Report of 2013 APrIGF Seoul

September 2013

It is our great pleasure to inform you that the 4th Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum was held successfully depending very much to your support. There were many people from various countries who participated in lively discussion. We believe that it was the most active APrIGF meeting so far.

The result of the meeting will be reported to the 7th global IGF in Baku in November. However, we would like to take your time to briefly report the outcome of the meeting.

Secretariat of the host committee, IGF Seoul
Korea Internet & Security Agency
Letter from the Chair

On behalf of the Multi-stakeholder Steering Group, I would like to thank all participants for making the 2013 Asia Pacific Regional IGF a successful and productive event. The latest APrIGF demonstrated continuous growth and improvement in terms of both content and participation, reflecting the increasing importance of Internet Governance issues in our region. The MSG worked hard during the year to achieve this; to stage a forum that effectively addressed issues relevant specifically to the Asia Pacific, while ensuring topics, discussions, and insights will be fed into the global IGF process.

Under the overarching theme of the regional event, there were four tracks that aligned well with the main tracks at IGF 2013 in Bali: Multistakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation; Access; Openness; and Security. Each track featured numerous sessions, and each session had representatives from a range of stakeholder groups; all of which guaranteed a wide spectrum of views, and fruitful discussions.

The Multistakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation track featured 7 workshops, which together addressed the status, concerns, and way forward for many important aspects of Internet cooperation within the Asia Pacific community. There was robust dialogue among panelists and participants that addressed questions such as: how ICANN can engage better with the region; what are the needs of developing small island states; what does the multi-stakeholder model mean to individual economies in this region, and the region as a whole; and how do we create a better environment for IDN TLDs?

In the Access track, there were four sessions, including two extended, double-length sessions. The extended session on large-scale IPv6 deployment addressed key technical challenges facing the Internet as its rapid growth cannot be sustained with IPv4. Another IPv6 session was dedicated to sharing national deployment plans within the Asia-Pacifi region. The “Kompu Gacha” session (named after a system of in-app purchases within online gaming platforms) highlighted the monetization of virtual goods across borders, while the “Giga Internet” double session examined in detail national plans for expanded high bandwidth networks in the region.

The Openness track had five sessions that explored the open nature of the Internet, across its multiple levels of infrastructure, content, innovation and utilisation; and the particular implications for users in the Asia Pacific region. Some of the topics which were addressed, such as human rights, open data, and user privacy reflect debates which are currently going on, and which may have great impact on Internet usage and policy in future.

Finally, the Security track had two sessions, including a joint session with the Youth IGF attendees, where the Youth IGF attendees presented a summary of discussions held during a multi-stakeholder role play exercise. These sessions addressed the opportunities and concerns presented by the evolution of the Internet, both to youth itself and to those with special concern for the rights and safety of "kids, teenagers and youngsters" on the Internet.

Contained in the following report are statistics, organizational details, and detailed summaries of each session, which I hope will extend the effect and impact of the Asia Pacific IGF event, by reaching and informing those who were not able to attend, and by contributing to a growing archive of important records of the global IGF process.

Thank you to everyone who contributed to the success of the 2013 Asia Pacific Regional IGF, by attending, contributing and supporting. I do look forward to working with you to produce an even more successful event next year in India.

Paul Wilson,
Chair, APrIGF Program Committee
Multi-Stakeholder Group
< 2013 APrIGF Seoul Result>

- **Participants:** 315 Participants
- **Participating Countries:** 28 Countries
- **Domestic Participants:** 238 (Foreign Participants: 77)
- **Foreign Government Participation:** 8 Countries
  - Invited: Laos, Vietnam, Mongol, Marshall Island
  - Voluntary: USA, Japan, Hungary, Malaysia
- **Theme:**
  Towards a Better Internet: A more Secured, Convenient, Vibrant, Equivalent, and Desirable Internet

* Previous APrIGF Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (Hong-Kong)</th>
<th>2011 (Singapore)</th>
<th>2012 (Tokyo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>June 14-16, 2010</td>
<td>June 16-17, 2011</td>
<td>July 18-20, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>7 Sessions / 24 Countries / 200 Participants</td>
<td>13 Sessions / 21 Countries / 218 Participants</td>
<td>22 Sessions / 28 Countries / 278 Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host</strong></td>
<td>DotASIA</td>
<td>Singapore Internet Research Center</td>
<td>JAIPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Overview

1.1 Overview

- **Date and Time**: September 4 – 6, 2013
- **Venue**: SUNY (State University of New York) Korea
- **Participants**: 315 (77 Oversea, 238 Domestic) from 20 countries
- **Number of Sessions**: 20 Sessions
- **Number of Presenter**: 105
- **Host**: MSIP (Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning)
  KIGA (Korea Internet Governance Alliance)
- **Sponsors**
  - **Platinum Sponsor**: Asia Internet Coalition
  - **Gold Sponsor**: ICANN, NIA (National Information Society Agency), Korail
  - **Silver Sponsor**: IDTC (Incheon Development & Tourism Corporation)
- **Secretariat**: DotAsia
- **Local Secretariat**: KISA (Korea Internet & Security Agency)

1.2 Expected Effect

- Expanding Multi-Stakeholder debate on the Internet Governance by discussing extensive fields of Internet such as Technology, Culture, Policy, Law, and etc.
- Improving recognition of public and private partnership in the Internet Governance field by co-hosting the event with MSIP and KIGA
- Forming friendly partnership with invited foreign government officials to build cooperative system in the ICT related international organization (ICANN, UN, ITU)

1.3 2013 APrIGF Seoul Preparation Progress Timeline

- **November 8, 2012**: Proposed and selected to open 2013 APrIGF Seoul during 7th IGF Meeting (Azerbaijan, Baku)
- **February 11, 2013**: Teaser page for the APrIGF opens, Accepting proposals
- **February 22, 2013**: Presenting promotional presentation of APrIGF during the 62nd APTLD meeting in Singapore
- **April 7-11, 2013**: Distributing promotional postcard of 2013 APrIGF Seoul and opening a promoting session for AP region GAC members during the 46th ICANN Meeting in Beijing
- **May 14-16, 2013**: Distributing promotional postcard of 2013 APrIGF Seoul during the 5th WTPF
meeting
- May 31, 2013: Grand opening of the official homepage and begin pre-registration
- June 14, 2013: Total of 32 Workshop program proposals submitted
- June 30, 2013: Evaluation and selection of workshop program (22 programs)
- July 1, 2013: Begin hotel reservation service (Sheraton Incheon, Songdo Bridge Hotel), and support of documents for the visa issues.
- July 5, 2013: Begin surveying sponsors
- July 13, 2013: Promoting 2013 APrIGF Seoul during the 47th ICANN meeting in Durban.
- July 17, 2013: Begin accepting reservation for SUNY Dormitory (40 Rooms)
- July 31, 2013: Begin accepting application for YIGF Camp
- August 1, 2013: Sending official invitation letters to the government officials (10 Countries)
- August 5, 2013: Deadline for the workshop program update
- August 16, 2013: Begin sending online invitations, producing and distributing posters & online brochures
- August 22, 2013: 2013 APrIGF Seoul Promotion presentation during the 63rd APTLD draft meeting
- August 30, 2013: Deadline for submitting Presentation Material (PPT)
1.4 Local Host Organizing Meeting List

- APrIGF Program Committee Meeting: Feb-Aug, 2013. 15 times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Main Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>February 14</td>
<td>- RFP for Local Host&lt;br&gt;- Operating Principles of MSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>February 24</td>
<td>- APrIGF 2013 Update at AP* retreat meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>- Extension of Deadline for Call for Workshop &amp; Comment on Themes to 18 May 2013 (Sat)&lt;br&gt;Venue, Detail list of Hotel &amp; Transportation&lt;br&gt;- Outreach Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>- Report from Host: Budget, Sponsorship&lt;br&gt;- Timeline review: Pending actions and assignment of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>April 12th</td>
<td>- APrIGF 2013 Update at ICANN Beijing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>- RFP for 2014 Hosts&lt;br&gt;- CFP for Workshop Proposals&lt;br&gt;- OP of MSG Final Comments&lt;br&gt;- Letter of Invitation by PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>- Call For Workshops&lt;br&gt;- Update from Local Host and Secretariat: Logistics, Invitations, Websites&lt;br&gt;- National/Regional IGF Session Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>- Workshop Proposals Review&lt;br&gt;- Update from Local Host: Logistics, Outreach Plan&lt;br&gt;- Regional/National IGF in Bali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>- Extension of Deadline Announcement by Secretariat&lt;br&gt;- Evaluation Sheet of Workshop Proposals&lt;br&gt;- Program Skeleton Spreadsheet by Secretariat&lt;br&gt;- Call for Committee on Coordination of APrIGF inputs /participation in Bali&lt;br&gt;- Program Framework by KISA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>- Workshop Proposals Evaluation &amp; Program&lt;br&gt;- Updates from Local Host: Logistics, Outreach Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Date   | July 5      | - Workshop Proposals Evaluation & Program  
|        |            | - Updates from Local Host : Logistics, Outreach Plan, etc |
| 11th   | July 19    | - Opening/ Closing Plenary Plan  
|        |            | - Workshop Program and Website Update |
| 12th   | August 2   | - Call for Volunteer  
|        |            | - Workshop Program  
|        |            | - Orientation Session Plan |
| 13th   | August 16  | - Program Review & Follow Up  
|        |            | - Update from Local Host : Logistics, Outreach Plan, etc  
|        |            | - APrIGF 2014 Local Host |
| 14th   | August 30  | - Opening, Orientation, Closing, Reception Plan  
|        |            | |
| o      | APrIGF Local Organizing Committee Meeting  
|        | May-Aug, 2013. 9 times |

Member:
Mr. Dong-Man Lee (Chair)
Professor, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)
Mr. Choon-Sik Park
Professor of Information Security Dept., Seoul Women’s Univ.
Mr. Ikkyoon Oh
Cyber Security Reseach Center Senior Research Fellow, KAIST
Mr. Inpyo Hwang
Director of Domain Team, Korea Network Information Center, KISA
Mr. Jaechon Park
Professor, Inha University
Chair, Korea Internet Governance Alliance (KIGA)
Mr. Jae-Chul Sir
Senior Researcher, Korea Internet & Security Agency (KISA)
Ms. Youngeum Lee
Professor, Korea National Open University
Ms. Youn Jung Park
Professor, SUNY Korea
Ms. Jungmin Lee (Secretariat)
Associate Research Fellow of Domain Team, Korea Internet & Security Agency (KISA)
Ms. Boyoung Kim (Secretariat)
Assistant Researcher, Korea Internet & Security Agency (KISA)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Holding Date</th>
<th>Main Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>May 27, 2013</td>
<td>- Venue and Session Room Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accomodation List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transportation Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>June 7, 2013</td>
<td>- Sponsor Booth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Website Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>June 17, 2013</td>
<td>- Hotel Group Rate Reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- List for Outreach Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>July 1, 2013</td>
<td>- Hotel Reservation Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Workshop Proposal Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>July 16, 2013</td>
<td>- Summary Session Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transcript, Translation for all session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Outreach Plan for lower development countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>July 31, 2013</td>
<td>- Workshop Program Merge and Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PR Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>August 3, 2013</td>
<td>- Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- YIGF Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>August 13, 2013</td>
<td>- Orientation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opening / Closing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>August 20, 2013</td>
<td>- Outreach Plan for lower development countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- YIGF Registration extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.5 Program

**Total of 20 Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Small Theater</th>
<th>Room 1</th>
<th>Room 2</th>
<th>Room 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 (Wed) 09:00</td>
<td>Registration / Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>A Multistakeholder Approach to Providing Public Access</td>
<td>Internet Governance for Human Rights and Democracy</td>
<td>Sharing Spectrum: A solution for Asia’s Mobile Bottleneck?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>ICANN Engagement with the Asia Pacific Community</td>
<td>Privacy in Asia: Building on the APEC Privacy Principles</td>
<td>Internet Accessibility in AP Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Reception (Banquet Hall in the Multicomplex)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 (Thu) 09:30</td>
<td>Towards a Better Internet in Pacific</td>
<td>Network Neutrality in the Asia – Current Issues</td>
<td>Large-Scale IPv6 Technology Deployment – From Millions to Billions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>ISOC Chapters in Asia</td>
<td>User Identity and Anonymity in the Cyber Space</td>
<td>Large-Scale IPv6 Technology Deployment – From Millions to Billions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>The Multi-stakeholder Model in the AP Region</td>
<td>How Open Data and the Internet are Transforming the Government</td>
<td>IPv6 Deployment Plan of Government in Asia Pacific Region Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>The Multi-stakeholder Model in the AP Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Issues Arising from the 2012 ‘Kompu Gacha’ Ban of Monetization of Virtual Goods</td>
<td>Concerns for Securing Cyberspace of Asia-Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 (Fri) 09:30</td>
<td>Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs (Fostering Better Environment for IDN TLDs)</td>
<td>Broader World of Network – Giga Internet</td>
<td>Governance for the Internet of Kids, Teenagers and Youngsters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Internet Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Broader World of Network – Giga Internet</td>
<td>Youth Public Session Presentation &amp; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Summary – Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Summary – Access &amp; Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>Summary - MS/EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Venue

- View of SUNY

- Session room map of SUNY
2. Sessions
2.1 September 4, 2013 Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation (Small Theater)

10:30 – 12:00: Opening Ceremony
JaeChon Park
Chair, KIGA
Paul Wilson
General Director, APrIGF/APNIC
Dongman Lee
Chairman, APrIGF
Jong-lok Yoon
Vice Minister II, Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning of the Korea
Ki-joo Lee
President, KISA
Fadi Chehadé
President & CEO, ICANN

14:30-16:00: A Multistakeholder Approach to Providing Public Access
Moderator:
Winston Roberts
Senior Advisor, National and International Relations, National Library of New Zealand
Panelists:
Atarino Helieisar
Chief Law Librarian, Supreme Court, Federated States of Micronesia
Susan Chalmers
Policy Lead, Internet NZ
John Ure
Asia Internet Coalition
Ki Yong Kim
Yoensei University
Valerie Tan
Microsoft
16:30-18:00: ICANN Engagement with the Asia Pacific Community
Panelists:
Fadi Chehadé
President & CEO, ICANN
Kuo Wei-Wu
Board Member, ICANN
Kuek Yu-Chuang
Regional vice-president, Asia Global Stakeholder Engagement, ICANN
Savenace Vocea
Regional vice-president, Australasia/Pacific Islands Global Stakeholder Engagement, ICANN

2.2 September 4, 2013 Openness (Room 142)
14:30-16:00: Internet Governance for Human Rights and Democracy
Panelists:
Keith Davidson
International Director, Internet NZ
Shahzad Ahmad
Bytes for all, Pakistan
Byoungil Oh
Korean Progressive Network Jinbonet, South Korea
YJ Park
SUNY Korea, KIGA
Jeremy Malcolm
Senior Policy Officer, Consumers International
Ashif Kabani (Remote Participant)
Director, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Pakistan

16:30-18:00: Privacy in Asia: Building on the APEC Privacy Principles
Moderator:
Jim Foster
Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University
Panelists:
Hyun-joon Kwon
KISA
Taro Komukai
Executive Director, NTT Infocom
Carolyn Nguyen
Director, Technology Policy Group, Microsoft
Nir Kshetri
Professor, Bryan School of Business and Economics, University of North Carolina
2.3 September 4, 2013 Access (Room146)
14:30-16:00 Sharing Spectrum: A Solution for Asia’s Mobile Bottleneck?
Moderator:
Jim Foster
Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University
Panelists:
Hiroshi Harada
Executive Director, Smart Wireless Laboratory, NICT
Andrew Jun
Department of Spectrum Strategy, Korea Telecom
Yoshihiro Obata
Director, JAIPA
Jeffrey Yan
Director, Technology Policy for Asia, Microsoft

16:30-18:00 Internet Accessibility in AP Region
Moderator:
Ho Woong Lee
Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning of Korea
Speakers:
Phetsamone Xilyvong
Ministry of Post & Telecommunications of Laos
Rommel Natividad
Ministry of Transportation and Communication of Marshall Island
Tran Xuan Dung
Ministry of Communication and Information Technology of Vietnam
Panelists:
Tseveendari Nusgai
Deputy Director, Information, Communications, Technology and Post Authority
Government of Mongolia
John Ure
Asia Internet Coalition
Ashif Kabani (Remote Participant)
Director, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Pakistan
2.4 September 5, 2013 Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation (Small Theater)

9:30 - 11:00 Towards a Better Internet in Pacific
Panelists:
  - Maureen Hilyard
    Board Chair, PICISOC (Cook Islands)
  - Gunela Astbrink
    Director, ISOC of Australia
  - Anonga Tisam
    System Technician, Cook Islands
  - Dan McGarry
    Vanuatu, Maximising ICT, Leveraging technology to support development in the Pacific

11:30 - 13:00 ISOC Chapter in Asia
Moderator:
  - YJ Park
    Professor, SUNY KOREA
Panelists:
  - Keith Davidson
    Chair, Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association
  - Duangthjp Chomprang
    AP manager, ISOC
  - Maureen Hilyard
    Board Chair, PICISOC (Cook Islands)
  - Gunela Astbrink
    Director, ISOC of Australia
  - Charles Mok
    Founding Chairman, ISOC HK.

