

Document WSIS-II/PC-2/DT-1 (Part 1)  
19 February 2005  
Original: English

## Chair of the WSIS PrepCom-2 Sub-Committee

### COMPILATION OF COMMENTS ON CHAPTER TWO OF THE OPERATIONAL PART (FINANCIAL MECHANISMS). PART ONE (PARA 12-26)

Note: New text in **bold**. Deleted text in ~~strike through~~. [*Comments in italics.*]

Existing text	Sources of Proposed text	Proposed Text
12. We thank the UN Secretary-General for his efforts in creating the Task Force on Financial Mechanisms (TFFM) and we commend them on their report.	No change	12. We thank the UN Secretary-General for his efforts in creating the Task Force on Financial Mechanisms (TFFM) and we commend them on their report.
13. We recall that the mandate of the TFFM was to undertake a thorough review of the adequacy of existing financial mechanisms in meeting the challenges of ICT for development.	Senegal (on behalf of African group), Mali, Cuba	13. We recall that the mandate of the TFFM was to undertake a thorough review of the adequacy of existing financial mechanisms in meeting the challenges of ICT for development. <b>Based on the conclusion of the review, improvements and innovations of financing mechanisms will be considered including the effectiveness, the feasibility and the creation of a voluntary Digital Solidarity Fund, as mentioned in the Declaration of Principles.</b>
	Canada	<b>New 13A. The TFFM report sets out the complexity of existing mechanisms, both private and public, which provide financing for ICTs in developing countries. It identifies areas where these could be improved and where ICTs could be given higher priority by developing countries and their development partners.</b>

<p><b>14.</b> We recognise the existence of the digital divide and the dilemma that this poses for many countries, which are forced to choose between many competing demands for development funds. We recognise the scale of the problem in bridging the digital divide, which will require huge investments in ICT infrastructure and services, and capacity building, over many years to come.</p>	<p>Brazil</p>	<p><b>14. We call for Digital Solidarity and</b> recognise the existence of the digital divide and the dilemma that this poses for many countries, which are forced to choose between many competing demands for development funds. We recognise the scale of the problem in bridging the digital divide, which will require huge investments in ICT infrastructure and services, and capacity building <b>and transfer of technology</b>, over many years to come.</p>
	<p>Canada</p>	<p><b>14.</b> We recognise the existence of the digital divide and the <del>dilemma</del><b>challenges</b> that this poses for many countries, which are forced to choose between many competing <del>demands for development funds</del><b>objectives in their development planning</b>. We recognise the scale of the problem in bridging the digital divide, which will require huge investments in ICT infrastructure and services, and capacity building, over many years to come. <b>It will be necessary to generate and attract resources from all potential sources, consistent with the Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development.</b></p>
	<p>Bangladesh</p>	<p><b>14. ....</b> We recognise the scale of the problem in bridging the digital divide, which will require <del>huge</del><b>adequate, sustainable and predictable</b> investments in ICT infrastructure and services, and capacity building, over many years to come.</p>
	<p>South Africa</p>	<p><b>14.</b> We recognise the existence of the digital divide and the dilemma that this poses for many countries, which are forced to choose between many competing demands for development funds <b>whilst having limited resources</b>. We recognise the scale of the problem in bridging the digital divide, which will require huge investments <del>in ICT infrastructure and services, and capacity building, over many years to come.</del></p>
	<p>Argentina</p>	<p><b>New 14A. We recognize that the issue of financing is at the core of all development discussions, as adequate financial resources are obviously an indispensable ingredient for alleviating poverty and securing sustainable development.</b></p>
	<p>Djibouti</p>	<p><b>New 14B. We recognize and acknowledge the special and specific funding needs of LDCs that face numerous challenges in the ICT sector that there is strong need to focus on their special financing needs to achieve the MDGs. The WSIS process should continue to give consideration to these needs.</b></p>

