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>> DONGMAN LEE: Good afternoon. Did I wake you? It is really awful this microphone. So ‑‑ because the screen is being placed low. So speakers are actually blocking the view of the audience. So just every time this comes up and give presentation one by one and everything is done and then all the speakers come up to the podium and then we can start the discussion and Q and A session, how about that? So as you said, Keith Davidson will be the first one. I am not sure whether he is here. He is not here yet. So we can change the ‑‑ we can change the sequence. We can change the sequence. So let's change the ‑‑ we are going to have the speakers come up here one by one and every speaker will come up to the podium later because you are blocking the view of the slide.

>> Oh.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Well, no, unless you use your forehead as part of the screen. I had that experience ten minutes ago because I showed some of the information on my forehead and everyone is looking at me. Actually glaring information is hard to read.
 (Laughter).

>> DONGMAN LEE: So let me change because Keith is not here yet. So maybe put him in the last. All right. Yeah. Before we start let me ask the one question about how to efficiently use two sessions launch that we are allowed to use. As a matter of fact each session holds one hour and 30 minutes, 90 minutes. And we are supposed to have the break and then we have another session. But the ‑‑ for the continuation of the discussion we can ‑‑ we may, you know, I would like to actually give enough time to each speaker, at least more than 15 minutes. So some ‑‑ we have the five people. So 75 minutes. So that's one. Usually last two days every speaker usually goes over 15 minutes. So if I calculate correctly we will take probably 100 minutes. I can't actually stop every 15 minutes. So if you plan to go to another session after like 4 during the break and move to another session then we can just kind of skip or we can continue until all the presentations is done and stop ‑‑ we are going to have the break because this is some separate from other three sessions. So would you please raise your hand. We will keep the original schedule as it is? Yes.

All right. We are very democratic. Let's start. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dongman Lee. I am not the head. Just the servant of the session. I am trying to encourage the audience to participate more and the speakers to give as much information as possible and pick up the right points. So originally we planned to have nine speakers but because of some reasons at last minute, so we turned out we are going to have the five speakers. But still combination wise pretty good. And the first part is we are going to have multi‑stakeholders from ccTLD point of view. We have three excellent speakers. All of them have been working on this domain over as I remember more than 15 years. So I can say even 20 or 30 years. So there are ‑‑ while you can consider them as real expert on these issues, in technical ‑‑ not on technical but policy wise. And the second part we are going to have the multi‑stakeholder model and laws and rules and regulations. More a little bit of the Government regulation and registration, the aspect. So we ‑‑ we are going to have some of the multi‑stakeholder model construction in various menus at the same time, how the Government or Government registration actually tackle or try to build the Internet Governance throughout the years in the region.
 And ‑‑ okay. And also if you can see the bottom, can you see the bottom? Let me just maybe change on the fly. So I think this is very dynamic, don't you think? This session will be very dynamic. And you can actually raise your questions and suggestions throughout this session if you know how to use Twitter. So we are going to keep all your suggestions and questions and then summarize the ‑‑ when we have the discussion session. Okay? So please I strongly encourage to send your suggestions and questions through online. Let me start. Let me first invite the first speaker Mr. Hiro Hotta who is the President of JPRS. So he is going to talk about governance of .jp and ccTLD registry. Please welcome him with a big applause
 (Applause.)

>> HIRO HOTTA: Thank you. Good afternoon. After lunch we seem that we have lost a lot of people here. So let me explain briefly about the governance model, governance framework to JP registry here. I am sorry, my name is Hiro Hotta. I am not the President. I am a director for the corporate planning.
 Today I will talk about the brief history of the JP management. And then speak about the framework of the JP management. So JPRS is not the only one who controls or who has influence to the policy of the .jp. And how JPL is overseen by the Japanese Committee is also briefed here and JP activities is .jp registry. This is the brief history of the JP management. In 1986, 27 years ago a .jp was delegated to a single person, who is Professor Jim Raye who is very much likely Kim Jung Chung in Korea. In 1993, it was incorporated as a session and was named as the JP management. This is because the ‑‑ for the first several years Jim Raye do the management of .jp by himself but as the number of domain names are growing. So ‑‑ so we need to have some formal organization to manage that. So JPNIC was established. In 2007 JPNIC decided to spin off a new company which is JPRS which is my company for the JP management. The background of this change is ‑‑ at this moment it was called the era of Dotcom boom. And in Japan the Dotcom number and the number of JP is around 10 versus 1.
 It means that a Dotcom almost dominated the Japanese market as a TLD. So JPNIC thought that it was mainly or somewhat related to the fact that the JPNIC is on semi private, semi public organization which cannot use money efficiently as business organization.
 And in 2002, January Japan's Government endorsed JPRS as the manager of .jp and JPRS and JP signed agreement of transfer of the .jp management from JPNIC to JPRS. In February ICANN and JPNIC signed agreement for transfer ‑‑ I am sorry, yes, JPRS and JPNIC signed agreement for transfer of JP. And in April transfer of management went to JPRS was completed. This was called re‑delegation in a formal sense.
 And Internet resource management in Japan, in Korea, in China, in Taiwan the IP address management and domain name management are done by a same organization. But in Japan these are done by different organizations. So JPRS managed the JP domain names. This means that it develops name registration policy, also policy in registry systems and manages registry database. And JPNIC has some job related to the .jp. It oversees management of the .jp conducted by us. It is done by consulting with the government, the Japanese government and it is find ‑‑ it will find new registry in case re‑delegation from us decide to be necessary. For example, if we ‑‑ in bankruptcy and we cannot continue the registry work, JPNIC will find a new registry. And JPNIC has JP‑DRP task. It maintains JP‑DRP which is a somewhat related, somewhat derived from UDRP. JPNIC maintains that.
 And, of course, in our case IP addresses, IPv4 and IPv6. And this is the mainframe of .jp management. So it is very complicated but I want to say that the JPRS at the bottom of right‑hand side it has communication through annual report website. Manager's meetings, customer support, ICANN meeting and so on.
 And JPRS has advisory committee, I will explain this later within that. And we have a contract with JPNIC. This is about the .jp transfer and how it is overseen. And JPNIC in the middle consults with the Government about the performance of JPRS. They consult each other to decide whether JPRS does a good job or not. Of course, the Government communicates with the local community and JPNIC has ‑‑ JPNIC is a membership organization who the members are from the local community including the IP registry ‑‑ IP address providers.
 And JPRS has contract with ICANN and, of course, we participate and input. And, of course, the ‑‑ our Government communicate with ICANN mainly through the GAC. So running .jp, one scheme is the advisory Committee on JP domain names serves policy.
 This advisory committee was established in 2002 and members, representatives from the current six sectors JPNIC, JP domain and names, ISP and academic companies and individual Internet users, mainly consumers and advisory committee discusses about the policy of JP name and services from various points of view. And Committee meeting and advisory report is open to the public. It can be heard. It can be seen. After getting reports from the advisory committee we inform JPNIC of our action, of the response to the advisory report.
 And then JPNIC reports it further to the Government. So this is one of the mechanisms how we define our service through consultation with the local Internet community and how it performs, is checked by JPNIC. Of course, we check on our organization as on registry, mainly the financial status. So JPRS reports our financial report to JPNIC at least once a year and then JPNIC checks it and reports it further. I extracted this from this year. This is a contractual framework of the .jp management.
 So I already explain this. But contract between JPRS and JPNIC, our contract says that JPRS has responsibilities such as we manage .jp. So that contributes to the community. And we establish JP domain name advisory committee to maintain the public nature of the management and JPRS adopts JP‑DRP and JP perform escrow of the data. Escrow agent approved by JPNIC and the Government just in case when we go in to background.
 So when JPNIC, re‑delegation from us it is needed, JPRS transfers the data to the new registry using the escrow. And re‑delegation from JPRS to some other ‑‑ some new registry will happen in either of the following cases. One, first one is a JPNIC and Government consult with each other and decide that we don't carry out our responsibility and didn't conduct corrected actions within a certain period or we are in bankruptcy and other one. So as you see on this here we don't have the direct contract with the Government. So no direct formal relationship but we have close dialogue and indirect relationship means that the Government is consulted about JPNIC concerning our management. And it is said that it is based on bottom‑up. Consensus among Committee members is expected. For example, the advisory committee.
 And balance between private sector, self‑government and regulation is somewhat achieved here. No governing law for .jp. Stakeholders of .jp community as a whole. So the Government is one of the Committee members and we communicate with Committee members through various channels such as advisory meeting, Working Groups for special topics and Forum and call center and so on.
 And this is a figure illustrating our activities of .jp registry. Of course, the main one is the middle one, JP domain name management. The basic function is the secure and stable management. The registry system and, of course, we have an organization. So we have ‑‑ and on top of that we do various contributions to the community. So, for example, the participation in policy design of international coordination of Internet resources such as, then most variable thing so far is an IDN development standard and security and stability activities for the whole community. So we do contribution to our communities.

Okay. And I think this is the last one. No. Other one. I am sorry. Our activities are expressed by JPNIC from the contractor view regarding the JP. So what we received from JPNIC is the middle part, JP domain name management. So JPNIC checks whether this portion is executed in a healthy way or not. So mainly the A, B and C are checked. The JPRS manage to .jp without hurting its public nature. And B is JPRS not in bankruptcy and C, does JPRS make contribution that is hard to be made by young entity.
 For example, participating in the ICANN meetings as ccTLD registry it can be done by JPRS. So what was discussed in ICANN concerning the ccTLD should be reported by us to the Committee for it is done by us.
 So this is the last one. So examples of JPRS activities, the top one is the main job of us. And second one from the bottom, the contributions promote secure Internet not only as a ccTLD registry but as a whole. And standardization and education of community about the JPRS technology and participation in Internet government discussion as I am here and discussion of ccTLD and IDN promotion. Participation against cyber attacks in Japan with cooperation with the Government and other organizations and research about the main names and report with the local Government. I think this is it. Yes. Thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Okay. I better get away from speakers. Thank you. And you can come down and please hold your questions about Hiro's presentation. And let me quickly adjust the presentation sequence and next speaker will be Keith Davidson who is the Internet director of .nz and is going to talk about how Internet Governance has been built throughout the years in New Zealand. Please welcome Keith.
 (Applause.)

