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 [mechanism] 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 Internet naming and addressing. It also includes other significant public policy issues such as, inter alia, 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 recognize that there are many cross-cutting international public policy issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms.

67.   **We are convinced** that there is a need to continue a process towards an international management of the Internet that should be multilateral, transparent, and democratic, transparent, democratic, and multilateral framework [mechanism], with the participation of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations, in their respective roles.

67 alt 1   **We are convinced** that there is a need to initiate a process towards establishment of a new transparent, democratic and multilateral Internet governance mechanism, with the participation of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations in their respective roles

67 alt 2 **We are convinced** that there is a need for ongoing evolution of the existing framework to maximize its transparency, democracy, multilateralism, and inclusion of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations.

67 alt 3 **We are convinced** that there is a need for ongoing evolution of the existing framework[/mechanism] to maximize their transparency, democracy, multilateralism, and inclusion of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations.

68. **We emphasize** that any Internet Governance approach should be inclusive and 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 the national interest and rights of countries in that particular region to manage its own Internet resources, while maintaining global coordination in this area.]

[**71.** **We recognize** the need for [further development of] / [strengthened coperation among stakeholders for] public policies for generic top-level domain names (gTLDs).]

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 / progressive] 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 / progressive] manner, while maintaining the stability, security, availability and reliability of the Internet. In this regard, we agree, *inter alia*, to create a new space for multilateral and multi-stakeholder policy dialogue.

New 74A (ex para 49). **We recognize** that all governments have an equal role and responsibility, for international Internet governance and for ensuring the stability, security and continuity of Internet. **We also recognize** the need for development of public policy by governments in consultation with all stakeholders.

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

[*Alt*. Such cooperation would address international Internet public policy-setting issues.]

FORUM

[76. We ask the Secretary General of the United Nations, in an open and inclusive process, to establish, by the second quarter of 2006, a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue—called the *Internet Governance Forum* (IGF)—, with a mandate to:

a) Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet Governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development 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, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, 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;

l) Publish its proceedings.]

77. The Internet Governance Forum, in its working and function, will be multilateral, multi-stakeholder, 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;

New 77A. The UN Secretary-General would Report to UN Member States at periodic intervals.

New 77B. We ask the UN Secretary-General to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in formal consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and make recommendations to the UN Membership.

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 [could be organised on the basis of ITU, which] may establish an effective and 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.