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:	8. What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and man
Yes	Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus member, Australia ian.peter@ianpeter.com	there is currently no sensible forum for this. IGF could be revised and expanded to perform such a role but it will obviously need to be able to make recommendations and have substantially more support at a high level than it has currently
Yes	Nnenna Nwakanma NNNENA.ORG/ACSIS/Africa IGF Rue des Jardins 22 BP 1764 ABJ 22 Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire	The management of critical Internet ressources needs to go beyond the "traditional" ones. I the just concluded West Africa Internet Governance Forum, there was a huge debate on broadband via cables, satellites and TV White spaces. Broadband is still critical in 2013.

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	In my humble opinion, we must improve the mission given forum on Internet governance that has already made its experience and gradually began to be understood by some ICT entreprises, governments, civil society. Too many mechanisms kills mechanism. So we just redefine the mission of the existing mechanisms.
Yes	Russia, Coordination Center for Russian Top-Level Domains, 8, Zoologicheskaya Str., Moscow, 123242, Russia; info@cctld.ru	8. No new appropriate mechanisms seem to have emerged to fully implement enhanced cooperation since the adoption of the Tunis Agenda. That said, the existing ones need to be revisited to assess their viability, efficacy and proportionality. For example, it might be appropriate to review the IGF mandate to the extent of whether debate should result in specific recommendations which in turn should be examined at some later point of time for their realism and practicability, with an unsophisticated but very practical set of benchmarks established with regard to each specific public policy issue associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
Yes	Sweden, Netnod, Franzéngatan 5, 112 51 Stockholm, info@netnod.se	By continuing exchange of information like is done in the Internet Governance Forum, and by opening up the decision making processes so that multi stakeholder participation is possible, if it is not already possible. This of course includes also global participation (geographical).
Yes	Bangladesh The Forum for Development, Journalism and Communication Studies (FOCUS) focus_bangladesh@yahoo.com	Make a declaration and asks governemnts and countries to follow the protocall to enhance the positive usage of Internet.

Yes	Russia Russian Association for Electronic Communications Presnenskaya embankment, 12, Federation Tower West, floor 46, Moscow, 123100 www.raec.ru info@raec.ru	8. No new appropriate mechanisms seem to have emerged to fully implement enhanced cooperation since the adoption of the Tunis Agenda. That said, the existing ones need to be revisited to assess their viability, efficacy and proportionality. For example, it might be appropriate to review the IGF mandate to the extent of whether debate should result in specific recommendations which in turn should be examined at some later point of time for their realism and practicability, with an unsophisticated but very practical set of benchmarks established with regard to each specific public policy issue associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
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 noted previously, we do not think that enhanced cooperation as defined by the Tunis Agenda is a desirable goal to achieve, because it implies giving governments a dominant and exclusive role in the formulation of public policy. If the question is reframed to focus on "what are the most appropriate mechanisms to formulate global public policy on international policy issues" we would advocate retaining a fairly decentralized approach to global internet governance. Public policy regarding the internet resources that require some form of centralized coordination should be focused on facilitating Internet usage and innovation in as neutral a manner as possible.
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	Any international Internet public policy process should be open, inclusive, and allow the participation of all stakeholders on equal footing. It should also facilitate the participation of stakeholders from developing and least developed economies. Mechanisms for checks and balances are key to ensure accountability and transparency, and should be an integral part of the process. Also, there should be mechanisms for reviewing such processes on regular basis to ensure its ongoing development. Such review processes should be carried out through multi-stakeholder groups. It is worth noting that exiting arrangements and processes pertaining to the coordination and management of critical Internet resources under the prevue of ICANN have been working effectively, with high availability and security of the Domain Name System. This of course does not mean that there is not a need to periodically to review, and potentially improve them. The stability and security of the DNS is critical to ICANN, a fact underwritten during the current process of enlarging the generic top-level domain space in the root.

Yes	South-South Opportunity jrtnchekoua@gmail.com B.P 33 Yaoundé Cameroon"	With the development of Internet and the emergence of the Web in the 1990s, government intervention to support the "Information Society" and the "Information Highway." During the 2000s, technological advances made by ADSL and fiber optic open a new era in the spread of the Internet. A digital economy develops, uses multiply in everyday life and access to the Internet should now be guaranteed to everyone where program development digital land.
Yes	USA American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) 3635 Concorde Parkway, Suite 200 Chantilly, Virginia, 20151 chandley@arin.net	Since their inception, many of the organizations associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet number resources have employed various media such as open mailing lists, websites and open face-to-face meetings, to reach those with an interest in these topics. Additionally, the IGFs on all levels, national, regional and global, have been instrumental in encouraging interaction between the stakeholders. The increase in communications and outreach has resulted in a better understanding of the issues for all involved stakeholders.
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	The Critical Internet Resources, CIRs have been managed under the scheme of ICANN and Regional Internet Registries or RIRs, with the policies considered in their open forums which have involved the global Internet stakeholders. Any public policy associated with coordination and management of CIRs should be discussed and considered in ICANN and RIRs forums. In our view, the participation of the governments in those forums is a great extent of enhanced cooperation.
Yes	Country:Japan Organization:KEIDANREN Address:1-3-2,OTEMACHI CHIYODA-KU,TOKYO 100-8188 E-mail:joho@keidanren.or.jp	The organizations who should conduct discussions about each issue exclusively and the partnerships between them should be clearly defined. For example, when it comes to CIR (Critical Internet Resources), the role of ICANN should be recognized, and its results should be shared with other specialized organizations. The WGEC's functions should include providing broad assessments of this kind of collaborative relationship and giving advice about new partnerships.

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	ICANN is a pioneering organization that employs multistakeholderism in coordinating the critical Internet resources based on the autonomous input from various stakeholders, such as governments, private sector, and civil society. We believe this model is the appropriate mechanism to fully implement the enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda. We should refer to this model as a basis in coping with issues other than the Internet resource management as well.
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	Enhanced cooperation should be implemented through, for instance, better coordination and reporting, for example using the IGF as a common platform for discussions between the forums currently engaged in debating Internet issues, such as the ICANN GAC, IGF, RIRs, the Human Rights Council, the Council of Europe etc. While these forums tend to reach out to slightly different audiences, improved sharing of information is valuable. In this context, we would welcome discussions on possible mechanisms for generating outcomes from IGF meetings.
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	To fully implement the enhanced cooperation it is necessary: - that all governments participate on an equal footing when addressing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, with the involvement of other stakeholders for consultations, if necessary - that permanent platform is established within such intergovernmental organization as the ITU, that would allow full implementation of a model with multi-stakeholder participation when addressing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. It would be reasonable to retain current format of the Working Group on the international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, for open dialogue between governments - that globally applicable public policy principles, as well as regulations, rules and decision-making procedures, concerning coordination and management of critical Internet resources are developed.

