

Document WSIS-II/PC-3/DT/14 (Rev.2)-E
29 September 2005
Original: English

WSIS Executive Secretariat

Compilation of comments received on the Chair's Paper (DT/10), Chapter Three: Internet Governance

This document contains a compilation of comments on Chapter Three: Internet Governance, Chair's Paper (DT/10) received between the publication of the paper on 23 September and 28 September. The complete text of all the contributions received is available at:
http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/listing.asp?lang=en?&c_event=pc2|3&c_type=col/sca.

Please send comments and additional contributions to wsis-contributions@itu.int.

Note: Additional text underlined. Deleted text ~~strikethrough~~. Comments in *italics*.

Original text (DT/10)	Source	Comments / contributions
1. Introduction	<i>(Text developed by drafting group and approved in Sub-Committee, 28 Sept)</i>	

39. We reaffirm the principles enunciated in the Geneva phase of the WSIS, in December 2003, that the Internet has evolved into a global facility available to the public and its governance should constitute a core issue of the Information Society agenda. The international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations. It should ensure an equitable distribution of resources, facilitate access for all and ensure a stable and secure functioning of the Internet, taking into account multilingualism.

New 39B. We acknowledge that the Internet, a central element of the infrastructure of the Information Society, has evolved from a research and academic facility into a global facility available to the public.

New 39C. We recognize that Internet governance, carried out according to the Geneva principles, is an essential element for a people-centred, inclusive, development oriented and non-discriminatory Information Society. Furthermore, we commit ourselves to the stability and security of the Internet as a global facility and to ensuring the requisite legitimacy of its governance, based on the full participation of all stakeholders, from both developed and developing countries, within their respective roles and responsibilities.

40. We thank the UN Secretary-General for establishing the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG). **We commend** the chairman, members and secretariat for their work and for their report.

41. We take note of the WGIG's report that has endeavoured to develop a working definition of Internet governance. It has helped identify a number of public policy issues that are relevant to Internet governance. The report has also enhanced our understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of governments, intergovernmental and international organisations and other forums as well as the private sector and civil society from both developing and developed countries.

42. A working definition of Internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet.

2. Stakeholders *(Text developed by drafting group and approved in Sub-Committee, 26 Sept)*

43. **We reaffirm** that the management of the Internet encompasses both technical and public policy issues and should involve all stakeholders and relevant intergovernmental and international organizations. In this respect it is recognized that:

- a) Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of States. They have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues;
- b) The private sector has had and should continue to have an important role in the development of the Internet, both in the technical and economic fields;
- c) Civil society has also played an important role on Internet matters, especially at community level, and should continue to play such a role;
- d) Intergovernmental organizations have had and should continue to have a facilitating role in the coordination of Internet-related public policy issues;
- e) International organizations have also had and should continue to have an important role in the development of Internet-related technical standards and relevant policies.

New 43 B. We recognise the valuable contribution by the academic and technical communities within those stakeholder groups mentioned in para 43 to the evolution, functioning and development of the Internet.

44. **We seek to improve** the coordination of the activities of international and intergovernmental organisations and other institutions concerned with Internet Governance and the exchange of information among themselves. A multi-stakeholder approach should be adopted, as far as possible, at all levels.

3. Public policy issues relevant to Internet Governance

3a) Infrastructure and management of critical Internet resources (see also Room Document 1)

3a)	Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)	<p><i>Proposal of new structure of part 3a) and new wording</i></p> <p>45. <i>Wording stays as it has been proposed</i></p> <p>46. <u>We recognise the need for multilateral the need for multilateral, transparent and democratic public policy setting and oversight over the root zone system and its future development.</u></p> <p>47. We seek to ensure balanced access to IP addressing resources on a geographical basis. <u>We recognise the need for elaboration of policies concerning the management and further development of the generic top level domain name space and the need to ensure sovereignty over the full administration of country code top level domains.</u></p> <p>47 48. <u>We seek to ensure fair and equitable distribution of IP addressing resources.</u></p> <p>46 49. We seek to develop public policy related to critical internet resources and strive to establish a new cooperation model that helps us implement the “Geneva principles” regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders. Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be found on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a strong emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.</p>
45. We recognise that, for historical reasons, the authorisation of changes in the root zone file system of the Internet has rested with a single government.	Brazil	[add text] 45. <u>We agree that no single government should have a pre-eminent role in relation to international Internet governance.</u>
	Iran	45. <u>We recognise that, for historical reasons, the authorisation of changes in the root zone file system of the Internet has rested with a single government. No single government should play predominant role in relation to international governing of the Internet. We express our appreciation for the way in which this task has been handled and acknowledge the priority given to the security, stability and continuity</u>

<p>We express our appreciation for the way in which this task has been handled and acknowledge the priority given to the security, stability and continuity of the Internet.</p>		<p>of the Internet.</p>
	<p>Russian Federation / Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova</p>	<p>[New]: 45 bis. <u>(see item19 WSIS-II/PC-3DOC/5) We recognize that, there are significant barriers to multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There is often a lack of transparency, openness and participatory processes.</u> • <u>Participation in some intergovernmental organizations and other international organizations is often limited and expensive, especially for developing countries, indigenous peoples, civil society organizations, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).</u> • <u>The content produced by some intergovernmental organizations and other international organizations is often restricted to members only or is available at a prohibitive cost.</u> • <u>Frequency and location of venues for global policy meetings causes some stakeholders from more remote areas to limit their participation.</u> • <u>There is a lack of a global mechanism for participation by Governments, especially from developing countries, in addressing multisectoral issues related to global Internet policy development.</u>
	<p>Uganda</p>	<p>45. (...) We express our <u>profound</u> appreciation for the way in which this task has been handled and acknowledge the priority given to the security, stability and continuity of the Internet.</p> <p>New: 45bis. <u>We seek to ensure equitable distribution of root server instances to facilitate access and we further seek internationalisation of root server management.</u></p>
	<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>45. We recognise that, for historical reasons, the authorisation of changes in the root zone file system of the Internet has rested with a single government. We express our appreciation for the way in which this task has been handled and acknowledge <u>wish to continue</u> the priority given to the security, stability and continuity of the Internet.</p>
	<p>WSIS CS Youth Caucus</p>	<p>New 45 bis: <u>On the other hand, we reaffirm that the management and evolution of the Internet must rest on the hands of sovereign States thus now call for a multilateral control of the Internet. A governance mechanism must be established after the Tunis Summit wherein Governments, both developed and developing; private sector; netizens and civil society are partners in the consultation and establishment process.</u></p>
	<p>ISOC</p>	<p>We recognise that, for historical reasons, the authorisation of changes in the <u>DNS</u> root zone file system of the Internet has rested with a single government. We express our appreciation for the way in which this task has been handled and acknowledge the priority given to the security, stability and continuity of the Internet. <u>We suggest that the internationalization of this responsibility is desirable when stakeholders can be sure that such internationalization strengthens the security, stability and continuity of the Internet, while ensuring its openness.</u></p>
	<p>CCBI</p>	<p>45. <u>We recognize that security, stability and continuity of the Internet have been, and continue to be, of the highest priority to all stakeholders. We express our appreciation for the way the private sector and governments and other stakeholders have worked in partnership to ensure the integrity of the Internet and welcome the many steps that have been taken so far to internationalize management of the domain name system. We commit to take no action that threatens the stability and security of the Internet.</u></p>
<p>46. We strive to establish a transition to</p>	<p>Iran</p>	<p>46. We strive to establish ..., with a stronger <u>strong</u> emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the</p>

<p>a new cooperation model that helps up implement the “Geneva principles” regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders. Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.</p>		different actors.
	South Africa	46. We strive to establish a transition to a new cooperation model that <u>ensures implementation helps up implement</u> the “Geneva principles”
	Sudan	46. We strive to establish ... different actors. <u>We seek to monitor and periodically evaluate the implementation.</u>
	Uganda/African Group	46. We strive to establish ... be founded on a <u>legitimate, more democratic, more-solid democratic</u> , transparent and multilateral basis, ...
	USA	46. We strive to establish a transition to a new cooperation model that helps up implement the “Geneva principles” regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders. <u>We recognize and acknowledge the vital role played by many existing organizations in the technical management of the Internet, and strive to build on the current structures which have facilitated a rapid, global expansion of the Internet in a secure and stable manner.</u> Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.
	ISOC	46. We strive to establish a transition to a new cooperation model that helps up implements the “Geneva principles” We recognize that the existing organizations responsible for the management of the Internet, the distribution of Internet number resources, and the development of technical standards, have been set up and managed in a way that is consistent with the “Geneva Principles,” with processes that are open to all stakeholders, including governments. We observe that these organizations are evolving with the Internet. 46a. We recommend that all stakeholders continue to support and build upon <u>the existing multi-stakeholder structure that has successfully managed the Internet to date. We commit that further cooperation on Internet governance matters will be organisations that have regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders.</u> Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be founded on a <u>more-solid democratic, transparent and multilateral multi-stakeholder basis , with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.</u>
	WSIS Gender Caucus	46. We strive to establish a transition to a new cooperation model that helps up <u>us</u> implement the “Geneva principles” regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders <u>and fulfil international development agreements.</u> Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.
	WSIS CS Youth Caucus	46. We strive to establish a transition to a new cooperation model that helps up implement the “Geneva principles” regarding the role of governments and all stakeholders. Institutional arrangements for Internet Governance should be founded on a more solid democratic, <u>geographically balanced</u> , transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy <u>and developmental</u> interests of all governments, and with clarification of the relationships among the different actors.
	Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society	46. We strive to establish ... different actors <u>with special attention given to developing countries, Indigenous Peoples, and vulnerable groups.</u>
47. We seek to ensure balanced access to IP	New Zealand	New: 47. We seek to ensure balanced access to IP addressing resources, through <u>continued multi-stakeholder participation, to provide equitable access to resources.</u>