<p><b>15.</b> We agree that the financing of ICT for development needs to be placed in the context of the growing importance of the role assigned to ICTs, not only as a medium of communication, but also as a development enabler, and as a tool for the achievement of the development goals of the Millennium Declaration.</p>	India	<p><b>15.</b> We agree that the financing of ICT for development needs to be placed in the context of the growing importance of the role assigned to of ICTs, ....</p>
	South Africa	<p><i>[While we agree with the spirit of the paragraph, we would however like to see the emphasis being placed on the economic aspects of development]</i></p>
<p><b>16.</b> In the past, financing of ICTs in developing countries has been closely related to the business cycles of the ICT industry. A significant influx of financial resources in the ICT sector, as well as governmental mobilization, in many developing countries has had visible results: in less than 15 years, more than a billion people have gained access to telephones (fixed and mobile), and to a lesser extent to computers, the Internet and other means of sharing information.</p>	Brazil	<p><b>16.</b> In the past, financing of ICTs in developing countries has been closely related to <b>public investment as well as to</b> the business cycles of the ICT industry. <b>Governmental mobilization, as well as a</b> significant influx of financial resources in the ICT sector, <del>as well as governmental mobilization,</del> in many developing countries has had visible results: ...</p>
<p><b>17.</b> We note that this investment has had the greatest development impact where ICT markets have been opened and private sector participation has been encouraged and where public policies aimed at bridging the digital divide have been implemented.</p>	South Africa	<p><b>17.</b> We note that this investment has had the greatest development impact where ICT markets have been opened and private sector participation has been encouraged and where public policies aimed at bridging the digital divide have been implemented. <b>We should however acknowledge that, left to itself, private sector investment has only gone to areas that are perceived as lucrative and profitable, and this has not had the desired effect of bringing inclusive development and access for everyone.</b></p>
	Argentina	<p><b>17.</b> We note that this investment has had the greatest development impact where ICT markets have been opened, <b>based on a sound regulatory framework,</b> and private sector participation has been encouraged and where public policies aimed at bridging the digital divide have been implemented.</p>
	Brazil <i>(delete, or if retained make changes)</i>	<p><b>17. We note</b> that this investment has had the greatest development impact where <del>ICT markets have been opened and private sector participation has been encouraged and where</del> public policies aimed at bridging the digital divide have been implemented, <b>and where market-friendly regulations are in place.</b></p>
<p><b>[18.</b> We are greatly encouraged by the fact that advances in communication technology, and high-speed data networks, have made it possible for developing countries, and countries in</p>	Cuba Iran, I.R. India, Algeria, Brazil	<p><b>18.</b> <i>[Remove square brackets]</i></p>

<p>transition, to participate in the global market for information-technology-enabled services on the basis of their comparative advantage. These emerging opportunities provide a powerful commercial basis for ICT infrastructural investment in these countries. It is imperative, therefore, that no action be taken by any country that could discourage, impede or prevent the participation of these countries in the global market for information-technology-enabled services.]</p>	<p>CCBI, El Salvador, USA</p>	<p><del>18. .... It is imperative, therefore, that no action be taken by any country that could discourage, impede or prevent</del> <b>national policies actively encourage</b> the participation of these countries in the global market for information-technology-enabled services.</p>
	<p>South Africa, India, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Philippines</p>	<p><b>18.</b> We are greatly encouraged by the fact that advances in communication technology, and high-speed data networks <b>are continuously increasing the possibilities</b> <del>have made it possible</del> for developing countries, and countries in transition, to participate in the global market for information-technology-enabled services on the basis of their comparative advantage. ...</p>
	<p>USA, Philippines</p>	<p><del>18. ... It is imperative, therefore, that no action be taken by any country that could discourage, impede or prevent the participation of these countries in the global market for information-technology-enabled services.</del> <b>Governments should take action, in the framework of national development policies, in order to support an enabling and competitive environment for the necessary investment in ICT infrastructure and for the development of new services.</b></p>
	<p>EU (Lux)</p>	<p><del>18. ... It is imperative, therefore, that no action be taken by any country that could discourage, impede or prevent</del> <b>We recognize the importance of removing difficulties regarding</b> the participation of these countries in the global market for information-technology-enabled services.</p>
	<p>Malawi, India, Philippines</p>	<p><del>18. ... It is imperative,</del> Therefore, <del>[that]</del> no action <b>should</b> be taken by any country that could discourage, impede or prevent the participation of these countries in the global market for information-technology-enabled services.</p>
	<p>Argentina, Brazil, Algeria</p>	<p><b>New 18A. We take note that the challenges for expanding the scope of useful accessible information content in the developing world are numerous, in particular, the issue of financing for various forms of content and applications requires new attention, as this area has often been overlooked by the focus on ICT infrastructure.</b></p>
<p><b>19.</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive enabling environment for business and an ICT policy and regulatory environment that encompasses [open entry,] fair competition and market-friendly regulation.</p>	<p>Korea (Rep.), Japan, EU (Lux)</p>	<p><b>19.</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon <b>good governance, including</b> a supportive enabling environment for business and an ICT policy and regulatory environment that encompasses {open entry,} fair competition and market-friendly regulation.</p>

