

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC REGION INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TAIPEI 2016
A NEW INTERNET ERA

27 JULY 2016
ROOM 401
17:30

SYNTHESIS DOCUMENT DISCUSSION

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> The next session, please stay, this is an open microphone session, please stay, join the session, contribute your thoughts. Thank you.

I know everyone is enjoying their conversations right now, we'll start this Macao Synthesis town hall session in a few minutes. If everyone could kindly take a seat and we'll begin in a few minutes.

If we could kindly take our seats, the Macao Synthesis document town hall session will begin presently. Thank you.

You're welcome to stay. Don't escape the room if you want to give your input.

Hello, everyone. Welcome to this document town hall session for this year. My name is Jennifer Chong I'm from the Secretariat team. Welcome.

Welcome to the remote participants who are, you know, on the Adobe Connect room. We value very much your input.

Can we go to the presentation? The first slide.

Next slide, please.

A little bit of technical difficulties.

A very brief, quick introduction on the document.

Last year was the first year we had the APrIGF document, it was

an inaugural year and it was a successful process. We had a few town hall meetings just like we're having right now where we had APrIGF participants coming in, going to open mikes and giving input on a document that we at the very end we actually used as a contribution from the Asia-Pacific region in the global IGF intersessional work.

You see on the slide here it was for policy options for connecting the next billion. This pair paper, it was presented last year in December at the IGF in Brazil and this year we're hoping to better our process, this year in Taipei we have this town hall session tonight, so the one you're in right now, and we'll have another extra session tomorrow, day 2, we'll have in the same room, in room 401 from 9:00 to 10:30 we'll have another document session particularly on input on the policy options for connecting the next billion, phase II. At the end of Day 2 we'll have another Synthesis town hall session.

A quick look at the timeline for the document this year. We had a public call for input which lasted from 11 to 30 of May this year. Draft 0 came out for public comments for three weeks and ended on the 7th of July. Draft 1 is actually the draft we'll be talking about today during our town hall sessions and the input from everyone here and remote and from the wider community will be aggregated into a draft 2 which will be put out for public comment sometime in August for three weeks. After draft 2 is done, draft 3 will be sent over to the drafting Committee review, and hopefully that should be done sometime early September and we'll be able to publish this final synthesis document early September and the projected time is 9th of September. Hopefully this will be final timeline.

Can we show the synthesis document? With this I would like to introduce to you our co-moderators for this town hall session.

First we have a deputy executive director of APC based from the Philippines.

We have miss Maureen hill yard from the Cook Islands, South Pacific and a member of the Board of The Pacific islands chapter of the Internet society and she's now a member of the at large advisory Committee of ICANN and currently a member of the Dotasia board, a cosponsor. Without further ado, I will pass it over to the moderators and one more point of housekeeping, we have two mike stands over here, one on the side of the room, the other on the other side of the room. Feel free to get up, come, give your input.

Let me -- when we have remote participants, also indicate so that we can hear from them as well.

>> Good afternoon. We have the easiest job here actually. We sit here, we say yes, please speak. Yes, please speak! That's about the only thing, only job we need to do, is ask you to please, come, participate. This is your opportunity to really come, to talk about issues. This session, it is really for us to talk about all the issues that you feel are important that you would like to be included in this synthesis document. That's the main purpose for this meeting.

It is either things you have looked at, discussed in your sessions today, your issues that your organizations, yourself, you would like to see in the document.

>> HI, everyone. A little technical issue that we'll sort out.

As mentioned, what we're really interested in is adding to a document that we have already made a start on. This was actually something we're actually building on from last year's model of the synthesis document text.

We have given you the link, right? If you can get in that document, you will actually see that there is already -- we have already made a start on it by including a lot of the it ex that's come from the presentations that are being made in the program we have over these few days. It is sort of quite important for us to get feedback from you. We need to know what have you heard while you've been to these sessions, something that you think is really important and something that we need to include into this document. It is a document we would like to present at the next IGF or a similar event where we can actually kind of really sort of promote the sorts of issues that are of concern to Asia Pacific. If anyone has got anything that they would like to say, please do so.

Anyone who has -- thank you. Thank you.

>> I'm from Thailand. You talk about the impact, about the issue that we're looking at, the international life of domain names which we know of lot of people don't know English correcters or in the Internet they're technical, they're the correcters and there are a lot of us that do not use that or the romanize or others, they don't understand like Thai people and they don't know who you to call the ministry office and we talk about an E. government, how do they know we have a Ministry of Finance, it is MOF, market, that every farmer has to use, that's MOF, the difference is MOF.org and the other, that's the only way people can know. It is impossible.