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. Can you ‑‑ can everyone hear me okay? Excellent. Okay. InternetNZ is the name of the organization that contracts me at the moment. My name is Keith Davidson, and I have previously been a Chairman of the governing council of InternetNZ and a treasurer for four years ago the CEO. And now gradually working towards retirement. I have quite a bit of history with our organization. To go back to the very beginning of the ccTLD operation, .nz was originally delegated to a university in New Zealand in 1988 and then the next step was the formation of a group of individuals who came together in 1995 and aligned themselves to ISOC principles and formed an incorporated society called the Internet Society of New Zealand. Its ambition was to affiliate with ISOC but the university that had seen the creation of ‑‑ sorry, the university that had started the operation of the ccTLD then saw this new group and was getting exceptionally busy because it was handling two or three registrations of new domain names per week. And it was too busy for them and decided that needed to re‑delegate. And this new group was the group to re‑delegate.

In 1995 a re‑delegation was attended to and it sits on ISOC NZ on a path of difficulty as it got to the .nz and its business. It subsequently separated its identity from ISOC and renamed itself in to NZ around the year 2000, but still remains a lot of objectives that align to ISOC principles. We have been able to use the money that we earn from the .nz operation to fund the broader activities of our work. We are a not‑for‑profit charitable society which allows us tax free status. And we do publicly state that of the domain name fees that we take we consume about six New Zealand dollars of each domain name in UN border activities that are not strictly related to the operation of .nz. We have formed on a different basis to .jp, more a public good society that then received the Delegation of .nz. We have a vision and mandate to keep the Internet open and uncapturible and to promote and protect the Internet for New Zealand.
 We ‑‑ we are very much a principles based organization. We have developed a set of principles for the operation of the ccTLD and for the way we develop policy. So those principles are on our website. And we consistently refer to them. If we are ever making submissions or trying to decide a position on a certain topic we refer to those principles. Make sure that what we are doing is consistent with those principles, and generally those principles are very much about the concepts of bottom‑up, open and transparent, level playing field, Consensus based and so on. So all the key threads of multi‑stakeholder are there in what we do. For example, the .nz registry operates first come first served. There are no reserved names. Any name that is there you can acquire. If you have a or if you ‑‑ if there is a dispute over that domain name we have our own dispute resolution process with New Zealand, and rather than the WIPO model that exists for Dotcom where an argument exists who has a greater right to a domain name we see if you have a legitimate right. And if you have the name you should be able to keep the name in spite of someone else having a greater right to the name. So quite interesting level playing field concepts that we continue through the .nz operation. As a structure we have a very low barrier to entry. It costs about 15 U.S. dollars a year to belong to our society. Members can be based anywhere in the world. I think we are ‑‑ the fourth biggest city membership is Washington D.C. strangely which is not very close to New Zealand in case you didn't know. And ‑‑ so people have the ability to join and when they join they have a vote. So they vote for the governing council and then can participate on membership and various policy mailing lists where we conduct a lot of our policy development processes.
 There are policy development policies for both .nz and the broader arena policy, developed bottom‑up and transparent and we tend to invite all stakeholders in to the room for discussions on specific topics. We have found it very productive to ensure that you have the range of opinion in the room rather than trying to develop policy in isolation or with a specific interest group. So we are dedicated to this concept of, you know, dialogue regardless of the party's positions.
 So given our background it is also important to note that we have no formal relationship with the New Zealand government, either with the ccTLD operation or organizationally in terms of our broader public policy perspectives. We ‑‑ that's not been deliberate or otherwise. Our Government believes that private sector driven is appropriate and do not generally interfere with the policies and processes. But certainly we regard them as a strong and important stakeholder and carefully listen and evaluate what they have to say in terms of their submissions to any policies that we want to pursue.
 So it is incidental that our current Chairman is employed by Government and has been New Zealand's Government representative on GAC and so on, but has been elected to the Chairman of our board on the basis of Internet and NZ principles. It is an interesting relationship in that regard. That's not to say that we don't occasionally get off side with our Government. Sometimes some people in Government get quite dictoral and insist that we should hear certain policies on certain things and act in certain ways, but while we respect their right for input we don't necessarily automatically follow what they suggest.
 In terms of what we have done over the years InternetNZ has been broadly a believer in self‑regulation that people like the ISPs who have been members of ours for many years should form their own association, create their own self‑regulatory structures, that soft laws is preferable to hard law using legislation as a last resort rather than a first resort. So, you know, we have generally been able to work well with our Government in a complimentary fashion. One surprise was in the early 2000s where we went to Government and insisted that we needed a law on Spam and combatting Spam and the Government sort of after all the years of us advocating for self‑regulation our Government found it quite hard to believe that we would be advocating for legislation, but I think there was one instance where there was no question that we needed law plus technology methods like education to combat the problem that has been presented.

Going forward over the last three years InternetNZ has been the sponsor and organizer of what we call NetHui. This is our equivalent of a New Zealand IGF and we undertake our IGF on a slightly different basis. Largely we have very brief introductions from Moderators and panelists and very in‑depth dialogue with the audience. So we invite real dialogue. And that's a really interesting exercise. We now have a number of politicians who come along to our IGT for the entire three days. They are not content to make the presentation and go. They don't want to miss on any aspect of the dialogue. So they sit in the room for as long as they can every day. And we find that quite inspiring that they are contributing and participating in the dialogue openly. I think that causes some of their officials quite a bit of a problem because the officials like to have them ‑‑ have the words put in front of the politicians. So we quite enjoy putting the politicians on the spot with our able to speak their mind rather than to Government messages. So as a multi‑stakeholder dialogue that's very, very efficient. We get all sorts of people along. We had high court judges as Moderators of panels on things like Intellectual Property Rights and so on. And we find that Forum very useful as a foundation stone for working out. Our efforts should be best spent in the coming year on what the focus of the community is.
 And then I think also as a result of the expertise that we have built firstly we are quite participative internationally as well. We have had Chairman positions coming from InternetNZ and ICANN and APTLD and Government positions in places like ISOC. So we also have contractors and staff members who have participated in the IETF and APNIC and establishing policies that are regional or global. And we are a big believer in the ICANN model. We are a big committed believer in the multi‑stakeholder model. And we want ICANN and ISOC to be the exemplar global examples of multi‑stakeholder.
 Quite often due to the expertise that's contained on our staff we end up being added to the New Zealand Government Delegations to such events as the ITU Plenipotentiary and IETF. Our Government quite appreciates our advice and again it is part of the value of the multi‑stakeholder model that we can work with our Government in a nonlobbying sense, but just a pragmatic advice giving sense in those sorts of Forums. And I think as a result New Zealand's voice compared to its size is quite often taken a lot more seriously because we are generally looking for pragmatic solutions, rather than additional columns.
 And so I think that in a very brief nutshell is our organization and our organization's commitment to multi‑stakeholderism. It is alive and well. And if anyone would like to have a look at things like our Internet Governance Forum please see me afterwards and I will give you the links. But it is a very interesting Forum. Very different to what you have seen at global or regional IGFs and a different way of conducting multi‑stakeholder dialogue. And I think you would find it quite refreshing and a quite enterprising way to look at the topic. Thank you.
 (Applause.)

>> DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you Keith. Our next speaker is Young‑eum Lee. She has been participating in local Internet Governance and she is currently the Chair of the Internet address infrastructure because Government asked us to change the name so many times. So I cannot exactly remember ‑‑ we are used to the Internet, the address and name policy Committee. And anyway she is a Chair of that. And she is member of the Korean Internet Government alliance. So she is going to talk about the ‑‑ how Internet Governance has been built last almost the 15 years in Korea. And the ‑‑ afterwards Mr. Boknam Yun, he is going to talk about the Internet Governance situation in Korea, has been the managed in terms of the Government involvement and also registration. So if you just kind of try to remember what Professor Lee is going to talk about and also just directly apply to next presentation. Please welcome Professor Lee.

>> YOUNG‑EUM LEE: Thank you very much. I would first like to kind of explain to you what this session is all about. We were basically interested in how the multi‑stakeholder model should be implemented in various situations. Because this term multi‑stakeholderism has been the focus of topic in many other meetings and other fora. But there seemed to be somewhat of a difference in how people considered what multi‑stakeholderism was.
 And so this session was designed to try to examine how this concept is applied in various situations. And we just heard from Japan and New Zealand which seems to have the least amount of sort of control from the Government. And it seems to be very ‑‑ as Keith said New Zealand seems to be a very strong believer of multi‑stakeholderism. Japan also in trying to come up with I guess a more efficient system the JPRS was instituted and it seems to be doing well. In terms of Korea however, we have gone through a lot of changes. So well ‑‑ so first of all, in order to discuss what multi‑stakeholderism is we need to first have at least a general idea of what we mean by Internet Governance or where this multi‑stakeholderism is applied. What is this being applied to? And then I will go through the changes in history and give you one example of recent Internet Governance activities and then further thoughts on Governmental legislation and participation which will be I think continued by Mr. Yun.
 Okay. So when we talk about Internet Governance, let's first discuss what we mean by Internet Governance in terms of who governs and what is governed. This is the definition that is being most repeated when we talk about Internet Governance because this was the definition that was agreed on by the heads of state during WSIS 2005. So if you look at the various components here it says that Internet Governance is the development and application by and then comes the who, Governments, private sector and Civil Society in their respective roles, that's another controversial phrase. And then what, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision making procedures and programs.

