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**PART I**

* The ITU World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) was established by the 1994 Kyoto Plenipotentiary Conference and is covered by the provisions of Resolution 2 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010). WTPF provides a forum where ITU Member States and Sector Members can discuss and exchange views and information on emerging telecommunication/ICT policy and regulatory matters, especially global and cross-sectoral issues. The WTPF shall not produce prescriptive regulatory outcomes; however, it shall prepare reports and adopt opinions by consensus for consideration by Member States, Sector Members and relevant ITU meetings.
* Resolution 101 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), as reaffirmed by Decision 562 (Council 2011), decided that WTPF-13 would discuss all the issues raised in: Resolution 101: “Internet Protocol (IP)-based Networks” (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010); Resolution 102: “ITU’s role with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses” (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010); and Resolution 133: “Roles of administrations of Member States in the management of Internationalized (multilingual) domain names” (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010).
* In accordance with Decision 562, the ITU Secretary-General convened an Informal Experts Group (IEG), each of whom is active in preparing for the Policy Forum. With the approval of ITU Council 2012, membership of the IEG was opened to all stakeholders. The IEG met three times under the Chairmanship of Mr Petko Kantchev (Bulgaria) - twice in 2012 (5 June 2012 and 8-10 October 2012) and on 6-8 February 2013. More than 180 experts participated in the work of the expert group.[[1]](#footnote-1) Around 75 contributions were received from all stakeholders towards the various drafts of the [ITU Secretary-General’s Report](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0003/en) (five in total) and the Draft Opinions. All documents of the WTPF-13 preparatory process are freely available on the [WTPF website](http://www.itu.int/wtpf/) without any restrictions.
* The Policy Forum was preceded by a Strategic Dialogue, [*Building our Broadband Future*](http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Documents/backgrounder-wtpf-13-strategic-dialogue-broadband-future-en.pdf), held on 13 May 2013 and moderated by Mr Raffaele Barberio of Key4Biz. Eleven panelists and two Scribes participated in dynamic debates on the status, progress and challenges of rolling out broadband in two Sessions, “[Building out Broadband](http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Documents/backgrounder-wtpf-13-strategic-dialogue-building-broadband-en.pdf)” and “[Broadband Driving Development](http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Documents/backgrounder-wtpf-13-strategic-dialogue-broadband-development-en.pdf)”. Session 1 debated whether access to broadband is a human need or a right. Session 2 debated the vital applications of broadband for improving people’s lives and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
* The following day, Mr Ulf Pehrsson and Ms Kathryn Brown presented the outcomes of the Strategic Dialogue to the Opening Plenary of the Forum,[[2]](#footnote-2) summarizing the discussions and rich insights from the Strategic Dialogue. For Session 1, participants generally agreed that access to Internet and access to broadband is indeed a basic human need, although some went further and called it a fundamental right. For Session 2, Ms Kathryn Brown noted a maturing of the conversation, and described the relevance, evolution and risk. Participants called for government and the private sector to work together on both supply-side and demand-side issues relating to broadband, emphasizing that we now stand at a tipping point and now is the time for action to realize the significant benefits of broadband. The programme can be found at <http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Pages/dialogue.aspx>.
* The Fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF-13) was held at the CICG in Geneva, Switzerland, from 14-16 May 2013. It was attended by 900 delegates, representing 126 Member States and 49 Sector Members and five United Nations entities, as well as 37 members of the public. 12 members of the IEG, invited as Special Guests of the ITU Secretary-General, attended WTPF-13. High-level participation by VIPs reached unprecedented levels, including a record attendance of 33 Ministers and eight Deputy Ministers as well as several heads of regulatory agencies. H.E. Mr Ivo Ivanovski, Minister of Information Society, TFYR Macedonia, was elected Chairman of the Forum.
* The Policy Forum opened with addresses from: [Dr Hamadoun I. Touré](http://www.itu.int/en/osg/speeches/Pages/2013-05-14.aspx), ITU Secretary-General; [H.E. Mme Doris Leuthard](http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Documents/statements/wtpf-13-suisse-en-fr.pdf), Federal Counsellor, Department of Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications, Switzerland; Mr Fadi Chehadé, President and CEO of ICANN; and [Dr Robert E. Kahn](http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Documents/statements/wtpf-13-cnri-en.pdf), President, CNRI, and the co-founder of the Internet.
* In his speech, Dr Touré underlined the need to work together. ITU will continue its bridge-building role and can leverage its unique position as a neutral convenor, where Member States, Sector Members and other stakeholders can come together. The timing of this year’s WTPF, with its focus on International Internet-related public policy matters, was particularly appropriate – as we stand at a ‘tipping point’ between the Internet as a vital enabler of social and economic progress in the industrialized world, and the Internet as a valuable global resource and a basic commodity of human life everywhere. The WTPF can create a shared vision that can be transformed into effective action to bring connectivity to the two-thirds of the world's people who are still offline. He reminded delegates that WTPF is a forum for free-thinking debate and discussion on new and emerging issues.
* In her speech, H.E. Mme Doris Leuthard, Federal Counsellor of Switzerland, emphasized how broadband is critical to a modern, global economy and underlined her Government’s support for the WSIS Forum, running in parallel to the WTPF. She highlighted how the Internet touches profoundly our society of today, our citizens, our businesses, our administrations, and schools. She stressed the importance of the responsibility of governments and their role in the protection of the rights of citizens and consumers.
* Mr Fadi Chehadé, President and CEO of ICANN, delivered a strong message of cooperation throughout the Internet community announcing it is a “new season”. He and noted that no one organization, no one country, no one person can manage the Internet – we must do this together. And it’s our unity that will make this a very strong Internet that is secure and stable for everybody.
* Dr Robert E. Khan, one of the founders of the Internet, took the opportunity to take stock of where we are today in terms of the Internet’s development and shared with us his vision of the future Internet as a global resource that will continue to evolve and bring value to the world.