addressing resources on a geographical basis.	Uganda/African Group	47. We seek to ensure balanced access to IP addressing resources on a geographical basis. <u>In this regard, we call for the reinforcement of the specialised regional Internet resource management institutions to guarantee each region's right to manage its own Internet resources.</u>
	Uruguay	47. We seek to ensure <u>equitable</u> balanced access to IP addressing resources on a <u>equitable</u> geographical basis.
	South Centre	47 B: We seek to ensure equitable access to IP addressing resources, on a geographical basis without prejudice to the reliability, security and continuity of the system, respecting international law and sovereign rights of States.
	ISOC	47. We seek to ensure balanced equitable access to IP addressing resources <u>and commend the establishment and evolution of the Regional Internet Registry system that has responsibility for this important role. Stakeholders are encouraged to support these organizations, and on a geographical basis.</u>
	WSIS CS Africa Caucus	47. We seek to ensure balanced access to IP addressing resources on a geographical basis. Supporting the Africa Group draft report : We call for the reinforcement of the specialised regional internet resource management institutions to guarantee each region's right to manage its own internet resources, while maintaining effective global coordination.
48. We recognise the need for elaboration of policies concerning the management and further development of the domain name space.	South Centre	<i>There is still time to get these issues properly discussed and reflected in the text between now and WSIS 2.</i> New 48B: <u>Special note is made of the fact that these public policy issues are in no way complete as simultaneous attention must be paid to: Physical Infrastructure Issues such as , Telecommunications Infrastructure, Broadband Access, VoIP, Spectrum as well as Technical Standards, Open Source and Free Software, Public Domain Information, the Technical Standards of Intellectual Property (Science, Technology and Innovation), Quality of Service (QoS), E-Governance and Navigation Aids and Services.</u>
	Uganda/African Group	48. We recognise the need for elaboration of policies concerning the management and further development of the domain name space. <u>We also recognize the need for further development of policies and procedures for generic top level domain names (gTLDs) and reiterate the legitimate right and sovereignty of countries with respect to the management of their country code top-level-domain names (ccTLDs)</u>
	Venezuela	<i>48 may go before 47</i>
	CCBI	<i>In the new paragraph 48 in room document 1, we believe that Internet resources should be available to meet the needs of stakeholders globally. Plans to allocate and distribute Internet resources should be based on engineering principles to meet those growing needs while keeping the risks to the stability and security of the Internet low. Private sector leadership in this area provides the opportunity for governmental and civil society participation and should be supported. We therefore request that you replace text with "We support a multistakeholder approach in meeting the needs of users for access to IP addressing resources." Furthermore, we suggest the insertion of a sentence with an example such as Afrinic.</i> <i>Returning to the Chair's Paper, in paragraph 48 of that document, we suggest deletion of the paragraph because it has been sufficiently addressed in other paragraphs in this section proposed by delegations.</i>
	WSIS CS Africa Caucus	The management of country code top-level domain names (ccTLDs) should remain the sovereignty of local internet community in respective country (rfc.org RFC1591) .

	<p>ISOC <u>We recognise the valuable role that ICANN and its supporting organizations have played in the management of the Domain Name Space. Stakeholders are encouraged to support and participate in these organizations and to build on their achievements to date. need for elaboration of policies concerning the management and further development of the domain name space.</u></p>
--	---

3b) Public policy issues related to the use of the Internet

<p>49. We seek to counter the growing threats to the stability and security of the Internet. We reaffirm that a global culture of cyber-security needs to be promoted, developed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and international expert bodies. These efforts should be supported by increased international cooperation. Within this global culture of cyber-security, it is important to enhance security and to ensure the protection of data and privacy, while enhancing access and trade. In addition, it must take into account the level of social and economic development of each country and respect the development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</p>	<p>Australia</p>	<p>New 49bis. [add] <u>We urge stakeholders to take guidance on this issue from UNGA Resolution 57/239, ‘Creation of a Global Culture of Cybersecurity’.</u></p>
	<p>Burkina Faso</p>	<p>49. ... of each country and respect <u>the ethical and development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</u></p>
	<p>Indonesia</p>	<p>New 49 B: <u>We reiterate our commitments on the positive and decent uses of the ICTs and to take appropriate actions and preventive measures, as determined by law, against abusive uses of ICTs as mentioned under the Ethical Dimension of the Information Society of the Geneva Declaration of Principles and Plan of Actions.</u></p>
	<p>Pakistan</p>	<p>New 49 B: <u>We reiterate our commitment to the positive uses of ICTs and to take appropriate action and preventive measures, as determined by law, against the abusive uses of ICTs , as mentioned under the Ethical Dimensions of the Information Society, included in the Geneva Declaration of Principles and Plan of Action.</u></p>
	<p>USA</p>	<p>49. We seek to build confidence and security in the use of ICTs by strengthening the trust framework. We reaffirm the necessity to promote, develop and implement in cooperation with all stakeholders a global culture of cyber-security. This culture requires national action and increased international cooperation to strengthen security while enhancing the protection of personal information and privacy. Development of the culture of cyber-security should enhance access and trade and must take into account the level of social and economic development of each country and respect the development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</p>
	<p>Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society</p>	<p>New49B. <u>We recognise that some technical standards including those related to languages and scripts are so deeply related with and affect respective cultures that they have to be made on initiatives and with full participation of all the related stakeholders especially in developing countries, Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable groups.</u></p>
	<p>ISOC</p>	<p>49. We seek to counter the growing threats to the stability and security of the Internet. We reaffirm that a global culture of cyber- security needs to be promoted, developed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and international expert bodies. These efforts should be supported by increased international cooperation. Within this global culture of cyber- security...</p>
	<p>CCBI</p>	<p>49. We seek to counter the growing threats to the stability and security of the Internet. We reaffirm that a global culture of cyber-security needs to be promoted, <u>continues to be developed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and international expert bodies.</u> ...</p>
	<p>Heinrich Boell Foundation on behalf of WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group (28.09.2005)</p>	<p>New 49. We seek to build confidence and security in the use of ICTs by strengthening the trust framework for building confidence among users of ICTs. We reaffirm the necessity to further promote, develop and implement in cooperation with all stakeholders a global culture of cyber-security as outlined in UN GA Resolution 57/239 and other relevant regional frameworks. This culture requires national action and increased international cooperation to strengthen security while enhancing ensuring the protection of personal information, data and privacy. Development of the culture of cyber-security should enhance access and trade and must take into account the level of social and economic development of</p>

		<p>each country and respect the development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</p> <p><i>In paragraph 35 of the Geneva Declaration, the “trust framework” is spelled out as a prerequisite “for building confidence among users of ICTs”. The user perspective should be mentioned, as their trust is key to the argument here. The Geneva DoP does not refer to any other resolutions or documents. The Geneva DoP agreed language reads “to ensure the protection of data and privacy”.</i></p> <p>49 bis: We reiterate our commitments to the [positive/ethical] uses of the ICTs [with internet (Korea)] and to take appropriate actions and preventive measures, as determined by law, against abusive uses of ICTs as mentioned under the Ethical Dimension of the Information Society of the Geneva Declaration of Principles and Plan of Actions.</p> <p><i>The formulations “ethical use” and “abusive uses” are too ambiguous. From a human rights perspective, there are only legal or illegal uses, and the definition of illegality has to respect freedom of speech and other human rights. “Preventive measures” opens a dangerous gate to suppression of civil actions even before they have happened. This approach is contradictory to due legal procedures.</i></p>
	<p>WSIS CS Youth Caucus</p>	<p>49. We seek to counter the growing threats to the stability and security of the Internet. We reaffirm that a global culture of cyber-security needs to be promoted, developed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and international expert bodies. These efforts should be supported by increased international cooperation with OECD member countries sharing their expertise and wide experience fully taking into account human rights and privacy issues. Within this global culture of cyber-security, it is important to enhance security and to ensure the protection of information, data and privacy, while enhancing access and trade. In addition, it must take into account the level of social and economic development of each country and respect the development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</p>
	<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>We seek to counter the growing threats to the stability and security of the Internet. We reaffirm that a global culture of cyber-security needs to be promoted, developed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and international expert bodies. These efforts should be supported by increased international cooperation <u>and the respect of all aspects of Human Rights</u>. Within this global culture of cyber-security, it is important to enhance security and to ensure the protection of data and privacy <u>for all</u>, while enhancing access and trade. In addition, it must take into account the level of social and economic development of each country and respect the development-oriented aspects of the Information Society.</p>
<p>50. We underline the need to develop effective instruments and efficient mechanisms for the prosecution of crimes using technological means, that are committed in one jurisdiction but have effects in another. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to continue to develop appropriate instruments</p>	<p>Israel</p> <p>USA</p>	<p>50. bis: <u>We underline the importance of countering the manifestations of terrorism at all its forms in the Internet. In particular we condemn the use of the internet for purposs of financing of terrorist acts, radicalization towards terrorist acts, recruitment for terrorist acts and glorification of terrorist acts that may incite further terrorist acts.</u></p> <p>50. We underline the importance of effective instruments and efficient mechanisms for the prosecution of crimes posed by the misuse, malicious use and criminal use of the online environment, including those that are committed in one jurisdiction but have effects in another. We recognize existing international frameworks such as the Convention on Cybercrime that allows for effective investigation and prosecution of cybercrime. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to build upon existing international frameworks in the development of international cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of cybercrime. We encourage the creation of national legislation on cybercrime where such instruments do not exist.</p>

<p>and mechanisms, including treaties and enhanced cooperation, to allow for effective criminal investigation and prosecution of crimes committed in cyberspace as well as against networks and technological resources. This should address the problem of cross-border jurisdiction, regardless of the territory from which the crime was committed and/or the location of the technological means used, while respecting sovereignty.</p>	<p>South Centre</p>	<p>50. ...technological resources. <u>This should address the problem of cross-border jurisdiction, regardless of the territory from which the breach or alleged crime was committed and/or the location of the technological means used within the framework of International Law and respect for national sovereignty.</u></p>
	<p>Council of Europe (28.09.2005)</p>	<p><i>During the first week of this Preparatory Committee, the Council of Europe made a statement to this Sub-Committee on the issue of cybercrime. It was recalled that the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime is an existing international framework for co-operation in the investigation and prosecution of cybercrime. Consequently, the Council of Europe would be very pleased if this could be recognised in paragraph No. 50 of Chapter Three, possibly alongside the relevant resolutions of the UN General Assembly on this subject.</i> <i>Convention on Cybercrime :</i> http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=185&CM=8&DF=28/09/2005&CL=ENG</p>
	<p>ISOC</p>	<p>We underline the need to support develop effective <u>national</u> instruments and efficient <u>cooperative</u> mechanisms for the prosecution of crimes using technological means, that are committed in one jurisdiction but have effects in another. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to continue to <u>support develop</u> appropriate instruments</p>
	<p>CCBI</p>	<p><i>Instruments and mechanisms have been developed and should be promoted.</i></p>
	<p>WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group WSIS Civil Society Human Rights Caucus</p>	<p>50. We underline the need to develop ... technological means used, while respecting <u>human rights, sovereignty, openness, accountability, and civil liberties</u>. <u>All efforts in this regard must be consistent with the rights to freedom of expression and privacy, and they must comply with the principles of due legal process.</u></p>
	<p>Heinrich Boell Foundation on behalf of WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group (28.09.2005)</p>	<p>New Para 50. We underline the importance of effective instruments and efficient mechanisms for the prosecution of cybercrime, including crime committed in one jurisdiction but having effects in another. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to develop national legislation for the investigation and prosecution of cybercrime, while respecting human rights, sovereignty, openness, accountability, and civil liberties. All efforts in this regard must be consistent with the rights to freedom of expression and privacy, and they must comply with the principles of due legal process. taking into account existing international frameworks, such as the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime [and the UN GA Resolution 55/63 and Resolution 56/121.] <i>Any measures to fight cybercrime have to be done in accordance with human rights and due legal process. We are concerned about international developments in this field that lack these foundations. Therefore it has to be made explicit here.</i> <i>Civil Society strongly opposes the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime and has done so publicly in the past years. This is mainly because of its overly broad mandate and the lack of “dual criminality” provisions.</i> <i>It is also a regional framework and therefore not appropriate to be mentioned in a UN summit document.</i></p>
	<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>50. We underline the need to develop effective instruments and efficient mechanisms for the prosecution of crimes using technological means, that are committed in one jurisdiction but have effects in another. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to continue to develop appropriate <u>gender responsive</u> instruments and mechanisms, including treaties and enhanced cooperation, to allow for effective criminal investigation and prosecution of crimes committed in cyberspace as well as against networks and technological resources. This should address the problem of cross-border jurisdiction, regardless of the territory from which the crime was committed and/or the location of the</p>

