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Executive summary

Eight years after the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society was written, the concept of enhanced cooperation remains subject to differing interpretations. To assist with ongoing discussions on how to further enhanced cooperation in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, this paper presents an overview of the WSIS documents and provides a small selection of current activities in the Internet governance space where governments work with other stakeholders on issues related to international public policy.

The idea of multistakeholder participation in policy development is not a concept unique to Internet governance. Global governance and global public policy networks are terms that have been used since the 1990s to describe a new type of governance. In this new model of governance, governments work with other stakeholders to find effective policy solutions to complex, and often trans-border, problems such as environmental degradation and social inequality. Within this larger framework, the World Summit on the Information Society created four major outcome documents: Geneva Declaration of Principles (2003), Geneva Plan of Action (2003), Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (2005) and Tunis Commitment (2005). While it is possible to find a small number of references in these documents that support a "governments only" reading of enhanced cooperation in Internet governance, overall, these four documents contain a much greater number of statements that support multistakeholder participation in Internet governance and the Information Society in general.

There are a number of examples of governments working with other stakeholders in the context of Internet governance, both at the international and national levels. Four examples are included in this paper. These are not meant to document the full spectrum of possible multistakeholder interactions between governments and other stakeholders, but are four interesting examples of relevance to the current environment. The first example, the Internet Governance Forum, was an outcome of the same Tunis Agenda that also contains the text on “enhanced cooperation”. Many believe that the Internet Governance Forum fulfills the principle of “enhanced cooperation” between Internet governance stakeholders; others believe this function could be further enhanced. The second example, the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, provides information on how multiple stakeholders can participate in Internet governance at a national level. The third example looks at the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, a United Nations body with a mandate far larger than Internet governance. The fourth and final example examines how governments have participated with other stakeholders to develop a very specific international public policy issue, the Internationalized Domain Names ccTLD Fast Track, within the ICANN framework.

These four examples are only a few among the many existing processes that confirm that enhanced cooperation is already taking place and that governments have an active role in shaping and developing national and international Internet public policy on an equal footing with other stakeholders.
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1 Introduction

Eight years after the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society was written, the concept of enhanced cooperation remains subject to differing interpretations. The process towards operationalizing enhanced cooperation began in 2006, the same year another part of the Tunis Agenda resulted in the first Internet Governance Forum being held in Athens. While there continues to be discussion about which stakeholders are the appropriate participants in enhanced cooperation—governments only, or all stakeholders with the aim of assisting governments, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet—the multistakeholder framework of the Internet Governance Forum has not been questioned. This paper presents a small selection of processes and institutions in the Internet governance sphere, examining to what extent they assist governments to perform their role in international public policy making. This paper does not attempt to propose a definition of what enhanced cooperation is or should be.

2 Historical background: The relationship between enhanced cooperation and multistakeholder values

2.1 Networked governance and policy networks in a globalized world

Although participants in the Internet governance ecosystem frequently use terms like “multistakeholder”, “bottom-up policy development” and “enhanced cooperation” in ways that suggest that Internet governance is a pioneer in the field of governance systems where many stakeholders—not just governments—participate, in reality, others have been working in this space too. Therefore, before examining the specific context of enhanced cooperation in Internet governance, it is useful to very briefly mention the wider world of governance discussions. Beginning in the 1990s, it became increasingly clear that in a world that was continuing to become more global, that the growing number of world problems—such as environmental degradation, climate change, social inequality—needed alternative governance strategies. A number of terms have been used to describe such alternative governance strategies: global public policy networks, global governance, networked governance. The common feature to many of these is the belief that governments and other stakeholders need to work together to develop effective policy solutions. It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide more detail on discussions and experience of networked governance in other fields. However, those wishing to do some reading on multistakeholder governance outside the sphere of Internet governance may wish to begin with the following:

- D Stone, 2008, Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks, [http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/1800/](http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/1800/)
2.2 The emergence of enhanced cooperation from the WSIS process

2.2.1 Main outcome documents from WSIS Phases I and II

WSIS Phases I and II produced four key documents:

3. Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (2005)⁴
4. Tunis Commitment (2005)⁵

These documents were developed by and agreed to by nation state representatives. Other sectors—the private sector, civil society, academic and the technical Internet community—were not officially involved in the drafting of the documents. A few governments, however, did include non-government representatives on their delegations. For example, Raul Echeberria, from LACNIC, was included on the delegation from Uruguay, Peter Hellmonds, from Siemens, was included on the German delegation.

The text on “enhanced cooperation” in international public policy issues related to the Internet appeared in the third of these documents, the Tunis Agenda. However, to better understand the “enhanced cooperation” text from the Tunis Agenda, it is necessary to provide an overview of all four WSIS outcome documents. In this way, the particular “enhanced cooperation” paragraphs can be understood within the larger framework of WSIS-endorsed views on the participation of stakeholders in both Internet governance and the larger Information Society.

2.2.2 The “governments only” reading of enhanced cooperation

Before examining the significant number of references that support a multistakeholder reading of “enhanced cooperation” processes in Internet governance, it is important to understand where the “governments only” interpretation of the enhanced cooperation text may come from. If a reader creates a definition of enhanced cooperation by only looking at the words contained in paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda, then, indeed, it appears to refer to a process limited to governments: “the need for enhanced cooperation in the future, to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities…”

The following paragraph, however, contradicts this government-only reading, as it refers to “the organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles”. In 2005, as now, the essential tasks of the Internet are performed by a wide variety of organizations—most of them not governmental in nature.

The third paragraph, paragraph 71, also strongly indicates a multistakeholder understanding of what an “enhanced cooperation” process should be when it states that “[t]he process towards enhanced cooperation, to be started by the UN Secretary-General, involving all relevant organizations by the end of the first quarter of 2006, will involve all stakeholders in their respective roles…” There has been debate since WSIS over the exactly what “respective roles” are. However, given paragraph 71, it is hard to imagine what type of role non-

² http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs/geneva/official/dop.html
³ http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs/geneva/official/poa.html
⁴ http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html
⁵ http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/7.html
government stakeholders could perform in enhanced cooperation if not as active members of
the process.