Six Vice-Chairs were elected for the Forum:

* Ms Magdalena Gaj (Poland);
* Mr Rashid Ismailov (Russia);
* H.E. Mr Rowland Espinosa Howell (Costa Rica);
* Mr Majed M. Almazyed (Saudi Arabia);
* H.E Blaise Louembé (Gabon); and
* Mr Rabindra N. Jha (India).
* In accordance with Resolution 2 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), discussions at the WTPF were based on the [Report of the Secretary-General](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0003/en),[[3]](#footnote-3) which served as the main working document of the Forum. The contributions and comments of members of the IEG were incorporated into this report. Annexed to the Report were six Draft Opinions which were forwarded by the IEG, by consensus, to WTPF-13 for further discussion.
* The General Secretariat presented the [Secretary-General’s Report](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0003/en), on behalf of the Secretary-General, giving a broad overview of issues covered by the Report based on the issues raised in the Plenipotentiary Resolutions 101, 102 and 133 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010).
* The presentation of the Report was followed by a succession of high-level statements[[4]](#footnote-4) by Member States and Sector Members based on the themes raised in the Secretary-General’s report. It was noted that the body of the Report serves as an input document to the Policy Forum, and will not be revised during the Forum.
* Three Working Groups were established to discuss the six draft Opinions annexed to the Secretary-General’s Report and associated contributions from Member States and Sector Members. The following were elected the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Working Groups.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Chairs** | **Vice-Chair(s)** |
| **Working Group 1** | Mr Daniel Cavalcanti (Brazil) | Ms Sally Wentworth (Internet Society) |
| **Working Group 2** | Mr Musab Abdulla (Bahrain) | Mr Tchonang Linze Michel (CAPDA, Cameroon) |
| **Working Group 3** | Mr Petko Kantchev (Bulgaria) | Dr Y.J. Park (SUNY, Republic of Korea) |

* The Working Groups worked constructively over two and a half days. The Chairmen of the three Working Groups presented the results of the work undertaken by the Working Groups to the Plenary for approval – see Annex I of this Report.
* In the discussion that followed the presentation of the report of the Chairman of Working Group 3, many delegates stressed the importance of continuing the discussion on the role of governments in various fora in an open, transparent and multistakeholder manner.
* The Chairman of the Forum presented the Draft Opinions, which had been revised and endorsed by the Working Groups. He invited the Forum to adopt the following Opinions:

Opinion 1: Promoting Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) as a long term solution to advance connectivity

Opinion 2: Fostering an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity

Opinion 3: Supporting Capacity Building for the deployment of IPv6

Opinion 4: In Support of IPv6 Adoption and Transition from IPv4

Opinion 5: Supporting Multi-stakeholderism in Internet Governance

Opinion 6: On supporting operationalizing the Enhanced Cooperation Process

* The forum delegates thanked the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the various Working Groups for their outstanding work
* The Policy Forum adopted the Opinions as presented in Part II of this Report.
* The concluding remarks of the Forum can be found here: <http://www.itu.int/en/wtpf-13/Pages/speakers.aspx> .

**PART II**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 1: Promoting Internet Exchange Points (IXPs)   
as a long term solution to advance connectivity**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*recalling*

1. that Paragraph 27, c)i of the Tunis Agenda recognizes the contribution that Internet Exchange points can make to reducing interconnection costs and broadening network access;
2. that Paragraph 50 of the Tunis Agenda calls for the establishment of national, regional and sub-regional Internet exchange points as a strategy for increasing affordable global connectivity, thereby facilitating improved and equitable access for all; and

c) Resolution 101 (rev. Guadalajara, 2010) *resolves 2),* that the ITU should fully embrace the opportunities for telecommunication/ICT development that arise from the growth of IP-based services, in conformity with the ITU purposes and the outcomes of the Geneva (2003) and Tunis (2005) phases of WSIS,

*considering*

1. that a study by ISOC, OECD and UNESCO[[5]](#footnote-5) states “this research finds a significant relationship between the development of international bandwidth and the price of local Internet access”;
2. that the ITU and UNESCO Broadband Commission Report[[6]](#footnote-6) recognised that “technology-based developments such as Content Distribution Networks (CDNs) and new Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) have resulted in some economic efficiencies and have generally proven helpful, where the regulatory environment has been favorable”;
3. that at the 2012 Connect Americas Summit, regional leaders committed to the development of Internet exchange points at the local, national and regional levels to reduce Internet access costs;

*d)* that IXPs and telecommunication traffic exchange points may play a relevant role in the deployment of Internet infrastructure and reaching the overall goals of improving quality, increasing the connectivity and resilience of networks, fostering competition and reducing the costs of interconnections,

*is of the view*

1. that establishment of local, national, sub-regional, and regional IXPs is a priority to address connectivity issues, improve quality of service and reduce interconnection costs;
2. that enabling the interconnection of international, national and regional networks through IXPs may be an effective way to improve international internet connectivity and to reduce the costs of such connectivity, with regulation only when necessary to promote competition;
3. that donor programmes and developmental financing mechanisms should consider the need to provide funding for initiatives that advance connectivity, IXPs and local content for developing countries;
4. that the creation of IXPs enables a virtuous cycle: as the IXP attracts more ISPs, it will also begin to attract local, national and international content providers, along with business, academic, and governmental users, which in turn attracts more ISPs;
5. that local content capacity in developing countries should be encouraged and supported within the enabling environment that local/ regional IXPs provides;
6. that effective IXPs often emerge where Member States have adopted multistakeholder policy processes, as IXPs rely on cooperation among relevant stakeholders;
7. that regulatory measures should not impede arrangements for transit and peering, to create an enabling and competitive environment for the creation of IXPs;
8. that liberalization of the electronic communications market may play a significant role in allowing a competitive market to emerge to support introduction and interconnection with IXPs; and,
9. that the increased level of interconnection enabled by participation in IXPs contributes to an enhanced level of resilience in the network infrastructure,

*invite*

Member States and Sector Members to work in a collaborative manner to:

