1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?
Non-Government

If non-government, please indicate:
Civil society

If non-government, please indicate if you are:
Access is an international non-governmental organization. We have been accredited to participate in WSIS and ITU meetings, specifically the WSIS+10 meeting in Paris, WSIS Forum 2014, and the World Telecommunication Policy Forum, but do not fit into any of the categories above. Access has applied for ECOSOC accreditation. Our application should be considered in 2014.

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

a) Significance: The inclusion of the concept of enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda is significant both for the impetus behind it and for what it created. In addition to the political factors for its inclusion, enhanced cooperation can be seen as a recognition of significant shortcomings in how international internet related public policies were being made. To be more specific, the existing internet governance ecosystem did not meet the WSIS criteria, as outlined by the WGIG report (para. 35), i.e. transparency, accountability, multilateralism, and the need to address all public policy issues related to internet governance in a coordinated manner. More importantly, the term enhanced cooperation reflects the lack of clarity regarding how to address the aforementioned shortcomings. As a result, the inclusion of enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda is significant for setting out a process for moving beyond the status quo, but without providing for a vision or specific modalities. This is perhaps why almost 10 years later this issue is still being debated.

b) Purpose: The purpose of enhanced cooperation is to improve international internet governance to realize the full vision of WSIS by working towards a people-centred, inclusive, development-oriented and non-discriminatory Information Society. This means addressing the gaps and deficiencies in the current internet governance system noted above. Para. 69 of the Tunis Agenda explicitly recognizes that governments need to be on equal footing in carrying out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the internet (other than the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues). However, in light of other paragraphs in the Tunis Agenda (in particular paras. 35 and 71), we would like to see enhanced cooperation also to put governments on equal footing with other stakeholders. Therefore we view the purpose of

enhanced cooperation to create a system of internet governance in which all stakeholder enjoy full participation and work for an internet that enables the fulfilment of human potential and respect for human rights.

c) Scope: Per para 70 of the Tunis Agenda, enhanced cooperation should be achieved by using relevant international organizations and per para 71, it should involve all relevant stakeholders. Without precluding the possibility of new institutions in the future, we consider the scope of enhanced cooperation to be addressing gaps in the current governance structures while working within existing institutions and improving linkages between them, in an inclusive manner.

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.

While there are examples that one could point to of progress in enhanced cooperation, for example at the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN or at the Internet Governance Forum, overall, enhanced cooperation has not been implemented. To take one internet-related public policy, one cannot consider the manner in which decisions that impact online privacy globally are made to meet the WSIS criteria of transparency, accountability, multilateralism, and coordination. In fact, the recent revelations of mass surveillance should serve as a wakeup call that the current system is failing.

But perhaps focusing on the concept of enhanced cooperation is not the most effective discourse to address the shortcomings of the status quo. Governments absolutely need to find a mechanism for meaningful and concrete contributions to decision making on internet-related public policy issues, but the same needs to be said for civil society. Civil society faces the same barriers in participating in major internet-related policy making venues that many governments, particularly those in the global south, often to a more acute degree. Moreover, the Snowden revelations highlight a valuable lesson, which is when there is a lack of transparency, opportunities for abuse arise. Therefore, a concerted effort should be made to amplify the role of civil society to strengthen and promote transparency and guard against abuse within the system. As we note under question 7, however, the role of civil society goes beyond providing a check on government and corporate power.

Therefore, it may make more sense to consider what the conditions are necessary for enhanced cooperation to begin to be implemented. Or to put it differently, what is the culture under which enhanced cooperation could thrive. A good start would be to ensure that all institutions making decisions on internet-related public policy issues are open to all interested parties; transparent in the decisionmaking processes; respectful of the equal participation of all stakeholder groups; bottom up in engaging those directly affected; diverse and multilingual; and build capacity for actors and stakeholders to meaningfully participate. Adopting this culture of enhanced cooperation is an important preceding factor to encouraging the flourishing of enhanced cooperation on a number of internet-related public policy issues and across many institutions.