		technological means used, while respecting sovereignty.
<p>51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This would entail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) development of technical measures; c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and user education of measures; e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problem. 	Australia	<u>New 51bis. We urge stakeholders to take guidance on this issue from the APEC Anti-Spam Strategy and other relevant documents.</u> [Australia to check the precise title of APEC document.]
	Singapore	51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. We call upon all stakeholders governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This <u>could</u> would entail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) development of technical measures; c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and user education of measures; e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problem.
	USA	51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. <u>We take note of current frameworks for international cooperation on spam that include existing multi-lateral memoranda of understanding as the London Action Plan. We call upon all stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam that includes consumer and business education; effective law enforcement authorities and tools; the continued development of technical measures and best practices, and international cooperation.</u> We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This would entail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) development of technical measures; e) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and user education of measures; e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problem. anti-spam-
	WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group WSIS Civil Society Human Rights Caucus	51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problems posed by of <u>privacy invasion, identity-theft and spam.</u> We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter these problems. This would entail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) <u>privacy impact assessments and the</u> development of technical measures; c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and <u>education of policy makers, data controllers, end-users and producers about privacy-enhancing measures;</u> e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problems; f) <u>mainstreaming of measures to ensure privacy protection in internet governance capacity-building programs.</u>
	Heinrich Boell Foundation on behalf of WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group (28.09.2005)	New para 51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam, <u>identity-theft and other privacy-invasions.</u> We take note of current multilateral multistakeholder frameworks for regional and international cooperation on spam, such as the APEC Anti-Spam Strategy and the London Action Plan. We call upon all stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam <u>these problems</u> that includes among others consumer and business education; appropriate legislation, law enforcement authorities and tools; the continued development of technical and self regulatory measures, best practices, and international cooperation. <i>We again underline that an approach that ensures privacy protection will automatically protect against spam and identity-theft. Reference to other international frameworks is not appropriate for a world summit. Especially if the summit only “takes note” of them, it should be rather left</i>

		<i>out here.</i>
ISOC		<p>We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other <u>all</u> stakeholders ; to pursue adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This would entail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) <u>support for the</u> development of technical measures; <p><i>Governments should support the development of technical measures, not develop them.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and user education of anti-spam measures; e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problem.
CCBI		<p>(...) We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged <u>coordinated</u> approach to counter spam. (...)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) development of <u>industry led</u> technical measures; e) <i>to be deleted</i>
WSIS CS Youth Caucus		<p>51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This would entail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) development of technical measures <u>and anti-spam software technologies</u>; c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships; d) awareness raising and user education of anti-spam measures; e) development of a global and coordinated approach to the problem.
WSIS Gender Caucus		<p>51. We resolve to deal effectively with the significant and growing problem posed by spam. We call upon governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders, to adopt a multi-pronged approach to counter spam. This would entail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) appropriate legislation and enforcement; b) development of technical measures <u>which are gender sensitive</u> ; c) establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships <u>in which men and women are equally represented</u> ; d) awareness raising and user education of anti-spam measures; e) development of a global <u>gender-responsive</u> and coordinated approach to the problem.
52. We reaffirm our commitment to the freedom to seek, receive, impart and use information for the creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge. We urge that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cybercrime and to counter spam do not violate the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS	Algeria	<p>52. We reaffirm our commitment to the freedom to seek, receive, impart and use information for the creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge. We urge that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cyber crime and to counter spam do not violate the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights <u>and in line with principles contained in articles 4 and 5 of the WSIS Declaration of Principles.</u></p>
	Norway	<p>52. We reaffirm our commitment to the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the right includes freedom to hold opinions without interferences and to seek, receive and import information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.</p> <p>We urge that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cybercrime and to counter spam <u>are in conformity with</u> do not violate the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS Declaration of Principles.</p>
	UK/EU	<p>(...) We affirm We urge that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cyber crime and to counter spam <u>must respect and promote the provision of the</u> do not violate the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights <u>and the</u> WSIS Declaration of Principles.</p>

Declaration of Principles.	South Centre	52. ... Declaration of Principles. <u>This should be achieved without compromise to Privacy, Universal Access, Data Protection and the availability of Application Technologies.</u>
	Council of Europe (28.09.2005)	<i>Turning to paragraphs 52 and 53 of Chapter Three, the Council of Europe, as the pan-European organisation for the promotion and protection of human rights, democracy and the rule of law, very much supports a strong reaffirmation of the Geneva commitments with regard to freedom of information and expression, as well as with regard to the protection of privacy and data protection. In this latter context, I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the Declaration of the Committee of Ministers on Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Information Society. This Declaration is available on the WSIS website and is the Committee of Ministers' contribution to the Tunis Phase of WSIS. The Declaration affirms that Human Rights must be respected in a digital environment as much as they have to be respected in a non-digital environment. Advocating a multi-stakeholder approach, the Declaration also addresses the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, i.e. governments, civil society, business, and the Council of Europe.</i>
	Human Rights Caucus (28.09.2005)	[Additional sentence to] para 52. <u>We are committed to include in the future framework for internet governance specific means to ensure that human rights are respected and protection under human rights law enforced. This applies both to intergovernmental, private sector, and multi-stakeholder Internet governance mechanisms.</u>
	WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group WSIS Civil Society Human Rights Caucus	52. We reaffirm our commitment to the freedom to seek, receive, impart and use information for the creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge. We will ensure that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cybercrime and to counter spam <u>protect and promote</u> do not violate the provisions for <u>privacy and freedom of expression</u> as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS Declaration of Principles.
	WSIS Gender Caucus	52. We reaffirm our commitment to the freedom to seek, receive, impart and use information for the creation, accumulation and dissemination of knowledge. We urge that measures undertaken to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cybercrime and to counter spam do not violate the provisions for freedom of expression <u>and human rights</u> as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS Declaration of Principles <u>the Beijing Platform for Action and other human rights conventions and declarations.</u>
	WSIS CS Youth Caucus	New proposed para 52bis: “ <u>We call on the international community to come up with concrete recommendations to promote ethical business practices and avert the further addiction of youth to online gaming and gambling.</u> ” “ <u>We further call the international community to strengthen the fight against cyber-pornography and build the technical capacity and legal policies of Governments on this regard with the involvement of all stakeholders.</u> ”
53. We encourage those governments that have adopted legislation on privacy and/or data protection to coordinate these measures, and their enforcement, with other countries and we call upon those governments that have	Ecuador	53. We encourage those governments that have adopted legislation on privacy and/or data protection, <u>without prejudice to the right to access to information</u> , to coordinate these measures, and their enforcement, with other countries and we call upon those governments that have not yet developed such measures to consider doing so, with the participation of all stakeholders.
	El Salvador	[Text Replacement] (...) we call upon those governments that have not yet developed such measures to consider doing so, with the participation of all stakeholders.

<p>not yet developed such measures to consider doing so, with the participation of all stakeholders.</p>	<p><u>We call upon those Governments that have not yet developed rules and legal frameworks on privacy and data protection to do so, according to their national legislation, with the appropriate participation of all stakeholders. We also encourage those governments who have adopted such a measures, to coordinate international efforts in order to avoid inconsistent application among countries, to protect population against the misuse of personal data and to facilitate international data transfers. Efforts should be made to strive to build enforceable and comprehensive global standards for privacy and data protection rights over the Internet. Those efforts should include self regulatory and technological measures.</u></p>
<p>Iran</p>	<p>53. We encourage those governments that have adopted legislation on privacy and/or data protection ...</p>
<p>Morocco</p>	<p>53. We encourage ... consider doing so, <u>in consultations with all stakeholders with participation of all stakeholders.</u></p>
<p>Nicaragua</p>	<p>53. We encourage those ... of <u>all interested and appropriate stakeholders.</u></p>
<p>Saudi Arabia</p>	<p>53. We encourage those ... the <u>consultation with participation of all stakeholders.</u></p>
<p>Salvador</p>	<p>53. We encourage ... of all <u>and appropriate stakeholders.</u></p>
<p>Singapore</p>	<p>[New] 53. We encourage all stakeholders to ensure respect for privacy and the <u>protection of data, whether via the adoption of legislation by governments, the implementation of collaborative frameworks or best practices and self-regulatory measures by business and users.</u></p>
<p>UK/EU</p>	<p>53. We encourage ... measures to do so consider doing so, with the participation of all stakeholders <u>and in accordance with the provisions for privacy as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Right and the WSIS Declaration of Principles.</u></p>
<p>USA</p>	<p>53. We encourage all stakeholders to adopt strong protective policies and <u>measures that safeguard privacy and personal information and to coordinate internationally, as appropriate.</u></p>
<p>Council of Europe (28.09.2005)</p>	<p><i>See contribution on para 52</i></p>
<p>WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group WSIS Civil Society Human Rights Caucus</p>	<p>New 53a. <u>The right to privacy is a human right and is essential, especially on the Internet where all social interaction takes place through technology. The collection, retention, use and disclosure of personal data, no matter by whom, should remain under the control of and determined by the individual concerned.</u> 53b. (revised old 53) We encourage those governments that have adopted legislation on privacy and/or data protection to coordinate these measures, and their enforcement, with other countries <u>and stakeholders</u>, and we call upon-urge those governments that have not yet developed such measures to consider doing do so, with the participation of all stakeholders. <u>The broad set of privacy issues related to Internet governance should be discussed in a multi-stakeholder setting. We agree on the establishment of a global Privacy Forum.</u> New 53c. <u>International, national and local measures must ensure open and transparent voting processes that fully and completely guarantee the privacy and integrity of the vote if and when electronic voting technologies are implemented.</u></p>
<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>53. We encourage those governments that have adopted legislation on privacy and/or data protection to coordinate these measures, and their enforcement, with other countries and we call upon those governments that have not yet developed such measures to consider doing do so, <u>as a matter of urgency</u>, with the participation of all stakeholders.</p>
<p>ISOC</p>	<p>We encourage those governments that have stakeholders <u>to adopt legislation and related measures and on privacy and/or data protection to coordinate these</u></p>