* promote the further development and expansion of networks on national, sub-regional and regional levels;
* enable the emergence of Internet Exchange Points through, inter alia, the exchange of technical expertise and the fostering of supportive policy environments through open multistakeholder consultations;
* promote public policies aimed at permitting the local, regional and international internet network operators to interconnect through IXPs.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 2: Fostering an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*recalling*

1. Resolution 71 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), The Strategic Plan for the Union;
2. Resolution 101 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) on the subject of Internet-Protocol based networks;
3. Resolution 139 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), Telecommunications/information and communication technologies to bridge the digital divide and build an inclusive information society;
4. the 2005 World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) outcome documents;
5. the third World Telecommunication Policy Forum (Geneva, 2001), Opinion A on the general implications of IP Telephony for the ITU membership,

*taking into account*

the Report of the fifth World Telecommunication Development Conference (Hyderabad, 2010), highlighting the importance of telecommunication infrastructure and technology development, particularly developing countries, and adopting regional initiatives and the Hyderabad Action Plan to assist developing countries achieve, to a greater degree, universal access to telecommunications,

*considering*

1. the Geneva Declaration of Principles adopted by WSIS;
2. the potential benefits of the rapid introduction of new and diverse telecommunication services, including those highlighted in Resolution 66/184 of the UN General Assembly, and consistent with § 54 of the Tunis Agenda, to “provide new solutions to development challenges and foster sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth, development, competitiveness, access to information and knowledge, poverty eradication and social inclusion that will help to integrate all countries, especially developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, into the global economy”;
3. the role of broadband connectivity in attaining the UN Millennium Development Goals;
4. the importance of broadband capacity to facilitate the delivery of a broader range of services and applications, promote investment and provide Internet access at affordable prices to both existing and new users,

*recognizing*

1. that, pursuant to § 22 of the Geneva Declaration of Principles adopted by WSIS, a well-developed information and communication network infrastructure and applications, adapted to regional, national and local conditions, easily accessible and affordable, and making greater use of broadband and other innovative technologies where possible, can accelerate the social and economic progress of countries and the well being of all individuals, communities and peoples;
2. the importance of competition in promoting investment, as presented in the Report of the Broadband Commission for Digital Development[[7]](#footnote-7) ;
3. the policy recommendations in the Report of the ITU/UNESCO Broadband Commission for Digital Development[[8]](#footnote-8) encouraging broadband infrastructure development and for creating a favourable environment for investment in telecommunications infrastructure by encouraging all Member States to:
4. provide policy leadership for investment, including open consultations on necessary policy and legal frameworks;
5. open telecommunications markets to competition through licensing and taxation reforms, including transparent licensing regimes;
6. enable government services that will stimulate demand for and investment in telecommunications, especially in developing countries;
7. establish a universal service program to support telecommunications infrastructure investment; and
8. encourage efficient and innovative mobile broadband practices for new market entrants and consumers,

*noting*

1. that progress has been made in access to information and communication technologies, including the steady increase in Internet access to the world’s population, and the availability of multilingual content, as well as Internet addresses, and that the international community affirmed its commitment to turning the digital divide into digital opportunity, and to ensuring harmonious and equitable development for all, in § 49 of the Tunis Agenda;
2. the establishment of the Broadband Commission for Digital Development at the invitation of the Secretary-General of the ITU and the Director General of UNESCO, and taking note of the Commission Report entitled “A 2010 Leadership Imperative: The Future Built on Broadband”, which calls for broadband-friendly practice and policies towards the attainment of the internationally agreed development goals, including the UN Millennium Development Goals,

*is of the view*

that Member States, Sector Members and other interested stakeholders should undertake all efforts to foster an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity,

*invites Member States,*

1. to create and promote widespread affordable access to telecommunication infrastructure by enabling legal and regulatory environments, and develop policies that are fair, transparent, stable, predictable and non-discriminatory; and that promote competition, foster continued technological and service innovation, and encourage private sector investment incentives;
2. to review their current regulatory frameworks with a view to adopting a competition-oriented approach with respect to IP-based networks in order to achieve clearly defined public policy goals, taking into account, *inter alia*, the concept of technology neutrality,

*invites Member States, Sector Members and all interested stakeholders,*

to continue to work, as appropriate, in the activities of ITU, and in all relevant international, regional and national forums considering the subject of broadband connectivity, to share best practices regarding the implementation of progressive regulatory regimes designed to liberalize markets, promote competition and stimulate investment,

*requests the Secretary-General*

to ensure the effective implementation of the relevant ITU programmes and activities, including the WSIS outcomes, through the promotion and strengthening of cooperation in the development of broadband connectivity.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 3: Supporting Capacity Building for the deployment of IPv6**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*considering*

*a)* the success of WTSA Resolution 64 (Rev. Dubai 2012) on the subject of IP address allocation and encouraging the deployment of IPv6 which, *inter alia*, instructed the Director of the TSB in close collaboration with the Director of the BDT to undertake tasks;

*b)* Plenipotentiary Resolution 180 (Guadalajara 2010) on Facilitating the transition from IPv4 to IPv6;

*c)* the work of the IPv6 working group, that was established by the Council at its 2009 session and relevant discussions in WTSA-12 Dubai;

*d)* WTPF Opinion 5 (Lisbon, 2009) calling for acceleration of activities related to WTSA Resolution 64;

*e)* the work of BDT and TSB already undertaken on the subject of IPv6;

*f)* that IPv6 address allocation and deployment is an important issue for Member States and Sector Members;

*g)* the ongoing work of the RIRs, ISOC and other stakeholders in the areas of IPv4, IPv6 in relevant capacity building,

*recognizing*

*a)* that IANA has allocated the last IPv4 blocks to the RIRs;

*b)* that RIRs have put in place measures to manage the remaining IPv4 blocks;

*c)* that migration to IPv6 is gaining speed and that many prominent international web-based businesses have already implemented IPv6 portals;

*d)* that IPv6 extremely large address space enables global connectivity to many more electronic devices, mobile phones, laptops, in-vehicle computers, televisions, cameras, building sensors, medical devices, etc;