Yes	RIPE NCC Singel 258 1016AB Amsterdam The Netherlands Email: externalrelations@ripe.net	The IGF has, over the last eight years, proved itself an important addition to the existing ecosystem of policy-making bodies and structures. At the same time, it has provided an example that has been followed at regional and national levels. This network of open, multi-stakeholder, non-decision-making bodies (including events, mailing lists, websites and other forums) should be seen as the key element in achieving the goals of enhanced cooperation. By providing new opportunities for stakeholders to interact and learn about each other's concerns and perspectives, IGF events serve as incubators for the range of new governance models demanded by enhanced cooperation.
Yes	Ellen Blackler Vice President, Global Public Policy The Walt Disney Company 425 Third Street, Suite 1100 Washington DC 20024 United States	As demonstrated by the range of successful approaches used to date, there is no established limited set of mechanisms that should be used. As a general rule, we believe that the direct and indirect costs of creating new entities should be avoided and that the existing flexible mechanisms of cooperation and knowledge available to and gathered by all stakeholders can be leveraged even further to advance the issues.
Yes	Mark Carvell Head, Global Internet Governance Policy Creative Economy, Internet and International Department for Culture, Media & Sport 100 Parliament Street London SW1A 2BQ United Kingdom mark.carvell@culture.gsi.gov.uk	The last 10 years has seen initiatives evolve that enable once stand-alone organisations engage more effectively within the ecosystem of the global information and knowledge economies. For example, the rollout of Internet Exchange Points in east and west Africa that reduce access costs and promote local content, has come about through greater sharing of knowledge amongst technical experts, aid funders, private sector investors and government policy makers. Key to this approach are ensuring that the mechanisms that foster this kind of cooperation promote commitment by a diverse but complementary range of stakeholders to shared goals, trust, openness and transparency. These commitments can be formalised in memoranda of understanding and other similar mechanisms or legal instruments. Other examples of such initiatives are the Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group (MAAWG) and the London Action Plan (LAP) with the active participation of government agencies such as the UK Information Commissioners Office, with the aim of mitigating the problems associated with spam; and ICANN partnering with UNESCO on securing greater multilingualism in the domain name system.

| 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 | The CSTD Working Group is itself an important mechanism for the stakeholders to set in train a process to fully implement enhanced cooperation, which may in turn eventually result in changes to frameworks, structures or institutions. This will not take place immediately, but in phases. We are now in a kind of distributed reform/exploration phase with the IGF and IGF-like processes trying to create more cooprative engagement, and institutions like ICANN and the ITU putting in place certain reforms, and institutions that previously ignore the Internet beginning to take it seriously (e.g. the Human Rights Council).

This should lead into an intermediate phase of more formalised transparency and reporting and collaboration among all institutions or processes dealing with Internet governance. The IGF (with its mandate to "promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes") could be the home for this role.

Ultimately however, this alone will not fill the gaps that created the enhanced cooperation mandate. There is also a pressing need to address very important global Internet related public policy issues, and to do so at the global level, and this work has to be done by democratic / representative structures. Through a process fully involving all stakeholders, this may require the eventual establishment of a new framework or mechanism, particularly in the case of emerging and orphaned issues that have no other global home. Although a logical home for such a framework or mechanism would be the United Nations, we acknowledge the many weaknesses in UN processes at present, including in relation to transparency and very uneven support for the inclusion of civil society influence in the UN system. Certainly, a traditional intergovernmental organisation is not an appropriate structure.

In the technical realm of Internet naming and numbering, the response to the weaknesses and shortcomings of the UN system has been to establish in ICANN a body which is independent of the UN system. But even ICANN is overseen by governments, or to be more precise by one government – the United States. And whilst the UN is characterised by some as being a haven for tyrannical regimes, the United States itself is widely criticised as having infringed global human rights norms through its global surveillance practices, and for its pursuit of whistleblowers such as Edward Snowden for exposing such practices. Therefore in comparing the respective merits of a UN-based institution (particularly if it is an innovative, multi-stakeholder, and semi-autonomous one |

such as the IGF), and a non-UN based institution that is nonetheless beholden to governments at some level, the choice is not as stark as it is often presented to be.

Therefore in both areas – general public policy issues in which governments have a leading role through the international system, and naming and numbering in which ICANN has a leading role – reforms are eventually required. Taking first the case of ICANN, the reforms for which we advocate would not be to bring it within the United Nations, but to broaden its oversight beyond the United States alone. This may take the form of a new international oversight board with techno-political membership derived from different geopolitical regions. The mandate of this oversight mechanism would be very narrow, more or less the same as exercised by the Department of Commerce of the United States Government at present. ICANN would become an international organisation and enter into a host country agreement with the United States, giving it complete immunity from US law or any other form of control or interference.

It is not necessary that the same new framework or mechanism that broadens the oversight of ICANN, should also deal with other general public policy issues. In fact there is considerable merit in looking at these aspects of enhanced cooperation separately. Because of the more mature state of the multi-stakeholder model that already exists around the regime for management of critical Internet resources, there is good reason to separate out the need to internationalise existing mechanisms for governmental oversight of that regime, from the need for new frameworks or mechanisms for dealing with more general public policy issues of various political, economic, social and cultural kinds, for which there might be a more central role for another new framework or mechanism.

In such fields of public policy outside the narrowly technical, there would be the choice to build upon the existing global order that we have in the United Nations, or to rebuild this from scratch (as in the case of ICANN). Whilst there is merit in the idea of a post-UN transnational democratic order that derives its legitimacy from the individual rather than from the nation state, and which could provide legitimacy and oversight for both technical and broader public policy bodies, nothing of this kind exists or is a realistic prospect for the short or medium term. Therefore, if the mechanism that we begin through the CSTD Working Group does lead towards a new framework or process, we accept the practical likelihood that for now such framework or process would likely have to be at least loosely linked with the UN.

It is sometimes claimed that there is no need for a new framework or mechanism, because all public policy issues are already covered by a network of existing mechanisms. But the WGIG and Tunis Agenda (paragraph 60) concluded that this was not true, and this remains the case. In fact, the kind of global Internet policy issues that are not adequately addressed by any existing mechanism has only grown in number and complexity since the WSIS. Does this mean that we are asking for a single new mechanism to cover all issues? No. But there must be at least one such mechanism (that is global, multi-stakeholder, etc) and if there is none, nor any scope for an existing narrower body (such as the ITU) to change in order to meet these criteria, then it follows that at least one new mechanism is needed. Conversely, whilst we agree that existing mechanisms should be used where available, we disagree that having a plethora of overlapping bodies or mechanisms is always a positive thing. This limits the ability for developing country governments and civil society representatives to participate, because of their limited resources.

If the CSTD does recommend a process that leads to some new framework or mechanism in the future, any such new framework or mechanism should be based on the principles of subsidiarity, and be innovative in terms of mandate, structure, and functions, to be adequate to the unique requirements of global Internet governance. It must be participative of all stakeholders, promoting the democratic and innovative potential of the Internet. Exactly what shape it takes will emerge through reasoned deliberation. Some of us believe that governments will accept nothing less than a new intergovernmental body, like a committee that could be attached to the UN General Assembly, and accordingly would accept such a body if and only if it includes an extensive structure of participation by all stakeholders (which could be modelled on the stakeholder participation mechanisms of the OECD's Internet policy development body, the CICCP), and would have a close and organic relationship with the IGF. This option proceeds from the position that global governance reforms should take place in-outwards, proceeding from current multilateral toward their further democratisation.