<p><b>19 Alt:</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive, transparent and pro-competitive policy and regulatory framework.</p>	<p>Russian Federation, South Africa, USA, India, Nigeria, Guinea, Saudi Arabia, Iraq</p>	<p><b>19 Alt:</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive, transparent and pro-competitive policy and regulatory framework. <i>[No changes]</i></p>
	<p>Argentina, Brazil, Algeria, Uganda, Egypt, Bangladesh</p>	<p><b>19 Alt1:</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive <i>[Uganda:]</i> <b>and enabling environment</b>, transparent and pro-competitive policy and regulatory framework <i>[Egypt: reflecting national realities]</i>. <i>[Brazil/Argentina]</i> <b>as well as skilled labour resources.</b> <i>[Bangladesh:]</i> <b>supported by dynamic and enabling international policy environment.</b> <i>[Brazil:]</i> <b>We are also aware that a market-friendly framework needs to be accompanied by socially-responsible business practices and by public policies oriented to development and to digital inclusion</b></p>
	<p>Norway, Guinea</p>	<p><i>[Insert a reference to good governance.]</i></p>
	<p>Iraq</p>	<p><b>19 Alt2:</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive <b>enabling environment for business</b>, transparent and pro-competitive policy and regulatory framework <b>considering strongly the local skilled resources.</b></p>
	<p>CCBI</p>	<p><b>19 Alt3:</b> We recognise that attracting investment in ICTs has depended crucially upon a supportive, transparent <b>and predictable process</b>, and pro-competitive policy and regulatory framework <b>as part of an enabling environment.</b></p>
	<p>Cuba</p>	<p><b>New 19A. This underlines that market forces alone cannot guarantee the full participation of developing countries in the global market for information technology enabled services. Therefore, we call for the reinforcement of international cooperation and solidarity aimed at enabling all countries, especially developing countries and countries in transition, to develop ICT infrastructure and information technology enabled services that are viable and competitive at national and international levels.</b></p>
	<p><b>20.</b> We note that the vast majority of financing of ICT infrastructure and services has come from the private sector and that North-South flows are increasingly being augmented by South-South co-operation and domestic financing.</p>	<p>Botswana</p>
	<p>Mali</p>	<p><i>[Request revision of the French translation.]</i></p>

	Brazil Colombia	<b>20. We note</b> that the vast majority of financing of ICT infrastructure and services has come from the <b>public and private sectors</b> and that North-South <b>financial flows need to be</b> <del>are increasingly being</del> augmented by South-South co-operation and domestic <b>and international</b> financing.
<p><b>21.</b> We recognize that, as a result of the growing importance of private sector investment in infrastructure, multilateral and bilateral public donors are redirecting public resources to policy reforms and other development needs, including the mainstreaming of ICTs in the development sectors. Nevertheless, we encourage multilateral and bilateral public donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional ICT infrastructure projects. They should consider aligning their aid and partnership strategies with the priorities of developing countries' poverty reduction and/or other national development strategies.</p>	Uganda	<b>21.</b> ...Nevertheless, we encourage multilateral and bilateral public donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional <b>and national</b> ICT infrastructure projects. ...
	Canada	<b>21.</b> ... Nevertheless, we encourage <b>developing countries and regional organizations to give higher priority to regional ICT infrastructure, leading to increased support from multilateral and bilateral donors.</b> <del>[multilateral and bilateral public donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional ICT infrastructure projects. ...</del>
	Australia Norway	<b>21.</b> ... Nevertheless, we encourage multilateral and bilateral public donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional ICT infrastructure projects. ....
	Argentina	<b>21.</b> <del>[We recognize that, as a result of the growing importance of private sector investment in infrastructure, multilateral and bilateral public donors are redirecting public resources to policy reforms and other development needs, including the mainstreaming of ICTs in the development sectors. ... Nevertheless, we encourage multilateral and bilateral public donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional ICT infrastructure projects. They should consider aligning their aid and partnership strategies with the priorities of developing countries' poverty reduction and/or other national development strategies. Nevertheless ICT for development is not limited to communication or infrastructure development. We encourage multilateral financial institutions and public donors to consider also providing more financial support, at national and regional level, for infrastructure projects, contents application, capacity development, and the strategic deployment of ICT. That will enhance the achievement of development objectives, deliver public services; as foster the creation of an inclusive Information Society]</del>
	Colombia	<i>[Redundant with 15]</i>