14:30 - 18:00 The Multistakeholder Model at Work in the AP Region
Moderator:
  - Dongman Lee
    Chairman, APrIGF
Panelists:
  - Hiro Hotta
    Board Member, APTLD, JPRS
  - Keith Davidson
    Chair, Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association
  - Young-eum Lee
    Co-chair, ICANN JIG
  - Boknam Yun
    Board Member, Law Firm Hangyul, Korea
  - Peter Major
    President, Hungary GAC
2.5 September 5, 2013 Openness (Room142)

09:30 - 11:00 Network Neutrality in the Asia –Current Issues

Moderator:
Izumi Aizu
Executive Director, Institute for Hyper Network Society, Japan

Speaker:
Byoungil Oh
Korean Progressive Network Jinbonet, South Korea

Panelists:
Toshiya Jituzumi
Professor, Kyushu University, Economics, Japan
Jeremy Malcolm
Senior Policy Officer, Consumers International

11:30 - 13:00 User Identity and Anonymity in the Cyber Space

Moderator:
Hangwoo Lee
Professor, Chungbuk National University, South Korea

Panelists:
Kyungsin Park
Professor, Korea University Law School, South Korea
Shahzad Ahmad
Bytes for all, Pakistan
Hamada Tadahisa
JCAFE, Japan
Jinkyu Lee
NHN Corp. South Korea

14:30 - 16:00 How Open Data and the Internet are Transforming the Government

Panelists:
Anne Fitzgerald
Professor, QUT Law Faculty, Australia
Tomoaki Watanabe
Glocom Japan
Waltraut Ritter
Hong Kong
Jaehoon Chung
Senior Counsel, Google Korea LLC
Jay Yoon
Project Lead, CC Korea
Terry Parnell (Remote Participant)
Cambodia
2.6 September 5, 2013 Access (Room 146)  
09:30 - 13:00 Large-Scale IPv6 Technology Development – From Millions to Billions  
Case Study Presentation  
Moderator:
Paul Wilson  
APNIC  
Panelists:
Xing Li  
CERNET  
Ichiro Mizukoshi  
NTT  
Soohong Park  
Samsung  
Keynote Speech on IPv6  
Moderator:
Kilnam Chon  
KAIST and Keio University  
Presenter:
Geoff Huston  
APNIC  
Panel Discussion  
Moderator:
Kilnam Chon  
KAIST and Keio University  
Panelists:
Geoff Huston  
APNIC  
Xing Li  
CERNET  
Ichiro Mizukoshi  
NTT  
Soohong Park  
Samsung  
14:30-16:00 IPv6 Development Plan of Government in Asia Pacific Region Countries  
Moderator:
Hyun Kook Kahng  
Professor, Korea University  
Panelists:
Myeong Shik Choi  
Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning  
Akihiro Sugiyama  
Telecommunications Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications  
Kuo Wei-Wu  
Board Member, ICANN
16:30 - 18:00 Trade Issues Arising from the 2012 ‘Kompu Gacha’ Ban of Monetization of Virtual Goods
Moderator:
    Adam Peake
        Senior Researcher, Center of Global Communications
Panelists:
    Jae-Yeon Kim
        Author, Digital Activist, Korea
    Jong-II Kim
        Team Leader, External Relations Deputy. NHN Entertainment Korea
    Kyung-kon Ko
        Senior Vice-President, In-line Business Unit, KT
    Pindar Wong (Remote Participant)
        Chairman, VerFi Limited

2.7 September 5, 2013 Security (Room 231)
16:30 - 18:00 Concerns for Securing Cyberspace of Asia-Pacific Region
Moderator:
    Ikkyoon Oh
        KAIST, KIGA
Panelists:
    Hongsoon Jung
        KISA
    Jaehyung Lee
        KISA
    Valerie Tan
        Microsoft
    Paul Mitchelle
        Microsoft

2.8 September 6 2013 Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation (Small Theater)
09:30-11:00 Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs (Fostering Better Environment for IDN TLDs)
Moderator:
    Edmon Chung
        Chair, ICANN's JIG
Panelists:
    Giovanni Seppia
        Eurid- UNESCO
    Hiro Hotta
        APTLD, JPRS
    Minjung Park
KISA
Hongbin Zhu (Remote Participant)
CNNIC
Kuo Wei-Wu
   Board member, ICANN

11:30-13:00 Internet Ethics
Moderator:
    Yong-Tae Shin
       Professor, Soongsil University
Presenters:
    Myoung-ju Kim
       Professor, Seoul Women’s University
    Jong-Hwa Lee
       Manager, Internet Culture Cooperation Team, KISA
    Gyeong-Tae Kim
       Secretary general, Korea Internet Self-governance Organization
Panelists:
    Yong-Tae Shin
       Professor, Soongsil University
    Min-ha Joung
       NHN
    Izumi Aizu
       Professor, Tama University
    Ma Yan (Remote Participant)
       Professor, Beijing University

14:00-16:00 Summary - Openness
Moderator:
    Edmon Chung
       CEO, DotAsia

14:00-16:00 Summary – Access
Moderator:

14:00-16:00 Summary - Security
Moderator:
    Duangthip Chomprang
       AP manager, ISOC

14:00-16:00 Summary - Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation
Moderator:
    Duangthip Chomprang
       AP manager, ISOC
2.9 September 6 2013 Access (Room146)
09:30-13:00 Broader World of Network – Giga Internet
Moderator:
   Jun Koo Rhee
       Professor, KAIST
Panelists:
   James Larson
       KAIST
   Daniel Ho
       Director, Singapore OpenNet Business Development & Communications
   Hyungjin Park
       Korea KT
   HongIk Kim
       CJHV
   Toshihiro Yoshihara
       NTT
   Gerrit W. Balhman
       Hong Kong Polytechnic University

2.10 September 6 2013 Security (Room 231)
09:30-13:00 Governance for the Internet of Kids, Teenagers and Youngsters
Moderator:
   Imran Ahmad Shah
       Internet Governance Forum of Pakistan
Panelists:
   YJ Park
       Professor, SUNY Korea
   Donghwan Oh
       KISA
   Elaine Chung
       DotAsia
   David Ng
       DotKids
3. Session Reports

3.1 MS/EC: A Multistakeholder Approach to Providing Public Access

Date: 4 September 2013
Time: 2.30-4pm
Track: Multi-stakeholder Enhanced Cooperation/Openness/Security/Access
Workshop Title: A Multi-stakeholder Approach to providing Public Access
Reported by & Contact Email: Winston Roberts (wroberts@caverock.net.nz (personal) or Winston.roberts@dia.govt.nz (work))

Moderators: Winston Roberts (Senior Advisor, National Library of New Zealand; member of the IFLA Regional Standing Committee for Asia-Oceania)

Panelists:
- Ms Susan Chalmers (Policy Lead, Internet New Zealand)
- Assistant Professor Giyeong Kim (Dept. of Library & Information Science, Yonsei University, Seoul)
- Professor John Ure (Executive Director, Asia Internet Coalition)
- Mr Atarino Helieisar (Chief Law Librarian, Supreme Court, Federated States of Micronesia; representing PIALA, the Pacific Islands Association of Libraries, Archives and Musems)
- Ms Valerie Tan (Director of Internet Policy for Asia, Microsoft)

A brief summary of presentations:

Susan Chalmers spoke on:
- The vision for public access to the Internet in the WSIS process
- The importance of public access in developing countries
- Public access in the post-2015 WSIS Framework

Giyeong Kim spoke on:
- Public access to the Internet in Korea

John Ure spoke on:
- Regulatory issues affecting public access to the Internet in the region

Atarino Helieisar spoke on:
- The importance of public access to the Internet in remoter islands of the Pacific
- The challenges facing those providing access in the Pacific

Valerie Tan spoke on:
- How the business sector supports public access to the Internet in developing countries in the Asia-Pacific

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

Susan Chalmers recalled the ‘Principles’ and Action Plan agreed by the 2003 World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), in Geneva. She recalled the Action line C3 referring to access to information, and other wording referring to access to information at community level, through such facilities as community centres, schools, post offices and libraries.

She commented that governments clearly have a role in facilitating such access by the public, as many of the facilities for access are developed with public funding and operated under the responsibility of local government authorities.
She noted that in New Zealand, a lot of work has been done across all government departments to facilitate citizens’ digital interaction with government for routine transactions. The current government has declared that access to government information will become ‘digital by default’ by 2017. To make this digital access ‘by default’ a reality for all sectors of the national community, across the digital divide, it will be important to leverage the existing service infrastructure represented by public libraries.

Giyeong Kim noted that in Korea there were 30+ million Internet users already in 2004; yet there was still a digital divide. The 3 main aspects of the question are a) access (marginalised people’s Internet access level is 93.4% of the general public’s), b) ability to use the Internet, and c) use of the Internet (the level of digital skills and use of marginalised people is about 56% in 2012).

It is recognized that cooperation between government and community is necessary for the development and implementation of programmes to promote digital information literacy.

The Korean Information Act is administered by the Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning; but it is the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism which is responsible for policy for public libraries. Clearly, effective national public access to the Internet through publicly-funded facilities depends to some extent on effective cooperation between different agencies, and policy ‘silos’ may work against this.

John Ure showed a brief Powerpoint presentation on the work of the AIC. (This PPT is available at: http://trpc.biz/asia-pacific-regional-internet-global-forum/.)

Prof. Ure commented on regulatory issues, noting that governments may adopt one of three possible positions:
- They may act (regulate) to maintain the status quo;
- They may be pragmatic and allow the Internet to develop in order to “see what works and what doesn’t work”;
- Or they may be proactive in promoting the development of access to the Internet.

Prof Ure noted that the outcome of the ITU World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) in December 2012 was regrettable: it meant that governments could claim to have an encroaching role in the development of the Internet. This threatens the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs), and the whole multi-stakeholder approach. (In fact Prof Ure quoted with approval the speaker at the Opening Plenary of the APriGF who called the process a ‘multi-EQUAL- stakeholder’ approach.) The not-so-well hidden intention of some governments to claim a greater role implies in fact that they want to be more than equal. Not so much a stakeholder model as a shareholder model in which some shareholders have more shares or preferential shares.

Prof Ure noted that we are moving away from a linear society to an interconnected non-linear society, and governments must adapt to that. Governments should not try to apply off-line regulations that arose from a top-down ‘mass consumption, mass communications’ linear society to the emerging non-linear horizontally- as well as vertically-interconnected society of the Internet. They just won’t work.

In answer to a question on regulatory barriers to public access to the Internet, Prof Ure noted that ‘white space’ in the spectrum was available for use.

Atarino Helieisar noted that in the Pacific island states access to the Internet, and also television, is limited, even with satellites. Public access is subject to geographical factors (great distances) and environmental factors (such as high humidity). On the other hand there is a proliferation of mobile phones.
There are public libraries which serve as community centres, providing Internet access free to those who can’t afford it in their homes. These facilities serve all ages, from school children to senior citizens. Pacific islanders consider public libraries as important, and the Internet as a lifeline.

With respect to support from business for public access to the Internet, Valerie Tan noted that Microsoft had been leading research on cognitive radio technology and the use of TV ‘white spaces’ (TVWS) – this sharing of the spectrum was being trialled by Singapore, and similar discussions are ongoing with Vietnam, Thailand and the Philippines to promote affordable access using TVWS technology. Ms Tan noted that the topic of access itself raised issues around net neutrality which should, from a policy perspective, start with a general prohibition on the blocking of legal content, applications and services.

The panelists agreed that public library services did support the achievement of development goals, through support for education (for school-aged students and older people engaged in life-long learning), and the delivery of health and welfare information. It was also agreed that public libraries had a role to play not only in delivering Internet access but also in promoting the acquisition of the skills to use it – that is the digital literacy required for citizens to function effectively as members of society. This digital literacy was required not only to surf the Internet directly, but also to deal with e-resources for education, and to understand how to handle new technology and software (such as e-readers and e-books).

The moderator noted that in New Zealand high-level discussions were taking place on the developing role of public libraries as ‘community digital hubs’ and how this development might be encouraged and promoted by government at central and local levels, for public policy reasons.

Questions and comments to the panel from members of the audience came from:
- Gunela Astbrink (GSA InfoComm, Australia)
- Dan McGarry (Pacific Institute of Public Policy, Vanuatu)
- Alfred Wu (Singapore Management University)

These comments dealt with practical questions affecting the operation of community centres for access to the Internet in various countries of the region, and the sharing of spectrum (white space). They also discussed the importance of consultation within the community and explaining and advocating to the authorities for public access at community level.

Conclusion & Further Comments:

Just as the workshop was closing, Mr Indriyatno Banyumurti (ID-CONFIG, Indonesia) observed that Indonesia has built “5000 rural telecentres, and not all of them were operating properly”. He asked what the reasons for that might be.

The moderator replied that such a question goes to the heart of the issues being discussed – what public access means, how it should be delivered, who should be responsible for it - but the question should be posed at the start of the discussion, not the end. He recommended to APriIGF that this question should be forwarded to the IGF for further exploration in a workshop at the forthcoming IGF meeting in Bali.
3.2 MS/EC: ICANN Engagement with the Asia Pacific Community

**Date:** 4 September 2013  
**Time:** 1630-1800  
**Track:** Multi-stakeholder Enhanced Cooperation/Openess/Security/Access  
**Workshop Title:** ICANN Engagement with the Asia Pacific community  
**Reported by & Contact Email:** Save Vocea   <save.vocea@icann.org>  
**Moderators:**  
**Panelists:** Fadi Chehadé, Kuo Wei Wu, Yu-Chuang Kuek, Save Vocea

A brief summary of presentations (If any)

1) **ICANN in APAC, The Path Forward.**
   A presentation by Kuek, new VP for Asia on unveiling plans to formulate an Asia Pacific regional engagement plan. This provided an opportunity to discuss with community members present at APriGF proposed timelines to work towards a plan and also to receive comments and feedback on way forward.

2) **ICANN Engagements in the Oceania sub region.**
   Save shared the sub-regions coverage area and various engagements that ICANN staff attend to. Also shared Oceania volunteer community engaged and numbers of SO/AC and fellows currently engaged in in ICANN space. This may not be sufficient engagement and certainly a regional plan to better engage the community may be something to be worked on. Plans now underway to formulate an Oceania sub-regional working group.

   Audience participation was sought to openly comment and discuss these plans by ICANN seeking community input into its AP engagement plans.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

Many views were offered from the floor to help ICANN engage effectively in the region. Key points discussed during the session include:

- Language localisation is an acute need for the diverse region to remove ‘barriers’ for Asian participation. ICANN can leverage on regional organisations (e.g. regional NICs) on language localisation projects.
- ICANN could also leverage on well-established processes/groupings in the region for training and engagement. Need to partner existing regional groupings/forums (APTLD, APNIC, APRICOT, etc) to harmonize training calendars, as well as use them as platforms to discuss issues and feed Asian input into the ICANN PDP process (given that Asians tend to not speak up at meetings).
- ICANN is still not well-understood in the region. In ICANN's communications with the region, ICANN should work on building a simple, ‘no fuss’ message to tell people who they are and what they do.
- There was a suggestion for smaller ICANN meetings in the APAC region. Smaller sessions within the APAC community – rather than an international community where Western participants appear to be more aggressive – would lead to greater participation. This applied for participation of capacity building programmes as well.
- On enhancing government participation, to work with GAC representatives to advocate for increased participation by governments at ICANN meetings.
- As Asia Hub is in listening mode, also do share with stakeholders what ICANN have heard, so that it can be a continuous dialogue to evolve and build our engagement based on
collaborative activities. In this regard, Kuek suggested that he will collate all the inputs, and arrange them thematically to be discussed at a session at the Bali IGF.

