We would like to highlight the fact that even if a national or regional process is fully multistakeholder, this does not substitute for inclusive processes at the international level. In other words, a successful national consultation cannot be an excuse for governments to shut

		civil society and other stakeholders out of international fora.
Yes	Brazil Center for Technology and Society of Fundação Getulio Vargas Praia de Botafogo, 190, 13 andar Rio de Janeiro - RJ joana.varon@fgv.br marilia.maciel@fgv.br	_
Yes	Japan, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications Kasumigaseki 2-1-2, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8926, JAPAN m3.ichikawa@soumu.go.jp	(1) Encouraging non-government stakeholders to participate in discussions over international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. (2) Providing timely information through government websites and inviting public comments with respect to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. (3) Collaborating with other stakeholders toward the implementation of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.
Yes	Cote d'Ivoire, DIGILEXIS – SPR, 28 BP 1485 Abidjan 28 kichango@gmail.com	(Not answered.)

Yes	France, INTLNET, 120 chemin des Crouzettes, Saint-Vincent de Barbeyrargues, France 34730, info@intlnet.org	Protect e-sovereignty, and for that identify what it is. How do you want to develop national capacities if one starts trying to impose foreign values, languages, and decisions. The first thing to do is to respect the HRD 15th article.
Yes	Saudi Arabia, Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) PO Box 75606, Riyadh 11588, Saudi Arabia MAJED ALMAZYED, mmazyed@citc.gov.sa	The responses to Q5, Q6 and Q7 provide a lot of information pertinent to this question in terms of structure and processes to be developed for enhanced cooperation and consultation with all stakeholders. Regarding national capacities, some of the key issues to be addressed (such as security, privacy, cybercrime and spam) will involve significant levels of international cooperation and open-mindedness. Among the capacities and modalities required is collaboration among all stakeholders, leveraging what each does best for the benefit of the entire global Internet community. Art. 35 & 36 of the Tunis Agenda break down the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder group in terms that define what they best. All parties will need to approach these global Internet issues from the perspective of good will and cooperation in order to be able to solve them.

Yes	United States of America	National governments can play a key role in maintaining and extending the multi-stakeholder approach: reaching out to stakeholders – industry, civil society, technical experts, and others – to promote stakeholders' engagement in multi-stakeholder processes that tackle Internet-related public policy issues; advocating for policy-making processes to be open, transparent, and accessible to all stakeholders, including those with limited resources. We offer our own experience in the U.S. as examples of stakeholder participation that could be informative for others, including (but not limited to): 1) A formal advisory group process, such as the Department of State's International Telecommunications Advisory Committee (ITAC) is used for multi-stakeholder engagement and input in U.S. policy development and participation in international organizations; 2) A multi-stakeholder consultative approach to Presidential action on cybersecurity and the critical infrastructure resulted in an executive order guiding our government agencies' work in this regard. Further, the executive order specifically calls for the development of a framework of cybersecurity practices to reduce cyber risks to critical infrastructure, work collaboratively with industry to develop the frameworkCybersecurity Framework ; 3) The Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has convened interested stakeholders -- including companies, privacy advocates, consumer groups, and technology experts -- to develop enforceable codes of conduct that specify how principles in the U.S. Consumer Privacy Bill of Rights apply in specific business contexts. Stakeholders engage in an open, transparent, consensus-driven processes to develop these codes of conduct; and 4) A multi-stakeholder driven process for preparing and convening the annual Internet Governance Forum – USA (IGF-USA) the national dialogue on Internet governance issues.
Yes	United States, Intel, 12 Poet Drive, Matawan NJ, 07747, Mike.s.chartier@intel.com	The normal best known methodologies for policymaking including an open, transparent public consultation process for comment and replies; and public workshops and conferences should be used when developing Internet-related public policy.

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	.
Yes	Switzerland, Federal Office of Communications OFCOM, 44 rue de l'Avenir, CH-2501 Biel/Bienne, Switzerland ir@bakom.admin.ch	To start with, national governments should promote the creation of national platforms and processes which allow all stakeholders to participate in a free and open dialogue which would help all stakeholders to better understand their situation and better articulate their views and needs on national as well as on international level. Open and free debates on national level is the basis for trust-building between all stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues on international level.
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	Many governments have seen the benefit of multi-stakeholder arrangements in the preparation of national positions on international Internet-related matters by including representatives of other stakeholders in preparatory meetings and national delegations at important intergovernmental conferences (such as ITU Plenipotentiary Conferences or WCIT). The benefit accrues to all stakeholders, not least to the government that will gain additional insight and information.

