

**THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

**MEETING ON ENHANCED COOPERATION ON PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES PERTAINING  
TO THE INTERNET**

**18 May 2012  
Geneva**

**Contribution by**

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**Mr. Mark Carvell  
Head, Global Internet Governance Policy  
Department for Culture, Media and Sport**

**The views presented here are the contributor's and do not necessarily reflect the views and the position of  
the United Nations or the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**

**STATEMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM**

Thank you, Chair. My name is Mark Carvell. I lead on Internet governance policy in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport which is the UK ministry with responsibility for Internet policy.

The UK Government recognises the importance of ensuring that all stakeholders – including governments – have due and full regard for the provision in the Tunis Agenda relating to enhanced cooperation. We appreciate very much the opportunity – the timely opportunity – to discuss the way forward with regard to enhanced cooperation.

I want first of all to comment on the statements that were made in the opening addresses which were very illuminating and very, very interesting for us to hear. I want to concur with statements to the effect that Internet governance and the landscape of the Internet has changed considerably in recent years. And during that time, we have seen the multi-stakeholder model or ecosystem become fully embedded in all our consciousness, in all our discussions, whether it's in this forum or indeed in other fora where Internet governance and Internet public policy issues are discussed. And we've heard that there are many, many such fora. My diary for the next 12 months, I just dare not look at it sometimes in terms of where I have to get to in order to engage it as effectively as I can. That's a problem we all have to face.

I think much of this change has been prompted by the success of the Internet Governance Forum, which has continued on an upward trend of establishing an effective and a comprehensive, diverse, inclusive forum for discussing Internet governance public policy issues. We are not here now to discuss that. We recognize the argument that the IGF is one track and enhanced cooperation is another track. But the IGF has developed very effectively. It's not perfect. We all, I think, would readily recognize that. And we appreciate very much the CSTD and the working group on improving the IGF for all its work over the last couple of years to look at how the IGF can continue to evolve, build on its success and become ever more inclusive. And extending the outreach to developing countries, to LDCs to small island states is a vital element of that track of improvement.

Mr. Kummer talked about how the IGF has been a catalyst for cooperation. And I want quickly to give an example of that. The recently launched Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative was borne out of discussions in the IGF convened by the Commonwealth Internet Governance Forum. So we had discussions in the IGF and we recognized that cybercrime was a critical issue. It inhibits trust. It leads to abuse of the domain name system, and a lot of action needs to be done and there's a lot of bringing up in terms of increasing the level of capacity to combat cybercrime.

That's what the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative is all about: capacity building. So from the dialogue came a cooperative action. We've now formally constituted a framework for cybercrime action, which brings in, as key partners, governments, including UK government, of course, but also governments from the Commonwealth and international, intergovernmental organizations including the UN Office of Drugs and Crime, the ITU, the Council of Europe. It also brings in international organizations such as ICANN, the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization; we've got Diplo, and we've got business participation. So we've got a range of partners who are around the

table contributing to cooperative action. And this has come out of dialogue in the IGF. And it's multi-stakeholder. I would be very happy to provide the CSTD with further information about this example of what I see as enhanced cooperation in practice.

Mr. Hickson from ICANB has spoken about ICANN's perspective on enhanced cooperation. And I'd like to touch briefly on that myself as my second example, from my perspective as the United Kingdom representative on the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN.

During my three years in this role, we've seen ICANN's remarkable progress in terms of its openness and its ability to engage stakeholders and reach out across the globe. I think there are two factors that have contributed to that. First of all, the Affirmation of Commitments, the framework now which ensures ICANN adheres to its mandate on adhering to the public interest that's now explicit in the Affirmation of Commitments. Secondly, the Affirmation of Commitments has initiated a series of independent reviews with representatives and experts from governments and other stakeholder communities. These reviews look at accountability, transparency, the stability of the domain name system - and the registrant database which had a lot of problems. We're now close to resolving that issue - that's the "Whois" database, for those who are in the know about that.

The GAC membership is now over 120 governments with a number of inter-governmental organisations as observers. And the methodology of the GAC is one that now is much more open. At each GAC meeting, we reach out to representatives from the other stakeholder organizations and constituencies within the ICANN family. That includes IP, the business users, the non-commercial users as well as obviously the registries, the registrars and the technical experts, to name but a few. There are others. ICANN is a real family. But the governments are there engaging with all of these stakeholder groups. And it's about cooperation. It's about promoting understanding and ensuring that ICANN delivers on its public policy mandate. So I just wanted to say that we believe there's been a lot of progress.

There's enhanced cooperation happening in many other areas. We've heard other examples, too. I don't have a fixed view on how the CSTD might continue this process. If we consider the wealth of examples that are now happening and the potential further enhanced cooperation, I don't really see the case for a new process at an intergovernmental level. That's not proven to me. But I would see value in the CSTD having some functionality that maps what's going on, that addresses the definitional issues we heard about earlier - there's a lot of controversy about the definitions regarding enhanced cooperation - and that showcases good examples of enhanced cooperation and what other opportunities there may be, for example, to be picked up on.

So I see the CSTD as having such a role that could be performed, a valuable role, and we would want to contribute to that. Whether it should be a working group or inviting people to submit reports to CSTD inter-sessional meeting and the next CSTD session next year, I defer to this meeting to agree a way forward on that. But that's basically the UK position on this. I hope that's been helpful for the meeting. Thank you very much, Chair. I hope I haven't gone on too long.