*e)* that IPv6’s security, when enabled and configured with the appropriate key infrastructure, in form of IPsec, will enhance authentication, encryption, and integrity protection at the network layer;

*f)* that, nevertheless, the proportion of IPv6 traffic on the Internet remains very small;

*g)* that, because of the opportunity to operate IPv4 and IPv6 in parallel, via either dual stack or tunneling operation, there will be a need for IPv4 addresses for an indeterminate period until a critical mass of web-based services is available via IPv6 addresses;

*h)* that new entrant Internet service providers will continue to require access to IPv4 addresses for an indeterminate time;

*i)* that the RIRs have developed special policies for the distribution of final blocks of IPv4 addresses aimed to ensure that new and emerging networks receive a small amount of IPv4 for the foreseeable future;

*j)* that some RIRs are seeking to reclaim the IPv4 address space that was allocated in large blocks to individual companies and organizations prior to the establishment of the RIRs;

*k)* that a growing market has developed in the transfer of IPv4 addresses between entities and that the overwhelming proportion of transferred addresses are from legacy allocations which are not subject to the policies of the RIRs;

*l)* that the Directors of the TSB and BDT have,

1) initiated a project to assist developing countries, responding to their regional needs as identified by the Telecommunication Development Bureau (BDT); this project should be carried out jointly by the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB) and BDT, taking into consideration the involvement of those partners willing to join and to bring their expertise;

2) established a website that provides information about global activities related to IPv6, to facilitate awareness-raising and the importance of IPv6 deployment for all ITU members and interested entities, and provides information related to training events being undertaken by relevant entities in the Internet community (e.g. Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), Local Internet Registries (LIRs), operator groups, the Internet Society (ISOC));

3) promoted awareness of the importance of IPv6 deployment, to facilitate joint training activities involving appropriate experts from the relevant entities, and to provide information to developing countries;

4) studied IPv6 address allocation and registration and reported to ITU Council 2012.

*recognizing further*

*a)* that the RIRs are developing policies to manage the inter-regional transfer of address space, underpinned by needs based demand for IPv4 addresses;

*b)* that needs-based address allocation should continue to underpin IP address allocation, irrespective of whether they are IPv6 or IPv4, and in the case of IPv4, irrespective of whether they are legacy or allocated address space;

*c)* that all IPv4 transactions be reported to the relevant RIRs, including transactions of legacy addresses that are not necessarily subject to the policies of the RIRs regarding transfers, as supported by the policies developed by the RIR communities;

*d)* that issues regarding IPv4 can be minimized by accelerating the transition to IPv6,

*is of the view*

*a)* that every effort should be made to encourage and facilitate the transition to IPv6;

*b)* that policies of inter-RIR transfer across all RIRs should ensure that such transfers are needs based and be common to all RIRs irrespective of the address space concerned;

*c)* that Member states and Sector members should promote the availability of affordable Customer Premise Equipment (CPEs) compatible with IPv6 in the shortest time possible,

*invites*

*a)* Member States to consider policies and incentives to promote, facilitate and support the fastest possible adoption and migration to IPv6 within their jurisdictions;

*b)* Sector Members with web and Internet business to offer their services via IPv6 as quickly as possible.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 4: In support of IPv6 adoption and transition from IPv4**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*considering*

*a)* WTSA Resolution 64 (Rev. Dubai, 2012) on the subject of IP address allocation and facilitating the transition to and deployment of IPv6 which, *inter alia*, instructs the Director of the TSB in close collaboration with the Director of the BDT to:

1) continue the ongoing activities between the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB) and the Telecommunication Development Bureau (BDT), taking into consideration the involvement of those partners willing to participate and bring their expertise to assist developing countries with IPv6 migration and deployment, and to respond to their regional needs as identified by the BDT, especially through capacity building programs;

2) maintain the website which provides information about global activities related to IPv6, to facilitate awareness-raising and the importance of IPv6 deployment for all ITU members and interested entities, and provides information related to training events being undertaken by ITU and relevant entities in the Internet community (e.g. Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), network operator groups, and the Internet Society (ISOC));

3) promote awareness of the importance of IPv6 deployment, to facilitate joint training activities involving appropriate experts from the relevant entities, and to provide information including roadmaps, guidelines, and to assist in the establishment of IPv6 Test bed Laboratories in developing countries in collaboration with appropriate related organizations;

4) take appropriate action to facilitate the activities for Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 in the area of IP addresses and to report annually to the ITU Council and to WTSA 2016.

*b)* Plenipotentiary Resolution 180 (Guadalajara, 2010) on Facilitating the transition from IPv4 to IPv6;

*c)* the work of the IPv6 working group, that was established by the Council at its 2009 session, as well as related discussions in WTSA-12 (Dubai 2012);

*d)* WTPF Opinion 5 (Lisbon, 2009) calling for acceleration of activities related to WTSA Resolution 64 (Johannesburg 2008);

*e)* the work of BDT and TSB already undertaken on the subject of IPv6;

*f)* that IPv6 address allocation and deployment is an important issue for Member States and Sector Members;

*g)* the ongoing work of the RIRs, ISOC, and other stakeholders in the areas of IPv4 and IPv6,

*recognizing*

*a)* that the IANA functions operator has allocated the last IPv4 blocks to the RIRs;

*b)* that RIRs are close to exhausting their IPv4 allocations;

*c)* that migration to IPv6 is gaining speed and that many prominent international web-based businesses have already implemented IPv6 portals;

*d)* that IPv6’s extremely large address space enables global connectivity to many more electronic devices, mobile phones, laptops, in-vehicle computers, televisions, cameras, building sensors, medical devices, etc;

*e)* that IPv6’s security, when enabled and configured with the appropriate key infrastructure, such as IPsec, will enhance authentication, encryption, confidentiality and integrity protection at the network layer;

*f)* that the proportion of IPv6 traffic on the Internet remains very small;

*g)* that because of incompatibility between IPv4 and IPv6, parallel (dual stack) operation is required and there will be a need for IPv4 addresses for an undetermined period until a critical mass of users and services is available via IPv6 addresses, thereby allowing IPv4 to be phased out;