So what, a lot goes in to what. So let's first go with who. The concept that I guess defines Governments, not Government is a concept of sharing. Sharing power. Yesterday it was said that he would like to rename multi‑stakeholder as multi equal stakeholderism. It is not just a shared. Shared, sharing of power, sharing of decision making, rights sharing of development of technology or technological standards but it is not determined or it is not strongly led by one party. It is a shared responsibility. In terms of who, let's go back to the definition on Internet Governance and identify Civil Society, private sector, and Governments. As for what, it is a little more complicated. There was a lot more there. But if you kind of organize this according to different characteristics of the what, one way of organizing the what is organizing it in terms of infrastructure, logical layer and content layer. And in terms of the infrastructure layer you ‑‑ the topics that are ‑‑ that fall under the infrastructure layer would be interconnection, universal access, pathway. So it is the physical actual method, actual lines, actual connection of the lines and the standards. As for the logical layer it is mostly the Domain Name System and IP allocation and numbering. And some ‑‑ and standards related to that. And when you go up to the content layer, when we talk about Internet Governance the content layer is what people usually think about. Intellectual Property rights, cybercrime, pollution control. But in order to be able to control the content layer what you have to have, what you need is the right or the means to do something about the cybercrime or the Intellectual Property rights and the most or the strongest power you can exert in terms of doing something about it is to cut it off. Cut it off. And that's why although the Domain Name System and IP addresses don't seem to be much, that is why this is so important. And when we talk about Internet Governance so far with regard to ICANN we usually go up ‑‑ only up until the logical layer and then we have started to go up in to some areas to the content layer. Okay.
 So now we know what Internet Governance is. And in my discussion regarding Internet Governance in Korea I am going to discuss mostly on the Internet Governance activities on the first two layers, not the content layer. The infrastructure layer, mostly the logical layer. When Internet was first introduced in to Korea, 1986. That's the same time JP was started I guess. It was operated by an academic institution. And when the Internet started to become bigger in the mid 1990s, 1994, 1995 that's when ordinary people could connect to the Internet. Internet started to get bigger and so the service that ‑‑ I mean the server that provided Internet service was moved from KAIST Institute to the national computer agency. So to a governmental agency. But that was not their main thing. It was just that they had the means and the resources. And then with the beginning of ICANN, with the establishment of ICANN and a more relatively formal sort of structure, Korea also went along with that because Internet in Korea was also growing. And so an independent organization was established. That organization was called the KRNIC. And up to that time the governance of the Internet was relatively similar to what was going on at ICANN.
 But alas in 2004 and we will hear about that from Mr. Yun in a minute there was this legislation which stated that Internet address resources belonged ‑‑ the rights to those addresses belonged to the Government. It was law. So all of a sudden KR which had been managed in a relatively sort of Consensus based bottom‑up or try to be, all of a sudden the Government took over. Okay, this is ours. And with the legislation KRNIC, the name of KRNIC changed to NIDA. Then with the new Government, the previous Government, the NB Government, in 2009 there was a reorganization of various bodies that was under the control of the Government. And although NIDA was able to kind of maintain the operation that or the operational procedures, relatively maintain the operational procedures of the previous KRNIC which means that the organization itself was not changed. I mean was not drastically changed. It remained relatively very similar to KRNIC. But in 2009 there was a reorganization and NIDA was combined with the National Internet Security Agency. And that's the name that's what KISA stands for, Korea Internet Security Agency, right? Okay. So in English it retained security because that organization was actually much bigger than NIDA. And another smaller organization was also combined. So KISA actually is a combination of three different organizations. The Korean name of KISA maintained the Korean name of NIDA. So it was kind of I guess a deal was made. English name retains the security aspect. The Korean name retains the more general aspect.
 And that's what we have today. And so as you can see if you look at the drastic change from 2 ‑‑ in 2004 you can imagine that Korea actually went through great changes throughout history. Okay. So what I tried to do was kind of make the size of each party to coordinate with the actual sort of power or responsibility that that sector had during those times.
 Initially when it was managed and operated by KAIST, 1986 KR was assigned and KAIST operates DNS. 1988 the Academic Network Committee of which I think Professor Tomani was a part of, was formed and this group was the Consensus based advisory committee that tried to assist the operation of .kr. In 1993 KRNIC was established, not 1999 but this was established because of the growing usage of the Internet. The private sector ‑‑ actually there was almost no private sector or domain name business until then. The Government was aware of it but the Government wasn't ‑‑ I mean Internet wasn't big. They did not pay too much attention, but members of Government were a part of the advisory committees or they participated in those meetings. 1994 to 1999 the National Computer Agency operates .kr and the Academic Network Committee becomes Korea Network Committee.
 And in 1998 the RFC‑KR documentation begins. Very similar to the IETF RFP system ‑‑ no RFC. Sorry. RFC‑KR documentation very similar to the RFC in IETF. Private sector not too much ‑‑ I mean the business wasn't too big, and because the National Computer Agency was a national or a Governmental body or a part of the Government, Government sector and then from 1999 to 2004 this was when the advisory committees, the previous advisory committees were divided in to names and numbers committee and Name Comm and there was a TechComm. And the NNC was responsible for a final decision on policy. Specific details were discussed in Name Comm and TechComm. And so this was the sort of Consensus based I guess multi‑stakeholder because we had people from academia, people from the business, Government officials attended these meetings. And so it was a very multi‑stakeholder type of a model. And KRNIC was established and operated KR.
 The Ministry of Information and Communication because it was aware that the Internet was becoming more and more important, it started to overlook KRNIC and started to kind of pay attention to what it was doing. And that's why all of a sudden they came up with the law.
 KRNIC becomes NIDA and all of a sudden the Committee, the Name Comm and the NNC and the TechComm all of a sudden just disappeared in to I guess almost in to thin air. We were ‑‑ I attended these meetings from 2000 and we had almost monthly meetings, and all of a sudden we had no right at all. It is up to the Government. And NIDA reported directly to the Ministry of Information and Communication. However, I need to add actually one thing, mention one thing. There was actually an Internet address policy committee that Professor Dongman Lee worked very hard to establish, even despite the law. So actually after the law was instituted for the first couple of months we did meet and we did discuss these things. Eventually it was ‑‑ it was dismantled. And in ‑‑ from 2009. So there was about I guess about three, four years of blank. Almost no participation. However because Korea had that core group that was concerned with Internet Governance that the interest of that group did not die out and many members are actually attending this meeting. And so as Professor Dongman Lee said the names changed. It was first the Korean Internet Development Association. And then from 2011 to 2012 it was named the Internet Address Policy Forum. And then currently we have KIGA not alliance but under KIGA we have the Internet address infrastructure subcommittee and these Committees are attended by almost the same group of people, same core group of people that used to attend the Name Comm and NNC and TechComm.
 And as I said NIDA merges with KISA and expands. So currently we are ‑‑ we are still under the law but because we had that strong core group that believed very strongly in the multi‑stakeholder model of Internet Governance there was one case in which that mechanism was able to show a bit of influence and that was when Korea was introducing that Hun group which was the IDN TLD.tr. There was a discussion between the KISA advisory committee but a major part of the work was done within the various ‑‑ the Committee that had various names depending on who the Governmental official was they wanted the names to be different as long as we can do this, we can change it. We met for a year trying to come up with policy and we had experts in Korean language, Korean codes, consumer rights, advocates and academics and technicians and we all ‑‑ I think we worked for about a year and a half before the ‑‑ that Hun group was finally instituted. So registration policies and so on. A major part of that was discussed within those Committees. And we were able to exert influence. I said significant influence on the implementation of .hungroup despite the legislation. Okay. Governmental legislation and participation, well, I am not going to discuss this. So we have Governmental control. But we are trying very hard and sometimes we are succeeding and now that we have the IGF here and KISA is getting stronger. I think we will be able to move more towards multi‑stakeholderism. Thank you.
 (Applause.)

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much, Professor Lee. She has actually given real details of the Korean Internet Government history. One sense is creating information more than she is supposed to. I am a little bit somewhat in a hesitant position whether we want to continue to have all the speakers presentation until 4 and squeeze two gentlemen in to 20 minutes or we can ‑‑ well, as I asked earlier because whether people like to have the break time as scheduled. So well, let's have the first speaker and then we will see and then maybe Charles he can stay until like 5? Okay. So I think it is better to have the speakers finish their presentations before the break and then we can continue to have the discussion so that Charles can take advantage of our discussion system. So now our next speaker is Mr. Boknam Yun. He is currently an attorney but he has been involved in the Internet Governance activities in Korea for several years. Actually the beginning of the 21st century at least I remember. He worked really hard. And every time there is some kind of issue of the summary or the writeup, the law form, our message, there is the agencies and Government he is always actually being asked and he gladly volunteers. So I personally appreciate his effort long years. So he is going to talk about just the annex or continuum of what Professor Lee has talked about, is the aspect of Korean Internet governance history. So please welcome Mr. Yun.