The second WSIS text that can work in favour of a governments-only reading of enhanced
cooperation comes, not from the Tunis Agenda, but from the Tunis Commitment:

8. While reaffirming the important roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders as
outlined in paragraph 3 of the Geneva Plan of Action, we acknowledge the key role
and responsibilities of governments in the WSIS process.

When the above paragraph is read in conjunction with paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda, it
can be read as suggesting a special role for governments in the Internet governance process:
one that can be turned into action through an intergovernmental enhanced cooperation
process. Given that much of the Internet governance discussions at WSIS were conducted with
a strong undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the United States government’s relationship
with ICANN, it is understandable that many governments focused on paragraph 69 of the
Tunis Agenda as a way to enable all governments to have equal input into the management of
the Internet’s names and numbers. However, a more comprehensive reading of the four main
WSIS documents shows a strong commitment to multistakeholder participation as essential
to achieving a global Information Society, including in matters of Internet governance. An
analysis of the four main documents is included below.

2.2.3 The “multistakeholder” reading of enhanced cooperation

2.2.3.1 Geneva Declaration of Principles and Plan of Action

Although the Geneva Declaration never uses the term “multistakeholder”, the text contains a
multiple references to the need to utilize partnerships between governments and other
stakeholders to achieve the goals of an Information Society. Given Internet governance is one
of many issues within the wider Information Society agenda, it seems reasonable to interpret
the Declaration’s recognition of the role of multiple stakeholders as an essential component in
achieving the goals of an Information Society as similar recognition of the need for multiple
stakeholders in Internet governance, too. Further, the text of the Geneva Plan of Action, which
includes a request for the United Nations Secretary-General to create a multistakeholder
Working Group on Internet Governance, strongly indicates that, in 2003, the governments
were closely associating Internet governance with a model of full multistakeholder
participation.

For more detail on the text from these two documents that supports a multistakeholder
reading of participation in the Information Society, see sections A.1 and A.2 of Annex A at the
end of this paper.

2.2.3.2 Tunis Agenda for the Information Society and the Tunis Commitment

The Tunis Agenda contains three paragraphs that specifically address the concept of
“enhanced cooperation” in Internet governance. These are listed below (bold text added):

69. We further recognize the need for enhanced cooperation in the future, to enable
governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in
international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, but not in the day-to-day
technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy
issues.

70. Using relevant international organizations, such cooperation should include the
development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues associated with
the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. In this regard, we call upon the organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles.

71. The process towards enhanced cooperation, to be started by the UN Secretary-General, involving all relevant organizations by the end of the first quarter of 2006, will involve all stakeholders in their respective roles, will proceed as quickly as possible consistent with legal process, and will be responsive to innovation. Relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders, proceeding as quickly as possible and responsive to innovation. The same relevant organizations shall be requested to provide annual performance reports.

There are, however, another two references to enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda. The first is in relation to e-business:

47. We recognize the increasing volume and value of all e-business, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of national consumer-protection laws and practices, and enforcement mechanisms where necessary, to protect the right of consumers who purchase goods and services online, and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion, in a non-discriminatory way, under applicable national laws, of e-business as well as consumer confidence in it.

Although this first reference is clearly referring to e-business, it is included within the Internet governance section of the Tunis Agenda. It is interesting to note that there are multiple stakeholders implicated in the expanding e-business opportunities: governments (through laws and enforcement mechanisms), consumers (a component of civil society), and the private sector itself (those who perform e-business).

The second additional reference to enhanced cooperation in the Tunis Agenda refers to the overall implementation and follow-up of the WSIS agenda:

89. We are determined to improve international, regional and national connectivity and affordable access to ICTs and information through an enhanced international cooperation of all stakeholders that promotes technology exchange and technology transfer, human resource development and training, thus increasing the capacity of developing countries to innovate and to participate fully in, and contribute to, the Information Society.

Notably, the a few paragraphs earlier, paragraph 83 begins, “Building an inclusive development-oriented Information Society will require unremitting multi-stakeholder effort” (emphasis added). It further notes that “effective cooperation among governments, private sector, civil society and the United Nations and other international organizations, according to their different roles and responsibilities and leveraging on their expertise, is essential”. When read as a whole, there appears to be a clear link in the Tunis Agenda between the notion of enhanced—or “effective”—cooperation and multistakeholder mechanisms.

In addition, the second major document of the second phase of WSIS, the Tunis Commitment, also refers to the indispensable role of all stakeholders in achieving the goals of an Information Society:
37. We are convinced that our goals can be accomplished through the involvement, cooperation and partnership of governments and other stakeholders, i.e. the private sector, civil society and international organizations, and that international cooperation and solidarity at all levels are indispensable if the fruits of the Information Society are to benefit all.

For more detail on the text from these two documents that supports a multistakeholder reading of participation in the Information Society, see sections A.3 and A.4 of Annex A at the end of this paper.

3 Four examples of how governments work with other stakeholders

Below are four examples of how governments work with other stakeholders in the context of Internet governance. The first example, the Internet Governance Forum, was an outcome of the same Tunis Agenda that also contains the text on “enhanced cooperation”. Many believe that the Internet Governance Forum fulfills the principle of “enhanced cooperation” between Internet governance stakeholders; others believe this function could be further enhanced. The second example, the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, provides information on how multiple stakeholders can participate in Internet governance at a national level. The third example looks at the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, a United Nations body with a mandate far larger than Internet governance. The fourth and final example examines how governments have participated with other stakeholders to develop a very specific international public policy issue, the Internationalized Domain Names ccTLD Fast Track, within the ICANN framework.

