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>> EDMON CHUNG: Good afternoon. I guess the others are organizing it a little bit. Before I get started I would love to if possible if they are here for the session leaders to come up to join me on the stage on the ‑‑ on the openness track. I guess I will get started and I am Edmon Chung from DotAsia and helping to moderate this summary session on the openness track. And this year we had five ‑‑ let me see, five sessions on the openness track. It is quite an important aspect on the Internet and especially coming from at least a recent declaration from the CEO of Syria that the Internet as we know is dead. We are talking about the openness and the culture behind it, especially after the prism I guess expose if you will. But with that we had five sessions. First one was the Internet Governance for Human Rights and democracy. Is Jeremy around? So you would join him instead? Please. The other session is privacy. Second session is privacy in Asia, building on the APEC privacy principles. I had Younjung Park who has been leading the session. Younjung Park or anyone from the session around that can join us on the panel to share a little bit what ‑‑ how the session went? This is the privacy in Asia, building on the APEC privacy principles.   
 Okay. And then we had a session on network neutrality in Asia. The session was led by Boknam Yun. Thank you for joining us and you are also the leader for the user identity and anonymity in cyberspace. And last we have how open data and Internet are transforming the Government and that was led by Jay Yoon from Creative Commons or anyone from that session who would feel comfortable to join us on the panel. So those were the five sessions. And I understand that a report was compiled for each of them. And we will spend a little bit of time looking in to that I guess. Since we have at least three of them here, I guess I will pass the mic over to them directly to give us a little bit of summary.   
 Before we do that, one of the things that we are trying to do, I understand that some of you have flights that are ‑‑ that could make it very tight to go. So we are going to try to make these summary sessions as short as possible and then we will immediately go in to the closing ceremony and we will target to close a little bit earlier than the scheduled time. Without further ado I will ‑‑ I would like from Internet Governance for Human Rights and democracy. Instead of that I guess we will jump to network neutrality in Asia. If Byoungil Oh, give us probably a quick summary. Probably spend three to five minutes on each of the sessions.

>> BYOUNGIL OH: I present in Korean. I am sorry. (No English translation). And all IP blocking situation and things and before and after was mentioned. So my point was that the introduction for iPhone had big impact on the Net Neutrality. And how regular have been doing with Net Neutrality was also introduced. So at the end of the day the voices of the users have not been defected.   
 This is a Consensus, we will need to have a preference where we can comment the voices of users. That was my proposal. And the second presenter, when it comes to the uses of Internet you said that are not big problems but the network chapter are increasing, and because of that there should be some mechanism to assess a cure and that information should be devoted to users and that was the point that she said. The next presenter talked about the DPI concept and how DPI are used and what kind of applications are using DPI. But DPI has the potential to undermine the Internet's principles. There was another point. And the DPI is ‑‑ has been using in the ‑‑ he took some examples from other countries and that is emerging interest in Net Neutrality and in China because of the political regions DPI has been used. So Jeremy Malcolm is the presenter, is the representative from the Consumer International and he talked about the rights of consumers in terms of Net Neutrality. Net Neutrality may mean lower prices to consumers in some perspectives but still it has problems. If mobile provide free access to second site including Facebook or other SMS service, was presented as a ‑‑ as one of the discussion points.   
 During the discussion session we talked about the secrecy of communications and the cross between one ISP to another. And lastly October this year we will be holding the IGF meeting at the Global Meeting and Net Neutrality will be on the agenda as well. So probably we need to have some demo from Net Neutrality and that the discussion has already been started to provide our positions about Net Neutrality.

>> EDMON CHUNG: The Consensus around the issue, you put the ‑‑ the session put out a fairly I guess ambitious goal to talk about Net Neutrality and how it may not be relevant anymore because of VoiP because of all the QoS items as well.

>> BYOUNGIL OH: Now in this workshop we did not have a panelist that can represent the position of ISP or the telecommunication carriers. So the debate ‑‑ so it was not fair enough but however so when ‑‑ so Net Neutrality concept was introduced. So we have ‑‑ so we tried to ‑‑ to look at this topic from different perspective, technical point of view and economic point of view of other issues. So it was still meaningful to have this discussion in this Forum.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Internet Governance for Human Rights and democracy.

>> BYOUNGIL OH: It was organized by Jeremy Malcolm and he cornered this workshop and the panelists were Mr. Keith Davidson, Internet New Zealand and Shahzad Ahmad and I was also part of the panel. Professor YJ Park from the university, State University of New York Korea and Mr. Kabani had to join us remotely but couldn't because of the technical problems and we could not get his input to. It is very good session. Discussions on how Internet Governance processes from global to national to regional, all these different discussions happen. So Jeremy started with ‑‑ in with a very comment that Internet is dead. He was referring to one author and then he was telling how quickly the Internet activities have gone from freedom to the position where it has been set as the Internet as we know it is dead. This reflects he said new awareness of how overconfident many of us were in the ability of existing Internet Governance regime at national and international levels. Mr. Keith Davidson spoke next and he had to say that nothing that ‑‑ although there are rights that the Internet places at risk, the Internet also enables us to exercise rights that we wouldn't be able to otherwise such as the right to free expression and communicate ideas which would otherwise be more difficult and costly.   
 Then Shahzad began with the issue of interception of personal conversations by Government agencies because not only in the United States or elsewhere. It is also happens in Korea. And inception of foreign ‑‑ foreigners communication is especially loosely used and he talked about Tunis Agenda and Government's obligations under national governance.   
 My input was mainly from regional perspective, what kind of Human Rights are at risk because of Internet rights, Internet issues and there were some examples not only from Pakistan and Bangladesh and from Asia as well. Professor YJ Park spoke about the need to ensure the participation of Government people at IGF and he mentioned that the organizing Committee of the current Asia Pacific regional IGF have paid equal attention to this with about five representatives from the Government sector present in the workshop room itself and that included Malaysia, United States, Hungary and a few others, but overall she said that Government participation remains low. So as I mentioned that Kabani could not join it.

So the concluding remark is what we can conclude is one of the main themes of the session that emerged is that there is a need to make sure that there is a two‑way exchange between national policy development processes and global multi‑stakeholder for us as well as replicating multi‑stakeholder structures at the national level. And there was also a broad consensus was to encourage and facilitate the participation of local representatives at the global and local IGF and to get the participation of IGFs in countries that don't have them. Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for the comprehensive summary. It is kind of interesting the particular topic but it seems like the discussion was quite well rounded and ‑‑ but is there a driving trend or are we getting there or is this just a hope at this point?

>> Yes, it is ‑‑ yeah. Both kind of discussion and a feeling there in the room, I mean on one side it said that the Internet is dead and there is hope for the future and how we have to engage with this. That is why regularly this focus came out very clearly. It is necessary to feed in to the regional and international processes. And only then if the global processes are there and what is happening on the ground in the countries in different policy spaces can the Internet global processes can be more meaningful. Otherwise I mean because of the very little participation of the Governments in the IGF, in the IG processes that's another cause of concern. So I mean though it is multi‑stakeholder Forum but then very little participation as why Professor YJ Park mentioned. So there needs to be more efforts to bring all different stakeholders together. That was the ‑‑

>> EDMON CHUNG: I just find that an interesting discussion in that I would have thought that at the global level sort of international pressure would bring that type of change better because we are talking about Human Rights and democracy. And I guess how the state is using that to, you know, on the other way because Internet, of course, helps with the development of democracy and Human Rights, but what we are seeing now is state using it to sort of muffle voices. So it is interesting that when you talk about that it needs ‑‑ it still needs to come back from the ground and then up to the global session. Anyway, so thank you for the summary. We now jump to also ‑‑ I guess we will invite Byoungil Oh to give a summary on the other session which is user identity and anonymity in the cyberspace. (No English translation).