	Iraq	<b>21.</b> ... Nevertheless, we encourage multilateral and bilateral <del>public</del> donors to consider also providing more financial support for regional ICT infrastructure projects. <del>They should consider aligning their aid and partnership strategies with the priorities of developing countries' poverty reduction and/or other national development strategies.</del>
	Bangladesh	<b>21.</b> ... They should consider aligning their aid and partnership strategies with the priorities <del>of</del> <b>set by</b> developing countries' <del>poverty reduction and/or other</del> national development strategies.
	CCBI	<b>21.</b> We recognize that, as a result of the growing importance of <b>sustainable</b> private sector investment in infrastructure, ...
	El Salvador	<b>New 21A. Some investments, either on infrastructure or otherwise, present a challenge of risks and benefits that makes the market approach unrealistic by itself. One way to address this is through the use of multi-stakeholder partnerships that can take up those challenges appropriately.</b>
	Civil Society (CRIS, APC, ITeM, Bread for All, Digital Divide Data and IT for Change)	<b>New 21B. We recognize that CSO and community networks have also been found to be effective in expanding ICT access to high cost (rural) and low income populations.</b>
	Civil Society	<b>New 21C. We recognize that public finance plays a crucial role in providing ICT access and services to rural areas and disadvantaged populations where markets are incomplete and inadequate.</b>
<b>22.</b> Although there are many different funding mechanisms for ICTs for Development, we note that there is sometimes a shortage of investment funds and/or a mismatch between needs and available funding.	Iran, I.R.	<b>22.</b> Although there are many different funding mechanisms for ICTs for Development, we note that <b>ICT-related funding represents a high level priority in all developing countries. The current financing levels, at national and international levels, have not been adequate to meet the needs.</b> - <del>there is sometimes a shortage of investment funds and/or a mismatch between needs and available funding.</del>
	Brazil	<b>22.</b> ..., we note that there is <del>sometimes</del> a shortage of investment funds ....

	Argentina	<b>22.</b> ... we note that there is sometimes a shortage of investment funds and/or a mismatch between needs and available funding <b>as well as the lack of adequacy in existing financial mechanism for new technologies in developing countries. We recognize that many of the principles and objectives cited in the Monterrey Consensus are directly relevant to the pursuit of adequate and appropriate financial mechanisms to promote ICT development as well and are reflected in the structure of the Digital Solidarity Agenda in the WSIS Plan of Action.</b>
	Philippines	<b>22.</b> ..., we note that there is <del>sometimes</del> <b>still</b> a shortage of investment funds and/or a mismatch between needs and available funding.
	Sénégal	<b>22.</b> Although there are many different funding mechanisms for ICTs for Development, we note that <del>there is sometimes a shortage of investment funds</del> <b>are insufficient and, even when financing is available, it does not always correspond to the needs.</b> <del>and/or a mismatch between needs and available funding.</del>
	Civil Society	<b>22.</b> ...we note that there is <del>sometimes</del> <b>often</b> a shortage of investment funds ....
<b>23.</b> We recognize that there are a number of areas where the current approaches to ICT for Development financing have devoted insufficient attention to date. These include:	Botswana	<b>23.</b> We recognize that there are a number of areas where <del>the current approaches to ICT for Development financing have devoted</del> is insufficient <del>attention to date</del> . These include:
<b>a.</b> ICT capacity-building programmes, materials, tools, educational funding and specialized training initiatives, especially for regulators and other public sector employees and organisations;	No change	a. ICT capacity-building programmes, materials, tools, educational funding and specialized training initiatives, especially for regulators and other public sector employees and organisations;
<b>b.</b> Communications access and connectivity for ICT services in remote rural areas, small island developing states and other locations presenting unique technological and market challenges;	Malawi	b. Communications access and connectivity for ICT <b>products and</b> services ...;
	Bangladesh	b. Communications access and connectivity for ICT- <b>based</b> services ...;
	Argentina	b. Communications access and connectivity for ICT services in remote rural areas, small island developing states and other locations presenting unique technological and market challenges, <b>taking into account specific modalities and successful experiences in developing countries;</b>



