

---

**Document WSIS-II/PC-3/CONTR/80-E**  
**12 September 2005**  
**Original: English**

**Switzerland**  
**Additional Comments on Internet Governance**

**Document WSIS-II/PC-3/DT/7E**  
**30 August 2005**  
**Original: English**

**Executive Director, WSIS Executive Secretariat**

**COMPILATION OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE REPORT OF THE  
WORKING GROUP ON INTERNET GOVERNANCE (WGIG)**

In line with the decision of PrepCom-2 (WSIS-II/PC-2/DOC/13 (Rev. 1), this document contains a compilation of comments on the report of the UN Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG) and proposals for Chapter three of the Operational Part of the Tunis Final Document(s). The WGIG report itself, which was published on 18 July 2005, is available as document WSIS-II/PC-3/DOC/5. This compilation is intended to provide a summary of the contributions received.. The complete text of all the contributions received is available at:

[http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/listing.asp?lang=en&c\\_event=wgig&c\\_type=col](http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/listing.asp?lang=en&c_event=wgig&c_type=col).

As of 29 August 2005, comments and contributions had been received from:

- 11 Governments (including a contribution from the 25 EU States plus 2 acceding Member States), and from Ghana for the Africa region
- 7 Business Entities.
- 3 International Organisations.
- 18 Civil society and non-governmental organisations.
- 4 Miscellaneous, including members of the WGIG.

Comments, or additional inputs to this compilation, should be sent to [wsis-contributions@itu.int](mailto:wsis-contributions@itu.int), if possible by 12 September 2005.

Source of comments	Comments
<b>General comments (Para 1-7)</b>	
Cameroun	Cameroun ... thanks the WGIG for this excellent report which will help to make the issues surrounding Internet Governance much clearer.
Canada	<p>Canada's original vision statement for this UN initiative was that the "WSIS is about development". ... Central to this belief is our understanding that all the peoples of the world must truly have the opportunity to participate in the information society, if we are to achieve the maximum benefits for mankind.</p> <p>The Internet is a central element of the emerging global information society. Thus, its security, stability, reliability and sustainability as a global network are of paramount importance for Canada in all discussions of Internet governance. To make governance effective however, we must also put capacity building at the centre of our efforts, so that all countries and all stakeholders are able to play their respective roles in an effective and responsible manner. These principles underlie the Canadian position on Internet governance.</p> <p>Canada agrees with the WGIG that consideration of Internet governance in the WSIS context will</p>

	benefit by separating the discussion of the broad policy issues categorized by the WGIG from discussion of the management of critical Internet resources.
Egypt	<p>The Internet in Egypt developed and grew over the past two decades through public-private partnerships in which the private sector played a pivotal role with continuous support from the government as well as significant contribution from civil society.</p> <p>In fact, Egypt believes that this multilateral partnership, in which the private sector implements, civil society has a key-role with respect to social and developmental aspects, and the government sets policies and provides the enabling environment for businesses to compete, is the optimum model that allows citizens to get the best services.</p> <p>The Internet is no longer a medium for exchanging data and information nor is it anymore seen as a repository for knowledge and e-content. It has rather become a developmental instrument that affects all facets of any nation's economy such as education, health, trade and legislation, just to name a few. Consequently, and in order to keep with the evolutionary pace of this phenomenon, there seems to be a persistent need to review the norms and mechanisms that used to govern the Internet over the past years and consider making the necessary adjustments as required.</p>
EU and acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania)	<p>The EU's position on Internet Governance has been outlined by the EU Council of Ministers during its 27/28 June 2005 meeting. The Council stated that the main issues of the debate on the internationalisation of Internet Governance were the management of the Internet's core resources, namely the domain name system, IP addresses, and the root server system.</p> <p>The EU advocates a new co-operation model, in order to concretise the provisions in the WSIS Declaration of Principles regarding the crucial role of all actors within Internet Governance, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations. The existing Internet Governance mechanisms should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interest of all governments. The respective roles of the international and intergovernmental organisations within the field of Internet Governance should be clarified.</p> <p>In this respect, the EU recognises the contribution made by international and intergovernmental organisations and encourages cooperation in this field. The new cooperation model should be based on the current bottom-up public-private partnership; it should also provide a platform for policy dialogue in the interest of all governments in a light, fast reacting and flexible approach.</p>
Ghana (on behalf of the African Group)	<p>The African Regional Conference for the WSIS held in Ghana from 2-4 February 2005, recommended an international participatory Internet Governance system which would harmonize technical and policy issues related to Internet Governance for the benefit of the global community. This should translate in practical terms to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Internet connection costs;</li> <li>• Affordable hardware and software;</li> <li>• Regional administration of root server system;</li> <li>• National administration of country code top-level domains (ccTLDs).</li> </ul>
Israel	<p>As a matter of policy, the private sector should be recognized as the primary engine of Internet robustness and development. This role should not be superseded by governance mechanisms and institutions because these have the potential to hamper the stable and secure functioning of the Internet.</p> <p>The Internet owes its current robustness not to institutional governance, but to the good judgment and wisdom according to which the Internet was allowed to develop with a minimum of outside intervention.</p>
Japan	Japan welcomes this report as the basis for discussion in the WSIS process. Secure and stable use of the Internet must be assured.
Korea (Rep.)	Korea welcomes the WGIG report as the basis for the further discussion. We agree that Internet is a central element of the infrastructure of the emerging information society, while recognizing that there are differing views on the suitability of current institutions and mechanisms for managing processes and developing policies for the global Internet.
Rwanda	<p>We strongly welcome the emphasis which the report has put on facilitating meaningful participation on Internet Governance by developing countries.</p> <p>On a general note, as an African country and a member of the LDCs, our major concerns in Internet Governance at the present time, centre around interconnectivity costs (including transit traffic costs), local content development, multilingualism and culture diversity.</p> <p>In places such as Rwanda we are still relying on decisions made abroad. Developing countries need to be active in Internet governance however it should be clear that participation in the development of the Internet is somewhat a prerequisite to full participation in internet governance. This is not explicitly mentioned in the document.</p>

Switzerland	<p>Switzerland welcomes the WGIG report and considers it as solid basis for the continuation of work. In particular, Switzerland appreciates the multi-stakeholder approach recommended in the report.</p> <p>Switzerland considers that there is a willingness to find a solution for the issue of internationalisation of Internet Governance. That should be achieved without endangering the stability, security or continuity of the Internet</p> <p>The numerous problems identified in the report will require profound reflection. They cannot all be solved at the Summit in Tunis in November 2005.</p>
Turkey	<p>We believe that this report will provide guidance to solve the existing problems regarding Internet Governance.</p>
USA	<p>Given the importance of the Internet to current economic, social, and political developments, it is critical that all stakeholders in the WSIS process work together collaboratively and constructively to find a consensus at the Tunis Phase of the Summit.</p> <p>The United States reiterates its commitment to the freedom of expression, to the need to preserve the security and stability of the Internet, and to infrastructure development.</p> <p>With respect to the roles of the stakeholders identified in the report, the United States believes that, while governments naturally have a key role in the development and implementation of public policy, consultation and cooperation with the private sector and civil society are critical to ensuring effective, efficient and representative outcomes.</p> <p>The United States remains open to discussing with all stakeholders ways to improve the technical efficiency as well as the transparency and openness of existing governance structures. However, it is important that the global community recognize that the existing structures have worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust and geographically diverse medium that it is today. The security and stability of the Internet must be maintained.</p> <p>The United States continues to support ubiquitous access to the Internet and the development of Internet infrastructure around the globe. Continued internationalization of the Internet is evidenced by the recent creation of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) for Latin America and Africa and the enhanced efforts of the Internet community to work towards an equitable distribution of IP addresses.</p> <p>The decentralization of the Internet is further evidenced by the level of innovation that occurs at the edges of the network. It is at the edges where individuals, groups and corporations alike have the opportunity to add value to the network through pioneering applications and services. It is at the edge where the true opportunity, promise and full participatory nature of the Internet is realized.</p> <p>Finally, the United States would like to highlight a fundamental area of public policy which is absent from the WGIG report – the role of an enabling environment in Internet development and diffusion. To maximize the economic and social benefits of the Internet, governments must focus on creating, within their own nations, the appropriate legal, regulatory, and policy environment that encourages privatization, competition, and liberalization.</p>
BT	<p>BT welcomes the approach of the WGIG in producing this report, in particular the adherence to the key WSIS principles relating to the stable and secure functioning of the Internet. The concept of inclusiveness as defined in the definition of Internet Governance is also fundamental to achieving a balanced and workable solution that will stand the test of time.</p> <p>As a provider of both infrastructure and services that utilise critical Internet resources, BT strongly supports the principle that the management and administration of the Internet protocol addresses and domain name systems continue to be undertaken by those bodies that have the relevant expertise and experience in these specific areas. BT also supports the continuation of the industry driven bottom-up, policy development process in which all stakeholders participate. . . . Unless it can be proved that the current functioning of the Internet at any particular level is not working, the introduction of cumbersome governance, or attempts to dismember, replace, or reconstitute key components of the current administration of the Internet's core resources, will impair the Internet's current performance and future development.</p>
CCBI	<p>Since the business community has the lead role in the technical, economic and operational aspects of the Internet, CCBI agrees with the WGIG that the need to maintain a stable and secure Internet is the guiding WSIS principle that is of paramount importance in this context. The private sector has succeeded in ensuring such stability and security and therefore the status quo appears to be compliant with this guiding principle.</p>
Centre for Democracy and Technology	<p>As a global medium for empowering individuals, promoting free speech and democratizing control over mass communications, the Internet is an unparalleled success story. Just as profoundly, it has become an essential element of worldwide economic activity. ....</p>

(CDT)	<p>While it is certainly worthwhile to look for ways to improve the transparency and openness of the existing governance structures, it is equally vital that we acknowledge that existing structures have worked quite effectively to make the Internet the robust medium it is today.</p> <p>The report fails to document its premise that existing structures have not responded to needs of the international community, and fails to consider how, to the extent they are unrepresentative, they could be made representative without overreaching and unnecessary change. The report does not examine the underlying notion that the Internet governance structure is broken beyond repair and should be shelved in favour of an untested alternative.</p>
Civil Society Internet Governance caucus (CS IG)	<p>The WSIS Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus expresses its strong support and appreciation for the process and outcome of WGIG. ... We hope that the multi-stakeholder approach as explored by WGIG will become a reference model for future WSIS discussions, and for Internet governance organizations and processes generally.</p>
Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries (CENTR)	<p>CENTR states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring the stability, security and robustness of the Internet infrastructure is of critical importance;</li> <li>• The basic principles of transparency, democracy and a multi-stakeholder approach are the key for any Internet governance models; and</li> <li>• It is clear that only a small minority of issues require global coordination.</li> </ul> <p>CENTR endorses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle that responsibility for policy should devolve to the most local level possible (the “subsidiarity principle”) and the recognition of the role of the Local Internet Communities in developing policy at local level. This means that only issues which <i>require</i> global co-ordination should be dealt with globally.</li> <li>• The importance of providing an environment that encourages innovation and investment.</li> <li>• The role of the private sector, which has been a leading actor in the Internet development so far and which continues to contribute to enhance the Internet’s potential.</li> <li>• The importance of relating the existing mechanisms to key objectives, and making participation open and inclusive to all stakeholders, particularly those from developing countries, on an equal footing.</li> </ul>
Cyber Security Industry Alliance (CSIA)	<p>CSIA is concerned that increased government involvement with “Internet Governance” could ultimately contribute to the erosion of the security and stability of the Internet, contrary to WSIS’ own principles.</p> <p>Do No Harm. The current system of distributed, multi-stakeholder governance has allowed the Internet to develop into an engine of the global economy and, in fact, does allow for government advice.</p>
GLOCOM (on behalf of Internet Governance Task Force of Japan)	<p>IGTF would like to express our concern on the general emphasis over the role of governments in Internet Governance, including the proposal of four models in the report. We believe that bottom-up, distributed open mechanisms have so far functioned well.</p> <p>Internet Governance should be primarily be handled by private sector cooperation, while the role of the government should remain as that of good collaborator with comprehensive understanding of the issues.</p>
ICANN	<p>ICANN believes that the WGIG report has provided an important contribution to the WSIS discussions. It also believes it is important to work and continue to cooperate with governments, civil society, the technical community, business community, and with all existing organisations to help ensure the stable and secure functioning of the Internet.</p> <p>Based on a multi-stakeholder model, ICANN has learned in its work that this model is not easy to achieve in practice, and to achieve it well requires continuous assessment of what can and should be done better. As a result, the ICANN Bylaws themselves require that each Supporting Organisation and Advisory Committee be regularly reviewed to ensure continued improvements.</p>
Information Technology Association of America (ITAA)	<p>Participation today in the global economy requires the availability of, and effective access to, an Internet that is stable, ubiquitous, and secure. We are pleased that the WGIG Report recognizes this fundamental point. .... Implementation of change must ensure continued stability, reliability and availability.</p> <p>The Report has not been able to fully recognize the depth and diversity of the existing work of many organizations, or undertake a full examination of the respective existing roles and responsibilities of governments, existing international organizations and other fora, as well as the private sector and civil society. ... We believe that the “options” and “recommendations” in the WGIG Report bypass a true assessment of existing organizations and how they can better do their jobs.</p> <p>We start from a premise that all existing organizations should first do better and more, before any</p>

	new entities, in any area, are created.
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	On behalf of the ITU and its membership, and in line with ITU Council Resolution 1244, the Secretary-General of ITU has submitted a package of ITU materials that are considered relevant to the current discussions on the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG). The package includes definition, a Handbook on IP-Based Networks, and the Resolution 102 Report to Council 2005, as well as other documents.
Internet Governance Project (IGP)	WGIG has moved us forward by clearly demonstrating that there are Internet governance problems that need to be addressed. ... The WGIG report offers a convincing list of public policy issues that are either unaddressed by or uncoordinated across existing international regimes. In addition to that, it is clear that there is unfinished business with respect to ICANN's supervision that must be addressed. The unilateralism of the US government in contracting with ICANN and monitoring changes in the DNS root zone file is not consistent with WSIS principles and is correctly criticized in the WGIG Report.
Internet-Mark2 project	The biggest weakness we see in the report is that it does not convey an understanding of what the Internet was, or what it will be. ... The other issue the report does not deal with is technical management, particularly as regards the role of IETF. The assumption is that current technical management is best practice; we, however, feel that technical decision making carried out in a void without a detailed methodology for measuring the impact on groups of end users is far from best practice. Some of the issues which stand out and are becoming increasingly problematic include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ossification by incremental change;</li> <li>• The difficulties in deployment of DNSSEC and IPv6;</li> <li>• The inadequacy of legacy messaging and web architectures in handling problems such as spam and cyber crime;</li> <li>• The failure to date of approaches to internationalised domain names;</li> <li>• The technical only co-ordination of IETF and the lack of avenues for non-technical input into decisions which have social policy ramifications.</li> </ul>
Internet Society (ISOC) Int'l secretariat	The report makes clear the wide diversity of opinion among those involved in Internet policy and Internet governance and thus provides a useful commentary on the on-going debates in this area. ... We also note that the report is very heavily focused on policy issues and often leaves the impression that regulation and international treaties are the best solutions to many or most Internet-related issues, even for those issues where most experts agree that far more effective (and global) solutions could be provided by new technologies and standards or new Internet services--or some combination of both. We hope that WSIS will examine the full range of solutions.
Internet Society (ISOC) Bulgaria	We hope that the results of the WSIS and the WGIG will not have negative influence on the way Internet is being run today. We would like to ask all stakeholders to not forget that the Internet has not only changed the way people communicate, but also the way information is being accessed. Therefore it requires a special treatment.
Internet Society (ISOC) New Zealand Inc.	InternetNZ contends that the Internet will continue to expand to all corners of the globe, that there are sufficient stakeholders whose interests are not so aligned to the pursuit of wealth as they are to the empowerment of all people on the planet, and that the continued evolution of improving standards, technologies and deployment will be best achieved by not attempting to change the existing model as it applies to the core infrastructure.
Internet Society Pacific Islands Chapter (PICISOC)	PICISOC would like to see more virtual participation ... where representatives can fully participate from any location in the world. Audio or text streaming of the meetings allows one to offer comments/opinions as appropriate. We do not encourage the formation of a body that will call for more international meetings, put a burden on the finances of the UN, and put a burden on the taxpayers in developing countries in ensuring one of their representative's is present. We would rather see this task delegated to current UN bodies where they properly run public awareness sessions on Internet Governance and bring these questions, comments and opinions into an existing forum, and if need be to the UN General Assembly with full stakeholder participation (government and civil society).
London Internet Exchange (LINX)	We have found it useful to divide the issues under consideration into four categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the management of globally unique common resources such as IP address allocation policy and the management of the DNS, there does need to be a unified global policy; and we believe that the current system works well and should not be fundamentally altered;</li> <li>• With regard to infrastructure and engineering issues ... we believe that there is no useful role for an intergovernmental institution in this area;</li> <li>• With regard to issues relating to the use of Internet services by end users as well as issues such the business practices that touch upon the economic and social policies of nations, we believe</li> </ul>

	<p>that this is a complex area of legitimate national sovereignty. ... We note that there are multifarious existing relationships. ... We support building upon these relationships, with increasing participation by industry and civil society.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the development of less developed regions and nations, we consider that the existing approach and framework of intergovernmental institutions is broadly appropriate.</li> </ul>
Nominet UK	We consider that a notable success of the WGIG has been the process itself, which enabled multi-stakeholder participation on an equal footing within a UN framework.
Number Resource Organisation	The report clearly shows a strengthening of the concepts already agreed by the Nations during the first phase of the summit, which are usually known as "The Geneva Principles." ... Thus the interpretation of "Multilateral" as "Multistakeholder", as it has been broadly accepted during the WGIG process, is a very positive concept in relation to the Geneva principles and deserves the full attention of the WSIS.
South Centre	<p>The report ... offers very little that contributes to making the Internet either a powerful engine of development, a bridge to narrowing the so-called 'digital divide' or to increasing developing countries' effective participation in Internet Governance. The proposals instead, are stuck in the hangovers of 'technical assistance' and 'capacity building', having become buzzwords with little content.</p> <p>The decentralized and distributed implementation of the Internet's technical system and its end-to-end principle should not be compromised. There must be competition and choice.</p> <p>There is broad multilateral agreement that more appropriate governance principles and structures are needed to reflect the internationalization of the Internet architecture, its structures, interests of users and the impact across all spheres of society and countries.</p>
Verisign Inc.	VeriSign strongly supports the WGIG report principle that "the stable and secure functioning of the Internet" is of paramount importance and that its work and "recommendations aiming to improve current governance arrangements" should be assessed against this principle.
Vox Internet	The Internet has become a part of the social, cultural, economic life for many people. Before talking about Internet Governance mechanisms, it is necessary to find a global agreement on a stable and sustainable set of rules, based on a common view of Internet Structures, Applications and Uses. A new "social contract" should be the consequences of a common sense and common understanding of Internet value.
World Press Freedom Committee	<p>The report's central assertion -- "No single government should have a preeminent role in relation to international Internet governance." -- has surface attractiveness. But it ignores the practical difficulty that internationalization of Internet governance would provide opportunities for authoritarian governments that have already found effective ways to institute Internet censorship internally would be positioned to work within new international governance institutions to block the free flow of information globally. ...</p> <p>The report by the Working Group on Internet Governance ignores the reality that US authority has in practice been lightheaded, benign and non-interventionist. While existing arrangements are not theoretically ideal and could be subject to politically motivated abuse, there has not actually been any such abuse. ... "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." ...</p> <p>The philosophy behind the WGIG report strikes us as an example of what Voltaire terms "the best [as] the enemy of the good."</p>
<b>Working Definition of Internet Governance (Para 8. to 12)</b>	
Cameroun	It is clear, generalized, descriptive, concise and centred on processes.
Israel	Fully support the broad functional definition.
Japan	Applaud the definition which includes not only issues related to Internet names and Addresses, but also includes other significant public policy issues
Korea (Rep)	Agree to the definition which ensures the participation from the private sector and civil society
Turkey	The definition of Internet governance and the established four key public policy areas are instrumental to understand internet-centric issues.
USA	Understandable definition.
BT	<p>Support the concept of inclusiveness proposed in the definition.</p> <p>We consider that the involvement of all stakeholders will be an essential requirement.</p> <p>However, insufficient emphasis on the role and importance of users, developers and suppliers of the Internet has been factored into the multi stakeholder perspective by the WSIS/WGIG programme.</p>
CCBI/CSIA	<p>Support the definition</p> <p>We do not in any way support the notion that a more centralized process for making decision is needed.</p>
CENTR	Agree that 'Internet governance is not just Internet Names and Address'.