3.1 The Internet Governance Forum

3.1.1 The Internet governance as a mechanism for enhanced cooperation

The Tunis Agenda, after inviting “the UN Secretary-General to convene a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue”,\(^6\) recognizes the “need for enhanced cooperation” which should “enable governments [...] to carry out their roles and responsibilities”\(^7\) – such as “development of public policy [...] in consultation with all stakeholders”.\(^8\)

With regards to “coordination and management of critical Internet resources” (CIR), the role of international organizations is emphasized for “development of globally-applicable principles on public policy”, while “organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet” are called upon to help creating an environment that facilitates “this development of public policy principles”.\(^9\)

While the UN Secretary-General is then mandated to start the “process towards enhanced cooperation”\(^10\) with involvement of all stakeholders, “relevant organizations”—including those previously mentioned with regards to CIR—are specifically requested to also commence such a process (internally and/or externally) with involvement of all stakeholders, and report annually (on these efforts, presumably).

---

\(^6\) Tunis Agenda, paragraph 67
\(^7\) ibid, paragraph 69
\(^8\) ibid, paragraph 68
\(^9\) ibid, paragraph 70
\(^10\) ibid, paragraph 71
In defining, immediately after this, the new Internet Governance Forum, the Tunis Agenda mandates it with number of tasks\textsuperscript{11} directly contributing to the enhanced cooperation (i.e. to enabling governments to perform their roles with regards to development of public policy in consultation with all stakeholders), including:

- “Discuss” those public policy issues that need to be developed by governments in consultation with all stakeholders
- Develop a connection or interaction with various “intergovernmental organizations and other institutions” which would in turn facilitate “a process towards enhanced cooperation” (within these institutions and externally)
- “Advise all stakeholders”—thus also governments, international and intergovernmental organizations and other “relevant organizations”—with regards to “availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world”, which enables development of public policy
- “Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance” i.e. facilitate the enhanced cooperation with greater engagement of all stakeholders, including governments, in all fora – within institutions and externally
- “Contribute to capacity building” thus enabling governments of developing countries to carry out their roles and responsibilities
- Involve “existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations” thus creating an enabling space for “development of public policy [...] in consultation with all stakeholders”

### 3.1.2 IGF impact on development of public policies by governments

Due to the fact that the IGF was not mandated to produce tangible outcomes (formal reports or even “policy messages”) that could be fed to and referred within global or national public policies, it is hard to estimate its practical impact on development of public policy by governments. The study, Identifying the IGF Impact,\textsuperscript{12} conducted in 2009 by DiploFoundation with support of AT&T, Egyptian MCIT and the Commonwealth IGF provides some light indications, as described below.

The interviewees—the active participants of the IGF representing variety of stakeholders—viewed the impact of the IGF as mostly an indirect one: transferring knowledge among different stakeholders, professional cultures and geographic strata (from global to local and backwards), developing a holistic understanding of the IG challenges by all stakeholders, opening policy discussions about the emerging issues, and transcending the professional “silos”. Many respondents mentioned that the IGF itself is a capacity building exercise: “people come in and learn and share about the IG issues and cannot help but come away with greater understanding”, which overlaps with the defined mandate of the IGF in the Tunis Agenda.

Transfer of knowledge seems to have reached out beyond the IGF. The results of this study showed that 34.31% of respondents communicated IGF relevant knowledge and information with the representatives of their national administrations, while another 22.59% did so with the people from their local administrations (Figure 1). This illustrates the inputs by IGF stakeholders to development of public policy and decision-making process on local and national level.

\textsuperscript{11} ibid, paragraphs 72 & 77

\textsuperscript{12} \url{http://igf09.eg/IGF-Identifying-The-Impact2009111710027.pdf}
3.1.3 Governmental involvement with the IGF

One way of evaluating the success of the IGF towards enhanced cooperation is the analysis of the involvement of governments in public policy discussions and level of interaction with other stakeholders. While their mere presence at the IGF doesn’t necessarily reflect the true involvement (even though listening could also contribute to the development of public policies), the careful analysis of their verbal inputs during the IGF events and meetings does signify the level of their proactive participation and thus the IGF contribution to the enhanced cooperation - as well as some of its current shortcomings.

To support the evidence-based reporting, some of the findings of *The Emerging Language of Internet Diplomacy* research project of DiploFoundation are used. This research project was based on verbatim reporting i.e. transcripts of the speeches and debates form the IGF meetings 2006-2012 which are also publicly available at the IGF website; the transcripts were collated into a single text corpus indexed by speaker, country, stakeholder, gender, session, topic, etc. and analyzed using a set of standard quantitative language analyses.

The report shows that the number of government representatives that took the floor was higher than of any other stakeholder group: 34% of all the speakers were from governments (Figure 2). While it could be a meter of diplomatic practice to come up with the official statement, it also shows the general interest of the governments in the IGF as a platform and their willingness (and courage) to address other stakeholders.

---

13 Source: DiploFoundation
14 [http://www.diplomacy.edu/IGFLanguage](http://www.diplomacy.edu/IGFLanguage)
Figure 2. Number of participants who spoke at the IGF sessions between 2006 and 2012 (stakeholder representation).\textsuperscript{15}

Overall at the IGF meetings 2006-2012, governments were also among the most “talkative” stakeholder groups in terms of the volume of contributions i.e. number of words (Figure 3). Observing year-by-year, however, most of the other stakeholders—except international organizations—have also caught-up with the governments since 2010 (Figure 4).

Figure 3. Total absolute verbal contribution, IGF 2006–2012.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} Source: DiploFoundation
\textsuperscript{16} Source: DiploFoundation
Since the government representatives taking the floor were the most numerous ones comparing to other stakeholders, the relative volume of contributions by each government representative was in fact less than those of other stakeholders, making the government representatives the least talkative of all. According to Diplo, a possible explanation may be that government representatives made official statements, unlike the ad-lib interventions by some other stakeholders that tend to be longer. Moreover, they didn’t change their relative volume of contributions much as the IGF meetings progressed year-by-year. This may signal that the governments are prone to express their formal positions and then listen to the lively discussions and interactions of other stakeholders, while the other stakeholders are the ones reacting on emerging issues and debates and discussing different perspectives.