		measures , and <u>to cooperate in</u> their enforcement , with other countries and we call upon those governments that have not yet developed such measures to consider doing so, with the participation of all stakeholders.
	CCBI	<i>In paragraph 53, WSIS should call upon governments to adopt a flexible and responsive approach to the protection of personal information, including the acceptance of self-regulatory solutions and technological innovations that empower the user, determining where specific laws are needed to protect consumers from harm. We encourage that those laws be enacted in the most targeted fashion possible and to educate the public about privacy protection and technology solutions. WSIS should also encourage governments to cooperate internationally to ensure a seamless environment for different privacy regimes. In assessing the level of protection provided to personal information in other jurisdictions, the criterion should be the objective level of protection afforded by the system as actually used in practice within that jurisdiction. Governments should avoid developing laws, policies and practices which create obstacles to trans- border flows of personal data.</i>
54. We call for the policy and privacy requirements of global electronic authentication systems to be developed through a multi-stakeholder process.	ISOC	54. We call for the policy and privacy requirements of global electronic authentication systems to be developed through a multi-stakeholder process.
	CCBI	54. We call for the policy and privacy requirements of global electronic authentication systems to be developed through a multi-stakeholder process.
	World Blind Union On behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Disability Caucus (28.09.2005)	54. We call for the policy and privacy requirements of global electronic authentication systems to be developed through a multi-stakeholder process, <u>accessible and useable for all.</u>
	WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group WSIS Civil Society Human Rights Caucus	54. We call for the policy and privacy requirements of global electronic authentication systems to be developed through a multi-stakeholder process. <u>The possibility of communicating and using the Internet anonymously must be ensured for everyone.</u>
55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of consumer protection laws and enforcement mechanisms to protect the rights of consumers during the online purchase of goods and services, and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion of the possibilities of e-commerce as well as	Cuba	55. We call for ... expansion <u>without any kind of discrimination</u> of the possibilities of e-commerce as well as consumer confidence in it.
	Morocco	55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of consumer protection laws, <u>conventions, and</u> enforcement mechanisms ...
	Nicaragua	53. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of <u>all e-transactions, including</u> services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. <u>New 55 bis. We also note with satisfaction the increasing use of ICT by governments to serve citizens and encourage countries that have not yet done so, to develop an e-government national agenda.</u>
	Singapore	55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of consumer protection laws <u>and practices</u> and enforcement mechanisms to protect the rights of consumers during the online purchase of goods and services, and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion of the possibilities of e-commerce as well as consumer confidence in it.

consumer confidence in it.	Council of Europe (28.09.2005)	<i>Council of Europe can also lend its support to the proposal by Nicaragua, to add to Chapter Three a new paragraph 55bis on e-government, encouraging countries that have not yet done so, to develop national programmes and strategies for e-government. The Council of Europe has a Recommendation on e-government and e-democracy, which also carries that same message. Recommendation Rec(2004)15 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on electronic governance ("e-governance"): http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated_projects/democracy/02_Activities/01_e-governance/00_Recommendation_and_Explanatory_Memorandum/default.asp#TopOfPage</i>
	ISOC	We recognize note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the application of existing development of consumer protection laws and enforcement mechanisms, as appropriate, to protect ...
	CCBI	55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development, <u>where necessary</u> , of <u>national</u> consumer protection laws
	WSIS CS Africa Caucus	55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of consumer protection laws and enforcement mechanisms to protect the rights of consumers <u>during the online purchase of goods and services</u> , and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion of the possibilities of e-commerce as well as consumer confidence in it.
	WSIS CS Africa Caucus	56. bis We resolve to promote access to knowledge, <u>developing countries content databases and ensure that IPR enforcement does not hinder development.</u> 56. ter Promote the use of free and open source software
	WSIS Gender Caucus	55. We note with satisfaction the increasing volume and value of the purchase of goods and services using e-commerce, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of consumer protection laws and enforcement mechanisms to protect the rights of consumers <u>during the online purchase of goods and services</u> , and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion of the possibilities of e-commerce as well as consumer confidence in it.

4. Measures to promote development

56. We reaffirm our commitment to turning the digital divide into a digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, fair and equitable development for all, particularly for those who risk being left behind and being further marginalized.	Honduras	56. We reaffirm our commitment to ICT as the engine of turning the digital divide into a digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, ...
	Brazil	56. We reaffirm to the role of ICT as a tool of economic growth, thus our commitment to
	Ecuador	[to be delivered]
	African Group	56. stays without changes 57. We commit to fostering and providing guidance on certain developmental areas in the broader Internet agenda to ensure equitable access for all, and to include among other issues international interconnection costs, multilingualism, capacity-building and technology / know-how transfer. We do also encourage the development of open source applications as well as low-cost equipment such as computers.
	Informal Coalition on Financing ICTD (AMARC, APC, Bread for All, CRIS, IT for Change, IteM)	56 (a). We recognize that apart from being a logical infrastructure, the Internet consists as much in the physical network that connects all people and enables them to use it for 'achieving their full potential in promoting their sustainable development and improving their quality of life' (Geneva DOP). Therefore effective universal access to the Internet and its effective use by all people in the manner that promotes their best interests is itself a central part of what is recognized as the Internet. The issues of universal access to, and effective use of,

		<p>Internet for all people therefore comprise core issues of Internet Governance.</p> <p>(b). We affirm the Internet to be a global public space that should be open and accessible to all on a non-discriminatory basis. The Internet, therefore, must be seen as a global public infrastructure. In this regard we recognize the Internet to be a global public good, and access to it must be provided as a public provision.</p> <p>(c) We recognize the fact that since the Internet is emerging as both the principal commercial infrastructure as well as an important social and developmental infrastructure, the issue of its financing and pricing presents a peculiar situation. If it is priced on purely a commercial basis, the socio-development possibilities of the Internet will be greatly compromised. However, its commercial basis also is as important. In these circumstances, it is best to provide basic access to Internet as a public provision made available to all people, and to price the specific commercial services provided over the Internet. Pricing of services instead of access to Internet allows separation of commercial and non-commercial, i.e. socio-developmental, aspects of the Internet, and can provide the best basis of maximizing the potential of the Internet for a people-centered and development-oriented information society.</p> <p>(d). We reaffirm our commitment to turning the digital divide into a digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, fair and equitable development for all by building a ubiquitous network society in which the Internet can reach its potential as a global public good, connecting the world through the universal extension of the Internet.</p>
	<p>World Blind Union On behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Disability Caucus (28.09.2005)</p>	<p>56. We reaffirm our commitment to turning the digital divide into a digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, fair, affordable, accessible, appropriate and equitable development for all, particularly for those who risk being left behind and being further marginalized.</p>
	<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>56. We reaffirm our commitment to turning the digital divide into an equal digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, fair and equitable development for all, particularly for those who risk being left behind and being further marginalized.</p> <p>New 56bis. We call for capacity building for SMEs, including women owned SMEs in developing countries, to participate in policy and take advantage of ICTs for their economic development.</p>
	<p>Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society</p>	<p>56. We reaffirm our commitment to turning the digital divide into a digital opportunity, and ensuring harmonious, fair and equitable development for all, particularly for those <u>including Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable groups</u> who risk being <u>further</u> left behind and being further marginalized.</p>
<p>57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <p>a) Reducing international Internet costs charged by</p>	<p>Australia</p> <p>Burkina Faso</p> <p>Brazil</p>	<p>[New wording] 57. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <p><u>a) Fostering sustainable investment and competition in local access networks within countries;</u></p> <p><u>b) Promoting sustainable investment and strong competition in the market for international Internet connectivity;</u></p> <p><u>c) developing regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access;</u></p> <p>57. d) mobilizing all stakeholders for development of digital solidarity fund and all other mechanisms which may continue effectively finance reduction of digital divide.</p> <p>57. c) Call upon the ITU to study and develop the appropriate recommendations</p> <p>57. d) Developing low cost equipment as low-cost use equipment, such as</p>

<p>backbone providers, supporting, <i>inter alia</i>, the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access;</p> <p>b) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations.</p> <p>c) Developing low-cost equipment, such as computers, especially for use in developing countries.</p>		<u>computers, especially for use in developing countries.</u>
	Colombia	<i>Revision of Spanish translation is required</i> b) <u>encouraging ITU to continue studies, which are related to the Internet and in particular to the questions of connectivity .</u>
	Egypt	New 57 b: We commit to fostering and providing guidance on certain developmental areas in the broader Internet agenda to ensure equitable access for all. We do also encourage the development of open source applications, as well as low cost- equipment, such as computers.
	Honduras	57 a) <u>Reducing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers, supporting <i>inter alia</i>, interrelated actions as the consideration as appropriate of the expansion of the number and distribution of regional root name servers, the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access;</u>
	Iran	57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. a) <i>keep in any condition the first phrase of this sub-para</i> b) <i>support for Brazil's proposal</i> c) <i>support for South Africa's proposal</i>
	Malaysia	57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be given priority and be redressed through greater collaborative efforts at regional and international levels. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue.
	Mauritania	A) Equitable sharing of costs A B) Reducing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers, supporting, <i>inter alia</i> , the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access;
	Norway	e) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) <u>electronic communications</u> as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations.
	Russian Federation	b) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) <u>and connectivity in the perspective New Generation Networks (NGN) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations.</u>
	South Africa	New 57c. [replace the wording] <u>Promote the development and growth of low cost terminal equipment such as individual and collective user devices especially for use in developing countries.</u>
	UK	57 a) <u>Addressing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers by promoting and encouraging the development of regional ICT backbones...</u> 57 c) <u>Promoting the development of low-cost equipment such as user devices, especially for use in developing countries.</u>
USA	Para 57 – Alternate paragraph based on 2003 Plan of Action 9. j & k <u>"We further reaffirm our commitment to optimize connectivity among major information networks by encouraging the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet exchange points, to reduce interconnection costs and broaden network access. We call for the development of strategies for increasing affordable global connectivity, thereby facilitating improved access. Commercially negotiated Internet transit and interconnection costs should be oriented towards objective, transparent and non-discriminatory parameters, taking into account ongoing work on this subject."</u> a) same b) same	

	c) same
African Group	<p>57 58. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. We therefore call for equitable access for all by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>Setting up of a regional high speed Internet backbone allowing the creation of national, sub regional and regional Internet Exchange Points (IXPs).</u> b) <u>Encouraging donor programs and other developmental financing mechanisms to take note of the need to provide funding for initiatives that advance connectivity, IXPs and local content for developing countries.</u> c) <u>Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate recommendations, as well as by encouraging the WTO to address the question through the GATS.</u>
South Centre	<p><i>[Replace 57 d with] Developing and deploying low-cost equipment such as computers and other ICT devices as well as applications for Access, Retrieval and Storage of data, especially for use in developing countries.</i></p>
ISOC	<p>We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed <u>addressed</u> through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <p><i>This issue has not been sufficiently explored. We fear that the assumption that is characterized in paragraph 57 is based upon the realities of yesteryear. While we do agree that this issue should be further discussed, there is no consensus as to the scope of this matter – as was noted in the compilation of comments to the WGIG report.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) [Reducing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers,] supporting, <i>inter alia</i>, the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access; <p><i>We strongly endorse the need for regional backbones, IXPs and other measures to bring infrastructure to those nations that truly need it. However, we would also note that regulatory and competitive environments must enable Internet access and usage otherwise these infrastructure investments will be for naught.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations. c) Developing low-cost equipment, such as computers, especially for use in developing countries.
CCBI	<p>In paragraph 57, we suggest that the first sentence be deleted. Furthermore, subparagraphs a and b should be deleted. We also suggest that you add to the end of the main paragraph <i>“creating a liberalized environment that encourages backbone providers to locate network access points locally, implementing Internet exchange points nationally and regionally, and facilitating the creation of more local content.”</i></p> <p>Our rationale for these comments is that it has been extensively documented that transit costs are competitive and have decreased from 50-30 % since 2003. Thus, the call to reduce the transit costs is inappropriate. It is also well documented that</p>