Conclusion & Further Comments:

In closing the workshop, Fadi said that to get more people involved in ICANN’s processes, apart from 'broad engagement' (through tools such as ICANN labs), ICANN will work on 'sustainable engagement' by working on building an inclusive; community based engagement model rather than a 'top-down' or 'bottom-up' one.

3.3 MS/EC: Towards a Better Internet in Pacific

Date: 5th September 2013
Time: 9am
Track: Multi-stakeholder Enhanced Cooperation/Openness/Security/Access
Workshop Title: TOWARDS A BETTER INTERNET IN THE PACIFIC
Reported by & Contact Email: Maureen Hilyard, Pacific Chapter of the Internet Society (PICISOC), hilyard@oyster.net.ck
Panelists: Maureen Hilyard (Cook Islands), Anonga Tisam (Cook Islands), Gunela Astbrink (Australia), Dan McGarry (Vanuatu)

A brief summary of presentations

1. Maureen Hilyard – Depopulation and its impact on development on small outer islands. A view of environmental impacts of depopulation and how the internet is helping to bridge the divide between the remaining population which is of the extremes of aged and young, and the diaspora.

2. Anonga Tisam – The Importance of the Internet to maintain language and culture in the Pacific Depopulation in the Pacific also impacts on the diminishing of traditions, language and culture. Anonga provided some data on these impacts and how the internet can be used to maintain the language and culture among the diaspora wherever they may be.

3. Gunela Astbrink – People with disabilities and IT

As the internet develops, it is important that people with disabilities as users of this valuable tool are also considered in the development of websites and other internet application. In the Pacific where there is always the risk of natural disasters, there is also a need to ensure that PWD are included in disaster risk management policies.

4. Dan McGarry – Focus on the landscape, not the architecture

Although internet development is a focus for organisations such as PICISOC, it is important that the needs of users and important governance issues are considered as a prerequisite to infrastructure development and hardware. It is important that governments buy into the importance of internet development but this still requires awareness, understanding and education before we can actually achieve their commitment to development. Those countries who have engaged with IT development across all sectors of society show the most progress within the region.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

Although this was a much smaller group than originally planned, the purpose of the panel was to demonstrate the effect of environmental influences on development, and the important role that government decision makers have on how effectively the internet can be used to enhance connections and opportunities for people on isolated island communities in the Pacific. There are
twenty two countries and territories in the Pacific region so that it is difficult to generalize, but a key factor in the development of the internet in the region is the decision-making that is made at a high level. Pacific governments sometimes lack understanding of the potential of the internet to advance social, educational, economic and other benefits. One of the roles of PICISOC is to raise awareness and contribute towards understanding of the infrastructure and governance issues that are attached to the difficulties of development in a region where large expanses of ocean lie between its twenty-two developing countries and their thousands of sparsely populated outer islands.

Conclusion & Further Comments:
It was a shame that there was not more funding to enable more representation from the Pacific at the APriGF event. It was also a shame that there were not more people at the session to ask questions of the panel but I hope that those who attended got a flavor of the difficulties surrounding the development of the internet in the Pacific region.

3.4 MS/EC: ISOC Chapter in Asia

Date: Sept. 5  
Time: 11:30 ~ 13:00  
Track: Multi-stakeholder Enhanced Cooperation/Openess/Security/Access  
Workshop Title: ISOC Chapters in Asia  
Reported by & Contact Email: Y.J. Park  
Moderators: YJ Park: Professor, SUNY KOREA  
Panelists:  
Keith Davidson: Trustee, The Internet Society ISOC  
Duangthjp Chomprang: AP manager, ISOC  
Maureen Hilyard: Board Chair, PICOSOC (Cook Islands)  
Gunela Astbrink: Director, ISOC of Australia  
Charles Mok: Founding Chairman, ISOC HK.

A brief summary of presentations (If any)

Keith Davidson (InternetNZ), ISOC board of trustee, explained how InternetNZ was initially named ISOC-NZ and was structured with similar objectives to the global ISOC, when it was initially set up in 1995. However, it was difficult to differentiate between InternetNZ and ISOC as organizations, and as a result of such dilemma, the local Internet community in New Zealand has supported the organization and activities undertaken by InternetNZ, and therefore there has not been any emerging desire to establish an ISOC chapter in NewZealand. InternetNZ is a major supporter of ISOC, and is an organizational member.

Duangthjp Chomprang (ISOC) informed the meeting that there are 90 chapters globally and 20 are in the Asia Pacific region, which is the largest concentration of the chapters in the world. Korea was the first one in Asia. With more than 20 years history, ISOC has been working closely with IETF. One of main agenda is IPv6. Because of diversity in Asia, there is no standardized ISOC model. Chapters should pursue multi-stakeholder model that allows more engagement of business, civil society, technical community together with governments.

Maureen Hilyard (PICISOC) highlighted PICISOC includes around 20 countries and 600 members. In 2002, PICISOC became the ISOC chapter in the pacific region. Since it is difficult to meet each other in person, PICISOC is a virtual chapter as well. A lot of PICISOC members have been actively
working in ICANN and in ISOC including the AP regional ISOC director. While funding is the biggest challenge, our activities have been supported by APNIC.

Gunela Astbrink (ISOC AU) presented ISOC AU was founded in 1996. Board of ISOC AU is composed of diverse stakeholder groups. Many organizations also participate in ISOC AU. ISOC AU charges membership fee and ISOC AU also seeks sponsorship from industry. Google has been main sponsor for ISOC AU. Since Australia is a huge nation, regional meetings of ISOC AU is also held. ISOC AU responds to governments’ Internet policy discussion such as IPv6 dialogue. When it comes to international Internet policy debate, ISOC AU has been proactively engaged with such policy debates.

Charles Mok (ISOC HK) placed high emphasis on the fact that ISOC HK is the most active ISOC Chapter in Asia. ISOC HK started back in 2003. ISOC HK has been organizing many workshops related with Internet policy issues especially IPv6. ISOC HK has held IPv6 summit every year working closely with global companies. ISOC HK started to promote entrepreneurship with universities reaching out middle and high school students. ISOC HK also works with media to spread its message to young generation.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

This session was designed by Y.J. Park to compare ISOC chapters in Asia Pacific. This panel tried to discuss “what work with the chapters and what do not work with the chapters” in this region. One of the main challenges of, especially, the newly set up ISOC chapters in the region seems to be to identify its clear vision and goals compared with existing Internet related institutions. So, panelists were asked to answer to “How would you differentiate ISOC chapter from other interest groups who may have similar goals?”

Conclusion & Further Comments:

In conclusion, ISOC chapters in the Asia Pacific region are very diverse like ccTLD institutions. Some ISOC chapters collaborate with governments like ISOC AU and ISOC HK in terms of Internet policy making process while some ISOC chapters have no connections with governments. Some chapters including ISOC AU and ISOC HK charge membership fees and seek sponsorship from industry while some chapters depend on government funding like ISOC Korea (in the process of getting recognition).

This panel reminded that many people in the Internet community have little knowledge on how ISOC chapters have been operated and managed. This panel was initially originated by KIGA/ISOC Korea’s struggle of how to differentiate its own functions and goals while these two institutions share many commonalities. This panel has offered in-depth understanding of how ISOC chapters in Asia Pacific have been contributing to Internet policy making process in their community. It would be great to see more panels on ISOC activities in the future Asia Pacific regional IGFs.

3.5 MS/EC: The Multistakeholder Model at Work in the AP Region

Date: 09/05/13
Time: 2:30p – 4:00p & 4:30p – 6:00p
Track: Multi-stakeholder Enhanced Cooperation/Openness/Security/Access
Workshop Title: Multi-stakeholder model in AP region
Reported by & Contact Email: Dongman Lee (dlee@cs.kaist.ac.kr)
Moderators: Dongman Lee
Panelists:
Hiro Hotta (JPRS)
Keith Davidson (Internet NZ)
Young-Eum Lee (KIGA)
Boknam Youn (Hankyul Lawfirm)
Charles Mok (Legislative council of Hong Kong SAR Government)
Peter Major (CSTD)

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 (KIGA), 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 stakeholders’ 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

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

3. 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
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 APtriGF meetings.

3.6 MS/EC: Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs (Fostering Better Environment for IDN TLDs)

Edmon: What does universal acceptance means? There some issues where many applications of various components are not working properly. If we use dropbox, it’s not updates frequently enough. And the domain names are being used in search results. Are they going to be able to accept IDN TLDs results? And the hardcodes are rarely updated in IDN TLDs. So we have to update them manually and it makes harder for the use of IDN TLDs. And with topdown domain, it is composed of more than 4 letters, so making harder to encode. These issues were arousing since long time ago, and new IDN TLDs has introduced 2010, but still problems are shown. So there are some Recommendations made by SSAC too. One of them is TLD verification code but the distribution is also another problem.
We are now working on the number of common issues and universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. Another recommendation is to use IDN guideline of ICANN. There’s registrar that offers IDN top level domain but it says its malformed. So Acceptance of IDN TLDs has still problem so registrars should work on their systems to solve it. We also need the trust from the consumers and this is the most important part. Third is to get supportive materials for new IDN TLDs. We have to make reliable
material for better application. Fourth is to urge ICANN to put some effort into beyond a been producing materials and producing code. Ask ICANN to be more proactive on this. We are working on with ICANN. And this will become more important issues in our future.

**Giovanni:** “As the internet has spread across the globe, the absence of support for non latin scripts became a notable deficiency”. He hopes IDNs are really used and to what extent they are used. Internet is not sufficiently multilingual.

The first thing is the adoption of IDNs, the usage of IDN and some factors that impact current uptake. It took quite long time to make is adopted, it is still important issue. How does the uptake of IDN registrations relate to the expectation? However, the expectation is decreasing. So it means IDN TLD is not going along with our expectation. End user has quite low awareness on the registry view. Since demand of IDN is not so high, we need more cooperation between each other. There are more than 100 IDN app in the new GTLD round. Chinese, Arabic, Japanese are the most.

IDN usage: 95 percentage of registries will have implemented IDNs they have implemented IDNs to cover the local lang. .eu IDN analyzes that there is strong link between local language and geographic location.

.eu IDN drop is due to that there is low end-use awareness of IDNs. Variable user experience of IDNs in browsers, email and app. Correlation domain name growth and economic growth also affect. And registrar price promotions and short term marketing campaigns.

Country indicators such as linguistic and cultural homogeneity also affect the IDN acceptance. And price also works as the indicator. There is insufficient support for IDNs by ISPs and domain name registrars.

- Education at end user level and the dialogue and cooperation among internet business players are and will remain the key elements to ensure the uptake of IDNs

- Supporting IDNs is one step to transform the Internet into a truly multilingual tool

**Hotta:** would like to update on the APTLD. Its Asia pacific top level domain association for ccTLD operators in the AP region. They are promoting and participate in the development of best practices for ccTLD registries for the benefits of its members and the internet. They will achieve objectives through consensus, coordination and collaboration between various cultural differences.

APTLD engagement in global IDN policy development, we need fast track IDN launching for the global internet. For example in the fast track, non latin, latin IDNs are not allowed. But in latin strea, they are allowed as TLD. And lack of such IDN aware application prohibits our use of IDN TLDs or IDN.cc. And difference in layers among applications such as, it may hinder the usage of IDN. And the typing method, IDN is very difficult to the process, and this hinders also.

**Park:** Introduces the history of KISA that it merges in with 3 diff orgs. It is gov’t affiliated institute so enhance quality of network and security, and to support international cooperation.

- Intro of .hanguk:
  - Since it is an IDN domain name, it needs at least one char and 17 max, more than 1 hanguel should be included
  - Registration trend is being increasing that has about 1.2million domain names.
  - Due to the renewal, there was sharp decrease.
Usage rate for dot hanguk is about 50% so probably have healthier environment.

Most of the complaints are from mobile so working to address on this.

- Efforts to improving usage of hanguk
- Meetings with global companies and domestic sites ad manufacturers to improve.
- Most of PC browsers updated app.
- Holding campaign to promote

Hiro - Acceptance of IDN in Japan. There are around 1.3 million domain names. It has been reduced, then new usage developed, then there was waiting for new value then new values are found these days. Explains IDN ccTLD decision process. For successful application, they first have to consult with the community. Domain name registrants and internet users, then JP registrars gather, then domain name advisory committee by diff communities decide. Only registrant of .jp can register the same domain label under .日本. It is provided as value added service of .jp. So far users perception seems to be just another notation of .jp. And technical preparation is being pursued by .jp registry.

Hongbin - Internet development of china, it has been very fast. Regarding the domain name market, right now China has total of 13.4 million domain names, including 7.51 dot “cn. However, china is diverse country; differences apply to diff regions and user groups.

Chinese language content and the international domain name should be major factor for Chinese users; non-barrier access after 20 years of improvements, china has vibrant Chinese online industry. Instant messaging ins most popular. Huge community is part of it. Chinese’s internet users are predicted to overtake number of internet users to dominate using English by 2015.

For IDN issue, responding to huge Chinese use marker, domain name work on promoting its universal acceptance. Development is still going on and working closely with other communities too. Registration number of 中國 is gradually decreasing since domain server is not resolvable and the app provide struggles too. There was slight increase for ASCII, still, its decreasing.

Chinese variants have the same pronunciation and meaning as its official form. Chinese users regard them as interchangeable. CNNIC experiences with 中國 shows over 10% of DNS queries are for variant form. Universal acceptance has always taken great effort for utilization of chines domain names in development app. Currently 90% of mainstream PC browsers in China are compatible with .中國. But chinese IDN domain names are still not widely used.

Q: Kuowei: IDN is quite new. We need to bring up the fact and choose to be careful when promote IDN. Actually not a lot of app are not ready and need time for providers to develop. We need the community trust, and the trusted data is what our consumer needs. Using own country character is easier than using English since there are fewer strokes. And the user who do not use special language char would not be able to see it and consider as a spam. So would be limited to specific language group because they want to use their own local lang.

Young Eum Lee:
- global cooperation: multistaskholder model should be applied in this situation of adopting the IDN globally
local aspect: Since IDN services are not as popular as we first expect, we need to emphasize the fact that IDN should be adopted since it would be more convenient for the local market. It is more of a value issue of preserving the culture.

Dongman Lee: domain name means not enough. Also including the converging code into the browser, it took few years. He would like to have support on email services, etc. He would also like to propose mail service providers to support IDN capability into their mail services.

3.7 MS/EC: Internet Ethics

Date: 2013.9.6
Time: 11:30 ~ 13:00
Track: Multi-stakeholder
Workshop Title: Internet Ethics
Reported by & Contact Email: Min-ji Sohn (mjsohn@kisa.or.kr)
Moderators: Yong-Tae Shin, Professor of Soongsil University, president of Korea Society of Internet Ethics
Panelists:
- Prof. Myuhng-Joo KIM, South Korea,
  Senior Vice-President of Korea Society of Internet Ethics(KSIE)
- Mr. Gyeong-Tae KIM, South Korea,
  Secretary General of Korea Internet Self-governance Organization(KISO)
- Mr. Jong-Hwa LEE, South Korea,
  Manager of Internet Culture Cooperation Team of Korea Internet & Security Agency(KISA)
- Min-Ha Joung, NHN, Korea
- Izumi Aizu, Professor of Tama University, Japan
- Jinghong Xu, China, Professor of Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications

<Why Internet Ethics ?>
- Anonymity and invisibility is another issue arouse through internet. People can hide their identity from others in communication. So abusive words and comments, weak sense of responsibility and lack of common courtesy are some ethical issues related.
- Amazing speed is also a problem since we can spread anything quickly over the internet. This can lead to cyber-crime&terror and bullying.
- Easy way to get rich: people have more change to get rich thru internet by falsely using data, info, and knowledge, content. However, it can lead hacking(site, company, personal info), threat with DoS&DDoS, APT attack), addiction to internet, game, cartoon, pornography etc.
- Infinite cloning: data leakage without notice, infringement of copyright, the right to be forgotten.
- Ethics is what we consider between human. However, internet ethics, we deal with human with virtual world. Hence it covers more than the original concept of ethics.
- So in internet world, all subjects are wider and broader in terms of consideration.
- We have to consider golden rule here: do to others what you would have them do to you
- Responsibility, respect, autonomy, justice, non-maleficence are five elements as basic principle of internet responsibility
- Internet world is a new ecosystem. So we need to deal with internet environment and if we do not address now, our generations will suffer.

