WSIS+20 Review process and Zero Draft

Recommendations from CGI.br

WSIS+20 Review process and Zero Draft

Recommendations from CGI.br

2025

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

CGI.br - Brazilian Internet Steering Committee,[1] which is responsible for the proposition of strategic guidelines regarding the development and use of the Internet in Brazil, has been very active in global discussion and decision-making forums on issues related to Internet governance and other digital policy processes. In particular, CGI.br has been very active in the IGF and WSIS. For these reasons, CGI.br has been following the WSIS+20 review process with great interest, especially regarding the topics that strengthen the IGF, WSIS, and the multistakeholder governance model that CGI.br itself so well represents. Regardless of the many other important topics in the WSIS Action Lines, this contribution presents CGI.br's position specifically on these three aspects of the WSIS+20 process. This position is very much in line with that of many other entities and governments that are active participants in the international Internet governance community. The contributions in this document also make direct reference to the Zero Draft, published on August 29, 2025.

This document puts together reflections and recommendations from CGI.br to the WSIS+20 Review Zero Draft and the process as a whole. The texts in italic are direct references to the Zero Draft contents. The highlighted excerpts are concrete suggestions of new text proposed by CGI.br to the final document that will be approved by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2025.

---

[1] https://cgi.br/

PART I.
IGF ECOSYSTEM

I.1. MANDATE RENEWAL AND FUNDING

1. We welcome the permanent renewal of the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), as indicated in paragraph 115 of the Zero Draft. However, although there is a call to action by the Secretary-General concerning the proposal of IGF funding in paragraph 118, it is important that the final document includes a more detailed and concrete proposal. In this regard, a stable and long-term funding should be ensured, possibly involving UN budgetary resources and donations from countries, organizations, and companies. A proactive funding search mechanism should be created and maintained within the appropriate IGF management body.

── Suggestion of new language: ──

118.

We call for the strengthening of the Secretariat of the Internet Governance Forum, to enable it to continue its development, implement further improvements and support the work of National and Regional Internet Governance Forums and intersessional activities, and invite the Secretary-General to make proposals concerning future and more substantial, stable and predictable funding for the Forum, so that required improvements are effectively implemented.

I.2. MISSION AND SCOPE

2. We welcome the recognition of the IGF as a *"unique platform for multistakeholder discussion of Internet governance issues, including emerging issues"*; the quest for its recognition as an ecosystem beyond the annual event, which includes all intersessional work; and the recognition of the relevance of National and Regional Initiatives (paragraphs 112, 113, 117, and 118 of the Zero Draft). In the same

vein, it is important to emphasize the permanence of the IGF as a space for multistakeholder dialogue, bringing together all relevant actors in Internet governance and digital policy processes, reinforcing its capacity to produce actionable recommendations on public policy, as provided for in paragraph 72 (item g) of the Tunis Agenda. It is also important to emphasize that the IGF should continue to cover all digital governance issues, including emerging issues (such as Artificial Intelligence and data governance), as well as the positioning of related sectors of society, in accordance with its broad and generic mandate as established in the aforementioned paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, and collaborate in defining the agendas of the various decision-making spaces.

Suggestion of new language:

103.

We reaffirm the working definition of Internet governance in the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society as the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet, and recognize that Internet governance is deeply intertwined with a broad range of digital policy processes and emerging issues, including, inter alia, Artificial Intelligence and data governance.

112.

We applaud the successful development of the Internet Governance Forum, established by the Secretary-General following the World Summit on the Information Society, which provides a unique platform for multistakeholder discussion of Internet governance issues and digital policy processes, including emerging issues, such as Artificial Intelligence and data governance, as reflected in paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society.

I.3. STRENGTHENING

3. We welcome the pursuit of inclusion, in the Internet governance ecosystem as a whole and within the IGF, of actors who are currently absent or underrepresented, especially from developing countries, vulnerable or marginalized communities, and other sectors of society involved in the development and use of the Internet and ICTs, as indicated in paragraphs 4, 5, 26, 105, and 117 of the Zero Draft. A mapping exercise should be carried out to identify the sectors and actors that need to be attracted to the IGF, and concrete strategies should be outlined to operationalize this objective.

