
Document WSIS-II/PC-3/DT/15-E
30 September 2005
Original: English

Chair, Sub-Committee A (Internet Governance)

Chapter Three: Internet Governance

Chair's "FOOD FOR THOUGHT"¹ (SECTION FIVE)

PREAMBULAR

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. Continued internationalization of the Internet is evidenced by the recent creation of new Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) and the enhanced efforts of the Internet community to work towards an equitable distribution of IP addresses.

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 support the evolution and internationalization of Internet governance, based on the Geneva Principles, through existing and future mechanisms, institutions and forums. In this regard, we consider that the time is right to elaborate the role governments should play in relation to Internet governance.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENEVA PRINCIPLES

66. In reviewing the adequacy of existing institutional arrangements for Internet Governance and for policy debate, and given the continued internationalization of the Internet and the principle of universality, **we agree that** adjustments ought to be made to bring these into line with the "Geneva principles". Accordingly, **we agree to:**

¹ This paper has no official or formal status in the WSIS process. It is intended to assist delegations to synthesise their inputs and to refine them.

- a) Implement the Geneva Principles in an evolutionary manner, avoiding any changes that would threaten the stability, security, availability or reliability of the Internet;
- b) Implement the Geneva Principles in a phased manner;
- c) Initiate two processes, at the international level, for:
 - i. A gradual transition to a new public-private cooperation model for coordination and management of critical Internet resources.
 - ii. Creation of a new space for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue;

A NEW COOPERATION MODEL

67. For coordination and management of critical Internet resources, **we will strive to establish** a phased transition to the elaboration of a new public-private cooperation model. That model could include the development and application of globally-applicable public policy principles and examine the feasibility of the involvement of governments, in an international setting, at the level of overarching principles in matters related to naming, numbering and addressing. These could include:

- a) A global allocation system of IP number blocks, which is equitable and efficient;
- b) Procedures for the root zone file, specifically for new top-level domains and changes of country-code top level domains ;
- c) Contingency plans to ensure the continuity of crucial domain name system functions;
- d) Arbitration and dispute resolution mechanisms, based on international law in case of disputes;

OVERSIGHT

68. **We call for**, at the conclusion of the transitional period, examination of the establishment of an Inter-Governmental Council for global public policy and oversight of Internet governance. Such a Council, if and when established, should be based on the principles of transparency and democracy with the involvement, in an advisory capacity, of the private sector, civil society and the relevant inter-governmental and international organisations. Such a Council could be anchored in the UN system and deal with the following issues:

- a) Public policy development and decision-making on international Internet-related public policy issues;
- b) Oversight relating to Internet resource management including IP addresses, generic top-level domains and country-code top-level domains;
- c) Global coordination of Internet governance through dialogue between governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisation.

FORUM

69. For a multi-stakeholder policy dialogue, **we agree** to invite the UN Secretary-General to examine the establishment of a new space for policy dialogue—Internet Governance Forum (IGF)—initially for a period of five years, with the following mandate to:

- a) Address multi-dimensional and inter-related public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance as a means for contributing to the sustainability and robustness of the Internet;
- b) Facilitate discourse between different bodies dealing with different cross-cutting areas;

- c) 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;
- d) Interface with appropriate inter-governmental organisations and other institutions on matters under their purview;
- e) Identify emerging issues, and bring them to the attention of the appropriate bodies and make recommendations;
- f) Address issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body;
- g) Advise all stakeholders in raising awareness, capacity-building and in proposing solutions to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world;
- h) Strengthen and enhance stakeholder's engagement in existing and future Internet Governance mechanisms, particularly for those from developing countries;
- i) Contribute to good Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise;
- j) Promote and assess, on an ongoing basis, the embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes.

70. 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 and be subject to periodic review;
- c) Meet periodically, as required. IGF meetings, in principle, may be interfaced with major relevant UN conferences, *inter alia*, to utilise logistical support and facilitation.
- d) Examine the desirability of its continuation after its initial mandate of five years.

71. The IGF should have no oversight function and should not replace existing mechanisms or institutions and should have no involvement in day-to day operations.

72. 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. The role of the bureau should be reviewed at the end of the transitional phase.

73. **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 including the Millennium Development Goals.

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