

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

N/A

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? \*

N/A

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? \*

- To effectively address today's global challenges, a multistakeholder approach must be prioritized. Governments alone cannot navigate the complexities of digital transformation, climate resilience, or technological governance. We must actively engage industry, academia, civil society, and users to ensure inclusive, sustainable, and trusted solutions.
- This model goes beyond traditional multilateralism by embracing diverse expertise, innovation, and lived experience. While intergovernmental cooperation remains essential, it must be complemented by the perspectives and expertise of those who are directly shaping and experiencing the impacts of global change. Solutions must be grounded in real-world contexts, informed by diverse knowledge systems, and built with the trust of those they aim to serve.
- In this regard, collaboration within the UN system is vital. Specialized agencies bring unique mandates and expertise, and their joint efforts can drive meaningful progress. However, such collaboration must be conducted through open and inclusive processes, and managed with efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency. Only then can we ensure that global governance remains responsive, accountable, and relevant.
- Therefore, as WSIS, we should call on the UN and its bodies to institutionalize multistakeholder engagement in future digital initiatives. This approach will strengthen legitimacy, foster innovation, and build resilience in the face of rapid technological change.

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? \*

- Japan proposes replacing the expression “people-centred”, which appears in Paragraph 2 and 10 of the Elements Paper, with “human-centric”. We consider the term “people-centred” to be inappropriate for use in the Elements Paper or any outcome document issued under the WSIS 20 framework, since it reflects the narrative of a specific country.
- The language in Paragraph 48 contradicts previous resolutions and gives an impression of shifting away from democratic ethics. It also contradicts the statement in Paragraph 45 of WSIS+10 results (UN Resolution A/RES/70/125), “We reaffirm our commitment to article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in which it is stated that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression”.
- Regarding Paragraph 59, the word ‘multilateral’ should be replaced with ‘multi-stakeholders’ as stated in Paragraph 27 of the GDC. With regard to AI governance, first of all, we understand all relevant issues were already addressed in the GDC and that there is no need to handle it in the WSIS+20 Review. Accordingly, the proposals in the zero-draft should not duplicate any elements of the GDC implementation. Secondly, in Paragraph 74, the phrase ‘human-centric approach’ should be used as a fundamental principle, instead of ‘public interest’, as stated in Paragraph 8 (i) of the GDC.
- With regard to AI governance, first of all, we understand all relevant issues were already addressed in the GDC and that there is no need to handle it in the WSIS+20 Review. As alluded to in paragraph 76, since the GDC follow-up process is an ongoing, UN-wide initiative covering topics suggested in this Elements Paper, the WSIS-20 review process should avoid duplication with the GDC process and focus on how to complement the GDC process in order to avoid confusion for Member States and other stakeholders.
- Regarding Paragraph 73, Japan does not support the narrative depicted in this paragraph, which describes that “there is currently a global governance deficit with regard to AI, with a fragmented patchwork of national and multilateral action” and on that basis states that “the United Nations, as the most inclusive multilateral platform, has an essential role in shaping, enabling, and supporting the governance of AI”. In light of the rapid evolution of AI technologies, various national and multilateral actions are being taken in an agile manner, and such actions and initiatives should not be discounted as “a fragmented patchwork”. Existing frameworks such as the OECD AI Principles, the G20 AI Principles, the CoE Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, and the Code of Conduct in Hiroshima AI Process are already providing a certain function of international AI governance. The work at the UN should support greater cohesiveness and interoperability between different national and multilateral actions and not discount them. Negative messaging about existing works should be avoided. The UN should also focus on ensuring inclusivity of multi-stakeholder perspectives in global AI governance. While the modality of the Global Dialogue on AI Governance is still under discussion, the multi-stakeholder approach should be applied.

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

N/A

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

Ayako Shiina, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan to the UN

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

Please enter an email