

**Timestamp**

9/9/2013 9:53:37

**The information solicited through this questionnaire will only be used in aggregate form, unless otherwise authorised by the respondent. Do you authorise us to cite/share your views individually?**

Yes

**Please enter your contact details:**

United States of America, United States Council for International Business (USCIB), 1400 K Street, NW, Suite 905, Washington, DC 20005  
bwanner@uscib.org

**1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?**

Non-Government

**If non-government, please indicate:**

Business community

**If non-government, please indicate if you are:**

WSIS accredited & participating in the work of the CSTD

**2. What do you think is the significance, purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda? a) Significance b) Purpose c) Scope**

Significance and purpose: As we describe further below, enhanced cooperation is not a mandate, but instead should be seen as a concept aimed at fostering voluntary cooperation. Enhanced cooperation is an important opportunity to continue to build cooperation among relevant organizations and stakeholders on Internet governance issues to ensure coordination, cooperation, exchange of information to avoid duplication in activities and work plans, and building partnerships to effectively leverage the experience and activities of all stakeholders. Scope: Enhanced cooperation among all relevant stakeholders on the range of Internet governance issues should be strengthened and continued at the national, regional and international levels.

**3. To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented? Please use the space below to explain and to provide examples to support your answer.**

Enhanced cooperation is not a mandate; it is a method of operation and a culture of cooperation between stakeholders, including relevant organizations. There are many examples of enhanced cooperation that have served to promote the development of ICT infrastructure and services in both developed and developing countries alike. And ICT infrastructure and services are critical; studies by the World Bank, the Internet Society (ISOC), McKinsey & Co. and other global economic experts have shown a clear and positive correlation between investment in high-speed networks and the growth of economic activity, productivity, and jobs creation.

Examples of enhanced cooperation can be drawn from the initiatives of ICANN, the ITU, ISOC, UNESCO, the OECD, and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, to name a few. Importantly, it is happening in the context of the IGF (Internet Governance Forum), which brings together different stakeholders -- nationally, regionally and globally -- to discuss policy matters in an open setting. (Please see our response to question #9.)

Specifically, we could like to draw attention to the following:

-The OECD's ground-breaking work in developing Internet Policy Principles (IPP), which was undertaken in a multistakeholder context. A Voluntary Group has been convened to enable multistakeholder dialogue on challenges at the regional, national, and local levels with IPP implementation. This initiative will help to make sound Internet governance principles and their related economic benefits more accessible to non-OECD developing countries;

- The OECD also has used a multistakeholder approach in order to update earlier guidelines on on-line privacy and cybersecurity that ultimately will serve as models for both developed and developing countries;
- Soon after its Ministerial Meeting on “The Future of the Internet Economy” in June 2008, the OECD broadened stakeholder involvement in its policy development process by recognizing the technical community (Internet Technical Advisory Committee) as a participant, joining government and business (Business and Industry Advisory Committee) participants;
- APEC has made important contributions to this space with its development of the Cross-Border Privacy Regulation system and engagement with the EU in implementing the concept of interoperability. This process has entailed input from numerous stakeholders and potentially will yield a practical approach to ensuring privacy of cross-border data flows;
- APEC has endeavoured to set forth principles for both developed and emerging economies alike for the development of a healthy digital ecosystem through its Digital Prosperity Checklist;
- APNIC has established relationships with various regional and global organizations aimed at enhancing understanding throughout the Asia Pacific region of the technical operation of the Internet. These partnerships range from the Advanced Science and Technology Institute, Philippines to the Beijing Internet Institute, Dhaka University, to the Internet Service Providers Association of Pakistan, among many others. See <https://www.apnic.net/community/support/memberships-and-partnerships/>;
- As we discuss in Question 8, ICANN has concluded numerous partnership MOUs, particularly with relative newcomer countries to the Internet economy. Notably, in 2007, ICANN concluded an MOU with the African Union expressly aimed at “increasing awareness about Internet Governance issues and working together on the development and growth of the Internet in Africa;” and
- The Internet Society (ISOC) produced a ground-breaking study that quantifies for the first time how IXPs enable Kenya and Nigeria to save millions in telecommunications costs and raise additional revenues in these countries while simultaneously speeding local data exchange, and encouraging the development of locally hosted content and services