If you ask them in local language they'll know exactly -- those are issues. I can make it -- it is the role of communities to understand and we talk to several people and that's why they have to have the domainnames. E-mail, myname can be spelled ten ways, and then Chinese, this is the correct names and they can be recognized. Just realize that's not only happened to the Thai people but also to others. The IPN is related to e-mail not only the domain and the IGF has talked a lot about this and the theme today is moving from physical space to cyberspace and I do hope that the physical space, that we'll actually stand in that physical space and transform himself into the cyberspace.

Thank you.

>> Thank you for that.

One of the things that we would really like if you make a presentation, please give us your name so that we can chase you afterwards.

We would like if you could just write a brief summary of what

you said so that we can -- give it to us, send it to us and -- because what we end up doing is taking all of your contributions and molding it into a statement under a particular heading.

If you have a particular heading that you're -- that you feel is appropriate for your presentation it is really good if you can just get as much as information as possible so we put it in the right space.

>> I'm Cass Park. I have had a lot of opportunities to provide input in the document and I haven't done any.

Apology to the fellow members. On paragraph 40 there is a mention of right to be forgotten. I think the paragraph is too approving of this new expansion of privacy and I think this has a special meaning for Asia. I don't know if you had read this, but when right to be forgotten jurisprudence was to be expanded in Latin America Eduardo Patino, a current privacy commission in Argentina wrote a piece that said right to be forgotten is an insult to Latin American history. He said our Latin American history. The reason being, democracies in Latin America have not matured enough in a sense that many wrong doings in the past have been uncorrected and they use the term impunity, Latin American impunity being -- it is notorious. Many of the Infrastructures, the products of past history have not been corrected. I do not say that the situation has gotten any better in Asia and many countries, we have regressed. I mean, in terms of regression, what right to be forgotten does, it puts the burden of proving public interest on the speaker when he wants to talk about or when he sets forth others wrongdoing in the past and, yes right to be forgotten only applies to the records of wrongdoings many years ago but again in Asia, wrong doings in many, many decades ago have not been properly addressed because of the slow progress on the work.

(Skype disconnection). And the common platform you see projected on the screen, it is actually live, go on it, we encourage very much if you have any text formulation or edits or comments to go through to the paragraphs and add that in so that everyone can see, you know, what you want to say or what the input is, including input that you want to delete the paragraph. You can actually butt that comment in.

Go ahead.

>> Thank you. Winston Roberts from New Zealand, I was the moderator of the session where we talked about right to be forgotten.

I would like to make a slightly different -- (Skype disconnection) is a question of right to be forgotten that we can form a little group and go away and work on some better wording and come back and give that to you. Okay. Any volunteers? Not right now but we'll come back with better wording. Thank you.

>> Absolutely. Okay.

>> I'm going to make a few comments.

First of all, it is really encouraging to see that the theme

of this year's APrIGF is meshing physical space with cyberspace is actually working when it comes to the sessions. Some of the sessions today, for example, the one I just attended on the right of association of freedom expression, right to protest, there were examples thereof for example in Taiwan where there were physical protests but also using online to ensure that the correct message was sent out and that there were no miffs and so forth and another one is on disaster risk management and disability where we actually saw people with disabilities interviewed on a video and how there can be various solutions on early warning systems. That's two examples of where that theme really works.

I wanted to mention, today there's been a very strong participation by women and I don't see that particularly mentioned in the synthesis document. It would be good to maybe include it maybe in the introduction mention some of the work done by APC, it's Association of communications and in association with the APrIGF and also I think when it comes to Human Rights we have a lot of sessions on Human Rights, it is very hard to had just list everything but if maybe we can pull out some more things that will be covered in the next couple of days certainly disability, right to accessibility would be one. I'm sure there will be others that come up over the next couple of days. Those are my general comments. Thank you.

>> I'm from the association of progressive communications. My comment relates to section 39 and also to add another aspect.

In section 39 we are looking at Internet blogs and we talk about blogs and that's freedom of expression, a whole other session of freedom of assembly, association that's impacted, Article 19 but also it would be Article 20 and 21, Article 21 as well. That's one comment. That's in relation to Internet blogs but the other point is also it would be -- it would perhaps be interesting to make a complete suggestion on the need to assess if network shut downs and Internet blogs are the right way to go forward in a situation and to impress on states the need to apply international standards when imposing those these blogs beyond Article 19 alone.