Not all the governments were equally active, however. In fact, the research shows that only 28% of countries spoke at the IGF (54 out of 193 UN member states). This comes as result of inability of some developing countries (especially the SIDS and LDC) to participate at the IGF, as well as lack of institutional capacities of many countries (and thus also their representatives) to get involved with the IGF discussions beyond listening. Observing per UN regions, Western Europe and Others (which includes the United States and Australia) takes over 40% of all the volume of contributions, Africa follows with as much as 25% (out of which a half was a contribution by Egypt), and about 10% to Eastern Europe, Asia-Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean each (Figure 5).

---

17 Source: DiploFoundation
If we go into details, the most “talkative” governments were the host countries (Greece, Brazil, India, Egypt, Lithuania, and Kenya) - which can also be attributed to their intensive contributions in preparatory meetings and official parts of each IGF like welcome addresses and opening speeches - as well as several other that are standing out: the United Kingdom, Switzerland, France, the USA, and Sweden, followed by China, Canada, Portugal, Spain, Australia, Japan, Finland, Russia and Germany (Figure 6). This signals that the IGF succeeds to involve lead global economies in public policy discussions with other governments and stakeholders, which may well contribute to the enhanced cooperation on a global level. It however also indicates that many developing countries are still lagging behind and that serious attempts should be made to enable their meaningful participation in order for the IGF to contribute more significantly to the enhanced cooperation on regional and national levels.

---

18 Source: DiploFoundation
Lastly, the “quality” of contributions by government representatives may signal their level of readiness for the meaningful participation. While quality in this context is certainly hard to define, one pointer to it is how distinguished the contributions of a particular country are from the contribution of other countries - i.e. how detailed, developed and unique their position regarding various public policy issues is. Analyzing the similarity among the patterns of word usage by government representatives, the report shows that only the most talkative governments listed above were able to distinguish themselves from the overall highly similar group of word patterns of other governments. The report concludes, “[t]he volume of verbal contribution triggered linguistic diversity”; this re-confirms that the most talkative countries were the ones with the most developed national positions (not necessarily policies, though). On one hand this means that the IGF enables the knowledge transfer among countries as well—not only among stakeholders—which is highly important for the capacity of lagging

---

19 Source: DiploFoundation
countries to perform their roles in developing policies on local and global level. On the other hand this signals the still wide gap between few leaders in digital policy and the other countries in the readiness to contribute to enhanced cooperation, and the need for further improvements.

3.2 The Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br)

3.2.1 Historical background

Brazil has a remarkable experience of multistakeholder cooperation for the discussion of Internet related issues, embodied in the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br). The initial inspiration for this model dates back to 1992, during the preparatory process of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). On that occasion, only a few academic institutions were connected to the global network.

The United Nations requested the deployment of an infrastructure that would allow the conference participants to be connected as well. To fulfill this task, a joint effort was carried out by The National Network of Research (RNP) and the Brazilian Institute for Economic and Social Analysis (IBASE). The former was responsible for the infrastructure that would connect Universities in Brazil, while the later was a non-governmental organization linked to the Association for Progressive Communications (APC). This successful partnership showed the potential of creating synergies among different sectors. This would influence the decisions concerning the composition of CGI.br in the future.

The development of the Internet in Brazil gained momentum in 1995, after a constitutional amendment introduced flexibilities that would put an end to state monopoly in the telecommunications sector. The still incipient but promising scenario fostered the creation of a Steering Committee—the embryo of CGI.br—by means of a joint decree of the Ministry of Communications and the Ministry of Science and Technology with the goal to follow-up the implementation of the Internet in Brazil. Among the roles of the Committee were: the distribution of IP numbers, the registration of domains under .br, making recommendations on technical procedures, standards of network management, strategies for network deployment and interconnection and proposing a code of use for Internet services in Brazil.

The Committee was initially composed of nine representatives chosen by the Ministry of Communications and the Ministry of Science and Technology. Five members were governmental representatives and four represented the non-governmental sector, namely: the academic community, the service providers, the business community and the Internet users. The presence of non-governmental representatives on the Committee, even though they were minority, was recognition of the important role of these sectors in the implementation of the Internet in Brazil.

---

20 CGI.br, 31 May 1995, Inter-ministerial decree n. 147, [http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/port147.htm](http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/port147.htm)
21 The five governmental representatives were: the Ministry of Science and Technology, which chaired the council, the Ministry of Communications, a representative of the state-owned Telebras system, a representative of the National Council of Scientific and technological Development (CNPq) and a representative of the National Network of Research (RNP).
3.2.2 The creation of CGI.br and its composition

In 2003, former president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva issued a presidential decree creating CGI.br in its present format. The competences of CGI.br were wider and more well-defined, particularly with regards to its role on policy and regulatory discussions. For instance, CGI.br could:

- Coordinate joint actions relating to the proposal of policies and procedures related to the regulation of Internet activities
- Deliberate on any matters referred to it that relate to Internet services in Brazil
- Adopt the necessary administrative and operational procedures for the management of the Internet in Brazil to be in accordance with accepted international standards

The council of CGI.br currently encompasses twenty-one members. Ten are governmental and eleven are non-governmental actors:

1. One representative from each agency and entity as follows:
   a. Ministry of Science and Technology (coordinator)
   b. Civil House of the Presidency
   c. Ministry of Communications
   d. Ministry of Defense
   e. Ministry of Development, Industry and Foreign Trade
   f. Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management
   g. National Telecommunications Agency (ANATEL)
   h. National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq)

2. One representative of the National Forum of State Secretaries for Science and Technology

3. One representative of reputed knowledge on issues related to Internet

4. Four representatives of the business sector, comprising:
   a. One from access and Internet content providers
   b. One from providers of telecommunications infrastructure
   c. One from the industries of informatics, telecommunications or software
   d. One from the corporate users