>> BOKNAM YUN: Good afternoon. My name is Boknam Yun. Today I will speak with regards to law, Korean law and my proposal of the amendment of law. My presentation has three parts. Part one is analysis of Internet Governance, mechanism of a very different view of points. Part two is the Korean Internet Governance law including the 2004 Korean address resources, what Professor Lee said. Third part my proposal by multi‑stakeholder to the amendment of Korean law.
 First of all, in my opinion the important thing of ‑‑ important points of multi‑stakeholderism is the ‑‑ this is a waiting process. If we want analysis of law is the same. That is a Consensus based versus topdown style. I think share these mechanism base same meaning. And second who is the major player on Internet Governance. For example, Government or private sector. How participate in minor players is a following question. And in Korean law the appointment process of major policy committees also important. And finally support on the private sector activity. The Government support this means. Let's go main. In the aspect of Korean law this is a decision making process which is typically topdown style and major players are Government with KISA, subsidiary or affiliate with Government and other minor player or other players is Internet of policy deliberation Committee which legally establish it and KISA is also explained ‑‑ I am sorry, KIGA, Korean Internet Government Alliance, the cohost of this Forum. Civil Society is also voluntary base participate. And appointment process of Internet address policy deliberation Committee's topdown style, multi‑stakeholder and finally support on private sector activity only concerning the international cooperation by the law.
 In this presentation private sector means not only commercial organization but also Civil Society and the users and experts. It is different from Tunis Agenda. I am sorry about many words but this is Korean law.
 Let's start with the law. Internet Resources Act 2004 said see Article 3, Section 1, does data share, promote development and use of Internet address resources. Share is important. And also see the Article 5, Section 1. The Ministry of Science ICT and future training shall implement promotion of use or management of Internet address resources. Very various areas.
 Just ‑‑ this law has just two key words about multi‑stakeholder model. First is to Article 3, Section 2, that's democratic manner and Article 5, Section 2, Subsection 5 cooperation between the state and private sector is all. Secondly, Government establishes and the Ministry of KISA, KISA is actually appoint by the other law, not Internet address law. Actually the promotion of Internet information and communication network utilize very long name, I am sorry and the information protection is Article 52. The Government shall establish KISA, it is very important, establish it. And another Section 3, Subsection 17, KISA have the mandate of the management of Internet address resources under the Internet address resource action. This is the resource action, the definition of the Internet resource management organization means KISA. The same meaning. Very special expression. I think so.
 Next we have a Committee in legally but see the Internet address Article 5, Section 3. Ministry of Science ICT and the future training shall undergo the deliberation of this policy committee who is okay but you can see the Article 6, Section 1. This Committee shall be established under the control of the Ministry of Science ICT and the future training. You can ‑‑ you can catch this meaning under the control. I think it is very important.
 The appointment process of Internet Policy Deliberation Committee is typically topdown style. The Chairman of Ministry of Science ICT be commissioned or nominated. So all Committee members is nominated or commissioned by the Chairman of the ministry or is appointees. Next, final, my precise view of the Internet address law, the government is supporting on private sector. Just to set Article 8, Section 2, support international cooperation on Internet address in the private sector. That's the meaning ‑‑ we can interpret Government just only issue involve the international cooperation. We can interpret by lawyer.
 I would like to summarize. Government has typically ‑‑ this is a making of topdown style. They are consulted by Internet address policy committee four times a year and KISS is affiliated and administered by Governments I think. And you can remember establish the Government establish KISA. It is very important.
 So another player KIGA already said Professor Lee and subcommittee on address and infrastructure is nonofficial consultee. Final, I would like to propose the Article to Korean Internet Governance law. Yeah. Okay. The proposal is the stay and I will say after this ‑‑ the presentation after then I will ‑‑ presentation, present this two pages, okay. Thank you.
 (Applause.)

>> DONGMAN LEE: All right. Thank you, Mr. Yun. Our last speaker is Mr. Charles Mok. I personally appreciate his participation because I ask him actually the last minute. We actually missed two ‑‑ actually original plans the speakers one Masou Sun from Japan and Professor Hong Xue and she couldn't come over here because of the visa problems. I ask him because he is very close to China. Whether he can speak about China or he said a little bit the hesitating but I twisted his arm. I hope that he can talk a little bit about the China situation as well. Thank you. Please welcome Mr. Mok.

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes. Really can probably not talk too much about China because that's not really my ‑‑ oops. That's really not something that I would be able to talk about with little preparation but on the other hand, I think I can talk about Hong Kong. Yeah. Nothing. Yeah. So if I talk about Hong Kong, think of it this way, pretty much China might be the opposite. And you can get the idea. Anyway, so yes, my understanding is that I am going to talk about the Internet Governance related especially from the legislative and Governments, governance structure perspective. And let me first tell you a little bit of my background. I used to work in the industry. I was in the ‑‑ well, before the year 2000 actually I ran my own Internet service provider in Hong Kong. And so I was from the industry side. And then after the year 2000 I got involved actually with the .hk domain in Hong Kong. From the early days of development I was a board member then until 2004 and then I started to work a lot with Civil Society founding the Internet Society of Hong Kong. And afterwards in the year ‑‑ in the years later on while I continue to run my own business I also get more involved in to politics. And last year I was elected to be a representative for the IT sector. We have a very strange system in Hong Kong but I was elected to represent the IT sector in the legislative council in Hong Kong.

So sort of moving from industry to Civil Society and then sort of in to government but not really Government. I mean I have to say I am on the opposition of the Government in the legislative. So sort of half foot in the Government. So I realized that today most of my previous speakers were talking about Internet Governance issues mostly related to the critical Internet infrastructure or resources angle with the addresses and domain names and administration and so on. So I will start talking a little bit about that but I really want to also mention a little bit about other aspects of Internet Governance as well in the end. Now first of all, when I first started as an ISP in Hong Kong in the mid to late '90s, actually at that time who runs the .hk, the ccTLD, who runs that process in the universities? The universities realized that they don't want to deal it with as it became more commercialized. In the beginning they didn't charge anyone any money to register domain name. And it was a public service and then they find out that everyone wants a domain name. We look at it, some people look at it as an opportunity. They look at it as a liability. They don't want to deal with it. So they go to the Government and say can somebody take it off our hands. And the Government decided to start to Delegate the whole process to an organization that the Government would form under an agreement, an MOU with the community. So this organization became, has become what is Hong Kong Internet Registration Corporation today which runs .hk. But it is very different from what I heard from the situation in Korea. First of all, we have no legislation. We have no Internet addresses, resources. Actually anything similar to that. No law. No legislation. Government don't want to deal with it. They want to throw it off their hands in to another body. So as long as there is no trouble they don't want to deal with it. And so everything is under administrative measure. Now obviously the Government owns the right to manage the domain names, the .hk but they don't want to do it directly. If they do it directly, civil servants may think that come on, I am going to have more work. So I rather give it to somebody else, especially if there is money involved that means that we have to charge people money. That means how do we deal with that. Does it go in to the Government money or Government treasury. Oh, no, no, don't deal with it. Let's administratively, that means without legislation, administratively Delegate it to somebody else to take over. So since about 2002 or so we have a this new corporation which is the HKILC, Hong Kong Registration Corporation which has a body aboard that is represented by elected representatives from general users, ISP representatives, IT industry and representatives from the commercial trade organizations and then finally one single Government representative. And the Government actually ‑‑ I have to say that the Government actually do get a chance to appoint a number of directors as well including the Chairman, but the majority of the board members are elected like I said from different sectors. So in that sense it is a multi‑stakeholder approach but not entirely, not entirely bottom‑up. In a sense the problem that we have with these representatives that are being elected is that there is very little interest. People are not interested in running. People are not interested in voting and so on.

So, for example, for the general users representative I mean out of more than 100,000, close to 200,000 domain names ending in .hk in Hong Kong you would probably get elected ‑‑ you would almost definitely get elected with 100 votes. So because nobody is interested in it. So in that sense Government feel that that's great. No trouble. Nobody cares, right? So that is Hong Kong. And like I said without going in to too much in to the details I mean China is probably the opposite. Very much state controlled and so on and they definitely have a lot of different pieces of legislation to govern the whole thing and Government would maintain the control in almost very little participation by Civil Society and so on.
 So that is I would say the situation in Hong Kong. And beyond these Critical Internet Resources, if I look at the related Internet Governance issues just like the different themes that we have in the IGF right here, we talk about openness. We talk about accessibility. We talk about security and privacy. Now on that ‑‑ in those areas there seem to be more Government interest and action because hey, this is what people understand, right? Security, privacy accessibility. Right? How much my Internet connection is going to be charged and so on. These are the things that average people understand. We talk to them about domain name, Chinese domain names. To be honest, to the wider community they don't really care and our Government don't care. If the people don't care they don't care because they don't want to do more.

So openness, let me quickly talk about openness. We have an open telecommunication regime in Hong Kong which means that anybody can own and run and apply for and get a license to run their fixed local Networks and so on. No problem and so on. So this full competition actually in a sense reduce a lot of issues that we face in terms of openness. This is very seldom or never an issue in Hong Kong because we have competition. If one company wants to do something to tighten up its bandwidth and so on and another company would suddenly come out and say fine, you don't want a business, I will do it. So competition in a way reduces many of these problems. But on the other hand, there is some times and recently there are minor issues that comes up. For example, in Hong Kong some of the rural areas that are not so much populated, then a lot of people living in those areas are charged more for their broadband charges for broadband lines. And then they are very unhappy and we see it as the side effects of full competition. And definitely we have very, very high penetration. Close to actually 100% Internet penetration and 270% mobile penetration with, you know, more than 70% adoption of Smartphones and so on. And in most of these comparisons we are usually just behind Korea in these areas. So in terms of accessibility there is also relatively again we don't ‑‑ Government usually don't deal with these issues by legislation. They would put in support measures, for example, because schools have to do e‑learning and some poor children, families do not have monies to buy own PCs and Internet connection. So Government give money to buy and procure with these connections and so on.

So ‑‑ but then again Government also find out and that, for example, two years ago or three years ago when they started implementing a plan to help poor children and family to adopt the Internet, at that time the Internet penetration was about for the poor families was about 85%. By the time they have implemented the system because of Government speed, very slow, okay, by the time they started the program, the penetration was all the way up to over 95%. Now over 97%. Even for the poor families. So Government is saying that oh, why am I doing this. So, you know, this is the mentality that we have in Hong Kong with our Government. But another point that I want to quickly talk about is security. Internet security is these days on the top of a lot of people's minds and Hong Kong have the great reputation of being the city that everyone wants to call home but he didn't. And the reason he said he would be considering Hong Kong at the time was because we have free Internet. We have no censorship for the Internet and we have free press and independent and judiciary and so on.

For a lot of reasons he left and went to Russia. But this being in Hong Kong actually made our community very aware of and worried about our Internet security because Edward Snowden told us that Hong Kong was one of the targets of NSA's attacks or surveillance. We ask ourselves what is in our law to prevent these sort of things from happening. And in fact, we see nothing and particularly because we don't have military. We don't have intelligence services in Hong Kong. So in a sense we are a lot more vulnerable. So anyway, so but on the other hand, we are also worried about our own Government trying to get information from us.