*h)* that new entrant Internet service providers will continue to require access to IPv4 addresses for an indeterminate period of time;

*i)* that large blocks of IPv4 address space were allocated to individual companies and organizations prior to the establishment of the RIRs and that the status of some legacy address space is unclear;

*j)* that a growing market has developed in the transfer of IPv4 addresses between entities with a significant proportion of transferred addresses from legacy allocations which are not subject to the relevant policies of the RIRs;

*k)* that consistent with the policies developed through the RIRs, all IP numbers continue to be allocated for use on a needs basis and should be returned to the numbering pool when no longer needed,

*recognizing further*

*a)* that transfers of IPv4 addresses that are not coordinated through the RIRs could have undesirable consequences;

*b)* that such consequences could be minimized by accelerating the transition to IPv6,

*is of the view*

*a)* that every effort should be made to encourage and facilitate the transition to IPv6;

*b)* that every effort should be made to facilitate the optimal use of IPv4 addresses, including legacy addresses and by inter-region transfers;

*c)* that plans and policies should continue to be in place to allow new entrant ISPs to enter the market via access to a reasonable block of IPv4 addresses at reasonable prices;

*d)* that needs-based address allocation should continue to underpin IP address allocation, irrespective of whether they are IPv6 or IPv4 addresses;

*e)* that all IPv4 transactions should continue to be reported to the relevant RIRs;

*f)* that policies of inter RIR transfer across all RIRs should work to ensure that such transfers are needs based and be common to all RIRs irrespective of the address space concerned;

*g)* that plans and policies should be in place to address the issue of legacy addresses which may not be subject to current policies of the RIRs,

*invites*

*a)* Member States to take appropriate measures to encourage, facilitate and support the fastest possible adoption and migration to IPv6;

*b)* Membership to promote affordable IPv6 compliant products and services as quickly as possible;

*c)* Member States to contribute to the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues on matters pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including addresses;

*d)* Member States, and other stakeholders, according to their roles and responsibilities as defined in paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda, to participate in the multi-stakeholder institutions directly responsible for the development of technical policy and allocation of these resources so that their policy priorities in these matters can be taken into account.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 5: Supporting multi-stakeholderism in Internet Governance**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*recalling*

Paragraph 34 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (Tunis Agenda) which provides a working definition of Internet Governance as 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,

*recognizing*

*a)* that, paragraph 37 of the Tunis Agenda seeks to improve the coordination of the activities of international and intergovernmental organizations and other institutions concerned with Internet governance and the exchange of information among themselves. It states that a multi-stakeholder approach should be adopted, as far as possible, at all levels.

*b)* that, as per paragraph article 35 of the Tunis Agenda, 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:

i) 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;

ii) 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;

iii) Civil Society has also played an important role on Internet matters, especially at community level, and should continue to play such a role;

iv) Intergovernmental organizations have had, and should continue to have, a facilitating role in the coordination of Internet-related public policy issues; and

v) International organizations have also had, and should continue to have, an important role in the development of Internet-related technical standards and relevant policies.

*c)* that, as per paragraph 55 of the Tunis Agenda, existing arrangements for Internet Governance have worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust, dynamic and geographically diverse medium that it is today, with the Private Sector taking the lead in day-to-day operations, and with innovation and value creation at the edges;

*d)* that, as per paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda, there is a need for enhanced cooperation to enable Governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues related to the Internet, but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues,

*considering*

Resolution 101 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), Resolution 102 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) and Resolution 133 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) each of which resolves to explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between ITU and relevant organizations (including, but not limited, to ICANN, IETF, RIRs, ISOC, W3C) on the basis of reciprocity,

*is of the view*

that it is important to further implement multi-stakeholder practices as outlined in the relevant paragraphs of the Tunis agenda,

*invites Member States and other stakeholders*

1. to explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between governments; the private sector, international and intergovernmental organizations, and civil society, as well as greater participation in multistakeholder processes, with a view to ensure that the governance of the Internet is a multi-stakeholder process that enables all parties to continue to benefit from the Internet;
2. to contribute based on their roles and responsibilities as stated in paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda;
3. to focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing country stakeholders in the initiatives, entities, organizations and institutions involved in various aspects of Internet Governance.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Geneva, 14-16 May 2013 |

**OPINION 6: On supporting operationalizing the   
enhanced cooperation process**

The fifth World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (Geneva, 2013),

*recalling*

1. Relevant Paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda including paragraphs 35, 37, 55, 60, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 83 related to *enhanced cooperation* and the roles of all relevant stakeholders;
2. the UNGA Resolutions - enhanced cooperation (2011 A/RES/65/141, 2012 A/RES/67/195);
3. the relevant ITU Resolutions (i.e., Res. 101, 102, 133),

*considering*

a) that the Internet has evolved into a powerful and very successful vehicle for innovation, economic growth, the spread of knowledge and culture, and the delivery of services;

b) that the Internet, where it is available, has provided, inter alia, economic and social benefits to governments, business and wider society. However, it is recognized that there are some problems related to network security and spam which should be addressed through cooperation among all stakeholders in their respective roles;

c) that the Internet is now essential for the continuing operation of business and government services around the world;

d) that international cooperation and support is also essential for bringing the benefits of the Internet to all peoples of the world, in particular developing and least developed countries,

*recognizing*

UNGA Resolution A/RES/67/195 which states the “significance and urgency of the process towards enhanced cooperation in full consistency with the mandate provided in the Tunis Agenda and the need for enhanced cooperation to enable Governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in respect of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet but not in respect of the day-to-day technical and operational matters that have no impact on those issues”,

*noting*

a) thatthe United Nations family of organizations has attempted to address some International Internet-related public policy issues;

b) that these attempts by the UN family, referred to in noting a) above, have not fully addressed those overriding issues of the Internet;

