

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

One of the most significant achievements of WSIS to be highlighted in the Zero Draft is the strengthening of the decentralized, multistakeholder model of internet governance. This model has advanced the development and voluntary adoption of internet standards through open, inclusive processes and enables a flexible, forward-looking approach towards innovation in information technologies. As a result, bodies such as the IGF, the WSIS Forum, and other UN-led platforms have proven effective in fostering early dialogue on artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, and quantum computing. WSIS has also enabled meaningful global cooperation and inspired new forms of collaboration at national and regional levels, reflected in the establishment of more than 150 national and regional internet governance forums (NRIs).

This decentralized model of governance has been fundamental to the internet's success as a driver of innovation and expanded global connectivity. The internet's architecture, defined by interoperability, general-purpose functionality, and independently managed networks, has allowed innovations to scale rapidly and meet evolving global needs. This openness has fostered continuous improvements in connectivity, reliability, and security, while safeguarding the confidentiality and integrity of communications. Cross-border collaboration among diverse stakeholders has been equally vital, facilitating the establishment of critical infrastructure such as ccTLDs, IXPs, and community networks, as well as coordinated responses to cybersecurity threats and disaster recovery efforts. Over time, this model has also incentivized sustained private sector investment and technological advancement, supporting a dynamic and competitive ecosystem. As the internet becomes ever more central to diverse sectors, including government services, commerce, healthcare, education, and more, its decentralized and interoperable governance remains essential to preserving its role as a powerful equalizer and engine of inclusive growth.

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? \*

Despite the transformative progress enabled by WSIS, its vision of an open, inclusive, and globally interoperable internet faces mounting and multifaceted challenges. A growing number of governments are asserting national sovereignty over digital infrastructure and introducing laws with extraterritorial reach, threatening the internet's global coherence and undermining its foundational cross-border nature. These actions, compounded by fragmented regulatory regimes, data localization mandates, and security-driven restrictions, are accelerating the risk of internet fragmentation. At the same time, the multistakeholder model is increasingly being sidelined in favor of state-centric approaches, reducing the meaningful participation of civil society, the technical community, and the private sector in shaping digital policy. These pressures coincide with persistent digital divides, with nearly one-third of the world's population remaining offline, with many more lacking affordable, reliable, and resilient connectivity. As access to digital services becomes increasingly essential for participation in economic, educational, and civic life, these divides risk entrenching global inequalities.

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? \*

The most important priorities for action are the need to support enabling regulatory environments and the multistakeholder nature of internet governance. Governments alone do not have the resources to address the challenges detailed above, and the private sector has the unique opportunity to accelerate the rate of innovation if supported through flexible, enabling policy directives. These include support for cross-border data flows, voluntary standards and interconnection agreements, and support for encryption.

Similarly, the multistakeholder model of Internet governance that has been central to the Internet's growth and global reach must continue to be supported. This model has enabled the deployment of essential infrastructure, rapid responses to cybersecurity threats, and the development of interoperable standards. Decisions reached through open deliberation and consensus tend to reflect a deeper engagement with competing perspectives and are more resilient and trusted. Given its proven effectiveness and foundational role in ensuring an open, secure, and global internet, WSIS implementation must prioritize the continued centrality of the multistakeholder approach.

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

N/A

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

Paragraphs 2 and 10 should clearly articulate the relationship with the Global Digital Compact (GDC), recognizing that the GDC is currently being implemented through targeted and actionable workstreams. Where the GDC is advancing specific initiatives on emerging technologies, such as AI, the Zero Draft should acknowledge these efforts to avoid duplication.

While many of the concerns cited in paragraph 7 are valid, this is an arbitrary list that detracts from a more holistic appreciation of the dynamics and evolution of the digital landscape, and thus, such specifics should be avoided.

Paragraph 19 should remove the language “Automation and AI risk deepening inequalities and displacing jobs where digital capacity is weak.”

Paragraph 21’s reference to the Action Lines should be kept minimal and should not be an entry point to opening discussion on them, given the narrow focus of this paper in reviewing the resolution of WSIS only.

Paragraph 31 should remove the language “and fear of potential risks associated with Internet use” as it is vague and unsubstantiated.

Paragraphs 36 through 38 on the “enabling environment” should clearly articulate the principles required to realize this vision. Given the private sector’s critical role in driving innovation, the Zero Draft should outline best practices, including support for cross-border data flows, measures to reduce the cost of innovation, and sound policy implementation practices in the form of transparent and predictable regulatory frameworks developed in close consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Paragraph 43 on human rights should be expanded to reflect the opportunities through which information technology can concretely strengthen the exercise of human rights. It should identify economic, social, and cultural rights alongside the right to development, and should outline the important role that ICTs can play in supporting these rights.

Paragraph 58 would benefit from an urgent and descriptive framing given the growing momentum behind proposals that threaten to undermine the core principles underpinning the Internet’s functioning, its global interoperability, and open architecture.

Paragraph 59 departs from the longstanding consensus favoring a multistakeholder approach to internet governance by introducing language that emphasizes a multilateral framework. To ensure consistency with established WSIS principles, the Zero Draft should reference the updated NetMundial definition of internet governance and reconsider the inclusion of language suggesting a shift toward multilateral governance.

Paragraphs 60-62 should recognize the critical importance of the IGF’s continued work through mandate renewal, including under permanent status. The references to “enhanced cooperation” in paragraphs 63 and 64 should be reconsidered for removal, as this issue has been thoroughly addressed in recent years. Notably, two separate Working Groups on Enhanced Cooperation have explored the topic extensively, and the successful completion of the 2016 IANA stewardship transition has effectively resolved the core concerns originally raised in the Tunis Agenda. Reintroducing this topic risks reopening a settled debate and detracting from forward-looking priorities.

Paragraphs 70 through 76 on AI should align with the technology-agnostic nature of the WSIS process by deferring, where appropriate, to ongoing workstreams on AI. The Zero Draft should recognize and build upon efforts under the Global Digital Compact, including the proposed UN Scientific Panel and Global Dialogue on AI, which remain in development and do not require additional direction from the WSIS process. Additionally, Paragraph 73 should revise its characterization of the UN as “essential” for “shaping” AI governance, to better reflect the GDC’s framing of the UN’s role as one of supporting coordination and information-sharing rather than leading regulatory design.

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

Additional suggestions to support the development of the WSIS framework are as follows:

Support alignment between the WSIS process and the Global Digital Compact where appropriate, through the development of a shared implementation framework. Relevant action items under the Global Digital Compact should be integrated into existing WSIS Action Lines to ensure coherence and avoid duplication.

Establish a Multistakeholder Sounding Board, based on similar practices from NetMundial and IGF, that allows a clear pattern of interaction between intergovernmental negotiations and multistakeholder consultations ahead of the High-Level Meeting in December 2025.

Safeguard the Internet Governance Forum’s role by formalizing its mandate as a permanent fixture of the global digital governance ecosystem and ensuring sustainable, long-term funding to support its activities.

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

N/A

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

Gabriel Delsol, United States, Computer & Communications Industry Association, Industry

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

Please enter an email