So in February in the legislature myself actually I ask a question to our Government how many times did our Government ask for information from our Internet service providers in Hong Kong, whether they are domestic or Internet foreign countries and the Government answered to tell us that over the last three years they have asked our ISP for over 14,000 times in the last three years. Mainly the police and customs to ask for information from our ISPs and they actually break it down by department by department. And we later found out that Hong Kong was the first economy in Asia that had this sort of Government breakdown figure that the Government released. Four other Governments do not release this figure. I think our Government released the figure without thinking about it. And now maybe they are regretting. And the only country that I ‑‑ my understanding has been doing this sort of thing is Estonia and recently Google and the University of Hong Kong put out a Hong Kong transparency report to analyze these figures from the Hong Kong Government. So if you have interest you can take a look at that. So that's something that I would want to continue to push in our legislature to make sure that our Government is fully accountable and be more transparent about these sort of things that they are doing to our ISPs which in turn it has to do with the privacy and security of our Internet users.

And finally a couple of other legislations, legislations that I think has to do with Internet Governance issues. First of all, censorship, we have a control of obscene indecent Article ordinance. They wanted to first implement a monitoring, filtering for our Internet service provider and they have told us Australia is doing it and we said really. We didn't really read it from the news. Are you sure. So we ask our friends from ISOC Australia what is happening and ISOC Australia friends told us that no, it is just a test. It was a proposal by the Government, by the Prime Minister that he wants to do it. But we are opposed to it and so on. In the end it didn't happen in Australia and didn't happen in Hong Kong either. And we found out that hey, Governments don't trust them. If they want to do something, they would tell you Australia is doing it. You have to have friends in Australia. So Internet censorship, so fortunately up to now we do not have Internet censorship in Hong Kong which is different situation in China. The second one is Copyright. For the last eight years, almost eight years in Hong Kong we have been ‑‑ the Government has been consulting about an update of our Copyright ordinance without success. And basically they are stuck and stored in the legislature because of how ‑‑ the trouble of finding out a way to deal with parity and this so‑called secondary creation or derivative. The community is very distrustful of the Government when it comes to this sort of thing because we have had a very active community that would be using a lot of Internet sharing and authoring movie poster or songs and so on in order to criticize the Government. The government when they want to introduce right now exemption allow these sort of activities, the Internet community is still very skeptical.

So want to mention that Copyright is another issue that has a lot of legislation, really having legislation that has to do with a lot with Internet Governance. And thirdly the final one is privacy. We have a personal data privacy ordinance in Hong Kong since 1997. It has been in place since 1997 and that put Hong Kong as one after earlier economy adopting a privacy law but it was only updated in last year 2012. But even recently there has been a lot of debate about, for example, one particular issue because of an app, an application that in Hong Kong that allow people to look up personal data, look up my name and then found out whether or not I have been sued or whether I have been bankrupt or whatever and things like that. And then the privacy commissioner banded this app because they ‑‑ he thinks this is an infringement in personal privacy but to many of us this is public data.

So we have a big debate right now about transparency and personal privacy. The balance. And we found out that even some newer legislation, even in places like Singapore and so on they have an exemption for personal data already in the public domain but we don't have it. Probably because our law is too old. So that's an example about another aspect of I think Internet Governance that will affect many users.

So in closing well, of course, I talk a lot more about a broader scope than just domain names and Critical Internet Resources. But I think many of these issues that I mentioned like content censorship, Copyright because many countries are considering implementing, you know, similar to some par type of laws that their country to band overseas websites and so on and privacy issues and security issues and so on. These are issues that I think that most people in the general community would have an easier understanding about. And it is also very important I think that we look at these issues in addition to focusing on the issues with Internet Governance just about the critical infrastructure and so on. So with that I turn the time back to Professor Lee. Thank you.
 (Applause.)

>> DONGMAN LEE: All right. Thank you very much. So we are going to have the 20‑ minute break. Before finishing the first part of this session, actually Charles actually made a great point in the last things. So second part in the discussion there are many aspects of the Internet Governance but the point is how to actually provide balanced views and actions on various issues like censorship and the things that you mentioned. So all the speakers I am going to put up the three questions that I would like to ask on the screen and then we are going to have the floor ask the various questions further. So we will see you in 20 minutes. Thank you.

(Break).

>> DONGMAN LEE: This mic is really loud. I don't know why. All right. We will start the second part of this session, multi‑stakeholder model in AP region. First of all, thank you very much for staying in this session. We just kind of talked about maybe the people, number of people on the podium may outnumber the participants, but unfortunately I counted the total number, we are about one‑third. So still okay. All right.
 I don't think that anybody actually posted their questions and suggestions through the Twitter that we announced at the beginning of the session. But it is okay. And now we have a small number of people. So you can actually ask questions any time you want. Before I actually handing over the control to you I would like to ask a few questions to the speakers by leveraging the power of the Moderator.
 Here we go. So I prepared the three questions. So first one is how balanced do you think Internet Governance stakeholders participation is in your country. Second question is to what extent has Government been involved in the formation of the Internet Governance structure, in what level does the registration support it. And third one is how can it balance the responsibilities of roles among stakeholders, especially the Government. If the Government role is a little bit skewed, is good or bad way. In what we could turn the direction to a more equilibrium state. The reason why you may think, you know, somewhat focus on the government, let me just kind of quickly give you the background history of the formation of this session.

Originally this session was split in to three parts. So one is the Government roles in Internet Governance and another one is Civil Society perspective on the Internet Governance and the relationship with the Government, and third one is registrations status in terms of Internet Governance in AP region. And the program committee made a suggestion, probably would be better to have three separate sessions in to one. So discussing about Internet Governance and how to actually build the multi‑stakeholder model in a more balanced way. In some countries, in AP region, well, if you already listen to the speakers' presentations some countries are well balanced and some are not. But moreover the ‑‑ if you actually count all the countries in AP regions probably situation is not really same as New Zealand or Hong Kong. Somewhere between in Japan. That's why we have a little bit more focus on the Government participation, how actually what is the role and responsibility and especially also we invited a few people from Government side. So Malaysia and United States and also Vietnam. I was told that they are willing to actually speak up through the discussion session. So I will give you a chance to talk about and first anyone would like to take the first shot? Maybe Charles, you need to go first because you need to leave. The first question. First question. Yeah.

>> CHARLES MOK: How balanced do you think IG, Internet Governance stakeholder participation is in your country? In our situation in Hong Kong I think the problem is still we are not at that stage yet. I think we need to first of all, have more people, more stakeholders interested in participating. And I think that's the kind of work that we are trying to do at the moment. And our approach is again to try to approach it with areas of public interest, things like security or technology adoptions and so on rather than going straight in to some of the harder, difficult issues that people unfortunately simply don't have a lot of huge interest in at the moment.
 So getting people involved that way first. So I don't think we are ‑‑ we ‑‑ on the other hand, is it balanced? I don't know. Yes and no because like I said our Government is not unlike a situation where Government in some countries might be overbearing compared to Civil Society participation. I think in our situation government is not that keen unless there is troubles. And then ‑‑ but then the Civil Society or general public is not as interested as they should be either. So in that sense it is very balanced because no ‑‑ neither side is interested. But I think we ought to, of course, try to do better than that.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: I think that question one, how balanced do you think IG stakeholders' participation is. In New Zealand I would say it is fairly balanced. If there is a piece that's out of balance it is probably the civil service side of Government. I think we have good political buy‑in from the rolling and opposition parties but not all the civil servants, not all the regulators in Government will solidly buy in to it. But certainly those concerned with issues of privacy or current topical issues they tend to be a little bit more interested. To what extent has the government been involved in the formation? Not at all. They have been passengers rather than drivers. So we drive. I would say if we pulled out of Internet Governance in New Zealand our Government would then support and continue to have the dialogue. I don't think they would allow the process to dwindle or move away. And I think thirdly what we did as a starter to get our Government thinking about why it should entertain concepts of multi‑stakeholderism and Internet Governance Forum was to establish with them a parliamentary Internet caucus. They could come along in a dinner break and we would provide an expert speaker on a specific topic they would raise with us. So they could get a world class opinion on a topic that's underlined to industry or anything else. Just here is a voice on this particular topic. And that was a very good way to get a dialogue going with the politicians to get them comfortable with this concept initially. So that helped us immeasurably. I think the other thing that can help us in this regard too, if your first position is from outside of Government, is to acknowledge that Governments have a right to legislate, not arguing that Governments have that right. So if you upfront say we recognize your right to legislate, we want to help you legislate in the right way. So that can be helpful, too.

>> DONGMAN LEE: I actually made a great mistake. We may wonder we have one new speaker I need to introduce and then we can continue. Mr. Peter Major can provide more international perspective of the Internet Governance. So sorry about that. Okay. So anyone would like to talk?

>> HIRO HOTTA: The Japanese administration, I don't think it is well balanced. I think the ‑‑ still operators or the service providers decide the final policy and, of course, they have to know how the customers demands. So they don't waste their customers, consumers and sectors. But still the service providers decide the final policy. And Government thinks ‑‑ they don't be ‑‑ they don't want to be complained by citizens. So if there is no problem occur, they will not intervene, but if something happen they will intervene. The final statement is that the old stakeholders don't discuss it not in a single platform but in a multi layer or multi scene. Thank you.

>> PETER MAJOR: Even though I was introduced as someone who is representing the international organizations being the Vice‑Chair of the Commission of Science and Technological Development I also kind of represent the Hungarian Government. While to answer the first question in Hungary I think it is mostly a question of awareness. And I believe there were some initiatives just around the 2009, 2009 when Hungary, the presidency of the European Union, at that time there was an initiative to form a kind of Civil Society driven Internet Governance group. And as far as I know this group was quite active. It was listened to by the Government itself. And apparently they made their appearances in the different IGFs. Last time I saw them in Bakru and there were some initiative to have a national IGF in Hungary but I haven't heard of that. But in more general terms and I am just taking my main hat, in the international organizations by nature of the Government, the Government dominance is evident. International organizations are Intergovernmental organizations. I am talking about the UN system. Having said that, however, we can recognize that there are already initiatives as ‑‑ at the beginning of the forming of the UN as old as in 1946 when some other organizations have been given some observatory status in the UN itself. And as a follow‑up other specialized agencies, let me give you some names, UNESCO, you may be familiar with that or WIPO, which is the World Intellectual Property Organization. UNCTAD is a trade organization. One has given the right to NGOs to participate. Now there was a very controversial issue about the ITU. ITU always claims that it has sector members, business representatives, technical organizations and recently academia.
 Some of you may remember that we had the WCIT, the World Conference of International Telecommunications where NGOs have been admitted as observers. Observer status is a very delicate issue. Observers may sit down and listen. And they are given the floor based on the goodwill of the Chairman.
 I don't think the Chairman had that goodwill last year.
 (Laughter).