	The definition should make it clearer that the governments, the private sectors and the civil society participate on an equal footing “to shape the evolution and the use of the Internet”.
GLOCOM (IGTF-J)	Welcome the broad definition.
ICANN	Agree that the definition is appropriate and reflects the wide range of issues, stakeholders, and principles surrounding issues relating to the Internet. We strongly support Para 12.
ITU	Telecommunication is defined in 1012 of the ITU Constitution as: <i>Telecommunication: Any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, optical or other electromagnetic means.</i> There is lack of agreement with respect to the extent to which this definition encompasses the protocols, facilities, and arrangements used for the technical aspects of the telecommunication networks used by the Internet. Nevertheless, it is recognized that the ITU, and particularly technical groups within ITU-T, have studied and continue to study a range of technical aspects of the telecommunication networks used by the Internet, on its own and in cooperation with other relevant bodies. Specific definitions are provided, including the following for “Internet”: <i>A collection of interconnected networks using the Internet Protocol which allows them to function as a single, large virtual network</i>
Internet Governance Project	Useful definition There must be a definition of the principles and norms on which governance is to be based.
Internet Mark 2 Project	The biggest weakness in the report is that it does not convey an understanding of what the Internet was, or what it will be. This is characterised by the decision not to address the history of the Internet, nor to attempt to define the Internet in a definition of “Internet governance”.
Internet NZ	Most useful definition.
Internet Society (Int’l)	Workable definition. The definition covers all the different mechanisms that shape the function and use of the Internet on a global scale. It is particularly important that the WGIG definition does not confuse governance with government or in any way imply that governments have or should have the lead role in shaping the development of the Internet.
ITAA	Accept the definition. We particularly agree with and support the explanation of the definition and conclusion shown at Para 12.
Number Resource Organisation	The broad definition opted by WGIG serves to emphasize the large number of issues involved in the question of Internet Governance. It is a very significant development in the discussion of Internet Governance as it clearly shows that there needs to be an understanding of the complexity of this issue. This definition firmly establishes that fact that Internet Governance is much more than Internet Resource Management. It is only with this definition that any analysis of Internet Governance models and systems can take place.
UNESCO IFAP Russia	Welcome the definition of WGIG, which corresponds with position of Russian experts reflected in Memorandum of the round table “Internet Governance: Sight from Russia” (April 12, 2005, Moscow, Russia)
VeriSign Inc.	The working definition is sufficiently broad, by design, to accommodate the interest of the various actors. However, it does not take on substance or meaning until it is read in the context of existing entities and the global, regional, and national legal and regulatory systems that already provide necessary and significant principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs for the Internet infrastructure.
Vox Internet	We conclude it is important to differentiate <u>material governance</u> (a set of regulatory norms and institutions in the large sense) and <u>formal governance</u> (guided by directing principles such as transparency, responsibility and equity). The former must, among other things, separate the operational functions of managing technical resources and the missions of monitoring or supervising their guidelines.
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	Welcome the adoption of a broad definition This definition allows all stakeholders to bring to the table any existing or future Internet governance related issue and facilitates the development of a holistic and inclusive global dialogue on ways to continually improve governance arrangements.
<b>Public policy issues: Administration of the root zone files and domain name system (paras 13-15 and 76), allocation of domain names (para 21) and IP addressing (paras 22 and 77)</b>	



European Union	The EU Council stated that the main issues of the debate on the internationalization of Internet Governance were the management of the Internet's core resources, namely the domain name system, IP addresses, and the root server system.
Japan	Japan also recognize the value of the report identifying public policy issues relevant to Internet governance based on this definition and making recommendations to address these issues.
Korea (Rep.)	We would like to lay a special emphasis on the legitimate public policy and sovereignty concerns with respect to the management of ccTLDs. We recognize that ccTLD associated with a particular country is the national resource of the given country and important to the country's future social and economic development.
Turkey	It is generally accepted that there is an imbalance in the distribution of IPv4 addresses. We believe that during the transition to IPv6, IP addresses should be allocated fairly based on population and geographical distribution.
USA	Continued internationalization of the Internet is evidenced by the recent creation of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) for Latin America and Africa and the enhanced efforts of the Internet community to work towards an equitable distribution of IP addresses. The United States recognizes that governments have legitimate public policy and sovereignty concerns with respect to the management of their country code top level domains (ccTLD) and the United States is committed to working with the international community to address these concerns, bearing in mind the fundamental need to ensure stability and security of the Internet's DNS. With respect to international coordination of the DNS, WSIS should recognize the role of existing institutions, encourage effective, bottom up decision making at the local level, the continued deployment of mirror roots and responsible address allocation policies.
BT	The arguments and issues surrounding the unbalanced distribution of IP addresses, due predominately to the disparate development of the Internet across the globe are well known. It is also widely acknowledged that the distribution of resources would take a different and more equitable form if assignment commenced today. The problem is how to redress the balance without causing severe disruption threatening the stability of the system. Any such measures should be carefully considered alongside the key criteria of maintaining the effective operation of the Internet. Current Regional Internet Registry (RIR) assignment policies ensure all parties are treated in a fair and equitable manner and have the same opportunity to secure resources. Estimates prepared within the RIRs indicate that there will be no immediate exhaustion of IPv4 resources and IPv6 allocations are available to all parties on an equitable basis. BT does not support an approach where the distribution of IP addresses could also take place at the national level. The availability of addresses would not be enhanced, and such fragmentation would undoubtedly have a serious impact on routing aggregation.
CCBI/CSIA	(Para 22) IP addressing: Internet resources should be available to meet the needs of stakeholders globally. Plans to allocate and distribute Internet resources should be based on engineering to meet those growing needs while keeping the risks to the stability and security of the Internet low. Private sector leadership in this area provides the opportunity for governmental and civil society participation and should be supported.
CDT	By adding new Internet domains -- .info and .biz, for example -- ICANN has expanded the Internet space, and created more choices for users seeking to communicate. It has established procedures for re-delegation of country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs) and has approved the re-delegation of numerous ccTLDs to local organizations more representative of the national Internet community.
CENTR	Most issues are local and regional in nature and as such are best solved at the national level. They should be directed to Local Internet Communities in accordance with local laws, customs and procedures. In this respect, ccTLDs can be differentiated from gTLDs.
Eurolink	Technical standards may have far reaching implications e.g. on security, privacy, multilingualism, or intellectual property, which belong to societal and public policies issues, and therefore concern all stakeholders, specially when technical requirements happen to be illegal in some countries.
GLOCOM (IGTF)	We appreciate the assessment of current governance practices, in particular on IP Numbers, Domain Names, and Root zone files and servers, which include well-balanced, objective and historically precise description, both in the main report and the background report. As for the Internet logical infrastructure of DNS, IP address and Root Server management currently handled by ICANN framework, in particular the post 2006 governmental oversight, IGTF would like to provide the following comments. If we are to change the current framework, implementation should be done in a careful and step-by-step manner. We should avoid any sudden change that might risk damaging the operational stability of the Internet. We also request that thorough consideration be given to the potential implications of policy changes over technical and operational aspects by collecting opinions from the relevant people.

ICANN	<p>The policies and procedures for authorizing and overseeing Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) is one of the main areas of ICANN’s work. ICANN welcomes the endorsement of the WGIG to its work in this field, and agrees with the need to further develop these policies, with a full understanding of the complexity of the matters. ICANN, however, finds questionable the WGIG report’s statement that new gTLDs have a significant impact on the equitable distribution of resources, and would welcome a clarification, if possible, of what the WGIG intended with it. Upon introduction of a new TLD, all users of the Internet have access to it, regardless of location. ICANN does recognize that in the long term the operation of gTLDs should involve geographically distributed operators whose operational and fiscal competence has been established.</p> <p>Since ICANN’s formation it has undergone two rounds (in 2000 and 2004) resulting in the designation of new TLD. In addition, in September 2004, ICANN published a strategy for the introduction of new top-level domains (TLDs). The envisaged strategy takes into account many relevant technical, economic, socio-political and cultural issues. ....</p> <p>In June 2005 ICANN posted for community input 5 important issue areas arising, which include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Whether and how many TLDs should ICANN designate and with what frequency;</li> <li>2) Which naming conventions should apply;</li> <li>3) Which allocation method or methods should be used;</li> <li>4) What conditions should apply for new TLD operators;</li> <li>5) As a special case, how will the deployment of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) at the top level impact discussion and findings on the questions above.</li> </ol> <p>ICANN continues to undertake this work in close consultation with ICANN’s Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC).</p> <p>While ICANN has heard community concerns over the allocation of IP addresses, it observes that the work of the five Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) and the Address Supporting Organisation under ICANN (ASO) have successfully ensured the distribution of IP addressing based on needs. ICANN has adopted procedures on the Review of Global Internet Number Resource Policies. With the deployment of IPv6 (the new IP addressing numbering protocol) global network interoperability continues to be one of ICANN’s primary goals. The RIRs have been providing regular information and clarifications regarding IP addressing space. ...</p> <p>ICANN agrees completely that any transition from IPv4 to IPv6 “should ensure that allocation policies for IP addresses provide equitable access to resources,” while noting that there may be different interpretations of the criteria for defining “equitable.” .... It should be noted that the technical community does not expect that IPv4 operation will cease any time soon. Rather, both IPv4 and IPv6 will co-operate for an indeterminate period of time, measurable in years, if not decades.</p>
ITU	<p>ITU Council 2005 has approved the publication of “A Handbook on Internet Protocol (IP) Based Networks and Related Topics and Issues”. Chapter 3 of that Handbook contains a discussion of key policy questions associated with the general use of IP-based networks and introduces the topic as follows:</p> <p>“As mentioned previously, the one constant with respect to communications technology is perpetual change. The technological changes have driven, and have been driven by, the policy changes. Governments around the world are faced with the issues arising from these fundamental changes, in particular how to manage the policy issues that are typical of any “network product”. By “network product” we mean any product whose utility or value increases more than linearly with the number of users. Network products include roads, railroads, air traffic systems, postal systems, and, of course, telecommunications networks. The policy issues that are typical of such “network products”, and that may apply to the general use of IP-based networks include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Universal access/service provisions</li> <li>2. Consumer Protection</li> <li>3. Supervision of dominant market players</li> <li>4. Emergency services</li> <li>5. Access for disabled persons</li> <li>6. Security (e.g., law enforcement, cyber-crime, legal intercept) and privacy protection</li> <li>7. Allocation of scare resources</li> <li>8. Dispute Resolution”</li> </ol>
Internet Mark 2 Project	<p>Some of the issues which stand out and are becoming increasingly problematic include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difficulties in deployment of DNSSEC and IPv6</li> </ul>
Internet Society	<p>The first three recommendations (and the ones that received the most attention within the WGIG process)—regarding the Domain Name System, IP addressing, and interconnection costs—received far more attention than seems warranted if the goal of WSIS is to bring the benefits of IT to all</p>

	<p>people of the world.</p> <p>One important area that is coordinated under consensus agreements is Internet number resource distribution. The five RIRs (AfriNIC serving Africa, APNIC, serving the Asia-Pacific region; ARIN, serving Northern America; LACNIC, serving Latin America and the Caribbean; and RIPE NCC, serving Europe, the Middle East, Central Asia) develop allocation principles and procedures in regional fora which are open not only to RIR members, but to all interested parties including Governments, private sector and civil society. They are specifically and formally accountable to their regional communities through defined open policy processes, and also to ICANN through the global policy processes of the Address Supporting Organization.</p> <p>IP addresses are endpoint network identifiers that intrinsically have no national attributes, and allocation principles regarding their distribution must be guided primarily by technical considerations relating to the viability of the operation of the Internet. A 'national allocation scheme' would not only be impractical, but it could also lead to fragmentation and de-stabilization of the Internet.</p> <p>We need to promote the adoption of new standards such as IPv6, which will enable new, innovative uses of the Internet.</p>
InternetNZ	<p>InternetNZ contests the concept promoted in the WGIG report relating to "national sovereignty" over the ccTLD namespace, and believes that further debate is required to fully understand the tenets of RFC1591, and its continued applicability today. As most ccTLD operators offer virtually unrestricted registration of names, rather than limiting registrations purely to residents of a country, it is arguable that there is no specific sovereign right or national attachment to a ccTLD. The fact that the ISO3166 list was used for the allocation of ccTLDs initially was not made with any view to a related sovereign right, and could have easily alternatively been the IDD telecommunications code for the country, or merely a random number.</p>
Internet Society (Pacific Islands Chapter)	<p>PICISOC would like to make a short comment on the statement on the limitation of the 13 root servers. While factually true, we find this sentence detrimental to the WSIS process. We would have hoped that the group would have moved on from non-issues as any country in the world can have an any cast root server. The original root servers are now only identified for historical purposes and not for the stability of the network, be it physical or political.</p>
LINX	<p>We have found that with regard to the management of globally unique common resources such as IP address allocation policy and the management of the DNS, there does need to be a unified global policy; and we believe that the current system works well and should not be fundamentally altered.</p> <p>Internet protocol (IP) addresses have the property that they are globally unique; this is an inherent feature of the Internet protocol. If global uniqueness of Internet addresses is not preserved the Internet Protocol, and hence the Internet, would not function properly. We therefore consider that adequate co-ordination of the global uniqueness of Internet addresses is a critical function failure of which would lead to fragmentation of the Internet.</p> <p>Internet domain names in the Domain Name System are also a globally unique resource. Although DNS is not literally crucial to continued Internet operation in the same way that Internet protocol addressing is crucial, almost all existing protocols and services currently rely on it and its failure would cause massive technical and economic disruption until the disruption was repaired or a replacement was deployed.</p>
Nominet	<p>Nominet strongly believes that management and policy procedures for individual ccTLDs should be done as locally as possible – thus ensuring that local requirements are met through national stakeholder involvement. It is only where issues cannot be resolved locally that a global solution is required. In our view, it is only a small minority of technical issues which need to be considered on a global scale, for example technical standards which affect interoperability.</p>
Number Resource Organisation	<p>We observed with satisfaction that the WGIG made only one recommendation in relation to this important issue, as this implies an acknowledgment of the effectiveness of the RIR system. As to the recommendation itself, that is to say the recommendation of ensuring equitable access to resources, especially in the context of IPv6 deployment, we express our agreement. This goal is an aim of the RIR system itself, and one toward which we strive through the ongoing operation of our open policy processes.</p>
South Centre	<p>The transition of the US stewardship over the unique Domain Name System and its numeric IP Addressing System and the administration of the Root Server System offers governments and their stake-holding communities opportunities to participate in the new international governance arrangements, especially as the Internet in all its aspects is evolving to meet the needs of diverse constituencies and users. Informed participation, reflecting the functional, geographic, multilingual and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making is underscored.</p>

	<p>[Governments] will therefore take appropriate steps regarding delegations and redelegations of their country code top-level domain names (ccTLDs) in consultation with the not-for-profit Incorporated ICANN and in accordance with the principles governing the processes.</p> <p>The critical core resources of the Internet Architecture are coordinated by ICANN, i.e. the allocation and assignment of three sets of unique identifiers of the Internet— domain names, IP addresses and autonomous system (AS) numbers, and protocol ports and parameter numbers. The relevant bodies, namely the four groups of primary stakeholders will need to be consulted in any transition process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) gTLDs and ccTLDs registries that depend on the root to direct potential users to them,</li> <li>ii) Root name server operators that serve the root zone file,</li> <li>iii) Internet service providers (ISPs) and intranets that rely on the root to enable them to do look-ups on the TLDs, and</li> <li>iv) The technical communities that define protocols and standards affecting the root and its operation.</li> </ul> <p>[Governments] agree that without prejudice to the integrity of the technical systems, entries and modifications to the root zone files, in particular, those that are within the sovereign jurisdiction of States will be managed accordingly. There is a strong shared interest in maintaining the reliability of Internet services by ensuring that alternative root systems incompatible with the technical architecture of the present unique domain name system are not deployed. The expansion of the numbers of root name servers will be a priority for deployment in developing countries and transition economies.</p>
VeriSign, Inc.	<p>The first category—name-and-address administration—has evolved over the past decade through a private sector led, public-private partnership that has facilitated the rapid, global proliferation of the Internet infrastructure in a secure and stable manner. Indeed, considering the expansion of the use of Internet names and connected host computers over the last ten year period, it is a testament to the public-private model that the Internet has scaled on a global basis without any fundamental or systemic interruption. Moreover, this model has created an environment that encourages private sector innovation that is driving the development of next generation networks and services.</p>
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	<p>Governments have legitimate public policy and sovereignty concerns with respect to the management of their ccTLD. No TLD should be removed from the root zone file, nor should any redelegation occur, without the explicit approval of the government or economy responsible for the TLD in the case of ccTLD and contracting party with ICANN in the case of any other TLD.</p>
<b>Interconnection costs (paras 16 and 78)</b>	
Cameroun	<p>The Republic of Cameroun supports, among other things, two proposals: a) Development of regional IP backbones and creation of local and regional access points, b) Financing of initiatives that encourage connectivity, internet exchange points and production of local content for developing countries</p>
Korea (Rep.)	<p>With respect to the interconnection cost, we attach importance to the alternative solutions for the countries that pay the full cost of the international circuits, and we are in favour of the development of regional IP backbones and the establishment of local and regional access points in order to lower the access prices of the developing countries. Moreover, these efforts will also contribute to bridging the digital divides among the developing and under-developed countries.</p>
Rwanda	<p>In the recommendation for interconnection costs there is suggestion to encourage donors to help with advanced connectivity projects and other similar projects. There is however, some work to be done before this to convince donors to look at funding IT infrastructure. In Rwanda's experience there is only a very small number of donors who approach IT projects with an infrastructure paradigm, most look at IT as being "cross-cutting" i.e. IT in education, IT in health etc. This has the result that a coherent information infrastructure is often overlooked by donors and that any infrastructure projects are often private sector driven. The consequences for countries like Rwanda who are dependant on aid, is that funds for national and regional information infrastructure are hard to obtain, in fact their importance is not well understood by many donor entities. The point to note is that there may be some work to be done in changing donor's ways of viewing IT before they can be encouraged to fund connectivity. The few donors who are active in information infrastructure could be encouraged to convince other donors to change their approach.</p>
Switzerland	<p>We are concerned about connexion charges for the developing countries and hope that solutions can be found: these should be oriented towards public-private partnerships.</p>
Turkey	<p>ISPs based in countries remote from Internet backbones, particularly in the developing countries, pay the full cost of the international circuits. We believe that regional distribution of root servers, development of regional IP backbones, and the establishment of local and regional access points may contribute to solving this problem.</p>

