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**A brief summary of presentations (If any)**

1. Multi-stakeholder model from ccTLD’s Point of View

- Hiro Hotta(JPRS), Governance Framework of .JP ccTLD Registry

- Keith Davidson(Internet NZ), Multi-stakeholder Model in .nz

- Young-eum Lee(KISA), Internet Governance in Korea, Legislation and the Internet Community

2. Multi-stakeholder model and Laws, Rules & Regulations

- Boknam Yun(Hankyul Lawfirm), Introduction of Korean Internet Governance Law and Proposal by MSHM

- Charles Mok(Legislative Council of Hong Kong SAR Government), Internet governance landscape in HK

**A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:**

The moderator asked three questions to the panelists and the floor:

1. How balanced do you think IG stake holders’ participation is in your country?

* .hk: it’s not ready yet; not much interest among participants
* .nz: well balanced; stakeholders are given a chance to talk with legislators and government
* .jp: not well balanced; operators and ISPs make a final decision though taking voices from consumers; government usually take a distance from it

1. To what extent has government been involved in the formation of internet governance structure? In what level? Does Legislation support it?

* maleysia: gov participation is low; ncmc handles internet policy;
* Laos: ministry gets involved deeply;
* .kr: very much involved
* other countries take some distance from the decision process or at least equal status

1. How can we balance the responsibilities/roles among stakeholders, especially the government? If skewed, in what way we could turn the direction to a more equilibrium state?

* .kr: NIC should be an independent org ;
* .jp: no law for IG; no role of government is yet defined
* The issue is though the gov appears not involved, she gets involved whenever the issue gets across her interest; sometimes too much involvement from the beginning (Europe – YE LEE)
* .hk: not much role in terms of gov since it’s economy, not gov

1. Other things discussed

* whether ccTLD operators have made enough efforts to get close to customers ?
  + IDN ccTLD is a good example which shows that local people’s desire to use local language for internet
  + ISOC (especially technical experts) should take more responsibility
* how to deal with illegal registration?
  + A general rule is that the law enforcement takes an action while complaints are usually passed to registrars;
* sensitive words reservation– how to work with gov?
  + .jp: ministry names and some words (but hidden)
  + .kr: ministry names, national security related nouns, derogatory nouns, etc (but very limited)
  + A general rule is that every country has a different measure

**Conclusion & Further Comments:**

* All the participants felt that the session was very informative and they learnt a lot about internet governance status of AP region
* It would be beneficial if a session like this one is held in future APrIGF meetings.