>> PETER MAJOR: Having said that well, the other part is that NGOs and business can be part of the national Delegations. And that is the main argument I think of the ITU, that well, what are you complaining about? It is a balanced representation. You are part of the Delegation. It is up to you how you interpret it. Let me get to my main point, that is the Commission of Science and Technology for Development which is a special commission of the ESOC, the Economic and Social Concept of the UN. By the way it has 4,000 NGOs registered and they can participate.
 The CSTD also allowed NGOs to participate. Now the special thing when we formed the Working Group on the improvements of the IGF which is of interest here. And you can't imagine the debate. It wasn't a debate. It was a war we had during the 2010 intersessional meeting in Geneva in December when the group was formed. In the end after this fight it was decided to form the group including non‑Governmental representatives. We had 22 Member States representatives and 20 non‑Governmental representatives, meaning five representatives of each of the stakeholder groups. So that was the result of the big fight. But even the denomination of the representatives made a distinction. The Member States were members of the group. The other representatives were invitees. So it was again the goodwill of the Chair that this distinction was abolished. And so I believe after that, after some hesitation we worked in a very, very friendly manner. There was some kind of mutual trust. So I can say it was a real kind of balance. But it was a ‑‑ we had a member of the Working Group whose service is from outside. He can have a different opinion. But I felt that at the end of the day we could work quite well together.

Now there was a second Working Group which was formed this year. And fortunately we had already the first one. So there was no debate that this Working Group will be a multi‑stakeholder Working Group. I happen to chair this Working Group as well. And this time I decided to open it up completely. That is whatever we are doing will be made public. And we have already started this work by issuing the questioner, you might be familiar with, it is open to anyone who is interested in these issues. So it is I would say to answer your question yes, there is a hope to have a balanced representation.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you, Mr. Major. I think you made a very good point. Within our own country's experience every time there is some kind of issue in our case Government is very reluctant to make it public even though they are taking public procedures but is well tailored format, right? So in terms of who will be speakers and the ‑‑ what people actually participating what kind of position is suppose to be taken. That situation is already well heard in previous subsessions.

I jump to the next question, so especially the Government side. How much, you know, Government has taken an action on the formation of Internet Governance structure in your country. Is there any legislation support? Or anything ‑‑ some regulation level? And so on. So Mr. Yun, you like to talk about? Well, maybe just kind of for a reminder and then I will jump to the few Government representatives on the floor. Is that okay? All right. So we have the few representatives from Vietnam and Malaysia. Who would like to go first? Microphone, please pass the microphone.

>> Hi. I am Rafeda from Malaysia. I would like to ask whether ‑‑ what we think about our country. I can say that at the moment Malaysia, the IG stakeholders participation is very low because at the moment it is fully governed by the Government which is my ‑‑ our organizations MCMC. We actually manage the domain name and all the policies, although it runs by a limited guarantee company by the government. But the policy and everything they come out with has to go through us. However we are looking in to more IG stakeholders starting from last year. Actually we have a few proposals that we bring up to the Government. And Hong Kong, I can say Hong Kong papers in 2002 has been one of our revisions. So we thank you to Hong Kong for your papers and others as well such as Japan, New Zealand. We have looked in to all and we bring it up to our Government to see if they are okay with the IG concepts. I mean the multiple multi‑stakeholder concepts. So far I can say that it looks positive. Hopefully by next year or the few ‑‑ a few years in near future we will have more multi‑stakeholder concepts in Malaysia for managing .my. Thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: I was told that we also have the Vietnamese Government. So do you have anything you would like to add or like to speak up? Over there.

>> Good evening. I would like to say we have some experience as far as two questions. I would like to say we have some experience. And also Laos ‑‑ sorry. Laos Internet center, in the near future, that's my intention to have registry for this IG.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Distance from your mic.

>> Okay. Okay.

>> Too close.

>> Too close. Okay.

>> DONGMAN LEE: I think you actually have sung too many songs in the karaoke.

>> I would like to say U.S. speaker and we DotCom registry. We would like to be the coregistrar and how can we do this now because after three years we use ‑‑ we have registry.

>> (Off microphone).

>> DONGMAN LEE: You got your mic too close. We cannot hear even though the scribers cannot take what you said. Take about 20 centimeters away from your mouth.

>> Now good registry, right? I would like to say how should we do to become the good registry. Because now it is managed by one company from OC. We would like to take back to Laos and manage by our Governments. We would like to say how to manage for registrar in future. Registrar in database in overseas. That's a question.
 I would like to say about the one question, one question, previous speaker about the model and how to balance the Internet Governance in Laos and include the Government organizations. Of course, proponents that means end users and private sectors. Thank you.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: I will respond and ask you to come and talk to me after the session. The three of us on this end of the table are all members of the ccNSO Council and ICANN and deal with a number of the re‑delegation requests and I chair a Working Group within ICANN on re‑delegations. So I can provide you with some information and links about that. I didn't quite understand the full extent of your question because of the sound. But please come and talk to me afterwards or any one of the three of us and we can point you to things that may be helpful to you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Yeah. I think it is the ‑‑ we really serve the participant's desire because this session was originally the design ‑‑ designed to actually share the information among the AP region countries in the last 20 or 30 years of Internet Governance, especially you ask how to balance among stakeholders. When all stage of Internet Governance would be wonderful and these three people as Keith said they have been involved many, many years. Delegation and re‑delegation and probably setting up structure would be a great asset to your country. After session visit these people and share their ideas.
 And let's move on ‑‑ we already answered the second question pretty much, right? So whether it is balanced or not, right, if not balanced, why if balanced and share your balance, the experience with other people, and the ‑‑ so because I stop Mr. Yun's presentation at the last minute. So I will let you go first for the third question.

>> BOKNAM YUN: Thank you. My proposal by the Korean legal system, the main idea is the same to the other country of the multi‑stakeholder model. Before 2004 the actual ‑‑ actually established Internet address resource, we try to the multi‑stakeholder model but for ten years it stopped and re‑constructed. And we want to discuss with the governor about this problem but it is very difficult because the ten years is not short time. And already the Government have strong power about Internet Governance. So we want the change of the idea of the Governments. At the first time I want to abolishment of that law. I think the Internet is the self‑Government is effective. You can see the other country, but at this time I recognize that it is very difficult. So I want amendment of the law just to like multi‑stakeholder model. It is not easy. First time we want the independent organization, not just KISA and Government should I suggest to hand over the major law at this independent organization many mandates. And KISA I think is restructured to independent organization or alternatively KISA can entrust to or re‑delegate to other competitive organization of Internet address management. The actual Article 9 is already right there entrustment.
 And I want the second ‑‑ my proposal is the independent Committee consist on the multi‑stakeholder model including the private sector and commercial organization and Civil Society end users and experts. The Government changed the mind and change the decision making process itself. It is very important. I think so.

>> HIRO HOTTA: Thank you. I think on the point that every stakeholder should contribute in finding or solving issues especially from the aspects of what they are good at. Not from all the aspects. Of course, this doesn't mean that such should be limited to the stakeholders. But who are good at what should be respected.
 So what ‑‑ what can be done by private sectors should be left over to the private sector and ‑‑ okay. And Government should not try to excessively control it. For example, in Japan there is no law for Internet domain name per se. In this sense as I perceive the role of the Government is done at appropriate level so far. Thank you.

>> YOUNG‑EUM LEE: Just one thing about the role of Government, I think in any country whether you have a law or not eventually the Government actually does have the final say as Hiro just said. Even though Japan does not have so far a law on Internet Governance, the Government does have, could eventually have very strong influence. And I am sure in New Zealand even if nothing goes wrong then maybe but if something does go wrong or if ‑‑ if .nz does something that the Government thinks would ‑‑ is not beneficial, very hypothetical situation, but then I think the Government is ready, would be willing to butt in. And I think that's what we are seeing in Europe more, more and more often. And it is the observation of many who have observed the European domain name governance system that the influence of the Government is getting stronger and stronger and not less and less. And so I think because the Internet is influencing almost every part of our society and because it is so critical to the management of the country itself, I think now most of the Governments are very well aware of the fact that they may need to be involved in the governance in a more active manner and that's partially why I think the discussions within ITU with regard to Internet Governance is getting more support, more and more support.
 Now as to how to ‑‑ so it is not just one thing. It is ‑‑ my second point is as for how to get things more balanced. Despite all of that, even within Korea I think that even within ITU, there is increased awareness that it is not the Government that should be managing. It is a governance mechanism that the Government should adopt or a society should adopt in order to get things done in a more efficient way. And so this may in the WTPF meeting in Geneva within ITU, I mean there was no country that did not agree that multi‑stakeholderism was important. Now as for getting things more equal, I guess it is just increased awareness and even within countries like Korea one thing that we could resort to is the expertise. Because people in the government are not as well informed about the whole process as some of the experts in the field are. So that's one mechanism that we could resort to in order to make things a bit more balanced. And, of course, we should work at the legislation also.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: It is extraordinarily difficult to measure a Government's commitment to the concepts of multi‑stakeholderism. They may participate in the Forum and dialogue that you establish but nothing that precludes them from enacting stupid laws. We see in New Zealand in spite of all their endeavors that we have made and the discussions and Forums that we have participated in some of the treaty discussions on SOPA and TPP and those sorts of things are not appropriate to our jurisdiction. And yet through some heavy handed tactics from outside the country we are pressured from free trade agreements from being at risk which comply to what is referred quite often to stupid law. Your Government can still be persuaded by powerful lobby groups and powerful other governments that can act in ways that are contrary to groups.

