Questionnaire issued by the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation

- Some important issues and possible responses

1.   **Which stakeholder category do you belong to?**

2.   **What do you think is the significance, purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)**

Note: The term 'enhanced cooperation' is rooted in the demands of most non-US countries at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) for (1) internationalizing the oversight of root zone management of the Internet (managed by ICANN[1]), which is currently under the supervision of the US government, and (2) to provide some mechanism which will allow all governments, on an equal footing, to fulfill their roles and responsibilities with regard to international Internet-related public policy issues. When this issue remained unresolved at the end of the WSIS, 'enhanced cooperation' was put in the Tunis Agenda as a placeholder term for the needed 'institutional developments' in the global IG space, with clear directions provided about the nature of the required 'institutional developments'. Tunis Agenda also instructed the UN Secretary General to commence the process towards 'enhanced cooperation' by the first quarter of 2006 (section 71 of Tunis Agenda). However, no progress has been made on this important WSIS mandate till date.

Sections 58 to 61 of Tunis Agenda[2] frame the context for a new process of 'enhanced cooperation' and section 65 speaks of the need to increase the participation of developing countries in global governance of the Internet. The most important sections dealing with 'enhanced cooperation' are sections 68 to 71. These sections define the scope and purpose of 'enhanced cooperation' and provide leads about how this mandate has to be fulfilled.

(a)Significance

The significance of the term 'enhanced cooperation' lies in the need to address the unfinished task left from the WSIS of democratizing the global governance of the Internet. The Internet is one of the most powerful contemporary social phenomenon – with enormous economic, social, political and cultural impact across the world. It is therefore needed that the global Internet is governed in a globally democratic manner. However, there either exist huge governance deficits in the global governance of the Internet, or its governance is done in a US-centric and North-centric manner. Such a situation, apart from being patently undemocratic, does not adequately address the needs of the developing countries. *Eight years after the WSIS, governance issues pertaining to the international dimensions of the Internet continue to become more and more important and urgent, and this upward spiral is expected to continue for a long term to come*. It has therefore become even more urgent today then ever before to undertake the needed 'new institutional developments', as envisaged in the 'enhanced cooperation' mandate of the the WSIS.

(b) Purpose

 Section 60 of Tunis Agenda recognizes "that there are many cross-cutting international public policy

---

1   Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
2   www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/**tunis**/off/6rev1.htm

issues that require attention and are not adequately addressed by the current mechanisms". The number and importance of such issues has only increased since the WSIS. The purpose of 'enhanced cooperation' is clearly laid out in the section 58 and 69 of the Tunis Agenda, which is to provide a platform *"to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet"*, in consultation with all stakeholders.

(c) Scope

The concerned international public policies pertaining to the Internet, for which an appropriate platform has to be provided, include "public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources" but do not include "the day-to-day technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy issues" (section 69 of Tunis Agenda). One could therefore consider *the scope of 'enhanced cooperation' in two parts; (1) general international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, and (2) public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources.* There could be a single convergent mechanism for dealing with these two kinds of public policy issues, or two separate mechanisms.

In terms of 'public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internal resources', it will also be required to set up an appropriate mechanism to implement such policies through *oversight authority over organizations dealing with critical Internet resources*. *(Note: This pertains to the important ICANN oversight issue.)*

3.   **To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented? Please use the space below to explain and to provide examples to support your answer. (Please try not to exceed 200 words)**

There is no global platform where governments can, on an equal footing, address the full range of international public policies related to the Internet, in a holistic and cross-cutting manner. Neither has the required internationalized of the oversight of organizations dealing with critical Internet resources taken place. It can therefore be said that the process of 'enhanced cooperation', as envisaged in the Tunis Agenda, has not been implemented at all.

Since 'enhanced cooperation' has not been implemented at all, it is not possible to give any examples. The significant areas of non-implementation are; (1) lack of a globally democratic space for dealing with the full range of international public policies related to the Internet in an holistic and cross-cutting manner, and (2) lack of an international mechanism of oversight over organizations dealing with critical Internet resources.