5. Four representatives of the third sector (civil society)

6. Three representatives of the scientific and technological community

In 2011, CGI.br decided to create four consultative chambers of multistakeholder composition on:

- Security and rights
- Content and cultural goods
- Universalization and digital inclusion
- Innovation and capacity building

---

24 For each segment, an electoral college makes the appointment of the representative of each of the four business segments.
25 An electoral college makes the appointment of representatives of the third sector.
26 An electoral college makes the appointment of representatives of the scientific and technological community sector. It is worth mentioning that only representatives of organizations, such associations of scientific or technological nature, are eligible. Individual research centres and institutions are not eligible.
Their role is, among others, to identify knowledge gaps and propose studies, to do outreach and dissemination, to propose activities and to bring issues to CGI.br’s attention. The creation of the chambers was a step towards opening CGI’s processes, increasing representativeness and transparency. The implementation of decisions and projects of CGI.br is made by NIC.br, a non-profit private organization, which also legally represents the Steering Committee.

3.2.3 CGI.br Internet governance principles as a baseline for national discussions

The guiding lines to the work carried out by the CGI.br are the “Principles for the governance and use of the Internet”.27 This Decalogue, approved in 2009, has served as baseline for policy and regulatory discussions in Brazil. It served as inspiration for the development of the Civil Rights Framework for the Internet (Marco Civil), a bill that aims to define the rights and responsibility of Internet users. The Decalogue has also been fed into the global debate, particularly in IGF meetings, as one of the subsidies for the discussion of Internet Governance Principles.

CGI.br is also part of the IGF process as the main organizer of the Brazilian Internet Forum, which is also considered a preparatory event to the global IGF. The national Forum brings together actors from all stakeholder groups to discuss themes such as accessibility, diversity, innovation and privacy, and important issues on the national agenda, such as network neutrality. The ten principles for Internet governance serve as a compass for discussion. Plenary sessions are followed by brake-out groups, in which participants need to identify: main issues, what are the areas of consensus and what are the areas of disagreement between them, what are the related regulatory issues, make proposals for action and identify issues that need to be further explored. The outcome of this exercise is presented in the final plenary session and becomes available online. 28

3.2.4 Outcomes of the multistakeholder dialogue: some initiatives carried out by CGI.br

CGI.br has managed to produce resolutions on some of the most important political debates related to the Internet. In spite of the diversity of interests that naturally characterizes a multistakeholder body, there has been room for finding convergent points of agreement. As an example, CGI.br adopted a resolution in support of the Civil Rights Framework for the Internet29 and produced a brochure to raise awareness about its relevance for society.30 It also approved a resolution on .amazon, contesting its assignment to a private company, a resolution against the Stop Online Piracy Act (SOPA) and a resolution against the indiscriminate collection of data and monitoring by the National Security Agency of the United States (NSA).31

Since its creation, CGI.br has launched initiatives and policies that support the development of the Internet in Brazil. The main indicators and statistics on the use of information and communication technologies in Brazil are produced by the Center of Studies on Information and Communication Technologies (CETIC.br), a department of NIC.br. The results of these

---

28 For example, see the report of the II Brazilian Internet Forum, 2012, [http://www.forumdainternet.cgi.br/biblioteca.html](http://www.forumdainternet.cgi.br/biblioteca.html)
29 CGI.br/RES/2012/005/P and CGI.br/RES/2012/010/P, [http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/resolucoes.htm](http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/resolucoes.htm)
30 O CGI e o Marco Civil da Internet, [http://www.cgi.br/publicacoes/documentacao/CGI-e-o-Marco-Civil.pdf](http://www.cgi.br/publicacoes/documentacao/CGI-e-o-Marco-Civil.pdf)
31 The three resolutions, CGI.br/RES/2013/011, CGI.br/RES/2012/003/P and CGI.br/RES/2013/020, are available from [http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/resolucoes.htm](http://www.cgi.br/regulamentacao/resolucoes.htm)
surveys are critical to monitor and assess the social and economical impact of ICTs and also to allow the comparison between the realities in Brazil and other countries. NIC.br also maintains the Brazilian National Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT.br), responsible for handling computer security incident reports and activity related to networks connected to the Brazilian Internet.

On issues related to infrastructure and critical Internet resources, some examples of initiatives carried out by CGL.br are PTT-Metro, a project to improve traffic exchange in metropolitan areas, the initiatives to support the deployment of IPv6, and the management of Port 25 for the Anti-spam initiative.

**3.3 Commission on Science and Technology for Development**

The Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) is one of the newer United Nations bodies—it was created in 1992—and sits under the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The CSTD’s secretariat function is performed by UNCTAD. Following WSIS Phase II, ECOSOC mandated CSTD as the focal point for the follow-up to WSIS outcomes. As part of its work to achieve that mandate, CSTD:

Promotes dialogue and foster partnerships, in coordination with other appropriate United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, to contribute to the attainment of the Summit objectives and the implementation of its outcomes and to use information and communication technologies for development and the achievement of internationally agreed development goals, with the participation of Governments, the private sector, civil society, the United Nations and other international organizations in accordance with their different roles and responsibilities.

**3.3.1 Participation in the CSTD**

Although the CSTD is a UN body, not all Member States are represented in the CSTD. Instead, ECOSOC’s 54 Member States elect which Member States serve on the CSTD for four-year terms. There are 43 CSTD Member States in total, with each of the UN’s five geographic regions represented by differing numbers of States.

CSTD holds two meetings per year: a main plenary Session in the middle of the year and an Inter-sessional meeting at the end or very beginning of the year. All of CSTD’s meetings are open to United Nations Member States as well as:

- Intergovernmental organizations
- NGOs in consultative status with ECOSOC

Since 2006, the CSTD has also invited the participation of the private sector, civil society and international organizations as part of its work on following-up WSIS outcomes.