< Internet Self-regulation of KISO & ISPs >
- 7 Internet portal service providers established Self-regulation organization, KISO in March of 2009. KISO works for freedom of expression, and ISP’s social responsibility arise.
- KISO mainly carries out policy making, online-Ad deliberation, and real estate information clean, etc. KOSO’s policies are about temporary blocking, autocomplete search, suicide prevention. Moreover KISO runs a 24 hour report center for infringement of one’s rights and campaign to arouse internet users’ awareness for better internet.
  Partnership with Seoul metropolitan gov’t, they respond to sexual harassment issues and case on victimization. Filtering system for database of pornography with major portal corporations will be provided, and this system will be open for small and medium enterprises for self-regulation activities.

< Activities again internet side-effects in Korea >
Activities for better internet
  - Abusive comments, Rumor diffusion : education and campaign
  - Illegal harmful contents, Infringement on a right : contents classification system

Organization is trying the principles of internet ethics education according to customized system by age specific education. They also made Korea Internet Dream Star consist of teenagers and educate them to be good leaders of the Internet world, and later to become a good mentor in this field. Furthermore, they are having PR or promotion activities to Internet ethics. This is divided into experience and participation types. Likewise many forms of efforts are made to give awareness on Internet ethics to the public.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:
We have considered how much it will help to discuss these issues for the current environment of digital world. And it is necessary to share and get considerable agreement of the situation how serious bad side-effects.

Conclusion & Further Comments:
It is hard to make a certain conclusion in this session, because internet ethics issues are different from countries. However it is significant to think internet ethics issues internationally and it is recommended to discuss this issue steadily.

3.8 Openness: Internet Governance for Human Rights and Democracy

Date: 4 September 2013
Time: 2:30–4:00pm
Track: Openess
Workshop Title: Internet governance for human rights and democracy
A brief summary of presentations (If any)

Jeremy Malcolm spoke about how quickly the Internet communities have gone from rallying behind the banner of Internet freedom last year at WCIT, to the position where it has been said "the Internet as we know it is dead". This reflects, he said, a new awareness of how overconfident many of us were in the ability of the existing Internet governance regime, at national or global levels, to channel public interest concerns expressed by Internet user communities into policy processes. Unfortunately the international human rights framework does not have the machinery to prevent the infringement of rights ex ante. The only way to do that is to have civil society human rights defenders participating in the development of policies that will affect Internet users worldwide. To this end, a civil society coalition has developed recommendations for the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation which can be found at http://bestbits.net/ec.

Keith Davidson spoke next, noting 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 freely express and communicate ideas, which would otherwise be more difficult and costly. Moreover the rights that are infringed over the Internet aren't uniquely challenged by the Internet, but would also be challenged using older technologies such as telephony also. Keith also pointed out that if a Web company is infringing your rights (for example your privacy), you can easily avoid it by choosing a different company. On the other hand he acknowledged that national laws are being influenced by lobbyists (for example in the area of copyright), so he suggested consumers of the Internet will need to become lobbyists ourselves. Trying to do so at the global level will be difficult – we already have some global treaties, but it's clear that those commitments are not always upheld. Therefore usually our efforts will be focussed at home. It is difficult to think of any new global mechanisms that would be effective, as this would require them to be enforceable and have broad international commitment.

Byoungil began with the issue of interception of personal conversations by government agencies, which occurs not only in the United States but in Korea. Interception of foreigners' communications is especially loosely regulated. Stronger regulation of interception is needed to protect the rights of individuals, and failure to control this will push each country to strengthen its own ability to intercept communications, in a race to the bottom. In doing this, there is a need to expand participation of civil society according to the Tunis Agenda. Despite the enhanced cooperation mandate, new treaties and laws are still being developed behind closed doors. There is a difficulty in dealing with human rights issues in an Internet governance context is that many of these issues are dealt with in a trade context, or as IP issues which are reserved to WIPO. We have to define the most important issues and the right places to discuss those issues, and to ensure that this takes place in a human rights framework. In Korea, public awareness of multi-stakeholderism is very weak, and it is also challenged around the world. Although the basic principles were declared at WSIS, many countries opposed the idea. Most governments don't clearly understand this and don't have an agency to handle it. Consensus needs to be established to apply this concept to their public policies.

Shahzad Ahmad gave some other examples of the infringement of human rights in Internet laws from around the region. He noted that blasphemy laws are often misused to control Internet usage in Pakistan. Another example in the new ICT Act in Bangladesh, which arose in the context of a blogger accused of false reporting on a political issue, who can now be imprisoned for between 7 and 14
years. Similarly in Malaysia, there were accusations of interference by ISPs or by the regulator with political expression, during the recent national election. The overall problems is that such issues at the national level don't feed into and are not informed by the global policy debates. For Muslim countries in particular, the OIC (Organisation of Islamic Countries) is not engaging at all with the IGF. In conclusion whilst the Internet is not dead, it will be a huge effort to keep the Internet as free as it was before. But these are real issues affecting people on the ground, and these larger issues must be discussed in appropriate venues such as the ITU, IGF and ICANN.

YJ Park spoke about the need to ensure the participation of government people at the IGF. The organising committee of the current APrIGF have paid particular attention to this, with about five representatives from the government sector present in the workshop room, including Malaysia, the United States and Hungary. But overall, government participation remains low. Extending Shahzad's examples, there have been human rights infringements in Korea also, with allegations of the Korean equivalent of the CIA (NIA) manipulating the last election. There has been government regulation of Korea's version of Google, called Naver, which could influence public opinion on political issues. Attempts to regulate the private sector have sown distrust amongst stakeholders. Such distrust is not only an issue for Korea, though. There is certainly a gap between what happens at the national level, and the best practices discussed at the global level. In Prof Park's view, multi-stakeholderism is only implemented well at ICANN, but has yet to be well reflected in other global Internet governance institutions such as the ITU, despite steps towards this at the CSTD. Can we guarantee that this approach will be taken in other platforms?

Asif Kabani was unable to present due to technical problems, but his presentation slides were made available, and included a reference to the Pakistan government's blocking of YouTube, and its recent decision to reverse this ban.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

During question time, the first intervention was from Keith Davidson who reacted to YJ Park's last assertion that ICANN is the only global example of multi-stakeholderism. He stated that the IETF is another good example, and that ICANN, in contrast, has a very narrow mandate. Milton Mueller, followed by Jeremy Malcolm, reacted in turn to that, stating that the IETF does not have a stakeholder model but a personal representation model, and has acknowledged that is has real problems with inclusiveness. Prof Mueller criticised ISOC's usage of the term "the" multi-stakeholder model, as if there were only one such model represented by the processes of the Internet technical community, and which is in contra-distinction to the government model. Keith rebutted again, stating that although the IETF does welcome individuals, many IETF participants do advocate for organisational opinions there.

Afida, a government representative from Malaysia, responded to a point in Shahzad's presentation, stating that Malaysia monitored the election to ensure free communication, without overstepping the boundaries of acceptable discourse. In this case, the people didn't cross the boundaries. But users in Malaysia are not ready for completely free speech online, due to sensitivities that may cause a national issue. As an example, Internet users of a particular race posted a photograph during Ramadan that was offensive to Muslims, and which led to violence. However in response to a question from Jeremy Malcolm, she agreed that Malaysia can increase its transparency about how content and communications are regulated online. Shahzad responded by denying that blocking would promote peace and harmony, and stating that it would inevitably be a political act.

Byoungil said that we Korea is managing ICANN issues well enough, but on other issues there is not enough consultation and policy makers mainly refer to practices in another countries. EU and UN recommendations at the regional and global level also have influence in Korea. Sometimes, however, the policies and practices that are adopted from one country into another were not developed in a multi-stakeholder process to begin with, and therefore are deficient in their observance of human rights. An example is the "real name system" in Korea, which requires Internet
users to give their real identities to use local online portals or games – this is a poor practice that has since migrated from Korea to China. As a way of ensuring that such bad practices do not become entrenched, there should be a Korean IGF.

Conclusion & Further Comments:

One of the main themes of the session that emerged was that there is a need to make sure that there is a two-way exchange between national policy development processes and global multi-stakeholder fora, as well as replicating multi-stakeholder structures at the national level. There was also a broad consensus that one of the ways to link the national to the global level would be to encourage and facilitate the participation of local representatives at the global and regional IGFs, as well as to seed the development of national IGFs in countries that do not have them.

3.9 Openness: Privacy in Asia: Building on the APEC Privacy Principles

Date: September 4, 2013
Time: 1630-1800
Track: Openness
Workshop Title: Privacy in Asia: Beyond the APEC CBPR
Reported by & Contact Email: Jim Foster, jfoster@sfc.keio.ac.jp
Moderators: Jim Foster
Panelists: Taro Komukai, Executive Director, Infocom
Hyun-Joon Kwon, Korea Internet Security Agency
Nir Kshetri, Professor, University of North Carolina
Carolyn Nguyen, Director, Technology Policy Group Microsoft

A brief summary of presentations (If any)
Panelist presented on the following topics:
1) Recent Developments in Japanese Privacy Policy (Komukai)
2) Privacy Policy in Korea and APEC Cross-Border Privacy Rules (Kwon)
3) Developments on Privacy Policy in the US, EU and China (Kshetri)
4) Creating a Sustainable Global Data Ecosystem (Nguyen)

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:
Presentations offered a snapshot of varying approaches in the region and globally to the issue of privacy. At one pole is the top down approach favored by the EU, which is seeking to develop a comprehensive legal framework enforced by a privacy commission designed to protect the privacy rights of EU citizens both within Europe and globally.

On the other side is the US, which favor a more market-based approach based on industry-developed standards but with enforcement powers given to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).
Within Asia, Korea may have the most comprehensive legal framework for privacy, but in the enforcement area it is closer to the US model of leaving enforcement to an independent agency (in Korea’s case, the Korea Communications Commission) that takes into account market factors as well as consumer rights in protecting privacy.

Japan is still struggling to develop a policy consensus on the approach it should take. Currently enforcement of privacy is left to the discretion of each ministry. Compliance is strong, but enforcement uneven. An advisory commission will report out a series of recommendations by the year end.
Finally, China is beginning to assemble a legal framework to regular privacy with respect to commercial transactions, but there are significant gaps and there are concerns about arbitrary and inconsistent enforcement. Nonetheless, China’s growing reach in the Asian Internet Economy makes developments here quite important.

At the regional level, APEC is making strides to implement a set of common rules for cross-border data transfers based on the APEC privacy principles – but the lack of common definitions and enforcement mechanisms leaves APEC nations at a disadvantage in trying to negotiate a “safe harbor” arrangement with EU regulators.

However, even as new regulatory frameworks are emerging, there are new questions as to how privacy should be defined and regulated especially with the advent of an era of Big Data and the Internet of Things. For example, one principle underlying current privacy regulatory approaches is “consent.” Yet how is “consent” to be obtained when disparate data most often gathered “passively” (think of roadside surveillance cameras) is then correlated to produce unexpected and novel connects that are of value to business and society?

**Conclusion & Further Comments:**

There has been a lot written and discussed about the challenges of privacy on the Internet. But a key conclusion from the panel is that we need more research and discussion – particularly in Asia where government are moving quite quickly in response to perceived consumer and business needs to develop new sets of regulation. There is a danger that we end up with a patchwork of regulation in the region that leaves consumers actually less secure and slows business innovation. These problems could be exacerbated by the new challenges from the advent of Big Data and the Internet of Things that are transforming the connection between the individual consumer and data.

We plan to further pursue this discussion in a panel that we are organizing for Bali that will take as its departure point the discussion and issues highlighted above.

### 3.10 Openness: Network Neutrality in the Asia –Current Issues

**Date:** 5 September 2013  
**Time:** 9:30-11:00 am  
**Track:** Openness  
**Workshop Title:** Network Neutrality in the Asia – Current Issues  
**Reported by & Contact Email:**  
**Moderators:** Izumi Aizu, Executive Director, Institute for HyperNetwork Society  
**Panelists:**  
Byoungil Oh, Korean Progressive Network Jinbonet  
Toshiya Jitsuzumi, Professor, Kyushu University, Economics, Japan  
Milton L. Mueller, Professor, Syracuse University School of Information Studies  
Jeremy Malcolm, Senior Policy Officer, Consumers International

**A brief summary of presentations (If any)**
Byoungil Oh – Network Neutrality in South Korea  
He introduced the debates between network neutrality advocates and telecommunication incumbents by giving mVoIP throttling case in S. Korea, and presented human rights, economic and regulative aspects of network neutrality. And then, he briefed the regulative situation in S.Korea and argued users’ cooperation would be very important for their voice to be heard.
Toshiya Jitsuzumi - Network Neutrality in Japan
He started with conclusion that ‘there is no problem’ in Japan as of now though ISP imposes restriction on internet usage under special circumstances. However, as the internet traffic in Japan is increasing rapidly, quality of network services is getting worse. To solve the problem with minimum government intervention, he suggested independent QoS evaluator & ISP sommelier for customer education.

Milton L. Mueller - Putting control into the network - A comparison of Deep Packet Inspection Technology Use in Canada, the US and China
He presented what is DPI and for what it’s applied, and pointed out that DPI would have tension or conflict with fundamental principles of internet governance and raised the question whether deployment of DPI would transform IG. From his research on DPI use for bandwidth management in different regulatory environment, he found network neutrality norms was reaffirmed despite of disruptive change in Internet regulation in USA and Canada, but nothing changed in China due to political consideration.

Jeremy Malcolm - Hard cases in Net Neutrality
He, first, briefed consumer rights, especially in regards to network neutrality, the right to be informed and to choose, and then raised question when network neutrality costs the consumer more, can we still be in favor of network neutrality, by giving examples where mobile providers give free access to certain contents or services. Whether it’s good or bad for consumer would be different depending on how it is done.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

The first topic discussed is why switching ISP is so hard for users? There is correlation between ISP competition and NN. One of the obstacles when people consider to change the ISP in Japan is his/her email address, because most e-commerce sites didn’t accept free email addresses like Gmail or hotmail in the former days, so people had to use the email provided by ISP and could not change it. This is quite similar to the situation when mobile number portability (MNP) was not available. Before the introduction of MNP, the switching cost in the mobile phone market was so high that most people could not afford to change his/her career. In the US, main problem is that there exists limited number of ISPs, so not much choice for users. Long term contract and bunding are another barriers.

Next discussion topic was communication secret and DPI. During his cast study of DPI, Milton Mueller found that people got surprised when they discovered what has been done in DPI. Although all DPI applications don’t violate the law, it violates people’s expectation of privacy. Byoungil raised question that throttling of mVoIP could be a violation of communication secret act, because communications are usually made between two part, so consent on throttling of only one part would not be sufficient if the other side don’t consent on throttling. DPI usually don’t recognize user identity, but it has a power which could be misused, so prior consent of users would be very important. Jeremy briefed Best Bits activity about revelation on NSA surveillance. According to Jitsuzumi, situation in Japan is unclear, because government didn’t say anything about DPI yet, except that secrecy of communication must be respected.

Next, we discussed about relationship between ISP and certain contents providers. In some developing countries, wikipedia has agreement with telco providers to provide content free of charge. Adam Peake raised the issue that mobile providers partnered with particular search engine in some developing countries. Jeremy answered that adopting default search engine is not necessarily NN issues, but may be a competition issue depending on how easy to change the default. In Korea, there isn’t such cases that ISP had special contract with certain content providers. Milton Mueller pointed out that it’s the matter of ISP competition. Jitsuzumi told that we need to separate between human rights issues and competition issues. As long as basic service is guaranteed, market could solve the problem.
Conclusion & Further Comments:

Jeremy told that network neutrality coalition has been formed and is discussing model framework on NN. This issue will be discussed further in IGF Bali.

3.11 Openness: User Identity and Anonymity in the Cyber Space

Date: 5 September 2013  
Time: 11:30-13:00  
Track: Openness  
Workshop Title: User Identity and Anonymity in the Cyber Space  
Reported by & Contact Email:  
Moderators: Hangwoo Lee, a Professor at Chungbuk National University  
Panelists:  
Kyungsin Park, a Professor at Korea University Law School, South Korea  
Shahzad Ahmad, Bytes for all, Pakistan  
Hamada Tadahisa, JCAFE, Japan  
Jinkyu Lee, NHN Corp. South Korea

A brief summary of presentations (If any)

Kyungsin Park raised a matter of ‘paradox of trust’ by giving real name system in S. Korea, where the identification number that used to identify user’s identity in the anonymous cyber space, became to have so much values to hackers as to threaten user’s privacy. And then, he explained on what grounds internet real name system had been decided as unconstitutional by the constitutional court last year, and worried about, regardless of the decision, the system still continued to work because of other laws which forced user identification.