For some others of us, although understanding the sincerity of governments and the legitimacy of their claim to set policy norms, there are too many dangers in proposing such a formal new intergovernmental body, but may be fewer dangers in an adjunct to the IGF, as described below in question 9. Whilst we are still formulating what format a new framework or mechanism might take, and will be discussing this question further at

		our meeting ahead of the Bali IGF, we are in accord that the CSTD should be open to considering a process that leads to some new framework or mechanism in the future, that is dedicated to fulfilling the purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation as mentioned in the Tunis Agenda and as described above, in a way that the uncoordinated efforts of individual stakeholders and institutions towards fulfilling that mandate have been unable to do.

| Yes | Malaysia
Consumers International
Lot 5-1 Wisma WIM, Jalan Wan Kadir 3,
Taman Tun Dr Ismail, WP 60000, Malaysia
jeremy@ciroap.org | A Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council (MIPC) could be established under the auspices of the IGF. The IGF in plenary session could discuss and agree by rough consensus to forward any proposal to the MIPC for its support. Those proposals could be initiated by IGF Dynamic Coalitions or (to be created) working groups, or by external bodies that hold Open Fora at the IGF, such as the OECD, Council of Europe, etc.

This would require reform to the IGF so that its plenary sessions have a more deliberative capacity, and work would also be required to ensure that the stakeholder representation mechanisms are better institutionalised, both of which are important topics in their own right but out of the scope of this submission.

The MIPC would be composed of equal numbers of self-selected representatives from each of the stakeholder groups (civil society, private sector, government), plus the cross-cutting technical and academic community constituency, and observers from intergovernmental organisations. They would meet both as a plenary body and as private caucuses for each stakeholder group/constituency. The purpose of the plenary meetings is to bring together points on which all the stakeholder groups can reach consensus, and the purpose of the caucus meetings is because each stakeholder group has its own preferred methods of negotiation and decision-making. A proposal can be sent back and forth between the plenary and the caucuses as many times as necessary to establish either that an overall rough consensus can be reached, or that it can't.

For a proposal to be finalised as a recommendation of the IGF (note: not "of the MIPC"), the MIPC has to reach an overall rough consensus on it as assessed by the MIPC chair, which includes rough consensus within each stakeholder group as assessed by the caucus chair. The recommendations would be non-binding, though they could call for the development of binding rules where appropriate, which would generally be at the national level. |

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	Eventually a meachanism like the WisdomTaskForce, see http://wisdomtaskforce.org/RFB/1 will be needed.
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	Several mechanisms are needed. The most important and urgent need is to create something like the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1 . For some issues no further international action will be needed beyond internationally coordinated recommendations for actions that can be taken nationally, together with international soft-law documents that explain how the internationally recognized human rights apply in specific information society contexts. Such recommendation and explanation documents can be developed through the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, while the authority for accepting or rejecting such recommendations remains in the hands of the appropriate national bodies such as parliaments, as well the UN General Assembly and specialized international bodies of the UN system. However, there are other issues where new, issue-specific internationally institutionalized coordination bodies or oversight functions are needed. In general, it will be possible to develop corresponding proposals through the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force. However there are some issues where the need for such institutions is so clear and urgent that it does not make sense to wait with establishing those institutions until the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force has been established and can be used to work out a proposal.

		These include the creation of an UN institution to take over the oversight function over ICANN and IANA from the US government, and the creation of an UN institution that works to enable governments to protect their citizens and residents from trans-border surveillance by foreign intelligence services.

| Yes | Anja Kovacs, Project Director
Internet Democracy Project
C14E
Munirka DDA Flats
New Delhi 110067
India

anja@internetdemocracy.in | As noted under question 6, we believe that the way forward to implement enhanced cooperation lies in a constituting a system of distributed Internet governance. This would entail networks of actors across stakeholder groups working together on making policies around an issue related to the Internet that falls within the specific domain of expertise of those actors (rather than a small group of actors taking the lead on all international Internet public policy issues, simply because they are of relevance to 'the Internet').

While the exact nature of the network and the process followed (including the extent of institutionalisation) will be determined at least to some extent by the problem at hand, details of the form such a system will take obviously require further discussion. At the very minimum, however, all processes and networks thus initiated should adhere to the following principles:

- They have participation from all stakeholder groups.
- They are inclusive, transparent and accountable to the wider Internet governance community, with sufficient and timely notice and background being provided to all stakeholders on modalities, aim/purpose and significance.
- They are global in nature. 'Solutions' developed in fora with a limited geographical reach do not amount to international Internet public policy making as envisioned by the enhanced cooperation agenda. In order to be global, substantial representation across regions is essential.
- They are arranged in such a way that none of the stakeholders or regions can determine the outcome without the cooperation of all other stakeholder groups and regions. Note that this will still leave space, for example, for governments to be the main decision makers once a mechanism that all stakeholder groups and regions have agreed on to address a particular issue has been put into place.

It deserves to be pointed out that by requiring that no stakeholder or region can determine the outcome of a process without the cooperation and agreement of others, such arrangements would also ensure that the global character of the Internet is preserved, rather than dissolving in favour of a set of interconnected national or regional networks, each functioning according to their own modalities. |

| 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 | There cannot be one single mechanism or one single entity to implement enhanced co-operation. It will be more appropriate to discuss the principles to be followed in evolving such a mechanism. It is essential for all inter-governmental and international organisations to work on the principle of enhanced co-operation. The implementation of enhanced cooperation should be based on the principles of transparency, balanced representation of stakeholders and informed decision-making. This would involve identification of issues and resolving the same through consultation with the stakeholders.
Enhanced co-operation model should not be a top-heavy model and should be balanced with proper representation from all stake-holders at all levels. Firstly, the stakeholders should participate in the relevant international Internet policy discussion fora in order to put forward their sectoral concerns in relation to policy developments in the respective sectors. They should then work towards spreading the learning from such fora in their respective areas. It can be done by publishing review reports or white papers or consultation documents. Once informed and educated, stakeholders will be in a position to have informed debates. This might be in the form of recommendation, critical analysis or economic analysis of the issue. Now the stakeholders will have to reach out to the non – participating entities affected by the decisions, educate them and note down their concerns and analyze them in respect of the outcomes of the processes. |

| Yes | LACNIC

Latin American and Caribbean Regional Addresses Registry

Rambla República de México 6215, Montevideo, Uruguay.

comunicaciones@lacnic.net | The IGF has, over the last eight years, proved itself an important addition to the existing ecosystem of policy-making bodies and structures.

This network of open, multi-stakeholder, non-decision-making bodies (including events, mailing lists, websites and other forums) should be seen as the key element in effectively implementing enhanced cooperation.