---

32 The reports are available at [http://www.cetic.br/english/](http://www.cetic.br/english/)
ECOSOC resolution added academic entities\textsuperscript{36} and in 2011, an ECOSOC resolution added technical entities to the list of stakeholders welcome to participate in the CSTD’s work\textsuperscript{37}. Participation of all non-Member State entities interested in CSTD’s work has been assured on an exceptional basis by ECOSOC resolutions until the year 2015. It is important to note, however, that while any civil society entity or non-government organization can participate in CSTD’s WSIS-related work,\textsuperscript{38} civil society entity or non-government organizations that wish to participate in non-WSIS-related CSTD work must have WSIS-accreditation.\textsuperscript{39} The WSIS accreditation process ended with close of WSIS Phase II in 2005. No doubt, the outcomes of the WSIS+10 process will influence how non-Member State participation in the CSTD will take place after 2015.

Members of civil society, the private sector, and the academic and technical communities have been invited to speak at CSTD meetings and to contribute to the CSTD’s annual report. Progress made in the implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society at the regional and international levels.

Although there are strict formal procedures for the way non-Member State organizations can participate in the CSTD, in practice, the Chairs of CSTD, and Chairs of individual CSTD panels, have been overwhelmingly open to input from non-government participants. In particular, it is now accepted practice for non-government stakeholders to be able to sit in the sessions where draft ECOSOC resolutions are developed and, in response to invitations by the Chairs of the drafting sessions, to offer feedback on the text under discussion.

3.3.2 Working Group on improvements to the IGF (WG on IGF)

In 2011, the Member States of the CSTD agreed to a fully multistakeholder working group to develop ways to improve the IGF. The multistakeholder composition of the working group was assisted by the working group’s subject matter: the IGF. As the IGF itself is multistakeholder, it was easier for supporters of the multistakeholder model to argue that the working group could only be effective in its work if it, too, was multistakeholder in composition.

WG on IGF participants who were not able to attend in person were able to contribute via remote participation. A number of the working group members tweeted live during the WG on IGF meetings to keep the wider Internet governance community informed of the discussions. External observers were not permitted into the working group meetings.

The working group concluded its activities in 2012. Although Member States had greater proportional representation on the working group than the civil society, business or technical and academic community representatives, the fact that all stakeholders had equal status during deliberations and drafting was a significant achievement.\textsuperscript{40} The successful working

\textsuperscript{36} ECOSOC Decision 2008/218, Participation of academic entities in the work of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, \url{http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/docs/2008/decision%202008-218.pdf}
\textsuperscript{38} ECOSOC Decision 2011/239, Participation of non-governmental organizations and civil society entities not accredited to the World Summit on the Information Society in the work of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development regarding the discussion about the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit, \url{http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/docs/2011/dec%202011.239.pdf}
\textsuperscript{39} ECOSOC Decision 2011/236, Participation of non-governmental organizations and civil society entities in the work of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, \url{http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/docs/2011/dec%202011.236.pdf}
\textsuperscript{40} There were 22 Member States, and five representatives each from civil society, business, technical and academic communities, and intergovernmental organizations.
relationship between different stakeholder groups was used to encourage the CSTD to replicate the multistakeholder model when creating the latest working group, the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

3.3.3 Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC)

Given the sensitivities surrounding divergent views of what “enhanced cooperation” is—enhanced cooperation between all stakeholders, enhanced cooperation between governments and other stakeholders, or enhanced cooperation between governments alone—the working group established to make recommendations on how to fully implement enhanced cooperation was not necessarily going to be multistakeholder in composition. However, given the success of the multistakeholder interaction in the WG on IGF, even governments who had initially opposed replicating the multistakeholder model of IGF for the WG on IGF were willing to accept a multistakeholder WGEC. This is further evidenced by the many States from WG on IGF who chose to nominate themselves again to participate in WGEC: Brazil, Finland, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Tunisia and the United States of America. In total, 10 of the 22 States who participated in WG on IGF chose to participate in WGEC, which is a significant achievement for the multistakeholder model.

After the first day of the first WGEC meeting in May 2013, the members decided to allow ECOSOC or WSIS accredited observers to attend the remaining days of the meeting. Future meetings are also going to be open to onsite observers. It is unclear if observers will be permitted to speak during future meetings. It is also unclear if webcasts or audiocasts of the meeting will be available to offsite. Online participation tools will depend on the capabilities of the CSTD Secretariat.\(^41\)

WGEC has introduced another new dimension to multistakeholder participation in CSTD activities: at the first WGEC meeting in May, the working group members agreed to hold public consultations, via a questionnaire,\(^42\) on the community’s views about enhanced cooperation. The WGEC members were keen to get wide community input on the extent to which enhanced cooperation is considered to have been implemented to date, as well as ideas for how enhanced cooperation could be fully operationalized in future. While the first published version of questionnaire limited participation to WSIS or ECOSOC accredited entities, this was quickly updated to allow anyone to complete the questionnaire.

The public consultation closed on 17 September 2013. WGEC members will discuss the contributions received—over 70 in total—at their second meeting in November 2013.\(^43\)

3.4 Internationalized Domain Names ccTLD Fast Track

The IDN (Country Code Top-Level Domain) ccTLD Fast Track\(^44\) is an example of an enhanced cooperation process within the set of organizations that manage the technical functions of the Internet. The policy and implementation process was lead by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Country Code Name Supporting Organization (ccNSO) and it consisted of a full consultation with all stakeholders within ICANN community,

---

41 The UNCTAD staff who provide day-to-day support for the CSTD have changed since the time of the WG on IGF, resulting in a loss of some of the technical capabilities that enabled remote participation during the WG on IGF. In addition, CSTD has a limited budget from which to perform non-core functions such as the WG on IGF and WGEC.
44 http://www.icann.org/en/resources/idn/fast-track
including governments, private sector and civil society, and users at-large and the ICANN Board itself.