Stray, one-off meetings and/or agreements between different bodies dealing with Internet governance cannot be considered as implementation of 'enhanced cooperation'. The term cannot be taken in its normal meaning of more coordination and working together, but has to be seen in the specific meaning in which it is used in the Tunis Agenda, which is about a standing mechanism for addressing public policy issues. Similarly, for instance, progressive changes to the MOU between one country and an organization dealing with critical Internet resources cannot be called as 'enhanced cooperation', since the Tunis Agenda is clear in affirming the status and role of all governments as being 'on an equal footing'. (*Note: It is sometimes claimed that 'enhanced cooperation' is taking place when, for instance, UNECSO and ICANN enter into a non-binding agreement concerning some issues related to internationalised domain names, or when US modifies its MOU with ICANN to include some outside parties in performance review of ICANN.)*

4.   **What are the relevant international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet? (Please**

try not to exceed 200 words and list in order of priority, if possible)

The report of the Working Group on Internet Governance[3] (WGIG), set up during the WSIS process, identified many international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. This output of the Working Group was recognized by the Tunis Agenda, which reasserts most of these issues. Some more issues were identified in the background report[4] to the WGIG report. More recently, the ITU Council Resolution 1305 (2009), in its Annex 1, recognized some public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, especially those with rather significant technical aspects.

It is difficult to have a closed list of international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, since new ones keep cropping up, with amazing rapidity. An indicative, non-exhaustive, list of public policy issues pertaining to the Internet is given below. It is difficult at this stage to do such a listing in any strict order of priority. We start with issues listed in the WGIG report and its background report, move to the listing made by the ITU, and then add some more emergent issues.

Issues listed in the WGIG report (see the report for elaboration of each issue)

- Administration of the root zone files and system
- Interconnection costs (especially global interconnection)
- Internet stability, security and cybercrime
- Spam
- Allocation of domain names
- IP addressing
- Intellectual property rights (IPR)
- Freedom of Expression
- Data protection and privacy rights
- Consumer rights
- Multilingualism
- Convergence and next generation networks
- trade and e-commerce

Some additional public policy issues mentioned in the background report to the WGIG report (elaborated in the report)

- Applicable jurisdiction, cross border coordination
- Internet service providers (ISPs) and third party liabilities
- National policies and regulations (harmonization of)
- Competition policy, liberalization, privatization and regulations
- Affordable and universal access
- Cultural diversity
- technical standards, and technology choices

Public policy issues recognized in the ITU Resolution 1305, with regard to "scope of work of ITU on international Internet-related public policy matters"

- Multilingualization of the Internet including Internationalized (multilingual) Domain Names

---

3   www.**wgig**.org/**WGIG-Report**.html
4   www.itu.int/wsis/**wgig**/docs/**wgig-background-report**.pdf

3

- International Internet Connectivity
- International public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses
- The security, safety, continuity, sustainability, and robustness of the Internet
- Combating cybercrime
- Dealing effectively with spam
- Issues pertaining to the use and misuse of the Internet
- Availability, affordability, reliability, and quality of service, especially in the developing world
- Contributing to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries
- Developmental aspects of the Internet
- Respect for privacy and the protection of personal information and data
- Protecting children and young people from abuse and exploitation

There are many more, existing as well as emergent ,public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, like;

- Cloud computing (global issues involved)
- Cross border Internet flows
- Tax allocation among different jurisdictions with regard to global e-commerce
- Economics of personal data (who owns, who makes money from, and so on)
- Net neutrality (that all data is given equal priority on networks)
- Search neutrality (that global search engines give neutral results)
- Media convergence - Internet and traditional media (Internet companies versus newspapers, radio, cable and TV, book publishing industry etc)
- Regulation of global Internet businesses (in terms of adherence to competition policies, consumer rights, law enforcement etc)
- Internet intermediary companies as private agents for extra-territorial law enforcement (problems with)
- Access to knowledge and free information flows, deepening the public domain on the Internet
- Accessibility policies for the disabled
- Development of, and protection to, local content, local application, local e-services, and local/ domestic Internet businesses
- Protection of vulnerable sections, like children, women, traditional communities etc
- Internet and health systems, education systems, governance systems and so on.