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

Recognizing that much work has been done to identify international public policy issues pertaining to the internet, in particular in the context of the Working Group on Internet Governance, and that a static list of issues cannot be created as with the emergence of new technologies comes new opportunities and challenges, we list below a set of issues that is most relevant to us.

Freedom of expression
Privacy
Data protection
Freedom of association
Anonymity
Network security

Cybersecurity
Digital security (users' rights secure online)
Meaningful participation in global policy development
Network discrimination
Intermediary liability
Legal jurisdictional issues and cross-border information flows
Standards for domain name registries
Due process
Remedy for abuses of users' rights at the intermediary and governmental levels
Standards/best practices for domain name servers
Secure communication
Authentication and trusted communication
Access to root zone files to all gTLDs and ccTLDs

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

Para. 71 of the Tunis Agenda clearly establishes that enhanced cooperation should involve all stakeholders. However we find the roles and responsibility framework outlined in para. 35 of the Tunis Agenda unnecessarily limiting. For example, civil society's role goes beyond the activity at the community level. Indeed civil society has been recognized for playing a valuable role at the international level at important policy debates, for example within the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation itself, as well as at the recent World Telecommunication Policy Forum, to name just two examples. In fact para. 32 of the WGIG report outlines a variety of roles that civil society plays, which go far beyond what is commonly understood in referencing para. 35 of the Tunis Agenda. Therefore even though the debate over enhanced cooperation tends to focus on the role of governments, we believe it is critical to involve all stakeholders in the various aspects of enhanced cooperation according to the broadest understanding of the language of roles and responsibility. Not only is it mandated in the Tunis Agenda, but it will also enrich the process because as noted earlier, other stakeholders face similar barriers to meaningful participation in decision-making about internet-related public policy as governments.

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?

Recognizing that there is a need to find mechanisms/means for governments to play a concrete and meaningful role in international public policy issues pertaining to the internet, we would like to emphasize that enhanced cooperation should not be driven by the need to empower governments as stakeholders in the process alone. Instead, it must seek to address the many shortcomings of the current system. In the discussion of enhanced cooperation there tends to be a focus on finding new mechanisms to facilitate government involvement in decision-making with regards to the internet, however, this approach is misguided. This is not to say that we support the status quo or that the creation of a new institution should never be considered; but rather that the creation of a new body will not address the culture problem mentioned in our response to point 3 or the structural challenges that make it difficult for governments from the global south, as well as civil society, to participate meaningfully.

In terms of pragmatic steps, we suggest continuing the constructive debate we saw at WTPF-13 on the Brazilian proposal "Operationalizing the role of government in the multistakeholder framework for internet governance" (WTPF-13/5(Rev.1)) in a multistakeholder environment. Furthermore, we suggest identifying specific international internet-related public policy issues that are not currently being addressed by any venue, formulating action plans to reform existing institutions so that they meet the WSIS criteria, and strengthening linkages between all institutions and processes addressing international internet-related public policy at the national, regional, and international levels.

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

As noted above, we do not view enhanced cooperation as an end unto itself, but rather a means to deepen the multistakeholder model and meet the vision set out by WSIS to create a people-centred, inclusive, development-oriented, and non-discriminatory Information Society. Additionally, while the purpose of enhanced cooperation is to put all governments on equal footing, we note that governments are stakeholders within the multistakeholder framework set out by WSIS and enhanced cooperation should not be as an opportunity to diminish the role of other stakeholders. The best way to ensure this is to include other stakeholders in all aspects of the enhanced cooperation process, following the example of WGEC. Finally, because the challenges and barriers to concrete and meaningful participation in international internet-related public policy decision making are often faced by all stakeholders, operationalizing enhanced cooperation for governments may very well reveal means of empowering other stakeholders.

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?

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.

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

We consider the IGF to be one institution where enhanced cooperation is being operationalized, but which does not in itself fully implement enhanced cooperation. In fact, the IGF may be the one institution that has fully embraced the culture of multistakeholderism discussed in the response to question 3, as it is open to all interested parties, transparent in its decisionmaking processes, respectful of the equal participation of all stakeholder groups, bottom up in engaging those directly affected, diverse and multilingual; and builds capacity for actors and stakeholders to meaningfully participate. Of course, the IGF has a number of institutional shortcomings, which we do not need to reiterate here.