4. In this same vein, it is important that the IGF offer concrete incentives that attract more active participation from governments and the private sector, in addition to establishing more effective connections with decision-making spaces, whether intergovernmental or non-governmental. To this end, among other measures, the IGF can and should produce, when appropriate, highly tangible results, such as objective and actionable reports aimed at decision-making spaces and specific audiences. These reports should contain relevant recommendations, as already expressed in the Tunis Agenda (paragraph 72, item g), for the different actors and sectors involved in these other spaces—especially the governmental sector—that can inform, guide, and impact public policies. This measure will also have positive effects in attracting other relevant actors, as discussed in item 3 above.

⌐ Suggestion of new language:

114.

> *We recognise the successful steps that have been taken since the ten-year review of the World Summit to improve the working modalities of the Internet Governance Forum, increase and broaden the participation of governments, the private sector, and other stakeholders, particularly from developing countries and under-represented groups, build stronger relationships with other digital*

discussion fora, and enable more substantive and tangible outcomes that can achieve greater impact, including in decision making spaces that are not usually connected to the IGF but are strongly interested in digital policy processes. In particular, we call for more substantive recommendations, when appropriate, as already proposed in paragraph 72(g) of the Tunis Agenda, that can inform, advise and impact public policies. We call for these measures to be extended and strengthened and request the Forum to report annually on progress towards their implementation to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development.

5. We welcome the recognition of NRIs and intersessional work as fundamental components of the IGF ecosystem, as indicated in paragraphs 113, 117, and 118 of the Zero Draft. Even with this recognition, it is important that stronger and more effective integration between these components and the annual global IGF event are achieved. These multiple components of the IGF ecosystem produce a huge volume of relevant content, which needs to be properly incorporated into the IGF discussions and outcomes.

Suggestion of new language:

117.

We further call upon the Forum to enhance its working modalities, including by reinforcing its intersessional work, supporting national and regional initiatives, strengthening the integration of contributions from these two important components into the outcomes of the IGF, and to apply innovative, open, inclusive, transparent and agile collaboration methods. We emphasize the need to broaden the participation of all relevant stakeholders, with particular attention to underrepresented communities as well as Governments and other stakeholders from developing countries.

I.4. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

6. In order for the IGF to be strengthened in its mission and live up to its central role in discussing the current challenges of digital governance, the IGF needs a review of its institutional design[2], considering its multiple components — Secretariat, MAG, Leadership Panel, host country, intersessional tracks, and NRIs — as well as its relationships with the UN bodies involved in its planning and conduct (in particular DESA, CSTD, and UNGIS).

7. For this redesign, in 2026, a multistakeholder group should be created, with a well-defined mandate and timeframe, which should operate transparently, following the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines[3]. This group shall produce a roadmap with concrete and binding measures for this institutional redesign and for strengthening the IGF across the main dimensions discussed throughout the Zero Draft. Among other measures, this redesign will also outline modalities for the ongoing planning, monitoring, and evaluation of the IGF.

┌─ Suggestion of new paragraph:[4] ─

118. +1

We call upon the Secretary-General to convene a multistakeholder working group in 2026, whose goal will be an assessment of all components of the IGF ecosystem and the production of a roadmap with concrete and binding recommendations for the strengthening of the Forum and of its integration into the WSIS framework and for its continuous evaluation, monitoring, planning and improvement.

---

[2] As discussed in Bertrand de la Chapelle's blogpost: https://circleid.com/posts/a-constitutional-moment-for-the-igf

[3] https://netmundial.br/pdf/NETmundial10-MultistakeholderStatement-2024.pdf

[4] Suggestion of new paragraph to be added after paragraph 118.

