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Note: This document consolidates the comments received by WSIS Stakeholders from the 9th October to 17th November. All the detailed submissions available at:

<http://www.itu.int/wsis/review/mpp/pages/consolidated-texts.html>

This serves as an input to the 2nd Physical meeting and could be considered as the proposal for the 1st draft to be considered by the meeting.

This document has been developed keeping in mind the [Principles](http://www.itu.int/wsis/review/mpp/pages/consolidated-texts.html).

Please note that the Geneva Declaration and the Geneva Plan of Action still remain valid until further decisions by the General Assembly.

WSIS+10 Vision for WSIS Beyond 2015

[Accountability and] Measurement of the WSIS Action Lines beyond 2015, targets and Indicators for an open and inclusive information/knowledge society for all beyond 2015

To enable the monitoring and evaluation of the WSIS Action Lines, stakeholders are calling for:

1. The **review of the WSIS Action Lines and Targets and the identification and development of forward-looking targets and clearly measurable indicators**,**, as well as,**  assessment and benchmarking tools in domains which can be measured and quantified at a reasonable cost.. In particular:
   1. WSIS targets and Action Lines should be reviewed and checked for their relevance and selected, retained objectives of the specific Action Lines should be measurable
   2. Indicators should be widely available and enable the tracking of progress and impact
   3. Indicators should be forward-looking  and go beyond *access* as well as address the post-2015 development agenda and relevant development areas/policy issue
   4. Indicators should be understandable, useable by policy-makers and internationally comparable
   5. Indicators should be forward-looking  and go beyond *access* as well as address the post-2015 development agenda and relevant development areas/policy issues
   6. Indicators and benchmarking tools should address the needs of developing countries whilst not neglecting other countries
   7. Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development should be encouraged to identify and disseminate statistical standards to monitor the impact of ICTs.
2. An open and inclusive, **multi-stakeholder monitoring process and framework.** In particular:
   1. The Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development should take a coordinating role in the monitoring of the Action Lines beyond 2015, while institutions’ unique mandates and leads are fully respected
   2. The Partnership should expand its scope to include non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders into the monitoring process after consultation with UN bodies in charge of monitoring the respective domains
   3. Data collection should be open and inclusive and provide an online platform for all stakeholders to provide data/information.
   4. To increase the data availability and quality, the monitoring must be carried out in close cooperation with the National Statistics Offices (NSOs).and relevant Ministries.
   5. Dedicated funds should be made available for data collection and capacity building of National Statistics Offices (NSOs), relevant Ministries and relevant WSIS stakeholder groups should be ensured.
   6. The monitoring framework could create national multi-stakeholder committees that include the government , the private sector, academia, and civil society.
   7. The monitoring framework should include a timetable and also regular assessments/reviews of progress.
   8. Public awareness about the importance of and benefits about the Action Lines and WSIS Targets should be raised, including through regional multistakeholder workshops.
3. The **production of** quantitative and **qualitative information that will help policy makers identify appropriate policies**. In particular:
   1. Detailed analysis and evaluation of progress that goes beyond quantitative information.
   2. The development of best practice examples and the identification of success stories that could be replicated in other countries.
   3. The identification ofareas where implementation is not as successful as was hoped for and further investigate the challenging factors that led to such a result. Looking at reasons why a policy was not successful can teach valuable lessons: best practices seeking to improve information of all stakeholders involved could be identified; sharing best practices could provide guidance and set benchmarks..
4. The identification of areas where implementation is not as successful as was hoped for and further examining the challenging factors that led to such a result. Allocation of voluntary contributions that would contribute to the measuring the above.