Yes	France, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 38 Cours Albert 1er 75008 Paris, aha@iccwbo.org	Multistakeholder processes create processes whereby there is automatic consultation with all stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues, in particular entities impacted by the results, responsible for the implementation, or part of what the policy impacts. Whether at the national or international level, any policy issue that impacts stakeholders needs to engage those stakeholders for the appropriate policy. -Create national IGF initiatives and foster their contribution to regional IGF initiatives. -From a practical point of view, a single governmental point of contact or ambassador for Internet related issues would help. -Create national level policy dialogue and consultation processes with all stakeholders (eg, Brazil, Kenya, USA, UK and others)
Yes	Czech Republic, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, Na Frantisku 32, 110 15 Prague 1, novakovam@mpo.cz	Should be identified and based on national analysis and reports.
Yes	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	In my opinion, the only sufficiently effective method to regulate the internet both on the national and international level is to form the comprehensively approach, which offers coherent and balanced solutions. It is necessary to stimulate the creation of open work-areas which can be used for making a dialoged between the government, public organizations and commerce firms. The main potential of these areas is the creation of expert documents, which can be used as a base for a law. As for the activity of media-grounds, it should be aimed at the production of such legislation standards, which would be easy to realize, have a margin of safety for the rapid changes, and correspond to the main provisions of cyber-laws of other countries and international cyber-laws.

Yes	Mexico 1) Camara Nacional de las Industria Electronica de telecomunicaciones y tecnologias de la informacion (CANIETI) Culiácan No. 71 col. Hipodromo Condesa México D.F. 2) Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor (INDAUTOR), Puebla #143, Colonia Roma	INDAUTOR: En el ámbito de su competencia este Instituto no cuenta con elementos para responder esta pregunta. CANIETI: IDEM (ADN)
Yes	United States of America, United States Council for International Business (USCIB), 1400 K Street, NW, Suite 905, Washington, DC 20005 bwanner@uscib.org	A multistakeholder model creates processes whereby there is automatic consultation among all stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues, in particular, between entities affected by the results and those responsible for implementation. Whether at the national or international level, any policy issue that has a potential impact on stakeholders necessitates dialogue among all stakeholders to determine the appropriate policy. We propose the following to help build this capacity: -Create national IGF initiatives and foster their contribution to regional IGF initiatives; -From a practical point of view, it would be helpful for governments in both developed and developing countries to create a single governmental point of contact or ambassador for Internet related issues; and -Create national-level policy dialogues and consultation processes with all stakeholders. In the United States, there are two relevant examples of this: (1) the multistakeholder approach being utilized to implement President Obama's Consumer Privacy Bill of Rights, issued in February 2012, of which there is a strong digital component; and (2) the US government is working with critical infrastructure owners and operators to create a public-private Cybersecurity Framework – a set of core practices to develop capabilities to manage cybersecurity risk.

Yes	43 civil society organizations, 10 of them with ECOSOC consultive status, and many more individuals. Organizations supporting the proposal: 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	The national capacities that need to be considered by national governments to develop Internet related public policy include: • Setting up of Centre of Excellence on Internet Governance and related issues. • Establishment of R&D centers in the area of Internet related Public Policy. • Introduction of formal courses on Internet governance in premier educational institutes for Industries, Academia & Civil Society. • Introduction of Training and Awareness building programmes in the area of Internet Governance. • Creation of online Knowledge Repository Portal on Internet Governance.
Yes	LATVIA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission.un-gen@mfa.gov.lv	Establishment of a National framework in which all stakeholders can engage and seek answers to emerging challenges is a necessary first step. International and Intergovernmental organizations can assist national governments in this task. To maximize the benefits of the Internet and Internet-related public policies may simultaneously be accompanied with measures to nourish user confidence and improve cybersecurity.
Yes	BULGARIA, Law and Internet Foundation, bul. Patriarh Evtimii 36, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria info@netlaw.bg	Incomprehensively: National think tanks. Special government unit dedicated to the issue.