>> CHARLES MOK: In the end that Government is in charge and that make the final decision. Keith is also very right that Government, you just can't stop them from making mistakes and like I mentioned about Copyright Law they make a lot of mistakes that have delayed the situation for many, many years. But in our situation in Hong Kong we have additional level of difficulty. Because we are not really ‑‑ we are in an economy but we are not a country. So when we talk about ‑‑ when you talk about all these ITU participation and so on, that actually explains why our Government is sometimes so passive because they have no role in a UN process. They probably can join and observe but they would not be saying too much because they don't want to contradict the central Government and sometimes they don't even know what the central Government really wants to say. And certainly they don't ‑‑ necessarily civil servants don't want to echo what the Central Government want to say. Given that which means in our situation as Civil Society if we want to engage the Government we have one extra level of difficulty. When I make my presentation I sort of make it sound so like Government really don't want to do too much because it is lazy but in a way it is not only because of that. And it may not be really because of that. It may be because they are in a situation where they cannot be too active for better, for worse. So that's probably our unique situation. Of course, the situation in China is probably the opposite because there is really very little Civil Society to speak up and Government do dictate all the directions. And with that I probably have to leave and thank you, professor, and thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Yeah. Okay. I will just kind of pass the control back to the floor. Before that I would like to kind of quickly summarize. As you heard the Government sometimes, you know, they just lay back. But at the last minute if the issue gets across the Government's interest they jump in and then turn ‑‑ sometimes turn over the decision. Or as Young‑eum said the European situation, they try to get involved. Balanced leadership. It is not the one side leadership. So I would like to then ask the floors, you can actually add the knowledge and the suggestion. Also you can ask question to the panelists. Please.

>> Thank you. My name is Isaeme. By listening to what Peter have said I was also a member of DSD of improving the Internet Governance Forum. I have been counting how many times I have been involved with you, approximating the multi‑stakeholder on a balanced manner and I recall the first occasion was with the ICANN in 1998 until recently about at large the membership be the Civil Society component of ICANN. That was not an easy job and they decided to get rid of all this at large right after 2001, a 9/11 thing and then it came to the WSIS. We spent two prep coms of Civil Society almost being ignored and we did a lot of lobbying in the works and with these multi‑stakeholder thing is not a given. You have to build together or you have to fight for or request for. There are some others like IGF which is relatively more calmer than other occasions like WCIT or IGF. Like Peter said, we were in the same room until 10 or 11 in the evening and we really lobbied a lot. We saw a setback from where we were with IGF and some improvements that the government doesn't understand the importance of multi‑stakeholder. When it comes to regional thing I don't see that some countries have sufficiently balanced the equal multi‑stakeholder level. It is everyone's responsibility, but also I would like to ask the question of the operators' roles or the ccTLD, how far can you really outreach to your users or citizens. It goes through the Government guys. And unfortunately my Government people are not here and engaging. And they were scratching their head when we had an interesting dispute. We are totally unsatisfied with outcome, but we didn't have any legal tools to change the situation.

If not a law, I would like to have some common rules performed by all stakeholders. Are we doing an effort to reach out. I welcome the laws which specifies the multi‑stakeholder which we haven't seen. So the laws doesn't mean that Government will have more regulatory power. It could recognize each stakeholder on their own respective roles and responsibilities which was in the agenda of the Tunis Agenda. We can start from there. I stop here.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Let's respond and then I will go over it.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: I would like to step back a little bit and just reflecting on the panel that is here and one exercise of multi‑stakeholderism that was enormously successful that started with and finished with the people here on the stage and that was adoption of the IDN domain names for ccTLDs and, you know, the APTLD group took forward proposals for the establishment of IDNs, building on previous ideas and concepts around this. Built a model, built a multi‑stakeholder Working Group within and outside of ICANN and establish the principles and developed the policies and deployed IDNs working with the Governments to ensure that Governments were aware and familiar with what was happening along the way and very, very successfully deployed IDN and ccTLDs. Probably the most successful has not been from our region but certainly the greatest need was perceived from the Asia Pacific region. But the most successful deployment has been Russia who have about a million IDN domain names, about 2 million ASCII domain names and they believe if we can resolve around e‑mails. As exercise of multi‑stakeholder and involving Government and registry operators and despite all the differences that you have heard between the ccTLD operations, the different ways we run our registries, the different levels of Government engagement that we have been able to conquer all the issues in front of us. And the group of Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and China and mostly led by Hiro have come up with a very successful example of a robust framework that works and is utilized internationally for people who want IDNs. So and your last point was something about having standard rules for registries. And I just like to say that it is probably the fact that we are nonstandard. That we appreciate that there are no one size fits all. That means we can interact with our own communities or maybe we should talk about that at another time. Thank you.

>> I will just follow up on something that Professor Lee just touched on, but I think it is actually integral to the ‑‑ sort of the strategic approach to having a role to play within Internet Governance and that is leveraging expertise. In my experience it is albeit limited and within a very small context but one of the most effective tools that we were able to bring to bear on the building of broader structures was building the community of practice. In other words, showing every single technical practitioner that there was a benefit, a direct benefit to membership in the community and define that as you will whether it is one ISOC, PIC ISOC in our case. That bought us a lot of creditability and it allowed us to conduct what I call a friendly insurgency. We were able to put a lot of people in to mid and higher levels of Government who remembered us as the ones who gave them a hand, you know, when they were just starting out. In our example it has been a ten‑year process. It is not a simple thing. And I will grant you that working in larger ‑‑ countries with larger populations, much larger bureaucracies it becomes a significant task and working between nations so that we have sort of a shared understanding of the implications of particular decisions that are being made at the political level, and a knowledge about how to mitigate the effects of these when we are actually getting along when we are trying to hammer out the deals.

That is something for which I think ISOC could and should be playing a very significant role trying to show direct benefits just in elevating and improving the expertise of its membership. And expanding that membership to the extent that we see, you know ‑‑ we end up talking with our colleagues, if you will, rather than with competitors or opponents for that matter. It is a really important thing that we have to bear in mind. Internet Governance is not one and done. And it is a process that we have to live with over a great period of time. Governments will make stupid decisions on a regular basis and to a great degree it is up to the technocracy to mitigate. What we get at the end of the day there was no crisis. We don't necessarily get gains. Sometimes we do get the gains. But there is a real potential for engagement here. I was glad to see Fadi talking about it yesterday finally and I would love to hear a lot more about that from ISOC. They have done a wonderful thing in the Pacific islands. I didn't see the same sort of effects when I was working in technology in North America.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Well, as a matter of fact the ISOC's, the participation in Internet Governance actually varies from country to country, especially in the AP region. I don't think the ‑‑ there is many ISOC chapters in Asian countries. It is not as active as United States or European. Well, some of them. Well, Korea, we just recently revitalized. As a technical person as you said the technical expert, the involvement is really important as a starting point because we need to have the infrastructure and good infrastructure can actually lead to balance on the Internet Governance side I believe. Is there any other questions on the floor? All right. Go ahead.

>> Hello. I would like to ask Keith from New Zealand, because just the way that you run the domain name business by private entity, no involvement with the Government at all. So I just like to know how you handle sensitive issues in your country. Some issues that are sensitive to the people and like what we have sometimes if it is race or religion, it is sensitive. So how actually ‑‑ how you manage this perception from the public. Thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: I think you had made a very good question but all panelists can answer depending on their own experience. Keith.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: I am happy to go first. I think we have a first principle for .nz. There are no reserved name. Any domain name that is available can be purchased. If that name happens to deintegrate a race or religion or something, it is nothing to do with us. We firmly believe that the first come first served principle should apply.
 And if that domain name is in breach of law and someone contests in court, if the court orders that domain name to be taken down, we will. We will only respond to law from a court order. And if the police come to us and say we think it is rude and you should take it down, we will not act. We will say here is a way to get a court order. If someone registers a domain name for a phishing site and they want to scam people, again the police might come to us and say will you take this domain name down immediately and we will say no. We won't respond to your request but here is an expedited method of going to court to get a court order. We suggest that you use that and bring us the court order within 30 minutes and then we will react. So that's the basis on which we work. So firstly we have these high level principles. Secondly we act on a response to the court when a law has been actually broken. And then we respond. But not otherwise.

>> HIRO HOTTA: .jp is almost the same as .nz. So law enforcement or a court order can make the domain name deleted or disconnected from the Internet. We can do that immediately. Before the complaints about phishing or Copyright infringement we do actually say to the complainant that they have to ‑‑ no, no. I am sorry. We conveyed such complainant ‑‑ complaints to our registrars that this domain name is used incorrectly or illegally. Somebody complains about that and the registrar will check with the register and usually if the domain name is really used illegally that such a registrant will not respond. So the registrars can delete this domain name. So this is how the immuning works.

>> DONGMAN LEE: It is quite interesting in Japanese case. In Korean case we don't usually pass to registrants and all old country assembly, whenever law enforcement gets involved then the registry has no free and room to make a decision. Simply follow the law enforcement decision and the ‑‑ as far as I understand all of the ‑‑ our countries probably have UDRP stuff, right? So that's the contention of the ownership. So I don't think that you asked that question. So probably you have that system, too.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Despite resolution processes is an interesting area, all gTLDs must comply with WIPO, the World Intellectual Property Organization. So there are WIPO appointed mediators and Avatars who will hear a case. Some countries have or some country codes have decided not to adopt that. Some have decided that it is appropriate. And the countries like New Zealand we have our own dispute resolution process. And in that instance we allow our registrant to put up a case for their right to the domain name. And if they have a legitimate right it doesn't matter how many more rights the contestant has the legitimate right maintains an end. Whereas in WIPO normally the dispute is over who has the greater right to the name. And we never entertained the concept that a greater right entitles you to something, but if you were first come first served and you had a legitimate right it belongs to you.

>> BOKNAM YUN: I am a lawyer. So I should answer about Korean situation. Resolution include the address. Establish the domain Committee about domain dispute policy Committee and they have meditation of the domain dispute in domestic area. But I ‑‑ when I checked the number of the disputes there are very few cases and another case is UDRP by the international level. Yes.