Over the last few years, there has been increased importance of regional and national discussion. Latin American and Caribbean experience with LACIGF can be seen as a interesting example on how the regional interaction can be as important as the global stages such as the IGF by providing new opportunities for stakeholders to interact and learn about each other's concerns and perspectives, at the regional level.

Also, International Public Organizations should keep their transparency and openness efforts in order to allow non-governmental entities, and individual users from the world to contribute in their processes. |

| Yes | United States
Center for Democracy & Technology
1634 I Street NW #1100
Washington, DC 20006
mshears@cdt.org | The CSTD WG EC correctly asks "what are the mechanisms" – rather than what are the structures – for implementing enhanced cooperation. However, before discussing mechanisms it is important to agree modalities. Any discussion about mechanisms for enhanced cooperation must ensure the following:

• All stakeholders are fully involved (as equals) in any process that could lead to new frameworks, mechanisms, or structures for discussing international Internet-related public policy issues
• That whatever the result(s) of that process all stakeholders should be involved in the discussion of international Internet-related public policy issues, and
• That no particular mechanism or framework should be prescribed or considered the default mechanism or framework – we believe that ensuring flexibility of the process will ensure the greatest efficacy and suitability of the outcomes.

One possible approach would be to use the IGF to: 1) map Internet public policy issues, actors, and fora; 2) identify and agree a limited set of international Internet-related public policy issues that need further (enhanced) cooperation; and, 3) explore the most appropriate mechanism(s) for deciding how the issue should be addressed. |
| Yes | | The CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation is itself a very important mechanism for implementing enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda. Its recommendations to the UN General Assembly will be instrumental in operationalizing enhanced cooperation. Additionally, existing bodies and institutions already working on international public policy issues pertaining to the internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical internet resources, such as ICANN and the IGF, are also important mechanisms, as it is within these bodies where serious work needs to be done to make decision making more transparent, accountable, multilateral, and coordinated. Mechanisms in the broader sense, such as north-south and south-south knowledge sharing and connecting national and regional processes to international ones, are also important in the context of implementing enhanced cooperation. |

Yes	Brazil	The answer to question 8 should not be seen as a definitive one. An institutional mechanism can only be successfully conceived in a dialectical manner, contraposing divergent views and making incremental improvements. The CSTD Working Group is an important initiative and, by the end of its work, it should propose concrete institutional arrangements and steps to implement EC.
	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	Taking into consideration the scope of EC, as mentioned on question 2-c, it shall address: a) International public policy issues; b) general principles for coordination and management of critical internet resources. In this session we intend to focus on the first aforementioned goal. The discussion of International Internet public policies should not be performed in any existing body in the UN system. Implementing EC mechanism directly through the already existing UN bodies would mean to extend their mandates well beyond what has been initially planned. Moreover, existent traditional intergovernmental institutions have faced shortcomings to combine multilateral and multistakeholder democratic participation, currently using the term "multistakeholderism" with the absence of it's original meaning, in the absence of a proper criteria for representation or equal participation. Also, the existing network of UN institutions does not cover all the public policy issues mentioned in question 4, and the tendency is that the number of global issues related to the internet will only grow. Therefore, a new lightweight institutional mechanism created under the UN, such as a council, could be envisioned to embody EC. This council would maintain a close connection with the Internet Governance Forum (see question 9), which should remain as the main space for agenda setting in the Internet governance regime. This council would have different roles depending on the issue under discussion. In policy areas that fall under the scope of existing organizations, the council would serve as a catalyst of discussions emerging from the IGF and would be responsible to properly frame them as policy discussions and to channel them to other UN bodies dealing with internet issues, such ITU, WIPO and UNESCO. In the policy areas that do not find a home in existing international organizations, this council should address this gap and serve as a primary space for policy development, producing outcomes such as guidelines, principles or even hard law to address these issues. The council should have a multistakeholder composition and each stakeholder group

would choose its representatives in a pre-defined and transparent manner. The council would have two components: a governmental committee and a non-governmental committee, and the later would be composed by technical community, academy, civil society and private sector. Ad hoc multistakeholder sub-groups with regional diversity would be created to draft policy proposals.

When a policy proposal is drafted by an ad hoc sub-group, the non-governmental committee and the intergovenmental committee should engage in a process of co-decision. The inspiration for this was the legislative process of the European Union, in which the council of the European Union, composed of governmental representatives, engages in co-decision with the European Parliament, whose members represent the interests of the constituencies that elected them.

The dynamics of co-decision can take different forms. An initial proposal, inspired in EU co-decision, could be the following:

A - first round
1) The ad hoc multistakeholder drafting group elaborates a proposal by consensus
2) The proposal is forwarded to stakeholder groups. Each stakeholder group could present suggestions for improvement.
3) The ad hoc multistakeholder drafting group incorporates the suggestions as appropriate.

B - second round:
4) The text is forwarded to the non-government committee, composed of all non-governmental stakeholders;
2) The non-government committee carries out the first reading. It could agree with the text or propose changes.
3) The draft would follow to the governmental committee for a first reading. If no changes are made, the proposal is approved. If changes are introduced, the text would go back to the non-governmental committee for a second reading.
4) The Non-government committee carries out the second reading. If it agrees with the changes, the proposal is approved. If it introduces new changes, the proposal goes back to the governmental committee for a second reading.
5) The government committee carries out the second reading. The governmental committee may approve the proposal or call a conciliation committee of multistakeholder

composition.

6) The conciliation committee proposes a compromise text.

7) The proposal would then be forwarded to the non-gov committee for a third reading. It could agree with the text or propose changes.

8) The proposal is forwarded to the governmental committee for a third reading. The proposal would be either approved or definitely rejected.

Lastly, it is important to mention that all these steps should comply with pre-agreed deadlines and due process. Moreover, if the EC mechanisms forwards inputs to other UN bodies, these bodies should remain accountable to the EC mechanism, informing its members of the steps that have been taken to address those issues.