The IGF could contribute further to enhanced cooperation in a few different ways. First, since governments are in fact on equal footing at the IGF (both with each other and with other stakeholders) the IGF could deepen enhanced cooperation if more governments participated at a higher level, which would be more likely if the proceedings at the IGF translated into or contributed more directly to concrete policy decisions. Second, since we view strengthening linkages between different institutions as an important aspect of enhanced cooperation, connecting proceedings/discussions at the IGF to other decision-making bodies could help in this respect. Third, being a relatively new institution and one that has not yet fully matured, the IGF can provide important insight into the challenges of creating new institutions.

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

There are a number of measures that can be taken to facilitate more effective participation from stakeholders from developing countries. Given the sheer number and geographical

spread of meetings related to internet governance, the logistics of participating in meetings can be difficult in itself. Therefore, greater resources, travel fellowships, specially allocated staff, calendars planned long in advance, multilingual content and translation/interpretation, and better use of remote participation, are just a few measures that would improve the effectiveness of stakeholders in global internet governance. Additionally, outlining clear modalities for participating and expected outcomes of the meeting would help stakeholders determine how to best utilize the resources they have.

Furthermore, capacity building programs like South School for Internet Governance, the African School for Internet Governance and the Online Training Programme on Internet Governance and Policy in Middle East and North Africa (MENA) run by the DiploFoundation, Association for Progressive Communications, and others are excellent ways to support the role of developing countries in internet governance. These initiatives, as well as national and regional internet governance fora are important and mutually reinforcing ways to improve the overall effectiveness of global internet governance.

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?

As a member of civil society, we will limit our response to the particular barriers that we face. These include:
*Exclusion from participating in global internet governance debates, or from participating as independent actors: While we welcome governments forming multistakeholder delegations to global internet governance fora, being part of a national delegation does not substitute for independent civil society participation.
*Barriers to full participation, on equal footing with other stakeholder groups: Without addressing the issue of decision-making, civil society is often limited in our ability to participate fully in meetings. For example,
**We often do not enjoy speaking rights or the ability to contribute documents;
**We are sometimes not permitted to view the all relevant documents, which limits our ability to make informed contributions;
**Modalities of participation are often unclear so it is difficult to participate fully, or make the decision to participate at all;
*Limited resources: Civil society has limited resources, both financial and human, to fully participate in internet governance at the global level. To compound this problem, lack of information about or notice of meetings can make it difficult to make an informed decision about which meetings to attend.
*Linguistic barriers often prevent a diverse representation of civil society from participating internet governance at the global level.

Proposed solutions include:
*Outline clear modalities, with the default being that civil society can attend and participate on equal footing with other stakeholders.
*Provide advance notice for all meetings
*Make available travel fellowships
*Schedule meetings far in advance and in places that are not exorbitantly expensive
*Publish all relevant material, with no password requirements
*Use multilingual content and translation/interpretation whenever possible
*Remote participation

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

Those who are most marginalised in the global information society are those who are not yet online. So the most urgent action in this respect is to spread affordable access to the majority of the world's population who is not yet enjoying the benefits of new technology. Further actions that can promote effective participation of all marginalised people in the global information society are leveraging national and regional platforms and south-south knowledge

sharing; incorporating multilingualism; utilizing remote participation and technologies for people with hearing, visual, and other impairments.

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

Not answered.

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

Not answered.

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

Not answered.

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?

Not answered.

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?

Just as at the international level, the development of internet-related public policy should be the result of processes that are open to all interested parties, transparent in its decision-making processes, respectful of the equal participation of all stakeholder groups, bottom up in engaging those directly affected, diverse and multilingual; and builds capacity for actors and stakeholders to meaningfully participate. We would like to highlight the fact that even if a national or regional process is fully multistakeholder, this does not substitute for inclusive processes at the international level. In other words, a successful national consultation cannot be an excuse for governments to shut civil society and other stakeholders out of international fora.

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

We appreciate this opportunity to provide input into WGEC's work and trust that the working group will continue to operate in the spirit of openness, transparency, and inclusiveness.