That's one comment.

The second comment relating to delayed information, it would be interesting to include a section on right to information especially on proactive disclosure and also to promote the need to use Internet platforms for obtaining information from state agencies because right now to great extent information in many states, it is being followed through physical requests. How do you anticipate states to establish platforms to make those requests for information? I think these two would be important to include.

Opposed to put paragraph 40 in brackets and we agree that we'll have a meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. at room 405 but we have not made the reservation. We only know Thai that room is available now. First up, first serve basis, I want to make the announcement

now so if others don't grab it before we do. If any want to.

Could, again, it is 9:30 a.m.

>> And in addition to what was just announced, if you want to be connected to either, you can e-mail the Secretariat and we'll put you in contact. In contact with them if you don't get to go tomorrow, if you want to work on this topic after the event or, you know, continue to do that. Please, come, e-mail us, we'll put you in contact with them.

>> Thank you for arranging this session. (No audio).

>> Prosecution, section 36, that which agreements signed between countries to investigate cybercrimes but the process, it is cumbersome, what is the possibility of having a cybercrime convention at least for the AP region with less complex procedures? It sounds good, but I have two, three questions around it.

First I know that there is a global one, the Budapest convention, maybe there is a concern on that and that's why a regional one is being proposed likely? The other thing, unlike trade, labor movement, for example, in the region, Internet is truly global, would a regional convention be very useful? I'm more often than not from outside of the region than not, for example.

As to do we really truly, we need a global one. This is a question why is the Budapest convention not working and if it is not, maybe we can come up with another global one.

One thing I do know about the Budapest convention is that it requires countries to have eCybercrime law. I'm not sure that it requires that the individual -- to become a signatory or to ratify the Convention. I'm not sure it requires individual countries cybercrime laws to comply with the Human Rights, international Human Rights laws and frameworks.

For example, you know if Pakistan cybercrime law is actually past which it is in the process right now, I do know that the issues on surveillance, communication surveillance do not comply with the 13 principles on communications. In fact, they go -- some of the provisions, they're exactly the opposite. For example, 13 principles talk about bypassing legal procedures and acting in an emergency where for communications where maybe there is danger to human life. But never does it allow bypassing those if there is just a fear of somebody fleeing or destroying data whereas Pakistan's draft Bill right now says exactly that, that you can bypass getting a warrant if you think somebody is going to free or destroy the data. There are several questions and it could be a good way of going about it. We come up with a convention and already the cyberlaws are facilitated in a sense, prosecution, across regions and it may actually turn out to be worse for Human Rights unless this new convention, with I would prefer it to be global actually requires each country's law to comply with Human Rights, international Human Rights standards.

Thanks.

>> I would like to ask and maybe comment on the paragraph 37. Sorry, Anika from the Philippines.

I would like to ask what is the reason why we have -- what's the rational why we have paragraph number 37 where in draft 0 we don't have this perception. Just to understand what is the rational?

>> Just a quick explanation of why there is new content in draft 1 as opposed to draft 0. Draft 0 was open for public comment. All the comments and input we received during that public comment was put in draft 1. You may see some text in draft 1 that you didn't see in draft 0 before. Also we received some input from the drafting Committee so that also got reflected into draft 1. That's a had brief explanation as to why the two drafts may be different.

>> I would like to frame it in a more positive way.

I think this is just focusing on privacy, no? If we want to focus on culture or cultural development maybe we can just frame it in a right framework, no?

If this is respectable cultural differences, I'm thinking of just scrapping it and -- let me just -- I have -- maybe can we participate in cultural life or about cultural development or something like that? I will try to give an alternative text to it.

Right now is it -- we can't delete it now.

>> What we can do, if you have an alternative text, please edit here and what we'll do, we'll add both and what will happen from everybody else, we'll have another chat about it tomorrow.

>> All right.

>> Please do.

We -- there's -- there is obviously things in here that are going to be removed because they're one person's thoughts at the time and we have been happy to receive. You know, we'll -- amending it, it is great.

>> Thank you.

Like we said, we can highly suggest additional headings so I think that the document will see this change, no? Okay.

