

Input to Rev. 1 of the WSIS+20 Outcome Document

From A Technical Community Coalition for Multistakeholderism (TCCM) - www.tccm.global

TCCM is made up of members of the Internet's technical community: the companies, organizations and groups that operate the critical infrastructure and services at the heart of the Internet. Our members come from all regions of the world to ensure a global technical community perspective.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on Revision 1 of the WSIS+20 outcome document. We commend the Co-facilitators on their proactive engagement with the broader multistakeholder community so far, and encourage them to continue this engagement going forward in this process.

TCCM considers that Revision 1 is a practical and constructive document that balances a range of different interests, and that the drafting process is on a promising trajectory.

We strongly support the document's reaffirmation of multistakeholder cooperation and engagement and we welcome Revision 1's recognition of the technical community as a distinct stakeholder group. We commend the inclusion of the reference to the NETmundial+10 guidelines for multistakeholder collaboration and consensus-building.

We wish to highlight a number of specific points, as follows:

1. We strongly support the language in Revision 1 that would make the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) permanent
 - We further strongly support the call to strengthen the IGF Secretariat, and the invitation to begin work on future funding for the IGF.
 - We consider that any future funding must be stable and diverse if it is to support the permanent IGF.
 - To support stable and diverse funding, we call on paragraph 101 of Revision 1 to specify that the Secretary-General should undertake the future funding work in meaningful consultation with all stakeholders, including existing funders.

2. We strongly support the provisions in Revision 1 that commit to better cooperation and coordination in the Internet governance ecosystem.
 - We consider that the IGF is the ideal focal point for that cooperation and coordination, as the primary multistakeholder platform for discussion of Internet governance issues.
 - To further support the IGF's inclusivity and relevance, intentional connections should be created between the IGF and the rest of the Internet governance ecosystem, including with the NRIs, with other Internet governance institutions such as ICANN and the IETF, and within the UN system among the bodies dealing with digital issues.
 - We call for Revision 1 to:
 - commit to ongoing improvement in coordination among all stakeholders,
 - reaffirm the importance of the IGF as the primary multistakeholder platform for discussion of Internet governance issues,
 - recognize and build on the IGF's role in setting the agenda and fostering coherence across the Internet governance ecosystem, and
 - require the IGF to improve its connections within the Internet governance ecosystem with respect to its annual outcomes, so as to enhance this role.
3. We strongly support recognition in Revision 1 that fragmentation would undermine the Internet as a critical global facility for inclusive and equitable digital transformation.
 - We note that the Zero Draft contained language rejecting models of state-controlled or fragmented Internet architectures.
 - We considered this language in the Zero Draft to be clear and useful in identifying the cause of Internet fragmentation, and would support its reinstatement in the text.
 - We call for continued commitment in Revision 1 to recognizing that the Internet must remain open, global and interoperable if it is to remain the global facility that benefits us all, and ask that this not be diluted further.

4. We support Revision 1's commitment to maintaining and improving coordination of the activities of international and intergovernmental organisations and all other stakeholders concerned with Internet governance.
 - We believe that ongoing cooperation between all stakeholders remains the best way to engage support for the Internet and digital technologies which are critical to building inclusive, resilient societies.

Thank you for this opportunity.

The undersigned organisations associate themselves with the above written inputs to Revision 1 of the WSIS+20 outcome document:

1. Asia Pacific Network Information Centre (APNIC)
2. Associação DNS.PT (.pt)
3. .au Domain Administration Limited (auDA)
4. Brazilian Network Information Center (NIC.br)
5. Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA)
6. Council of European National Top-Level Domain Registries (CENTR)
7. CZ Domain Registry (CZ.NIC)
8. DENIC eG
9. DotAsia Organisation
10. Internet New Zealand Incorporated (InternetNZ)
11. Internetstiftelsen (the Swedish Internet Foundation, .se)
12. Japan Network Information Center (JPNIC)
13. Japan Registry Services Co., Ltd. (JPRS)
14. Kenya Network Information Centre (KeNIC)
15. Latin American and Caribbean Top-Level Domains (LACTLD)
16. Network Information Center Costa Rica (NIC Costa Rica)
17. Network Information Center México (NIC México)
18. Network Information Center Panamá (NIC-Panamá)
19. NIC Chile
20. Nominet UK
21. Norid
22. Public Interest Registry (PIR)
23. SVNet: El Salvador's ccTLD (.sv)
24. Taiwan Network Information Center (TWNIC)
25. Tucows Domains, Inc.