PART II.
WSIS

II.1. INTEGRATION BETWEEN WSIS AND GDC

8. We welcome the reference in paragraph 141 of the Zero Draft to UNGIS as "*the United Nations system's inter-agency stewardship mechanism*" for ensuring coherence and coordination on digital issues. However, the current wording of the paragraph and its reading in conjunction with other sections of the Zero Draft, such as paragraph 125, is unclear as to the role of each entity, especially the relationship between UNGIS and ODET. This is because paragraph 125 recognizes the role of ODET as a coordinating body within the United Nations system on the topic of digital cooperation—which could be confused with the role of UNGIS itself. The wording of these two paragraphs could be improved to avoid confusion.

9. We welcome the recognition in paragraph 140 of the Zero Draft of the need to avoid duplication of efforts in implementing the outcomes of WSIS and the GDC as a whole. The monitoring of GDC commitments should be integrated into WSIS, as both have similar objectives, in order to avoid: a) overlapping efforts by the UN system and the global community on similar issues; and b) the costs of monitoring two parallel processes, which is especially problematic for actors in the Global South. In the same vein, there should be an integration between the GDC commitments and the WSIS Action Lines, without creating new spaces for discussion or follow-up outside the WSIS framework. This approach is also in line with the provisions of paragraph 68 of the GDC itself, which indicated an expectation in the WSIS+20 review process to understand how the forums and processes derived from WSIS could support the contribution of different stakeholders to the implementation of the Compact.

10. Therefore, we welcome the recognition in paragraph 142 of the Zero Draft of the development by UNGIS of a matrix that maps the GDC objectives against the existing WSIS structures and mechanisms. We welcome the call in that same paragraph for UNGIS to develop a joint implementation roadmap that allows for this integration and monitoring of the GDC commitments to the WSIS framework. Along these lines, we suggest that, as part of this work, the WSIS Action Line facilitators,

under the coordination of UNGIS, develop specific implementation roadmaps that connect each Action Line to the GDC commitments and also to the SDGs.

Suggestion of new language:

142.

We note with appreciation the matrix prepared by the United Nations Group on the Information Society, which maps the Global Digital Compact objectives to existing World Summit structures, mechanisms and activities, offering a structured approach for effective follow-up and implementation of the Compact - thus implementing the expectations of paragraph 68 of the GDC. We request that the United Nations Group on the Information Society develop a joint implementation road map, to be presented to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development at its twenty-ninth session in 2026, to integrate the Global Digital Compact commitments into the World Summit architecture, ensuring a unified approach to digital cooperation that avoids duplication and maximizes resource efficiency.

129.

We further request Action Line facilitators to develop implementation roadmaps for their Action Lines, considering their integration to the Global Digital Compact and to the Sustainable Development Goals and including potential targets, indicators and metrics to facilitate monitoring and measurement, and to report on the outcomes of this review to the 30th session of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development in 2027.

11. Discussion or monitoring spaces for the GDC that have already been created in contexts outside the WSIS need to work in an integrated manner with the WSIS environment. In particular, discussion spaces on the topics of data governance and Artificial Intelligence, referred to in paragraphs 96 and 102 of the Zero Draft, need to be better coordinated with the IGF.

⌐ Suggestion of new language:

96.

We note the establishment of a working group of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development to engage in a comprehensive and inclusive multistakeholder dialogue on data governance at all levels as relevant for development, including the development of recommendations towards equitable and interoperable data governance arrangements, which may include fundamental principles of data governance arrangements. We call upon this working group to work closely with the Internet Governance Forum, as appropriate.

102.

We welcome the work that is underway to establish a multidisciplinary Independent International Scientific Panel on AI with balanced geographic representation to promote scientific understanding through evidence-based impact, risk and opportunity assessments, drawing on existing national, regional and international initiatives and research networks, and a Global Dialogue on AI Governance involving Governments and all relevant stakeholders which will take place in the margins of existing relevant United Nations conferences and meetings. We call upon the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI and the Global Dialogue on AI Governance to work closely with the Internet Governance Forum, as appropriate.