1. that, the UNGA has passed Resolution (A/RES/67/195), on 21 Dec. 2012,

“20. Invites the Chair of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development to establish a working group on enhanced cooperation to examine the mandate of the World Summit on the Information Society regarding enhanced cooperation as contained in the Tunis Agenda, through seeking, compiling and reviewing inputs from all Member States and all other stakeholders, and to make recommendations on how to fully implement this mandate; advises the Chair, when convening the working group, to take into consideration the meetings already scheduled on the calendar of the Commission; and also advises that the working group should report to the Commission at its seventeenth session, in 2014, as part of the overall review of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society;

21. Requests the Chair of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development to ensure that the working group on enhanced cooperation has balanced representation between Governments from the five regional groups of the Commission, and invitees from all other stakeholders, namely, the private sector, civil society, technical and academic communities, and intergovernmental and international organizations, drawn equally from developing and developed countries.”,

*is of the view*

to reaffirm the need for enhanced cooperation to enable governments to develop international Internet-related public policy in consultation with all stakeholders as outlined in paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda,

*invites*

all stakeholders to work on these issues.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX I**

**1. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF WORKING GROUP 1 TO THE PLENARY**

Working Group 1 met on 14 May 2013, from 16:15 - 17:40 to discuss two draft opinions, chaired by Mr Daniel Calvacanti (Brazil) with Vice-Chair Ms Sally Wentworth (ISOC):

[Draft Opinion 1: Promoting IXPs as a long-term solution to advance connectivity](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0047/en)

[Draft Opinion 2: Fostering an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0043/en)

Given below are the reports for the two opinions:

**1.1 Opinion 1**

The Working Group considered [Draft Opinion 1: Promoting IXPs as a long-term solution to advance connectivity](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0047/en), as well as a number of contributions by the United States ([WTPF-13/6](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0006/en)), Turkey ([WTPF-13/7](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0007/en)), RIPE NCC ([WTPF-13/8](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0008/en)), ISOC ([WTPF-13/9](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0009/en)) and Australia ([WTPF-13/11).](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0011/en) The United States, RIPE NCC, ISOC and Australia presented their contributions orally, expressing their support for the opinion in its current form.

Turkey’s contribution proposed the addition of the phrase “especially in developing countries” to the second bullet of the *invites* section and the replacement of the word “permitting” with “encouraging” in the third bullet of the *invites* section. During the discussion that followed, however, other countries did not advocate reopening the text. For the sake of compromise, Turkey generously accepted that it would not insist on its amendments. A number of delegations expressed their thanks to the Turkish delegation for their spirit of compromise.

In view of these discussions, Working Group 1 endorsed Draft Opinion 1 in its unaltered form and submitted it to the consideration of Plenary.

**1.2 Opinion 2**

The Working Group considered [Draft Opinion 2: Fostering an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0043/en), as well as a number of contributions by the United States ([WTPF-13/6](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0006/en)), Turkey ([WTPF-13/7](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0007/en)), ISOC ([WTPF-13/9](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0009/en)), Australia ([WTPF-13/11](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0011/en)), Avanti ([WTPF-13/12](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0012/en)) and the Global VSAT Forum or GVF ([WTPF-13/13](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0013/en)). The United States, ISOC and Australia presented their contributions orally, expressing their support for Draft Opinion 2.

Turkey’s contribution proposed the addition of the word “relevant” before “international, regional and national forums” in the *invites Member States, Sector Members and all interested stakeholders* section.

Avanti and GVF proposed a number of edits to the subsection (c) of the *recognizing* section. These proposed changes sought to reflect a technology-neutral approach to the establishment of broadband networks, which should include terrestrial fixed, terrestrial mobile, as well as satellite broadband, to enable the provision of broadband services including in un-served and under-served areas.

During the discussion that followed, a number of countries expressed their support for the amendment proposed by Turkey as an improvement. In addition, Senegal requested that the valuable work of the ITU Telecommunication Development Bureau (BDT) be acknowledged in two additional bullets (c) and (d) noting the GSR 2011 Best Practice Guidelines and the GSR 2009 Best Practice Guidelines in the *noting* section. Ghana proposed the addition of the phrase “to spur up demand for” in (iv) of sub-section (c) of the *recognizing* section, to reflect the balance in both demand and supply sides under the broadband ecosystem. The UK sought clarification on whether the Forum could *request* the ITU Secretary-General, or whether the Forum would rather *invite* the Secretary-General to ensure the effective implementation of the relevant ITU programmes and activities.

The Secretariat clarified that a precedent existed from the first WTPF-1996 for the Forum to request the Secretary-General. In a spirit of compromise, however, Avanti, Senegal and Ghana all accepted that their amendments should be reflected in the Chairman’s Report, rather than the Opinion itself.

In view of these discussions, Working Group 1 endorsed Draft Opinion 2 with the addition of the word “relevant” and submitted it to the consideration of Plenary.

Although the Working Group dealt with two draft opinions within a limited period of time, the discussions were concluded in one Session to the satisfaction of the WTPF delegates. Working Group 1 therefore allocated its second scheduled working session the following morning to the use of Working Group 2.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its support, the Vice-Chairman, interpreters and caption providers.

**Mr D. CAVALCANTI**Chairman of Working Group 1

**2. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF WORKING GROUP 2 TO THE PLENARY**

Working Group 2 met on **15 May from 09:30-10:10** to discuss two draft opinions:

[Draft Opinion 3: Supporting Capacity Building for the deployment of IPv6](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0046/en)

[Draft Opinion 4: In Support of IPv6 Adoption and transition from IPv4](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0045/en)

The Working Group considered [draft Opinions 3 and 4](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0047/en) as well as five written contributions from USA, Turkey, RIPE-NCC, ISOC and Australia.

Contributor delegates presented their contributions orally and expressed their overall support of these two opinions, prepared by the IEG, on promoting the IPv6 deployment which is urgently needed and critical to the sustainable future development of the Internet.

The United States, RIPE NCC and ISOC supported these two opinions in their current form. The RIPE-NCC delegate, in his intervention, especially recognized that these two draft opinions address different and distinct areas of concern and interest for Member States and other members of the global Internet community. In recognition of the consensus achieved by the IEG, the delegate of Australia, in his intervention, supported the adoption of Draft Opinions 3 and 4 in their current form and withdrew their earlier suggestion of merging them.