>> I want to bring the discussion back to 37. This provision concerns me. We need to be -- this whole argument about cultural specificities has been discussed for several years now and this has specifically serious implications for women and for gender, also for people raising democracy-related issues. I would caution we should look at this section carefully. This is exactly the issue we're facing in India, pack San and most South Asian countries where cultural specificities is used against rights quite blatantly and it is important to talk about that directly in addition to reinforcing the need to -- how do I say it -- look at culture from a rights perspective.

>> Okay.

>> I also want to add my reservations and I'm having difficulty understanding why culture is being applied to privacy and law. It can be applied, indeed is used as an excuse for talking about various

different freedoms, for example, in our culture freedom of expression could be different and there's -- culture can be different from home to home, not just region to region so we have to take the right approach and very internationally defined rights, right?

>> This is Jennifer Chong from the Secretariat again, just a brief reminder for everyone to just state your name before you make your contribution because we also have some remote participants joining us online and they may not know who is speaking if it is a little bit of a delay. Just please do remember to do that.

Thank you.

>> I think the point of paragraph 37 or the point of the heading is a difference in cultures but a difference in jurisdictions and maybe you would resolve doubts about that paragraph or you could make progress in discussing that paragraph if you simply change the heading to refer to different approaches to privacy in different jurisdictions.

>> We're still getting together a little group here that wants to focus on this particular issue so over the next few days if you can get us something that actually addresses what Winston has actually mentioned as well.

>> I'm from ISOC U.E. Section 32.

I think -- I just made a comment on that.

>> We had an interesting workshop today on this topic. Yeah. Okay. We had an interesting workshop on this topic about the impact of recently agreed treaties like TPP and others that are developing in the Asia-Pacific region particularly. There has been some deficiencies in the treaties, particularly when it comes to cross-border data. There's been some -- I mean, while it's been generally agreed that it is an advantage for the Internet in general to have these treaties but there should be mechanisms that should be built in the treaties to ensure that all of the parties have a level playing field when it comes to announcing their digital economies which is currently missing in the treaty.

There should be an increase for person and advocacies when it comes to including those mechanisms and transparency when such things are agreed on. That's something that governments need to address and also should have a mechanism which offsets the advantages of what a data vocalization applies. So essentially it is one country, it is not at the cost of advantages of development of resources, technology development and other aspects.

>> We have five more minutes. If there is other public comments?

>> Yes. I'm Rbian Reyes, I'm from the Philippines.

The issue I would like to bring up right now, it is Internet speed in my country. Currently my country, there's a Monopoly happening because companies are blocking other companies from entering the market. For example, in -- they're monopolizing and giving variable Internet speed and making it really expensive.

I think others could relate. That's it. Thank you.

>> Maybe a session around access perhaps, a place holder to look at different tissues that can have a guideline around the access.

>> This is Nakia from Pakistan.

Just to add to what this of gentleman just mentioned, the spectrum issue, I think we can put that under point 34, the cyber connectivity because it directly relates to access on something. So, spectrum, that's more or less, that's like related to connecting, for example, the spectrum harmonization or issues related to spectrum for connectivity. We can add that to that.

Again, one more proposal that I have, it is for 39, we should add the issue of net neutrality as well. There is something that's burning within the Asia-Pacific region particularly South Asia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, telecommunication operators and ISPs, they have been practicing it and the communities don't know what exactly is their right in terms of open access and unusual access to Internet and content.

There's been instances of Civil Society organizations challenging in India and some of the biggest markets within Asia-Pacific communities still don't know. We should actually add net neutrality to this heading as well and explain it here.

Thank you.

>> Paul Wilson again.

I would like to suggest another place holder for capacity building.

I think capacity building is the justification for the Asia-Pacific region IGF, this is about bringing people together and bringing up the level of knowledge and interchange and networking in training, education, opportunity for access to information and other people. This is all about capacity building and I think that behind the issues we're dealing with in many, many possibly all sessions is the capacity building and bringing people in to have a better access to training and education and training and participation, we talk about the participational a lot and people need the capacity to participate. I suspect that is something, a theme we could draw out of many of the sessions even if it is not explicitly named and really point out that is a huge issue for us in this region with half of the world's population, with the vast majority of the world's Internet growth to come which would be happening here, we have the capacity to deal with that, that's something for this event to really look into.

Thank you.

>> Any one last comment? You all want to go home, right? You're all tired.

We'll let you go! There is one more! You have to hold that! After that, the last comment.