12. Finally, we understand that the digital agenda, within the UN ecosystem, is already sufficiently covered by the annual events discussed in the scope of this WSIS+20 review process. If there is a need to create new spaces for discussion, it is important that certain aspects be considered so as not to create barriers to stakeholder participation, especially those from developing countries: a) overlapping events should be avoided so that the public does not divide its focus of participation; b) the schedules and agendas of existing events should be coordinated so that they are sufficiently complementary in terms of the topics under discussion and inviting in terms of the logistics of participation by different stakeholders.

II.2. ROLE OF IGF IN WSIS

13. The IGF should participate in the monitoring of the WSIS Action Lines and GDC commitments, from a multistakeholder perspective, in modalities to be defined. Options would include intersessional tracks or tracks at the annual event itself. NRIs should also be encouraged to engage in this monitoring.

14. There is little coordination between the IGF and the WSIS Forum. Therefore, and in accordance with paragraph 116 of the Zero Draft, we welcome the effort to have the Forum share the results of its annual event and intersessional work with different UN bodies engaged in the WSIS process, such as UNGIS, the Action Line facilitators, CSTD, and the WSIS Forum. In the same vein, we welcome the call for these actors to take such results into account in their activities. We understand, however, that this coordination should be a two-way process between the IGF and the WSIS Forum, ensuring complementarity and synergies between the two. Tangible reports should be shared and discussed, e.g., through specific sessions at both events. This coordination should also include monitoring the Action Lines and GDC commitments.

Suggestion of new language:

116.

We call upon the Forum to report on outcomes of its annual meetings and intersessional work to relevant UN entities and processes, and call, in particular, on the UN Group on Information Society and all relevant UN agencies, Action Line Facilitators, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and the WSIS Forum to duly take Internet Governance Forum outcomes into account in their work and proceedings. We call upon the IGF and the WSIS Forum to build stronger cooperation mechanisms, especially with regard to the follow-up of the Action Lines and of the Global Digital Compact commitments.

II.3. REVISION AND STRENGTHENING OF WSIS AND UNGIS

15. The WSIS Action Lines, as defined in the Geneva Plan of Action, are comprehensive and sufficiently neutral in their descriptions, and therefore remain valid even after the emergence of new technologies and phenomena in the digital world. Even though their wording may be updated to better reflect such technologies and phenomena, they do not need to be reformed.

⌐ Suggestion of new language:

127.

We recall that the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society established a framework of eleven Action Lines, together with eight subsidiary Action Lines, concerned with different aspects of digital development. We recognise the value that many governments have attributed to these Action Lines in supporting the formulation of national strategies and approaches to digital development. We further recognise that the Action Lines are comprehensive and technologically neutral, such that they adequately address emerging technologies and phenomena, even if some minor language revision could be considered.

16. The management structure of UNGIS must be considerably strengthened and revised. In this regard, we welcome the provisions contained in paragraphs 141 and 142 of the Zero Draft, which suggest the inclusion of ODET in UNGIS and the establishment of roadmaps that integrate the commitments of the GDC with the WSIS Action Lines. Through management modalities to be defined, ODET should collaborate with CSTD in monitoring these GDC commitments, integrated into the Action Lines.

17. It is essential to create a multistakeholder committee to monitor and supervise the WSIS governance structure and the actions of UN bodies in the process, in particular UNGIS and CSTD[5]. This committee will act as a strategic advisory group, providing guidance on the implementation of mechanisms for integration between WSIS and GDC (such as the roadmaps proposed in paragraph 10 above), monitoring progress, and making recommendations to address emerging challenges. In addition, measures to ensure the transparency and effectiveness of WSIS and UNGIS should be adopted.

⌐ Suggestion of new language: ⌐

120.

We recognise that multistakeholder participation has been crucial to the success of the World Summit's implementation framework, drawing expertise and experience from governments, international organisations, the private sector, civil society, the technical community and academia. We reaffirm the values and principles of multistakeholder cooperation and engagement that were established at the Summit, reaffirmed in General Assembly resolution 70/125, and reinforced in the Global Digital Compact, and request that the multistakeholder approach is adopted also in the supervision of the WSIS framework.