	<p>implementation of the other points will eliminate any current uneven distribution of costs. No one has proven that there is an "uneven sharing" of the costs. The focus should be on lowering costs for everyone. This issue can be addressed by fostering open and competitive markets and national level attention.</p>
<p>World Blind Union On behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Disability Caucus (28.09.2005)</p>	<p>57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Reducing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers, supporting, <i>inter alia</i>, the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access; e) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations. f) Developing low-cost equipment, such as computers, especially for use in developing countries, <u>including accessible software which are universal designed and appropriate for the users</u>.
<p>WSIS CS Africa Caucus</p>	<p>57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <p><i>Additional paragraphs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g) <u>Encourage and promote interoperability of equipment (hardware and software)</u> h) <u>Governments to ensure an enabling policy environment which should include both:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Policies that prevent public or private monopolies</u> b. <u>Public interest oriented regulation that will support open access to infrastructure and bandwidth with a view to extending affordable access to under-served areas.</u>
<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed <u>with urgency</u> through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p>
<p>WSIS Gender Caucus</p>	<p>57 new(b). Reducing losses by developing countries from new Internet telephony technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Developing low-cost <u>interoperable</u> equipment, such as computers especially for use in developing countries <u>and among disadvantaged populations</u>. <p>New c) Recognising ITU as a key stakeholder in the facilitation of reduction of International Internet costs charged by backbone providers and losses from new Internet telephony technologies.</p>
<p>Informal Coalition on Financing ICTD (AMARC, APC, Bread for All, CRIS, IT for Change, IteM)</p>	<p>57. We maintain that the following steps should be taken to ensure Internet access that is universal and affordable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reducing international Internet costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By different policy options towards universal access. These may include by eliminating exploitative monopolistic practices for the backbone provision, including through submarine cables; - by supporting the establishment of national and international internet exchange points;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - by building local demand for national, regional and international backbone networks; - by reducing costs charged by backbone providers; <p>b) Through public initiatives for backbones and internet provision, in areas of market failure, that, inter alia, leverage existing public infrastructure like electricity and railways networks</p> <p>c) Eliminating monopolistic practices for the provision of IP-based services, including VoIP;</p> <p>d) Exploring an open network access approach to extending Internet access in poor communities, particularly through the promotion of SME and community networking;</p> <p>e) Reconfiguring the mandate of national Universal Access Funds to support Internet connectivity, applications and content development and capacity building;</p> <p>f) Exploring the use of free and open source software as both a source of innovative content and applications development in poor communities as well as a way of reducing the cost of connecting to the Internet;</p> <p>g) Promoting free-share or open content paradigm for socio-development content on the Internet, and recognizing it as distinct from commercial content that may require different IPR regimes.</p> <p>h) Encouraging organisations to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations;</p> <p>i) Developing low-cost equipment, especially for use in developing countries.</p>
	<p>Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society</p>	<p>57. We maintain that the uneven sharing of the burden of costs for international Internet connectivity should be redressed through further dialogue. We call for affordable access to ICTs, including by:</p> <p>a) Reducing international Internet costs charged by backbone providers, supporting, inter alia, the creation and development of regional ICT backbones and Internet Exchange Points to reduce interconnection cost and broaden network access;</p> <p>b) Encouraging ITU to continue the study of the question of the International Internet Connectivity (IIC) as an urgent matter to develop appropriate Recommendations.</p> <p>c) Developing low-cost equipment, such as computers, especially for use in developing countries, <u>indigenous and other vulnerable communities</u>.</p>
<p>58. We would work to enhance multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms. This would involve making available adequate resources to build capacity in a range of areas relevant to Internet management at the national level and to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance,</p>	<p>Iran</p> <p>African Group</p> <p>Saudi Arabia</p> <p>South Centre</p>	<p><i>Separate the two concepts included in this paragraph. Have one paragraph for meaningful participation and one for capacity building.</i></p> <p>58. 59. We would work to enhance multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms <u>particularly for developing countries</u>. This would involve making available adequate resources to build <u>Centres of Excellence for capacity development as well as to facilitate know-how transfer</u> in a range of areas relevant to <u>the Internet industry</u>.</p> <p>60. We would work to in-governance mechanisms. This would involve making <u>make</u> available adequate resources to build capacity in a range of areas relevant to Internet management at the national level <u>and to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance, particularly for developing countries</u>.</p> <p>58. 59. We would work to enhance <u>meaningful and effective</u> multi-stakeholder participation, including from developing countries.</p> <p>58. ... developing countries <u>This would involve making available adequate</u></p>

particularly for developing countries.		<u>resources to build capacity in a range of areas relevant to Internet management at the national level and to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance, particularly for developing countries.</u>
	ISOC	We would work to enhance multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms. This would involve making available adequate resources to ensure participation and build capacity building in a range of areas relevant to Internet governance management <u>governance</u> at the national, regional and global levels and to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance , particularly for developing countries.
	CCBI	In paragraph 58 we would like to remind you of the text we proposed by on September 22, which we think would be an appropriate replacement here. <i>“Governments, businesses, civil Society working together, including where appropriate, through partnerships for education and Training in developing countries, can improve and expand the availability of basic education, and develop the human capacity to participate effectively on Internet governance-related issues nationally, regionally, and globally by such steps as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Committing to ICT education and training as a top priority to ensure that people have opportunities to acquire the necessary ICT skills,</i> - <i>Establishing national strategies for ICT education and workforce development in consultation with private and academic sectors that will be one part of overall national education and ICT Strategies,</i> - <i>Establishing goals and dedicating the financial, people and physical resources to achieve the goals that include metrics that are time-related and measurable, and</i> - <i>Integrating ICT curricula into formal education systems - within the formal secondary, vocational and tertiary education systems as well as through labor/workshop training”</i> <p>Furthermore, as a general point, we believe that Capacity should be built for internet governance and ICTs generally rather than limiting it to “internet management.”</p>
	WSIS Gender Caucus	58. We would work to enhance guarantee multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms <u>with equal representation of men and women</u> . This would involve making available adequate resources to build capacity in a range of areas relevant to Internet management at the national <u>and regional</u> level and to ensure effective <u>and equal</u> participation in global Internet governance, particularly for developing countries.
	Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society	58. We would will work to enhance multi-stakeholder participation in governance mechanisms. This would involve making available adequate resources to build capacity in a range of areas relevant to Internet management at the national level and to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance, particularly for developing countries <u>with the full participation of all the stakeholders, especially taking into account developing countries, Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable groups.</u>
59. We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, and promote and	Iran	59. We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations, where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, <u>within their respective roles</u> , particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, and promote and support such participation.
	Saudi Arabia	59- 61. We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, <u>in accordance with their respective roles</u> , and promote and support such participation.
	African Group	59- 60. In order to ensure effective participation in global Internet governance, we urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions, and

support such participation.		promote and support such participation.
	South Centre	New 59 B: <u>We commit to ensuring that all countries in International Organizations and Intergovernmental Organisations are full and equal participants in the policy discussions and decisions, and that all stakeholders have the opportunity to participate effectively in deliberations as appropriate.</u>
	CCBI	59. (...) including online participation via the Internet and other technologies. Initiatives to bring information and resources to developing countries, including those that use technology available in the Information Society, leads to the development of sustainable activities within the country itself and deserve continued support.
	ISOC	We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, and promote and support such participation, <u>using the Internet and other communications means to the maximum extent possible.</u>
	WSIS Gender Caucus	59. We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly <u>women from</u> developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, and promote and support such participation
	Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society	59. We urge international organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, to ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, <u>Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable communities,</u> have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions <u>and standards</u> that affect them, and promote and support such participation.
60. We commit to working earnestly towards multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. Specifically we would speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names, including for email addresses and keyword look-up.	Iran	<i>Multi-lingualization in the area of content is missing. It should be reinserted.</i>
	Saudi Arabia	60- 62. We commit to working earnestly towards multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders <u>in accordance with their respective roles.</u> Specifically we would speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names <u>and content,</u> including for email addresses and keyword look-up.
	African Group	61. 60- We commit to working earnestly towards multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. Specifically <u>we would underline the need to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names, including email addresses and keyword look-up.</u> • <u>Implement programmes that guarantee the presence of multilingual domain names and content on the Internet and the use of free and open source software in order to fight against the linguistic digital divide and ensure the participation of all in the emerging new society.</u> • <u>Create a sound international environment for the further development of technical standards and action plan for global deployment.</u>
	New Zealand	60. We commit to working earnestly towards multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. <u>We would urge acceleration towards the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names, including for email addresses and keyword look-up. In this context, we also support local content development, translation and adaptation, digital archives, and diverse forms of digital and traditional media, and recognise that these activities can also strengthen local and indigenous communities.</u>
	South Centre	New 60 B: <u>We undertake to expedite the work in progress on the Multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. Specifically we</u>