>> BYOUNGIL OH: In the user identity and anonymity session Korean ‑‑ a presentation about how Korean administration and in the Chinese market and why do they have economic values in the Chinese market, that was the question we raised. The purpose is to identify the individuals so that has caused the trust of a paradox. Last August strip down the Internet real name system because it will undermine privacy and it is not effective. After the decision is made still a number of systems for IEP identifications. Overall we had the IEP verification requirements from them, and another example is game related apps and it requires IEP identification. And so there are still ‑‑ that requires IEP identification even though Internet system was struck down but things are not so clear. And so this is an example of Korea to be expert to China, that they are trying to adopt a similar law which is a copy of like Korean Internet real name system. The idea of 88 million people are being sold to other countries but the country lacks the legal protection to keep the personal, the privacy or the data. So we are now living in a situation where the anonymity is being impaired. And that may cause physical, real risk and threat to people. And the presenter, example of a real case which happened during the election period. The third presenter was Hana and she talked about the situation, the country received regarding anonymity and Internet anonymity in Japan.   
 In real world the anonymity is being disappeared. And in the intersection of the real world around the virtual world is one of the discussion item and that Japan is trying to introduce the number system for people and he pointed that ‑‑ there is problems regarding the new legislation and in order to protect the personal privacy he presented some reasons, proposals. And lastly, the presenter from the Korean neighbor continues another discussion about the part, that even though the Internet is the main system is gone but still get a lot of mechanisms, legal mechanism that require the IEP verification from users. For example, under the Protection Act users required to present their IEP on line. And another case is the game side and ‑‑ but these mechanisms are not effective. And also it undermines privacy and it also increases the risks. And these are the main points as presented by the neighbor speaker.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. It seems like a fairly reasonable conclusion. It seems like that real name systems does to very much a certain degree undermine privacy. I am curious, I guess one question in terms of the group, what's the feeling about the importance of anonymity versus the real identity? Was there any discussion about different ‑‑ different areas you might need, you know, both of them in different places but is there a trend or you see a general, a feeling about that that particular topic which is what the session was about?

>> BYOUNGIL OH: This is my personal opinion. So the need for the verification of IEP and in which cases do we need that. So in which cases do we have to secure the guaranteed anonymity. We actually do not discuss that issue. But though we discussed the potential problems. So that might happen ‑‑ so that occurs when we, so first of all, impose the real name so these days in the social network sites including Facebook. So we can introduce the mechanism to prove the identity that it can ‑‑ just infringe it privacy and other personal information protection issue. So I hope that in Bali in October we will have further opportunities to discuss this issue further.

>> EDMON CHUNG: And I guess with this I would like to see if anyone that trickled in came from the ‑‑ there were two other sessions that we didn't have a summary from. Privacy in Asia building on APEC privacy principles, I don't know whether Younjung Park may be around or anyone from that session is willing to share a summary. If not I think there is a summary that was submitted to the Secretariat. I know that you can bring up the report quickly. Is that the case? If there is a report that was produced and provided for the two sessions, privacy in Asia building on APEC privacy principles and the other, the last one that we didn't have a representative here, how open data and the Internet are transforming the Government, I wonder if Jay Yoon, Jay Yoon or anyone who was in that session willing to share? If not we can quickly just bring up I guess the ‑‑ first of all, the APEC, the privacy in Asia. I guess that's ‑‑ no. I guess it is privacy ‑‑ it is the ‑‑ this. Yep. This one. So I guess we ‑‑ I will keep it up there. It is probably not the best for me to try to read or summarize it on the fly. It is going to be posted online and everyone can take a look at it. Well, the other session as well ‑‑ ahh that would be very good. Professor Chung.

>> Propose this one. Yes, yes. Quickly. Yes. Jim, as you see in the title, Jim proposed to the IGF in Bali and which was accepted. And he thinks this privacy in Asia is very important now. First of all, I ask him to make a proposal to the IGF and he did. And additionally I ask him all those proposals to the IGF, you should also present it to AP IGF which again he accepted. And he did it. And in a very good style and he invited ‑‑ there was several people from the Microsoft and U.S. Department State and Korea university. And they have a discussion. So this is sort of a preliminary discussion which eventually followed by the IGF in Bali next month. So if you are interested in this area, please do come to Bali. And I guess this is a topic. We had a very good Consensus. We should keep discussing on this topic for the next couple of years, both at IGF and also the APrIGF.

>> EDMON CHUNG: I am just getting some questions now. No, you think that particular conclusion might sound like nothing has happened but it is really the message because things are changing as well and changing fast in the next couple of years. That's very important. So final call, how open data and Internet are transforming the Government. If nobody is willing to share anything I guess I will open the floor to any questions to the previous summaries.

>> Hello. So Milton Miller, Syracuse University. My point is to emphasize how we need more interaction from everyone in the room rather than ‑‑ rather than static repetitions of what went on in the actual sessions. I think the point here is we are going to ‑‑ we need to digest and sort of interact as a community regarding what we heard in those sessions and probably how it all fits together. You know, I think the whole point of the Forum is to have these dialogues. For example, before we started having a conversation with Professor Park about the opening speech by one of the vice ministers and he called my attention to something I never heard in a speech and how it meant and how it translated in to policy. So I would hope as we go in to these summary sessions that we can do more of that where we can get some interaction going with the ‑‑ all of the really smart and experienced people in the room.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for the comment. And I guess as the Moderator I am trying my best to facilitate the conversation. And the summary session is we can't be in multiple places at one time and we get a general sense of what was discussed there.   
 So any further questions? Yes.

>> Since nobody commented on open data, there was two proposals here in APrIGF. And both of them was about ‑‑ submitted to the IGF, too. And so the ‑‑ it is similar to the privacy. This is sort of a continued discussion to Bali. And in the case of the DotAsia we have a couple of major developments. First of all, you see you have a guideline on open data. And also just couple of months, last spring we had a ‑‑ there was a G8 on open data. Seems to be open data is really coming. The APrIGF, I guess we should deal with this issue individually in each country and also we should sort of collaborate how do we position. And, of course, if the APEC can handle it it is even better. But the APrIGF, probably one of the very good Forum for us to discuss and coordinate if possible on open data. So for that one I guess we did a very good job. But the weak point is we just didn't have enough time to merge the proposal in to one. So next year I hope we can have a long coherent workshop both in here and also at the IGF.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. On that topic I am actually following quite closely myself and I guess two of the challenges. One is on the standardization of those data that's provided. So that we can actually use it. But then once you standardize then the privacy concern comes back again. One incident recently in Hong Kong there was Government provided data that people abrogated from different sources and finally came up with a program that allowed people to consolidate information from various sources and created some kind of privacy concern.   
 But with that I am seeing no other hands. There is. That's great. Please.