USA	The United States believes that arrangements for international Internet connections should continue to be the subject of private, commercial negotiations. The international settlement regime that applies under the telecommunications regime cannot be applied to Internet traffic. WSIS should look to ongoing work on this important topic in existing institutions, such as ITU and the OECD, and encourage national authorities to take steps to open markets to competitive entry and promote increased competition in the market place. A competitive market creates an enabling environment that encourages investment and/or international infrastructure assistance. The development of regional Internet Exchange Points and local content should also be encouraged.
BT	BT believes that interconnection is best handled by commercial negotiation. As Internet traffic grows in areas outside Europe and North America there will be increasing opportunities for regional traffic exchange arrangements; and as web hosting develops in these areas there will be increasing demand for connectivity from European and North American customers.
CCBI/CSIA	It is important to recognize that the problem is often one of national regulations that either do not promote competitive pricing or do not help to create transparency in telecoms costing and due to the lack of competitive ISPs in many countries, who can build and support a base of users and host content locally and regionally. The problem as outlined in the definition of it and the recommendations do not fully address the scope of what must change in affordability of user devices. This issue is often exacerbated by lack of competition in basic telecommunications infrastructure which includes regulations that are needed to promote competition in infrastructure consistent with the WTO reference paper. The problem definition and recommendations do not fully address the scope of what must change in affordability of user devices, creation/hosting/mirroring of content and also fail to recognize the role of emerging wireless approaches to local connectivity. There is an underlying theme that still considers that the Internet is like the telephony networks. Given the suggestions throughout the WGIG report and discussions related to Internet Governance that various issues should be given to governmental or intergovernmental entities, it should be pointed out that an intergovernmental entity has been working on international interconnection costs for more than 7 years. International infrastructure has grown significantly and costs have decreased where procompetitive national policies or regulations exist. Investment and/or international infrastructure assistance are more likely in such enabling environments.
ITU	Section 4.4 of "A Handbook on Internet Protocol (IP) Based Networks and Related Topics and Issues" discusses the issue of international Internet connectivity.
ITAA	With respect to interconnection costs, they are being studied in a number of fora around the world, including the ITU. It is important to recognize that much of the problem can be traced back to national regulations that do not promote competition, and even restrict it. While the transit market is competitive and characterized by steeply declining costs according to the OECD, connectivity to the nearest Network Access Point (NAP) is often controlled by a local monopoly provider with little incentive to provide competitive pricing. Progress is being made where regulations and legal frameworks are clarified, an enabling environment is created, Internet exchange points are established, and local content is encouraged. ITAA applauds the reference in the Report, "...to provide funding for initiatives that advance connectivity, Internet exchange points (IXPs) and local content for developing countries." Since 2002, in particular, significant changes have occurred in traffic dynamics and growth of Internet connectivity within some countries and within different regions. ... Further, there is no exploration of possible roles for wireless and other platforms as alternative Internet access mediums within a country, or a region.
Internet Society (Int'l)	We welcome the WGIG report's recommendation (in Paragraph 78) that more funding be provided for "initiatives that advance connectivity, Internet exchange points (IXPs) and local content for developing countries" since such steps would have a major and near-term impact on the cost of connecting national networks to the global backbone and provide Internet users (and prospective Internet users) more choice and better access to Internet services and content.
South Centre	The policy determination of the Internet and its infrastructure or services, as information or telecommunication services, is critically important in shaping the kind of regulation in many jurisdictions. In certain situations, this will be of great importance to small ISPs especially in developing countries dependent on conditions of competition, including through cost-related pricing models for interconnection. The policy responses in the technical and operational fields will be subject to the laws of natural sciences. There must be far greater emphasis on the scientific principles and technology applications as central public policy issues if capacity for informed participation is to be enhanced in developing countries.
WSIS CS	With regard to international interconnection charges, the Caucus believes that there must be

Internet Governance Caucus	international rules encouraging fair, cost-oriented charging, considering that developing countries pay the full cost of the circuits involved. This is a matter of considerable urgency that should be investigated in relevant international fora like ITU, WTO and the proposed forum.
<b>Internet stability, security and cybercrime (paras 17 and 79)</b>	
Cameroun	For an efficient fight against insecurity and the Internet crime, the report proposes strong collaboration, for instance through the adoption of international treaties related to these issues. In regard to functionality of the Internet and its cross-border character, international treaties are more efficient to solve problems than any national legislation.
EU and the acceding countries (Romania and Bulgaria)	The EU Stresses that stability, dependability and robustness of the Internet remain a high priority; security and spam are important issues in this field. A global common understanding of the issue of Internet security must be developed. This includes the use of security policies in general at all relevant levels.
Israel	The State of Israel reaffirms its strong conviction that the use of the Internet to commit any sort of criminal activity should not be tolerated. As Israel understands there already exists a wide agreement on the definition of Cyber Crime and relevant spheres of action. These include crimes committed against computers such as for instance intrusions and distribution of computer viruses; "classic" felonies which involve computers and Internet such as fraud, forgery, pedophilia etc; and computer forensics. Israel believes that it is of the interest of the states of the world to take a firm hand against those who exploits the Internet in order to commit illegal acts, which, by their very nature, infringe the basic human rights and dignity of people the world over. However, due to the global nature of the Internet, this task can only be completed if all states will join together and share their information regarding these cross borders offenders This collaboration may include: close cooperation between international law enforcement agencies to ensure flow of information on real time; sharing of professional knowledge in order to expose investigators to a large number of softwares and other means of high-tech investigation tools; joint investigations to allow the freezing of digital evidences. This need for international collaboration, can be viewed as a golden opportunity to increase the role of the GAC in ICANN.
Rwanda	The suggestions for cybercrime centre around increased cooperation. However many countries like Rwanda have yet to develop national laws on cybercrime. The need for national laws on data protection is mentioned in the report – why not for cybercrime?
Turkey	We believe that the international cooperation in fighting against cybercrime is of vital importance. But, the measures taken on the grounds of security or fighting against cybercrime should be in line with the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the WSIS Declaration of Principles.
USA	Building confidence and security in the use of ICT systems and networks is a priority of the United States. These systems and networks are subject to threats and vulnerabilities from multiple sources and different geographic locations; security requires a concerted preventive effort by all stakeholders, appropriate to their roles. National action and international collaboration across a range of legal, enforcement, administrative and technical areas are required to build a global culture of cybersecurity. In developing a national cybersecurity strategy, governments should draw upon existing structures and processes such as: the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, UNGA Resolutions “Combating the criminal misuse of information technologies” (55/63 and 56/121) and “Creation of a Global Culture of Cybersecurity” (57/239), and actions taken by computer security incident response teams (CSIRTs).
BT	BT does not share the concerns in the Report on the absence of multilateral mechanisms in the field of security and cybercrime, and does not support the creation of an institution or mechanism in this area. The UN General Assembly itself offers guidelines for countries on security and 46 countries, including countries outside of Europe, have participated in development of the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, which offers a very good standard for countries to implement. It should be acknowledged that there is no single "cybercrime", therefore no single solution to the problem. Furthermore, many “cybercrimes” come and go, with many other so-called being merely traditional crimes and frauds facilitated by the internet as a communication path instead of by phone, fax or post.
CCBI/CSIA	CCBI/CSIA do not agree with the problem as identified. There are multilateral mechanisms and tools that are beginning to address these issues. For example, the Cybercrime Convention of the Council of Europe (COE) is open to countries to join and provides a very good standard for countries to implement. The OECD and the UN General Assembly also offer guidelines on security, which countries can turn to for guidance on updating laws and policy in their country. Furthermore, many

	<p>countries have existing memorandums of understanding (MOUs) for law enforcement cooperation, International Consumer Protection and Enforcement Network (ICPEN), etc. The issue is best addressed by more outreach and information sharing, which CCBI/CSIA supports as needed, but not necessarily by new mechanisms. In fact, adding new mechanisms may deter the productive work of the existing mechanisms. A better approach would be to seek to increase awareness and involvement in existing mechanisms.</p>
CSIA	<p>[Para 79] CSIA supports the recommendations in this section but underscores the fact that many organizations are already working on these issues and have developed substantive and important arrangements and procedures. Cooperation and information exchange should be the emphasis of future activities.</p>
ICANN	<p>[Para 17]. Internet stability and security are paramount objectives for ICANN, as it carries out its responsibilities together with many other organisations and entities involved in the Internet's operation. In this field, ICANN's main concerns are the assurance that domain names will resolve uniquely to IP addresses; that IP addresses and ASNs (Autonomous System Numbers) will have been assigned unequivocally, each to a specific organisation or individual, and will resolve uniquely to a network resource such as a computer, a port, or network; and that the parameters associated with Internet protocols, such as port numbers for specific protocols, will be assigned uniquely and can be easily referenced. Further and as part of this same mandate, ICANN's functions and responsibilities include the security and stability of the Domain Name System's root nameservers and the certainty of the propagation of the root zone files, by mechanisms such as DNSSEC, as well as the continued availability of domain name resolutions even in face of catastrophic physical, computational, or other events affecting name registries. ICANN performs the related operations, which include the IANA function, in an environment of continuous improvement.</p> <p>[Para 79] ICANN's first core value is "Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet." ICANN's role in this area brings together many different stakeholders and players involved in the areas of work that contribute to the interoperability and unique resolvability of domain names. ICANN performs the related functions in this area, which include the IANA function, in an environment of continuous improvement. ICANN's Security and Stability Advisory Committee advises the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems, and has a Liaison to the ICANN Board. It is important to note that many issues related to Internet stability, security and cybercrime are under the jurisdiction of national and international agreements.</p>
ITU	<p>The contributions submitted by ITU include several documents dealing with security, notably the chair's report of the WSIS Thematic Meeting on Cybersecurity, 28 June – 1 July 2005.</p>
Internet Society (Int'l)	<p>We strongly endorse Paragraph 79 on Internet stability, security, and cybercrime, which is consistent with ISOC's sixth policy priority. In the survey of ISOC members on their reaction to the WGIG report, the three top priority areas were Freedom of Expression, Security, and Privacy. More than 55 percent of respondents indicated that these were "very high priorities." In contrast, fewer than 45 percent of respondents felt that domain names and IP addressing were "very high priorities."</p>
South Centre	<p>Governments note the several Internet-related policy issues identified that go beyond the strictly technical Internet architectural issues of design and implementation. Some of these issues influence and in turn are influenced by the specific characteristics of the technology and regulatory framework. Among these are Spam, Network Security and Information Systems, Cybercrime and Cybersecurity. Data and Content (accuracy, offerings and access), Whois Services (internationalization), Privacy Issues, including Spyware, Intellectual Property, and Open Source and Free Software are among issues of special concern to broadening the accessibility of the Internet to users.</p>
VeriSign	<p>The WGIG report cites the lack of multilateral mechanisms to ensure the network stability and security of Internet infrastructure services and applications. The report also cites the lack of efficient tools and mechanisms to be used by countries to prevent and prosecute crimes committed in other jurisdictions, using technological means that might be located within or outside the territory where the crime had a negative effect.</p> <p>With regard to the first point, national governments already play an important collaborative role in ensuring network stability and security. In fact, the infrastructure of the Internet which sustains the network's stability and security consists of a wide range of elements in addition to the DNS, which operate with less visibility, but no less efficiency and effectiveness than the DNS. These infrastructures—both physical and logical—include backbones, switching, global and regional peering points and subnetwork routing facilities, operated by dozens of private entities that cooperate with each other through standards activities, contractual arrangements and other institutional and</p>



	<p>informal cooperative arrangements. When one truly recognizes the multitude of infrastructures and entities that constitute “the Internet,” it becomes clear that no one government exerts control over the Internet and that collaboration of a broad and, in some cases, highly specialized nature is already in place. Additionally, with the backdrop of 9/11 and other terrorist attacks around the world, the role for government participation in addressing security considerations across the broad range of Internet infrastructures is self-evident, but clearly not exclusive.</p> <p>National governments must recognize that, with regard to the “stability and security” of the relatively narrow aspect of DNS administration, it is the industry led public-private model that has facilitated the operation and coordination of this key Internet infrastructure, and is responsible for the global roll out of the DNS in a stable and secure manner. While there are certainly areas where existing DNS administration can be improved, there is no need to create new mechanisms to achieve that end. Where governments endeavour to improve and ensure Internet stability and security more broadly speaking, they should do so with the active and continuous participation of the private sector stewards of critical aspects of the Internet infrastructure.</p> <p>With regard to the stated lack of efficient tools and mechanisms to be used by countries to prevent and prosecute Internet crimes, VeriSign encourages government engagement on this front and points to the Council of Europe Cybercrime Convention as an example where national governments have already collaborated constructively to provide a basis for law enforcement officials to address and prosecute criminal activity migrating to the Internet. VeriSign supports the ratification of the Cybercrime treaty by the United States Senate and by other countries that have not already done so, and the prompt development of national laws and law enforcement capabilities to effectuate commitments in the Convention. ...</p> <p>VeriSign joins the growing body of commentators who believe abuses such as spam and identity theft are symptoms of failures in both deployments of adequate available technologies by users and network managers as well as failures of legal structures by host governments.</p> <p>While increased government involvement and collaboration is required in this area, VeriSign notes that it is axiomatic that government regulatory mandates of technology generally (as in response to abuses) become less effective as they become more explicit and indeed hinder technological response to such abuses. Effective training of investigators and prosecutors, coupled with vigorous prosecution, are the best supplement to vigilant deployment of best-in-breed network security and data custody tools in combating the range of on-line fraud, crime, and consumer abuses such as spam.</p>
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	<p>Invasions of privacy must be prevented, and when necessary, there must be clear rules setting forth the conditions for surveillance, subject to independent judicial authorisation and oversight. We strongly support paragraphs 24, 25 and 81, 83 of the report. Measures taken in relation to the Internet on grounds of security, stability or to fight crime must not violate rights to freedom of expression or rights expressed in Article 19 and Article 12.</p>
<p><b>Countering spam (Paras 18 and 80)</b></p>	
Cameroun	<p>SPAM generates a significant share of traffic and contributes noticeably to degradation of the quality of connection, particularly in developing countries that do not have adequate infrastructure. In regard to functionality of the Internet and its cross-border character Cameroun proposes the international cooperation and international treaties that are more efficient to solve problems than any national legislation.</p>
Israel	<p>The problem of spam is elusive, both on the technical side and the legal side, mainly due to its trans-border features. In this context, the importance of international collaboration is all the more important. Up to now, the use of technological measures to combat spam has not been satisfactory. In addition, more effective technological management of spam may have other negative implications. It seems, therefore, that legal coordination in this field is also necessary. As the OECD task force on spam has shown, spam may prove as a dangerous barrier to internet access in developing countries, and consequently its containment should be part of the connectivity and access agenda. Israel believes that the WSIS forum should treat spam as one of the negative phenomena of the internet, which requires coordinated international action, for the robustness of the internet. Indeed, we think there is need for international legal collaboration, alongside the technical cooperation.</p>
Rwanda	<p>Is spam notably different from other cybercrimes? There are any number of cybercrimes (attacks to confidentiality, privacy, integrity, denial of service, viruses, Trojans, worms)... We feel the generic term of cybercrime includes also spam and consequently wonder why it is singled for attention out here. If there are pressing reasons to the separate examination of spam, they should be explicitly mentioned.</p>
USA	<p>Increasingly, spam is, in large part, a security issue: spam is one way in which viruses and other</p>



	<p>security threats can be delivered to computers. Industry must play a lead role in developing technical tools to address this problem. In addition, many of these security threats often result from criminal conduct. The Convention on Cybercrime provides a comprehensive framework to address these threats. In 2003, the United States enacted an anti-spam law established a framework of civil and criminal enforcement tools to help America's consumers, businesses, and families combat unsolicited commercial e-mail. However, the United States does not believe that the statute alone will solve spam. The United States approach to combating spam relies on a combination of legal tools for effective law enforcement, development and deployment of technology tools and best practices by the private sector, and consumer and business education. We believe that work undertaken to combat spam should ensure that email continues to be a viable and valuable means of communication. Governments have a role to play in educating consumers and enforcing spam laws. To this end, governments should encourage spam enforcement agencies to join the London Action Plan on international spam enforcement cooperation.</p>
BT	<p>As stated within the WGIG report, no unified or co-ordinated approach towards resolving issues related to SPAM exists, but BT would argue that a 'unified' approach would be unnecessary and unworkable. The threats posed by SPAM cannot be dealt with by the action of any single group. Instead, it requires a co-ordinated approach that combines best practice with technological tools and regulatory policies that tackle the root cause of the problem as well as its effect. BT supports the use of 'tool kits' such as those prepared by the OECD and ASEM, which offer a range of best practice models in resolving the issue of Spam. In the UK, co-operative initiatives have been developed between government, the private sector and consumers/users. These initiatives, and the technological solutions that arise from them, are proving an effective response to this global problem.</p>
CCBI/CSIA	<p>[Para 18] The statement that "there is no unified approach" implies that it is possible, practical, or effective to create such an approach. CCBI/CSIA does not agree. Work by ITU, APEC and the OECD has indicated that anti-spam efforts require multiple approaches and that no "silver bullet" exists to address spam. Through the work of the WGIG on the issues papers that delved into the issue of spam, there was recognition that a unified definition is not possible given cultural differences and other elements. CCBI/CSIA encourages the distribution and use of toolkits such as was called for by the OECD. Such toolkits recognize that there is no one single solution to spam and offer a range of complementary approaches with a role for all stakeholders. ICC and other organizations have developed resources and toolkits that are important contributions to resolving the issue of spam. In addition, CCBI/CSIA notes that many countries have ISP associations and other private sector initiatives cooperating to address spam, and that technical solutions are being developed that hold promise for dealing with spam at the origin. Such initiatives should be supported.</p> <p>[Para 80] CCBI supports the recognition of the need for a "toolkit approach" and efforts of all stakeholders. ... CCBI believes that PrepCom-3 should complete drafting of the WSIS text and that any attempts to develop a separate annex on spam at WSIS would not be appropriate.</p>
ITU	<p>The contributions submitted by ITU include several documents on countering spam, including the comprehensive report submitted to Council 2005.</p>
Internet Society (Int'l)	<p>Paragraph 18 on Spam states that there is "No unified, coordinated approach," and implies that it is possible to gain a global consensus on a definition of spam and to come to global agreement on anti-spam laws. This clearly reflects the top-down, government world view — and not the consensus view of the entire Working Group. In contrast, Paragraph 80 on Spam reflects both of the world views described above. That paragraph makes clear that "policies and technical instruments to combat spam," "industry self-regulation," and "awareness-raising and user education" are all needed. Clearly, Paragraph 80 does not leave the impression that there is one global, legal or regulatory solution to the problem of spam. It does call for the final document(s) of the World Summit to include an annex on how best to address spam. We trust that such an annex would reflect the world view of Paragraph 80 rather than focus entirely on government regulation and the role of intergovernmental organizations.</p>
World Press Freedom Committee	<p>The report also suggests "enforceable global standards" for privacy and data protection rights over the Internet - providing endless opportunities for governmentally inspired mischief, restrictions and controls. The report's approach to "spam" leaves open the possibility that authoritarian governments could define political campaigning over the Internet as "spam" and therefore undesirable.</p>
<p><b>Meaningful participation in global policy development (para 19 and 82)</b></p>	
Egypt	<p>Egypt perceives the Internet Governance debate more as a continuous dialogue which should involve the participation of all stakeholders from developing and developed countries, and should seriously take into consideration the dynamism and future development of the Internet.</p>
Rwanda	<p>We feel it is acceptable that the producer of content decides to make it public or not. However, if</p>

	<p>reference is being made to the same international organizations that participate in global internet policy development, then the phrasing should change, eg. replace “some” by the explicit names of the organizations or state that information produced in the process of global internet policy development should be put in the public domain and be easily accessible.</p> <p>(Bullet 4) What is meant by “remote areas”? Everywhere is in a sense remote, depending on the context – Bujumubura may be remote from Washington but is quite convenient to Kigali. No location for a meeting will be universally easily accessible and more accessible locations may not be geographically obvious. For example, some European locations are more accessible to Kigali than are West African locations. In any case, the issue here is more capacity, both in terms of finance and technical knowledge for some stakeholders to attend meetings, than the location and frequency of meetings themselves.</p> <p>As a side note, the use of the term “remote areas” is used elsewhere in the IG report and the background report to mean areas which are remote from the Internet backbone. This is clear and well defined, but seems to have been wrongly applied in this paragraph.</p>
Switzerland	We appreciate in these recommendations the highlighting of the principles of transparency, of participation open to the parties involved and of fostering the capacity building in the developing countries.
Turkey	Limitations should be removed, costs should be decreased and various financial and administrative support should be provided to the governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector from developing countries and LDCs, in governance mechanisms in order to promote their participation.
USA	The United States encourages the participation of developing countries in ICT forums as a complement to national development efforts related to ICTs. As such, it is important to develop the capacity of government officials and other stakeholders who can address the complicated issues and difficult choices raised by the evolving ICT environment. Through the US Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI), the United States, together with US industry, has demonstrated its commitment to capacity building by providing tuition free training courses for policy makers around the world in the telecommunications, broadcast and ICT-related fields.
BT	Meaningful and equitable multi stakeholder participation in global policy development is essential. Participation by developing countries is already growing within the existing forums for discussion and this should be actively encouraged. A co-ordinated approach through existing forums and outreach programs could go a long way towards achieving the desired result of WSIS in this area (see our comments on capacity building below).
CCBI/CSIA	The issue of meaningful participation should be considered in light of the appropriate participation given the mandates and structures of organizations. It is critical to address this issue in terms of cooperation/ exchange of information between the various bodies addressing issues related to the Internet. The phrase “there is often a lack of transparency, openness and participatory processes” only applies to some organizations and then only to varying degrees. It should not be interpreted that this is equally characteristic of all organizations. In addition, it is important to recognize that promoting cooperation between organizations can best be achieved via “neutral” mechanisms in which organizations can participate in a fair and equal environment.
ICANN	<p>ICANN agrees with the importance of meaningful participation in global policy development, and its multi-stakeholder model is designed to ensure the broadest possible participation from interested individuals and groups in all regions of the world. The participation of organisations and individuals in the processes of ICANN decision-making is made meaningful by: assuring that such participation can be continued both online and in physical meetings, so as to reduce the potential disadvantage for participants endowed with weak infrastructures; workshops in the ICANN meetings that facilitate the up-to-date understanding of issues under development or discussion; regional meetings and workshops such as those started by the GAC to bring government officials up to the latest information; and full respect for the internal operational autonomy of its constituencies, as far as compatible with the coherent functioning of the organisation.</p> <p>ICANN continues to seek greater participation from developing countries, including government participation in the GAC, and respective stakeholder participation in ICANN’s Advisory Committees and Supporting Organisations. Additionally, representation from all of ICANN’s regions in the ICANN structure is required under ICANN’s Bylaws. Participation via the Internet has provided a meaningful way to enable participants to take part in discussions within ICANN and other organisations. The availability online of materials, transcripts, speeches, whether for a specific meeting or a longer term discussion means that if there is access to the Internet all interested around the world have equal access to the information and ability to participate.</p>
ITU	The report to Council 05 on Resolution 102 activities outlines ITU’s main activities with respect to