3.4.1 About the ccNSO
The registries operating ccTLDs, such as CNNIC (.cn) and Registro.br (.br), created their own supporting organization, ccNSO within ICANN in 2003. The ccTLD representatives within the ccNSO work with other stakeholders within ICANN. This includes governments within the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), individual Internet users via the At-large Advisory Committee (ALAC), as well as a range of commercial and non-commercial stakeholder groups via the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO). The members of the ccNSO elect one board member of ICANN, meet at least three times a year during ICANN meetings to discuss any issues of importance with regards to the Domain Name System (DNS) and its technical coordination. ccNSO members exchange best practice documents and guidelines, operational information and expertise about how they go about serving their TLD communities on a daily basis and any issues with regards to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function.

3.4.2 The development of internationalized domain names
The Internet serves a global community with many scripts and languages. To enable non-Latin script users to enter domain names in their own languages, the Internet standards body, Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) developed the IDNA protocol and IDNAbis protocols.45 Realizing the need to provide users with non-Latin scripts as early as possible, some generic TLD (gTLD) registries, then ccTLD registries, started introducing IDN or non-ASCII scripts on the second level of a domain name as far back as in 2003. For example, Afilias, a gTLD registry, offered second level domain registrations in German script, such as www.müller.info. This was shortly followed by DENIC, the German ccTLD registry, providing German umlauts under .de (for example, müller.de).

Although in the introduction of non-Latin scripts at the second level was a significant step, it was clear that with more non-Latin using the Internet, the real solution was to enable top level domain names to use non-Latin scripts as well.46

3.4.3 The development of the IDN ccTLD fast track process
It was clear to the ICANN community that the technical and policy complexities of introducing top level IDNs for all types of domain names would need a multi-year policy development process. Given a number of countries wished to have TLDs available in their scripts sooner than a traditional ICANN policy process would permit, there was a decision to develop a “fast track” process that would introduce IDN ccTLDs in a shorter timeframe. The development of the fast track was based on recommendations from the IDNC Working Group, which included members from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO observers, SSAC, the technical community and ICANN staff support. The GAC was a significant contributor to the fast track development process and supported its multistakeholder approach:

The GAC welcomes the results of the IDNC Working Group towards the development of the “fast track” methodology to allow on an exceptional basis the introduction of a limited number of country code IDN top level domains. The GAC believes the IDNC WG

46 For a number of non-Latin scripts, it is awkward for an end user to enter a second level domain name in their original or non-Latin script, then change scripts, and possibly direction of typing if a language like Arabic is being used, to add a top level domain name in a Latin script.
report and the recommendations contained therein provide the basis for the development of an implementation plan, and encourages the Board to initiate that process. The GAC looks forward to contributing to these implementation proposals.

The GAC would like to stress its support for a continuation of the multi-stakeholder approach for the consideration of these matters to date, which has been useful in identifying many of the key issues in the IDNC Working Group report, issues which now need to be addressed in order to achieve the early implementation of IDN ccTLDs. 47

The fast track process was a process that involved close cooperation between governments, represented in the GAC, the ccTLD managers, the ccNSO, ICANN staff and other stakeholders such as the Internet technical community and Internet users at large. GAC members were supportive, or at least sympathetic, of a desired technical path that they knew would be a disruptive change, but a change for the greatest good of the greatest number.

3.4.4 The IDN ccTLD fast track process in action today

Launched on 16 November 2009, eligible countries and territories can now request their respective IDN ccTLD(s) through the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. As of 14 October 2013, there are 31 countries that have successfully passed the second stage of the fast track process, including Iran, Bangladesh and Serbia. Of these, a number of the countries have IDN ccTLDs in more than one non-Latin script. 48 More IDN ccTLDs will continue to be added over time.

4 Conclusion

Internet governance, is a networked system of governance that draws on the capabilities of many stakeholder groups to achieve benefits for all. The value of networked governance is also a reflection of the value of the Internet network itself.

Metcalfe's Law suggests that as more people join a network, the value of the network increases. This has been especially true for the global Internet where participants are rewarded with benefits from those interconnected networks. The benefits multiply as the network attracts even more connections. Participants of the lesser-interconnected networks lose out.

In the context of the Internet, if particular nodes of the Internet were to choose to disconnect from the global Internet, and operate as a separate network, they will provide significantly less value to its participants as well as missing out on enhancing everyone else’s experience on networks on the other side of bifurcation.

This law can also be seen, to a lesser extent, when you look at Internet governance. Today's networked system of governance, which draws on the capabilities of many stakeholder groups to achieve benefits for all, is an active part of how the global Internet functions. In the governance sphere, a decision to limit participation to a limited sector of a much larger range of contributors may result in less robust policy. Providing an equal voice to everyone within the governance process is vital, including governments, however not at levels any different than other stakeholders.

erationDate=1312542509000&api=v2
48 http://www.icann.org/en/resources/idn/fast-track/string-evaluation-completion
Annex A

Below are the relevant paragraphs from the four main documents produced during the two phases of WSIS. References to multiple stakeholder coordination to achieve WSIS goals have been marked in bold text.

A.1 Geneva Declaration of Principles

17. We recognize that building an inclusive Information Society requires new forms of solidarity, partnership and cooperation among governments and other stakeholders, i.e. the private sector, civil society and international organizations. Realizing that the ambitious goal of this Declaration - bridging the digital divide and ensuring harmonious, fair and equitable development for all - will require strong commitment by all stakeholders, we call for digital solidarity, both at national and international levels.

19. We are resolute in our quest to ensure that everyone can benefit from the opportunities that ICTs can offer. We agree that to meet these challenges, all stakeholders should work together to: improve access to information and communication infrastructure and technologies as well as to information and knowledge; build capacity; increase confidence and security in the use of ICTs; create an enabling environment at all levels; develop and widen ICT applications; foster and respect cultural diversity; recognize the role of the media; address the ethical dimensions of the Information Society; and encourage international and regional cooperation. We agree that these are the key principles for building an inclusive Information Society.

20. Governments, as well as private sector, civil society and the United Nations and other international organizations have an important role and responsibility in the development of the Information Society and, as appropriate, in decision-making processes. Building a people-centred Information Society is a joint effort which requires cooperation and partnership among all stakeholders.