		<u>would speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names, including for email addresses and keyword look-up.</u>
	CCBI	<i>In paragraph 60 we urge recognition that introduction of IDNs raises complicated technical, political and policy issues that must be carefully considered. These issues are currently being addressed by several organizations at a pace that ensures the continued stability and security of the Internet. Replace “we would speed up process” with “we encourage continued progress towards” and insert at end of paragraph “at a pace that fully and carefully considers the involved complicated technical and policy issues.”</i>
	ISOC	We endorse the work of those organizations commit to working earnestly that are working towards the multilingualisation of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. Specifically we commit to maximizing available resources would speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names and the facilitation of local content, including for email addresses and keyword look-up.
	WSIS Gender Caucus	60. We commit to working earnestly towards multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process that promotes <u>human rights</u> , involving governments and all stakeholders Specifically we would speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in the area of domain names, including for email addresses and keyword look-up.
	Cultural Diversity Caucus / Indigenous Caucus of the Civil Society	60. We commit to working earnestly towards cultural diversity including the multilingualisation of the Internet as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process, involving governments and all stakeholders. Specifically we would will speed up the process for the introduction of multilingualism in <u>computers and Internet the area of domain names, including for email addresses and keyword look-up domain names.</u>
61. We recognise that an enabling environment, at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use.	Saudi Arabia	61- 63. We recognise that an enabling environment, at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including <u>technology and knowledge transfer</u> , for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use.
	USA	61. We recognise that an enabling environment, at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use. <u>In particular, the role of the private sector and civil society as the driver of innovation and private investment in the development of the Internet is critical. Value is added at the edges of the network in both developed and developing countries when the domestic policy environment encourages investment and innovation.</u>
	South Centre	61 ... and its optimal use.) <u>This would include appropriate regulatory frameworks and transparency of contractual arrangements.</u> New 61 B: <u>Governments recognizing the need for sufficient sustainable funding for Internet and Internet related public policy issues as well as the financial implications of Internet Governance, commit to the Financing in support of national, regional and multilateral Internet Governance and related public policy issues and multilateral arrangements, in addition to funds earmarked for the broader ICT programmes.</u>
	ISOC	61. We recognise that an enabling environment, at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use.
	CCBI	<i>In paragraph 61, we believe that the elements of an enabling environment must be specifically mentioned. Without the components of the enabling environment in place, the other objectives are not obtainable. After “enabling environment”</i>

	<i>insert text "Including the establishment of policy, legal and regulatory frameworks that are pro-competitive, spur investment, and foster entrepreneurship, while highlighting the critical need for continued progress creates an environment for investment and innovation."</i>
World Blind Union On behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Disability Caucus (28.09.2005)	61. We recognise that an enabling environment <u>without any need for extra applications or programs formarginalised groups,</u> at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use.
WSIS Gender Caucus	61. We recognise that an enabling environment, at national and international levels, is essential for the development of the Information Society, including for the development and diffusion of the Internet and its optimal use. <u>We commit to ensure such an environment that promotes the convergence of traditional and new ICTs to enhance development and maximum use of the Internet</u>

5. Follow-up and Possible Future Arrangements

<p>62. In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance and for policy debate, we agree that some adjustments need to be made to bring these into line with the "Geneva principles". Accordingly, we propose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Approach: evolutionary; incremental</i> • <i>Framework for interface between existing and future arrangements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Governance/oversight function: (models)</i> ○ <i>Recommended mandate and structure, subject to agreement on the interface.</i> • <i>Possible forum.</i> 	<p>Argentina (28.09.2005)</p> <p><u>We agree to contribute to the evolution and internationalization of the Internet governance system, based on the Geneva Principles, through every existing and future mechanism, institutions and fora.</u></p> <p><u>It is our conviction that all stakeholders - Governments, the private sector, civil society and other interested parties - should actively participate in Internet governance in a coordinated and balanced manner, commensurate with their respective roles and responsibilities.</u></p> <p><u>We recall that main responsibility of all stakeholders is awareness raising, capacity building and to propose solutions to accelerate the availability and affordability of Internet in the developing world.</u></p> <p><u>In order to strengthen the global interaction and cooperation on a multi-stakeholder basis on public policy issues and development-related aspects of Internet governance, we propose a forum.</u></p> <p><u>This forum should not replace existing mechanisms or institutions but should build on the existing structures of Internet governance, should contribute to the sustainable stability and robustness of the Internet by addressing appropriately public policy issues (referred to in para....) excluding any involvement in the day to day operations and focusing on those matters that at present have not an adequate treatment.</u></p> <p><u>We encourage also to establish several fora at national, regional and global levels to discuss and collaborate on Internet expansion and dissemination and to support development efforts to achieve the UN Millennium Development Goals.</u></p>
	<p>Brazil</p> <p><u>[New] 65. We agree to create new space for dialogue for all stakeholders on an equal footing in an effort to realise the development-oriented Information Society. This forum shall be linked to the United Nations and shall assume, inter alia, the following functions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Interface with intergovernmental bodies and other institutions on matters under their purview which are relevant to Internet governance, such as IPR, e-commerce, trade in services, and Internet/telecommunications convergence;</u> • <u>Identify emerging issues and bring them to the attention of the appropriate bodies and make recommendations;</u> • <u>Address issues that are not being dealt with elsewhere and make proposals for</u>

		<p><u>action, as appropriate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Connect different bodies involved in Internet management where necessary;</u> • <u>Contribute to capacity building for Internet governance for developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise;</u> • <u>Promote and assess on an ongoing basis the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes</u>
<p>UK (EU) (28.09.2005)</p>		<p>62. <u>In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance and policy debate we agree that adjustments need to be made and we propose accordingly:</u></p> <p>63. Principles <u>The new model for international cooperation stated in paragraph [49] should adhere, besides the Geneva principles, to the following guiding principles:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>it should not replace existing mechanisms or institutions, but should build on the existing structures of Internet Governance, with a special emphasis on the complementarity between all the actors involved in this process, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations each of them in its field of competence;</u> - <u>this new public-private co-operation model should contribute to the sustainable stability and robustness of the Internet by addressing appropriately public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance;</u> - <u>the role of governments in the new cooperation model should be mainly focused on principle issues of public policy, excluding any involvement in the day-to-day operations;</u> - <u>the importance of respecting the architectural principles of the Internet, including the interoperability, openness and the end-to-end principle.</u> <p>64. Essential tasks <u>The new cooperation model should include the development and application of globally applicable public policy principles and provide an international government involvement at the level of principles over the following naming, numbering and addressing-related matters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Provision for a global allocation system of IP number blocks, which is equitable and efficient;</u> b. <u>Procedures for changing the root zone file, specifically for the insertion of new top level domains in the root system and changes of ccTLD managers;</u> c. <u>Establishment of contingency plans to ensure the continuity of crucial DNS functions;</u> d. <u>Establishment of an arbitration and dispute resolution mechanism based on international law in case of disputes;</u> e. <u>Rules applicable to DNS system.</u> <p>65. Forum function <u>In order to strengthen the global multi-stakeholder cooperation within Internet Governance, we decide to create a Forum. The task of this Forum is to address multidimensional and interrelated public policy issues, through the exchange and sharing of information and good practices. It shall work on the basis of a clear mandate for a predefined period. It should work with existing institutions or organisations and not try to dominate issues already dealt with elsewhere. It should not perform oversight tasks.</u></p> <p>66. Transition to this new model of international cooperation <u>In order to implement par. 62 to 65, two separate processes will be launched, firstly</u> <u>- Creation of the new Forum: and secondly</u> <u>- Transition to this new model of international cooperation.</u></p>
<p>Iran</p>		<p><u>Follow-up Arrangements</u></p>

	<p><u>[New] 62. We agree that the continued internationalization of the Internet and the principle of universality reinforce the need for a review of existing governance mechanisms. In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance, we agree that adjustments need to be made to bring these into line with the “Geneva principles”.</u></p> <p><u>Global Public Policy and Oversight</u></p> <p><u>[New] 63. We recognize that any organizational form for the governance function/oversight function should adhere to the following principles:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o <u>Governments should have a role in relation to international Internet governance.</u>o <u>The organizational form for the governance function will be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of Governments, the private sector, and civil society and international organizations.</u>o <u>The organizational form for the governance function will involve all stakeholders and relevant intergovernmental and international organizations within their respective roles.</u> <p><u>[New] 64. We Decide to establish an intergovernmental Council for Global Public Policy and Oversight based on the principles of transparency and democracy with the involvement, in an advisory capacity, of the private sector, civil society and the relevant intergovernmental and international organizations. The Council shall be anchored in the United Nations and have, inter alia, the following functions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o <u>Setting of international Internet public policy and providing the necessary oversight relating to Internet resource management, especially the related to ICANN/IANA competence in the areas such as additions or deletions to the root zone file, management of IP addresses, introduction of Global Top level Domains (gTLDs), delegation and redelegation of Country Code To Level Domain (ccTLDs). The relationship between the Council and technical and operational Internet institutions, such as the reformed and internationalized ICANN/IANA, should be formalized. In this model, the reformed ICANN/IANA will be accountable to the Council. This internationalization should be accompanied by an adequate United Nations like host-country agreement for reformed ICANN/IANA.</u>o <u>In addition, its functions might include international public policy issues relating to Internet resource management and international public policy issues that do not fall within the scope of other existing intergovernmental organizations.</u>o <u>Facilitating negotiation of treaties, conventions and agreements on Internet-related public policies.</u>o <u>Fostering and providing guidance on certain developmental issues in the broader Internet agenda, including but not limited to capacity-building, multilingualism, equitable and cost-based international interconnection costs, and equitable access for all.</u>o <u>Approving rules and procedures for dispute resolution mechanisms and conduct arbitration, as required.</u>
<p>Russian Federation / Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova</p>	<p>62. In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance and for policy debate, we agree that some adjustments need to be made to bring these into line with the “Geneva principles”.</p> <p><u>[New] 62bis. We agree that, (see item48 WSIS-II/PC-3DOC/5) any organizational form for the governance function/oversight function should adhere to the following principles:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>No single Government should have a pre-eminent role in relation to international Internet governance.</u>• <u>The organizational form for the governance function will be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of Governments, the</u>