>> Internet Coalition. Two points. First of all, I would like to endorse Milton's point, that I think more opportunity for kind of Round Table type discussion would be very welcome. I find it slightly ironic that I often think as we move in to the Internet age Governments develop their policies in what I call a linear fashion, topdown fashion, the age of mass communications, television, radio, Government bodies, et cetera, et cetera. And when I attend lots of international fora which are Intergovernmental international fora we hear a lot of repetition and shopping lists, et cetera, et cetera. It is not very conducive to a two‑way debate and discussion. I can see you are trying to accommodate, you are trying to square a circle to some extent. And since that's not possible, I think we should come down on one side or the other and I know which side you would like to come down on I am sure. But that raises a second point which I would like to highlight and it is a point which I raised in the last workshop and that is I told a little story when I first moved to Singapore from Hong Kong and Hong Kong is robust and Singapore is a much more sedate society. The media development authority called a meeting, a closed door meeting with the Internet community to discuss many of these issues. Codes of conduct, privacy, et cetera, et cetera, ethics and I was expecting a very polite meeting. Lots of yes, sirs, no, sirs. On the contrary the Internet community said you are asking us to cooperate with you. Forget it. Last five years you have been trying to control us. We don't believe you anymore. I was frankly taken aback. I thought am I in Singapore. I think it highlights two issues which I would like to throw back to the panel. One is for across a whole range of issues people don't trust Governments. They just don't. And given that obviously that makes it ‑‑ when we are discussing these kinds of issues whether net zone and local Internet companies don't know what the motive of the Government is. And it is very often not because the Government is Machiavelli because the agencies that deal with the Government are not ministry that introduces the rules and regulations that ultimately carry the day and that's certainly been the case in Singapore. But the trust issue is a very, very difficult one to overcome now I think.   
 The other point I would like to make is at that meeting I saw the inter‑Government community pretty much for the first time. They don't seem to have a coherent voice. When the Government calls a meeting like that, then they can turn up and each one of them will say they are in bit but there is no real coherent voice that we can see influence of the Internet community on Government. And there are plenty other influences that are working very hard on Government. So just like to throw those points out and ‑‑ for your consideration.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thanks, John, for the very insightful comments. In fact the last point you made is very relevant for the IGF and the APrIGF, at least my personal view. Because in Korean sometimes locally between Civil Societies of ‑‑ between different groups that these foras allow us to have that conversation and to build our case better as we, you know, discuss with the different stakeholders. I guess as we discuss with Government or as Civil Society discuss with businesses because through IGF and through APrIGF we get to hear other, you know, other Civil Societies and other people from other places who have similar viewpoints to voice out their concerns. And this is kind of a learning and people criticize that there is no decision or any sort of a statement that comes out of these meetings, but at least to understand what other people are doing in their stakeholder group I personally think that it has always provided me a lot of good experience there.   
 And any more questions? If not I encourage everyone to join, I guess Milton and John to join the program Committee and join the discussion to build our next meeting and to make it even more interactive and to build better formats so that we can engage the discussion better. Oh, there is one.

>> We feel that you mentioned citizens, a lack of trust towards Government. I think it is the case towards private sector as well. I am talking about ‑‑ I am talking from the citizen's perspective, the users, citizen's perspective or Human Rights worker, from that angle. We see that ‑‑ and again that you mentioned word control, that's how government have been trying to control them for last five years and then they ask for them ‑‑ ask them for cooperation and again they push them back. So it is ‑‑ it is very complex and very chaotic. We have seen, for example, in Pakistan, even academia just to keep a funded project for totally support, for example, filtering systems and then without realizing and then no real research, publication or intervention on Government policies that what it will impact. I mean it happens in a developed world through think tanks and through research organizations talking about all different angles and aspects of it. No, it doesn't happen unfortunately in less developed worlds. What happens is that policies or laws are passed overnight just to deal with an issue at hand.

I can give you a very recent example from Bangladesh where a Human Rights defender was picked up accusing him of putting something online of Government and it was fake and then next week pass amendment to the law and that amendment now costs him probably major part of his life behind bars. So it can come back to haunt them as well, the people who have passed this law. But again all of these Governments usually have signed on ICPPR and they have signed ‑‑ they are a part of Human Rights Council and they go back and respond and yet aware of their obligations, national obligations, national, regional level. Fine but then what happens on the ground is totally a different story which usually is controlled seeking, which is usually problematic towards citizens.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. And with that I will thank you for that intervention and I will wrap this particular session up. And the next summary session would be, sorry, actually, security. I wasn't sure who ‑‑ you would be ‑‑ okay. So I will pass the mic to them. Please join me in a round of applause to them.   
 (Applause.)

>> Hello. Can I invite ‑‑ under security we have three sessions. The first one is Concerns for Securing Cyberspace of Asia Pacific Region. I would like to invite Mr. Ikkyoon Oh. Hopefully you are here. And the second one is Governance for Internet of kids, teenagers and youngsters, Mr. Imran Ahmad Shah. And the last one is the youth of IGF, I think we will have a representative from the youth IGF to share. I think we are trying to do a youth statement and basically on the discussion about Internet Governance and multi‑stakeholder and determining what is ‑‑ how do you build a sustainable and healthy Internet, do we have a representative from that? Okay. So refreshing to see young people. So please.   
 (Applause.)

>> Please introduce yourself. Please sit down. You can sit next to me if you would like. Okay. That's a microphone. So if it is all right we will reverse the sequence a bit while I wait for my other two speakers. Okay. For those who don't know me my name is Tipp and I am from the Internet Society Asia bureau.

>> Hello. My name is Hatan Hung and or Amy. I am studying Internet development. I am expected to learn how developed countries use Internet Governance in their countries and then I got lots from here by participating in person. Thank you very much.

>> So maybe you can share with us because this is a very unique perspective. All of us are much older to you and the youth group. So there were discussions on access, security, privacy, and in one particular area that you were talking about that had a lot of response from the audience with multi‑stakeholder. And so a lot of people were trying to define what multi‑stakeholder is. Now what do you understand by the meaning of multi‑stakeholder in the context of Internet Governance?

>> Multi‑stakeholder approaches or multi‑stakeholder like discourse, both words throughout this meeting and I think I learned multi‑stakeholder by doing role play discussions. Role play discussions mainly divide in to two meetings. One is Internet meeting and the other is external meeting and an internal meeting is between same stakeholder and then brief stints and brief informations about each stakeholder was actually given by the net ambassador because they had to prepare for this about three or four past months. And virtually I like totally identified myself with my role as a Government officer, especially I represented the chairperson of the Korean Communications Standard Commission. It was a really big name. And then by the name when I was through I was occupied by my role. I had a big challenge. I had to go to an external meeting and I had to represent my viewpoint to other stakeholders who were in different situations. So it was very like challenging. And the first moment, like I need censorship, for national security and later on I realized that if I had been stubborn that much ‑‑ I learned to accommodate others opinions and it was very meaningful and rewarding to me.   
 (Applause.)

>> So you understand that multi‑stakeholder is basically different people from within ‑‑ say, for instance, in Korea you have many actors, right? So there you have the ‑‑ you will think the censorship agency, okay. KISA. Okay. All right. She was a very good commissioner. I remember block. So yes. But there were also others. The other Ministry of Culture and Information and Ministry of Information as well and then you had ‑‑

>> Committee. Election Committee.