	IP-based networks and related topics.
Internet Society (Int'l)	We believe strongly that the goals laid out in Section V.A—multi-stakeholder participation, more involvement by governments, and a greater voice for Less Developed Countries--would not be best accomplished by creating a new forum linked to the United Nations. Instead, these goals could be quickly and effectively achieved by creating or expanding dozens of different fora under each of the different intergovernmental and non-governmental international organizations and consortia that are dealing with different aspects of Internet policy and Internet technology.
Internet Society (Bulgaria)	It is critical for Bulgaria, as for other economies in transition, to build, maintain and develop proper communications between the businesses, the civil society and the government. They should be equal partners, and coordination between them on the Internet issues should be working really well. We understand the WSIS as part of this process, and we hope it will continue to involve all stakeholders to achieve its goals.
LINX	<p>We note that there are many bilateral and multilateral exchanges between government bodies, at many levels including the practitioner level, some of which include participation or consultation with industry and civil society groups.</p> <p>We welcome intergovernmental co-operation on individual issues on an as-needed basis. We encourage consultation with industry and civil society, and their participation in intergovernmental meetings when appropriate.</p> <p>We recommend that governments increase the participation of industry and civil society within the development of policy regarding use of the Internet so as to utilise all available expertise and avoid unintended consequences.</p> <p>We note and acknowledge the role of intergovernmental institutions, including the United Nations, and bilateral and multilateral relationships in providing assistance for development</p> <p>We note that assistance for development may take many forms, including aid, trade agreements, provision of technical assistance and the encouragement of appropriate policies in the locality likely to result in development.</p> <p>We counsel caution with regard to the financial consequences of any recommendation that industry provide support for less developed nations and regions, as an adverse financial impact on business impedes investment and so may be significantly counter-productive.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that financial assistance for less developed nations and regions is the proper role of governments and intergovernmental institutions.</p>
<b>Capacity building (para 20)</b>	
Cameroun	Faced with the problem of insufficient financial resources in developing countries for physical participation in international meetings, and insufficient human resources qualified in domain of Internet Governance the Republic of Cameroun proposes two measures: a) to create discussion forums to let all actors participate in debates related to Internet Governance and b) to develop human resources for local competences
Canada	The forum should focus on capacity building, particularly to develop the knowledge and experience necessary for developing countries to be able to participate effectively in the discussion of Internet issues.
Korea (Rep.)	<p>In global policy development and capacity building, we encourage the contribution of developed countries in helping developing countries improve their participation and make their voice heard as well as build more capacity to understand ongoing issues of Internet governance. We would like to recognize the importance of promoting virtual meetings by using ICTs and other technologies to allow participants from developing countries.</p> <p>In association with capacity building, as WGIG report identifies, we should develop some support tools or systems for the creation of multilingual content, and we believe that the multilingualization of local content will facilitate the development of local internet community and increase the use of Internet in general.</p>
USA	The United States believes that each person should have the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge in order to understand, participate actively in, and benefit fully from, the Information Society and the knowledge economy. This requires increased capacity building in the areas of ICT policy and regulation, technology know-how, access to information, and the application of ICT to various development sectors. WSIS should support the continuing work of multiple stakeholders to build capacity of professionals and institutions in developing nations and to ensure the efforts are both technically innovative and supportive of market-based approaches.
BT	The Report highlights that the issues which are central to fostering increased participation in Internet governance arrangements by developing countries are not in fact specific to the internet and "Internet governance" as such, but are the fundamental and pervasive issues that various UN agencies and other organisations such as WTO are already engaged with such as education/ development of

	skills/cultural exchanges and investment and opening of markets. This indicates that the output from the WGIG process should be to re-focus on these core “building-block” aspects to pull through sustainable and meaningful participation in all areas instead of placing an artificial focus on “Internet governance” in isolation.
CCBI/CSIA	CCBI/CSIA commend the report's emphasis on capacity-building; if the different stakeholders have a greater understanding of both Internet policy and technologies they will be better able to address key Internet issues. Unfortunately, the report does not contain many concrete recommendations on how best to build capacity. For example, as has been pointed out many times by many interested parties from all stakeholder communities, translation of existing materials and technical resource documents into multiple languages is often the first, and critical step to making information accessible. There was limited attention to examining what has worked to increase meaningful participation already in the developing countries. Utilizing successful experiences to develop best practices would be an effective tool to be emphasized. While funds to participate in remote meetings are one approach, existing approaches of bringing information and resources to developing countries to develop sustainable activities within the country itself deserve continued support. Many very worthwhile activities that are showing growing success could otherwise be disrupted particularly in developing countries. Governments, along with all other stakeholders, have a critical role to play in capacity building. We recommend that the WSIS process focus more attention on this critically important area.
ICANN	ICANN's mission can only be accomplished through the participation of a broad community that has a high level of technical and non-technical understanding of the issue under discussion. Therefore, although ICANN's foundational documents do not mandate it to be directly involved in capacity building, ICANN's work has and will continue to contribute to training, understanding, and in general capacity building and enhanced reach to the Internet around the world. ...
ITU	The report to Council 05 on Resolution 102 activities outlines ITU's main activities with respect to IP-based networks and related topics, which includes, in the area of capacity building, the publication of “A Handbook on Internet Protocol (IP) Based Networks and Related Topics and Issues”.
Internet Society (Int'l)	We also hope that the need for capacity building and particularly the training of Internet users, technicians, and policy makers, especially in Less Developed Countries, will receive more attention at the second World Summit. This is an area where the Internet Society has focused since its inception more than thirteen years ago. In the recent ISOC survey, several respondents echoed the comments of one respondent: “Provision of Internet service in less developed countries should be made a top priority in the (WSIS) conference.” There are many areas which the WSIS might explore. Specifically, the WSIS could examine ways that existing government, intergovernmental, and corporate aid programs might work together more closely to maximize the benefits of their investments in capacity building. In particular, they should look for ways to ensure that their projects are sustainable and have long-term impacts.
VeriSign Inc.	The development of local infrastructures, developers, and user populations is largely a combination of financial resources development, training of large populations of experts and the public-at-large. There are many excellent public and private mechanisms for accomplishing communications infrastructure development. Capacity building will be achieved through the purposeful establishment of market environments that provide incentives for private sector investment combined with the recognition by developed countries and their respective industries of the mutual long term benefits of expanding network infrastructures, knowledge transfer, and training in the developing world.
<b>Intellectual property rights (para 23)</b>	
Ghana on behalf of the African Group	The following issues should be tackled with the participation of all, including the African stakeholders: multilingualization of Internet naming systems, consumer, user protection and privacy, unlawful content and access protection, intellectual property rights, cultural and linguistic diversity, national policies and regulations among others.
Israel	Israel notes that Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) have a dual role in the context of the internet society. They form the legal regime, which sets up the incentives for creation and distribution of the creative content. On the other hand, the very same rules that make up the legal rights, limit the use of the content without consent of the right holder, be they the creator or distributor of the content. The balance between these two core interests of IP policy is ever evolving. In this context, Israel believes that the WSIS process should maintain a link with recent developments in the WIPO fora, where this balance is being reviewed. In the specific context of standard setting and the Internet, Israel would like to underline two important points. First, it is our opinion that internet standards that are set up to enable technical

	<p>protection of content (such as Digital Rights Management infrastructure), as mentioned in the Background Report, section 162, can serve both as a opportunity and as a danger for the distribution of content on the Internet. The opportunity is a new system of control and remuneration for use of protected content, enforced not by law, but by technology itself. The danger is over-limitation and control of protected content by right holders. In this context we would like to point to the balance set in the European Directive 2001/29/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 22 May 2001, on the harmonization of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society, in which the European legislator set limits to the digital protection systems, and mandatory public access to works, safeguarding "fair use" of works.</p> <p>The second aspect relevant to standard setting is the imperative that standards should be open and non proprietary, as much as possible, in order to promote access and interoperability. This theme has enabled the internet to grow to what it has become, and any change in this area may endanger its open and free nature, and allow excessive power to private interests.</p>
Japan	<p>Japan considers that it is important to acknowledge the new global issues that continue to emerge, such as spam, security and cyber crime, Intellectual Property Rights, freedom of expression, privacy, and capacity building among others. Sharing information on best practices and other measures, and finding the right way to address these issues are of importance.</p> <p>Japan recognize the value of the report identifying public policy issues relevant to Internet governance based on this definition and making recommendations to address these issues.</p>
Korea	<p>Regarding Intellectual Property Right, there is a challenge for striking a balance between creating the incentives to innovate and enabling the use and dissemination of information by individuals and groups across the Internet. In order to find a solution to this challenge, we need to focus on measures to give easier access to knowledge, especially for developing countries and non-commercial users through the effective cooperation between developed and developing countries.</p>
Turkey	<p>We are of the opinion that the application of intellectual property rights to cyberspace is an exigency and these can only be achieved by balancing the rights of holders and users. However, while taking into account the free nature and technical basis of the Internet, it seems too hard to prevent IPR infringements with only legal regulations. Therefore, a versatile and comprehensive approach is needed along with international cooperation. Within this framework, on the holders side, the ways in which we can remove the root causes of infringements and provide enough incentives for innovation need to be assessed, such as; shortening the protection period of products and works of art, so as to foster information society across the globe and reassessing current IPR rules to prevent monopolistic/oligopolistic market structure.</p>
USA	<p>The United States attaches great importance to a comprehensive, effective and properly enforced intellectual property system and believes that any Information Society envisioned by the WSIS must clearly and explicitly recognize that such a system is essential to the Information Society because it creates an incentive for creativity and innovation. To that end, WSIS and its documents must recognize, respect and support the existing international intellectual property system. The balance between owners and users of intellectual property is an important underpinning of an effective intellectual property system. Existing international intellectual property agreements encompass and reflect the balance between owners and users of intellectual property. Indeed, this balance is struck so that intellectual property owners are encouraged to develop and disseminate their works and inventions to the public for use and enjoyment. The United States believes that the appropriate United Nations forum for dealing with intellectual property issues is the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), which has regularly examined the interaction of cyberspace and intellectual property since the early days of the Internet.</p>
American Library Association	<p>We applaud the Working Group's attention to the issue of balancing the rights of users and holders of intellectual property, as is illustrated in paragraph 23. We agree that striking this balance will require more thought and attention. This is an issue that is central to maintaining the accessibility of information in the Internet for all users.</p> <p>As the report points out, the Internet is just one medium through which the essential balance of intellectual property rights must be struck. There is an international regime overseen by WIPO to deal with these issues inherent in intellectual property worldwide. We have been urging WIPO to address the balance in copyright law and to develop an agenda addressing the impact of intellectual property law on developing nations.</p>
BT	<p>The UN already has an internationally respected, expert body on intellectual property, The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Duplicating any aspect of WIPO's portfolio would be both unnecessary and undesirable. Therefore, BT considers that any discussions in the WGIG process relating to IPR should take place within the current and future work program of WIPO.</p>
CCBI/CSIA	<p>The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the UN's expert body on intellectual property,</p>



	<p>has promoted and continues to examine appropriate intellectual property norms and procedures in a manner that takes into account the interests of all stakeholders. WIPO concluded the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonogram Treaties in 1996, which were a direct response to the need for harmonization of international copyright laws in response to the growth of the Internet, recognizing the need for protections in the digital environment as the foundation for encouraging the availability of legitimate services and content. Moreover, since at least 1999 WIPO has dedicated resources to evaluating the role of IP in relation to e-commerce.</p> <p>Finally, WIPO's work has shown great attention to the role that IP plays in development, and WIPO is currently engaged in a lively debate on the relationship between IP and development, in addition to its ongoing activities to provide outreach and technical assistance to developing countries. With this in mind, CCBI believes that any discussions related to IP should take place within WIPO's current and future work programs.</p>
Eurolink	<p>Technical standards may have far reaching implications e.g. on security, privacy, multilingualism, or intellectual property, which belong to societal and public policies issues, and therefore concern all stakeholders, specially when technical requirements happen to be illegal in some countries.</p>
ICANN	<p>While ICANN's mission does not directly involve intellectual property rights protection, it has, together with the appropriate organization responsible for intellectual property rights, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), established protections to facilitate more economical means of addressing domain name related trademark disputes by establishing the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) to resolve dispute over trademarks and domain names. The application of the UDRP has been used to resolve over 12'000 dispute resolutions, largely to general satisfaction, without direct ICANN involvement, and mostly among experts who are able to consider disputes in the relevant language.</p>
LINX	<p>Intellectual property rights are subject to the laws set by national governments to promote economic, social, cultural, and other collective objectives. This category is therefore defined to cover those areas where national governments already determine policy within their respective jurisdictions.</p>
VeriSign, Inc.	<p>In addition to name and address administration, the WGIG report also identifies the following "highest priority" public policy issues: intellectual property rights (IPR), freedom of expression, data protection and privacy rights, consumer rights and multilingualism. With regard to these public policy issues, governments unquestionably have a definitive role to play in developing laws, regulations, norms, rules and decision-making processes by which they are addressed. In fact, governments already play an active role in Internet related public policy issues, as documented in the WGIG report. VeriSign welcomes encourages and recognizes the essential contributions of government participation in addressing these critical issues. Indeed, VeriSign participates in many government-sponsored collaborative efforts open to industry participants. The focus of this debate should not be whether there is a role for government in Internet policy, but rather the manner in which governments collaborate in the future with the private sector and civil society in addressing Internet related public policy issues. Governments, the private sector, and civil society need to more fully understand the identity and role of the varied entities which address the broad range of public policy issues that are identified in the WGIG report.</p>
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	<p>Whilst we welcome that the vastly divergent views on the fairness of the current intellectual property rights regime have been acknowledged, we would like to raise three public policy issues of concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The application of traditional IPR rules to cyberspace creates unique challenges that necessitate the need for assessment in forums other than the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).</li> <li>ii. New instruments to govern Intellectual Property on the Internet (such as WIPO's Internet Treaties, and the UDRP) have been developed without effective consideration of the rights of users. In a similar vein, the WIPO's proposed Broadcasting Treaty raises troubling issues about the proper balance between particular industries' ambitions and the broader public interest in promoting an open public sphere of ideas and information, including in the Internet environment. We support the proposals in WIPO for a significant Development Agenda and consideration of an Access to Knowledge Treaty.</li> </ol> <p>We believe that organisations responsible for developing such instruments must look to the interests of end-users and society as they have been articulated in other IP legislation such as copyright and fair use, and provide an ongoing voice for these interests.</p> <p>We further believe that key technologies and standards underpinning the Internet should be made available for use free of charge and not subject to capture or control by any single government or entity.</p>
<p><b>Freedom of expression (para 24 and 81)</b></p>	

Switzerland	We support initiatives that are intended to preserve freedom of expression and protection of privacy.
USA	The United States reconfirms the importance of the fundamental right to freedom of expression and to the free flow of information as contained in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as reaffirmed in the Geneva Declaration of Principles adopted at the first phase of WSIS. A free, independent print, broadcast and online media is one of the key institutions of democratic life. The United States believes that no nation can develop politically or economically without the ability of its citizens to openly and freely express their opinions in an environment in which everyone can seek, receive and impart information. The United States fully supports the principle that all measures taken in relation to the Internet, in particular those measures taken on grounds of security or to fight crime, not lead to infringements on the freedom of expression.
American Library Association	The Internet is not only a resource through which users access information; it is also a forum for individuals to express opinions and express beliefs. It is essential that we protect this function. In paragraph 24, the working group addresses the need to maintain freedom of expression while fulfilling the requirements of law enforcement, pointing to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS Declaration of Principles. We fully support this sentiment and encourage leadership to move forward on developing guidelines on this issue. In some cases, the infrastructure of the Internet makes the protection of freedom of expression challenging. An example of this is the freely-available WHOIS database. What began as an easy tool that enabled the relatively small pool of Internet developers to contact one another has become in some cases a threat to freedom of expression. WHOIS could pose a real threat to political dissidents, victims of stalking, and others. We urge ICANN to be sensitive to national privacy laws and the impact of publicly available WHOIS databases on freedom of expression.
CCBI/CSIA	CCBI/CSIA strongly supports Human Rights and freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the WSIS Declaration of Principles.
CDT	The report includes a commendable commitment to preserving free expression, as well as to involving all stakeholders -- including governments, public interest groups and businesses -- in the governance process.
Internet Society (Int'l)	In comments submitted with the survey (made among ISOC members with respect to the WGIG report), many members stressed that the UN and ISOC should be working to reduce government influence over the Internet, particularly in those countries where governments are attempting to suppress the freedom of expression. We are very glad to see the report's strong support for Freedom of Expression, one of the six focus areas of the Internet Society's policy efforts.
Internet Society (Bulgaria)	We hope the Internet will continue to encourage freedom of speech and freedom of access to information, while at the same time efforts are needed to preserve privacy and secure personal data.
LINX	Freedom of expression and content control is subject to the laws set by national governments to promote economic, social, cultural and other collective objectives. This category is therefore defined to cover those areas where national governments already determine policy within their respective jurisdictions. We note and welcome the Geneva <i>acquis</i> on freedom of expression; we agree with the many participants who have said that this question should be considered settled within the WSIS process and should not be reopened. We note that some of the issues in this area have a close relationship with the issue of freedom of expression and its proper boundaries.
Number Resource Organisation	It is extremely important that the Summit pays attention to those other matters which have and will continue to have considerable impact on the development of the Internet and information society. These matters, which include Freedom of Expression, and Privacy, deserve the in-depth attention of the WSIS.
World Press Freedom Committee	The WGIG report makes a brief but welcome bow to the need to address restrictions on freedom of expression: "Measures taken in relation to the Internet on grounds of security or to fight crime can lead to violations of the provisions for freedom of expression as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the WSIS Declaration of Principles. Ensure that all measures taken in relation to the Internet, in particular those on grounds of security or to fight crime, do not lead to violations of human rights principles." Yet, the report also suggests "enforceable global standards" for privacy and data protection rights over the Internet - providing endless opportunities for governmentally inspired mischief, restrictions and controls. The report's approach to "spam" leaves open the possibility that authoritarian governments could define political campaigning over the Internet as "spam" and therefore undesirable.
WSIS Civil Society Internet	We are pleased to see the recognition of the imperative of upholding universally agreed human rights in relation to measures to address security and the investigation of crimes committed online. Human