Yes	Japan, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications Kasumigaseki 2-1-2, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8926, JAPAN m3.ichikawa@soumu.go.jp	As reconfirmed in the Tunis Agenda, governments, private sector, civic society and intergovernmental and international organizations are playing their respective roles in Internet governance, and the multi-stakeholder approach is significant on the occasion of the implementation of enhanced cooperation. The Internet has been developing smoothly under private initiative in Japan, and we think it is indispensable to maintain the multi-stakeholder approach for the Internet to continue contributing to economic growth and innovation in the future.
Yes	Cote d'Ivoire, DIGILEXIS – SPR, 28 BP 1485 Abidjan 28 kichango@gmail.com	Enhanced cooperation is a process, not a structure. The key features that should come with any implementation of such process include transparency and inclusiveness. As a process, EC should be implemented in Internet governance related issues in any relevant organizational settings (e.g., ICANN, ITU, WIPO, etc.). However a forum such as the IGF offers an exceptional venue for an all-inclusive EC process, as it is not tied to a particular organization. The CSTD Working Group is itself an important mechanism for the stakeholders to set in train a process to fully implement enhanced cooperation, which may in turn eventually result in changes to frameworks, structures or institutions. At this point we are still in a kind of exploration phase with emerging trends for reform including the IGF and IGF-like processes trying to create more cooperative opportunities for engagement, and institutions like ICANN and the ITU putting in place certain reforms, and institutions that previously ignore the Internet beginning to take it seriously (e.g. the Human Rights Council). Ultimately for enhanced cooperation to be effective and fulfill its promises as institutional innovation, some form of structure and mechanisms will need to be put in place. The first set of structure-mechanism will be mutistakeholder and international in its composition with the task to broaden ICANN oversight beyond the United States alone and to implement and sanction accountability mechanisms for ICANN on a regular basis. This will not be a UN body. It may take the form of a new international oversight board with techno-political membership derived from different geopolitical regions. The mandate of this oversight mechanism would be very narrow, more or less the same as exercised by the Department of Commerce of the United States Government at present. ICANN would become an international organization and enter into a host country agreement with the United States, giving it complete immunity from US law or any other form of control or

			interference.
			A second set of changes will be an independent international committee in charge of making a policy assessment for any major internet related policy to be adopted at a supranational level (for instance, in the case of ICANN, a policy developed by any relevant Supporting Organization or Committee but not yet voted on by the Board.) That independent and autonomous body will operate a bit like the US Congressional Budget Office which evaluates and provides an estimated cost for a bill being passed in the Congress. The difference here is that this internet related body will be analyzing the global significance and impact of a new policy developed by any of the main player in the IG institutional field. Mechanisms should be in place for stakeholder groups to petition the said committee/body/office to undertake such analysis of a policy being considered by any relevant organization in the IG field.
			Lastly, a third set of functions will be to attend to those emerging global Internet policy issues or long standing ones that are not adequately addressed by any existing mechanism, which have only grown in number and complexity since the WSIS. Whilst we agree that existing mechanisms should be used where available, we are more skeptical about the interest of having a plethora of overlapping IG bodies or mechanisms. This limits the ability for developing country governments and civil society representatives to participate, because of their limited resources. New frameworks or mechanisms might therefore be needed for dealing with more general public policy issues of various political, economic, social and cultural kinds, which do not pertain to or derive from the primary functions of existing IG structures.
			In any case, none of the three sets of functions outlined above shall be carried out by an intergovernmental structure or by any international treaty-based mechanism (unless the notion of treaty changes to include non-sovereign, non-state actors as signatories.) The first steps shall be to agree on the relevant and necessary functions, then all stakeholders must work relentlessly to come up with innovative institutional design that reflects the innovation that is the internet not only as technology but at the social, economic and political level. If the CSTD does recommend a process that leads to some new framework or mechanism in the future, any such new framework or mechanism should be based on the principles of subsidiarity, and be innovative in terms of mandate, structure, and functions, to be adequate to the unique requirements of global Internet governance. It must be participative of all stakeholders, promoting the democratic and innovative potential of the Internet. Exactly what shape it takes will emerge through reasoned deliberation among all stakeholders.

Yes	France, INTLNET, 120 chemin des Crouzettes, Saint-Vincent de Barbeyrargues, France 34730, info@intlnet.org	The WSIS area is the information society. The appropriate mechanism, at least one which can be attempted, is to decontaminate its enhanced cooperations from their money virus and inject "some intellitive serum" (the good practice of negentropic intelligent linking). The first candidate could be the naming system, as a positive result would be widely noticed; however, there is also a major risk of hijacking by obscure market forces if it is not quickly sponsored by a global enhanced cooperation, which should include ICANN, but not depend on ICANN.
Yes	Saudi Arabia, Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC) PO Box 75606, Riyadh 11588, Saudi Arabia MAJED ALMAZYED, mmazyed@citc.gov.sa	See response to Q6. The mechanisms described would apply equally to all international Internet-related public policy issues.

Yes	United States of America	The current arrangements associated with these issues are successfully implementing the mandate of enhanced cooperation as articulate in the Tunis Agenda. There is neither one mechanism nor one stakeholder group that can address the multitude of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. ICANN remains the most appropriate mechanism for coordination of the domain name systems and, along with the regional Internet registries (RIRs), is the best mechanism for global allocation of Internet protocol (IP) numbers. These bodies are multi-stakeholder and provide a role for governments to participate on equal footing. The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) have provide for an Internet that is open, interoperable, and innovative. OECD and APEC promote collaboration among members and global stakeholders to share best practices and make recommendations address across a range of Internet/ICT policy and economic issues ; and UNESCO works with stakeholders to address freedom of expression, multilingualism, local content, and building knowledge societies. Several organizations address specifically cybersecurity and cybercrime elements, including the OSCE, ARF, the Council of Europe and the Budapest Convention, the Forum of Incident Response Security Teams (FIRST), the Meridian Process and Conference, the Organization of American States (OAS), and Asia Pacific Computer Emergency Response Team (AP/CERT). There are many mechanisms that are addressing the various Internet issues, as appropriate to their specific participating and interested stakeholder groups, their expertise, and their mission, and this list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive. We encourage all stakeholders to leverage these mechanisms in the fullest way possible.
Yes	United States, Intel, 12 Poet Drive, Matawan NJ, 07747, Mike.s.chartier@intel.com	As demonstrated by our answer to Question 3, many and varied organizations, initiatives, and processes have been created which contribute to enhanced cooperation. Accordingly, the most effective mechanism is to foster these current and future Internet governance organizations to proceed with their work. To that end environments that encourage and allow parties coming together in a spirit of compromise and consensus, such as the successful WTPF, should be promoted. Conversely those events where participation is constrained and outputs determine by vote result in less positive results, and are not the best mechanism for implementing enhanced cooperation.

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	n my understanding, enhanced cooperation is a process and therefore in this case: we can have enhanced cooperation framework integrated to the national development forums and engage from a grass root level the discussions on the progress of the same. Through this governments will be able to understand the very vital details pertaining to public policy and coordination and therefore extend the governance or services to the very vital and little known concerns of public policy to the people.
Yes	Switzerland, Federal Office of Communications OFCOM, 44 rue de l'Avenir, CH-2501 Biel/Bienne, Switzerland ir@bakom.admin.ch	All processes of enhanced cooperation should involve all stakeholders in their respective roles. This should be done involving existing international organisations and processes including the IGF and it should be done responsively to innovation.