141.

We call for continuation of the work of the United Nations Group on the Information Society (UNGIS) as a platform for multistakeholder dialogue, partnership-building and review of progress on digital development. We request the UN Secretary-General to strengthen the agility, efficiency, effectiveness and transparency of UNGIS as the United Nations system's inter-agency stewardship mechanism for advancing policy coherence and programme coordination on

---

[5] Cf. proposal by the Swiss government, available in: https://publicadministration.desa.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/2025/Inputs%20 to%20Elements%20Paper/20250715%20Swiss%20Language%20proposals%20 for%20zero%20draft%20-%20and%20WSIS%20Plus%20non-paper.pdf (p. 22)

digital matters, including by expanding its membership with further United Nations entities with responsibilities in matters of digital cooperation, such as the Office of Digital and Emerging Technologies and the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), as well as multistakeholder advice to its work as appropriate. We call for the establishment of a multistakeholder committee to advise and monitor WSIS as a whole and the activities of the UN bodies within the WSIS framework, in particular UNGIS and the CSTD.

II.4. WSIS FORUM

18. We welcome the reference to the WSIS Forum and its role in monitoring the Action Lines, particularly in paragraph 126 of the Zero Draft. While we recognize that the WSIS Forum has had multistakeholder participation in its programming, we stress that the multistakeholder approach should also be adopted in the organization of the event, as well as in all other components of the WSIS environment.

┌─ Suggestion of new language: ─────────

126.

We applaud the work undertaken by the International Telecommunication Union in collaboration with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the United Nations Development Programme to establish the annual World Summit on the Information Society Forum, which has become a central platform for multistakeholder dialogue and collaboration in the implementation of the World Summit outcomes, the development of networks and coordination of initiatives on digital development, as well as the annual review of the Summit's Action Lines. We call for the Forum to be continued annually, to create a stronger cooperation with the Internet Governance Forum and to adopt stronger multistakeholder practices in its organization.

PART III.
MULTISTAKEHOLDER MODEL AND SÃO PAULO GUIDELINES

III.1. MULTISTAKEHOLDER MODEL

19. The multistakeholder model should be applied to all debate and decision-making spaces, whether intergovernmental or non-governmental, that address the various issues related to Internet governance and digital policy processes.

III.2. SÃO PAULO MULTISTAKEHOLDER GUIDELINES (SPMGS)

20. The international Internet governance community should maintain the SPMGs as the standard for multistakeholder and multilateral debate and decision-making processes, ensuring their implementation and evolution.

┌─ Suggestion of new language: ─

3.

We reaffirm the value and principles of multi-stakeholder cooperation and engagement that have characterized the World Summit on the Information Society process since its inception, and recognise that effective participation, partnership and cooperation of Governments, the private sector, civil society, international organisations, the technical and academic communities and all other relevant stakeholders, with balanced representation of all countries has been and continues to be vital in developing the Information Society, including the implementation of Summit outcomes. We further recognise the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines, as defined in the NETmundial+10 outcome document, as an appropriate standard for the improvement of multistakeholder and multilateral governance processes.

21. The IGF should act as custodian and caretaker of the SPMGs, as recommended in the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Declaration. The international community, through a mechanism to be defined within the IGF, should develop a methodology for applying the SPMGs to new governance processes and also for evaluating and monitoring existing processes in light of the SPMGs. This methodology will include a set of appropriate qualitative and quantitative indicators.

Suggestion of new paragraph:[6]

118. **+2**

We call upon the IGF to act as a caretaker of the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines, as suggested in the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Statement. We further call upon the community, by mechanisms to be defined in the context of the IGF, to develop a methodology, with appropriate indicators, for the application of these guidelines, both in the evaluation of existing governance processes as well as in the creation of new processes.

---

[6] Suggestion of new paragraph to be added after paragraph 118.

cgi.br