>> Yes, the election Committee and you had the users and businesses and the CEO of Facebook and Google. And anyone else? So from that role playing, basically you can understand what multi‑stakeholder is, at least I guess from a field standpoint, meaning if you were in the real world, you would need to actually get many people, different players or actors to come together and basically discuss things. And it is not always smooth.

>> Yes.

>> It is quite frustrating but you have to believe in the system because multi‑stakeholder is about making sure everyone has a voice and, you know, making sure that everyone participates. So did you enjoy yourself?

>> Of course. Yes.   
 (Laughter).

>> So maybe we should have, you know, the youth IGF join the adult discussion as well.

>> Yes. That would be nice.

>> So we can throw some ideas. Because I think that Kilham was saying that the youth is actually not considered at least not part of the multi‑stakeholder, at least identified by certain groups of organizations but I think you are part of that, right? You are part of that stakeholder group.

>> Yes. My voice.

>> Okay. Does the audience want to ask any questions to our youth? Their opinion about something? Yes. Oh, no, no. They were role playing. They were role playing. Okay.

>> Actually I represented Korea Communications Standard Commission. There is like a misunderstanding.

>> She referred to KISA. So just for the record. No, no. I don't know if they do censoring or not. As far as I know officially they are not a censored organization but who knows.

>> Apologies. My sincere apologies. Anyway you had fun?

>> Yes, I had fun.

>> Yes.

>> My name is Hasan. I am from Tokyo. I was invited to be at the role playing just to observe. I found it is pretty useful perhaps to bring ‑‑ the format to be our IGF as well not just to let youth do the role playing. So Milton may play a Government Bureaucrat and some guy will play a noisy Civil Society, and I will be in the business or something like that to trying these positions and try best to develop the argument and see how we can reach the Consensus or how we see the differences. One which is to make a note for kind of debate but other ways is kind of role playing. I think it is quite interesting that we can learn from the youth.   
 (Applause.)

>> Put it on a note somewhere and maybe we can as our committee, why not. Yes. I agree. We should always innovate. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much.

>> All right. Yes, Gunela.

>> I totally agree about the role playing. I participated about 15 years ago in a weekend retreat with looking at telecommunications regulations and all the different stakeholders involved. And my role then was a consumer advocate. And it is very easy to get entrenched in a particular position and just believe that that's the only way. And in the role playing I represented Governments and there were various activities. And it became very clear to me then how difficult it is to balance all the different stakeholders together.

>> Wow.

>> And so I really think that it is a privilege for you to participate as youth. And hopefully we can do that as a whole IGF in some way in the future.   
 (Laughter).

>> Well, perhaps we can do this and okay. I will carry the agenda in to our next meeting when we have them. Any more comments? Okay.

>> Can I make a comment like ‑‑

>> Of course. Please.

>> Because it is like role play is imaginary role. It is not reality. So we are very like generous every time. If somebody asks specific accommodation and then we list it and then we think yeah, it is nice. And then we try to like accept it. There is no like chart, like conflict, must have some gap between reality and like our role playing. But the thing is very interesting. We only ‑‑ we did care about our role in a wider space, not abide by or certain like interest group. We tried to think our own business and other own Government and Civil Society. Kind of essential, fundamentalist like perspective, like harmonize together very easily. Did I answer to your ‑‑   
 (Laughter).

>> ‑‑ question?

>> Yes. Thank you very much.

>> So we need ‑‑ the power of youth they have more energy than we do and more imagination and boundary. Excellent. Maybe we can review for our next Rapporteur. So I need a representative for the governance for Internet of kids, teenagers and youngsters. And Mr. Ahmad Shah is not here and I haven't seen the report either. So I have Cheryl. Cheryl, you attended. So you gave me the notes, right? So I am just going to read what she attended and she basically were able to capture the messaging and the discussion from the session. So basically they were looking at lack ‑‑ the challenges in terms of the lack of interests and awareness of students and kids when they access the Internet. Obviously there are no safety mechanism for Internet users, especially for kids. But one very good example is dotKIDS which is actually a dedicated space for kids where there is more safety in terms of kids accessing, you know, the Web space.   
 So the key message here is that a lot of ‑‑ a lot more things need to be done. The initiatives within the community, the Internet community is not a lot. But we can take the best practice of dotKIDS as a starting point. So that was basically what I got the summary from, Cheryl. Thank you.   
 So that's it. I can't really respond to any question because that isn't my session. But anyway, it is a very important agenda as much as it is about youth. The last session in security is the concerns for securing cyberspace of Asia Pacific region. There were people from KISA and a lot of people from the Korean side because we had a lot of sharing from the Korean experience. Anyone from the ‑‑ even the Cert group was there to share experiences. Were you there at the session? You were? Can you share? Okay.

>> One session ‑‑ I am from the KAIST and I was the Moderator in the security session. On the security, the topic itself is a growing and broad one and very professional, professionalists are required to understand and discuss this issue. Professor Wee from Singapore and KISA Korea and KAIST and the game company and all of the professors from the Beijing university participated in the sessions. It is multi‑stakeholder discussion. Basically the security, something we can reach based on the trust among countries. So they were working jointly to address these other techs. So once that trust is reached among the countries, then the cooperation at the corporate level, across the board is another homework we need to resolve. And then, you know, the cooperative institutions and cooperative corporates across the board they need to secure trust and they need to share the knowledge once again. So that the sheer cooperation can be reached. So at KISA especially in Korea with areas where ‑‑ areas which are very vulnerable to the cybersecurity. So with China cert and JP cert and Israel Cert. With the three players we are actually holding the annual meeting. And in Asia Pacific we suggest as a form of cooperation and at the KAIST the biggest problem is the international violation is malware. So the malware detection, analysis of the malware, the tools for these two purposes are actually developed a lot in Korea. So if necessary, we can actually support a service. We actually support this tool to detect and analyze malware.   
 And also there are security experts in Asia Pacific who can actually continue the exchange of our knowledge and also exchange our tools so that we can be much more well prepared for malware. And lastly the Homeland Security, economy of scale in terms of regulation and usability these were also discussed and Professor Wee from Singapore actually discussed this topic. Time was actually very much limited. So we didn't have any discussion. We actually stick to improve the understanding on each situation.   
 So we reviewed current status and we reviewed our plan. So that was discussion and the presentation we had in the session.   
 (Applause.)

>> Just in terms of cyberspace in Asia Pacific as much as ISOC has been involved at least in being an ‑‑ observing a lot of discussions in this region is that there isn't actually a specific model or a framework in terms of addressing cyberspace and a lot of countries in Asia Pacific are looking at something like that. And it is very interesting to see that there is a Korean ‑‑ Korea is actually pretty advanced in that way. That you actually have a framework, a policy and even you came up with a tool, right, to address this issue. And the interesting part that the SMU professor that I had an interesting message from him is that one side having security is great. But the fact that you are going to have what we call smart cities, basically Internet is going to be just part of your life, that excessive security is going to be a problem because in smart cities everything is run by the Internet. So it is all issues of privacy. So at the end of the day I think looking at the whole ecosystem, the Internet cybersecurity is part of it, but if the goal is to smart cities then we need to think hard about a bigger picture of how we want to address cyberspace. Thank you very much and that was a very interesting session. Yes, too bad we didn't have any discussions at all.   
 Okay. With that we basically completed the security track. Any question to ‑‑ yes.