5. **What are the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)**

'Enhanced cooperation' pertains to the required mechanism for the development of Internet-related international public policies. It is for governments to develop international Internet-related public policies through various inter-governmental means and mechanisms. Such development of policies should, however, be done in consultation with all stakeholders. The role of other stakeholders is to provide their inputs and expertise for policy development. In addition, other stakeholders may also be involved, as appropriate, in ensuring the implementation of public policies thus developed. Organizations dealing with critical Internet resources have an especially important role in this regard.

Section 35 of the Tunis Agenda clearly lays out the role of different stakeholders in various aspects of Internet governance in the following fashion.

1. Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of States. They have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues.
2. The private sector has had, and should continue to have, an important role in the development of the Internet, both in the technical and economic fields.
3. Civil society has also played an important role on Internet matters, especially at community level, and should continue to play such a role.
4. Intergovernmental organizations have had, and should continue to have, a facilitating role in the coordination of Internet-related public policy issues.
5. International organizations have also had and should continue to have an important role in the development of Internet-related technical standards and relevant policies.

6.   How should enhanced cooperation be implemented to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

Implementation of 'enhanced cooperation' requires developing a platform(s) where all governments, on an equal footing, can be enabled to carry out their roles and responsibilities, with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. It will be appropriate for the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) to give its recommendations for creating such a new platform(s), and ensuring corresponding required institutional changes/developments, to the UN GA through the ECOSOC. Taking note of UN General Assembly's recommendations in this regard, the high level WSIS review, to be held in 2015, should further finalize the appropriate form and modalities for setting up the required mechanism(s). It may then require an UN General Assembly decision for establishing 'the new mechanism under the UN'. The same decision should lay out the relationship of this new mechanism with (1) other international bodies, including of the UN system, that deal with international public policy issues that may have Internet-related aspects, and (2) with organizations dealing with critical Internet resources. This should be able to provide a democratic and participative architecture of global governance of the Internet whereby the world can maximize the numerous opportunities provided by the Internet, while also addressing the many new dangers that are being encountered.

7.   How can enhanced cooperation enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

In terms of the role and responsibilities of organizations that deal with critical Internet resources, section 70 of Tunis Agenda directed the "organizations responsible for essential tasks associated with the Internet to contribute to creating an environment that facilitates this development of public policy principles". Development of public policy principles has to be undertaken by the new mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation', where all governments have an equal footing. These organizations should therefore begin to make the necessary internal and external changes to facilitate an appropriate relationship/interface with an internationalized mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation' that is to be set up. This task is expressly required of these organizations by section 70 of the Tunis Agenda.

There should be adequate avenues for all stakeholders to input, as appropriate, into the processes of policy development undertaken by governments and inter-governmental organizations. One way to structure consultation with all stakeholders is to do it through the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), which should be strengthened for this purpose. Other avenues for inputting directly into the new

mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation' can also be set up. The greatest possible amount of transparency and participative-ness of the processes of 'enhanced cooperation' is very important, as envisaged by the Tunis Agenda.

8.   What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

(Note: This is the most specific question in the whole questionnaire, and also the most important one. One of the reasons that there has been no progress on the 'enhanced cooperation' agenda is because the developing countries have largely failed to present a concrete model for the needed mechanism for 'enhanced cooperation'. They should preferably agree on one model, and then pursue it with their collective strength. To do so is the single most important imperative in the present context. Below are some important principles to be followed in setting up such a mechanism. Also, outlines of a suggested model is provided which may be considered, as appropriate.)

Implementing 'enhanced cooperation' requires development of a platform where all governments, on an equal footing, can be enabled to carry out their roles and responsibilities with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. As envisaged in the *section 61 of Tunis Agenda, it could require "creation of a suitable framework or mechanisms".*

Such a new mechanism(s) should be created under the UN. It may be a single space to address both (1) general public policy issues pertaining to the Internet as well as (2) public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources (such a distinction is contained in the Tunis Agenda). Alternatively, two separate mechanisms, one each for 'general public policy issues' and 'public policy issues of a greater technical nature', may be considered (a possible central role of the ITU with regard to the latter category of issues can be considered).