Shahzad Ahmad also criticized the situation in Pakistan where huge databases of citizens had been sold to other countries, but peoples had no means to protect their privacy, and then gave some examples of how non-anonymity could threaten people’s life.

Hamada Tadahisa - Anonymity in the cyberspace in Japan
He explained how we were losing our anonymity in real space, cyberspace, and both space, and criticized the problem of common number law and secret protection bill which had been newly adopted in Japan. Lastly, he proposed several recommendations for protecting privacy.

Jinkyu Lee presented, in line with Kyungsin park’s presentation, how internet real name system had been applied, even after the decision of its unconstitutionality, in regards to internet payment system, age verification and online game, and then criticized the problem of the system in the aspect of its effectiveness, privacy violation and security weakness.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

A participant raised the issue of telemarketing by the telecom, how is it possible and how could we respond to it. Kyungsin Park answered that if telecoms would share user’s personal information for telemarketing, it could be illegal, so User’s voice and action including legal suit would be needed.

It was not only the matter of mobile telecommunication providers, but millions of phone numbers were being collected from the internet and sold. Government should regulate it. But people should speak up for that. Consumer rights movement would be needed to protect our privacy.

Regards to internet real name system in S. Korea, Kyungsin park pointed out that the system misled
policymakers into preferring ID verification, so be transmitted to other policy areas and to other nations.

Another participant raised the problem of PRISM revealed by Snowden. This issue is not presented or discussed in this workshop because it’s not directly related to the subject of this workshop. However, government surveillance would be related to user identity or anonymity in that it’s very important for the government to identify who is the target of surveillance.

**Conclusion & Further Comments:**

User’s movement is very important to preserve the right to anonymity. PRISM issue should be discussed in-depth in the future forums.

### 3.12 How Open Data and the Internet are Transforming the Government

(This summary is written by secretariat)

**Date:** 5 September 2013  
**Time:** 14:30~16:00  
**Track:** Openness  
**Workshop Title:** How open date and the Internet are transforming the government  
**Moderators:** Waltraut Ritter  
**Panelists:**  
Jay Yoon, TH Schee, Alfred, Anne Fitzgerald(remote)

**Waltraut**

Open government data and Internet as a catalyst for transparency.  
Open data is public sector information which is shared with the public digitally in way that promotes analysis and reuse.  
Open data can be freely used. Public information which is raw, free, open, standard can be used by machines and people.  
PSI should be more open and can create value.  
In Korea in 2008, there’s OECD international meeting on the future of the internet economy. OECD has produced guidelines policy principles more in detail.

**Jay Yoon**

Title: Open government data and civic engagement in Korea  
The way to enact legislation and enhance effectiveness is important.  
There is a law called act on provision and promotion of the use of public data. (enforcement of date: 10/31/2013)  
According to Gov3.0, the government now emphasizes the open data.  
Bridge the government sector, public sector and civic sector is always an issue.  
‘Sharing city Seoul declaration’: it aims a city that share times, spaces and information to connect government organizations and enterprise institutions.  
For open government data project, feedback from people is needed.

**TH Schee**

Open Data in Taiwan (How open data is changing government)  
There are certain grey lines be whether you have open data portals of just public portals where you can grab the data but not use for public use.  
Demand of open data government identifies all the stakeholders as many as possible.  
Everything is reproduced in software. The government was forced to bring all the public servant to the filed to talk with young people, entrepreneurs or even NGOs.
Open data eco-system (mid 2013)
Taiwan is a great example where you can see open data development driven by the community. And it shows us that demand is really organized by the community and then changes the government.

(Alfred, iCity lab in SMU, Singapore)
What is the status of the open data development in Singapore. But it is not moving as fast as Korea or Taiwan.
To make a balance act for sustainable growth among people, economy and government public resources is important.
Intelligent people living in a smart city are coming by technology which can provide better life.
Value of open data
Role of open data in urban environment
Up Singapore is like participation of Singapore government, developer activities.
In Singapore it is mentioned that government is focusing on services, and this e-government is so strong to citizens.

Q&A
Q.(Carlyon, Microsoft) Open data and big data surely seems to be a kind of new trend in Asia-Pacific Region. How do we merge these two and make a progress?
A.(Th) We have a different platform and open data to the public. For example, National health insurance system is the big data.
A.(Waltraut) In smart cities, there are many intersection of open data and big data. Having smart data programs is possible and they will come together in the future.
A.(Alfred) Data that matters because what we see open data as the data that actually is like owned by the government.
That just comes from different angel but not really from the tech perspective.
A.(Jay) In terms of approach, there are slight differences between them. Character of big data is volume. But Open government is different. It includes many topics like transparency, public interests and economy.
A.(Hamada, Japan) Japan government has not open data but it is in progress.
(Waltraut)
There are many interesting cases in Cambodia.
(Anne, Australia)
The fact that open comments licenses can effectively be used to support and give an effect to government open data polices. What we can see is that this way of open, flexible licensing is giving a bit to the principle.
Q.(Waltraut) Case studies in Australia are published and available for other countries as well?
A.(Anne) Yes. It’s available through web site.
Q.(Waltrau) CC means Creative Common. What is happening in Korea with the copyright of public data?
A.(Jay) Central government is just offering data not copyright things in Korea like EU. There’s new version of CC.

3.13 Access: Sharing Spectrum: A Solution for Asia’s Mobile Bottleneck?

Date: September 4, 2013
Time: 1430-1600
Track: Access
Workshop Title: Sharing Spectrum: A Solution for Asia’s Mobile Bottleneck?
Reported by & Contact Email: Jim Foster; jfoster@sfc.keio.ac.jp
Moderators: Jim Foster, Keio University
Panelists: Hiroshi Harada, Smart Wireless Laboratory, NICT  
Andrew Jun, VP, Spectrum Policy, Korea Telecom  
Jeffrey Yan, Director, Technology Policy, Microsoft Singapore

A brief summary of presentations (If any)
In their opening remarks, each panelist was asked to summarize research, commercial and policy developments regarding the use of white space in their respective jurisdictions (Japan, Korea and Singapore). Reference was also made to developments in the US, where the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has used a variety of policy instruments to promote unlicensed use of white space and more efficient and economically rational use of spectrum.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:
Definitions of white space are not completely uniform. The most common understanding is spectrum made available through the “digital dividend” i.e. the transition from analog to digital broadcasting, which has opened up areas of spectrum formerly reserved for television. But increasingly there is an appreciation (and the technology to support it) that white space might include any “open channels” in heretofore assigned frequencies as long as issues related to interference and quality of service can be managed. Both government and commercial research groups in Japan, Korea and Singapore are actively exploring the opportunities opened up by this to expand Internet services in rural areas, off-load mobile traffic, expand the availability of Wi-Fi and provide a variety of novel services.

These developments have technological and commercial significance, but they also may raise interesting issues related to the management of spectrum and indeed to Internet governance. Spectrum has traditionally been thought of as a valuable and limited resource and as such has been regulated by governments and licensed to users on an exclusive and purpose-designated basis. Yet new technologies that map actual spectrum use both in terms of location and time may open the door to use of the same spectrum by multiple users for multiple purposes. This is a challenge to the role of traditional telecoms and broadcasters that currently hold large amounts of commercially valuable spectrum and to the traditional preeminence of government in managing spectrum as a key national resource. And it opens the door to a discussion of how we might move from spectrum “allocation” to spectrum “sharing” as well as how we might expand the range of “stakeholders” using both licensed and unlicensed spectrum to offer and consume a range of services quite beyond telephony and broadcasting.

White space usage schemes and the technology that support it are still in the realm of the experimental. But as Asian populations increasingly move on line, the ability to manage and use spectrum effectively will be key to economic growth. This will be particularly true in rural and economically depressed areas where affordable connections to the Internet are still not widely available.

Conclusion & Further Comments:
There is quite a bit of research and growing business interest in the concept of “sharing spectrum.” But there also needs to be a parallel discussion of the policy and regulatory requirements for “spectrum sharing.” Over time, this could result in a veritable “sea change” in government thinking and management of spectrum. Indeed, spectrum management has been the starting point for much of the government role in the ICT sector. Changes here could boost competition and promote new innovation. A crucial next is for standards bodies to work on harmonizing technical approaches to mapping and accessing white space and other unlicensed frequencies across the region and globally so that devices and services based on white space can operate seamlessly in multiple markets.
3.14 Access: Internet Accessibility in AP Region

Date: 09/04/13
Time: 16:30-18:00
Track: Access
Moderator: Ho Woonog Lee, Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning, Korea
Panelist: Phetsamone Xilyvong, Ministry of Post & Telecommunications of Laos
Rommel Natividad, Ministry of Transportation and Communication, Marshall Islands
Tran Xuan Dung, Ministry of Communication and Information Technology of Vietnam
Asif Kabani
Peter Major, UN CSTD

As Internet Access is becoming one of the pivotal issues in the development agenda in ICT sector, this session was prepared as a forum for sharing the current status and practices in each country and improving cooperation among governments in Asia Pacific countries. Ho Woong Lee gave a presentation on the role of government in the success of Korea's ICT and Internet development and current policy situation. He attributed the success of ICT and Internet development in Korea public-private partnerships, with heavy investment from the government and incentives for private investment since the 1980s. This also helped to bridge the digital divide between urban and rural populations. The government also works in partnership with other Asia Pacific economies in joint research, policy consultation, and training initiatives, including contributions to the ITU. He noted that part of the Korean infrastructure policy is to restrict the illegal collection of personal information from online users. This has all served to promote broadband use and competition, lowering barriers to market entrants and boosting demand for services and infrastructure. He concluded that policy makers should have a long-term perspective on broadband policy.

Phetsamone Xilyvong presented on Internet access in Laos. The Ministry of Communication of Laos was established in 2007, and then the government changed hands in 2011, leading to department shuffles. The Communications Ministry has many departments, including LANIC, the Laos National Internet Center, which is a carrier neutral non-profit organization and government agency. There are six ISPs in Laos, with 40% of the market share at Lao Telecom (LTC), established in 1996. Some of the other ISPs are private, and some are partnered with ISPs in other countries including Russia and Vietnam. There are 5.4 million mobile subscribers in Laos, and Internet penetration is about 5% (600,000 users).

He mentioned that the security threats and concerns on their radar is the same as anywhere, and they are particularly aware of spreading malware through email. There is currently no policy to address cyber crime, and there are few security and ICT experts in the country. There are some laws currently being drafted through the Ministry of Public Security based on international standards and best practices.

Tran Xuan Dung discussed the current policy situation in Vietnam and gave an overview of the situation in Vietnam, which has been connected to the Internet since 1997 with cable ADSL with coaxial cable, fiber optic, wireless, and mobile. There are free public access areas in major centers; however out of 90 million, about 70% of the population lives in rural areas.

The policy surrounding Internet legislation is a reformed version of the Press Law, which was reformed in 2002 to encompass the Internet. The changes aim to address pornography, abuse such as data theft and network attacks, copyright infringement and so on. The government also intends to monitor Internet user activity, while raising subscriber rates to 6-8% for fixed connections and 20-25% for mobile subscribers; to increase household access to 35-40%, and overall users to 55-60%. They aim to achieve this through partnerships with VNNIC and NTT; also to build a national IPv6 test network.

Rommel Natividad gave an overview on the Marshall Islands situation as a small island developing state. There is one telecom provider, MINTA. Fiber optics have been available through Guam since 2010, and the outer islands communicate by HF radio. There are 29 telecenters; each center costs
USD 30,000 to set up. The challenge is to find a way to make infrastructure development sustainable. Currently the connections are primarily 64kbps, and there is ADSL in Majuro but it's very expensive; there is a 2G broadband network, and that infrastructure is also very costly to upgrade. In 2010, MOTC and MINTA signed an MoU for all ICT initiatives, and in 2013 MINTA regained the .mh domain. Other projects include ICT related work in partnership with APT, ITU, discussions of establishing an ISOC MH chapter, and a cyber crime bill.

John Ure gave an analysis of the emerging policies in the region that he viewed as problematic, saying that approaches to law in "linear and non-linear" (or hierarchical) society are different. He said that laws that applied to society before the Internet will not work for the Internet era, because they will serve to undermine the role of the Internet; this approach will also limit foreign trade and investment when international companies will be restricted where their national laws are in conflict. He used Vietnam as an example.

Asif Kabani gave a brief overview on the status of Internet development in Pakistan, as there were some remote participation difficulties. Internet penetration in Pakistan is currently 16% with 120 million mobile users (70%) and 10% of those are smart phones. This is very high considering the average annual household income is less than USD 3,000.

He noted the challenge posed by censorship, citing the 2012 national URL filtering system that blocks social networking sites; a total of 4,000 URLs. This poses a significant challenge for educational institutions and news channels that rely on YouTube. The government is apparently preparing to lift the ban. He suggested the solution would come through multilateral discussions about freedom of expression and privacy and consumer rights in Pakistan, working with trade partners to address these issues and develop infrastructure while preventing Internet misuse. Pakistan would work closely with MSIP (Korea), and learn from experiences of others in the AP region.

Peter Major from UN CSTD talked about how these concerns were currently being addressed in the CSTD WG.

### 3.15 Access: Large-Scale IPv6 Technology Deployment – From Millions to Billions

- **Date:** 09/05/13
- **Time:** 9:30-13:00
- **Track:** Access
- **Moderator:** Kilnam Chon
- **Panelist:**
  - Xing Li, CERNET
  - Ichiro Mizuguchi, NTT
  - Dr. Byoun-Joon Lee, Samsung
  - Geoff Huston, APNIC
- **Second panel moderator:** Paul Wilson, APNIC

This workshop consisted of three presentations, one keynote speech, and a panel discussion session. The aim of the workshop was to learn about large scale IPv6 deployment in Asia, review the current IPv6 deployment status, and discuss how we can further increase momentum on IPv6 deployment in the Asia Pacific region. Xing Li presented the CERNET2 IPv6 deployment story, and challenges that China’s three major telecom operators are facing while deploying IPv6. Ichiro Mizuguchi shared IPv6 deployment in NTT Flets networks, challenges experienced, and some technical recommendations while deploying IPv6. Dr. Byoun-Joon Lee presented IPv6 readiness of Samsung mobile devices, and the most recent IPv6 transition technologies, 464XLAT, which is gaining attention from mobile network operators.
Geoff Huston provided an overview of the current IPv6 deployment status by comparing historical data of IPv6 deployment statistics. Mr. Huston concluded IPv6 deployment is not happening everywhere, nor all at once, however; he emphasized that we have started to observe some economies taking the lead such as the US, Japan, Germany, and Singapore, as well as some individual networks such as AT&T, Comcast, KDDI, Chubu Telecommunications, Mobileone and so forth, referring to data provided by labs.apnic.net. Mr. Huston pointed out positive impact of two World IPv6 Launch efforts toward recent increase of IPv6 deployment.

Paul Wilson chaired the final panel session with the above listed all speakers to explore possible measures to support further deployment IPv6 with a robust exchange of opinions among speakers and audience participants. Participants shared the view on the importance of continuous collaboration between the public and private sectors. Participants also noted a need to encourage mobile network operators to make a conscious decision in preparation of their networks for LTE by considering IPv6 deployment. Paul Wilson concluded the session by emphasizing importance to maintain open and transparent Internet with deployment of IPv6.

3.16 Access: IPv6 Deployment Plan of Government in Asia Pacific Region Countries

Date: 09/05/13
Time: 14:30-16:00
Track: Access
Moderator: Dr. Hyun-Kook Kahng, Korea University
Panelist : Hyun-cheol Jeong, KISA
Akihiro Sugiyama, MIC
Kuo-Wei Wu, NEIPA
Miwa Fujii, APNIC

This workshop was designed to exchange information on IPv6 deployment current status and future plan of government in the Asia Pacific region. The Korea Internet & Security Agency (KISA) Korea, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Communications (MIC) Japan and Ministry of Transportation and Communications (MTC) Taiwan have all provided significant support on IPv6 deployment by coordinating various types of partnership activities undertaken by the public and private sectors. These activities include holding an IPv6 study group, developing IPv6 transition national plan, enabling IPv6 in government networks, raise awareness among decision makers of governments and industry, providing IPv6 skill up trainings, monitoring IPv6 deployment status, and so forth. Both Mr. Sugiyama and Mr. Jaong emphasized the need to increase attention to IPv6 securities while pursuing IPv6 deployment.