>> It is really interesting how New Zealand, Japan. However as a Government for itself I think we still need ‑‑ we still want to hold certain things, especially for sensitive names. In Malaysia although we are looking for multi‑stakeholder structure in future we probably would like to remain the sensitive names. We have ‑‑ we call SNDRP which is sensitive name resolution policy which was developed to capture all the sensitive names. Just would like to share on that. Thank you very much for the information sharing. I found these sessions very, very useful. Thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Yeah, I think we missed the key questions. Reserve name, sensitive names and the ‑‑ before I actually hand over the mic to the New Zealand and Japan case, let me first talk about the long experience of reserve name battle between our community and the Government. In all the years we have many, many number of the reserve and the year about 2005 we just ‑‑ we got rid of most of the reserve names in English case. And then a nightmare came back when we actually opened up Korean second level domain names. So Government was to actually put every single Government issue related, even suicide and plus something and some derogatory words about the big companies and even further some ‑‑ the Government organizations, all the ministry, they like have the ‑‑ anything relate to include or expansion of their ministry name as a reserve name. So we actually fought back and forth and we reached ‑‑ still I think it is a few hundred. And even further we actually raise up to third level to second level, the Korean level. And still is ‑‑ we are struggling. So for the record. So if you like to ‑‑ hold up some names, well, in some sense for the future it is good but you have to think about really seriously whether holding the name is really good for your grandson or grandchildren or after that. No, I am really serious. We always ask that. He gathered all the people and started the ‑‑ this Internet community. He raised every time a particular point. He asked is it really good for next hundred years. Yeah. I think we have to keep that in mind, right. Okay. I will pass the mic to Hiro first.

>> HIRO HOTTA: So for the Japanese case the sensitive names it is ‑‑ we are ‑‑ we have the same situation with the Korea .kr. When we open our Japanese domain name in 2001 we consulted with the Government what kind of strings, labels should be reserved for them and for the community.
 And we actually reserved from 1,000 names. Most of them, most of them are ministry names and related names. And other than those sensitive names for already just want something, it is not open to the public. But yes, it is not open. It is not easy to decide what really sensitive. So it is ‑‑ but we have a kind of hidden names. But actually the ministries is born and disappear day by day. We should maintain the result list every day with the consultation.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Yeah. I think it is really important to note that there is no right or wrong here. You know, the policies that you have for Malaysia or JP or KR or NZ has ‑‑ is entirely up to each of us. And it is part of the interesting diversity of no size fits all that we come up with these policies. If you can demonstrate that you are using a process to arrive at your policies that involves multi‑stakeholders and involves discussion with your community then that's fantastic. If you are doing the job that was entrusted to you and the Delegation of the ccTLD under RFC 1591 that is the commitment and that is truly the reward of the ccTLD world is that we are not so alike. That we do have our points of difference and that as often the reflection of our local Internet community and Government legislation and other things as well. But generally it is the reflection of the community mirroring in to the ccTLD that makes us a rich and vibrant community. Thank you.

>> PETER MAJOR: I just want to make two comments. One comment that I really like the approach, the Korean approach that was wait 100 years. It would be good for your grandchildren. And the other thing ‑‑ the other thing which I would like to say that this issue is getting even more complicated with the new gTLDs and even though it was said that one size doesn't fit all, the new gTLDs we tried to find this one size. And sometimes we manage to find it. And sometimes we don't manage to find it but we try to push everyone in to this one size. So I would recommend my colleagues under GAC as well to follow your advice.
 (Laughter).

>> PETER MAJOR: And it ‑‑ I think that life would be much easier.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Herein lines the great difference between the ccTLD community that has a set of rules that it makes on its own. And its interactions with ICANN are quite aloft. We don't allow ICANN to develop policies for us. We have the independence from ICANN to do that. The gTLD have relinquished all rights and enabled ICANN to establish how they run. And ICANN has chosen a particular path of cost and methodology and structure that has ended up with most of the applicants being almost the same even though it is in different strengths. It is quite an interesting process. And ICANN could have chosen other paths that were more diverse and more interesting and more leisure use of the DNS than merely the domain names and this is the path they chose.

>> Yeah. Edmon and I would like to offer our experience from DotAsia. There was a point in time where there was something called a sponsored gTLD where certain policies were left to the gTLD to develop. So just to add to that. And one of the things about the reserve names it ‑‑ when we developed DotAsia there were a lot of feedback from Governments around Asia as well and on sensitive names. So our ‑‑ our view or what we eventually did in fact, perhaps not a lot of people know but we invited all the governments from around Asia to submit to us all the names that we want reserved. We ended up with a fairly lengthy list and it is very interesting because certain countries actually, for example, Australia decided that they don't need to reserve anything. And certain countries decide they want a very relatively long list of reserve names. But one thing that is important is that it doesn't have to be black and white as in if it is reserved it can never be activated. The way that we approach it is that we introduced a process where it is even reserved and it is Governmentally reserved can apply for the name. And if it is consented by the corresponding Government you can go ahead and register the name. It doesn't have to be if it is reserved it can't be used forever. So there are cases, in fact, since then quite a number of these reserved names have been activated and used under DotAsia with the consent, you know, from the Government.

One particular case that I was just working on which is seeking Government sort of consent is the United Emirates, the airline wanted to register emirates.asia but it is reserved for the UAE and we are going through the process of getting their acceptance. So brand names also, it is sort of the country ‑‑ it is related to the country name but it is also a brand is looking to use it. We expect they would usually give the consent and that's the kind of process that could be put in place as well.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Yeah. Okay. Keith, you would like to ‑‑ a short one.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Very quick. New Zealand government and InternetNZ were one of the sponsoring organizations of DotAsia. Both said no to any reserve names and again that's a question of examining our principles and saying if we run a first come first served registry we should stand in line with everyone else equally if we want to register InternetNZ DotAsia and that's why we deliberately chose not to.

>> HIRO HOTTA: So I am sorry, in Japan, in .jp reserve names have two categories. Reserved for someone and reserved for blocking. So as you said if the legitimate registrant come to us to register, want to register that we will give it.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you.

>> You have to wait ‑‑

>> DONGMAN LEE: It is not working.

>> I have a question. Some comments to Malaysia or Japan or Korea or New Zealand and that relates to the multi‑stakeholder governance model. How do you decide what are the reserve names? In the case of Japan I don't think there is any public consultation process there. You may have consulted with certain parties but not in open public manner. If I am wrong, correct me. Is there any similar processes? For New Zealand, for example, you decide not to bother. But, of course, each TLDs may have different policies. But by and large I haven't seen much of the public involvement in these processes but going forward should be revisited in my view. If you have any responses I welcome you guys. It is a public sphere.

>> DONGMAN LEE: We will let Uslin speak and then Korea, you will be surprised because we have gone through many public processes. But still we are not satisfied. Go ahead, please.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: Without reserve names there is no process to seal this. If a group of stakeholders came to us and said they wanted to have reserve names and they felt they had some reason and policy backing for it we would test it among our local Internet community and we could introduce it. We haven't said we will never have them. We just never had them so far.

>> Who do you define the local Internet community? Because it is often described and that's why problem. Why don't you consult with local public, not Internet community. What's the distinction.

>> KEITH DAVIDSON: The local Internet community is essentially the population of New Zealand who use the Internet and registrants of .nz names many of who are not based in New Zealand.

>> I don't want to go in to too much details for New Zealand.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Because if you ask the local community ‑‑ we still have the discussion with the Government. But as far as the Korean Internet, the address regulations concerned the local Internet communities, actually people who use the Internet domain .kr is supposed to be resident inside of Korea. So get back to the reserve word, the first process is actually we send out the request for the name reservation to every single organization and the Internet communities. And bring it back and the ‑‑ we also ask the language expert organization. So we have the organization for ‑‑ I cannot translate in to English but Korean language, specific common agency and we filter through all the names and they actually ‑‑ well, our most recent experience for the Korean second level domain name they actually list several hundreds of the words, especially derogatory words. So I didn't know, the derogatory words is existing in Korea. We reviewed in our Internet the policy, the Committee and we did how many times? Two or three times, public hearings. We did two or three times public hearing and then we tried to reduce the number of the reserve word as much as possible. But as you said, you know, there is no fine line there, is it, right? So we need to actually continuously look in to every few years whether just where it should be in this release or added.

>> I don't want to dominate. But just quickly in 1999, 1998 or 1999 when we are designing the membership of ICANN we have a serious debate of how to define individual Internet users and those domain name holders or just users or e‑mail users. And majority went to the e‑mail users or the users, not domain name holders. So it has a history of how you define the users. And to me it is pretty important. And these days it is almost the same as the public. If you see the penetration rate now of the Internet and down to the future, and 20 years ago or 15 years ago it was about 15% of the population max. That's the difference. I think that should be reflected in to our discussion. Thank you.

>> HIRO HOTTA: May I go back to the resolve name definition? So I am not sure how the .jp reserve name list was defined. Because it was defined in 2000 before JPRS was established. It was done by JP but I believe that they had public comment ‑‑ they had public comment process. So I will check that and come back to you.

>> Let me answer for Malaysia with the questions. In Malaysia we categorize it and it is not that people cannot register. It will trigger the registry when it ‑‑ someone tries to register and the category we have the royal names we cannot use royal names. You can use the ‑‑ we have certain names that you cannot use. And ‑‑ you can use that, no problem. And then we have bank or finance, you must get approval from bank and finance. And then we have geographical name. You have to ask from that geographic location, regulator or Government of that state before you can apply. And then we have Malaysian Government's name like primeminister.my, for example. But not in English. And religions, if they want to apply for religion's name, Muslim, Islam, Christian, Hindu they must get approval from the recognized bodies before they can apply. So these are the categories we have for reserve of names. Thank you.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Would like to answer or ‑‑ well, we are at pretty much the end of the time. So if you have any further questions please visit any of the panelists in person after session. So if there is ‑‑ if there is no further question, I would like to finish the session. Thank you very much for your participation.
 (Applause.)
 (Session concluded at 1549 CET)
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