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	We are glad to note the plural in the question: indeed, it is a question of many mechanisms, not one. The issues in question are different in nature, importance and urgency, and the mechanisms have to take this diversity and complexity into account. We can envisage a variable geometry of different mechanisms focusing on various Internet-related public policy issues, and appropriately structured for their tasks. However, they should all be of multi-stakeholder nature, and they should not work is silos, but rather in communication, coordination and collaboration with each others. In his 2011 report, cited above, the UNSG noted similar thinking emerging from the consultations on EC: "(T)here seemed to be a convergence of opinion that Internet governance involved many dimensions and layers of cooperation with diverse forms of stakeholder consultation suited to different types of policy innovation and need for consistency with due legal process." Since the coordination and management of critical Internet resources was singled out at the end of the question, we can point to ICANN as a very successful "mechanism" that enables all stakeholders – including governments - to carry out their roles and responsibilities on the issues of ICANN's mandate.
Yes	France, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 38 Cours Albert 1er 75008 Paris, aha@iccwbo.org	There has been significant progress to build cooperation, information exchange, and engagement of all stakeholders on these issues. As we detail in our response to question 3, appropriate mechanisms exist and are evolving to enable the participation of all stakeholders. Existing institutions, such as, UNESCO, ISOC, ICANN, IETF, W3C, WIPO and other entities with responsibilities over different topics touching the Internet are partnering with other organizations to better cooperate and coordinate. For example, UNESCO has a partnership with ICANN on the implementation of multilingualism, WIPO serves a role in dispute resolutions around domain names, and MAAWG (Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group) works with organizations on addressing spam. That is, expert forums, institutions and mechanisms exist, and enhance their cooperation in order to better address public policy issues. For a range of partnership MoU's, and other cooperations, it is useful to look at different institutions and the entities they work with. For example, PITA (Pacific Islands Telecommunications Association) and ICANN. That is, there are a range of partnership MoUs, whether formal or informal, and other initiatives that exist and are specific examples to addressing public policy issues.

Yes	Czech Republic, Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic, Na Frantisku 32, 110 15 Prague 1, novakovam@mpo.cz	National cooperation is crucial. Broadband networks development, capacity building and liberalization of the market.
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	As it was mentioned above, taking part in the international discussion of problems connected with cyber-space and its regulation is the best mechanism to enhance cooperation.
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: A través de organismos internacionales establecidos y reconocidos como la ONU, OCDE, y no creando nuevos específicos del tema. Esto dej

| Yes | United States of America, United States Council for International Business (USCIB), 1400 K Street, NW, Suite 905, Washington, DC 20005 bwanner@uscib.org | There has been significant progress to build cooperation, information exchange, and engagement of all stakeholders on these issues. As we detail in our response to question 3, appropriate mechanisms exist and are evolving to enable the participation of all stakeholders. Existing institutions, such as UNESCO, ISOC, ICANN, IETF, W3C, WIPO and other entities with responsibilities over different topics touching the Internet are partnering with other organizations to better cooperate and coordinate in addressing public policy issues. For example: UNESCO has a partnership with ICANN on the implementation of multilingualism. The UNESCO-ICANN agreement covers a variety of cooperation areas so that as many language groups as possible can benefit. UNESCO's network of linguistic experts play a leading role in this partnership, which entails informing Member States about the new IDNs, encouraging involvement of other relevant United Nations agencies, and establishing working groups to help developing and least-developed countries participate fully; -In the same vein, UNESCO has collaborated with the European Registry of Domain Names (EURid), supporting publication of a EURid study that examined the global use of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) that support non-Latin scripts and multilingualism online; -WIPO serves a role in dispute resolutions around domain names; -MAAWG (Messaging Anti-Abuse Working Group) works with organizations on addressing spam; and -There are a range of partnership MoUs, whether formal or informal, that demonstrate how the concept of enhanced cooperation has been implemented. These have had a direct and positive impact on coordination and management of critical Internet resources. Specifically, we note the MoU between the Pacific Islands Telecommunications Association (PITA) and ICANN. The objective of the MoU was to build a non-exclusive partnership that would enable information on Internet issues flow in both directions, promote regional telecommunications and information technology standards, and aid in transferring skills, knowledge, and capacity to the Pacific Islands region. |

| 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 | Why global governance of the Internet?
Internet governance is seen largely in terms of national sovereignty and security or as pertaining to free speech and privacy. We are of the view that there exist many other equally important issues for global Internet governance that arise from the whole gamut of rights and aspirations of people – social, economic, cultural, political and developmental. The relationship of the global Internet to cultural diversity is one example. The Internet increasingly determines not only the global flows of information but also of cultures, and their commodification. No social process is exempt from the influence of the Internet – from education to health and governance. Social systems at national and local levels are being transformed under the influence of the global Internet.

Instead of decentralizing power, the current structure of the global Internet tends to centralize control in the hands of a small number of companies. Some of these companies have near-monopoly power over key areas of economic and social significance. Therefore, regulation of global Internet business through pertinent competition law, consumer law, open interoperability standards, etc, is becoming a pressing need. Increasing statist controls need to be similarly resisted. With the emergent paradigm of cloud computing presenting the looming prospect of remote management of our digital lives from different 'power centres' across the world, it is inconceivable that we can do without appropriate democratic governance of the global Internet. Post-Snowden, as many countries have begun to contemplate and even embark upon measures for 'digital sovereignty', the only way to preserve a global Internet is through formulating appropriate global norms, principles and rules that will underpin its governance.

Background of this civil society input:
A group of over 60 civil society organizations and several individuals, made a statement on 'Democratizing the global governance of the Internet' to the open consultations on 'enhanced cooperation' called by the Chair of the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) on May 18th, 2012, in Geneva. The statement inter alia sought the setting up of a CSTD Working Group to address this issue. We are happy to note that such a Working Group has been set up and has now called for public inputs to make its recommendations. This document is an input to the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) on the behalf of the undersigned .

In the aforementioned statement of May 2012, the civil society signatories had called for |

the following institutional developments to take place in the global Internet governance architecture:

Our demands with respect to 'global' Internet Governance espouse a simple and obvious democratic logic. On the technical governance side, the oversight of the Internet's critical technical and logical infrastructure, at present with the US government, should be transferred to an appropriate, democratic and participative, multi-lateral body, without disturbing the existing distributed architecture of technical governance of the Internet in any significant way. (However, improvements in the technical governance systems are certainly needed.) On the side of larger Internet related public policy-making on global social, economic, cultural and political issues, the OECD-based model of global policy making, as well as the default application of US laws, should be replaced by a new UN-based democratic mechanism. Any such new arrangement should be based on the principle of subsidiarity, and be innovative in terms of its mandate, structure, and functions, to be adequate to the unique requirements of global Internet governance. It must be fully participative of all stakeholders, promoting the democratic and innovative potential of the Internet.

As the WGEC deliberates on concrete ways to move forward, the time is ripe to propose clear and specific institutional mechanisms for democratizing the global governance of the Internet. We have, therefore, expanded the above demands into specific mechanisms that should be set in place for this purpose.

New global governance mechanisms are needed:
We are of the view that it would be useful to have two distinct mechanisms – one that looks at the global Internet-related public policy issues in various social, economic, cultural and political domains, and another that should undertake oversight of the technical and operational functions related to the Internet (basically, replacing the current unilateral oversight of the ICANN by the US government). This will require setting up appropriate new global governance bodies as well as a framework of international law to facilitate their work, as follows.