Governance Caucus	<p>Rights with specific relevance in this context include the right to a fair trial (UDHR art. 10), the right to privacy (UDHR article 12), freedom of expression (UDHR article 19), freedom of assembly (UDHR art. 20), and the right to enjoy your own culture and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits (UDHR art. 27). Furthermore, we wish to emphasize state obligations on implementation and enforcement (UDHR art. 28).</p> <p>We feel that the report could have been strengthened by addressing human rights as cross-cutting standards, with particular reference to the rights mentioned above, in relation to the development and application of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution and use of the Internet. Any measure taken must effectively respect human rights such as the right to privacy and freedom of expression, including press freedom online, in conformity with UDHR art. 12 and 19. Nothing in Internet governance negotiations must impair, restrict, or contradict human rights, as they are spelled out in UDHR and international law.</p>
WSIS CS Privacy and Security Working Group	<p>We also strongly oppose efforts underway in several UN member states for mandatory retention of Internet traffic data, regardless of any offences or criminal investigations. The Internet can only stay an open and public infrastructure if all individuals can use it freely, without having to fear constant observation and monitoring.</p>
<b>Data protection and privacy rights (paras 25 and 83)</b>	
Cameroun	<p>We propose the creation of new national law in order to guarantee the protection of private data and privacy in general, as well as the harmonization of differing national legal systems concerning this issue. It is essential that internet users feel protected. This will reinforce their reliance on this important medium of modern communication.</p>
Rwanda	<p>The concept of privacy in the real world differs according to culture. An example of this would be the public outcry in the UK at the proposed national ID cards, when for citizens of many countries including Rwanda, this is quite natural. Our concern is that concepts of privacy in the digital domain may also have variances according to culture. It will be useful to have an agreed concept of the term "misuse of personal data" in order to avoid imposing concepts of privacy, particularly in countries with no legal tradition in such fields.</p>
Switzerland	<p>We support initiatives that are intended to preserve freedom of expression and the protection of privacy.</p>
Turkey	<p>There is a lack of national and international legislation and standards about privacy and data-protection. This deficiency causes misuse of personal data and infringes privacy. Solving this problem within the national borders is impossible because of free and global nature of the Internet. Therefore, there is a great need for international and enforceable legal regulations and measures, <u>while respecting national sovereignty</u>. Developing an international complaint procedure, which would entail measures against internet operators as well as internet users breaching the rules, would provide an effective instrument to this end.</p>
USA	<p>The United States appreciates the concerns expressed in the report on data protection and privacy. Protecting the privacy of individuals' sensitive personal information is a priority for the United States government and for United States consumers. Companies have an important role to play by implementing reasonable safeguards to protect sensitive consumer data. The United States also believes that multilateral and private-sector initiatives have a strong and important role to play in encouraging the development and use of privacy-enhancing technologies and in promoting consumer education and awareness about online privacy issues. A deliberate and balanced approach to privacy that is open to innovations offers the best environment for Internet expansion. Any effective approach to ensuring protection of personal information includes: appropriate laws to protect consumer privacy in highly sensitive areas such as financial, medical, and children's privacy; government enforcement of these laws; and encouragement of private sector efforts to protect consumer privacy.</p>
American Library Association	<p>Many Internet users have a high expectation of the privacy of their transactions and activities. While these expectations may be unreasonable in some cases, the working group recognizes that data protection and privacy rights are a priority and central to the sustainability of the Internet. It is necessary that we take decisive steps toward protecting data and privacy in all contexts – as users, as consumers, as publishers.</p>
BT	<p>There is no single, shared understanding between countries on the substance and nature of such rights. Sector-specific, national and regional approaches to data protection and privacy rights continue to evolve and develop at variable rates worldwide.</p> <p>Mechanisms such as the annual International Conference on Privacy and Personal Data Protection, now in its 26<sup>th</sup> year, already provide for exchange of information and developments in best practice and policy between different countries. There are many other fora too, e.g. APEC, OECD and the Council of Europe at which there is dialogue between different governments. There is no benefit to</p>



	<p>be gained from creating additional mechanisms for dialogue on aspects of data protection and privacy rights relating to the Internet in isolation from dialogue on the development of laws and policies of data protection and privacy in general.</p>
CCBI/CSIA	<p>Neither APEC nor OECD, which have developed and promoted international guidelines, mandate legislation to address privacy concerns. Adequate protection of data should be ensured; however, there are different ways of doing so, including self regulation, which address privacy in the context of issues and preferences that are frequently national or regional in nature. The phrase “there is a lack of national legislation” could suggest that all countries must have legislation or that regional legislation (such as EU Privacy Directive 200/58/CE) is not adequate. Some countries may not have omnibus legislation in light of the needs and collective desires of their citizens. However, some countries do have such legislation, and others have strict privacy law systems.</p> <p>Furthermore, CCBI/CSIA believes it is incorrect to characterize the WHOIS database as failing to protect personal data. In the generic Top Level Domains, all public access to personally identifiable data in WHOIS is based upon the acknowledgement and agreement of the registrant. There has yet to be any definitive finding of conflict between this long-standing policy and the privacy legislation of any country. It is important to note that contractual provisions between ICANN and domain name registrars also allow and encourage registrars to adopt measures for enhanced protection of privacy to take into account special circumstances.</p> <p>Data protection and privacy rights: The WGIG Report recommendation for revising the WHOIS database to take into account local privacy legislation is already being addressed within the ICANN framework. ICANN’s Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) is involved in a thorough policy development process to address this particular issue. The GNSO will soon be presented with a policy recommendation to establish a process for resolving conflicts, if any arise, between a domain name registrar’s (or registry’s) contractual obligations to ICANN regarding WHOIS, and national privacy legislation applicable to that registrar (or registry). Once implemented, this policy may be fully responsive to WGIG’s expressed concern.</p>
CENTR	<p>WHOIS policy and data protection requirements have been adequately addressed in many jurisdictions by regulations or regional treaties, particularly in the EU. Off-line laws apply to the Internet, and the international community could learn lessons from successful models at national level. In this respect CENTR commends the initiative of the WGIG Secretariat in organising the workshop on Internet governance at the national level.</p>
Eurolink	<p>Technical standards may have far reaching implications e.g. on security, privacy, multilingualism, or intellectual property, which belong to societal and public policies issues, and therefore concern all stakeholders, specially when technical requirements happen to be illegal in some countries.</p>
ICANN	<p>ICANN recognizes the importance of data protection and privacy rights, and the complexity surrounding these issues. With regard to those areas under its mandate, it is working with stakeholders on concerns raised over the issues surrounding Whois databases. ICANN is also looking forward to new technical proposals from the IETF for re-structuring of the databases vital to the operation of the Internet and the registration of IP address assignments and domain name registrations.</p> <p>ICANN’s work in relation to WHOIS has been ongoing, reflecting the fact that the issue is complicated by a divergence of laws and regulations around the world. It is not clear that these laws and regulations will be harmonized in the near term, if ever. However, ICANN is faced with the practical reality of the need for a coherent approach that can address this divergence. Furthermore, it would seem that the positions of law enforcement agencies and data privacy authorities may also diverge. In light of this, work continues in ICANN’s GNSO1 and GAC, to try to address some of these complex and interdependent areas.</p>
International Working Group on Data Protection in Telecommunications	<p>Having read the Report and in particular paras 25, 79 and 83, I (Mr. Dix) would like to congratulate you and your colleagues on the results of your work and in particular the clear analysis and recommendations concerning privacy as an important public policy issue in the discussions on Internet governance (especially in the area of WHOIS databases). I fully support your recommendations and my colleagues in the International Working Group on Data Protection in Telecommunications will almost certainly join me.</p> <p>With respect to the discussions, which will take place prior to and at the Tunis Summit, I want to stress that the recommendations which the WGIG has made on privacy protection should be integrated in any Final Document or Action Plan which may be adopted at the Tunis Summit. Data Protection and privacy are human rights in a global information society and should be taken into account in any new set-up for Internet governance.</p>
Internet Society (Bulgaria)	<p>We hope the Internet will continue to encourage freedom of speech and freedom of access to information, while at the same time efforts are needed to preserve privacy and secure personal data.</p>

LINX	<p>Data protection and privacy rights are subject to the laws set by national governments to promote economic, social, cultural and other collective objectives. This category is therefore defined to cover those areas where national governments already determine policy within their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p>We note that persons using the Internet still physically lie within a particular jurisdiction at any particular moment. The law of that jurisdiction continues to apply to them with regard to their actions on the Internet as it does to their other actions.</p>
Number Resource Organisation	<p>It is extremely important that the Summit pays attention to those other matters which have and will continue to have considerable impact on the development of the Internet and information society. These matters, which include Freedom of Expression, and Privacy, deserve the in-depth attention of the WSIS.</p>
South Centre	<p>Governments note the several Internet-related policy issues identified that go beyond the strictly technical Internet architectural issues of design and implementation. Some of these issues influence and in turn are influenced by the specific characteristics of the technology and regulatory framework. Among these are Data and Content (accuracy, offerings and access), WHOIS Services (internationalization), Privacy Issues, including Spyware, Intellectual Property, and Open Source and Free Software are among issues of special concern to broadening the accessibility of the Internet to users.</p> <p>Other issues arising from the use of the Internet, with significant impact on the lives and livelihoods of citizens, involve public policy making in all spheres of political, economic and social activity and involves all stake-holders in appropriate ways. These include, among others, Freedom of Expression, Intellectual Property and Consumer and User Protection. They involve policy choices relating mainly to the use of technology and their applications. It is moot whether all of these are appropriate for consideration in essentially technology focused forums or even in a single entity. In considering these issues, national and regional circumstances will shape the policy responses.</p>
VeriSign, Inc.	<p>The Report cites a “lack of existence or inconsistent application of privacy and data-protection rights,” and “a lack of national legislation and enforceable global standards for privacy and data-protection rights over the Internet; as a result, users have few, if any, means to enforce their privacy and personal data-protection rights, even when recognized by legislation. An example of this is the apparent lack of personal data protection in some of the WHOIS databases.”</p> <p>VeriSign notes that privacy and data protection have been the subject of significant legislative activity in a number of countries and geopolitical regions over the past few years. Privacy and data protection issues are colored by the history, culture, and economic models in a given country or region. In fact, there has been a fairly vigorous form of regulatory competition between different jurisdictions over privacy and data protections issues. The existence of this competition is not noted to support the notion that a single global privacy standard should be established or to suggest that there is a vacuum of engagement and participation. To the contrary, this on-going debate reflects serious engagement on this issue by governments, the private sector, and individuals alike. ...</p> <p>What is urgently needed for both infrastructure protection and law enforcement support is the effective authentication of user and provider directories associated with the use of names and addresses. Not providing for the privacy mechanisms mentioned above exacerbates the ability to maintain authenticated, accurate directory information.</p>
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	<p>We support the recognition of the importance that privacy and consumer rights have in the Information Society and the consequent recommendations of the WGIG. However, notwithstanding efforts in some fora, there is no global and inclusive policy process regarding these issues. As a consequence, privacy and consumer protection policies are defined by governments and industry without the meaningful involvement of the Internet users they affect.</p>
WSIS Civil Society Privacy and Security Working Group	<p>While fully supporting the related findings and recommendations of the WGIG, especially in paragraph 83 of the report, we would like to stress some specific areas of concern for civil society. In an information society, where almost all attributes of an individual can be known, interactions mapped, and intentions assumed based on records, the need for protection of privacy is more crucial than ever. We agree with the WGIG that on a global scale, there is a lack of enforceable standards and legislation for privacy and data-protection rights on the Internet. On the other hand, a growing number of countries have enacted privacy legislation. In others, the lack of privacy protection is often based on low awareness of this fundamental human right. We support the recommendations of WGIG to encourage countries that have no legal tradition in this field to develop clear rules and legal frameworks with the participation of all stakeholders. To reach this goal, we strongly recommend that privacy capacity-building becomes part of all WSIS-related programs to expand the use and improve the governance of the Internet. A crucial issue in the future of the global information society will be the incorporation of human rights, especially privacy, into all global efforts related to the</p>

	<p>Internet. Privacy impact assessments therefore should become part of all projects in this area. We agree with the WGIG that all efforts to create arrangements and procedures between national law enforcement agencies have to be consistent with the protection of privacy, personal data and other human rights. This also relates to the growing cooperation of the private sector and government agencies in the fight against crime and terrorism. We insist that privacy protection must be fully respected in this field, especially in cross-border cooperation. Personal data must only be exchanged if there is a legal ground for privacy protection in all countries involved.</p> <p>We also strongly oppose efforts underway in several UN member states for mandatory retention of Internet traffic data, regardless of any offences or criminal investigations. The Internet can only stay an open and public infrastructure if all individuals can use it freely, without having to fear constant observation and monitoring.</p> <p>While the findings and recommendations of the WGIG are a great step forward in the WSIS discussions around privacy, we all have to make sure they will be integrated in any documents which will be adopted at the Tunis Summit. They must not be neglected or made part of a trade-off when the contested political issues of Internet governance such as the future control of the root zone file are being discussed in the months leading up to the Tunis summit. Privacy and data protection are too important in the Information society to be forgotten in the struggles over the core technical resources of the Internet.</p>
<b>Consumer rights (Para 26 and 84)</b>	
Rwanda	<p>Paragraph 84: Comments here relate to online consumer rights. What is the effect of this recommendation in countries where there is no tradition, legal or otherwise, of consumer rights 'offline'? Tied with this is the idea of consumer empowerment, having rights is of limited benefit if customers are not empowered to demand them. We found no reference to consumer empowerment in the report.</p>
Switzerland	<p>We are of the opinion that greater consideration should be given to consumer protection in the very distinct cross-border context of information society services on the Internet.</p>
BT	<p>As with the majority of issues identified, the issue of cross-border sales and "distance-selling" are not unique to the Internet. Despite the concerns expressed, increasing millions of consumers do weigh up the risks for themselves and enter into transactions and knowledge does spread quickly about reputable (and disreputable) providers. As the frequency of such transactions has been increasing at the consumer level, many countries are already pursuing dialogue on how to work through the associated highly technical legal issues of applicable law, jurisdiction, alternative dispute resolution and enforcement in expert regional and international fora such as the Hague Convention and in the OECD.</p> <p>Countries regard issues of consumer protection as very much national issues. However, it is far from clear that traditional approaches based on the premise that a consumer is always a weaker and/or less informed party in transactions will be the appropriate basis when dealing with consumer rights over the Internet. For example, it cannot be assumed that a provider of an Internet service will even know when the other party to a transaction is indeed a consumer, the country in which a specific transaction is taking place or the home country of the other party. Then, in order to acquire accurate information on such features raises significant technical and legal issues on data protection and privacy. As per our comments on cybercrime and security above, WSIS should encourage greater government cross border co-operation, and continued dialogue with expert fora outlined above. Promoting education and awareness raising schemes should also be actively pursued so that consumers are aware of risks and how to avoid or deal with them if they arise.</p>
CCBI/CSIA	<p>Differences in culture and "conflict of laws" makes achievement of a global standard for consumer rights difficult. However, international cooperation may be possible among some countries and regions and indeed the OECD and APEC have developed guidelines for consumer protection in the context of e-commerce.</p>
ICANN	<p>ICANN has an extremely limited mandate, which does not lead into acting in consumer protection, not even in the registration of domain names. Issues surrounding consumer rights as they relate to the registration of domain names fall to the national jurisdictions and national law. ICANN-approved registries and registrars are obligated to comply with national laws. ICANN does encourage responsible behavior of the approved registries and registrars before consumers worldwide.</p>
LINX	<p>Consumer rights are subject to the laws set by national governments to promote economic, social, cultural and other collective objectives. This category is therefore defined to cover those areas where national governments already determine policy within their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p>We note that persons using the Internet still physically lie within a particular jurisdiction at any particular moment. The law of that jurisdiction continues to apply to them with regard to their actions on the Internet as it does to their other actions.</p>

WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	We support the recognition of the importance that Privacy and consumer rights have in the Information Society and the consequent recommendations of the WGIG. However, notwithstanding efforts in some fora, there is no global and inclusive policy process regarding these issues. As a consequence, privacy and consumer protection policies are defined by governments and industry without the meaningful involvement of the Internet users they affect.
<b>Multilingualism (paras 27 and 85)</b>	
Egypt	There are other key areas that the Internet Governance discourse should not overlook, namely multilingual domain names, multilingual content, international interconnection and peering settlements, spam as well as cyber-security. On the other hand, there are areas that are not adequately addressed by the existing organizations such as spam, cyber-security, cyber-crime and multilingualism. Therefore, Egypt advocates either the creation of new forum(s) where such issues can be thoroughly discussed or that the existing entities spin-off new groups to be more focused on particular areas.
Ghana on behalf of the African Group	Although the functioning of existing institutions is in some way in line with the WSIS principles, enhanced multi-stakeholder participation is key to addressing important issues relating to local content/languages. Existing institutions should in line with the WSIS principles allow more participation by addressing the language barrier issue: open up for wider discussion on issues relating to content/language, security, universal access, affordability etc. The following issues should be tackled with the participation of all, including the African stakeholders: multilingualization of Internet naming systems, consumer, user protection and privacy, unlawful content and access protection, intellectual property rights, cultural and linguistic diversity, national policies and regulations among others.
Korea (Rep.)	In association with capacity building, as the WGIG report identifies, we should develop some support tools or systems for the creation of multilingual content, and we believe that the multilingualization of local content will facilitate the development of local internet community and increase the use of Internet in general.
Switzerland	Keeping in mind the different cultural approaches existing throughout the world, we think that solutions to be adopted in the future should take this fact into account. We believe that it is necessary to encourage the creation of local content, which is very important element for the developing countries, as well as multilingualism.
Turkey	We are of the opinion that international cooperation should be provided and current efforts should be supported for multilingualization of domain names and e-mail addresses.
Rwanda	Paragraph 85: (a) The phrase “multilingual domain names” is unclear and not defined; an example would be instructive. (b) This section relates to multilingual content. It is felt that the phrase “more efforts should be put into developing content development tools to facilitate the creation of multilingual content” needs to be clearly defined and elaborated in more detail. What specially is being recommended here? And, in any case how does this recommendation tie in with market forces? Surely if there were sufficient demand then such tools would already exist? If there is not enough demand to make such tools viable, what efforts should be made and by whom? We further feel that promoting content, while being important for access to the Internet and as tool for introducing cultural diversity, is not enough. Some care and attention needs to be given to quality of content produced, particularly in regional and local languages. Efforts must be made to ensure that such content is relevant, diverse and regularly updated.
USA	The United States believes that the development of technologies that facilitate the use of domain names in languages other than Latin based character sets is an important step in making the Internet truly global. WSIS should encourage continued work and collaboration on internationalized domain names by existing standards bodies and processes by which agreement can be reached on appropriate language tables.
CCBI/CSIA	CCBI/CSIA agrees with the WGIG report that there is great value in expediting progress toward multilingualism in both content on the World Wide Web, and in the use of non ASCII character domain names. However, it cautions that it is important to acknowledge that true progress must take into account the technical and other complexities of implementing internationalized domain names, including agreement on official language tables. Success in this area rests in substantial part on working with all organizations currently engaged in developing solutions including the browser /software development community.
Eurolink	Technical standards may have far reaching implications e.g. on security, privacy, multilingualism, or intellectual property, which belong to societal and public policies issues, and therefore concern all

	stakeholders, specially when technical requirements happen to be illegal in some countries.
ICANN	<p>The Internet historically began with the use of the English language and a small subset of Roman characters and Arabic numerals. ... While one cannot change history, one can build on it and draw lessons from it. With the increase in use of the Internet in all regions (and by diverse linguistic groups) of the world, there is a strong need for multilingual content, and the capability to support multilingual use. It is important to note that a large part of the concerns about multilingualism on the Internet refer to content in numerous languages, alphabets, scripts, and character sets; another part is concerned with keywords in search and directory systems, and only a fraction refer to domain names.</p> <p>The issues surrounding the use of non-ASCII character sets in the domain name system must be handled with appropriate care to ensure the continued interoperability of the global Internet. ... Working in coordination with the appropriate technical communities such as the IETF and stakeholders, ICANN adopted guidelines for the deployment of Internationalized Domain Names (IDN), opening the way for registration of domains in many of the world's languages. The work relating to IDN implementation is a continuing task and collaboration among all parties involved with respective expertise is essential, including that of the Arab League, the CJK (Chinese-Japanese-Korean) group, ongoing discussions in respective countries and regions, and organizations such as UNESCO.</p> <p>ICANN has undertaken much work over the past years on issues surrounding the implementation of IDNs, including establishing guidelines for the implementation at the registry level. ICANN continues to work with respective stakeholders to facilitate discussion and awareness on issues surrounding the introduction of multilingual domain names... ICANN agrees that while the implementation of IDNs is important for the global community, it must occur in a manner that ensures continued interoperability and stability of the Internet's unique identifier system. Barriers to interoperability will only jeopardize capacity building, increased use of the Internet by all, and achievement of a global information society. While IDN is important, production and dissemination of local content is essential, and ICANN supports the view that more effort should be put into developing content locally. Many users seek multilingual content, and this is an important area of work on the local and regional levels.</p>
ITU	The report to Council 05 on Resolution 102 activities outlines ITU's main activities with respect to IP-based networks and related topics.
ITAA	<p>On multilingualism, ITAA supports the importance of continued work that we view as critical to the development and use of the Internet in countries where the Roman alphabet is not the primary script. However, ITAA does not believe that the Report adequately recognizes the complexity of expeditiously resolving this issue.</p> <p>The work on multilingualism must address the availability of non-ASCII content for the Internet, as well as the development of standards for non-ASCII character domain names. ITAA notes that it is important to move responsibly as well as quickly, in areas such as advancing agreement on official language tables. Significant work initiatives are presently emerging. Success in this area will require the continued collaboration and cooperation across the different standards entities and language experts/organizations, as well as many other organizations presently engaged in developing solutions, including the software/browser development community.</p>
Internet Mark 2 Project	<p>... Some of the issues which stand out and are becoming increasingly problematic include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The failure to date of approaches to internationalized domain names</li> </ul>
Internet Society (Int'l)	We need to make it easier to support non-Latin alphabets.
LINX	<p>Linguistic and cultural diversity are subject to the laws set by national governments to promote economic, social, cultural and other collective objectives. This category is therefore defined to cover those areas where national governments already determine policy within their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p>The promotion of global linguistic diversity is necessary to support the development of less developed nations and regions and should be supported by more developed nations and by the global community as a whole.</p>
South Centre	There is a range of public policy issues that can improve the quality of life in developing countries through the enabling use of the Internet. The WGIG Report refers to these as developmental aspects of Internet Governance. Among these issues it identifies Multilingualism. The lack of any substantive discussion of the issues should be remedied. The poor results shown by adopting this policy in other sectors lead to the conclusion that development issues are not to be treated as add-ons or external to the systemic infrastructure and critical resource management and other directly related Internet public policy issues.

WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	Bodies responsible for international Internet governance functions should reflect the priorities of all affected cultures in their operations. They should ensure an effective voice for all cultures in the deliberations and decision-making processes of these bodies. Such representation will facilitate the development of local content in local languages, help implement IDNs, and ensure that other trans-border issues are confronted in an effective and culturally appropriate manner.
<b>Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders (paras 29-34)</b>	
EU and acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania)	The EU Stresses that governments have a specific mission and responsibility vis-à-vis their citizens, and their role within this new cooperation model should be mainly focused on principle issues of public policy, excluding any involvement in the day-to-day operations.
Rwanda	There is an issue on whether academia and research institutes are included by the term civil society? It was felt that the term civil society did not include research institutes and academia and we think that there should be some reference to the same in the definition of Internet Governance and in the paper as a whole.
BT	The Report lists extensive 'governance' responsibilities for governments, private sector and civil society. However, it should be acknowledged that the successful growth of the Internet is due in large part to its development in an unrestrained environment. The major role the private sector plays in investment in infrastructure and the development of internet technologies is also overlooked by the Report, along with the important element of shared responsibility or activity between the identified groups. The current governance model operates a bottom-up, policy development process in which all stakeholders participate and going forward this model, should be reflected in any description of roles and responsibilities.
CCBI/CSIA	<p>The governance of the Internet is a cooperative and collaborative effort amongst all stakeholders. The section on roles and responsibilities does not adequately highlight the shared nature of the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders. The phenomenal success of the Internet is due in large part to its development in a conducive and unrestrained environment. The private sector plays an essential role in investing in the Internet and Internet related technologies. Competitively priced services make the Internet available to the public.</p> <p>The list of topics discussed in relation to Internet governance was extensive. Most of them would not require the government roles of overseer, treaty maker and/or developer of best practices. The list in paragraph 30 might imply that these functions were required in all areas.</p> <p>The phrase "and applications" should be added to the end of "Governments can promote access to ICT services and applications." Governments can do this through public-private partnerships in the short and medium term and through the development of an appropriate policy framework in the long-term.</p> <p>In addition to combating cybercrime, governments can promote a culture of security through increased awareness and other programmes.</p> <p>Business has many other critically important roles and responsibilities that were not included in the WGIG report, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovate, invest, build, operate and maintain infrastructure, applications and services;</li> <li>• Foster human capacity building in and through ICTs (education and training)</li> </ul>
CENTR	CENTR endorses the role of the private sector. The private sector has a significant role in several areas that are not listed in the Report. As an example, the private sector is actively engaged in fostering regional as well as global cooperation, and with that contributes immensely to the aim of including particularly the communities of developing countries.
Commune d'arrondisse- ment de Hann Bel Air	<p>We should consider local authorities as stakeholders. They could play a role in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supporting the reinforcement of capacities in ICT domain,</li> <li>• facilitating access to the ICTs,</li> <li>• promoting multilingualism and cultural diversity,</li> <li>• awareness raising and capacity-building;</li> <li>• facilitating infrastructure construction,</li> <li>• mobilizing citizens within the democratic processes,</li> <li>• involving marginalized groups,</li> <li>• participating in policy development,</li> <li>• encouraging social responsibility and the practice of a good governance.</li> </ul>
ITU	The report to Council 05 on Resolution 102 activities outlines ITU's main activities with respect to IP-based networks and related topics.



Internet Governance Project	The report seems to have been guided by a consensus that “public policy” is the exclusive domain of governments. Most of the proposed institutional changes would, in accord with that philosophy, give government a “leading role” in defining and implementing public policy, often excluding civil society and the private sector from direct participation except as observers and advisors”. In our opinion, this represents a false consensus, because the report does not advance an analysis of when Internet policy becomes “public” and how one can reliably separate such “public policy” matters from operational administration, technical standardization, resource allocation and assignment, or ordinary business and social activity on the Internet. As a decentralized network of networks, Internet policies often emerge through collective action by distributed, private actors. Moreover, on the Internet, policy issues are often intimately and inextricably related to technical and operational decisions. <sup>1</sup> As a result, the report’s unelaborated conception of the role of government makes it possible that any and every aspect of the Internet might be subject to direct intergovernmental intervention, to the exclusion of civil society and the private sector.
InternetNZ	The UN has major roles to play to assist the ongoing outreach programmes, to empower disenfranchised communities and individuals most particularly in developing countries.
GLOCOM (IGTF-J)	We express our concern on the general emphasis over the role of governments in Internet Governance... We believe that bottom-up, distributed open mechanisms have so far functioned well...we wish to point out that just strengthening government’s role without clearly articulating what that role is may result in excessive regulation and constraints that might hinder the sound and dynamic development of the Internet. IGTF believes that when it comes to Internet Governance, it should be primarily handled by private sector cooperation, while the role of the government should remain as that of good collaborator with a comprehensive understanding of the issues.
NRO	The NRO salutes the explicit acknowledgment, included in the WGIG report, of the existence of the technical and academic community and their important contribution to the development of the Internet. It is important that the WSIS takes this into consideration in order to ensure that participation and representation mechanisms reflect this reality and, although we do not object to the more widespread practice of classifying stakeholders as Civil Society, Private Sector and Governments, it is important that the academic sector and the technical community have adequate participation and representation in the governance mechanisms.
VeriSign Inc.	Importantly, the WGIG work on this issue demonstrates that there is no vacuum within the context of existing structures to address Internet-related public policy issues. Governments, the private sector, and civil society can constructively collaborate to better understand the respective roles of the existing entities and structures. Effective collaboration will permit government and industry to identify ways in which the views of each can be recognized and harmonized. Existing entities can then cooperate in addressing many of the complex issues raised by the Internet and Internet usage.
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	The caucus agrees “that the academic and technical communities have been invaluable sources of inspiration, innovation and creativity in the development and secure and stable operation of the Internet”. It is important to preserve the independence of network layers, so that connectivity providers do not determine which content can be transmitted. The end-to-end principles should be preserved and reinforced against all attempt to introduce control over the Internet. The caucus is “concerned that the specific roles of civil society and the private sector in relation to that of governments are not fully defined, allowing for ambiguous and/or different interpretations”. The WGIG report could have given greater attention to the contributions of individual users, sometimes referred to as “netizens”, to the development of the Internet. It is essential to preserve and promote users’ ability to make such contributions in the future... In addition, users should be able to participate in global policy discussions without being required to join organizational delegations. The Caucus strongly advocates a mutually reinforcing process of support for ‘bottom-up’ national level multi-stakeholder processes and an enabling environment for meaningful participation by civil society in public policy processes also at regional and international levels, given the expanded diversity of stakeholders in this context.
<b>Forum function (paras 40-47)</b>	
EU and acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania)	The EU advocates a new co-operation model, in order to concretise the provisions in the WSIS Declaration of Principles regarding the crucial role of all actors within Internet Governance, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations.
Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle, Canada supports the idea of creating a multi-stakeholder forum to discuss a broad</li> </ul>

	<p>range of public policy issues related to the Internet. We believe it is desirable to build upon the dialogue established by the WGIG and its public consultations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We agree with the WGIG Report that the forum for dialogue should not be a continuation of the WGIG itself. As well, the forum should not be a permanent institution. It should be established for not more than five years, and its operation should make maximum use of ICTs to operate in a cost-effective and inclusive fashion.</li> <li>• The forum should focus on capacity building, particularly to develop the knowledge and experience necessary for developing countries to be able to participate effectively in the discussion of Internet issues. The forum could encourage examination of a range of public policy options which may be useful for interested countries.</li> <li>• The forum should not be involved in day-to-day operations of the Internet, nor distract from discussions taking place in existing organizations.</li> <li>• Adequate resources must be identified to ensure that all stakeholders (including developing countries, SMEs and civil society) are able to participate. The forum should be supported by a very light organization, with a focus on development.</li> </ul>
Egypt	Egypt strongly believes that while reviewing, adjusting or even introducing new mechanisms regarding Internet Governance, the stability and security of the Internet must not be jeopardized, rather, they need to be further enhanced.
Ghana on behalf of the African Group (add. 1)	<p>There was unanimity on the need for an additional body which would not only serve as a multi-stakeholder discussion forum, but would also proffer policy advice albeit in a participatory manner... The new organizational model of governance should take into account regional and sub-regional specificities in terms of level of development, culture, needs, constraints etc. Other functions of this body could include that of serving as a coordinating linchpin among the different entities involved in the various aspects of Internet management and inter-governmental bodies including the UN. This body would therefore address all issues related to the Internet within the confines of the available expertise and should be anchored at the UN.</p> <p>The modalities for financing this body could entail soliciting for subscriptions from beneficiaries and bodies involved in the Internet management and administration field.</p> <p>On the structure of this entity there was general consensus that the ideal structure could be in the form of a multi-stakeholder alliance/Board of appointed or elected public, private, civil society members and individuals taking into cognizance geographical representation. Membership tenure could be for a fixed 4/5 year term under the possible supervision of the proposed anchor, the UN. Partnerships and coordination would be required with existing organizations and institutions, which could also play a role as multi-stakeholder alliance members.</p>
Israel	Israel supports the decision reached during the WSIS deliberations that emphasizes the importance of the including all the different stakeholders within the WSIS decision-making process and governance mechanisms. We also support the idea of establishing a forum that will expedite the ongoing exchange of views between all stakeholders.
Japan	<p>The report mentioned, "the WGIG identified a vacuum within the context of existing structures, since there is no global multi-stakeholder forum to address Internet-related public policy issues. It came to the conclusion that there would be merit in creating such a space for dialogue among all stakeholders." As Japan thinks it is necessary to continue the momentum of global dialogue, it would be worth considering the creation of such a space. ...</p> <p>Accordingly, while Japan believes that attention should be paid to avoid duplicating the activities of these existing institutions, it is necessary to discuss the creation of a forum that engages in high-level dialogue on a broad spectrum of issues through multi-stakeholder participation.</p>
Korea (Rep.)	In principle, we support the idea of creating a global forum for dialogue among all stakeholders such as governments, the private sector and civil society to address problems linked to Internet governance, including spam and cybercrime. We hope that the forum would be held on a regular basis to cope with issues of the rapidly changing Internet.
Switzerland	The establishment of a forum such as it is proposed by the group constitutes a first stage in facilitating dialogue, examining the fundamental issues and ensuring liaison between the different partners, , in particular with intergovernmental bodies. However, with regard to the questions of "public policy", we think that one should use all the possibilities that offer the existing institutions before creating new bodies which can involve a long and costly process. The international organisations in the UN system have certainly a role to play here; all the more so as these organisations already started work on these topics.
USA	While the United States recognizes that the current Internet system is working, we encourage an ongoing dialogue with all stakeholders around the world in the various fora as a way to facilitate discussion and to advance our shared interest in the ongoing robustness and dynamism of the



	<p>Internet. The focus of these discussions should be on how all stakeholders can continue to collaborate in addressing Internet related issues. In these fora, the United States will continue to support market-based approaches and private sector leadership in Internet development broadly.</p>
Turkey	<p>The Government of Turkey believes that the international governance of the Internet should be multilateral, legitimate, transparent, accountable and participatory.</p> <p>Ensuring the network stability and safety and security of Internet infrastructure services and applications, preventing and prosecuting cyber crimes, spam, IPR infringements and other similar problems require multilateral and effective mechanisms, including administrative, technical, and legal precautions enforced on a global scale. Therefore, full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and the international organizations has vital importance for the success of international Internet governance that we are to design.</p>
American Libraries Association	<p>The Internet developed through an informal collaboration between public, private, and government organizations. ... It is important to avoid overly centralized and hierarchical structures and preserve this multi-faceted collaboration. We would also strongly support the increased participation of public interest groups in policymaking.</p>
BT	<p>BT considers that the most timely and efficient way to facilitate the progress ... will be to encourage all the stakeholders and communities ... to further develop their own outreach programmes with each other instead of creating a new "Forum Function" linked to the United Nations.</p>
CCBI / CSIA	<p>A variety of existing organizations are addressing issues related to the evolution of the Internet and are responsive to its dynamic needs and its applications. These organizations provide forums and space for discussion and have liaisons between each other, as appropriate. The Internet was designed to be managed/coordinated in a decentralized fashion without the need for "centralized" control. Certainly, it has worked that way for many years and today is bringing the benefits of the Information Society to people around the world, improving their quality of life. CCBI / CSIA supports efforts to increase awareness of the work of existing organizations and to promote greater participation as appropriate in them. There may, in some cases, also be benefits from issue-specific, time-limited forums sponsored by, and accountable to, existing expert organizations, including private sector organizations.</p> <p>The WGIG has demonstrated the overlapping involvement of many entities and stakeholders in most issues related to the Internet. Thus, it is important that any issue-specific forum, as described above, be flexible enough to encourage greater information exchange across organizations and stakeholders on issues that may be addressed by existing organizations but that have a horizontal cross-cutting nature. This could actually promote cooperation and collaboration and thus promote greater efficiency. However, to do so, it would have to add value and be a neutral forum that could facilitate bringing all the stakeholders and existing institutions and organizations together as equal partners to promote cooperation.</p> <p>CCBI / CSIA supports using existing organizations for informational and educational forums. CCBI / CSIA supports increased participation and outreach especially at regional, sub-regional, and national levels amongst all stakeholders.</p> <p>CCBI / CSIA does not support enabling further debates related to issues addressed by existing expert organizations, other than within those organizations. This would be a duplication of costs and resources and could damage productive and vital work already underway, or just emerging to address ICTs access, the real reason for the WSIS. Where there is a need to exchange information on a specific issue addressed by multiple organizations and stakeholders, the relevant organizations should jointly convene a meeting for discussion of that issue. Such meetings should be limited in focus and function to information exchange and enhancing awareness of ways to participate in existing forums. It is important that any forum promote cooperation, collaboration and greater efficiency without undercutting the work and initiative of the existing organizations themselves.</p>
CDT	<p>Creating such a forum poses two major concerns. First, without a very clear charter circumscribing the powers and scope of the new entity, there is a danger that a new international forum could attempt to assume some sort of regulatory function, or expand its involvement into areas that are the province of sovereign governments. Secondly, even if the forum were established in such a way that it had a limited scope and mission, "Internet governance" is a vast topic and could yield many years of discussions on literally dozens of issues. Such an open-ended structure could force Internet policy experts to commit thousands of hours of work that may be better used addressing the immediate problems of Internet management.</p> <p>One possible solution is, instead of creating a single, open-ended forum, the global Internet community could address issues like spam, electronic copyright, and free expression in a series of time-limited, issue specific forums. ... Stakeholders should also explore whether existing global</p>

	forums could be leveraged to address these issues, thus saving the effort and potential dangers associated with creating a new entity.
CENTR	<p>We have strong reservations about how a forum as sketched out in Section V.A.1 of the Report could work in practice and are concerned that such a forum, over time and against its creators' intention, could be regarded as "The Internet Government". Instead of taking on a role as regulatory or policy making body, such a forum could and should only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serve as a vehicle for the exchange of concerns and ideas of various sectors; and</li> <li>• Make provision for the effective participation of all stakeholders including non-governmental sectors from developing countries that are usually blocked out of such forums on account of financial and other logistical obstructions. Indeed the power of the Internet could be used to facilitate such participation.</li> </ul> <p>. . . . We believe that most of such local bodies already exist and there would be no need to duplicate them. Instead, any global forum should rely on organisations like CENTR or RIPE as regional points of reference for those aspects related to their respective activities.</p>
EUROLINK	Whether or not the "Forum" proposed in the report should come to existence, and whatever IG structure should be adopted, there is a pressing need for more balanced internationalization and effective multi-stakeholder <u>validation</u> in the internet standard making process.
GLOCOM (IGTF)	<p>IGTF believes that if a new forum is to be created, we must be very careful and creative in making this forum work and work meaningfully. To be more specific, if a new forum is to be established the following conditions should be applied.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Predefine the forum's mission and areas and issues clearly. A principle should be set that the forum should not deal with issues already handled by other bodies or issues which do not have explicit consensus to be handled by the forum.</li> <li>2) The forum should remain as a space for exchanging views and opinions freely. It should not make any binding decisions.</li> <li>3) Selection of participating actors and officers should be done in an open, transparent and democratic manner. It should ensure equal participation from government, private sector and civil society. Hence it should guarantee that the most relevant actors to the issues be involved.</li> <li>4) Be sensitive to the cost performance. Not only the financial cost, but time cost and travel cost should also be taken in to full consideration for the operation of the forum.</li> <li>5) Be considerate of languages. In global debate, giving priorities to a few languages will impose great burden to those who do not use these language in an everyday environment. When limiting its working languages, full consideration is desirable to ensure linguistic equality as much as possible by employing such innovative measure as simultaneous interpretation, document translation, real-time transcription and large-screen display, among others.</li> <li>6) Participation from the developing parts of the world must be ensured. The new forum is expected to facilitate participation from the countries and economies where Internet development is still less than ideal. This function would include identifying capacity building programs and best practices, identifying problem areas in developing economies.</li> </ol>
ICANN	ICANN agrees with the WGIG recommendations on institutional coordination and regional and national coordination, and would note that this should occur under existing arrangements with existing organisations. Organisations and entities, whether intergovernmental, private sector, business, technical, academic, civil society, or any other already exchange information regularly and should work to build on existing work to ensure further information sharing with each other and to interested stakeholders and participants. All organisations can improve the coordination of activities and exchange of information, and in particular work to ensure that the multi-stakeholder approach is implemented as far as possible in all regions and supported on the national level as well.
ITU	The report to Council 05 on Resolution 102 activities outlines ITU's main activities with respect to IP-based networks and related topics.
ITAA	<p>ITAA is not persuaded by calls for a new, general-purpose discussion forum. Nor do we think this In is a logical conclusion from the WGIG Report itself. We note that the Report references a discussion "space" or a discussion "function". We believe that the discussion "function" can, and should be, accomplished through the use of existing mechanisms. We further believe that those existing mechanisms, for the most part, should become more inclusive, transparent and responsive. It is more important to focus on concrete work and outcomes, and on specific achievable tasks than to repeat arguments and position statements in new fora. There is much work to be done at the local, national and regional levels and in existing entities, including the ITU, WIPO, ICANN, and UNESCO, UNDP initiatives and others. All of these bodies and groups should be encouraged to focus on their work, to grow in participation and transparency, and to fulfill their missions. In particular, we cannot support the creation of an open-ended forum that lacks accountability for its</p>