Mr. Wu pointed out that making investment decisions on IPv6 is a serious commitment and governments need to make wise and effective decisions on funding allocations. Mr. Wu suggested that we need to carefully choose our messages to decision makers so we do not lose our credibility on issues related to IPv6. Ms. Fujii mentioned the level of IPv6 awareness among governments in the AP region is very high, and there is a lot of anecdotal evidence of governments’ proactive engagement with industry. Ms. Fujii suggested effective government support would not necessarily require huge funding, and that lower cost activities such studying the impact of Carrier Grade NAT (CGN) and sharing common understanding among decision makers of governments and industry will help industry to make informed decisions while transiting to IPv6.

During the discussion session, Geoff Huston pointed out from the audience that government has important role to maintain the openness of the Internet and competitiveness of Internet industry. Mr. Huston said that openness of the Internet and industry could be maintained through regulatory intervention.

Date: 09/05/13
Time: 16:30-18:00
Track: Access
Moderator: Adam Peake, GLOCOM, International University of Japan
Panelist:
- Jae Yeon Kim, Author, Digital Activist, and Researcher
  - Kim, Jong Il, NHN Entertainment
  - Jay Yoon, Seoul Northern District Court; Creative Commons Korea Association
  - Kyung-kon Ko, KT
  - Pindar Wong, VeriFi Limited Hong Kong

Jae Yeon Kim began by saying the online gaming industry has played an important role in the growth of the Internet and commerce in general, and he briefly outlined the virtual economy and why mobile gaming has been such a successful market. There have been negative aspects, such as gaming addiction and difficult areas to tackle, such as gambling regulation.

He then went on to explain the Kompu Gacha controversy in brief, asking if there be a compromise on virtual sovereignty among stakeholders and adding that the users should be given priority. The reality is that item trading is legal in Korea, but illegal in many Terms of Use of game developers. The discrepancy causes instability in the virtual economy.

Jay Yeon gave a legal perspective on the matter of partial monetization, or Real Money Trade on in-game items, saying it’s a difficult set of issues, including addiction, gambling regulation, virtual crime, and the nature of trade – the most ambiguous of all of them. There are gambling regulations in place, including the banning of exchanging “game money” for real money. RMT in gaming poses the question of virtual goods and how to place value on them, which is a potential stability issue. Jay remarked that banning these services in to some extent is a common approach. He noted people are sensitive to the effects of online gaming, and there is a need for some sort of control mechanism, but not a ban, admitting it’s a tricky area because it affects companies’ business models.

Jong Il Kim talked further about the legality of these transactions, opening with a figure: 20 billion USD is now traded online, giving rise to large corporate intermediaries. He expressed concerns about the trend of gaming regulation in Korea, having followed the parallel developments in China and Japan, because the regulations penalize users.

He gave an overview of the structure of game money transaction, giving advantages and disadvantages. The regulations against monetary transactions for online games exist in Korea, Japan, and China. He argued a society that is conducive to “free transaction” should have as few regulations on transactions where they aren’t necessary, especially those based on social and ethical issues. He argues there are more constructive ways to tackle these issues, without excessive regulations that penalize users, such as the Notice and Take Down alternative scheme he offered.

Kyung-kon Ko’s perspective, as a representative of a telecom, was that these issues are business model challenges. In the past, voice call was the main revenue, but that has changed. He said KT Capex has increased after some stagnation, due to investing in increased bandwidth for online services. He noted that virtual goods do not have national boundaries, so this area of trade should be discussed on an international level as well as national. KT is proposing joint ventures with telecoms in other countries to provide distribution platforms for virtual goods and social applications.

A question was posed from the audience: as the intermediary can be sued for infringement, in this instance, how would the NTD mechanism function without citing a right that has been violated? What is the liability here? Jong Il answered that the image of game companies can be tainted, and the trading activity liabilities do fall on them and not the users conducting the activities, which can be an incentive for them to mitigate risk. Jay replied there is no incentive for the user to take any notice, but Jong Il noticed there could be incentives built in.

When Pindar joined remotely, his question for the panel was, what is the future of Internet intangibles trading? He said if there is a virtual good, establishing markets is a way forward, noting that this
controversy has been interesting because it exhibits the classical problems in Internet governance. One way to address the complexity is to see what will happen with an established market. For example, Hong Kong is open. Questions he posed for the panel and audience: do the users own property, and how do you determine price? The HK government provides a framework for a level playing field and the providers can have their own approaches. He sees that HK will be come a net IP exporter and the role is to facilitate the common law.

3.18 Access: Broader World of Network – Giga Internet

Date: 09/06/13
Time: 09:30-13:00
Track: Access
Moderator: Dr. June-Koo Rhee, KAIST
Panelist:
- Dr. James Larson, KAIST
- Daniel Ho, OpenNet
- Dr. Hong-Ik Kim, CJHV
- Gerrit W. Bahlman, Hong Kong Polytechnic University
- Toshihiro Yoshihara, NTT
- Hyunglin Park, KT

This workshop discussed the potential for implementation of the “Giga Internet”, or next generation high-speed networks, which have garnered increased interest due to mass storage of digital contents, such as UHD and 3D, supply of 802.11ac based Giga-bit-class wireless terminal, and expansion of Fiber-to-the-home. The Giga Internet could provide Internet connection speeds up to 1 Gbps. The APrIGF theme, ‘Towards a Better Internet’, lends to discussions of increased Internet speeds to provide prospects for Internet ecosystem changes and advancing the region towards a more widespread information and knowledge society.

James Larson gave an overview of broadband policy goals until now, and future planning in the US and the giga-city challenge. He noted the US Federal Communications Commission warned the US would lose its “technology lead” without sufficient government investment. There have been a few private small-scale gigabit initiatives.

Daniel Ho gave details on plans from OpenNet to build a large high-speed fiber grid in Singapore, including in-home wiring, in partnership with regional ISPs. He noted that building code standards will enable large scale implementation.

Toshihiro Yoshihara gave a status update of FTTH services, including gigabit Internet access from NTT.

Dr. Gerrit Bahlman discussed the history and current status of the Joint Universities Computer Centre Limited, which is a consortium of all the government-funded universities in Hong Kong.

Dr. Hong-Ik Kim talked about environmental changes in the Internet industry and how the increased market competition affects the ability of HelloNet to implement new high-speed networks. In Korea there is already high Internet penetration, and there are several things to consider when delivering new services.

The second part of the session was a panel discussion on fundamental considerations in such a big undertaking, namely who would provide the funding. James Larson commented that this would
require fiber, that mobile would not be sufficient for the upgrade. Toshihiro noted this new network would consume a lot of energy and there would need to be ways to mitigate that, or find energy efficient means to implement it. Dr. Sun-moo Kang commented there is a lot of competition to provide the gigabit Internet services as a new standard. Dr. Bahlman added that there would be a huge impact on entertainment, but also for education with the advent of more powerful networks. There could also be implications for attitudes to the status quo in terms of how people live, work, and learn. Daniel Ho reminded the panel that the last mile to the end users, like other deployments, would present the greatest challenge. Hyung-Jin Park talked briefly about their trials as a service provider and noted that users did not see a difference from 100Mbps, asking what is the service target for this project? Hong-Ik Kim noted that the competition is key to sustainable growth, and another business model for the Giga Internet would probably be necessary.

The Chair summarized those points and asked the panelists for final comments on how to make the Giga Internet successful.

3.19 Security: Concerns for Securing Cyberspace of Asia-Pacific Region

Date: Thursday 5 September
Time: 16:30~18:00
Track: Security
Workshop Title: Concerns for Securing Cyberspace of Asia-Pacific region
Reported by & Contact Email: oik123@hanmail.net
Moderators: IkKyoon, Oh (KAIST), Korea
Panelists: Jae Hyoung Lee, KISA (Korea Internet and Security Agency), Korea
Hong Soon Jung, KISA (Korea Internet and Security Agency), Korea
Sang-Yong Choi, KAIST (Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology), Korea
Joong Sup Choi, Neowiz Games Corp., Korea
Hee Kyung Kong, CBU(Chungbuk University), Korea
Alfred Wu, SMU(Singapore Management University), Singapore

A brief summary of presentations
Trends of Cyber Threats and the incident response system (J.H. Lee)
Role of the CERT and international cooperation (H.S. Jung)
Cooperation Suggestion for Detecting Malwares of Websites in AP Region (S.Y. Choi)
An Analysis on Homeland Security a Regulatory Perspective (H.K. CBU)
Cyber Security Applicability and Compliances for Global Online Service (J.S. Choi)
A balance act between cyber security and user convenience (Alfred Wu)

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:
The expansion of Internet and increased use of ICTs has brought about new opportunities, along with new challenges for the Information Society in Asia-Pacific region. However, the Information Society has direct stake in addressing the threats facing cyberspace. Cyberspace is also being used to conduct illegal and criminal activities related to counterfeiting, fraud and identity theft.
This panel discuss the progress we have made till now, and provide practical guidance on national cybersecurity strategies and cooperated actions needed to establish secure and reliable cyberspace in Asia-Pacific region.

Conclusion & Further Comments:
“Security” issues have wide range concerns, also big GAPs between maturity and primary country.
Hereafter, will be prepared more sessions for corporation, communication and information sharing between Asia Pacific region and countries, as political, social, economical technical, educational, operation, best practice, regulation and so on.

3.20 Security: Governance for the Internet of Kids, Teenagers and Youngsters
(Internet for The Innocent Minds & Next Generation)

Date: 6th September 2013 (Friday)
Time: 09:30 ~ 11:20
Venue: B-Zone 2nd Floor, Room # 231
SUNY (State University of New York), Song-do, Seoul, Republic of South Korea
Organizer: Imran Ahmad Shah
Founder Contributor & Adviser for Linguistic Internet Council: Urdu Internet Society (UISoc.org), Working Group: Internet Governance Forum of Pakistan (IGFPak.org), Think Tank: Brains for Innovative Research & Development Strategies (BIRDS) Contact: imran (at) IGFPak.org, imran (at) UISoc.org

Co-Organizers: Dr Wang Shengkai, CNNIC, China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist Name</th>
<th>Affiliation with</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Imran Ahmad Shah</td>
<td>UISoc, IGFPak, BIRDS</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yuliya Morenets</td>
<td>TaC-Together against Cybercrime Intl’</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dr Wang Shengkai</td>
<td>CNNIC</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professor YJ Park</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Donghwan Oh</td>
<td>KISA</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minsik Choi</td>
<td>Korea Internet Corporations Association</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. David Ng</td>
<td>dotKIDS</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>- Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elaine Chung</td>
<td>dotASIA</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>- Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Yannis Li</td>
<td>dotKIDS</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Irfan Shahid</td>
<td>Aeon Telecom</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>- Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dr Razi Iqbal</td>
<td>Youth Leader IGF Pak, UET</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>- Remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Imran Ahmad Shah - Foundation of Internet for The Innocent Minds & Next Generation
He believes that the purpose of 2013-APrIGF proposed theme was to invite Enhanced Cooperation among Internet Users Constituencies and all stakeholders to ensure that the standardization of code of ethics is properly implemented according to the fundamental needs of the Internet Communities. If there is a gap founded in the policies and reported or suggested at local or national level, should be highlighted at global level to engage global policy development institutions. He invited extending focus of global organizations for a common dialogue understanding the regional needs of good governance towards a Secure, Convenient, Vibrant, Equivalent and Desirable Internet. Emphasizing on the need of the time to evaluate the current Internet System, contents and users, he said that “we should know that what kind of contents we have, what kind of safety & protection we are providing to our users and what kind of Internet we are handing over to Our Next Generation, to THE INNOCENT MINDS”.

48
asked Internet Users Constituencies and all other stakeholders for their cooperation in the establishment of fundamental code of ethics for a good, clean healthy and useful Internet that should be secure and accessible for everyone living anywhere in the world and without any fear or any threat to the end users. He described it as the fundamental need for peaceful and healthy atmosphere of the Internet Sphere.

He discussed about the awareness and mechanism of Online Security & Safety, Privacy & Human Rights for protection of users and definition about the safe and clean contents identification and delivery to the age base Internet users groups and constituencies. He also highlighted the obligations for Source Provides for abuse Internet Contents (such as pornography, hacking and phishing) and need for the global legislation against them. He asked to unite all global organizations who are working on the same theme for the safety & protection of kids from Online Threats, on a single platform to share their experience and deliver it to the Internet Communities jointly and globally.

He also shown support for the innovative ideas like dotKID(S), or dotBaby, Internet Address for each newborn baby, Separate Internet Devices, Browsers, search engine databases, Web/Mobile Apps for the age-base users like Kids, Teenagers and Youngsters.

He strongly recommended the development of a certified white-list for the categorization & classification of Networks, Utilities, Web-Apps, Cloud Hosting Services, Websites & Contents (either that are related to text, audio or video base contents or contents delivery). One of the mechanisms he elaborated was the contents rating system through meta tags. He invited global cooperation to support one of his forthcoming request to the IETF to release a new RFC for standardization & compulsory identification of Internet Contents & Utilities.

**Foundation of a Civilized Internet:** He set forth the Foundation of a Civilized Internet for The Innocent Minds, for our Next Generation. He also elaborated a wish list in detail for this Secure, Convenient, Vibrant, Equivalent and Desirable Internet. At the end of his presentation, he said that Civilized Internet is only possible with the Global engagement and sharing social responsibilities, whereas the Secure and Safe Database of Contents and Utilities are only possible by a unique global certification association and trustworthy authority to serve in local communities according to their national bylaws for the benefit of a common user. He again invited Users & Business Constituencies and all stakeholders to join their hands together with him for enhanced cooperation for the formation of a global consortium as a trustworthy council for the practical implementation of this Civilized Internet.

We request all stakeholders and users for enhanced cooperation for the standardization of code of ethics and civilized internet.

2. **Professor Ms. YJ Park – Sharing her views, emphasizing the need for multi-stakeholders cooperation for Internet Governance for Kids and Youth.**

She explained about why one should have to pay attention to this movement. These days, including ICANN and ISOC and many Internet related institutions, even ITU consider youth as very key stakeholders. That means like many institutions, are willing to give you some rights: The voting rights and the rights for you to participate and to make it happen. They are willing to even provide some funding. So many of you probably attended yIGF which has been coordinated by Yannis here, dotAsia, so dotAsia has been doing a lot of this youth participation promotion through NetMission. So NetMission Program has been in Hong Kong and which it will be soon implemented in Korea, as well. So Net mission is going to come to Korea. I hope many of you can also participate in those programs and be engaged with Internet Governance debate.

She said that ‘going back to Internet Governance debate about dotKIDS debate, maybe you have to think for yourself why we need that space for Internet, so I really want to hear from your people
but as someone who is teaching a class to the stakeholders, I always have a difficulty of persuading them to get engaged with this kind of decision-making project as direct stakeholders because many times they feel like why they have to really participate in this, while stakeholders like Governments, public sectors, have been making decisions for them which they have no problem with.”

She also said that “That was exactly the response from them when I was trying to teach them to get engagement with all ICANN or ISOC and other institutions. So maybe this is the sort of right timing for you to think about. So I asked some of the students here including sitting next to me and he was willing to give his thoughts. Let me invite one of the students, Minsu Park about his thoughts, the Internet Governance in general and self-regulation and also because I have sort of shared a lot of these institutions with the students and they always had a struggle to grasp about those institutions mission and goals and the law for themselves in those institutions, and hopefully I think this kind of the platform can make them feel more-- consider those questions for themselves directly. And also, they participate in the cyberspace conference Youth Forum again. Cyberspace conference sort of also like created this Youth Forum for people like the college students and I understand many of you just applied for that-- the contest.”

3. **Minsu Park – Sharing Personal Experience about Cyber Security in Korea**

   As for personal experience about cyber security, uploading picture by anonymous people on Facebook becomes a topic.

   He personally believe that the user itself should carry the greatest responsibility of what they’re uploading in the social networks, but it is the Governments and the institutions’ responsibility to provide us a safe platform so that the users can have a secure environment.