<p>c. Regional backbone infrastructure to link networks across borders in economically-disadvantaged regions requiring coordinated legal, regulatory and financial frameworks and seed financing;</p>	<p>Argentina</p>	<p>c. Regional backbone infrastructure, <b>regional networks, NAPs and all regional projects</b>, to link networks across borders and in economically-disadvantaged regions requiring coordinated legal, regulatory and financial frameworks and seed financing <b>and to share experiences and best practices</b>;</p>
<p>d. Broadband capacity to facilitate the delivery of services, catalyse investment and provide Internet access at affordable prices to both existing and new users;</p>	<p>CCBI</p>	<p>d. Broadband capacity to facilitate the delivery of a <b>broader range of services and applications</b>, catalyse investment and provide Internet access at affordable prices to both existing and new users;</p>
<p>e. Coordinated assistance for Small Island Development States in order to lower otherwise prohibitive transaction costs in access to international donor support;</p>	<p>Barbados Trinidad Tobago</p>	<p>e. Coordinated assistance for Small Island Development States in order to <b>improve effectiveness and to lower otherwise prohibitive transaction costs in access to associated with the delivery of</b> international donor support;</p>
	<p>Mauritania</p>	<p>e. Coordinated assistance for <b>LDCs and</b> small island development states ...;</p>
<p>f. ICT applications and content aimed at the integration of ICTs into the implementation of poverty eradication strategies and in development sector programmes, particularly in health and education.</p>	<p>Argentina</p>	<p>f. ... particularly in health, <del>and</del> education, <b>agriculture and the environment</b>;</p>
	<p>South Africa</p>	<p><b>New 23g. The maintenance of ICT infrastructure together with sustainability of Information Society related projects;</b> <b>New 23h. Community based and co-operative programmes and projects;</b> <b>New 23i. Funding of Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs);</b> <b>New 23j. Local manufacturing of ICT applications and technologies by developing countries.</b></p>
	<p>Brazil</p>	<p><b>New 23k. Financing programmes which enable industrial, technological and scientific development.</b></p>
	<p>Indonesia</p>	<p><b>New 23l. Activities on ICT-related institutional reform and enhanced capacity on legal and regulatory framework.</b></p>
	<p>Barbados</p>	<p><b>New 23m. Donors funding ICT projects should specify funding for studies to determine the optimal structure and business process change that would be necessary to optimize the impact and effectiveness of ICT projects.</b></p>
	<p>Civil Society</p>	<p><b>New 23n. Local government and community-owned initiatives that deliver ICT services to communities in the areas of education, health, livelihood support, etc.</b></p>

<p><b>24.</b> Although central responsibility for coordination rests with governments, we recommend that greater cross-sectoral and cross-institutional coordination of financing programmes and ICT development initiatives should be undertaken, both on the part of donors and recipients.</p>	South Africa, Sénégal	<p><del>24. Although we recommend central responsibility for coordination rests with governments,</del> greater cross-sectoral and cross-institutional coordination of financing programmes and ICT development initiatives should be undertaken, both on the part of donors and recipients, <b>we recommend that the central responsibility for coordination rests with governments.</b></p>
	Argentina	<p><b>24.</b> Although central responsibility for coordination rests with governments, we recommend that greater cross-sectoral and cross-institutional coordination of financing programmes and ICT development initiatives should be undertaken, both on the part of donors and recipients. <b>Multilateral development banks must adapt their existing mechanisms, and design new ones, to provide for national and regional demands on ICT development. This should include also coordination between donor governments and business entities.</b></p>
	Sénégal	<p><del>24. Although central responsibility for coordination rests with governments,</del> we recommend that <b>financing programmes are subject to</b> greater cross-sectoral and cross-institutional coordination of <del>financing programmes</del> and <b>that</b> ICT development initiatives should be undertaken, both on the part of donors and recipients, <b>the central responsibility for coordination rests with governments.</b></p>
<p><b>25.</b> We acknowledge the following pre-conditions for the creation and better utilization of financial mechanisms:</p>	South Africa, Egypt	<i>[Find better word for “pre-conditions”].</i>
	Philippines	<p><del>25. We acknowledge the following pre-conditions</del> <b>needs</b> for the creation and better utilization of financial mechanisms:</p>
	Malawi	<p><del>25. We acknowledge the following pre-conditions</del> <b>enabling conditions</b> for <del>the creation</del> <b>access to</b> and better utilization of financial mechanisms:</p>
<p><b>a.</b> Creating policy and regulatory incentives and more open access policies;</p>	Argentina	<p><b>a.</b> Creating policy and regulatory incentives, more open access policies, <b>and public policies to support SME and national ICT providers;</b></p>
	Brazil	<p><b>a.</b> Creating policy and regulatory incentives and <del>more open</del> policies aimed at <b>universal</b> access;</p>
	Civil Society	<p><b>a.</b> Creating policy and regulatory incentives and more open access policies <b>that will enable achieving the goal of universal access;</b></p>
<p><b>b.</b> Identification and acknowledgement of the key role of ICTs in national poverty reduction strategies, and their elaboration, when appropriate, in conjunction with e-strategies;</p>	Bangladesh	<p><b>b.</b> Identification and acknowledgement of the key role of ICTs in national <del>poverty reduction</del> <b>development</b> strategies, ...;</p>