	<p><u>private sector, civil society and international organizations.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The organizational form for the governance function will involve all stakeholders and relevant intergovernmental and international organizations within their respective roles.</u>
<p>African Group (28.09.2005)</p>	<p>62- We recognize the efforts deployed by the initiators of the Internet, and the need to guarantee a stable and secure operation of this efficient tool for Humanity. We are also convinced that there is a need for an evolutionary process towards a new transparent, democratic and multilateral framework, with the participation of government, private sector, civil society and international organizations.</p> <p>63- While recognizing the need to create a new structure for the management of Internet, we support the establishment of a global consultation forum, to review in depth the general policies on Internet Governance. Such a framework should facilitate participation for all stakeholders.</p> <p>64- We further recommend an evolutionary approach which aims to set up an efficient, transparent and democratic mechanism and ensure equitable resources distribution leading to internationalized oversight functions of the Internet public policy in particular with the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The reinforcement of the role of Governments in ICANN decision making with regard to all Internet Public policy development issues;</u> • <u>The reinforcement of the Internet Regional Resource Management Institution, to ensure regional autonomy in Internet resources management;</u> • <u>The Internationalization of root server management;</u> • <u>The strengthening of the participation of specialized institutions from developing countries in the technical management and standardization Internet bodies.</u> <p>65- Call for the follow up of this evolutionary approach which should be in the context of relevant international institutions, and coordinated by the UN system.</p> <p>66. We call upon the UN Secretary General to organize the Forum before the end of the first term of 2006.</p>
<p>South Centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Approach: evolutionary; incremental</i> <p><u>It will be important for all stakeholders in the consideration of Internet Governance not to lose sight of the urgent need to be engaged actively in the ICANN led process, in which the benchmarking to meet the US government's stated objective of transferring its sole oversight role to other bodies is slated to be complete by September 2006.</u></p> <p><u>Governments agree to give effect to the shared principle that the key internet resources must be managed within accountable multilateral, multi-stakeholder frameworks. Accordingly Governments agree that the ICANN led process, should be improved as a high priority, through the effective participation of the stakeholders from developing countries.</u></p> <p><u>Governments agree to meet to consider their future role in the ICANN led process including the necessary reforms to the role and responsibility of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), leading to the identification of an appropriate forum, and building on the existing arrangements without prejudice to the possible creation of a special forum for Internet public policy issues. Such a public forum should be geared to providing practical policy advice which would be implemented by the appropriate bodies and institutions.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Framework for interface between existing and future arrangements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Governance/oversight function: (models)</i>

	<p><u>In strict conformity with the WSIS Principles which require shared multilateral responsibility by all governments, it is agreed that the unique oversight function provided by the US Government is a transitional stage and a multilateral oversight framework will be developed in the course of 2006 taking into account ICANN's Strategic Plan 2004- 2005 to 2006 -2007, the US ICANN Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) benchmarks, and the Decisions adopted at WSIS 2. This might entail a "creation of a forum for policy dialogue".</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Recommended mandate and structure, subject to agreement on the interface.</i> ● <i>Possible forum</i> <p><i>This information is offered for consideration</i></p> <p><i>Would a 'forum', if agreed, be selected from among the biennial ITU Telecom World Conferences, the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly (WTSa), or the ITU's Fourth World Telecommunication Development Conference (WTDC-06), the highest policy-making authority at the International Telecommunication Union for development? The latter will take place in Doha, Qatar from 7th to 15th March 2006. There is also the 6th Annual Global Symposium for Regulators (GSR), an open forum for dialogue between regulators and ICT Stakeholders dealing with several Internet public policy issues. It will meet in Tunisia on 14 -15 November 2005.</i></p>
<p>Diaspora Africaine pour la Société de l'Information (DAPSI) on behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Africa Caucus (28.09.2005)</p>	<p><u>Recognizing that the existing operational mechanisms on Internet governance have been to a large extent effective in ensuring the technical functioning of the internet. Recognizing the need for the reforms of these existing mechanisms to ensure independence, full participation and representation of all stakeholders.</u></p> <p><u>We therefore call for the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>That the role of Government Advisory Committee (GAC) within ICANN should be reinforced</u> ▪ <u>That ICANN should be transformed into an autonomous body, independent from government and/or commercial interest.</u> ▪ <u>That ICANN structures and especially the governing bodies should ensure multi-stakeholder participation comprised of Governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations.</u> ▪ <u>That developing countries should be more involved in ICANN functioning and governance.</u> ▪ <u>That ICANN must take into account cultural diversity and multilingualism in its operations, including technical constraints of online participation for developing countries.</u> ▪ <u>That an adequate mechanism for coordinating Internet governance public policy issues be established</u> <p><u>A forum should be established under the auspices of ECOSOC, to facilitate discussion on Internet-related public policy issues with the participation on equal footing by Governments, the private sector and civil society.</u></p>
<p>ISOC</p>	<p>62. — In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance and for policy debate, we agree that some adjustments need to be made to bring these into line with the "Geneva principles". Accordingly, we propose:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approach: evolutionary; incremental ● Framework for interface between existing and future arrangements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governance/oversight function: (models) ○ Recommended mandate and structure, subject to agreement on the interface. ● Possible forum

	<p><i>Delete and replace with new paragraphs 62 through 68. There is no consensus as to what the next steps should be. Many issues related to Internet usage are covered by existing treaties or national laws and international cooperation. Many of the issues related to Internet resources and administration are successfully addressed through existing mechanisms, although awareness of those mechanisms seems to be limited. The role of the WSIS should be to encourage participation in those existing mechanisms before assuming that some other over-arching mechanism is necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Issues related to capacity building are being addressed – albeit inadequately. The latter is where the WSIS should seek to effectuate change, for it is there that the most impetus and change is needed. This is addressed in paragraphs 67 and 68.</i></p> <p>62. <u>Having reviewed the issue of Internet Governance across institutions and regions, we find that the existing mechanisms work, while recognizing that some improvements related to education as to role and responsibilities on the one hand, and the means to participate on the other, could be made.</u></p> <p>63. <u>In order to increase good governance practices, we recommend that all stakeholders encourage and facilitate participation in the existing Internet governance mechanisms. Given the imperative of the stability, security and openness of the Internet, change is best brought about through these mechanisms, not from without.</u></p> <p>64. <u>We reaffirm that it is the responsibility of all stakeholders to accelerate and facilitate the availability of the Internet in developing nations, and that governments, with the help of all stakeholders, should encourage and facilitate infrastructure investments, Internet usage, multilingualisation and local language content, and participation in national, regional and international Internet governance fora.</u></p> <p>65. <u>We recommend that governments, in consultation with all stakeholders, adopt national laws and cooperate internationally to combat crime and spam.</u></p> <p>66. <u>We recognize that Internet governance is a complex matter involving many stakeholders. We encourage greater cooperation and information sharing across stakeholders so that roles and responsibilities, and mechanisms for participation, become clearer.</u></p> <p>67. <u>We urge all stakeholders to re-commit themselves to facilitating and encouraging the Internet in developing nations, recognizing that ICTs and the Internet are enablers of development, capacity building and economic change.</u></p> <p>68. <u>Should measures taken to bring about change as per paragraph 67 not be deemed adequate, we recommend stakeholders confer regarding a multi-stakeholder dialogue on specific matters related to capacity building in developing nations. This dialogue should take place among governments, the private sector, the Internet community, Civil Society and inter-governmental organizations on an issue specific basis. This dialogue should encourage and facilitate participation by stakeholders from developing nations.</u></p>
<p>GLOCOM</p>	<p>62: Follow-up and Possible Future Arrangements</p> <p>Having reviewed the issue of Internet Governance across institutions and regions, we find that the existing operational mechanisms work. However, we recognize</p>

	<p>that are issues regarding the participation and representation of all stakeholders in the policy mechanisms.</p> <p>We also recognize that while some policy issues are dealt with in the existing institutional structure there is a lack of space in particular for cross cutting issues. There is no global-multi-stakeholder forum to address Internet-related public policy issues.</p> <p>Forum Function</p> <p>62a: We recommend the UN SG to initiate a forum that incorporates the Geneva principles for significant multi-stakeholder participation. We recommend that the forum not be anchored in any existing specialized international organization, but rather be organized as a legally free-standing entity Stakeholders from all sectors must be able to participate in such a forum as peers.</p> <p>We recommend that the forum provides the following functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. inclusive dialogue, with a differentiated architecture allowing for peer-level interaction. b. comparative, cross-sectoral analysis of governance mechanisms, with an eye toward "lessons learned" and best practices that could inform individual and collective institutional improvements c. assessment and monitoring of horizontal issues applicable to all Internet governance arrangements, e.g. the promotion of transparency, accountability, inclusion, and other guidelines for "good governance," such as the WSIS principles; d. identification of weaknesses and gaps in existing governance mechanisms, especially multidimensional issues that do not fall neatly within the scope of any existing body; e. efforts to promote enhanced coordination among existing governing bodies f. provide a clearing house for coordination and resource mobilization to supporting meaningful developing country participation and capacity building; g. release recommendations, best practices, proposals and other documents on the various Internet governance issues. <p>We recommend that operations are designed in such a way that physical attendance is not strictly required and disadvantaged stakeholders (developing countries, civil society organizations, individuals) are proactively supported. We recommend the forum have clear organization and decision-making procedures. It is also important that the structure that will be given to the forum is able to produce practical results.</p> <p>The forum will not have a mandate to negotiate hard instruments like treaties or contracts. However, in very exceptional circumstances when all stakeholders agree that more formal arrangements are desirable, the forum could request an appropriate international organization to negotiate such instruments. The forum focuses on the development of soft law instruments such as recommendations, guidelines, declarations, etc.</p>
<p>Heinrich Boell Foundation</p>	<p>62 b. Political Oversight</p> <p>62b: We recognize that the time has come for a change in the political oversight of the logical Internet infrastructure. We do not recommend the creation of a new oversight organization for domain names and IP addresses. However, we do recommend the following changes with regard to ICANN:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The US Government recommits to handing over its pre-eminent role of stewardship in relation to ICANN and enters into an adequate host-country agreement for ICANN. 2. ICANN must ensure full and equal multi-stakeholder participation on its Board

	<p>and throughout its organizational structure by the community of Internet users, private sector and governments.</p> <p>3. ICANN must ensure that it establishes clear, transparent rules and procedures commensurate with international norms and principles for fair administrative decision-making to provide for predictable policy outcomes.</p> <p>4. ICANN must establish a review process for its decisions in the form of an independent multi-stakeholder review commission, established on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>5. Once all the conditions listed above are met, the US Government transfers the IANA function to ICANN.</p>
Bahá International Community / Caucus	[Add] 62. <u>An inclusive multistakeholder working group with a clear mandate and timeline should be formed, to ensure the translation of the concepts of “trusteeship” and “multistakeholder” into action.</u>