While public policy issues of a more technical nature can be treated separately, a single convergent space or platform is certainly needed for dealing with the diverse kinds of 'general public policy issues pertaining to the Internet'. Even though many of these issues may have some aspects that come under some existing international bodies, including those of the UN, *most Internet-related matters are required to be dealt in a holistic and cross-cutting manner because of their inter-relatedness*, in addition to possible specialized treatment by these other bodies. With regard to issues that overlap with the mandate of other agencies, the proposed 'new mechanism' will add Internet-related policy perspectives to the issues, as well as coordinate and ensure coherence among the work of different specialized agencies dealing with different aspects of the issues. *In addition, there are numerous existing and emergent public policy issues which do not have any existing home in the UN/ international system at present (as has been recognized by section 60 of Tunis Agenda).*

There may be considerable merit in considering two separate mechanisms; one for general public policy issues of a social, economic, cultural and political nature, and another for public policy issues of a more technical nature. The competencies, nature of processes, involvement of other stakeholders, etc required for dealing with these two kinds of public policy issues may be quite different. *It is therefore suggested that while a 'new body under the UN' may be suitable for addressing 'general public policy issues', the ITU may be considered for a central role in addressing 'public policy issues of a relatively technical nature'.* The envisaged new body under the UN for 'general public policy issues' can direct those issues that have a greater technical content and nature to be dealt with by the ITU. (*Note: This will also strengthen the role and legitimacy of the ITU to deal with those technical and*

techno- public policy aspects of the Internet which should appropriately be dealt by it. To strengthen such legitimacy of the ITU is important in the current context where, lately, it has often been challenged.)

The required new mechanism should be appropriate and adequate for the unique nature of international Internet-related public policy issues. Such issues are often cross-cutting and involve aspects that may be under the purview of different global organizations. They also have intermingled social and technical aspects. The Internet is deeply impacting so many of our basic social systems at such an enormous pace that sudden, unexpected policy challenges get thrown up routinely, requiring urgent resolution. Much of the Internet is inherently global, and therefore, quite often public policy issues may require global implementation mechanisms, and employing only national mechanisms may not be adequate. Public policy issues pertaining to domain names provide just one example of such public policies that require global mechanisms of implementation.

The proposed new mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation' should therefore be able to quickly take up emergent issues on a rolling basis, and come out with the needed resolution, directing the necessary activities in this regard. It should be able to help ensure the required coordination and coherence, as appropriate, among national level policies and practices, given the inherently global nature of the Internet. It should have well-defined, standing relationships with other UN bodies and also with bodies dealing with technical issues, including critical Internet resources. ***There may also be a need for new kinds of crisis response and dispute resolution mechanisms.*** Lastly, such an mechanism should also be able to address existing and emerging issues, as appropriate, including through facilitating negotiation of treaties, conventions and agreements on Internet-related public policy issues.

The process of 'enhanced cooperation' will, importantly, include developing ***an appropriate international oversight mechanism over organizations dealing with critical Internet resources***, ***which will inter alia replace the current oversight by the US government over the ICANN.*** This mechanism can be separate from the above referred new 'body under the UN' dealing with general Internet-related public policy issues, or the same 'body' can be mandated with the 'oversight' task. Along with replacement of the US government's oversight role by an international body, ***an internationalized ICAAN must enter into a host country agreement*** with the US (if ICANN is to continue to be headquartered in the US), ***and be governed solely under international law***, with complete immunity from the laws of the US, or of any other host country.

The nature, composition etc of the international oversight body can be discussed. However, it will have a narrow mandate, and will not get into "day-to-day technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy issues" (section 69 of Tunis Agenda). This mandate can largely be on the lines of the oversight role played at present by the Department of Commerce of the government of US. I*t will ensure that ICANN runs as per "globally-applicable principles on public policy issues associated with the coordination and management of critical Internet resources"* (section 70). These principles will be developed by the above mentioned mechanism for 'enhanced cooperation'.

All these above imperatives much be addressed and covered under the 'enhanced cooperation' mechanism. Most of the required functions for a new global Internet policy mechanism(s) are mentioned in various models of 'global public policy and oversight' provided in the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance[5], set up during the WSIS.