48. 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.

49. 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.

60. We aim at making full use of the opportunities offered by ICTs in our efforts to reach the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration, and to uphold the key principles set forth in this Declaration. **The Information Society is intrinsically global in nature and national efforts need to be supported by effective international and regional cooperation among governments, the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders, including the international financial institutions.**

A.2 Geneva Plan of Action

1. The common vision and guiding principles of the Declaration are translated in this Plan of Action into concrete action lines to advance the achievement of the internationally-agreed development goals, including those in the Millennium Declaration, the Monterrey Consensus and the Johannesburg Declaration and Plan of Implementation, by promoting the use of ICT-based products, networks, services and applications, and to help countries overcome the digital divide. **The Information Society envisaged in the Declaration of Principles will be realized in cooperation and solidarity by governments and all other stakeholders.**

3. **All stakeholders have an important role to play in the Information Society, especially through partnerships:**

   a. Governments have a leading role in developing and implementing comprehensive, forward looking and sustainable national e-strategies. The private sector and civil society, in dialogue with governments, have an important consultative role to play in devising national e-strategies.

   b. The commitment of the private sector is important in developing and diffusing information and communication technologies (ICTs), for infrastructure, content and applications. The private sector is not only a market player but also plays a role in a wider sustainable development context.

   c. The commitment and involvement of civil society is equally important in creating an equitable Information Society, and in implementing ICT-related initiatives for development.

   d. International and regional institutions, including international financial institutions, have a key role in integrating the use of ICTs in the development process and making available necessary resources for building the Information Society and for the evaluation of the progress made.

8. **The effective participation of governments and all stakeholders is vital in developing the Information Society requiring cooperation and partnerships among all of them.**

12. Confidence and security are among the main pillars of the Information Society.
a. **Promote cooperation among the governments at the United Nations and with all stakeholders at other appropriate fora** to enhance user confidence, build trust, and protect both data and network integrity; consider existing and potential threats to ICTs; and address other information security and network security issues.

b. **Governments, in cooperation with the private sector**, should prevent, detect and respond to cyber-crime and misuse of ICTs by: developing guidelines that take into account ongoing efforts in these areas; considering legislation that allows for effective investigation and prosecution of misuse; promoting effective mutual assistance efforts; strengthening institutional support at the international level for preventing, detecting and recovering from such incidents; and encouraging education and raising awareness.

c. **Governments, and other stakeholders**, should actively promote user education and awareness about online privacy and the means of protecting privacy.

13. Confidence and security are among the main pillars of the Information Society.

b. We ask the Secretary General of the United Nations to set up a working group on Internet governance, in **an open and inclusive process that ensures a mechanism for the full and active participation of governments, the private sector and civil society from both developing and developed countries, involving relevant intergovernmental and international organizations and forums**, to investigate and make proposals for action, as appropriate, on the governance of Internet by 2005.

d. **In cooperation with the relevant stakeholders**, promote regional root servers and the use of internationalized domain names in order to overcome barriers to access.

i. **Governments and stakeholders** should actively promote user education and awareness about online privacy and the means of protecting privacy.

j. Invite stakeholders to ensure that practices designed to facilitate electronic commerce also permit consumers to have a choice as to whether or not to use electronic communication.

l. **Governments, in collaboration with stakeholders**, are encouraged to formulate conducive ICT policies that foster entrepreneurship, innovation and investment, and with particular reference to the promotion of participation by women.

o. **Governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders**, should raise awareness of the importance of international interoperability standards for global e-commerce.

p. **Governments, in cooperation with other stakeholders**, should promote the development and use of open, interoperable, non-discriminatory and demand-driven standards.
A.3 The Tunis Agenda

INTERNET GOVERNANCE

47. We recognize the increasing volume and value of all e-business, both within and across national boundaries. We call for the development of national consumer-protection laws and practices, and enforcement mechanisms where necessary, to protect the right of consumers who purchase goods and services online, and for enhanced international cooperation to facilitate a further expansion, in a non-discriminatory way, under applicable national laws, of e-business as well as consumer confidence in it.

69. We further recognize the need for enhanced cooperation in the future, to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy issues.

70. Using relevant international organizations, such cooperation should include the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources. In this regard, we call upon the organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles.

71. The process towards enhanced cooperation, to be started by the UN Secretary-General, involving all relevant organizations by the end of the first quarter of 2006, will involve all stakeholders in their respective roles, will proceed as quickly as possible consistent with legal process, and will be responsive to innovation. Relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders, proceeding as quickly as possible and responsive to innovation. The same relevant organizations shall be requested to provide annual performance reports.

Implementation and Follow-up

83. Building an inclusive development-oriented Information Society will require unremitting multi-stakeholder effort. We thus commit ourselves to remain fully engaged—nationally, regionally and internationally—to ensure sustainable implementation and follow-up of the outcomes and commitments reached during the WSIS process and its Geneva and Tunis phases of the Summit. Taking into account the multifaceted nature of building the Information Society, effective cooperation among governments, private sector, civil society and the United Nations and other international organizations, according to their different roles and responsibilities and leveraging on their expertise, is essential.

89. We are determined to improve international, regional and national connectivity and affordable access to ICTs and information through an enhanced international cooperation of all stakeholders that promotes technology exchange and technology transfer, human resource development and training, thus increasing the capacity of developing countries to innovate and to participate fully in, and contribute to, the Information Society.
A.4 Tunis Commitment

8. While reaffirming the important roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders as outlined in paragraph 3 of the Geneva Plan of Action, we acknowledge the key role and responsibilities of governments in the WSIS process.

37. We are convinced that our goals can be accomplished through the involvement, cooperation and partnership of governments and other stakeholders, i.e. the private sector, civil society and international organizations, and that international cooperation and solidarity at all levels are indispensable if the fruits of the Information Society are to benefit all.