The delegate of Turkey presented their proposal to merge draft Opinions 3 & 4. Other delegations, in their interventions, cited the prevailing preference expressed during this Forum that these draft opinion texts, although not perfect, represent a delicate compromise and should not be significantly amended. Due to time constraints it was recommended not to reopen the discussions related to the two Draft Opinions. In the spirit of compromise, Turkey generously agreed not to insist on merging these two opinions. Thus WG2 agreed to keep Opinions 3 and 4 separate.

In the discussion to finalize the text of Opinion 3, Turkey proposed an addition of the following text:

“*Requests Secretary-General*

*To ensure effective implementation of relevant program and activities of ITU to support capacity building of member states for IPv4-IPv6 transition*”

The Chairman then invited comments on this proposed change. Some delegates noted that the proposed additional text is already contained in ITU mandate documents such as WTDC‑10 Resolution 63, PP-10 Resolution 180 and WTSA-12 Resolution 64, and this request is more appropriate to be addressed to the Director of BDT rather than the Secretary-General. In light of the WG’s preference not to amend the text of the two Opinions, the Chairman proposed that Turkey’s contribution would be included in the text of the Chairman’s report. In the spirit of compromise, Turkey accepted the proposal.

WG2 endorsed Opinion 3 in its unaltered form and submitted it for the consideration of Plenary.

In the discussion leading to the approval of Opinion 4, the US and ISOC highlighted the texts already in draft Opinion 4 which supports the multi-stakeholder system of IP number allocation and management centered on the five Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), and the invitation to governments to contribute to the RIR policy process.

While expressing their content to support draft Opinion 4 in its current form, RIPE-NCC, on behalf of all RIRs, clarified some specific points of the text of the Draft Opinion and referred the meeting to information document 12, submitted by APNIC. The floor appreciated the contribution from the RIRs and noted the useful information contained in this document.

In view of these discussions, Working Group 2 endorsed Draft Opinion 4 in its unaltered form and submitted it for the consideration of Plenary.

After the approval of these two opinions, APNIC, on behalf of the RIRs, expressed a very positive note that WTPF produced two important opinions on topics related to IPv6, which is essential to the Internet of tomorrow. APNIC further expressed that the RIRs will continue to partner with ITU on capacity building, which is an essential element for the deployment of IPv6.

ICANN was given the floor, during which they highlighted the role of the RIRs, mentioned ICANN’s contribution to some policy-making processes and commended ITU’s processes for this WTPF.

The Chairman thanked the Secretariat for its support, as well as the Vice-Chairman, interpreters and captioners and closed the Working Group meeting.

**Mr Musab Abdulla (Bahrain)**

Chairman of Working Group 2

**3. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF WORKING GROUP 3 TO THE PLENARY**

Working Group 3 met on 15 May 2013, from 10:40 - 17:40 and again on 16 May from 09:30 – 10:45 to discuss two Draft Opinions and the one contribution in the format of an opinion:

Draft Opinion 5: [Supporting Multi-stakeholderism in Internet Governance](http://www.itu.ch/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0042/en).

Draft Opinion 6: [On supporting operationalizing the Enhanced Cooperation Process](http://www.itu.ch/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0044/en)

New Draft Opinion[: On The Role of Government in the Multistakeholder Framework for Internet Governance](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0005/en)

Considering the number and nature of contributions, and in order to devote sufficient time to the new Draft Opinion from Brazil ([WTPF-13/5](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0005/en)), the Chairman proposed Opinion 6 to be discussed first, followed by the Opinion 5 and then the contribution from Brazil.

Below are the reports of the discussions on the two Opinions and the new Draft Opinion from Brazil in the order that they were discussed:

**3.1 Opinion 6**

The Working Group considered this [Draft Opinion *On supporting operationalizing the Enhanced Cooperation*](http://www.itu.ch/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0044/en), as well as a number of contributions by the United States ([WTPF‑13/6](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0006/en)), Turkey ([WTPF-13/7](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0007/en)), RIPE NCC ([WTPF-13/8](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0008/en)), ISOC ([WTPF-13/9](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0009/en)), Australia ([WTPF-13/11)](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0011/en)  and India ([WTPF-13/15)](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0015/en).

The United States, RIPE NCC, and ISOC, in their presentation, supported Draft Opinion 6 without modifications. Australia kindly accepted to not pursue its contribution to merge Opinion 5 and Opinion 6, in the interests of reaching agreement in the limited time even though it did not consider the text as perfect.

Turkey’s contribution proposed the inclusion of the following paragraph under the *invite* section of the Draft Opinion to add more clarity:

*invites Member States and Sector Members*

*to promote and encourage international cooperation among all stakeholders in their respective role for the issues related to network robustness and to work in collaborative manner to increase users’ trust to internet.*

However, since other delegates argued that the current text is an output of consensus in the IEG and asked that it should be kept unchanged, Turkey graciously accepted that it would not insist on the inclusion of the proposed paragraph for the sake of compromise.

India, in its contribution, asked for addition of references to some more paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda in the paragraph a) under *recalling* section. India stated that selectively quoting paragraphs could result in an incomplete picture of the topic under discussion. Some delegates from developing countries stated that a reference to paragraph 65 of the Tunis Agenda was important as it specifically addressed “developing countries”. During the discussion that ensued, some other paragraphs, such as paragraph 36, were also suggested for addition. Some delegates expressed their concerns regarding re-open the discussion In spirit of compromise, the following revised paragraph, under *recalling* section*,* was agreed by consensus:

*a) Relevant Paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda including paragraphs 35, 37, 55, 60, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 83 related to enhanced cooperation and the roles of all relevant stakeholders*;

Some delegates stressed that sufficient time should be given to revisit some of the key issues as necessary, even though they may have been already approved by the IEG. The Chairman clarified that the order in which the Draft Opinions were being discussed would result in ample time being allocated to address more sensitive issues and he encouraged delegates to express their concerns without hesitation.