A new UN body for Internet-related public policy issues:
An anchor global institution for taking up and addressing various public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in an ongoing manner is urgently required. It can be a committee attached to the UN General Assembly or a more elaborate and relatively autonomous set up linked loosely to the UN (as a specialized UN body). It should have a

very strong and institutionalized public consultative mechanism, in the form of stakeholder advisory groups that are selected through formal processes by different stakeholder constituencies, ensuring adequate representativeness. (OECD's Committee on Computer, Information and Communication Policy and India's recent proposal for a UN Committee on Internet-related Policies are two useful, and somewhat similar, models that can be looked at.)

This 'new body' will stay abreast of global Internet-related issues; where necessary, develop international level public policies in the concerned areas; seek appropriate harmonization of national level policies, and; facilitate required treaties, conventions and agreements. It will also have the necessary means to undertake studies and present analyses in different policy areas.

Most Internet-related public policy issues are of a cross-cutting nature, and involve overlaps with mandates of other existing global governance bodies, like WIPO, UNESCO, WTO, UNDP, UNCTAD, ITU and so on. Due to this reason, the proposed new 'body' will establish appropriate relationships with all these other existing bodies, including directing relevant public policy issues to them, receiving their inputs and comments, and itself contributing specific Internet-related perspectives to issues under the purview of these other bodies.

A new 'Internet Technical Oversight and Advisory Board':
This board will replace the US government's current oversight role over the technical and operational functions performed by ICANN. The membership of this oversight board can be of a techno-political nature, i.e. consisting of people with specialized expertise but who also have appropriate political backing, ascertained through a democratic process. For instance, the board can be made of 10/15 members, with 2/3 members each from five geographic regions (as understood in the UN system). These members can perhaps be selected through an appropriate process by the relevant technical standards bodies and/or country domain name bodies of all the countries of the respective region. (Other mechanisms for constituting the techno-political membership of this board can also be considered.)

The Internet technical oversight and advisory board will seek to ensure that the various technical and operational functions related to the global Internet are undertaken by the relevant organizations as per international law and public policy principles developed by

the concerned international bodies. With regard to ICANN, the role of this board will more or less be exactly the same as exercised by the US government in its oversight over ICANN. As for the decentralized Internet standards development mechanisms, like the Internet Engineering Task Force, these self organizing systems based on voluntary adoption of standards will continue to work as at present. The new board will have a very light touch and non-binding role with regard to them. It will bring in imperatives from, and advise these technical standards bodies on, international public policies, international law and norms being developed by various relevant bodies.

For this board to be able to fulfill its oversight mandate, ICANN must become an international organization, without changing its existing multistakeholder character in any substantial manner. It would enter into a host country agreement with the US government (if ICANN has to continue to be headquartered in the US). It would have full immunity from US law and executive authority, and be guided solely by international law, and be incorporated under it. Supervision of the authoritative root zone server must also be transferred to this oversight broad. The board will exercise this role with the help of an internationalized ICANN.

This board will also advise the afore-mentioned new public policy body on technical matters pertaining to the Internet policy making, as well as take public policy inputs from it.

Framework Convention on the Internet:
An appropriate international legal framework will be required sooner than later for the above bodies to function properly. Accordingly, one of the early tasks of the proposed 'new body' dealing with Internet-related public policy issues, discussed above, will be to help negotiate a 'Framework Convention on the Internet' (somewhat like the Framework Convention on Climate Change). Governance of the Internet concerns different kinds of issues that are ever-evolving. It is, therefore, preferable to formulate an enabling legal structure as a 'framework convention' rather than as a specific treaty or convention that addresses only a bounded set of issues. It may also be easier to initially agree to a series of principles, protocols and processes that can then frame further agreements, treaties etc on more specific issues.

Such a Framework Convention will thus enable appropriate and ongoing global policy responses to various opportunities and challenges that the fast-evolving phenomenon of

the Internet throws up. It will also formalize the basic architecture of the global governance of the Internet; inter alia recognizing and legitimizing the existing role and functions of the various bodies currently involved with managing the technical and logical infrastructure of the Internet, including the ICANN, Regional Internet Registries, Internet technical standards bodies and so on.

Appropriate mechanisms for crisis response and dispute resolution in relation to the global Internet, and the social activity dependent on it, will also be required to be set up.

| Yes | INDIA, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations Office 9, RUE DU VALAIS, 1202, GENEVA Mission.india@ties.itu.int | It is relevant to recall relevant paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda to identify most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation. The Para 69 sets the tone for Governments to define a mechanism of the enhanced cooperation. This paragraph together with other paras in the Tunis Agenda, when read with the WSIS outcomes clearly provides the basis for establishing the mechanism of enhanced cooperation. The sequence of paragraphs that help define the contours of a mechanism is as follows:
• Para 29 states that international management of internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic with the full involvement of governments and other stakeholders.
• Para 31 commits to full participation of all stakeholders, within respective roles and responsibilities, to ensure requisite legitimacy of governance of internet.
• The roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders have been defined in brief in para 35 of the Tunis Agenda and in detail in paras 29-34 of WGIG report.
• In Para 60 of the Tunis Agenda, the Leaders have clearly pointed out the inadequacy of the current mechanisms for dealing with many cross-cutting international public policy issues. As a sequel to this recognition, Para 61 stresses the need to initiate, and reinforce, as appropriate, a transparent, democratic, and multilateral process, with the participation of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations, in their respective roles.
• Para 68 further recognizes the need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders. The Para 69 recognises the importance of the governments to act on an equal footing with each other.

 Thus, there is a clear mandate for defining a mechanism for effective and enhanced cooperation on global internet governance. India would submit its recommendations on such a mechanism separately to the WGEC. |
| Yes | LATVIA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission.un-gen@mfa.gov.lv | Internet critical resources are managed in a collaborative way by number of organizations, including IETF, IAB, ICANN, RIRs, W3C, root server operators. Intergovernmental organizations such as ITU, UNESCO, OECD, as well as number of specific regional initiatives contribute to the safety and security of operations. ISOC plays important role in supporting IETF work and building Internet related capacity at the regional and national levels. This cooperation should be preserved and developed in order to ensure the Internet develops as an open, free, multilingual and interoperable system. |