>> Sorry. This is Yen. Actually I was also in the Government for kids sections and I should have spoken earlier, but actually I just want to add to what Shalee's report back about the section. What I got from this section is another important point is about the collaborations through different sectors and multi‑stakeholders because we believe it is actually ‑‑ is not only for one organization's responsibility, but we have together to really make sure there is enough like dotted line or a code of conduct for different parties that they can be followed and that's one thing.

And the second thing is really about the participation from the youth themselves and also maybe the ‑‑ maybe treating themselves because they were born with the Internet and they may have a very different perspective. So that's why we actually also had another guest from France. They introduce about the French IGF which is also similar to what we are doing here with all these youth IGF in Korea. And so that I guess that's the two other main points that I got from this section. Thank you.

>> Hello. It looks like Internet Governance is expanding. So we have the community and all of us, we are all a part of it. So yes. That's a very good statement. Any more comments, questions for the youth or for cyberspace? Okay. So it will be interesting to get the notes from each of the Moderators and then will probably have a better idea of the entire session. So anyway thank you. And I am not sure who is next, which track. Is it access? Yes. Yes, Pablo. Thank you very much.

>> Adam Peake and I don't know if Romal is here. Oh. So you were all involved in the organization of the different workshops on the access track and I don't know if you could accompany me here to give an interactive summary of the sessions. I also hope that some of you that have participated in these sessions can also help to give your perspectives on how these sessions went and what you are taking home to reflect and I hope it was very valuable. It was definitely for us. I am Pablo. I am from APNIC and indeed access feature that is prominent track in these regional IGF, it has been a most access actually is a theme that has been I think in all IGFs since Athens. There were seven sessions distributed along the three days with diverse topics. And I think there was active participation and very good content.

I was very happy to attend some sessions that were not IPv6 related. That should make understanding APNIC. We see a lot of that and it was good to see some fresh content and topics vary from spectrum sharing. I thought that was a fantastic session. There were a couple of sessions on IPv6 deployment. There was one about monetization and that was a good, good topic and problems in GIGA Net session. And I don't know if someone who attended GIGA Net can join us and if we can do this interactive with the participants that would be great. Something that I found in common with all the sessions was that multi‑stakeholder approach to address important questions is the only model that can guarantee informed decisions and that can guarantee that these positions are taken for the public interest. Even the topics in the access track were very different. That was something very, very present. I don't see anyone from the sharing spectrum and if someone attended that and would like to give your view, please raise your hand. This was a session organized by Jean Foster from the University of Japan. Okay. And he talked about means and ways to use, reuse and segment available spectrums. There were presentations about the TV white spaces in Korea and Japan and databases that track much better how frequencies are used in order for them to be more effectively sort of allocated. And I found something very interesting. The relation of spectrum sharing with Internet Governance because the majority of the devices that are connected to the Internet are being connected wirelessly. So this is a very important issue. And all the panelists agreed to make wireless connectivity cheap enough, you know, to common line. And it is a fact that the most expensive part of offering a service is spectrum. And it is something which supply is limited naturally. And I relate this a lot with IP addresses. IP addresses can grow the spaces as is the case on IPv6 which cannot grow the space on spectrum. Very interesting cross‑cutting issues.   
 I made a comment that these discussion is great for the IGF. And I really hope that it can be taken to the global IGF. It is not a discussion that has a multi‑stakeholder approach to it. It is usually a dialogue between industry player, big industry player, particularly broadcasters and the Government. And it seems with this ideas that was shared by the panelists there is a lot that can be discussed in public spaces such as the IGF. That is the first session that happened on Wednesday. And I don't know, Romal if you would like to give some views on the Internet accessibility in the AP region. I heard it was a very good one. You have a microphone there and if you can help us, that will be great.

>> Yes. Thank you for having me here. This is my first time to attend an APrIGF. And also to make a closing. Very honored to do such. As a summary in the Asia Pacific first we have an estimate ‑‑ no, around 15 Pacific countries and in Asia around 40 plus. So as part of the Pacific we have a common denominator in terms of Internet accessibility. We have an expensive Internet access and our next ‑‑ other challenge is low Internet subscription penetration. We have our own share in our Internet access. We are still starting to run or delegate or re‑delegate our Country Code Top Level Domain and also we are still lobbying for cybercrime bill. In our case we just ‑‑ it occurred to us that our pattern that we are getting is like an obsolete pattern. We are seeking an international organization to help us in such ‑‑ in building our cybercrime bill. And capacity building is also needed for the Pacific countries. As for Asia in which innovation originates, I see it coming from the Pacific perspective, that Asia is like five steps, ten steps ahead of us. So we are behind. But in one region accessibility and making our voice heard as one region is very critical.   
 Accessibility can be a remote place, can be through ‑‑ for Pacific is through sea, body of water. And in some countries villages can be separated by sand, by highlands and such, sea, sand and mountains can be separating us. So what I am trying to drive at this, like at the end of the day we are ‑‑ we need to be one. Internet accessibility is being threatened. We need to have our voice heard as one. One ‑‑ one that I have seen, I have been involved with IT works. One instance that Internet accessibility was threatened was the controversial WCIT vote in which 89 countries out of 190 plus countries voted. So Internet emergence has changed the international telecommunications. So this is where our voice is heard. After this APrIGF then we go for the IGF, national ‑‑ the IGF and then we go in to the proper arena in which we as one make our voice heard. That's it for us.

>> Romal, please if anyone from the audience would like to share their perspectives you should be very welcome to do so. And I heard that there were very interesting cases presented in this session about Laos, Pakistan, Vietnam and also from the CSV perspective Peter Major gave some overview. So I think it was a very rich session.   
 Any comments so far that someone would like to give? We can move to the IPv6 sessions. There were a couple of them. One double track was proposed by Professor Kilnam and I don't know if you would like to share with us sort of your views about how the panel went.