	<p>agenda. Those who should be working within existing and productive organizations might be tempted to abandon the hard work necessary for real impact to come to a new and unproven organization which promises to resemble more a “debating society” than an effective contributor to concrete accomplishments in addressing Internet Governance issues.</p> <p>Such an arrangement does not appear to be a useful approach and would risk damaging existing organizations. We believe that much hard work needs to be accomplished within the existing bodies because they have responsibilities and challenges to fulfill. This particularly applies to both ICANN and the ITU that are actually complementary to each other when they each fulfill their core mission.</p>
Internet Governance Project	<p>The consensus notion of a multi-stakeholder forum suggests that further discussion, debate and negotiation should take place. This can build on the growing body of analysis that informed the WGIG work, but clearly must be given a greater sense of direction. The forum, therefore, has to be seen as a preparatory element for something else.</p>
Internet-Mark2 project	<p>We strongly support the forum proposal. This can provide an ongoing means of addressing issues which will emerge as the Internet grows and changes. This is the most important structural proposal. The forum needs to have wide input from industry, governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, and needs to encompass existing governmental, commercial and institutional interests as well as otherwise under-represented segments of the internet user community whose wishes must also be respected in any workable forward plan.</p>
Internet Society (Int'l)	<p>It is worth restating that the processes that support the development and operation of the Internet today are truly open to all and are already multistakeholder. They have supported the development of the Internet for many years and we welcome increased participation by all in these processes. We do not see the benefit of creating new organization(s), but welcome initiatives that foster continued dialogue and recommend these be built on existing institutions while fully utilizing the Internet and the new technologies and communications options that the Internet affords.</p> <p>We disagree with those parts of Section V.A which imply that there is a need for a single forum where Internet policy issues can be discussed and debated. Instead, we would emphasize the language in the first sentence of Paragraph 43, which defines a “forum” as a “space or forum for dialogue” but does not imply that this “space” would be provided by a single organization or single event(s).</p> <p>We believe strongly that the goals laid out in Section V.A would not be best accomplished by creating a new forum linked to the United Nations. Instead, these goals could be quickly and effectively achieved by creating or expanding dozens of different fora under each of the different intergovernmental and non-governmental international organizations and consortia that are dealing with different aspects of Internet policy and Internet technology.</p>
InternetNZ	<p>InternetNZ would welcome collaboration from the WSIS and the UN that would assist the private sector, in the reduction of threats to the stability and security of the Internet most particularly in the areas of cyber-crime and cyber-security, and we perceive major benefits from greater UN participation in these regards.</p>
Internet Society (Pacific Islands Chapter)	<p>In summary we do not encourage the formation of a body that will call for more international meetings. We would rather see this task delegated to current UN bodies where they properly run public awareness sessions on Internet Governance and bring these questions, comments and opinions into an existing forum</p>
Nominet UK	<p>If a forum is to be created, the challenges will lie in realizing this objective within a lightweight, flexible structure, and in avoiding mission creep. We anticipate difficulties in deciding who gets a seat at the table, and sufficient flexibility to allow participants to change according to the issue at hand. In terms of the scope of the forum, we believe that it ought to be limited to the exchange of best practice and should not make binding recommendations.</p> <p>We also support the greater involvement of developing nations and other interested parties, and suggest that in conjunction with other initiatives, the power of the Internet itself may assist in this regard. We note that existing structures such as the IETF currently enjoy effective participation from developing nations, and we should learn from the success of such models.</p> <p>We also recommend that, given the fast changing nature of the Internet, the forum should have a “sunset provision” for no more than 5 years’ time after it begins, to enable formal review of its role, effectiveness and continuing relevance to the Internet and its stakeholders.</p> <p>That said, and bearing in mind the success of the WGIG process, we can see the benefits of a forum in which all stakeholders may engage on an equal footing to discuss emerging issues.</p>
NRO	<p>We are convinced that the active participation of all interested parties on an even playing field is a key factor in the success of any governance model.</p>
South Centre	<p>The centrepiece of the WGIG Report is its recommendation for “the creation of a new space for dialogue for all stakeholders on an equal footing on all Internet governance-related issues”. There is</p>

	<p>however no common agreement on the form, structure and function of this 'space'. Would a 'forum', if agreed, be selected from among the biennial ITU Telecom World Conferences, the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly (WTSA), or the ITU's Fourth World Telecommunication Development Conference (WTDC-06), the highest policy-making authority at the International Telecommunication Union for development?</p>
UNESCO IFAP Russia	<p>[We] Urge the respective government bodies, private sector and civil society representatives to implement forthcoming decisions of the WGIG on Internet governance issues at international and national levels.</p>
Verisign Inc.	<p>A large global ecosystem of well-established and effective international multilateral, regional, national, and local forums already exists to treat "Internet governance." It is not apparent that an additional new forum is needed, or would usefully contribute to the objectives of the WSIS process. ... What does seem to be needed is more effective collaboration among existing organizations, effective participation in these organizations by interested parties, and ongoing dialogue among all the actors in question.</p>
Vox Internet	<p>Numerous private and public authorities are involved today with various aspects of Internet governance: a coordination should be established, allowing both loyal competition and the promotion of Internet as a common good.</p>
WSIS CS Internet Governance Caucus	<p>The caucus supports the establishment of a new forum to address the broad agenda of Internet governance issues, provided it is truly global, inclusive, and multi-stakeholder in composition. Stakeholders from all sectors must be able to participate in such a forum as peers.</p> <p>The caucus recommends that Sub-Committee A create a multi-stakeholder working group to address the evolution of the forum, including aspects of scope, structure, membership and modalities, funding and timeline. Initial comments which could feed into such a process are noted below.</p> <p>The forum should not be anchored in any existing specialized international organization, but rather should be organized as a legally free-standing entity. If this is impossible, then the forum should be organized directly under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary General.</p> <p>The forum should not have a mandate to negotiate hard instruments like treaties or contracts. However, in very exceptional circumstances when the parties all agree that such instruments are needed, there could be a mechanism that allows for their establishment. Normally, the forum should focus on the development of soft law instruments such as recommendations, guidelines, declarations, etc.</p> <p>The forum could provide, for example, the following functions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. inclusive dialogue, with a differentiated architecture allowing for peer-level interaction where appropriate, for example in Birds of a Feather, working groups, study groups, plenaries, etc.</li> <li>b. comparative, cross-sectoral analysis of governance mechanisms, with an eye toward "lessons learned" and best practices that could inform individual and collective institutional improvements</li> <li>c. assessment and monitoring of horizontal issues applicable to all Internet governance arrangements, e.g. the promotion of transparency, accountability, inclusion, and other guidelines for "good governance," such as the WSIS principles;</li> <li>d. identification of weaknesses and gaps in the governance architecture, i.e. "orphaned" or multidimensional issues that do not fall neatly within the ambit of any existing body;</li> <li>e. identification of potential tensions between separately developed mechanisms, and possibly efforts to promote enhanced coordination among them;</li> <li>f. promotion of decentralized convergence among positions and initiatives, where possible;</li> <li>g. pre-decision agenda setting that could, inter alia, feed into the work of other bodies;</li> <li>h. provide a clearing house for coordination, resource mobilization, identification of new needs and gaps, in relation to supporting meaningful developing country participation and capacity building</li> <li>i. promote the usage of ICTs to allow remote participation in Internet governance processes;</li> <li>j. release recommendations, best practices, proposals and other documents on the various Internet governance issues.</li> </ol> <p>Participation in the discussions and working groups of the forum should be free and open to all interested individuals from all stakeholder groups. Operations should be designed in such a way that physical attendance is not strictly required and disadvantaged stakeholders (developing countries, civil society organizations, individuals) are proactively supported.</p> <p>It is important that the forum has clear organization and decision-making procedures, and responsibilities for its functioning and effectiveness are clearly defined and attributed. It is also important that the structure that will be given to the forum is able to produce practical results. A</p>

	forum for discussion will not be particularly useful if it will not be coupled with the ability to bring all stakeholders to agreement and determine actual changes.
<b>Global Public policy and oversight (four models) (Paras 48-71)</b>	
Canada	<p>Canada does not support the creation of a new treaty organization for the purposes of Internet governance.</p> <p>Canada has been a long-time and strong supporter of the ICANN model, as a private, not-for-profit, bottom-up entity. ... Indeed, it is because of the primarily technical nature of ICANN's mandate that Canada has long supported this approach.</p> <p>Canada supports the continuing evolution and reform of ICANN in the post-2006 environment. Canada acknowledges the vital role that the United States government has played in the development of the Internet itself and, through the establishment of ICANN, in initiating a process aimed at increasing competition, privatization, and enabling international participation in the management of the Internet's technical functions. We also applaud the arm's length, light-touch approach which the United States government has adopted in its oversight of ICANN itself. Like the vast majority of participants in the WGIG, Canada agrees that the path of increasing competition, privatization and internationalization should be pursued.</p> <p>Canada supports the continued participation of governments in ICANN through the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). Outside the WSIS context, it may be worth exploring the establishment of mechanisms to help focus the GAC's agenda, and governments' relationship with ICANN, in a manner consistent with the narrow policy role foreseen for ICANN itself, and supportive of the goals of increasing competition, privatization and internationalization.</p> <p>The GAC's effectiveness could be enhanced by the establishment of a permanent GAC Secretariat which would focus on providing necessary logistical support to the GAC, and contribute to capacity development aimed at improving GAC participation by developing countries. A secure funding mechanism would have to be found, perhaps via an untied contribution from ICANN itself. Canada does not believe there is a need for such a secretariat to provide policy research capability. Instead, the GAC should draw on the expertise of its membership, including that of other international organizations.</p>
Egypt	<p>Egypt respects the sovereign rights of states as regards international Internet-related public policy issues. Accordingly, Egypt encourages the creation of a high-level multi-stakeholder board of trustees that has a more legitimate international mandate as far as Internet public policy issues are concerned.</p>
EU and acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania)	<p>The EU advocates a new co-operation model, in order to concretise the provisions in the WSIS Declaration of Principles regarding the crucial role of all actors within Internet Governance, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations. The existing Internet Governance mechanisms should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interest of all governments. The respective roles of the international and intergovernmental organisations within the field of Internet Governance should be clarified.</p> <p>In this respect, the EU recognises the contribution made by international and intergovernmental organisations and encourages cooperation in this field. The new cooperation model should be based on the current bottom-up public-private partnership; it should also provide a platform for policy dialogue in the interest of all governments in a light, fast reacting and flexible approach.</p> <p>The new model should be based on the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it should not replace existing mechanisms or institutions, but should build on the existing structures of Internet Governance, with a special emphasis on the complementarity between all the actors involved in this process, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations;</li> <li>• the new public-private co-operation model should contribute to the sustainable stability and robustness of the Internet by addressing appropriately public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance.</li> </ul>
Ghana (on behalf of African Group)	<p>The governance of Internet is not about the simple management of IP addresses, but about taking decisions related to the general functioning of Internet whether it is in term of regulation in its widest sense or technical adaptations. The oversight function could include issues such as policy advice, arbitration, monitoring, audit and communication. The general consensus [in the online African consultation] was that the proposed new body should not only take over the Governmental oversight functions of the DNS and root server system administration, but all other areas of activity under the oversight of the US Government. This oversight function through this new body should not only be applicable to ICANN, after the termination of the MoU in 2006, but also post 2006.</p> <p>This new body should also replace the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) and take over its</p>

	responsibilities and activities.
Israel	The Government of Israel is of the opinion that the proper mechanism for the implementation of the decisions agreed upon with regard to the subject of Internet Governance that is outlined in model no. 2, as presented in the WGIG Report.
Japan	<p>With respect to “global public policy and oversight,” Japan recognizes that all four models reported in WGIG are suggestive and satisfy the WSIS principle: “multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations.” Regarding the governance mechanism of Internet resources, there has to be recognition of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the private sector has played the leading role in successfully expanding the business aspects of the Internet;</li> <li>• that the Internet is now a vital infrastructure and must be operated with increased stability and reliability;</li> <li>• that it is necessary to give priority to protecting Internet users now and in the future; and</li> <li>• that feasible mechanisms must be put in place capable of addressing issues promptly and effectively, and that do not inhibit rapid technological innovation.</li> </ul>
Korea (Rep.)	<p>Although WGIG was unable to agree on a single model for the Internet governance, we believe that the recommendation of four Internet governance mechanism models by WGIG is a meaningful step for further discussions on the global Internet public policy coordination. No matter what mechanism of name and address administration is decided, the stability and security of the DNS infrastructure should be the most critical criterion when making the decision in order to ensure the benefit of the global Internet community. ...</p> <p>We would like to lay a special emphasis on the legitimate public policy and sovereignty concerns with respect to the management of ccTLDs. We recognize that ccTLD associated with a particular country is the national resource of the given country and important to the country's future social and economic development.</p>
Rwanda	We feel that the best model for Internet Governance in the future is one which is as inclusive as possible in terms of representation, participation and benefits for all Internet users, irrespective of location. The model should take particular care to empower all stakeholders while making allowances for the challenges faced by certain user groups in participation in global policy dialogue.
Switzerland	The question of a simple and effective multilateral oversight concerning the "public policy issues" aspects is important in our view; the summit in Tunis should provide clear indications on the path to be taken.
Turkey	<p>We support the general principle that no single government or a group of governments should have a pre-eminent role in relation to international Internet governance (para 48).</p> <p>The new organizational structure should function under the auspices of the United Nations, which can guarantee the participation of all governments on an equal basis. There should be three bodies within this new structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Policy and decision making body</b> should be responsible for international Internet-related policy issues. Besides, this body should act as the final decision making mechanism of the whole structure. This body will consist of members from governments with appropriate representation, which allows equal and rotating participation from all UN regions. The representatives of private sector and civil society should follow this body's work as observer.</li> <li>• <b>Operational body</b> should be responsible for the development of the Internet in both technical and economic fields and day-to-day operational management of the Internet. This body should consist of administrative, technical and legal experts, and follow the rules and the procedures of other specialized UN agencies for recruitments. There should be cooperation mechanisms between this operational body and other technical entities, such as the Internet Engineering Task Force.</li> <li>• <b>Advisory body</b> should be responsible for providing suitable platforms for all relevant parties to discuss and facilitate coordination of Internet-related policy issues.</li> </ul>
USA	The United States remains open to discussing with all stakeholders ways to improve the technical efficiency as well as the transparency and openness of existing governance structures. However, it is important that the global community recognize that the existing structures have worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust and geographically diverse medium that it is today. The security and stability of the Internet must be maintained.
American Library Association	While the working group lays out some good options for the future of Internet governance, it is difficult to know which would be able to resolve the key issues while continuing to encourage development and innovation. However, we strongly agree with the sentiment that all stakeholders

	must be involved in the process, including those from developing countries.
BT	BT has reservations about each of the four models proposed in the WGIG statement. None offers solutions that meet the needs of all stakeholders, or enhance the existing structures in a manner that would provide any overall benefit. .... Even with Model 2, which BT considers to be the only one close to viability, we doubt the wisdom of the approach. It is not appropriate for ICANN to evolve into a body that has a much wider remit than it has today. BT also considers that all of the organisational models proposed place insufficient emphasis on the role and importance of users, developers and suppliers of Internet.
CCBI / CSIA	CCBI / CSIA does not believe that any of the models proposed are appropriate in providing the needed stability and security for the Internet. The important roles of the many organizations in a decentralized manner needs to be recognized. CCBI /CSIA underscores that multi-stakeholder discussions should take place in neutral fora in which all stakeholders are allowed and encouraged to participate equally. Any multi-stakeholder discussions and issue-specific forums, as described above, should be funded in a way that does not create barriers to participation for governments, civil society or business.
CDT	Three of the four governance models proposed by WGIG call for drastic, potentially destabilizing changes to the Internet oversight structure -- changes that simply aren't supported by the current state of online affairs. Indeed all four of the recommendations call for more hands-on involvement by government-dominated bodies, a development that would undercut the speedy, bottom-up decision-making process fostered by the existing network of non-governmental management bodies that oversee the Internet's key functions. The report fails to acknowledge that top-down governmental structures may not be the most effective – or even the most representative – source of governance for the Internet.
CENTR / Nominet UK	<p>We note that the Working Group on Internet Governance was not able to reach consensus on a single best way forward and therefore chose to present four options for consideration.</p> <p>To the extent that private sector and civil society involvement is limited to “an advisory capacity” (notably options 1, 3 and to some extent option 4), these models fail to meet the WSIS criteria set out in paragraph 48 ...The private sector has been responsible for much of the investment and innovation that has driven the development of the Internet. Therefore it seems incongruous to propose reducing non-governmental actors' participation to advisory or observer roles.</p> <p>Also, option 4 sounds very complex and potentially bureaucratic and it is doubtful that such an all-encompassing scheme could prove workable in practice.</p> <p>Option 2 appears to take a more incremental approach, but the scope of the “<i>enhance[d] role</i>” of the GAC is unclear to us. CENTR members would be unable to support any solution which could impose binding recommendations.</p> <p>In our view, the overriding principles are subsidiarity and local determination, which are endorsed in the revised GAC Principles. We believe that balance between stakeholders needs to be guaranteed in any model. This balance could promote participation that accords with models and approaches of local Internet communities that have proven to be successful.</p> <p>Furthermore, we would like to reiterate that certain processes, like deciding the operator of a TLD Registry or the policies under which that Registry provides service to the Internet user community, must accord with national law, must have high levels of technical competency and reliability and address the needs of the local Internet Community. Consequently most decisions are local matters that should not be up to any external organisation.</p>
GLOCOM, on behalf of IGTF- J	<p><u>Changes should be made in an evolutionally manner.</u> If we are to change the current framework, implementation should be done in a careful and step-by-step manner. We should avoid any sudden change that might risk damaging the operational stability of the Internet.</p> <p><u>Oversight should be only limited to simple audit function.</u> For the oversight to ICANN, we think “simple audit function” is the most appropriate function. In the future, it will be desirable to make a transition from current single-government oversight to the oversight based on the consensus of all stakeholders. In an emergency situation, for example if ICANN goes into bankruptcy, we expect the provision of financial support be included in the oversight responsibility. However, governmental oversight should stand aside from ICANN's daily operation.</p> <p><u>ICANN’s Government Advisory Committee (GAC)</u> should stay under the current framework with possible improvement. ...We find great value in the current position of GAC, and oppose to give any stronger function or to be transformed to take on any oversight functions. We do not think any alternative body to GAC is necessary.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> In conclusion, IGTF would like to propose adding “Simple Audit Function” and “Host-country arrangement” onto Model 2 as a pragmatic solution.</p>

<p>ICANN</p>	<p>ICANN ... notes that the WGIG could not come to any agreement on the possible future mechanism surrounding global public policy and oversight (and the 4 'models'). This is not surprising given that the Internet comprises many different arrangements, and having one 'oversight' for all 'global public policy' relating to Internet issues and involving a multi-stakeholder model is in and of itself difficult. There is an inherent tension between public international law and the private international law on which much of the Internet is based. For example, one of the main ways in which ICANN acts, and the only extent of 'authority' it exerts, is through the many hundreds of international private law contracts and Memoranda of Understanding between ICANN and registries and registrars around the globe. Each of these contracts has explicit provision for amendment when new "consensus-based policies" are approved by ICANN.</p> <p>By involvement through the GAC in multi-stakeholder discussions on such technical policy issues, governments have ensured that public policy concerns related to ICANN's area of responsibility have been injected into these private international law contracts. This is an effective way for governments to ensure that key public policy aspects are consistently accounted for in the operation of the private bodies that operate the Internet's DNS and IP addressing infrastructure throughout the world. The importance of these contracts is that they are the only enforceable means through which ICANN actually affects the behaviour of market actors that provide naming and addressing services to Internet users.</p> <p>ICANN appreciates governments focusing on their appropriate role in exercising public policy responsibilities in the overall realm of Internet governance, and in ICANN in particular. Experience demonstrates how difficult it can be for a broad and diverse group of governments to reach consensus on complex technical issues. This difficulty arises partly because of different legislative realities and political views, and partly through very different interpretations of which aspects of ICANN's work raise public policy issues. As a result, any efforts to create 'oversight' must be considered with a great amount of care, particularly on the merits of effectiveness and rapid and practicable implementation. Further, experience also shows that any development of oversight must first consider the nature, scope, and extent of the oversight under discussion, and the objectives intended by implementing it.</p>
<p>Internet Governance Project</p>	<p>The report did not propose a specific set of governance functions or a specific organizational model. Instead, it set out four different organizational models in a very brief outline format, none specifying particular governance techniques or functions.</p> <p>Looking at the four models, it is clear that there are really only two positions expressed. One, called Model 2, says that other than creating the new multi-stakeholder discussion forum, not much needs to be done. The second, consisting of the other three models, says that in addition to the forum there needs to be some formal intergovernmental organization to centralize public authority over global Internet governance, although there are differences among the models in the details. ...</p> <p>The three models suggesting new institutional frameworks based on new intergovernmental bodies are ... premature. Until it is clear what the institutions are expected to do, and the necessity for doing it, consensus would be hard to obtain. ...</p> <p>Yet, something must be done. The definition of Internet governance proposed by the WGIG suggests a sequence in which agreements must be made. First, there must be a definition of the principles and norms on which governance is to be based. If the first stage is to agree authoritatively on principles and norms, the negotiation of a framework convention is clearly a reasonable, practical and feasible mechanism. Framework conventions in areas like climate change have allowed States, with the input of non-State actors, to reach agreements that will provide a legally-binding context for subsequent efforts to deal with issues. Negotiating a framework convention would provide a focus for policy analysis and discussion through a new multi-stakeholder forum – but would also provide a specific <i>objective</i> for the discussions.</p> <p>Negotiation of international conventions can either take place within an existing institution, or if one cannot be agreed, can take place on an ad hoc basis reporting to a more general intergovernmental body like the United Nations General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council. Eventually, a convention would have to be adopted by the General Assembly – the only universal body whose competence covers all of the elements in Internet governance – prior to signature, ratification and entry- into-force.</p> <p>Secretariat support to the negotiations, including monitoring and facilitating the forum as part of the process, could be provided by an existing organizational unit, or by an ad hoc unit attached to an existing organization, much as was done with WGIG. This would keep the financial implications of the negotiation process to a minimum. Once a framework convention has entered into force, its periodic meetings of States parties would constitute a general intergovernmental body in which</p>