c. Developing institutional and implementation capacity to support the use of national universal service/access funds, and further study of these mechanisms;	Argentina	c. Developing institutional and implementation capacity to support the use of national universal service/access funds, and further study of these mechanisms <b>and those aiming to mobilize domestic resources;</b>
d. Ensuring the relevance to developing countries of the information applications, services and local content delivered by ICTs;	Canada	d. <del>Ensuring the relevance to developing countries of the information applications, services and local content delivered by ICTs</del> <b>Encourage the development of locally relevant information, applications and services that will benefit developing countries;</b>
	Russian Federation	d. Ensuring the relevance to developing countries <b>and countries with economies in transition</b> of the information applications, services and local content delivered by ICTs;
e. Supporting the “scaling-up” of successful ICT-based pilot programmes;	No change	e. Supporting the “scaling-up” of successful ICT-based pilot programmes;
f. Using ICTs in government as a catalyst for implementation of successful e-strategies;	Uganda	f. Using ICTs in government as a catalyst for implementation of <del>successful</del> e-strategies;
	Russian Federation	f. <del>Using ICTs in government as a catalyst for implementation of successful e-strategies</del> <b>To support the role of ICTs in government as a first priority and a crucial target area for ICT-based development interventions;</b>
	CCBI	f. Using ICTs in government as a catalyst for implementation of <b>sustainable and</b> successful e-strategies;
g. [Enabling tax, tariff, import, and business regulation policies designed to reduce risks and financial burdens for, and provide incentives to, ICT investors, start-up firms, and domestic financial resources;]	Venezuela, Egypt, Argentina, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Algeria,	<del>g. [Enabling tax, tariff, import, and business-regulation policies designed to reduce risks and financial burdens for, and provide incentives to, ICT-investors, start-up firms, and domestic financial-resources;]</del>
	Japan	g. Enabling <b>appropriate</b> tax, tariff, import, and business regulation policies ...;
	Nigeria	g. Enabling <b>appropriate and enabling</b> tax, tariff, import, and business regulation, <b>in line with national</b> policies designed to reduce risks and financial burdens for, and provide incentives to, ICT investors, start-up firms, and domestic financial resources;
h. Building human resource and institutional capacity (knowledge) at every level for achieving Information Society objectives, especially in the public sector;	No change	h. Building human resource and institutional capacity (knowledge) at every level for achieving Information Society objectives, especially in the public sector;
i. Encouraging business sector entities to help jump-start wider demand for ICT services by supporting local producers, programmers, artists and small businesses in the applications and content fields;	No change	i. Encouraging business sector entities to help jump-start wider demand for ICT services by supporting local producers, programmers, artists and small businesses in the applications and content fields;