9.   What is the possible relationship between enhanced cooperation and the IGF? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

---

5   www.**wgig**.org/**WGIG-Report**.html

WSIS envisaged 'enhanced cooperation' and IGF (Internet Governance Forum) to be two distinct processes. One was supposed to be a mechanism "to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet", and the other was to be a "new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue". Such a clear distinction is obvious in the entire relevant text of the Tunis Agenda. ***This distinction is further clarified in the UN GA's resolutions on ICTs for development of 2010, 2011 and 2012***, all of which clearly state that:

> ***"...the process towards enhanced cooperation and the convening of the Internet Governance Forum, are to be pursued by the Secretary-General through two distinct processes, and recognizing that the two processes may be complementary."***

'Enhanced cooperation' is to be a 'policy making space' and the IGF is a 'policy dialogue space'. The two cannot be confused or conflated, although a relationship between the two should certainly be fostered.

IGF should contribute its outcomes as inputs into the policy development/ making processes undertaken by the new mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation', and all possible means to enable this should be developed and supported.

10.   How can the role of developing countries be made more effective in global Internet governance? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

Most of all, developing countries need a platform or mechanism at the global level where they can take up and address international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet on an equal footing with all other governments. Such a mechanism should be adequately resourced and strong enough to ensure proper development of policies and their implementation, as appropriate. ***Adequate resources should be provided to the body hosting this new mechanism to undertake research and develop analyses which can help with the process of policy development.*** This body should also aim at building the capacity of developing countries to be able to represent their interests at the global level in IG mechanisms. However, such research and analysis activities and capacity building measures should not be employed to sell a hegemonic North-centric Internet governance or a Internet model to developing countries. All the concerned activities should therefore be funded through permanently committed public funds. One possible funding strategy is to tap into the domain name charges that are collected from the Internet users globally by organizations dealing with critical Internet resources. This is a kind of global Internet tax, which can be used to support global governance of the Internet.

The basic policy and practice paradigm for the global Internet, and the Internet-mediated new social systems, is being built right now, mostly in an undemocratic, North-centric manner. Developing countries need to be at the table when the relevant crucial decisions, of a global implication, are taken. This imperative is urgent, as the 'paradigm formation' is well under way, and setting up the required new mechanism of 'enhanced cooperation' cannot be delayed any longer.

11.   What barriers remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance? How can these barriers best be overcome? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

The main issue in this regard, which is the absence of adequate venues, more specifically, a convergent platform, for governments to fulfill their roles and responsibilities in terms of Internet-related public policy issues, has been discussed above at length.

Considerable barriers to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance exist for civil society, small businesses, and diverse technical views and expertise, from developing countries.

'Fragmentation of policy spaces', and absence of a convergent platform for policy development, greatly undermines the capacity of such under-resourced groups to engage with global Internet governance, because they are unable to be present in all places. Simply opening up policy spaces to all, without due recognition of relative economic and social power and resources can oftentimes actually further skew participation rather than democratize it. This is being witnessed in many multistakeholder spaces of global Internet governance, in which the so-called 'open spaces' get quickly dominated by people and organizations from developed countries. This has the effect of further skewing participation in global public spaces towards the global North. Merely being 'open', therefore, is not enough to ensure that all stakeholders are able to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance. It requires strong processes of 'positive discrimination' in favor of those who are actually seen as under-represented. Such an assessment and ensuring necessary correctives have to be an ongoing process. Such 'positive discrimination' will include resource support, including funds for attending events, giving equal and proportionate representation on agenda setting and/ or advisory committees, speaking slots, and so on.

Existing and envisaged global Internet governance bodies also need to have sufficient transparency and responsiveness, as well as develop adequate, institutionalized spaces for participation of all stakeholders in their respective roles.

12.   What actions are needed to promote effective participation of all marginalised people in the global information society? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

This imperative, first of all, requires democratic spaces for global governance of the Internet, in consultation with all stakeholders, especially those connected with the most marginalized people. Marginalization of all kinds, such as based on gender, ethnicity, disability, poverty, geo-location, etc, should be adequately considered in this regard. Presence of such groups need to be specifically ensured, and they cannot simply be subsumed in an overall category of 'civil society'. Who of civil society always remains an important question.