>> Just a procedural issue, I think do we need to commend a place holder or the Committee will look at if the comment, if there is consensus? What are the model you work? I never see 37 place holder and you have two days. It is almost Mission Impossible to reach a consensus with

37 place holders like this. How are we going to do --

>> What is the model?

>> These are the consensus based or is it a full consensus based or what needs to get this recommendation out.

>> SECRETARIAT: That's a very good question. That's also why we have the drafting Committee and the Secretariat will be assisting into this input. I know there will be some input that may be contradictory to each other. I'm very encouraged actually at this session when I heard from the participants from about the right to be forgotten when there is some competing ideas on it that they're willing to work together to work out some better text and actually all the input that we have heard from in the room, hopefully the remote participants will also think of some input as well, be we really encourage you to use the commenting platform to put your thoughts into text on this commenting platform so that other people can see what you're suggesting, can see what you're proposing. Back to your question about the 37 place holders, after the APrIGF event, after we collect this input we're going to try to reconcile the drafting Committee, they'll try to reconcile all of this input into a new draft that is going to be out for public comment again. There will be another chance for everyone to look at this document to say, hey, did they actually synthesis my ideas and input in the correct way? Was I represented correctly? Had does it still need tweaking or modifying or refining? There will be additional opportunities and time for everyone to give their input. This is not -- you know, it is not a deadline right now that you have to put your input in right now or you won't be heard. I just wanted to stress that point.

>> Edmond, responding a bit. As Jen said, we learned actually last year that the few days here is not enough to put this together. We have the extended process to engage everyone here to continue to keep an eye on the outcome of the document. That's one point.

The other point, with all of the place holder, I think if there's nobody really supporting a particular point then those place holders should go away and it could go away and so if you see some -- see a place holder there and you think those points are relevant, please bring it up and make sure that you state that those are relevant points either online or come to the mike. I think a shorter document that has the consensus and has meat is more, you know, useful than a big document that has very, very fluff -- more fluff. The place holders are there, they get the people to come to the mike and speak on it. I think while we have 37 place holders they could go away in the next draft.

We're not looking at creating such a big -- consensus around so many items, we may not be able to do it. You are probably right.

>> A follow-up do that, what I was going to suggest, if anyone here sees any of those paragraphs, points of the paragraphs of being particularly important, it would be good, I think, to have stated

maybe on the system or through another means. It is important, I think it is important this synthesis document should be linked to what happened at this event. It is a bit of a process of iteration, we suggested -- you suggested a draft based on what was proposed in the workshop proposals, but what's actually happening on the floor is a bit different, it's a more of a refinement, it is important since the document should reflect what was actually happening as well. I would be encouraging everyone who has a laptop in front of them or means to access that site to put a +1, thumbs up on these points so it shows that this is what people have seen and understood and what we all individually would like to see in the outcome of the event. Thank you.

>> I think that's very important. We need some indication from you of what's actually being supported at this meeting. Yes. If you can get into that document please indicate in some way or make a comment about some of the issues that are important to you.

If there's no other points should we close?

>> SECRETARIAT: So just a few reminders actually, besides going on the platform and putting your input we do have a new session that we have the first session tomorrow, which is in this room, room 401 from 9:30 to -- at 9:00 to 10:30 and we will be talking about part of the synthesis document, specifically the part that will be used as input into the global IGF. There will be nine guiding questions for all of you to consider. I really encourage everyone to take a look at that new session, take a look at the overview and come ready for your, you know, thoughts, inputs, comments.

At the end of tomorrow, end of day two we'll have another synthesis document, town hall session, and that will be in room 402, room 402 would be from 5:30 to 6:15. Hopefully we'll begin on time tomorrow so we have sufficient time for everyone to give their inputs in person and don't forget you can also do that online. If you feel like tonight, you thought about it a little bit and you want to put in some input and text, feel free to do this. The commenting platform will be open, the entire APrIGF and if you're in a work SHP -- and you hear something that's really important and if you think it should definitely be captured in this document, please go on this platform and give your input. Thank you so much. Sorry we have taken 7 more minutes of your time. I do note that we started late!

Thank you, everyone! Have a great evening!

Reminders, the social event will start at 7:00 tonight, the shutting bus will be waiting for you at the outdoor square outside of the Convention center. Refer to the invitation card when you receive it at the registration counter so the next bus is at 6:40 and 6:45. See you there!

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are

provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