>> KILNAM CHON: Okay. Why IPv6? Here at IGF in particular at the APrIGF now 2013, I mean we had an AP meeting two weeks ago. Not surprised to talk about IPv6. This is a possible IGF. The reason is my opinion, my personal opinion, next 20 years if we don't have a good deployment over IPv6, I guess we have a very inconvenient Internet infrastructure and that which will affect this Internet Governance tremendously. So in order to provide a good critical social infrastructure of the Internet in our next 10, 20 years, I guess we should discuss on this deployment and then why this year? We have about 20 years. 21 years ago we had an IPMG. We used to call the ‑‑ before IPv6 we used to call the IPMG and we are a Working Group of the IETF and also 20 years later may be a good time.   
 And that today IPv6 deployment is somewhere between 1 to 2%. Much less than what we expected. And then from this 1 to 2% we should reach to the tipping point. Tipping point is typically 20, 25%. Once you reach a tipping point then it just go on its own. We don't have to work hard anymore. And from today's 1 to 2% to the 20, 25% it is very critical. And I roughly translate this tipping point as a billion, billion users. Today we have 2.5 billion Internet users. In about five or six years we will have about 5, 6 billion users including human being and the device.   
 And then why in Asia Pacific? We have a couple of those ‑‑ very good ‑‑ there was a case and this may be the area we may lead globally. Because of the area on the Internet led by North America on the investor green in Europe, not too much in Asia Pacific. So the IPv6 may be the area we could take the lead. Then what area in order to reach to the billion? So let's look in to the subarea where we reach to the millions already, like wired broadband. It is a remarkable experiment in Japan led by the entity called the FDTH. And second is a country as a whole the country of China is in a sense leading and then wireless broadband, mobile. And I look in to how do we do it on the mobile area. Then looking to the Smartphone, then I came across with a Samsung which is a Korean company through the Verizon. We pick up those three as a case study. So the ‑‑ now this three‑hour workshops, first we spend an hour and a half on the case study. The first China. About five, six, seven years ago China had more than half the world production of IPv6 service led by service 2, production research and education network. The first network. It was so successful. And by now if you go to the China, 20% of those Internet traffic among the education Committee, university, these are IPv6, 20%. So it is first time we pass the tipping point in a particular area. So if you think naively why don't you expand this to all of China. Then we found out how big is China. You put all those students together, it is about more than a quarter million. A quarter billion. And if you ‑‑ each student has three Internet devices, like a computer and a Smartphone and tablet and then you get 1 billion right there. So in China may be the candidate and there was some project deploying production service among the outsiders' education community. Was very impressive and I hope they can go all the way.   
 And the second is a Japan entity. Probably the first ‑‑ wired broadband service in the world with IPv6 deployment and they are doing pretty good. And I hope Japan to lead the ‑‑ this wired broadband with IPv6 but overall I am not too optimistic compared to this wireless mobile. Then the last presentation is Samsung. I came across this new service, Verizon made a commitment to IPv6 on their production service, not experiment, year and a half ago, June. American company. So why American company making a commitment to the IPv6? Then we checked, and then their partner is Samsung, not Apple or any other company. Samsung is the only one ready where make production service commitment with Verizon.   
 So it was good. So I contact Samsung, why don't you make a presentation, how you did it. And then later we ask okay, okay, you did in USA. And then how are you going to do in Asia, Japan or Korea? And preparation here no commitment yet in Asia Pacific. So those are the picture we are getting. One area we missed almost completely is IoT. How do we connect the device to the Internet? Because within about five, six years we will have 5 billion Internet users human being and then 1 billion machines. And then looking to 20 years from now is more like 100 billion. Almost most of them will be the machine. Human being will be the minority as Internet users. But the area I couldn't find a good speaker, which may be good because that's a good reason to do the similar workshop next year. And probably by then we may be more ready.   
 Now the end of the panel discussion, yes, we spend about ten minutes. I ask each panelist to comment on IoT because each one of them had one or two slides on this IoT, Internet of Things. Then the second part, we did keynote speech, about 45 minutes. Geoff Huston from the APNIC did a remarkable presentation as usual. It is a very good presentation material which you can access from the Website. IPv6 past, present and the future. And he did a very good summary of how did IPv6 start and where we stand now and what's the issue. And after him both from the very beginning, about 1990. So he is a white person and did an excellent presentation. If you didn't participate in that meeting, I do recommend you to go through his presentation material. 96 pages. He did it in 45 minutes.

Then we spend 45 minutes for the discussion. We allocate plenty of time so people can ask questions to each presentation and also we discuss the things in general in IPv6. Who do we go from this million to a billion and how we can take a lead, which area is good. And there are no conclusions yet, but I guess we are not too pessimistic. Since things are taking off, if you look ten years from now, look back to the past, then you may say around this time early part of 2010 is a time we had takeoff of IPv6. So the people, some are optimistic. Let's put it this way, very cautious of the optimism. So the ‑‑ that may be a good reason to have a ‑‑ this workshop again from the perspective of Internet Governance next year at least in APrIGF and possibly at IGF, too, if the IGF community is interested.   
 Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Professor Kilnam. We are pressured on time and I would like to give the floor to Adam. He moderated the session on monetization of virtual goods. I don't know if you can give us a short summary.

>> ADAM PEAKE: Yes. Thank you very much. Adam Peake. It was a session on monetization of virtual goods and thank you very much to Samantha Marks on giving me notes. And I was trying to moderate the session and spent most of the time to get the session working. There are some excellent notes available both produced by the Secretariat and by APNIC and I will just briefly introduce perhaps the goal of the session which is a little bit different. So it is about the monetization of virtual goods, particularly in gaming and these have been important very much in the Asia Pacific region. But the goal of our session is to begin this process of discussing these issues, first of all, at the Asia Pacific regional IGF and take that to the Bali meeting where we have a workshop that expands on the discussion and to try and take recommendation from our workshop in to the World Trade Organization's ministerial meeting which will also be held in Bali in December. And this attempts to satisfy part of the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum which is to identify emerging issues and to bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies in the general public and where appropriate make recommendations. Recommendations are usually not something we associate with the IGF. So we were trying to build a process that began here in the region and went forward to an external body, in this case the WTO.   
 So as I said there is some very, very good notes about this. So let me just go down to the bottom part of this when Pindar Wong, who is the author of this workshop and his suggestion was we should be looking to market forces and the ability of markets to find solutions when there has been a problem of online gambling or addiction through young people and older people like me becoming addicted to the Internet, that we may find market mechanisms. And he spoke particularly about activities that have begun in Hong Kong to launch Internet exchanges which will hopefully support the development of such markets. Hong Kong's goal is to become a net IP Intellectual Property exporter and that is as you can imagine for a trading ‑‑ sorry, a trading nation that has a history of a port and center of trade they are looking for how to expand that in to an Internet age and the trading of virtual goods. I will stop there because we are out of time, but please take a look at the notes and they are comprehensive and more than I can give you anyway. Thank you very much.

>> Two minutes for comments or questions, anyone? Please be very brief. We have to finish in a couple of minutes.

>> I have a question to Kilnam. What's your basis of points about cautious optimism or what are sort of the real issues around IPv6 deployment in essence?

>> KILNAM CHON: We didn't do a good job in the last ten years. So the ‑‑ we shouldn't be too optimistic and why we can be optimistic, two things. One of them is mobile. The Smartphone. Since Smartphone they need IPv6. But we are getting many symptoms including those ‑‑ all those American ‑‑ those subprovider made a commitment. Second is totally different area. Internet of Things, which eventually overtake the human being as a number of Internet users. IPv6 is so natural. So eventually they move to the IPv6. That may not be what we expected originally. So by those two reasons I guess we can be optimistic but we should be cautious.

>> Thank you very much. Shall we then ‑‑ Milt.

>> A question for Adam. First of all, I'd just like to say I really appreciate the way you are going from a regional IGF to the global IGF in to recommendations in to an authoritative international institution. But I didn't quite catch the connection to trade policy in virtual goods. What are the current barriers to trade that you are trying to overcome and what are the recommendations you are making?

>> ADAM PEAKE: Hello. Yes. Good question. And not one that I can answer. I am sorry. It is out of ‑‑ this is one for Pindar and there may be some examples given in the notes but I have been trying to facilitate and learn as you are. No, I am sorry I can't answer. Thanks.

>> Going back in to the notes, there is a document that Samantha put together on the summary of all the tracks from access and from there I can have the risk to try to answer that. Virtual goods did not have national boundaries. So trade has been discussed on an international level as far as the national level. Ikkyoon Oh gave his perspective. It was very interesting. All right. Shall we then leave time for the next ‑‑ is it the closing ceremony? Of course, the multi‑stakeholder track, yes. I lost the contest with Tipp and that's why I have the access track and she has the multi‑stakeholder one.