There are many other issues with regard to improving the effective participation of all marginalized people in the global information society. However, the WGEC has a limited mandate and limited time for its deliberations. It should therefore just focus on the above aspects of effective participation in global Internet governance mechanism.

13.   How can enhanced cooperation address key issues toward global, social and economic development? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

Appropriate public polices have always been considered key to development. Internet is driving a transmutation in most social systems, which are key to global, social and economic development. The best way to develop appropriate public polices is to develop them democratically. The Internet has considerable inherently global dimensions, as few other social phenomenon do. Therefore, many of the Internet-related public policies required for global, social and economic development may need to be discussed and anchored at the global level. This makes a strong case for setting up suitable mechanisms to democratizing global governance of the Internet.

Some Internet-related public policy issues that specifically come to mind as being key to global social and economic development are listed under question 15 below. *Any new mechanism for 'enhanced cooperation' must have a strong track for specifically looking at development related issues.*

14.   What is the role of various stakeholders in promoting the development of local language content? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

The issue of local content, as of local applications and e-services, and promoting local/ domestic Internet business, is very important for developing countries. However, in the limited time available to the WGEC, it should desist from going into the details of specific public policy issues and focus its effort on the need for a new mechanism to address all the important Internet-related public policy issues at the global level.

15.   What are the international Internet-related public policy issues that are of special relevance to developing countries? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

Internet impacts almost all social systems. The new paradigms that inform the emergent social structures, and the various public polices that have a role in shaping them, are all very important to developing countries. It is of utmost importance to them that they participative on an equal footing in determining these international public policies pertaining to the Internet. Still, a non-exhaustive and non-prioritized list of public policy issues of special relevance to developing countries is provided below.

- Interconnection charges/ regimes
- Multilingualism
- Applicable jurisdiction, cross border coordination
- Competition policy, liberalization, privatization and regulations
- Affordable and universal access
- Cultural diversity and cultural protection
- technical standards, and technology choices
- Cloud computing (global issues involved)
- Tax allocation among different jurisdictions with regard to global e-commerce
- Net neutrality (that all data is given equal priority on networks)
- Search neutrality (that global search engines give neutral results)
- Media convergence - Internet and traditional media (Internet companies versus newspapers, radio, cable and TV, book publishing industry etc),
- Regulation of global Internet businesses (in terms of adherence to competition policies, consumer rights, law enforcement etc)
- Internet intermediary companies as private agents for extra-territorial law enforcement (problems with)
- Access to knowledge and free information flows, deepening the public domain on the Internet
- accessibility policies for the disabled
- Development of, and protection to, local content, local application, local e-services, and local/ domestic Internet businesses
- Protection of vulnerable sections, like children, women, traditional communities etc
- Internet and health systems, education systems, governance systems and so on.

16.   What are the key issues to be addressed to promote the affordability of the Internet, in particular in developing countries and least developed countries. (Please try not to exceed 200 words)

It is best for the WGEC not to go too deep into national level public policy issues, or even delve too much into any one area among many international public policy areas. The WGEC should focus on the

need for a new institutional mechanism, acknowledging that there indeed are a large number of very important international Internet-related public policy issues that require to be urgently addressed. This said, affordability of the Internet does implicates a number of international Internet-related public policy issues; for instance, global interconnection charges, global net neutrality, competition policies, technology standards and technology choices, regional Internet Exchange Points, and so on.

17. **What are the national capacities to be developed and modalities to be considered for national governments to develop Internet-related public policy with participation of all stakeholders? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)**

The manner in which national governments develop domestic Internet-related public polices is outside the mandate of this WG, and it should not spend the limited time available to it going into this issue. However, the research and capacity building parts of the proposed 'new body under the UN' for 'enhanced cooperation', which are described under question 10, will be useful for enhancing the knowledge and capacities of national governments in this regard.

18. **Are there other comments, or areas of concern, on enhanced cooperation you would like to submit? (Please try not to exceed 200 words)**