

## Chair, Sub-Committee A (Internet Governance)

### Chapter Three: Internet Governance

#### Chair's Paper (SECTION FIVE)

##### *PREAMBLE*

62. **We recognise** that the existing arrangements for Internet governance have worked effectively to make the Internet the highly robust, dynamic and geographically diverse medium that it is today, with the private sector taking the lead in day-to-day operations, and with innovation and value creation at the edges.
63. The Internet remains a highly dynamic medium and therefore any framework designed to deal with Internet governance should be responsive to the exponential growth and fast evolution of the Internet as a common platform for the development of multiple applications.
64. The security and stability of the Internet must be maintained.
65. **We recognise** that Internet Governance includes more than the Internet naming and addressing, issues dealt with by ICANN. It also includes other significant public policy issues such as critical Internet resources, the security and safety of the Internet, and developmental aspects and issues pertaining to the use of the Internet.
66. **We further recognise** that there are many cross-cutting international public policies that are not adequately addressed with the current mechanisms which require attention.
67. **We are convinced** that there is a need for an evolutionary process towards a new transparent, democratic, and multilateral framework, with the participation of government, private sector, civil society and international organizations.
68. **We emphasize** that any Internet Governance approach should continue to promote an enabling environment for innovation, competition and investment.
69. Countries should not be involved in decisions regarding another country's ccTLD. Their legitimate interests, as expressed and defined by each country, regarding decisions affecting their ccTLDs, need to be respected, upheld and addressed via a flexible and improved framework.

**70. We call for** the reinforcement of specialized regional Internet resource management institutions to guarantee each region's right to manage its own Internet resources, while maintaining global coordination in this area.

**71. We recognize** the need for further development of public policies for generic top level domain names.

**72. We underline** the need to maximise the participation of developing countries in decisions regarding Internet Governance, as well as in development and capacity-building.

**73. We support** an evolutionary approach towards implementation of the Geneva Principles in regard to Internet governance.

### ***IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENEVA PRINCIPLES***

**74.** In view of the continuing internationalization of the Internet and the principle of universality, **we agree** to implement the Geneva Principles, in an evolutionary manner, while maintaining the stability, security, availability and reliability of the Internet. In this regard, we agree to create a new space for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue

**75. We further recognise** the need for enhanced cooperation in the future, building on existing structures, to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, but not in the day-to-day technical operation or arrangements. Such cooperation would envisage discussion on coordination and management of critical Internet resources.

### ***FORUM***

**76. We agree** to invite the UN Secretary-General to establish, by the first quarter of 2006, a new space for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue—called the *Internet Governance Forum* (IGF)—initially for a period of five years, with a mandate to:

- a) Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security and stability of the Internet;
- b) Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body;
- c) Interface with appropriate inter-governmental organisations and other institutions on matters under their purview;
- d) Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities;
- e) Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world;
- f) Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet Governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries;
- g) Identify emerging issues and bring them to the attention of the appropriate bodies and make recommendations;

- h) Contribute to capacity-building for Internet Governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise;
- i) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet Governance processes;
- j) Discuss, *inter alia*, issues relating to critical Internet resources;
- k) Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.

77. The Internet Governance Forum, in its working and function, will be multilateral, democratic and transparent. To that end, the proposed IGF could:

- a) Build on the existing structures of Internet Governance, with special emphasis on the complementarity between all stakeholders involved in this process -- governments, business entities, civil society and inter-governmental organisations -- each of them in their field of competence, and their participation on an equal footing;
- b) Have a lightweight and decentralised structure that would be subject to periodic review;
- c) Meet periodically, as required. IGF meetings, in principle, may be held in parallel with major relevant UN conferences, *inter alia*, to use logistical support;
- d) Examine the desirability of its continuation after its initial mandate of five years.

78. The IGF would have no oversight function and would not replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organisations, but would involve them and take advantage of their expertise. It would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process. It would have no involvement in day-to day or technical operations of the Internet.

79. The IGF may establish a small, lean, cost-efficient bureau, comprising a handful of professional and technical staff. The bureau should be representative both in terms of balanced geographical representation and of multi-stakeholder participation.

80. Diverse matters relating to Internet Governance would continue to be addressed in other relevant fora.

\*\*\*

81. **We encourage** the development of multi-stakeholder processes at the national, regional and international levels to discuss and collaborate on the expansion and diffusion of the Internet as a means to support development efforts to achieve internationally-agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals.

82. **We reaffirm our commitment** to the full implementation of the Geneva Principles.