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

There are a host of critical public policy issues related to the Internet that all stakeholders are grappling with, including privacy, transparency, security, transborder data flows, free flow of information, market development, protection of intellectual property, creativity and innovation. It is important to protect all fundamental rights on the Internet. An issue of growing concern is the number of countries in the world that are blocking content or requesting removal of content for political reasons thereby violating fundamental free expression principles, and indeed, there are entire countries that filter and block content from getting in to their countries.

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

All stakeholders including governments should continue to build cooperative initiatives between organizations and processes related to Internet governance matters. All stakeholders have a responsibility and role in operationalizing enhanced cooperation.

#### **6. How should enhanced cooperation be implemented to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet?**

Continued efforts should be made to facilitate the participation of governments from around the world in the existing processes and forums at national, regional, and international levels. Governments acting in a multistakeholder environment should contribute according to their mandates and competencies. However, they cannot act alone defining or implementing policy. They necessarily must rely on the private sector, civil society, and others to define and implement policy. The importance of multistakeholder processes, and hence enhanced cooperation between and among stakeholders, is fundamental to the successful operationalizing and implementation of public policy issues pertaining to the Internet in a

manner that scales, is effective and benefits all, while not harming innovation, creativity, investment, and opportunities to users globally  
USCIB, of course, recognizes that different stakeholders should take the lead on particular issues. We underscore that transparency and dialogue are keys to the success of multistakeholder processes and to enhanced cooperation.

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

We feel it is important to reiterate that enhanced cooperation is not a mandate. Rather, it is a method of operation and a culture of cooperation between organizations and stakeholders. The exchange of information between stakeholders is crucial to the growth of the Internet. Enhanced cooperation, with openness to participation, enables stakeholders to better carry out their roles and responsibilities because it ensures transparency, awareness, responsibilities, and accountability, in addressing different facets of a public policy issue.

### **8. What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources?**

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.

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

The IGF serves as a shining example of enhanced cooperation given the many illustrations we see each year – particularly coming from IGF workshops -- of how the IGF has assisted in the achievement of the purpose and objectives listed in our response to question 2. By bringing together stakeholders in workshops, sessions and open forums, the IGF has catalyzed partnerships in a multistakeholder manner among participants, and reinforced cooperation and coordination among respective areas of expertise. For example:

Through a series of IGF workshops beginning in 2006, the cooperative work of UNESCO and ICANN on multilingualism has evolved, eventually resulting in the conclusion in December 2009 of an MOU aimed at supporting the introduction of top-level Internationalized Domain Names (IDN), particularly in the developing world;

-At the 2010 IGF, UNESCO and ICANN signed a letter of intent aimed at assisting Internet users' access in Member States whose official languages are based on the Cyrillic script; and  
-A workshop planned for the Bali IGF will feature a discussion involving an expert who worked closely with the government of Porto, Portugal. He will elaborate on Porto's experience in building an ecosystem where universities, municipalities, large corporations, SMEs, and end-user communities can come together to develop future Internet technologies and cloud-based services that leverage big data to improve the quality of life, safety, and environmental sustainability in modern cities. The Porto case study not only illustrates the economic and societal benefit of enhanced cooperation in urban planning, but serves as a "how-to" model and opportunity for IGF participant follow up in their home countries.

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

The views of emerging regions are critical. The next billion Internet users likely will come from developing countries and they will play important roles in driving and shaping the development of the Information Society and the digital economy.

Over the years, there has been significant progress in involving more developing country governments and stakeholders in global Internet governance processes.