Some statements without specific wording	
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Australia wanted to respond to the question concerning ‘evolutionary or incremental’ change. And the proposition by some that there is a need for more radical change. In doing so, however, Australia’s comments are pertinent to the second dot point you have asked for input on.</i> • <i>In doing so we would indicate our support for many of the views put by ISOC, Japan, NZ, the US and Croatia.</i> • <i>Australia considers the question is itself problematic because it is essentially directed at change to the overarching framework and ignores the possibility of change within the existing framework.</i> • <i>Australia considers that the prime consideration in discussion of Internet governance arrangements is maintaining the stability, security and continuity of the Internet. That is, for example, the Internet should continue to work reliably, resolving domain name inquiries, providing end-to-end interoperability and offering a platform that can be used with trust and confidence by the person in the street and other user groups.</i> • <i>We agree with NZ’s comment last week that the question of IG arrangements should be viewed through this lens.</i> • <i>To this, we would add that the governance arrangements should continue to foster innovation and provide opportunity – opportunities of the kind just mentioned by Singapore.</i> • <i>Australia considers that the governance arrangements in place have been generally been successful in achieving these objectives.</i> • <i>These governance arrangements are based on a very broad range of institutions, many of which were helpfully listed by India in its thoughtful contribution last week.</i> • <i>There is broad acceptance that governance should be multistakeholder. This is a key feature of the current arrangements and needs to be reinforced.</i> • <i>Given the success of these governance arrangements Australia therefore finds it contradictory to suggest these arrangements should be traded for arrangements that are ill-defined at best and untried, and whose results cannot be predicted.</i> • <i>[In particular, we consider the notion inherent in many models, both in the WGIG report and elsewhere, that unitary system can oversee all aspects of Internet governance is flawed. The breadth of issues is so vast and diverse that no one body is likely to be able to confidently or competently undertake the task. As such, we would run the risk of jeopardizing the very goals we are committed to achieving.</i> • <i>Australia therefore considers we should focus on evolution and enhancement of institutions within the current broad framework.</i> • <i>In this regard, we would recommend focus be given to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the effectiveness and efficiency of existing bodies, acting within their mandates and according to their competencies;</i> - <i>improving the opportunities for and realities of multiple stakeholder participation; and</i> - <i>collaboration between existing organizations – and I emphasise - respecting each others’ mandates and competencies.</i> • <i>WSIS should be cautious of new institutions that divert valuable resources, both human and financial, from the other priority of WSIS, namely ICT4D and its contribution to achievement of the MDGs.</i> • <i>Where there are issues that need to be discussed, we should seek to use existing institutions, enhanced as necessary.</i> • <i>Australia is happy to give consideration to constructive proposals in this direction.</i>
Bangladesh	<p><i>For each country Government can play important role to implement Internet Governance along with Stakeholders. The government is the key player to implement IG.</i></p>
Canada	<p><i>Canada has been a strong supporter of the WSIS since its inception. Canada’s original vision statement for this UN initiative was that the “WSIS is about development”. Our support has been based on our belief in the importance of information and communications technologies (ICTs) as a tool for creating the information society. Central to this belief is our understanding that all the peoples of the world must truly have the opportunity to participate in the information society if we are to achieve the maximum benefits for mankind. For that reason, we continue to believe that the WSIS must strive to raise awareness of the potential of ICTs for development at the highest political levels.</i></p> <p><i>In principle, Canada supports the idea of creating a multi-stakeholder forum to discuss a broad range of public policy issues related to the Internet. We believe it is desirable to build upon the dialogue</i></p>

	<p><i>established by the WGIG and its public consultations.</i></p> <p><i>The forum should not be a permanent institution; it should be established for not more than five years and its operation should make maximum use of ICTs to operate in a cost-effective and inclusive fashion.</i></p> <p><i>The forum should focus on capacity building, particularly to develop the knowledge and experience necessary for developing countries to be able to participate effectively in the discussion of Internet issues. The forum could encourage examination of a range of public policy options which may be useful for interested countries.</i></p> <p><i>The forum should not be involved in day-to-day operations of the Internet, nor distract from discussions taking place in existing organizations.</i></p> <p><i>Adequate resources must be identified to ensure that all stakeholders (including developing countries, SMEs and civil society) are able to participate. The forum should be supported by a very light organization, with a focus on development.</i></p> <p><i>Canada does not support the creation of a new treaty organization for the purposes of Internet governance.</i></p> <p><i>Turning briefly to the contents for Part 5, Canada believes that this section should include a series of strongly and positively-worded promises by leaders to the global Internet community, including present and future users. This section should serve as a commitment to expanding the benefits of the information society, consistent with the purposes of WSIS.</i></p> <p><i>As an example, and a contribution to that section, Canada proposes the following text:</i></p> <p><u>New : "We commit to take no action that threatens the stability and security of the Internet, and call on all other stakeholders to do the same."</u></p>
<p>Ghana/African Group</p>	<p><i>Para 62:</i> <i>Interviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for internet Governance and for policy debate, we agree that some adjustments need to be made to bring these into line with the "Geneva Principles". Implementation of these adjustments must ensure continued stability, reliability and availability of the Internet.</i></p> <p><i>Accordingly , our proposal seeks to ensure that the changes of the management structure should be evolutionary and result in transparent and democratic Internet Governance. In proposing an evolutionary approach, we also calling for the establishment of benchmarks on time allotted bases to ensure assessment of progress over time.</i></p> <p><i>We note that there is a vacuum within the context of existing structures to address global multi-stakeholder Internet related public policy issues. To that end, the existing framework for Internet Governance should evolve so as to enable governments and other stakeholders to participate and ensure Internet Governance is efficient, transparent and democratic and that the Internet service and resources are distributed in an equitable manner.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst reserving the right to intervene again, the Africa Group will need to see the other proposals in writing before making its comments.</i></p>
<p>India</p>	<p><i>The Indian delegation does not favour a "root and branch" change in the existing institutional arrangements for internet governance.</i></p> <p><i>On the definitions we have the following submission:</i></p> <p><i>EVOLUTION: We agree with the Distinguished Chair that evolution is a change over time and we may add that such a change is imperceptible.</i></p> <p><i>INCREMENTAL: The word incremental has a modular connotation where each module is a defined whole. The change is modular where each module is introduced at a fixed time line ab initio. The discrete steps are as per well defined time lines. Increments are ,typically, augmentations or additions or even a percentage change.</i></p>
<p>Japan</p>	<p><i>As for the evolutionary or incremental manner we prefer to the evolutionary manner. We believe that the security and stability of the Internet is most important and also, we recognize the vital role played by many of existing organizations in the technical management of the Internet.</i></p>

	<i>Therefore, concerning the issue of the oversight or cooperative model, further discussion should be made based on a current structure in a evolutionary manner. We can be associated with EU in this point.</i>
Croatia	<i>We have listened very carefully to contributions from many countries made during the morning. We feel that there is a fair amount of consensus regarding the paramount importance of ensuring stable and secure functioning of the Internet as an enabling infrastructure for the development of global information society. Taking this into account, we believe that evolutionary model of change is more appropriate. We can associate ourselves with contributions of Singapore and New Zealand stating that the existing mechanisms are far from perfect and a profound change. However, we believe that we should not create new international organisations before we have made full use of the existing mechanisms. In respect to this, we find the EU proposal to be well balanced, adequately incorporating the Geneva principles, while ensuring secure and stable functioning of the Internet.</i>
New Zealand	<i>I would like to say a few words to your point regarding whether to take an evolutionary approach or not-- - and in doing so, I would like to bring in some comments from internet users echoed by many delegations - as follows -</i> <i>The existing mechanisms are not perfect as many have pointed out, but they have worked, they have been demonstrably resilient and adaptable and have enabled the internet to grow and adapt and is bringing ever lower cost connectivity to ever increasing parts of the globe. Many of the policy areas that we are discussing are already addressed by fora around the world at international, regional and national levels. Many issues cannot be solved by new, overarching structures at a global level but rather by building on today's open, multi-stakeholder and cooperative processes. With Spam, for example, a new mechanism would not solve the issue, as we are already working on text that says we need a multi-pronged approach at different levels to address spam.</i> <i>We therefore [support an evolution, taking measures to bring about constructive change and to address concerns that have arisen during the WSIS process [concerning some public policy aspects relating to the internet] - Issues such as spam, such as cyber security, multilingualism - but not to throw the baby out with the bathwater, as they say Support Japan, India, Africa, chair your own words about incremental, or evolutionary change Support the need to set out principles at the outset of this section, in a manner in which the EU has made some interesting proposals that will need further consideration</i>
Singapore	<i>The status quo is not acceptable any future as via the process and WSIS I & II, we have come to understand better the public policy imperatives and governments. These public policy issues are not well enough addressed and must be.</i> <i>Let's change in an evolutionary way but think now on phased change. What would phase I look like? Let's address our minds to this. The EU principle can guide us as we consider this question. India's and Africa's view on phases is supported.</i> <i>Any changes must ensure the stability , security and robustness of the Internet.</i>
Turkey	<i>· Approach: We believe that the new cooperation model to be developed within the WSIS process should not jeopardize stability, security and continuity of the Internet. Therefore, an evolutionary approach should be adopted. However, depending on the timeframe and actions to be taken, evolution to a new cooperation model would be unsatisfactory if concrete steps are not taken in a decent amount of time. Evolutionary approach with a timeframe would be more acceptable.</i> <i>· Governance/Oversight function: Without pointing out a specific model, we believe that the equal participation of all governments to the policy-making process in Internet governance is fundamental. Therefore, international Internet governance should be multilateral, legitimate, transparent, accountable and non-discriminatory, and also should be placed under the auspices of the United Nations.</i> <i>· Possible Forum: We support a forum that will facilitate the participation of all stakeholders. The mandate of this forum should be providing recommendations on the issues related to Internet public policy.</i>
CCBI	[Forum Functions] <i>We approach this issue with four thoughts in mind. First, whatever action is taken should not threaten the stability and security of the Internet. Second, whatever we do should promote development and expanded access to the Internet in order to facilitate the bridging of the digital divide. Third, any and all follow-up should ensure the full and effective multistakeholder participation. Fourth, such follow-up should be sensitive to financial and human resources.</i>

What we have seen from the debate over the past year is that there is a need to increase awareness of the work of existing organizations and to promote greater participation in them. We have also observed that there are many issues, such as cyber-security and spam, where multiple stakeholders each have a role in combating the problem. In both cases, information exchange and examination of best practices can be a valuable step in a process.

Business supports relevant organizations jointly convening events for discussion of a specific issue. Such events should be limited to a specific topic and function as information exchanges that will enhance awareness of existing activities and ways in which to participate. We are confident such events can stimulate progress on the topic within the specific expert groups for which the event is called.

These events are not substitutes for the organizations that are responsible for dealing with the issue. The events should be specific, time- and subject matter-limited events to promote cooperation and collaboration. They can serve to educate or to facilitate groups working better together, but are not to be duplicative of other efforts.

CCBI believes that this approach can benefit all stakeholders.

We do not support enabling debates nor creating institutions that will address issues and activities already addressed by existing organizations. We believe that the analysis and discussions over the course of the last year and a half demonstrate that many stakeholders and institutions are addressing the important Internet governance issues. Their work has been effective: solutions are being found and issues are being resolved. Throughout yesterday's discussion, there was a recognition that Internet institutions are meeting the challenges within their core competencies and that there is real and substantial progress.

As we said yesterday, one guiding principle for our deliberations is that we should do no harm. The duplication or displacement of existing organizations could have that negative effect. They could drain limited resources unnecessarily and cause competition and conflict where cooperation is the goal.

The focus of WSIS and this debate must be about development. Supporting issue-specific events to facilitate education or exchange best practices can move all stakeholders forward. Spending money and diverting attention on duplicative organizations will not. In fact, it may move us backward. We urge this body to keep focus on development and the things that will make development happen.