Yes	BULGARIA, Department of Administration Modernization, Council of Ministers, 1 Dondukov Blvd.1594 Sofia is.ivanov@government.bg	Bulgaria has a reasonably well developed capacities in this aspect, both as ICT development, relevant businesses, academic community and civil society, and as government strategy for the development of appropriate policies and partnerships both on national, regional and international level.
Yes	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	The process is complex and it should be shaped according to the national legislative and managerial traditions of the countries However, a number of fundamental principles can be distilled. Four phases of developing the Internet public policy are of relevance here: preliminary phase – setting the design – approving stakeholders, sketching the decision-making process, defining avenues for exchange of information; planning - formulating objectives and goals and the means for accomplishing them, identifying the major issues and risks, structuring the executive team, inviting and involving stakeholders, appropriating the budget and settling logistics matters, implementation of the whole process and final feedback and evaluation. We would suggest indicators for developing Internet policy with participation of all stakeholders to be elaborated – a challenging task to be pursued by relevant international fora (IGF) in an open, transparent and multistakeholders' manner. Bulgaria as a part of European Union has already participated in developing and implementing Digital Agenda for Europe, A Europe 2020 Initiative. On local level Bulgarian Ministry of transport, information technologies and communications has developed national program Digital Bulgaria 2015 with the collaboration of all government and non-government stakeholders. Bulgaria has a reasonably well developed capacities in this aspect, both as ICT development, relevant businesses, academic community and civil society, and as government strategy for the development of appropriate policies and partnerships both on national, regional and international level.
Yes	Bulgaria, Executive Agency Electronic Communication Networks and Information Systems. Bulgaria 1000 "Gurko 6" str. mail@esmis.government.bg	Bulgaria has a reasonably well developed capacities in this aspect, both as ICT development, relevant businesses, academic community and civil society, and as government strategy for the development of appropriate policies and partnerships both on national, regional and international level.

Yes	Bulgaria, Council of Ministers, Strategic Development and Coordination Directorate 1 Dondukov Blvd 1594 Sofia y.stoyanov@government.bg, l.kamenova@government.bg	Comprehensive ICT education from primary to high schools and further on. On-going ICT training. E-government.
Yes	Bulgaria, Bissera Zankova - Media Adviser to the Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications (MTITC) Sofia, 9 Diakon Ignatii Str. bzankova@gmail.com	The process is complex and it should be shaped according to the national legislative and managerial traditions of the countries However, a number of fundamental principles can be distilled. Four phases of developing the Internet public policy are of relevance here: preliminary phase – setting the design – approving stakeholders, sketching the decision-making process, defining avenues for exchange of information; planning - formulating objectives and goals and the means for accomplishing them, identifying the major issues and risks, structuring the executive team, inviting and involving stakeholders, appropriating the budget and settling logistics matters, implementation of the whole process and final feedback and evaluation. We would suggest indicators for developing Internet policy with participation of all stakeholders to be elaborated – a challenging task to be pursued by relevant international fora (IGF) in an open, transparent and multistakeholders' manner. See Public Policy and Public Participation Engaging Citizens and Community in the Development of Public Policy (about health reform in Canada – BZ) – at http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/regions/atlantic/pdf/pub_policy_partic_e.pdf
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	.

Yes	Bulgaria, Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski" Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics 5 James Bouchier Blvd. Sofia 1164, Bulgaria krassen@fmi.uni-sofia.bg	Each government and local authorities should develop and offer the basic set of E-government, E-business and E-learning services to all, in order to ensure the real participation of all the citizens in developing the Internet public policy and culture of use.
Yes	Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy and Energy 8 Slavyanska str., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria ts.tsankova@mee.government.bg	Bulgaria as a part of European Union has already participated in developing and implementing Digital Agenda for Europe, A Europe 2020 Initiative. On local level Bulgarian Ministry of transport, information technologies and communications has developed national program Digital Bulgaria 2015 with the collaboration of all government and non-government stakeholders.
Yes	Country: Switzerland Organization: Internet Society Address: Galerie Jean-Malbuisson 15 Email: bommelaer@isoc.org	National governments should consider putting in place systematic multistakeholder processes in order to consult their national stakeholders on Internet-related public policy issues. Such processes will not only enhance democratic participation at the national level, but will also contribute to foster more efficient and legitimate policies. As a general rule, governments should consult with all parties that would be affected by the results of policy decisions. This includes the technical and academic community, civil society and the private sector. In terms of concrete mechanisms, national governments should support national and regional IGFs as a means to address local issues, as well as to provide input to the global IGF. Consultation mechanisms should also be created in the development processes of Internet-related public policies, whether they are of national nature, or concern negotiation of international treaties that may impact local stakeholders (e.g. WCIT, ACTA).

| Yes | Division for the Information Society (DI)
Ministry of External Relations - Brazil
Tel: +55 (61) 2030-6609 - FAX: +55 (61) 2030-6613 | National governments could be encouraged to develop an institutional multistakehoder framework for oversight and management of Internet at the national level. In the case of Brazil, the experience of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee must be mentioned as a good practice that enables relevant participation of all stakeholders. Implementation of e-government tools and fostering the development of local technologies and local content are also important initiatives.

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