Some delegates also brought the attention of the meeting to the information documents from members of the IEG, especially who are not ITU members. These information documents have been posted on the WTPF website but not discussed as per the rules and procedures of the forum.

In view of these discussions, Working Group 3 endorsed Draft Opinion 6 with the one amendment to *recalling (a) shown above.*

**3.2 Opinion 5**

The Working Group considered this [Draft Opinion on *Supporting Multi-stakeholderism in Internet Governance*](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-C-0042/en), as well as a number of contributions by the Russian Federation ([WTPF–13/4](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0004/en)), the United States ([WTPF-13/6](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0006/en)), Turkey ([WTPF-13/7](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0007/en)), RIPE NCC ([WTPF-13/8](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0008/en)), ISOC ([WTPF-13/9](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0009/en)), Australia ([WTPF-13/11)](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0011/en)  and India ([WTPF-13/14](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0014/en)).

The United States, RIPE NCC, and ISOC in their presentation, expressed their support for the Draft Opinion in its current form. (ISOC proposed the inclusion of paragraph 37 of the Tunis Agenda, but not insisted). The Russian Federation presented its contribution which proposed inclusion of additional text in the Draft Opinion on the role of Member States, but agreed to discuss the proposed text within the context of the contribution from Brazil (WTPF-13/5).

*Turkey’s contribution proposed the addition of the word “organization” to “c) to* focus in particular on how to improve the participation of developing country stakeholders” under the *invites Member States and other stakeholders* section.This was added by consensus.

India presented its contribution; among three points, India withdrew its first point (reference to a list of paragraphs of the Tunis Agenda), insisted the second point (exact reference to paragraph 37 of Tunis Agenda under the *recognizing* section a)), and generously agreed to include their last point (the addition of a new paragraph e) under *recognizing* section, reflecting paragraph 61 of the Tunis Agenda) only in the Chairman’s Report.

*61. We are convinced that there is a need to initiate, and reinforce, as appropriate, a transparent, democratic, and multilateral process, with the participation of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations, in their respective roles. This process could envisage creation of a suitable framework or mechanisms, where justified, thus spurring the ongoing and active evolution of the current arrangements in order to synergize the efforts in this regard*.

During the discussion that followed, *recognizing (a)* was revised to align with the text in paragraph 37 of the Tunis Agenda, and the amendment was accepted by consensus. In addition, some delegates suggested that the following sentence, proposed by India, should use “states” rather than “suggests”, and this change was made accordingly by consensus. In view of these discussions, Working Group 3 endorsed Draft Opinion 5 with the addition of the word “organization” and the revised *recognizing (a)* made by consensus, and submitted it to the consideration of the Plenary.

**3.3 New Draft Opinion (contribution from Brazil)**

Working Group 3 considered [the new Draft Opinion on *the Role of Government in the Multistakeholder Framework for Internet Governance*](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0005/en)submitted by Brazil, with support from Russia (incorporating aspects from the Russian Federation contribution made on Draft Opinion 5). Brazil introduced the rationale for submitting this contribution to the forum, while emphasizing the central issues to be discussed at this WTPF: operationalizing the role of governments in the multistakeholder model and capacity building with the support of ITU. The Russian Federation, in support of the contribution, highlighted the important role of governments in Internet governance and the need to define international rules for the Internet.

There was significant discussion on the new Draft Opinion from Brazil at the afternoon session of May 15. Based on the feedback received, at the urging of the Chairman, Brazil consulted on an informal basis with various delegations and came back in the morning session of May 16 with a revised version of their contribution ([WTPF-13/5 rev. 1](http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13-C-0005/en)).

After a 45-minute adjournment for delegates to consider the revised version, the group continued the discussion on the revised Brazilian contribution.

All delegates expressed their sincere appreciation to Brazil for their dedication and constructive spirit in consulting and revising the contribution.

Many delegates, while supporting the issues expressed in the contribution, indicated that some modifications were needed to more accurately reflect various views and concerns. Some modifications were suggested from the floor.

Many delegates as well as the Chairman agreed that the issue of the role of governments in the multistakeholder model of Internet governance is a very important topic and one of the key issues that have not clearly been addressed to date. It was emphasized by the Chairman that we should not shy away from talking about it and that until we do address the core issue, there will be a degree of uncertainty especially when it comes to public policy issues.

Many delegates expressed the view that the topic was very complex that there was insufficient time left to consider all aspects in detail and that while we cannot conclude here, this discussion could be continued.

Brazil accepted that in the absence of a consensus, it would be difficult to pursue their Draft Opinion at Working Group 3 and expressed their willingness to work with others to continue to deliberate on the issues expressed in the contribution.

The Chairman concluded that while the new Draft Opinion was not adopted, there was support for the principles embodied in that contribution. He noted that these are building blocks and encouraged all the delegates to stay engaged on this issue and continue debating within ITU and also at other forums. Some delegates suggested that aspects of the discussion could be continued at other forums such as CSTD, ECOSOC and the IGF. The Chairman suggested the ITU Council Working group on Internet related public policy issues as one such forum (noting the ongoing open consultations with all stakeholders) and that Brazil could make a contribution on this important issue, taking into account the relevant deliberations at WTPF-13 as well as any further inputs received from delegates. Mr Cavalcanti could be contacted at [daniel.cavalcanti@anatel.gov.br](mailto:daniel.cavalcanti@anatel.gov.br). The Chairman also indicated that the Council Working Group could consider forwarding the output of its deliberations to ITU Council for further consideration.

In view of these discussions, the Chairman of Working Group 3 reported that the new Draft Opinion was not endorsed by the Working Group for further consideration by the Plenary.

The Chairman thanked the Secretariat for its support, the Vice-Chairman, interpreters and caption providers.

**Mr Petko Kantchev**Chairman of Working Group 3

1. List of members of the IEG is available at: <http://www.itu.int/md/S13-WTPF13IEG3-ADM-0002/en>
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