   User itself should carry the greatest responsibility what they are uploading in the social network, but government and institutions need to provide safe secure environment.

   dotKIDS can make kids surf safely without being threatened by violent factors.

   A question to all: An Ideal environment of the internet?

   **(YJ Park)**

   APNG Korea, cyber security issues

   **Q&A**

   **(Chirstoper Kim, SUNY Korea)**

   Q. I am confused a browser where kids can get domain names dotKIDS what is that.

   **(Yannis)**

   A. That is suitable format for kids and it is not just about the browser. I am hoping to get more people to be aware of that.

   **(Hojoong Kim, SUNY Korea)**

   Q. Can you define that the word is suitable for kids?

   **(Yannis)**

   A. For safe internet for kids, it is easily based on the maturity level and it will be friendly content if it is guarantee friendly atmosphere.

   **(Hojoong Kim)**

   Q. It is forced to use that domain website?

   **(Yannis)**
A. We are trained to have more kids friendly content out of dotKids website and make it a really suitable internet for them.

4. Minsik Choi, KISA - South Korean Activities for the classification of Internet Contents and the Public Policies for youth.

He elaborated the Laws for the protection of youth in South Korea and fact-revealing about that. He said that There is no clear boundary two types of contents, about freedom of speech and the freedom of the right to know something. For the concerning of youth, we might reduce the actual access by even adults. The rating system for online games is to protect the youth, which is the first priority. Depending on the type of contents, there are different rules and standards to control contents. A one year age gap between standards (the first one minimum age on act is 18, the other is 19). The most important guiding principles are defined by the youth protection law in Korea. For same issue, but different public agencies are competing and conflicting each other. Three main factors as below:
Media related materials, and the drugs, and some private spaces

(Daniel Choi, SUNY Korea )

Q. How you going to apply aging restriction? Are they going to use national ID number like Koreans do?
(Mnsik)
A. Everyone in Korea has the registration number based on identification. As for applying the laws, there is discrimination between residents and foreigners. But from the industry perspective there is a reverse discrimination, so only Korea companies are flowing the law about the age data blocking.
(Minsu)
Q. Does simply blocking the illegal contents resolve the problem of accessing there illegal contents?
(Minsik)
A. No 100% filtering. Using technology doesn’t mean you fully filter the obscene materials. Producer of the contents have to have the responsibility to identify if some contents is suitable for a certain age group.
In Korea, pre-screening and post-reporting is recommend,
(Hojoong)

Q. Internet culture has developed in Korea. I am curious about the other countries cases. How the governments are controlling the access to obscene materials and other contents?
(Minsik)
In overseas countries, if various internet contents regulation were blocking, the first specification means is the children protection act. And in Russia, they use and apply children protection act well.
(Hojoong)
As for law for protecting youth, classification up to 7 up to 12 is meaningful?
TV materials are usually governed by self-regulation. But it really depends on different agencies applying age rating.

For games, publisher has to develop the mechanism to block the minor from accessing those games.

In my country, young kids usually go out to a café to get internet not in home. How are you going to ensure the high level security for these kids who are going to frequently enter the bank information or the credit card information to log into the internet from the café?

It is not possible. Very strict security mechanism is needed such as ISP installation.

Do you think installing a different operating system like Window for kids it would be a better alternative rather than to block internet contents?

I don’t think it will be effective to create a separate independent channel for the kids.

When the dotKIDs was created, it will be targeting from harmful materials.

Yannis: Sharing the Initiative dot KIDS and her Experience in Hong Kong

She elaborated the motivation for her participation in the workshop and discussed that what the children really think is maybe different from our perspective, because this Internet, they're the end user and they're the one that they know what they want best so we think it is really important to engage children themselves in our discussions and development of these guidelines.

So actually for dotKIDS Foundation we'll have to invite kids so they can join our discussions on the policy, how they want this Internet, this content guideline would look like and what they don’t want to see in here.

Kids-friendly content guideline which based on the UN, UNCLC as the fundamental basis, Kids-friendly internet should be run by community.

We are interested in cooperation of stakeholders, child online safety. dotKIDS would be really good example and platform for the government and advocating children’s right.

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

- All the panelists and participants felt that the workshop session was very important to discuss the global needs of blocking adult contents, secure contents delivery and users protection and to highlight enhanced cooperation for the governance of Internet for age-base user groups in the AP region.

- as the fundamental need for peaceful and healthy atmosphere of the Internet Sphere Civilized Internet is only possible with the Global engagement and sharing social responsibilities, whereas the Secure and Safe Database of Contents and Utilities are only possible by a unique global certification association and trustworthy authority to serve in local com
- Enhanced Cooperation of Multi-stakeholders invited for the foundation of a Civilized Internet: Users & Business Constituencies and all stakeholders were invited to join their hands together with him for enhanced cooperation for the formation of a global consortium as a trustworthy council for the practical implementation of this Civilized Internet.

Conclusion & Further Comments:
Multi-stakeholders should cooperate for the formation of a global consortium as a trustworthy council for the practical implementation of this Civilized Internet which has become the fundamental need for peaceful and healthy atmosphere of the Internet Sphere.

4. Events

4.1 Opening Ceremony
- Date/Time: September 4, 2013 (Wed) 10:30-12:00
- Venue: SUNY(Song-do, Incheon) Multi Complex 5F Small Theater
  ※ 60minutes distance by automobile from Daedong Government Complex
- Host: Young-Eum Lee Co-chair of ICANN JIG
- Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30 ~ 10:35</td>
<td>5' Opening Speech</td>
<td>Jaechon Park, Chair of KIGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35 ~ 10:50</td>
<td>15' APriGF Program Committee Report</td>
<td>APriGF Program Committee (Paul Wilson, Edmund Chung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 ~ 11:00</td>
<td>10' APriGF Local Organizing Committee Report</td>
<td>Dongman Lee, Chair of APriGF Local Organizing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 ~ 11:05</td>
<td>5' Welcoming Speech</td>
<td>Yoon Jong-Iok, Vice Minister II of Ministry of Science ICT &amp; Future Planning of the Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 ~ 11:10</td>
<td>5' Congratulatory Address</td>
<td>Ki-joo Lee, President of KISA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 ~ 11:30</td>
<td>20' Keynote Speech</td>
<td>Fadi Chehadé, ICANN CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 ~ 11:35</td>
<td>5' Group Photo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 ~ 12:00</td>
<td>25' Moving to VIP Lucheon</td>
<td>On foot 20minutes, by car 15minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 ~ 13:20</td>
<td>80' VIP Luncheon</td>
<td>Sheraton Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Welcome Reception
- Date/Time: September 4, 2013 (Wed) 18:00~19:30
- Place: SUNY Reception room
0. Expected Attedee: 150 people (including yIGF 40)

0. Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:05~18:10</td>
<td>5’ Welcome Remark</td>
<td>SUNY vice president</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Closing Ceremony

0. Date/Time: September 6, 2013(Fri) 16:30-17:10

0. Venue: Small Theater, Multi-Complex 5F, SUNY(Song-do, Incheon)

0. Host: KISA In-pyo Hwang Team Manager

0. Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:30~16:32</td>
<td>2’ Ceremony Notice</td>
<td>KISA In-pyo Hwang Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:32~16:37</td>
<td>5’ Review about &quot;APrIGF Seoul&quot;</td>
<td>Edmon Chung, Co-Chair of APrIGF Program Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:37~16:46</td>
<td>9’ 2013 APrIGF Seoul Review(3 Minutes)</td>
<td>Kyenam Lee, Vice President of KISA KRNIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF &amp; YIGF Camp Movie (6 Minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:46~16:56</td>
<td>10’ Presenting Certificate Award to Youth IGF Camp Representative</td>
<td>Kyenam Lee, Vice President of KISA KRNIC / Paul Wilson, APrIGF Program Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:56~17:01</td>
<td>5’ Greeting from Platinum Sponsor</td>
<td>John Ure / President of AIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01~17:11</td>
<td>10’ Introduction of IGF Bali</td>
<td>CEO of PANDI(IGF Parties) Yudho Giri Sucahyo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Event Venue

<Exterior-Multi Complex>  <Interior-Small Theater>

5. Session Management Result

5.1 Track Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation</td>
<td>Small Theater 5F (Inside Multi Complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>B-Zone 1F (146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>B-Zone 1F (142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>B-Zone 2F (231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Management Support

- Supporting simultaneous interpretation, stenography, live Internet broadcast, remote participation (Webcam Chat)
- Personnel: Information Desk Assistant (Distributing receiver & Check for panel arrival), Operator, 4 Summary Editors (Dispatched in each rooms)
## 5.3 Room Plan

- **Small Theater (Multi-stakeholder and Enhanced Cooperation)**

- **B-Zone (Openness/Security/Access)**

### Equipment List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Theatre</th>
<th>B-Zone (Each Rooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3 Screens (For Presentation Material, Stenography, Webcam Chat)</td>
<td>1. 2 Screens (For Presentation Material, Stenography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Speaker’s Podium</td>
<td>2. A Speaker’s Podium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDP 52&quot;</td>
<td>3. PDP 52&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4 Laptops (Presentation, Broadcast, Relay-check, Webcam Chat)</td>
<td>4. 4 Laptops (Presentation, Broadcast, Relay-check, Webcam Chat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2 Relay Cameras</td>
<td>5. 1 Relay Camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interpretation Booth</td>
<td>6. Interpretation Booth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 90 Receivers</td>
<td>7. 80 Receivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 4 Wired, 4 Wireless microphones</td>
<td>8. 3 Wired, 2 Wireless microphones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Interpretation Management
- Company: Green Service
- Language: Korean-English, English-Korean
- Management Method: 2 Interpreters in each session rooms (Total 6 Interpreter)
- Interpreting booth in each room (4 Booths)
- Min. 80 Receivers in each room

5.5 Live Broadcast
- Purchased Live broadcasting platform (U stream) exclusively for APrlGF
- Management Plan
  - Premium Account + 3 Additional Channel
  - Total VH: 9,000 VH / month
  - Main account: APrlGF2013
    - Channel 1: [www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-MSEC](http://www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-MSEC)
    - Channel 2: [www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-OPENNESS](http://www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-OPENNESS)
    - Channel 3: [www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-ACCESS](http://www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-ACCESS)
    - Channel 4: [www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-SECURITY](http://www.ustream.tv/channel/APrlGF-SECURITY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 APrlGF = 9,000 VH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Homepage Image (Live Section)

5.6 Stenography
- Company: Caption First
- Operator: Roy Graves (+719-481-9835)
Operating Method: 1 technician in the venue, remote support from stenographers in each session.

**System Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Technician (Laptop) → Screen Streaming (Beam Equipment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓ Sound Signal (Audio) (Wired Internet)</td>
<td>↓ Sound Signal (Audio) ↑ Text (Wired Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer (Laptop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stenography Screen Form**: Separate screen implemented on the stage to display stenographer’s subtitles

---

5.7 Remote Participation

Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Adobe Connect Trial Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Open 3 meeting rooms – Each room has operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature</strong></td>
<td>* Sufficient functions to use during conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Screen share function, Multi video conference, Raise hand function etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.8 Production List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APrIGF</td>
<td>Shuttle Bus Guide</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Banner (B-zone)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF Leaflet (Event Guide)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF Participant Nametag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF VIP Nametag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APrIGF Staff Nametag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Necklace strings</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luncheon Guide X Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIP Luncheon Banner (Sheraton)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Reception Guide X Banner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Reception Banner (Reception Hall)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-zone 1F Wide Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-zone Exterior Banner (Background)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-zone Exterior Banner (Width)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail Banner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width Banner (Korean)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Large Name Plate</td>
<td>Background Banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Room 2</td>
<td>Agenda Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Room 2</td>
<td>Agenda Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Room 3</td>
<td>Agenda Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGIF</td>
<td>YGIF Poster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.9 Check List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Theater</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Fixed Projector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Screen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Screen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Projector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Broadcast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired Microphone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Microphone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC Line1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC Line2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC Line3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation Booth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Router</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN Line</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenography Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Desk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Chair</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium Title</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Zone Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Nameplate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP Nametag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Sticker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Desk</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YGIF</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Fixed Projector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Screen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wired Microphone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wireless Microphone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Width Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-Zone</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Fixed Projector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Fixed Screen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Screen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Projector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Broadcast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wired Microphone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wireless Microphone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIC Line1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIC Line2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIC Line3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clicker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation Booth</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Router</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Stenographer, Live broadcast, webcam chat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAN Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Trans-jack)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stenography Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation Line</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Table</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel Chair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Width Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podium Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table Nameplate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info-desk</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Sort</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Color Printer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copying Machine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkie-Talkie</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stationary Box</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STAFF T-shirt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STAFF T-shirt</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy Papers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior Banner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10 Online Promotion

- (Facebook) Forum Page Management ([www.facebook.com/2013aprigf](www.facebook.com/2013aprigf))

- **Goal:** To induce and to spread Awareness of APrIGF through SNS
- **Method:** Posting Event outline & Program, uploading live session broadcast, Event Notices

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Internet Related Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 National Domain Registered Agents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>516 Internet &amp; Information Protection Seminar Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 Internet Ethics Symposium Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,410 SIS 2013 Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 2,104</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2nd Webmail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 28 (Wed)</td>
<td>30 Related Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Internet Related Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 National Domain Registered Agents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>516 Internet &amp; Information Protection Seminar Participants</td>
<td>Official Document,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 Internet Ethics Symposium Participants</td>
<td>APrIGF Guide,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,410 SIS 2013 Participants</td>
<td>Webmail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 Database from KISA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 2,208</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Webmail Sample

![Webmail Sample Image]

### 5.11 Offline Promotion

- APrIGF posters posted in 10 stations by KORAIL Airport Railroad Express / Obtaining promotional support from homepage and SNS
- Posters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 20 (Tue)</td>
<td>21 Related Organizations</td>
<td>Official Document,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Internet Related Associations</td>
<td>APrIGF &amp; YIGF Poster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 National Domain Registered Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Internet Security Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incheon Transit Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

o Poster Image

![APrIGF 2013 Draft Poster](image1)

![Posters posted in SUNY Campus](image2)

o Leaflet Image

![Leaflet Image](image3)
6. Registration

- Pre-registration Homepage: 2013. 6. 30~

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (Penal &amp; Moderator)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-registered</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Register</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Organization</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Community | 24 | 7.6%  
Youth | 41 | 13.0%  
Others | 5 | 1.6%  
Total | 315 |

7. Linked Event (Youth IGF Camp)

7.1 Purpose
- To let young participants grow their skill of Internet governance debate and Expanding their participation on Development of Future Internet Policy

7.2 Event Summary
- Event Name: Youth Internet Governance Forum Camp (YIGF Camp)
- Date/Venue: September 3(Tue)-September 6(Fri), SUNY C-Zone
- Participants: 40 Asia-Pacific region Students (Foreign: 10, Domestic: 30)
- Eligibility: University or Graduate Students who have good communication skills in English
- Participation Fee: Free
- Host: MSIP, KIGA
- Co-Host: KISA, NetMission(Hong-Kong)