Yes	BULGARIA, Law and Internet Foundation, bul. Patriarh Evtimii 36, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria info@netlaw.bg	Incomprehensively: Common government policies. Engagement of the civil society representatives. Funding projects for implementing the public policies.
Yes	BULGARIA, Department of Administration Modernization, Council of Ministers, 1 Dondukov Blvd.1594 Sofia is.ivanov@government.bg	The partnership between all relevant stockholders would seem to be among the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
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 establishment of another global mechanism to accomplish enhanced cooperation will be costly because it will result in new bureaucracy; notwithstanding the fact that the aim is pertinent and it is expected to foster transparency, inclusiveness and efficacy of the process of interaction, paradoxically it may lead to overregulation of the Internet sphere, parallelism and final inefficiency. Enhanced cooperation can be pursued within existing international, regional and local structures by improving their procedures and especially by giving a chance to all stakeholders to have their voices heard and taken into account in decision making.
Yes	Bulgaria, Executive Agency Electronic Communication Networks and Information Systems. Bulgaria 1000 "Gurko 6" str. mail@esmis.government.bg	Stability, security and ongoing functioning of the Internet depend on Critical Internet Resources and their management, including the root name servers, the backbone structures, the Domain Name System and Internet Protocols. Critical Internet resources are managed by various entities, without any common governance approach. Enhanced cooperation can be pursued within existing international, regional and local structures by improving their procedures and especially by giving a chance to all stakeholders to have their voices heard and taken into account in decision making.
Yes	Bulgaria, Council of Ministers, Strategic Development and Coordination Directorate 1 Dondukov Blvd 1594 Sofia y.stoyanov@government.bg, l.kamenova@government.bg	The Digital Solidarity Fund. A global public finance plan (See p. 6 above)

Yes	Bulgaria, Bissera Zankova - Media Adviser to the Ministry of Transport, Information Technology and Communications (MTITC) Sofia, 9 Diakon Ignatii Str. bzankova@gmail.com	At first glance it seems that the Tunis Agenda has introduced two separate mechanisms – the institutional one through the IGF and the functional one – through enhanced cooperation among stakeholders. Such interpretation though not ungrounded might lead to ambiguity and give birth to divergent approaches. As pointed out in expert reports "the debate around this notion has however significantly evolved since then, as illustrated by discussions in the IGF, the CSTD and this first WSIS+10 review session.The Working Group of the Chair of the CSTD will have a key role to further this discussion and operationalization of this concept." (Workshop 50. Enhanced cooperation and the Internet addressing organizations. Joint workshop with APRICOT meeting in Singapore at http://conference.apnic.net/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/59107/Workshop50BdlC.pdf) The establishment of another global mechanism to accomplish enhanced cooperation will be costly because it will result in new bureaucracy; notwithstanding the fact that the aim is pertinent and it is expected to foster transparency, inclusiveness and efficacy of the process of interaction, paradoxically it may lead to overregulation of the Internet sphere, parallelism and final inefficiency. Enhanced cooperation can be pursued within existing international, regional and local structures by improving their procedures and especially by giving a chance to all stakeholders to have their voices heard and taken into account in decision making. The Tunis Agenda in art. 70 calls on existing organizations related to the Internet to facilitate elaboration of public policy principles. Consistent implementation of principles such as openness, transparency, diversity of participation and input and better overall coordination can place the process on a safer and human rights oriented ground.
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	To establish a multistakeholder working group which could give further consideration to the best ways of achieving enhanced cooperation. To identify the next step required for achieving progress towards enhanced cooperation, building on those areas of common understanding. To facilitate and contribute to multi-stakeholder dialogue, through formal or informal cooperative arrangements. To establish forms of cooperation that have emerged from information and experience-sharing, consensus-building and fund-raising to the transfer of technical knowledge and capacity-building. Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states and that states have related rights and responsibilities.

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 role of UN and different mechanisms around suitable UN committees should play the major role in implementing international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
Yes	Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy and Energy 8 Slavyanska str., Sofia 1000, Bulgaria ts.tsankova@mee.government.bg	Deeper and broader collaboration betweenUnited Nations -Commission on science and technology for development and European Commission will increase effectiveness of the enchased cooperation.
Yes	Country: Switzerland Organization: Internet Society Address: Galerie Jean-Malbuisson 15 Email: bommelaer@isoc.org	As stated before, international public policy touches upon a wide range of issues, including copyright, security, capacity building and many more. Policy decisions on such issues may be dealt with by specialised agencies, whether at the national, regional or the international level, depending on the scope of those issues. Existing mechanisms which have been dealing with Internet-related issues in the past few years include WIPO (intellectual property), the Human Rights Council (human rights), WTO (trade issues), ITU (telecommunications) or UNESCO (freedom of expression, education), among many others. Regional/cross-regional organisations such as the OECD or APEC are dealing with issues such as Internet security and privacy from the angle of economic development. In Europe, BEREC is an example where multiple national telecommunications regulators come together, consult non-governmental stakeholders, and disseminate best practices and suggest common approaches in implementing the EU regulatory framework for electronic communications. Many of these existing mechanisms are evolving to be more transparent and inclusive with non-governmental stakeholders. For example the Messaging, Malware and Mobile AntiAbuse Working Group (M3AAWG) is a global industry lead partnership of governments, trusted network operators, ISPs and bulk mail distributors who collaborate on global technical and policy initiatives to mitigate spam and messaging abuse. M3AAWG's membership is organized around technology, and collaboration between trusted stakeholders to address cooperative

| | | capacity building to mitigate spam, malware, botnets and phishing and other abusive messaging.

Regarding the management of critical Internet resources, one key issue is the deployment of Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6), in   light of IPv4 address depletion. While this is a technical issue in   nature, the reality of IP address shortages (two of the five global   registries are already depleted) and the serious impact of this on   Internet driven growth has led some governments to take action and show their support for the transition to this new protocol (e.g. OECD 2008 Ministerial). |

| Yes | Division for the Information Society (DI)
Ministry of External Relations - Brazil
Tel: +55 (61) 2030-6609 - FAX: +55 (61) 2030-6613 | At this point Brazil does not consider it would be productive to work around ideas regarding the most appropriate mechanism to fully implement enhanced cooperation for a number of reasons:
(i) the discussion of any new 'suitable framework or mechanisms, where justified, thus spurring the ongoing and active evolution of the current arrangements in order to synergize the efforts in this regard' must be preceded by the assessment of those "current arrangements" in line with proposal outlined in answer to question 2;
(ii) the discussion of any "suitable framework or mechanisms" should be guided by the purpose of addressing perceived needs or filling gaps and should only be undertaken when there some comfortable margin of support for these ideas. In other words, Brazil proposes first to deepen discussion on WHAT we want before discussing HOW to achieve what we want.
Notwithstanding, Brazil would like to offer some preliminary comments. First of all, we consider that discussions could be divided into two groups of issues, as per paragraphs 69 and 70: (i) international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in general; and (ii) public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
While public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources might be treated separately, a single convergent space or platform is needed, in our view, for dealing with the diverse kinds of 'international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet' in general. Even though many of these issues may have some aspects that come under some existing international bodies, including those of the UN, most Internet-related matters are required to be dealt in a holistic and cross-cutting manner because of their inter-relatedness, in addition to possible specialized treatment by these other bodies. With regard to issues that are already being dealt with by other institutions, the new "framework of mechanism" could add Internet-related policy perspectives to the issues, as well as coordinate and ensure coherence among the work of different institutions dealing with different aspects of the issues. It should be able to help ensure the required coordination and coherence, as appropriate, among national level policies and practices, given the inherently global nature of the Internet.
Brazil considers, on the other hand, much more substantial progress is needed with regard to enhancing cooperation, on an equal footing, towards the development of globally applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical internet resources.
Brazil notes the various models contained in the WGIG Report. |