j. Strengthening capacities to enhance the potential of securing funds and utilising them effectively;	No change	j. Strengthening capacities to enhance the potential of securing funds and utilising them effectively;
	Cuba	<b>New 25k. Guaranteeing the universal and non-discriminatory access to financial mechanisms by every one and all peoples.</b>
<b>26.</b> We recommend improvements and innovations in existing financing mechanisms, including:	El Salvador	<b>26.</b> We recommend improvements and innovations in existing financing mechanisms <b>to be implemented by 200X</b> , including:
	El Salvador	<b>New text before 26a. Improving financial mechanisms to make financial resources become stable, predictable and untied and sustainable;</b>
<b>a.</b> Enhancing regional cooperation and creating multi-stakeholder partnerships; especially by creating incentives for building regional backbone infrastructure;	Sénégal Chad	a. Enhancing regional cooperation and creating multi-stakeholder partnerships; especially by creating incentives for building regional backbone infrastructure;
	Brazil, Cuba, India, Holy See	<b>New 26 a1. Providing affordable access to ICTs, by reducing Internet interconnection costs charged by backbone providers and by promoting awareness of the positive externalities generated by the use and development of free and open source software;</b>
	Civil Society	<b>a.</b> Enhancing regional cooperation and creating multi-stakeholder partnerships; especially by creating incentives for building regional backbone infrastructure, <b>particularly support for building regional backbone infrastructure in Africa as a matter of priority, and recognize the important role of multilateral finance for this purpose;</b>
<b>b.</b> Coordinating programmes among governments and major financial players to mitigate investment risks and transaction costs for operators entering less attractive rural and low income market segments;	Brazil	<b>b.</b> Coordinating programmes among governments and major financial players to <del>mitigate investment risks and transaction costs for operators entering</del> <b>stimulate investments in less attractive rural and low income market segments.</b>
	Sénégal	<i>[Revise the French translation].</i>
<b>c.</b> Helping to accelerate the development of domestic financial instruments including by supporting local microfinance instruments, ICT small business incubators, public credit instruments, franchises, reverse auction mechanisms, community networking initiatives, digital solidarity and other innovations;	Ghana	c. ... including <b>by</b> supporting local microfinance instruments, ...;
	Chad	<i>[Revise the French translation]</i>
	Argentina	<b>New 26 c1. Enabling developing countries benefiting from the stimulus of the technology to be increasingly able to generate funds and new financial instruments including trust funds and seed capital adapted to their economies;</b>

<p><b>d.</b> Establishment of a “virtual” financing facility to leverage multiple sources in support of identified investment objectives in key locations (notably broadband, rural and regional projects, and capacity building);</p>	Argentina	<b>New 26 d1. Establishing appropriate financial mechanisms to create functioning, sustainable business relationships at all levels of the information value chain, from producer to distributors, from retailers to customers;</b>
	Argentina	<b>New 26 d2; Providing the financial support necessary to launch and nurture start-up media, information, or entertainment enterprises, training software, regional Web Portals, community radio broadcasts, or motion picture DVDs, in order to gain adequate, ongoing market positions;</b>
	Argentina	<b>New 26 d3: Urging developed countries to make concrete efforts to fulfil their international commitment under the Monterrey Consensus.</b>
	Civil Society	<b>New 26 d4. The creation of a mechanism for coordinating research and analysis into enabling policy environments.</b>
<p><b>e.</b> Development of a “rapid response” policy and regulatory support mechanism to intervene in support of short-term ICT sector policy initiatives;</p>	No change	e. Development of a “rapid response” policy and regulatory support mechanism to intervene in support of short-term ICT sector policy initiatives;
<p><b>f.</b> Encouraging increased voluntary, consumer-based contributions.</p>	USA Philippines, CCBI	Encouraging increased voluntary, <del>consumer-based</del> contributions.
	Colombia	<b>New 26 g. Responsibilities relative to universal service: regulatory frameworks must establish the responsibilities for universal service of all national and international telecommunication services operators, in a technology-neutral manner.</b>
	Civil Society	<p><b>New 26A. We recommend the formation of a Global ICT4D Policy and Financing Facility to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>assist developing countries utilize existing financial mechanisms for ICT4D more effectively;</b></li> <li>• <b>provide policy information, advice and capacity building to developing countries without conditionality;</b></li> <li>• <b>explore new financial mechanisms to support ICT4D; mechanisms that avoid diversion of existing funds (e.g. ODA). Such mechanisms could consist of a global tax, voluntary or compulsory, and contributions from commercial internet domain name holders.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Such a facility should be established and operated on a multi-stakeholder basis.’</b></p>