	<p>issues could be resolved. This would provide intergovernmental oversight to the Internet without the creation of a more complex and definitive structure, unless, as rules and procedures were worked out in subsequent negotiations, a more formal institutional structure was found necessary at some future time.</p>
Internet-Mark2	<p>We ... urge consideration of the four options advanced to deal with governance structures. Each has merits. Importantly, the question of root zone policy authorisation needs to be addressed; indeed the most suitable determination here might be that no such structure or authorisation is necessary. However, disquiet with the current unilateral control of this function is significant, and a structure whereby countries clearly control policy authorisation for their top level domains needs to be formalised. .... We suggest the need to do something here is urgent; we are seeing now the beginnings of fragmentation of the centralised root structure as various people react to their perceptions of problems with the current structure – whether they be concerns about unilateral control or perceptions of inadequacies in dealing with multilingual domain name development. These pressures are immediate and deserve attention by an expert group.</p>
ISOC Int'l	<p>This section has been the most controversial and most misunderstood section of the WGIG report. One problem mentioned previously is that some readers did not understand that there was no consensus on the four options outlined, let alone which of them may actually be preferred. Further, there was not even consensus on the need to select one of the four options. There is further confusion because the Working Group's call for a "forum function" or "space" to discuss global public policy issue related to the Internet has been misinterpreted as an endorsement of a much more extensive role for governments and the United Nations (as described in Model I, Model III, and Model IV). Our survey of Internet Society members around the world revealed strong opposition to all four of the options for increased government oversight of the evolution of the Internet. Even Option II, which stated that "There is no need for a specific oversight organization," was supported by less than 40 percent of respondents. In comments submitted with the survey, many members stressed that the UN and ISOC should be working to reduce government influence over the Internet, particularly in those countries where governments are attempting to suppress the freedom of expression or where government officials are trying to use government policy and power to reward specific companies.</p>
ISOC Bulgaria	<p><b>Model 1</b> keeps the stability the Internet has enjoyed in the last years, but also outlines governments as the key players in the IG. It provides opportunities for countries like Bulgaria to be part of the solution, not part of the problem. However, we feel uncomfortable that in this model, civil society and private sector are given an advisory role – a solution which we don't find good and relevant. ...</p> <p><b>Model 2</b> keeps the current model with almost no change. We believe that while it preserves the status quo, which has proven to be successful so far, there is lot that may be done in the field of better involvement of governments in the work of ICANN. ...</p> <p><b>Model 3</b> requires the establishment of a new body, and a de facto change of ICANN into a UN-type of body. While such an agreement seems adequate, given the multiple court cases where ICANN is involved, further research of this field needs to be carried out before we can develop a more concrete position on this model.</p> <p><b>Model 4</b> also requires the foundation of an UN-type of body, in this case not only a new, upgraded version of ICANN, but also the creation of the GIPC. This model requires even much more in-depth studies before we can decide on the concept and approach it proposes.</p>
InternetNZ	<p>InternetNZ believes the continuation of the ICANN model is likely to provide the most cohesive form of Internet Governance in the longer term. ICANN is only 6 years old, and has been constantly changing and evolving towards a truly globally representative Internet Governance body. The US Government quite properly, in our opinion, will not relinquish its rights to authenticate root server changes until such time that it has certainty that ICANN is sufficiently mature and globally representative that it is able to properly and legitimately be trusted to assume such responsibility. ...</p> <p>InternetNZ believes the UN is not the correct body to engage in those aspects of Internet Governance that relate to the core infrastructure of the root services. However, with regard to enhanced participation we acknowledge that many organisations including the UN have major roles to play to assist the ongoing outreach programmes to empower disenfranchised communities and individuals, most particularly in developing countries. Furthermore InternetNZ would welcome collaboration from the WSIS and the UN that would assist the private sector, in the reduction of threats to the stability and security of the Internet most particularly in the areas of cyber-crime and cyber-security, and we perceive major benefits from greater UN participation in these regards.</p>
ITAA	<p>ITAA remains concerned that the WGIG Report has focused too much on the technical coordination of the Internet and not enough on the broader issues within the scope of Internet governance. We are further dismayed that three out of four of the models for Internet governance proposed for consideration preclude continued private sector leadership. ...</p>

	<p>For models 1, 3, and 4, there is a change in the role of the civil society and business stakeholders to merely advisory. Model 2 does assume that the existing body – ICANN – responsible for the technical coordination and management of names and numbers will continue, with enhancements. However, it provides for a new forum to address issues. It is not clear how this model would not compete or interfere with existing bodies. Overall, we remain skeptical about the need for new discussion fora. Model 4 is especially troublesome since the commercial/business sector is completely ignored, and even omitted under paragraph 70.</p> <p>ITAA continues to believe that ICANN is the appropriate body for technical management of the Internet. ... ITAA supports ICANN and believes that ICANN adequately meets the WSIS principles of being multilateral, transparent and democratic, and embodies the participation of Governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations...</p> <p>ITAA notes also that, unfortunately, the WGIG Report does not support the ability of countries to self-select for themselves what works best for them in Internet governance initiatives and approaches. ... ITAA cannot support the concept of dictating a “one size fits all” approach.</p> <p>On the other hand, the spirit of the WGIG to support robust and full participation in advancing ICTs is worthwhile, and we fully support that goal</p>
LINX	<p>We note that the WGIG and almost all participants in the WSIS process express broad satisfaction with ICANN’s discharge of its function in the management of operations of the DNS root and the IANA function. ....</p> <p>We note the legitimate concerns of sovereign governments that the current arrangements create the impression that they need the permission of the US government to redelegate the domain servers for their country-code top level domain (ccTLD)....</p> <p>We note that national governments, being concerned for the resilience of their critical infrastructure, have an increasing awareness of the importance of a stable and resilient internet infrastructure.</p> <p>a) We do not believe that this concern translates automatically into a right or necessity that decision-making by ICANN be controlled by an intergovernmental institution.</p> <p>b) We do believe that their general responsibility to the world community places an obligation on ICANN, the Regional Internet Registries, and the root server operators, to communicate to governments and other stakeholders appropriate insight into their business continuity plans so as to provide reassurance of continuing resilience. ..</p> <p>We assess the historical role of the US Department of Commerce as having had a benign influence: We note that any change in the supervision of the governance of ICANN from the US Department of Commerce to an intergovernmental institution would carry its own risks that the successor institution might not be able to react to any future changed circumstances promptly and effectively.</p> <p>We are concerned that any successor institution charged with supervising ICANN, claiming the legitimacy of a mandate from the community of nations, might develop ambitions to constrain appropriate technical policy choices for addressing and DNS in order to further policies in other areas (including both other aspects of “Internet governance” and unrelated fields). We are concerned that this might seriously threaten the success that ICANN and its predecessors have achieved.</p> <p>Having regard to all the foregoing we respectively disagree with all four options posed by the WGIG with respect to the supervision of ICANN</p> <p>a) We recommend that ICANN continues, with its current functions and no more, to operate under the supervisory oversight of the US Department of Commerce;</p> <p>b) We recommend that no intergovernmental institution be established nor existing intergovernmental charged, with responsibility for determining policy in this area;</p> <p>c) In the event that an intergovernmental institution is established with responsibility for determining policy in this area, we strongly recommend that it be an independent institution with tightly constrained terms of reference that preclude the consideration of broader social, economic and political goals such as other aspects of Internet governance.</p>
NRO	<p>We strongly support the WGIG recommendation in the sense that no single government should exercise oversight functions in relation to Internet Governance or any of its components.</p> <p>As a consequence of this principle, we believe that the current oversight role that the United States Government exercises over ICANN and the IANA functions must finish.</p> <p>The preservation of the operational stability has to be the key principle in which the transition to any new framework should be based.</p> <p>The WGIG has presented four oversight models for certain specific Internet functions, those usually named as “Administration of Internet Resources”.</p> <p>The NRO supports the proposal presented as Model 2. We believe that the participation of interested parties in all organizations relating to Internet Governance, together with the multistakeholder forum proposal included in the report, ensures the efficient control of the system. This control exercised by</p>

	<p>all stakeholders, including governments, is much more beneficial than an oversight exercised exclusively by governments.</p>
<p>South Centre</p>	<p>[Governments] agree that without prejudice to the integrity of the technical systems, entries and modifications to the root zone files, in particular, those that are within the sovereign jurisdiction of States will be managed accordingly. There is a strong shared interest in maintaining the reliability of Internet services by ensuring that alternative root systems incompatible with the technical architecture of the present unique domain name system are not deployed. The expansion of the numbers of root name servers will be a priority for deployment in developing countries and transition economies.</p> <p>[Governments] will therefore take appropriate steps regarding delegations and redelegations of their country code top-level domain names (ccTLDs) in consultation with the not-for-profit Incorporated ICANN and in accordance with the principles governing the processes. The US government, its agencies, ICANN and its relevant supporting organizations shall take the appropriate steps, in the context of the current transition process mandated by the US Department of Commerce and within the time frame ending September 2006.</p> <p>The ICANN Board and its stakeholder bodies, in implementing its US Department of Commerce benchmarks will be guided by these decisions, consulting with all stakeholders to ensure that the policy, technical, administrative, operational and oversight functions are undertaken, building on the traditional principles and processes that have brought the Internet to its present stage. Governments and other stakeholders who have not been active participants in this process therefore have the opportunity to be fully engaged. ...</p> <p>The future role of the not-for-profit ICANN and its IANA functions as well as its other Internet and Internet-related functions (policy, technical, regulation, administrative, dispute resolution and financing) remain to be spelt out. This must reflect the ongoing implementation process of the US-ICANN Memorandum of Understanding, which will be reviewed in mid-2006. It is unclear whether the original objective of the 'privatization' of ICANN is compatible with the internationalization of the Internet and its governance.</p> <p>A start might be made with defining the meaning of, and the implications of different kinds of 'privatization'. There certainly is a need for more effective consultations among a wider group of stakeholders, who in turn will be required to commit in a timely manner and to participate as informed partners. The reform of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) must be a first priority or alternative arrangements must be made.</p> <p>[Governments] and their stakeholders recognize that the reforms undertaken and in progress, by the ICANN-led Internet community are clearly insufficient to meet either its own principles, criteria or WSIS principles of effective, democratic, representative, multilateral, multi-stakeholder participation from all regions and sectors of society. Accordingly, they agree to convene in early 2006 a series of extraordinary consultative meetings, including electronic exchanges, to review, <i>inter alia</i>, ICANN's Strategic Plan 2004- 2005 and 2006 -2007 and the US ICANN MOU benchmarks and the Decisions adopted at WSIS II. It is in this context that one might expect convergence of the central elements in the four (4) Models presented in the WGIG Report.</p>
<p>World Press Freedom Committee</p>	<p>The WGIG members apparently could not agree on a single "model" to replace the existing system. They accordingly offered four such "models," all of which call for an increased say by other governments, in varying degrees. It also calls for creation of a standing "Global Internet Governance Forum" for "dialogue among all stakeholders" to "address Internet-related public policy issues" - "preferably" under the UN. It would presumably act as a permanent, floating arena to: "interface" with intergovernmental organizations, set the world agenda for Internet policy debate, make recommendations, and inspire academic research.</p>
<p>WSIS Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus</p>	<p>The caucus finds model one to be unworkable and not in keeping with the inclusive processes recommended throughout the WGIG report. We also find certain aspects of Model 4 to be not in keeping with the WGIG recommendations. Model two is clearly the most workable as a starting point, and is favoured by most civil society participants. However, aspects of model 3, particularly the importance of a host nation agreement and provisions for tackling developmental issues, merit greater attention.</p> <p>Civil Society believes that it is clear that oversight is a significant issue that needs further discussion. To this end, we would support the establishment of a multi-stakeholder working group (under auspices of the Chair of Sub-Committee A) to explore approaches mutually acceptable to all stakeholders in the lead up to the WSIS summit. We also indicate our willingness to work with all stakeholders, and as a caucus, towards evolution and acceptance of an effective and transparent</p>

	<p>global public policy and oversight processes. An acceptable oversight framework would Allow multi-stakeholder input into policy development Ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders from developing countries Focus on shared responsibility rather than oversight and control We believe that this broad issue and in particular the issue of governance structures as regards the root zone authorisation function should be addressed with some urgency. The acceptance of a single root for the DNS is an important enabler of the Internet's international reach Governance arrangements for the root zone file should be outside the control of any individual government, and broadly acceptable to all stakeholders. If this issue is not addressed, it will lead to an increase in the number of alternative root structures that could impact negatively on the Internet's security, stability and interoperability. Under the current naming scheme, this could lead to the fragmentation of the Internet and the user community.</p>
<b>Coordination (paras 72-74)</b>	
Egypt	Egypt perceives the Internet Governance debate more as a continuous dialogue which should involve the participation of all stakeholders from developing and developed countries, and should seriously take into consideration the dynamism and future development of the Internet.
EU and acceding countries Romania and Bulgaria	<p>The EU advocates a new co-operation model, in order to concretise the provisions in the WSIS Declaration of Principles regarding the crucial role of all actors within Internet Governance, including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations. The existing Internet Governance mechanisms should be founded on a more solid democratic, transparent and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public policy interest of all governments. The respective roles of the international and intergovernmental organisations within the field of Internet Governance should be clarified.</p> <p>The European Union will work towards a positive outcome of the Internet Governance discussions in the WSIS framework. It will also encourage the implementation of the Tunis results in a way that enables multistakeholder involvement. In this context the European Union will take into account the future development of the Internet, including technological and usage aspects.</p> <p>The EU still has outstanding concerns on a number of issues, for instance on implementation at the regional level, co-ordination of multi-stakeholder activities and UN agencies and evaluation and benchmarking. However, in a spirit of compromise, the EU agrees that the text as it now stands can be forwarded to PrepCom 3 as it will form a useful basis for negotiations. The EU will want to reflect further on the draft and reserves the right to make further specific comments during negotiations.</p>
Ghana on behalf of the African Group	Lessons relating to multi-stakeholder models could be drawn from organizations such as the UN ICT Task Force, ICANN, UN Regional Commissions, the ITU and Regional Internet Registries etc.
Japan	While Japan believes that attention should be paid to avoid duplicating the activities of these existing institutions, it is necessary to discuss the creation of a forum that engages in high-level dialogue on a broad spectrum of issues through multi-stakeholder participation.
USA	While the United States recognizes that the current Internet system is working, we encourage an ongoing dialogue with all stakeholders around the world in the various fora as a way to facilitate discussion and to advance our shared interest in the ongoing robustness and dynamism of the Internet. The focus of these discussions should be on how all stakeholders can continue to collaborate in addressing Internet related issues. In these fora, the United States will continue to support market-based approaches and private sector leadership in Internet development broadly.
Switzerland	With regard to questions of “public policy”, we believe in using all the possibilities offered by existing institutions to the maximum extent before creating an new ones. The UN agencies certainly have a role to play.
CCBI / CSIA	CCBI/CSIA supports the recommendations in this section.
Internet Society (int'l)	Section V.A of the WGIG report provides strong support for multi-stakeholder involvement in Internet governance, and the Internet Society strongly endorses that view. It is worth restating that the processes that support the development and operation of the Internet today are truly open to all and are already multistakeholder. They have supported the development of the Internet for many years and we welcome increased participation by all in these processes. We do not see the benefit of creating new organization(s), but welcome initiatives that foster continued dialogue and recommend these be built on existing institutions while fully utilizing the Internet and the new technologies and communications options that the Internet affords. It will truly allow us to maximize participation while supporting the most effective and timely progress on many fronts.

Internet Society (Bulgaria)	It is critical for Bulgaria, like for other countries in transition, to build, maintain and develop proper communications between the businesses, the civil society and the government. They should be equal partners, and coordination between them on the Internet issues should be working really well. We understand the WSIS as part of this process, and we hope it will continue to involve all stakeholders to achieve its goals.
ITAA	ITAA notes also that, unfortunately, the WGIG Report does not support the ability of countries to self-select for themselves what works best for them in Internet governance initiatives and approaches. Paragraph 73(b) suggests that there is a single approach that a nation should follow. We cannot support such a concept, noting that, for instance, in New Zealand, the private sector/civil society/and government are quite productively engaged in advancing the Internet via a “society” that is open to all, but is not established, or overseen by government. Similarly, other countries – Canada, Australia, the U.S., and many more – have adopted other models, which have worked well for them.
LINX	We welcome intergovernmental co-operation on individual issues on an as-needed basis. We encourage consultation with industry and civil society, and their participation in intergovernmental meetings when appropriate. We recommend that governments increase the participation of industry and civil society within the development of policy regarding use of the Internet so as to utilise all available expertise and avoid unintended consequences.
NominetUK	A multistakeholder forum could be an effective means for better coordination. -Are there existing models of inter-agency cooperation that could be followed? Should any existing institution be given the role of lead agency? We do not believe it appropriate for any existing institution to be given the role of lead agency. In our view, rather than seeking to control and manage existing bodies, any additional body or arrangement should work in partnership in an enabling, coordinating capacity. We would recommend the latter. We would encourage the WGIG to look closely at successful models of multi-stakeholder participation at the national level, for example .uk’s Policy Advisory Board model
VeriSign Inc	Importantly, the WGIG work on this issue demonstrates that there is no vacuum within the context of existing structures to address Internet-related public policy issues. Governments, the private sector, and civil society can constructively collaborate to better understand the respective roles of the existing entities and structures. Effective collaboration will permit government and industry to identify ways in which the views of each can be recognized and harmonized. Existing entities can then cooperate in addressing many of the complex issues raised by the Internet and Internet usage.
World Press Freedom	[O]verall international coordination should be a light-touch function. We need to avoid creating new systems that would impose a heavy administrative burden. It is well understood that there is no single ownership of the Information Society, neither within the UN system, nor within other parts of the global community.”
<b>Recommendations to address Internet-related issues (paras 74-85). See earlier compilation of comments on public policy issues.</b>	
<b>Other issues not directly addressed in the WGIG report</b>	
Israel	Israel emphasize the importance of the inclusion in WGIG report of these “new “themes”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cyber Terrorism</u>: Israel is firmly of the view that the counter terrorism principles acknowledged by the international community are fully applicable in this context as well. These include the recognition that "no terrorist act can be justified in any circumstances," and that such acts are "in any circumstances unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other nature that may be invoked to justify them" (UNGA Resolution 59/46)". Israel also considers that emphasis should be placed on the responsibility of states to confront terrorism at all fronts and thus "Refrain from providing any form of support, active or passive, to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts" as well as "Take the necessary steps to prevent the commission of terrorist acts, including by provision of early warning to other States by exchange of information" (UNSC Resolution 1373 (2001))</li> <li>• <u>Anti-Semitism</u>: In the spirit of the UNGA resolution no. 59/199, that declared “9. Recognises with deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and Christianophobia.”, the State of Israel would like to stress the importance of the prevention of any attempts to increase religious intolerance through the Internet. The world must make a great effort to prevent religious intolerance, through the some measures that were suggested above to stop terrorism.</li> </ul>

USA	A “fundamental” area of public policy is absent from WGIG report: The role of an enabling environment in Internet development and diffusion. To maximize the economic and social benefits of the Internet, governments must focus on creating, within their own nations, the appropriate legal, regulatory, and policy environment that encourages privatization, competition, and liberalization. In particular, the role of the private sector and civil society as the driver of innovation and private investment in the development of the Internet is critical. Value is added at the edges of the network, in both developed and developing countries, when the domestic policy environment encourages investment and innovation.
ITAA	There is no reference to the positive role that private innovation, market forces and competition have played to date in expanding the Internet and the access to it.