There are increasing numbers of national and regional IGF initiatives in developing countries, dialogues on public policy issues, and identification of priorities and challenges. These priorities are important contributions to the overall global Internet governance evolution. But more opportunities should be created to enable all stakeholders, regardless of region, to engage in global Internet governance through the various forums that contribute.

The following are aimed at continuing to build on this progress:

-Raising awareness about the global Internet governance processes and forums at the national and regional levels for governments and stakeholders. This may be done by continuing to use the national and regional IGF initiatives and stakeholder meetings, such as ICANN's global and regional meetings, Internet Society and other Internet technical community events, business meetings (USCIB events), WITSA events and many others;

-Creating informational resources to explain the global Internet governance process and opportunities for engagement. This should be complemented by more effective distribution;

-There are fellowship and ambassador programs sponsored by many stakeholders aimed at providing travel support to developing country governments and other stakeholders to raise awareness and enable broader developing country participation in the global Internet governance process. We must continue to build on these opportunities and raise awareness about them; and

-Ensuring remote participation opportunities, webcasting, audiocast and transcripts, and translation wherever and whenever possible to better ensure participation by non-English speakers.

## **11. What barriers remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance? How can these barriers best be overcome?**

Barriers include financial, informational/educational, and operational elements:

-Financial – There needs to be greater support to engage in global Internet governance, whether through fellowships and sponsorships, or through other means, for example employer recognition of the importance to engage in Internet governance processes. Financial support to cover travel expenses remains an obstacle for some stakeholders. More should be done to build the IGF trust fund, for example, to help cover travel costs and broaden participation from emerging economies. In addition, existing funding support programmes offered by several stakeholders including the Internet technical community, governments and business, should be maximized;

-Informational – Some stakeholders are not aware of the processes and forums where they can contribute and have an impact at national, regional and international levels. Raising awareness at all levels and across stakeholder groups would help to overcome this. While information may seem available, it is essential to improve ease of access to information on Internet-related public policy issues. Information also needs to be more readily understandable to a newcomer audience that may not yet possess in-depth technical expertise or knowledge of Internet governance policy issues; and

-Operational – Global Internet governance processes must continue to operationalize in ways that scale to a global stakeholder constituency, including governments -- recognizing that different stakeholders may lead on different matters/issues, and that different processes and forms of engagement may better enable the respective participation of all relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process.

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

-Increasing awareness and assessing whether additional financial support to facilitate participation in processes and forums would be helpful; and

-Easing the ability to engage, whether physically or remotely, in Internet governance discussions and ensuring broader information dissemination.

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

Greater efforts should be made to achieve a baseline understanding of the value that the Internet and the sectors that drive demand for Internet infrastructure, including government services, bring to economies. Such an understanding is crucial to appreciating how the Internet contributes to economic development.

Many studies are now available freely on [www.valueoftheweb.com](http://www.valueoftheweb.com). In addition, WIPO has done studies on the impact of the content sectors on a nation's gross domestic product (GDP). Enhanced cooperation is key to exchanging information on the policies that can help augment the contribution of the Internet and those sectors driving demand for the Internet to expanding a country's GDP.

The Internet has evolved to date through multistakeholder processes and enhanced cooperation. The value of these processes is that they bring issues to the forefront, rapidly in Internet time, and identify solutions that can scale. For example, issues such as e-education, or e-government, are successful if all stakeholders—governments, civil society, the Internet technical community, and business -- engage to identify the best ways to further development. The Porto, Portugal urban planning example cited earlier very effectively illustrates this.

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

Many stakeholders, through various standards organizations and industry forums have developed and continue to develop the technical capabilities that allow for development of content on the Internet in most languages as well as the ability to develop internationalized domain names.

As for the private sector, we note that many companies are developing programmes to promote local language content on the Web. One example is Arabic Web Days, [www.arabicwebdays.com](http://www.arabicwebdays.com)

Many stakeholders have the ability and responsibility to promote the development of content in local languages: governments through education and primary schools, the private sector, civil society, the Internet technical community, and academic community through other means. Finally, the adequate and effective protection of intellectual property is critical to promoting local content and indeed cultural diversity.

