1. What are the most important **achievements** arising from WSIS that should be highlighted in the Zero Draft? *

A) The creation and consolidation of the IGF, as a privileged space for multistakeholder dialogue.

The IGF is a neutral, issue-framing and agenda-setting space that is unparalleled. It brings new, emerging issues to the attention of the decision-makers, well in advance of other decision-making spaces. It also brings the perspectives of an extremely wide range of stakeholder groups on those emerging issues and allows the validation of possible avenues for tackling those issues. The IGF shall not be considered as a single, annual event, but as a complex ecosystem, including robust and action-oriented intersessional work (Dynamic Coalitions, Best Practice Forums, and Policy Networks).

In particular, a great achievement was the creation of the NRIs, which were a not anticipated, spontaneous, bottom-up initiative of the global community, which created regional, sub-regional and national multistakeholder dialogue spaces that did not exist before. They are a privileged two-way communication channel between the global and the local policy environments.

B) The consolidation of the multistakeholder model

The multistakeholder model proved its relevance in the past 20 years in discussion spaces like the global IGF and the NRIs and in technical bodies such as ICANN, the RIRs, and many ccTLD registries. CGI.br, the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, stands out as a respected and admired example of multistakeholder composition and operation.

2. What are the most important **challenges** to the achievement of WSIS outcomes to date and in the future that need to be addressed in the Zero Draft? *

One of the most important challenges is the fragmentation of the governance space, as this avoids a harmonization of the various policy approaches that are proposed in different decision-making forums. Although the proliferation of multilateral spaces is relevant for the facilitation of and cooperation regarding government-related issues, it is important that such new spaces do not sideline the multistakeholder processes and participation. In fact, all the stakeholder groups (including the private sector, the technical community and the civil society) should be meaningfully involved in the proposition of public policies, even in discussions taken in multilateral spaces. This is, and always was, the essence of Internet and digital cooperation. For this involvement, the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines offer a valuable standard to be followed.

In this sense, the GDC, as a new UN process running in parallel to the WSIS process, also creates another challenge, as both deal with very similar policy issues, but risk to follow different paths. Coordination between them is essential. In particular, the GDC implementation and the follow-up of its commitments could be fully integrated into the WSIS framework, which already has a proven record after 20 years.

The lack of a closer articulation between the IGF and the WSIS Forum is also a challenge to the WSIS framework. They should inform each other in a much more action-oriented way.

3. What are the most important **priorities** for action to achieve the WSIS vision of a 'people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society' in the future, taking into account emerging trends? *

Meaningful connectivity is still a great challenge. Two billion people are still off-line. Most people online do not have real meaningful connectivity, for various reasons – affordability, lack of digital literacy, lack of meaningful contents and services.

Protection of human rights online, information integrity, Artificial Intelligence and data governance, digital public infrastructures and a better integration with the SDGs are also issues that should receive priority in the WSIS going forward.

There is a growing demand for regulation and legislation. The WSIS shall look for harmonized digital policies, regulations and legislation, while at the same time protecting fundamental properties of the Internet (openness, interoperability, trustworthiness, security, among others).

4. What **additional themes/issues**, if any, should be included in the Elements Paper? *

> The Zero Draft should propose a strengthening of the WSIS framework, with better articulation between the IGF and the WSIS Forum.
>
> The WSIS Forum should be mentioned in the Zero Draft, as an integral part of the WSIS framework.
>
> The NRIs should also be mentioned in the Zero Draft and recognized as a powerful instrument for a close articulation between policy discussions at the local, regional, and global levels.
>
> The Zero Draft should also propose a concrete articulation between the Action Lines and the SDGs.

5. Do you wish to comment on **particular themes/issues/paragraphs** in the Elements Paper? *

> The Zero Draft should not reopen old and closed issues, such as "enhanced cooperation".
>
> In paragraph 59, language should refer to multistakeholder cooperation, instead of multilateral, and the technical community should be included as an essential stakeholder group.
>
> The IGF should not be confined to a single section of the document, which deals with "Internet governance". The IGF, despite its denomination, has always covered all digital issues. Internet governance should not be considered in a very narrow sense, since in fact the global IGF community always addressed also the "governance ON the Internet", which covers the governance of all applications and services that are implemented on top of the Internet. As an example, the IGF has been covering AI and data governance for many years. But the Elements Paper has separated sections for AI and data governance, which do not mention the IGF as a discussion space and instead suggest other venues (the CSTD WG on data governance and the High-Level Advisory Board on AI), which will lead to fragmentation.

6. What suggestions do you have to support the development of the **WSIS framework** (WSIS Action Lines, IGF, WSIS Forum, UNGIS etc.)? *

> The mandate of the IGF should be renewed and it should have a permanent mandate. This will allow for long-term planning. The IGF needs much more robust funding, both from the UN and from other funding sources (other governments, other companies, other organizations), considering its various components - Secretariat, intersessional work, and NRIs.
>
> IGF outcomes should have a much more meaningful impact. This shall be addressed by: 1) a closer coordination with decision-making spaces, both within and outside the UN environment; 2) more targeted communication of IGF outcomes to those decision-making spaces.
>
> A better articulation is required between the IGF and the WSIS Forum. Their roles must be clear and complementary.

7. Do you have any **other** comments? *

> No

8. Who is **submitting** this input? *

Kindly provide the name of the person submitting this input, as well as the associated country, organization, stakeholder type, and relevant contact information

> Hartmut Glaser, Executive Secretary of CGI.br - Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, Brazil. CGI.br is a multistakeholder body that is responsible for managing the .br ccTLD, for proposing guidelines for the development and use of the Internet in Brazil, and for developing projects, programs, and studies of public interest on matters related to the Internet.

9. Please provide your **e-mail** address: *

Please enter an email