>> So we are told by the organizers by 4 sharp we need to get out of the stage. So now it is the multi‑stakeholder track and I will be comoderating with my good friend Gunela but ‑‑ so I think this is the largest track with the most sessions. So we have ‑‑ so first of all, I would like to invite the Moderators for the following sessions: Maureen Hilyard, Towards a Better Internet in Pacific. Please come to the front. Younjung Park for ISOC chapters in Asia. Multi‑stakeholder model at work in the APEC region, Dongman Lee and IDN TLD, fostering a better environment, Edmon. And ‑‑ so I will be summarizing the Internet ethics. I don't believe there is ‑‑ the Moderator isn't here.   
 Okay. So let's just get in to it. But before we do I would just like to mention that we have to be brief. But to the point and only good stuff. All right. So Gunela, you will be doing the first two sessions. So get on with it.

>> GUNELA ASTBRINK: Certainly will. Thanks very much, Tipp. We have to finish by 4 o'clock. So we have to move it very quickly. So I will be brief. The first session that I will be talking about is public access. And that was really talking about producing the digital divide and the mechanisms to do that. What skills do the community need to use the Internet. So we are talking about digital literacy and benefits to the public Internet at the community level, what are the national policies that Governments could apply and how could policies be implemented at the local level and community centers and public libraries and roles they play in public access and importantly as well the role of a public sector. That particular panel really did represent the multi‑stakeholder model with representation from all different sectors where it was a very useful session talking about the wide perspective of the viewpoints from the different sectors. Because I have to be brief I will leave it there and ask anyone if you have any further comments to make from that session.

In that case moving very quickly along the next session was about ICANN and stakeholder engagement and we were fortunate to have Fadi Shardi here to speak to us and to listen to us. The key message of ICANN was the importance of regionalization of ICANN with the Singapore office and the expanding presence there. And we had heard from Krik even though he had been in the position for four weeks. And Fadi talked about multi equal stakeholders. So this particular term refers to horizontal or lateral engagement.   
 And also there was discussion about not duplicating but complementing regional activities within the Asia Pacific community. That's my very brief summary. I am very happy to have any comments about that.   
 No. If not, we are going to continue moving along. And we will cover the better Internet in the Pacific. Thank you, Maureen.

>> MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Very, very briefly. One of the things that we wanted to do was to provide some sort of perspective of what is actually happening in the Pacific. And I think that we ‑‑ I mean I did a session on environmental influences and the impact of political will or lack of it within the region. Gunela did a session on People with Disabilities and the importance of emphasizing an inclusion of their needs in to any development and especially in relation to disaster risk management which is a real issue in the Pacific. Anna did a session on local content and ensuring that the Internet is relevant to the users. And that people aren't going to use it if they don't ‑‑ it doesn't mean much to them. I think it all came together with Dan's presentation. What we are doing is we are looking that we need to focus on the landscape. We need to look at what those needs are. So that what we actually provide, what is actually provided for the region is actually what is appropriate and relevant to the needs. We have got 22 different countries and each got their individual needs. So therefore we need to be looking at what is ‑‑ like what is going to be relevant and appropriate to them. So and his presentation looked at, you know, like what's sort of like at different phases and the ‑‑ for us I think that we decided that the Government ‑‑ the governments were definitely ‑‑ were still at raising awareness and education level. They haven't been able to commit to development as such because they just like there is other priorities and stuff. So, you know, we are still working on it. And we need your help. Okay. Thank you.

>> The next one is ISOC chapters in Asia.

>> Unfortunately we have many panelists for that session, like Tipp and Maureen and Gunela. And the reason I organized this session was ‑‑ in Korea we didn't have that much understanding about the ISOC activities and some dynamics and many people think that ISOC is like a Civil Society but it is not really Civil Society. I think that ISOC attends a lot of global international Government meetings like APEC and ITU as very key stakeholders. I think it is good to know like many stakeholders including Governments can pay attention to ISOC and they can be also very collaborative with this ISOC activities. And that was one of the reasons. But those chapters who were invited to this panel was, for example, Australia and PeopleSoft and also Hong Kong and New Zealand. It is very similar to ccTLDs. ISOC chapters have uniqueness of their own chapters. For example, New Zealand doesn't have any chapter but Keith Davidson from InternetNZ has been serving as the ISOC board of trustee from last year. So each chapter has very different perspectives and dimensions and hopefully this can be integrated to the future ISOC Korea process.

And likewise Australia's case they have been deeply involved with IPv6 penetration activities with the chapter and that's the case with the Hong Kong chapter as well. And PeopleSoft they have been actively engaged with APNIC and ICANN. And so this is the reason we wanted to call different chapters in the Asia Pacific region how we can kind of collaborate among the regions. And what's the kind of best model for ISOC chapters in this region. So hopefully we can continue to kind of discuss more like ccTLDs as I said earlier, different chapters have a different history and different membership, different abundance on the structure. So hopefully we can learn from different chapters and also we can participate in this potential Internet Governance debate. If you have any questions about this ISOC chapters and also any of you who participated in this session wanted to add something, you are welcome to do that as well. Yeah.

>> Perfectly said. Nothing to add. Thank you. So we move to the next session, which is the multi‑stakeholder model at work in the AP region.

>> DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let me first briefly share why we actually formed this ‑‑ the session. The original purpose even though the name itself is multi‑stakeholder model in AP region, please let me kind of paraphrase. It is the session for getting to know the current model and how to move it forward if necessary. And also try to find out the ‑‑ what the Government's role is supposed to be and how so far the Government inserts a specific country has been involved in multi‑stakeholder model buildup.   
 So ‑‑ but at the last minute we actually failed to invite the Government representatives in to the session. So we had the panelists for ‑‑ speaking for the ccTLD and also the registration aspect of the multi‑stakeholder model in Korea and Hong Kong. So we have the five excellent speakers, Hiro Hotta from JPRS and Keith Davidson from InternetNZ and Young‑eum Lee from KIGA and Boknam Yun and Charles Mok from Legislative Council of Hong Kong Government. And later Peter Major from CSTD when he had a discussion. The session was divided in to two parts. And the first part was allocated for the panelists to talk about the multi‑stakeholder implementation of each representative, I mean the representing country at the same time the ‑‑ how that the ‑‑ has been evolved in the past. And the second part, Moderator, myself, we asked the three questions to the panelists and also the floor and I am going to talk about it later. And what we found was that New Zealand, Korea, Japan and the ‑‑ actually shared many things in terms of the multi‑stakeholder model implementation and started from the non‑Government side and tried to work with the Government. In some sense some Government has deep involvement, but some other Governments has really standby position. Still the point that whenever there is something comes up, bad thing, and always Government gets involved in and try to get ahold of it. So later in the discussion how we actually resolve that issue is actually the future, the research.   
 The ‑‑ during the discussion session the three questions were asked. Let me try to ‑‑ yeah. Sorry, the ‑‑ I am a little bit getting old. It is hard to read the iPad, small size font. The first question was how balanced do you think Internet Governance stakeholder participation is in your country. Interestingly all the panelists said not well balanced. So still people think, you know, the recurring, the many parts of the Internet stakeholders' participation except New Zealand. New Zealand is well balanced. But the New Zealand Government is bystanding. All other aspect of or the members of the multi‑stakeholders in Internet Governance they did well participating in New Zealand.   
 And the second question is to what extent has Government been involved in the formation of Internet Governance structure. In what level. And does registration ‑‑ hang on ‑‑ support it. And besides Korea there is no specific registration so far being structured. So we have had some ‑‑ the explanation on the Korea case. And the third question was how can we balance the responsibilities and roles around the stakeholder, especially the Government. If skewed, in what way we could turn the direction to a more equilibrium state. The Korea side, the panelists, the Korean information center is supposed to be an independent organization is currently under Government agency subsidiary. So like other, you know, the Asian countries supposed to be independent organization. And the ‑‑ okay. As I mentioned earlier the ‑‑ let me just reiterate, the current issue even though the Government appears not involved but they get involved whenever the issues gets across the government interest. How are we going to resolve that issue. In summary the ‑‑ everyone participating in the session felt it was very informative. And the ‑‑ I think it is beneficial to have a session like this one in the future, the IGF meetings. Thank you.