We feel it is important to note UNESCO's extensive efforts to foster the development of local language content. In addition, the OECD has made important contributions to this space through its project, "The Internet Supporting Local Content Development." This project, which is poised to enter a second phase, has focused on how the Internet can be leveraged for

social and economic benefit. Building on complementary work done by UNESCO and ISOC, it has been examining how the Internet supports the development, storage, and dissemination of local content. In particular, the second phase of the project will make an important contribution by examining the Internet and the development of local content in Arabic-speaking countries.

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

The single most important issue for developing economies is the question of how to create an ecosystem that can support demand for broadband by attracting investment that promotes its development and deployment. It is important to remember that promoting broadband without promoting the growth of the products and services delivered over it through appropriate policy frameworks may result in underutilized investments.

In recent years we have witnessed an increase globally in the number of governments requiring foreign companies that produce digital content and services to localize investments, production, services, procurements or other activities as a condition for doing business in that country.

We have also seen the potentially deleterious effects of Internet traffic charging arrangements based on the principle of sending-party-networks pays (SPNP) that are being discussed in relation to the need to invest in upgrading local telecom networks to meet the demands of increasing traffic volumes. However, as a result of the SPNP approach, we could see more content going behind paywalls and certain regions, especially those with limited purchasing power, potentially being excluded from some content.

Such localization requirements often are aimed at protecting and nurturing a nascent ICT sector. In reality, though, they can work at cross-purposes with this goal by inhibiting precisely the kind of foreign investment and competition that would help spur growth and innovation in indigenous industry and broad-band development as well as stimulate digital trade, and encourage responsible Internet governance practices. USCIB is actively supporting a workshop (#301) at the IGF Bali that will delve into the impact of local rules on global trade and Internet governance.

Secondly, enhanced cooperation between law enforcement and the private sector for cybersecurity is important, such as establishing Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) and other response units.

Finally, developing economies have made known their desire to have more of a voice in ICANN and in other groups focused on Internet governance. It therefore is incumbent on ICANN and other similar organizations to continue to develop the opportunities and, if necessary, provide financial support to enable greater involvement of developing economies.

**16. What are the key issues to be addressed to promote the affordability of the Internet, in particular in developing countries and least developed countries?**

To advance and continue the affordability of the Internet it is important to create an enabling environment that attracts investment, promotes innovation and fosters entrepreneurship. An essential factor in this enabling environment is the deployment of broadband infrastructure. It has been statistically verified that the adoption of national broadband plans and policies that stimulate competition has resulted in marked increases in fixed and mobile broadband penetration. In addition, there is now ample evidence that broadband deployment is a significant stimulus to employment creation, growth in GDP, and an overall key driver of economic growth.

A key driver of Internet access and its affordability is the deployment of broadband infrastructure – both fixed and mobile. The trending in cost of access to broadband and therefore the Internet has continued to drop among developed countries (recent statistics indicate that broadband access typically costs less than 2% of average income in 49 leading economies of the world). In the developing world the number of countries witnessing a decline in cost of broadband has increased thus stimulating Internet affordability and access. (See The State of Broadband 2012: Achieving Digital Inclusion for All -- <http://www.broadbandcommission.org/Documents/bb-annualreport2012.pdf>)

Availability of spectrum has a role as well in promoting the availability of the Internet.

Research and development on new technologies that lower cost and increase bandwidth, and opening up markets to competition, where feasible, can also help lower cost.

A great deal of information on best practices to ensure an enabling environment that promotes broadband deployment is available. Regional IGFs are excellent platforms for the exchange of information on best practices for creating an enabling environment that encourages investment, for example, in broadband deployment and its corollary an affordable Internet.

**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?**

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.

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

It would be important to ensure this questionnaire has a wide range of input, in particular from developing and emerging regions and stakeholders.