

## COMMENTS ON PART A

**Vint Cerf**

[google.com](http://google.com)

[vgcerf@gmail.com](mailto:vgcerf@gmail.com)

104.132.0.74

2016/10/25 at 3:27 pm

I would think that all stakeholders have a responsibility, not just countries?

**Mike Jensen:**

[apc.org](http://apc.org)

[mike@apc.org](mailto:mike@apc.org)

85.245.164.84

2016/11/14 at 5:11 pm

One aspect that is missing from this list of priorities is the role of local communities in building their own access networks and related infrastructure. The need for awareness raising and information sharing on this important strategy has prompted the formation of the IGF Dynamic Coalition on Community Connectivity (the DC3), of which APC is a member. With support from FGV, ISOC, and the APC, the DC3 is holding a series of workshops before, during and after the IGF to discuss strategies going forward and to publish a declaration on Community Connectivity. A short statement of the vision for the DC3 is as follows:

Community networks (CN) are structured to be open and neutral. Such networks rely on the active participation of local communities in the design, development, deployment and management of the shared infrastructure as a common resource, owned by the community and operated in a democratic fashion. CNs can be operationalised, wholly or partly, through local stakeholders, NGOs, private sector entities and/or public administrations and are characterised by collective ownership; social management; open design and open participation; free peering and transit with networks offering reciprocity; as well as the promotion of free software and open standards and technologies.

The fact that almost 60% of the world's population lives in rural areas or urban slums suggests that new approaches – alternative to the mainstream commercial model – must be adopted if the Internet is to reach everyone. Over the past decade, a variety of successful examples of CNs have emerged on all continents, exploiting many technical and governance configurations, as documented by the Report of the Dynamic Coalition on Community Connectivity. Such examples

have demonstrated that CNs may be a viable option to connect the unconnected while truly empowering local communities and building local technical capacity. Notably, the establishment of CNs has proven that local stakeholders, including public administrations, entrepreneurs and NGOs, may become protagonists of the development of Internet connectivity, building infrastructure from the first square mile and proposing innovative sustainability models. Furthermore, CNs foster the development of new services, applications and local content as well as job creation – as in the Guifi.net and DEF India cases -. Therefore, CNs should be considered as a credible option for connecting the unconnected. Public policies should be crafted in order to facilitate rather than hinder the establishment of CN, as suggested by the Declaration on Community Connectivity. CNs are an example of connectivity for local communities by local communities through the community and relevant stakeholders. For further details, see: [http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot\\_download/3737/174](http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3737/174)

## COMMENTS ON PART B

**Susan Hyon Parker**  
[internetinitiative.ieee.org](http://internetinitiative.ieee.org)  
[shp@ieee.org](mailto:shp@ieee.org)  
74.66.81.5  
2016/11/18 at 11:05 pm

The cited references for national & regional methodology are missing from this section and should be included by country/region/metro area to identify differences in urban/rural areas.

## COMMENTS ON PART E

**Charles Dan**  
[goo.gl/EkApCr](http://goo.gl/EkApCr)  
[charlesdan558@gmail.com](mailto:charlesdan558@gmail.com)  
85.9.20.151  
2016/11/17 at 12:51 pm

This is very good content you shared. Thank you so much that for you shared those things with us. I am wishing you to carry on with your achievement. All the best.. Thanks for sharing.