>> Any questions or comments for the multi‑stakeholder session? We are in a rush but we have allocated time for questions and answers. So please feel free to just comment. Yes, I know. Because at the end of each session we do ask. Edmon, are you ready? It is your turn. You are doing the TLD.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Sure. This is the ‑‑ the session is about universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. The issue we talked about is the problem with different applications and infrastructure that is sometimes shown on IDNs, Internationalized Domain Names because expect the domain name to look like www.something.com, but today we know they could be in Chinese, Japanese character, especially after the last dot we talk about it is no longer dot.com. It could be dothungku. The first session talked about some things that were being done by the industry, especially from an ICANN Working Group which I talked about which is a joint Working Group between the ccNSO and GNSO to provide some recommendations for ICANN to bring this issue forward. We also heard from Giovanni Seppia who had a comprehensive report on the use of IDNs or the lack thereof and the problems that are facing IDN deployment. It was a EURid and UNESCO report that was provided. We heard from APTLD and talked a little bit about the works that APTLD has been working on and then heard from three of the major ones, languages here in Asia, China, Japan and Korea in their representative experiences for IDN ccTLDs. And one of the unfortunate situations however which we did see is it seems like there is a trend of reducing number of registrations of IDNs and that was the case both all including China, Japan and Korea. And in sort of ‑‑ in the discussion we invited Hongbin Zhu and Young‑eum Lee to join us and one of the things that was immediately identified and the reason why it is in part of the multi‑stakeholder track is that we need a wider call and to make sure that the market end users are involved in the process of developing IDN and IDN top level domains. And as I mentioned there is a challenge for developing the use and the value of IDNs and I think there was a mention of search engines, whether they are bad for or in some cases it is SCO, search engine optimization may be good. Interesting discussion there.

And finally one important point is that e‑mails, IDN with e‑mails is still not very well covered and CNIC highlighted work with ISOC at the APEC‑TEL which I think drives towards the key message was to have to go to the market and to the users to develop awareness. One particular point I want to reiterate which I find interesting we talk about IDNs as it is very new and we still find it kind of very new, but if you look back in to history DNS was invented 30 years ago, 1983. IDN was invented 15 years ago which was 1998. So half of the history of DNS we had IDN. So it is not that new anymore. And there is still many challenges ahead and part of the feeling of the group is we need to get the different stakeholders involved. Thank you.

>> Any questions or comments from the floor? All right. We will just digest. That's a very interesting topic. And last but not least is Internet ethics. So I have a short note here. And for those who do ‑‑ did attend the Internet ethics please feel free to contribute. The key message is this is what was captured. Ethics is relative because it is contextual and cultural and based on value and a need to establish some form of Consensus on the Internet ethics. Ethics is not an option but considered as a priority which we all as a community need to be engaged and we need to work on this area. And I know Gunela you have something to add. So I will give you the microphone.

>> GUNELA ASTBRINK: It is really not on Internet ethics but it is following on from that. It is looking at the multi‑stakeholder model. We have heard from various workshop panel organizers and it is clear that the multi‑stakeholder model means different things in different countries and cultures and the model needs to accommodate that. And we heard from Fadi about the multi equal stakeholder model and maybe that's a take‑home message. But within the multi‑stakeholder model there seems to be some gaps. And looking at the global IGF and the Dynamic Coalitions, there is a large number of these but ‑‑ and many of ‑‑ many of those topics have been covered here but the ones that are missing to a larger degree is climate change. We have heard from Maureen but we need ‑‑ we need to have more debate about that. Gender issues, we need to hear more about that. The Internet of Things has been raised a number of times but to have the full workshop about that. And last but not least is accessibility and People with Disabilities and heard from Keith Davidson that we need to look at providing access to the last billion and let's not wait until the last minute to provide that access. So that's just some ideas to take for the future.

>> Any comments? Contributions? Yes.

>> Just a comment on that very last point. I wonder how ‑‑ and I am new to the IGF. So I don't know what the past debates have been in this regard. But how wide are you casting on it? Because it seems ‑‑ I get the impression that just everything under the sun is up for discussion. And I wonder that means you might be losing focus. Maureen, my instinct is that there are a major urgent issues and priorities that should be addressed above all else. I am not saying other issues should be excluded but I wonder how you maintain the focus and kind of the import of the issues.

>> Anything you wish to add to that? Yes.

>> EDMON CHUNG: I guess quickly a couple of things. One is that the organization of the conference is ‑‑ the sessions is based on an open call for proposals for workshops and we in general we have kept it fairly broad. And you are correct, as we move along, this is the fourth year. It is not like it is brand new nor is it very mature. We are growing as a conference, the Asia Pacific regional IGF. I guess others can jump in and add to this. But IGF as a whole has kind of that criticism as well in a way because everything is essentially up for discussion. Over time there has been themes that are being developed and that's the reason why you saw the various tracks, multi‑stakeholder, access, and security and openness and that tries to bring some focus to some of the discussions. In general because I think the nature of the IGF is still to try to be a platform so that emerging issues can come to ‑‑ come to being discussed. The difficulty there is, of course, how we can maintain an open platform but still create the kind of focus that as you mentioned could happen. So that we can get the right people and talk about something in more in‑depth and more substantive fashion. I guess obviously the APrIGF is still learning how to do that. And again I encourage you to participate in the organization of this meeting. And I am guessing the IGF global is also still learning how to do that as well. And I see some nodding heads. I don't know whether others want to chime in as well.

>> I guess I will take back the stage now because I have given a note to end this. But before that I'd just like to maybe also add a comment from Edmon and also it relates back to this track. This is the most important track, the multi‑stakeholder track. This is why we are here. That's why we have APrIGF and virtual connect to the global IGF. It is no wonder that this is the richest track because without multi‑stakeholder a lot of things don't happen. What is interesting from an ISOC perspective that you have TLDs and Internet ethics, we are talking about balance and imbalance of multi‑stakeholders. These are more I guess richer conversations that are beginning to emerge in this region. Internet Governance is still very new in this region. We still need a lot of participation from some of the countries here. We have over 42 countries and economies. Not all of them are here. And I think keeping the door open is always a good thing and we are practicing this multi‑stakeholder model together and we are learning together. So with that I would like to keep ‑‑ I guess we want to keep it creative and open and as multi‑stakeholder as possible. So with that I would like to thank all my Moderators and speakers here and everyone for well, taking the time to listen to our session. Thank you so much.   
 (Applause.)

(Session concluded at 16:12 CEST)
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