7.3 Topic & Agenda
- Topic: Sustainable Development of Healthy Internet
- Detailed Discussion Topic
  - Security: Who has the biggest responsibility on Internet Privacy Protection?
  - Access: Is shutting off the Internet be a realistic solution to Internet Addiction?
  - Openness: Is Internet Contents Censorship necessary?
- Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>2013 Sep. 3rd ~ 6th (4-day-3-night)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>SUNY(State University of New York) Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room:</td>
<td>A Zone 141 (60 people), 326 (Access), 347 (Security), 348 (Openness) (24 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Theme:</td>
<td>Sustainable Development of Healthy Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security:</td>
<td>Who should bear the greatest responsibility of safeguarding privacy on the Internet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>Is “Blocking” a necessary way to tackle cyber addiction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness:</td>
<td>Should Internet censorship exist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1000</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1003</td>
<td>MC Self-Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003-1015</td>
<td>Self-introduction by NMA, Participants and DotAsia Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ice Breaking Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015-1035</td>
<td>1. Heart Attack (2 rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035-1100</td>
<td>2. Standing on Newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1130</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130-1140</td>
<td>Introduction (10 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NetMission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- yIGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- APriGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140-1150</td>
<td>Introduction of the program rundown (10 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1210</td>
<td>Introduction of Sub theme: Access (20 mins) (Q&amp;A session of 2 Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210-1230</td>
<td>Introduction of Sub theme: Openness (20 mins) (Q&amp;A session of 2 Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230-1250</td>
<td>Introduction of Sub theme: Security (20 mins) (Q&amp;A session of 2 Questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1300</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1430</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415-1430</td>
<td>Bebriefing &amp; Group Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430-1510</td>
<td>Internal Meetings (Brainstorming different point of view)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510-1600</td>
<td>1st Research Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605-1630</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-1700</td>
<td>Information Sharing after 1st Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1730</td>
<td>2nd Research Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-1745</td>
<td>In-group Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745-1815</td>
<td>Participants Expections Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-1830</td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-2000</td>
<td>Dinner Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2130</td>
<td>Internal Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td>NetMission Ambassadors Internal Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAY 2 Multi-Stakeholder Day 4 Sept 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0930-1015</td>
<td>APriGF Orientation Session</td>
<td>Small Theater (Multiplex 5F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1200</td>
<td>Opening Plenary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1400</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1600</td>
<td>1st External Meeting</td>
<td>Access: Room 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security: Room 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness: Room 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415-1430</td>
<td>Briefing and Group Division</td>
<td>Government: Rm 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business: Rm 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community: Rm 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430-1600</td>
<td>1st External Meeting</td>
<td>Access: Room 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security: Room 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness: Room 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>Internal Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1800</td>
<td>2nd External Meeting</td>
<td>Access: Room 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security: Room 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness: Room 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1715</td>
<td>Wrap-up of main argument points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715-1800</td>
<td>9 x 5-min sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1830</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
<td>Zone A Room 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-2000</td>
<td>Dinner Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2130</td>
<td>Debriefing + Informal meeting by each group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td>NetMission Ambassadors Internal Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Youth Participation Day</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 Sept 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1000</td>
<td>Recap &amp; Briefing</td>
<td>Zone A Room 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1100</td>
<td>Talk with ICANN CEO - Youth Engagement in ICANN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1245</td>
<td>Youth View Discussion (Topic-based)</td>
<td>Access: Room 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security: Room 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness: Room 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245-1330</td>
<td>Sharing views from groups &amp; Wrap up</td>
<td>Zone A Room 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330-1430</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430-1600</td>
<td>Free to Participate APiGF Sessions</td>
<td>Multiplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1730</td>
<td>Roundtable Discussion (All together)</td>
<td>Zone A Room 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is the future of Internet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What the problem and solution will be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How the youth can deal with the situation(such as creating business models)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-2000</td>
<td>Dinner Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2130</td>
<td>Debriefing + Informal meeting by each group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td>NetMission Ambassadors Internal Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1100</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Zone A Room 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130-1300</td>
<td>Public Forum</td>
<td>Zone B Rm 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access / Openness / Security (30mins *3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction + Stakeholder View (10 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest + Q&amp;A (10 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth View (10 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1430</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430-1600</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
<td>1 Large Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1730</td>
<td>APrIGF experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-1830</td>
<td>Closing Plenary of APrIGF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Running the homepage since July 29 (Mon)
- 2013 YiGF
- Call for Application

- Producing and distributing Posters with 2013 APrIGF Seoul
7.4 YIGF Venue

C-Zone Exterior

Main Conference Room

7.5 Participant Support

- Accommodation: Complimentary SUNY Dormitory
  - Foreign Participants: September 2(Mon) - September 7(Sat), 10 Participants
  - Domestic Participants: September 3(Tue) - September 6(Fri), 30 Participants

- Meal: Complimentary SUNY Student Cafeteria
  - Breakfast & Lunch: September 3(Tue)-September 6(Fri)
  - Dinner: September 3(Tue)-September 5(Thur)
  *2013 APrIGF Seoul Banquet Ticket is provided on September 4(Wed)

- APrIGF Secretariat, Presenting the Certificate of Participation approved by KISA & KRNIC

- YIGF T-Shirts Production

7.6 Event Preparation

- Conference Room
  - 1 Main Conference Room
    (Suitable for over 60 Participants, 9.6 오후 YIGF Public Session for APrIGF Participants)
  - 3 Separated Conference Room (Suitable for 20 Participants)

- Equipment: Laptop, Beam Projector, Printer, Wireless Internet, Video Camera, Digital Camera (Personnel Included)

- 2 Managing Assistants stationed regularly

- Others: Interpretation & Stenography Service provided during Opening Session(9/6 Expected)
Youth Camp Certificate of Participation

Certificate of Participation

to

as a Fellow during the

4th Youth IGF CAMP
Sustainable Development of Healthy Internet

held in
Seoul, Korea
on 3-6 September 2013

Mr. Paul Wilson
Director General of APNIC
Merieux Chair

Mr. Kye-Nam Lee
Executive Vice President of KISA
Local Host of APrIGF 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Choi Felix</td>
<td>CUHK, Professional Accountancy</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kwok Steve</td>
<td>HKBU, Physics with Computer Science</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kwok Daisy</td>
<td>HKSYU, Business Administration</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lee Emily</td>
<td>CUHK, Chinese Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lo Vivian</td>
<td>CUHK, Hotel &amp; Tourism Management</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ng Helen</td>
<td>CUHK, Sociology</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Po Cherry</td>
<td>CUHK, Accounting</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shum Mun Yee</td>
<td>HKU, Economics and Finance</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>June Lau</td>
<td>.asia</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yannis Lee</td>
<td>.asia</td>
<td>HongKong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Subrata Biswas</td>
<td>Sangmyung Univ.</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sara Bakhriar</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hyesun Cha</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stephanie Char</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>HyunKyu Choi</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Seung Jae Choi</td>
<td>Chungbuk Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Haejin Hwang</td>
<td>Sookmyung Women's University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Eun Ji Im</td>
<td>Seoul Womans' Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Youngjin Yun</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jeeyoon Jung</td>
<td>KAIST</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ju Hyeong Jin</td>
<td>Inha Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Seung Ho Jo</td>
<td>Inha Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Min sun Kim</td>
<td>Inha Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yeoni Kim</td>
<td>Inha Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Youjin Kim</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tae Woo Kim</td>
<td>Mokwon University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Miseon Kim</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hausol Kim</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Khan Md.Anwarus Salam</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ga Young Lee</td>
<td>Ewha Womans' Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hye Wan Lee</td>
<td>Seoul Womans' Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hye Ryan Lee</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ru Ri Lee</td>
<td>Inha Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Jo Hee Park</td>
<td>Seoul Womans' Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Subin Park</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>MIN Soo Park</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sung Kyum Park</td>
<td>SUNY Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sang Min Park</td>
<td>Chungbuk Univ.</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hyun Ho Shin</td>
<td>University of Seoul</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Soyoung Sung</td>
<td>Sangmyung University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>JuYoung Song</td>
<td>Mokwon University</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This year Net Mission Ambassadors (http://www.netmission.asia) continued one of its flagship programs - Youth Internet Governance Forum (yIGF) in Seoul, South Korea during 3rd to 6th September 2013. Held in State University of New York (SUNY) in Incheon, the 4-day camp aligned with Asia Pacific regional Internet Governance Forum (APrI GF) serving as a platform for the Youth to discuss IGF issues and ultimately advancing the Internet governance development in the world.

YI GF was initiated by Net Mission Ambassadors in 2010 with the mission of raising the awareness and participation of Youth on Internet governance issues and policy making process. Inspired by United Nation’s Internet Governance Forum, multi-stakeholders’ approach was adopted in which participants are assigned with roles of the interest groups such as government, business sectors and community expressing and interchanging their ideas and thoughts on Internet governance. Past YI GF were held in Hong Kong (2010), Singapore(2011) and Tokyo(2012).

This time, under the main theme of "Sustainable Development of Healthy Internet", 8 Net Mission Ambassadors together with more than 30 international students were role-playing various stakeholders in three working groups of Access, Openness and Security conducting their research and discussions. Highlighting the entire yIGF, the last session of the forum in which each working group presented their research results was open to all other APrI GF participants and fellows.

This youth statement, as an official final report of yIGF 2013, presents and summarizes the results and achievements made throughout the forum. All these are the collective efforts and achievements by Net Mission Ambassadors along with all participants based on their endeavors during the camp. Here are the summary reports by each working group respectively.
Research Question: Is “Blocking” a necessary way to tackle cyber addiction?

The effectiveness and feasibility of blocking was discussed during our Access’s external meeting. We all believed blocking was a direct method to tackle cyber addiction tentatively. Nevertheless, if the problem has to be addressed in the long run, other measures have to be adopted along with blocking. Suggestions were proposed to the three stakeholders: Government, Business and Community.

The game industry is suggested to create more educational games. It is because the content of the game is a crucial factor of determining whether users addicted to the game or not. If the content is healthy, there is no reason to prevent users from playing games for a long period of time.

The community is suggested to hold more outdoor activities that serve as an entertaining alternative to game addicts. Moreover, campaigns and programs raising the awareness of cyber addiction and providing the latest information could be launched so as to update youth online users. Hence, they will not only understand the bad consequences of online addiction and also familiar with how the Internet works.

The government is regarded as the coordinator between Business and Community. She is advised to allocate resources wisely in order to make a balance among the three parties. Nevertheless, the government is suggested to focus more on the growth of the children who are the future pillars of the society. More resources should be put in educating our younger generation how to use the Internet appropriately. In addition, the government could support the business and community in developing strategies of preventing cyber addiction through offering financial incentives.

If the above suggestions could be adopted, it is believed that cyber addiction could be addressed significantly. Nevertheless, we still face three limitations as a youth.
Firstly, we are confused with our responsibility and obligation in contributing to the healthy Internet. We were born in the Net-century that was already set up by the older generation. We are not familiar with the operation of the Internet, not to mention the structure of organizations responsible for Internet maintenance and operation like ICANN. Thus, we could not truly identify what constructive things we can do with the Internet even using the Internet is just like breathing to us.

Secondly, we feel powerless in raising our voice towards Internet issues related to us. It is because we have no authority in the decision making process of formulating Internet policies. For instance, youth is not regarded an official stakeholders in many formal meetings. Therefore, we could attend the meetings as a guest only and our opinions will just taken for reference. Hence, we are forced to be passive, as we are not recognized by the society.

Thirdly, we lack the professional knowledge and experiences in participating Internet conferences. Due to our age, we are still too young to be familiar with all the technical terms discussed in professional forums held in ICANN. Furthermore, we find difficulties in engaging in such conferences not only because of the technical constraints but also the atmosphere. It is too boring and tired for energetic teenagers to sit for a whole day and discuss the same issue repeatedly. Hence, the technical aspect and atmosphere are one of the major obstacles preventing us from contributing the healthy Internet by joining conferences.

To break through those limitations, we need empowerments from different stakeholders in order to support our ideas. We hope our opinions could be heard. Otherwise, it will be meaningless. Furthermore, it is hoped that our opinions could be actualized so that we can gain social recognition. Also, if we can be involved in the policymaking, we could truly contribute constructive ideas or at least share our views to the adults.
Research Question: Should Internet censorship exist?

We broke the word openness into O-P-E-N-E-S-S to deliver our answers by 8 words starting with the alphabets.

O-iginality by Taewoo, yl GF Participant
If you want to know something, what do you do these days? Google it right? The Internet has become a major source of information and knowledge. We can soothe our thirst for quality knowledge there! At home, we can access to almost all information, it directly stimulates people’s intellectual potential! Amazing! Securing openness of the internet is an indispensable part of making the best use of the Internet.

P-articipation by Sangmin, yl GF Participant
I think openness is participation. If people do not know their responsibilities, we will not reach agreement. To achieve openness, we need help every stakeholder and every internet users. I think that the effort of everybody can make openness circumstance and better internet governance because all of internet users have responsibilities. We need to know this, we try to achieve it and we educate people that all of internet users have freedom to use internet while keeping responsibilities.

E-ssential by Emily, NetMission Ambassador
It is essential to keep the Internet as open as we can. Openness is a significant feature of the Internet. An open Internet is a very important platform for innovation, creativity and exchange of ideas. But actually people sometimes say something that will harm the society on the Internet. That’s why the government implements Internet censorship. As a teenager, we can overcome the dilemma by doing two things. First, to do what we can do and to say what we can say based on our moral and social benefit. Second, to be observers of the Internet by discussing others’ behavior on the Internet to remind other Internet users they have to think twice before they make comments and write posts on the Internet. We can protect the open Internet and prevent Internet censorship is controlled by governments only.
Hello! Distinguished delegates! Let me put this question to you! Can you ID me? First, internet users could be stifled by me but I also could protect them! Second, if I am designed only for a certain interest group, I am called a method of dictatorship! Indeed, I have been love by dictatorships such as Adolf Hitler and the Kim dynasty in North Korea!
However, if I am designed reflecting all stakeholders, then I can be a safeguard against the drawbacks of the internet such as cyber bullying or scam? Does it ring any bell to you? The answer is “censorship!” Censorship cuts both sides, to make the right use of it, it is imperative to put “neutrality” or, “a censorship program considering public interest” in a top priority!

The openness of internet means the situation in all countries including the rich and the poor.
The pursuing of openness of internet that assessing to a variety of websites and high degree of freedom of expression should be applied in both developed and developing countries.

For the youth contribution, we can actively participate in public forum such as IGF and APriGF to voice out our opinion that the degree of internet censorship should be minimized as much as possible except for some special circumstances.

We can also give out our own opinion during public enquiry of legislation of law and policy related to internet openness. So the government of different countries can understand the youth's emphasis on freedom of speech and access to internet.
Exposure
by Sojeong, yIGF Participant

Internet is spreading different culture and knowledge beyond the borders. It already penetrates everyday life. Literally we’re exposed to the Internet minute by minute! Of course, it has some negative sides such as internet identity theft or easy access to child pornography. Still, the Internet openness, in other words, this open space empowers users. Now they can expose dirty secret at ease (whistleblowers). Censorship of the internet would hinder empowerment of users. Cyberspace should remain as open space!

Sociability
by Seungjae, yIGF Participant

In my opinion, openness means sociability because openness of the Internet influence on the sociability. Today’s communication is active in the Internet as much as what is happening in the real world. Openness makes people share their ideas about social issues freely and they can share their social life together on the Internet. Most of people can make a balance between social life and virtual internet life. However, some people might not have social skills and just turn to the computer for their social life. Some people are single handedly raised by computers and the Internet. Then they have no idea of how to properly interact with people when they start working and communicating in person. As a result, there is a need to improve sociability both in the real world and the Internet world.

Sensible
by Subrata, yIGF Participant

I just simply want to emphasize that we should use the internet sensibly so that we could enjoy blessing of open platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and etc.
Research Question: Who should bear the greatest responsibility of safeguarding privacy on the Internet?

This question addresses the concern of online security. By security, it means "netizens" can stay safe on the Net. Theoretically speaking, Internet should be a platform allowing free flows of information where Internet users retain the right to share, the power to decide who can view as well as make use of their own information. In short, they are the ultimate master of their details.

Unfortunately, the above notion is merely an ideal type that does not exist in reality. What we did observe is pervasive leakage of personal information on the Net. Worse still, personal data could be easily accessed and tracked by strange third parties. In other words, netizens do not have the full control of their information on the Net.

In view of such a gap between the reality and ideal, we believe that all stakeholders including government, business and individual Internet users are jointly responsible.

In the first place, government has the responsibility of its insufficient and lenient regulations in which hackers are likely to take advantage of the loopholes. While for business party, their self-control is not enough neither. Some of them misuse clients' data with permission, leading to the above-mentioned leakage problem. Last but not least, individual users tend to over-estimate the reliability of businessmen protecting their own data thereby over-sharing their personal and private information online. We believe no single stakeholder bears all responsibility of protecting online privacy. It is every stakeholder that shall take initiatives.
As the Net generation, we would like to make the Net a safer place to be as well. We promise to be self-disciplined and avoid over-sharing our private details online. In the meantime, we urge government to enact a more restricted legal framework. But without empowerment, Youth could barely contribute ourselves. We hope that government could involve more Youth in the legislation of law and regulations. We hope that business could adopt user control scheme monitoring their use of clients' data. We hope that there will be more resources on promotion of online discipline in the community.

We convince that through the contributions from different parties, Internet would become a safer place and the gap between the reality and ideal will be narrowed where Internet users can share their information without worries. One day, Internet will eventually be a pleasant, vibrate and harmonious place with all our collective efforts.
Conclusion

Youth are energetic and creative. As the major users of Internet, we pledge to continue our active participation in and making tangible contributions to the Internet governance. With the dedication to raise the awareness and involvements of Youth on Internet governance policy discussion, we believe that youth voices count and matter. See you soon in the next yIGF.
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