

Thank you very much.

There are three reporters in this session, Satish Babu, Nica Dumlao and me, Shita Laksmi. Our “buddy” is Ms. Maureen Hilyard.

We have five workshops to report, namely workshop number 59 (Democracy 3.0), number 27 (Multistakeholder Approaches in local and regional), number 57 (Internet policy Impact on Wildlife), number 77 (Youth Engagement in Internet Governance) and merger 6 (Internet Gov discussion on the Ground).

We will touch upon four main highlights across sessions:

1. Key issues
2. Commonalities
3. Recommendation
4. Overall relevancies

1. Key issues raised across the sessions:

- a) The multistakeholder model of Internet governance is still work in progress, and as it evolves, it may acquire a higher agility of decision-making, higher inclusiveness, more checks & balances, and internal capacity building processes.
- b) Diversity is a desirable characteristic. There was some divergence whether we should limit it to a mean because it slows down decision-making, or if it should be left unconstrained.
- c) There are set of pre requisites to have multistakeholder model to work effectively like political context that includes laws and regulations. Language barrier also being acknowledge in some session. Last but not least, capacity.

2. Commonalities or priorities in the sessions:

- a) Capacity is one of the main commonalities we found across the sessions. People need knowledge to understand, moreover engage in the multistakeholder processes. We can learn from the NetMission.Asia which engaged young people. Young people do not only have the new set of skills but also encourage to engage in the community and potentially influence the process.
- b) Dialogue among stakeholders –be it only between two stakeholders(for example government with private sector, or civil society with private sector) or between all stakeholder, is highly appreciated
- c) As part of the dialogue, dissent voices should also be allowed to be articulated and acknowledged well.

3. Recommendations or suggestions discussed in the sessions:

- a) We must be aware on that different power exists in the multistakeholder processes
- b) It is generally difficult to convince some Asia Pacific governments to subscribe to multistakeholder model, but we should be able to effectively explain it in a manner that will also show how this will benefit them.
- c) We should be able to bring in new (and young) stakeholder groups. We have to make people realize what their stake is, on the Internet.
- d) Rough consensus works well with homogeneous groups. For heterogeneous groups, it may need to be tweaked.

4. Overall relevancies of the sub-themes:

All workshops were acknowledging that the multistakeholder model has made significant strides until now. Multistakeholder model holds promise of contributing to a new, more participatory and efficient democracy.

Thank you.

#end#

Annex:

- > WS59 (11:00, 28 Jul) Satish –Democracy 3.0: Accountability and Representation in the geographical Constituency and Rough Consensus
- > WS27 (14:00, 28 Jul) NICA – Multistakeholder Approaches within Regional and Local IC Context: Diversity and Linkage
- > WS57 (11:00, 29 Jul) Satish – Internet Policy Impact on Wildlife Environment and Wildlife Friendly
- > WS77 (14:00, 29 Jul) Shita – Taking stock and moving forward: Youth Engagement in Internet Governance in Asia
- > additional: Shita - Merger 6. Igniting Internet Gov Discussions on the Ground

Report on WS 77: Taking stock and moving forward: Youth Engagement in Internet Governance in Asia

NetMission.Asia -- Dedicated young volunteers who highly value the capacity building program. In this program, the youth is learning different skills/ ability such as lobbying process, involving in community program, experiencing international (and challenging) conferences (such as ICANN, IGF)

What makes this more attractive for youth is also a challenge. Some issues that can make it more attractive is, because they can have more friendship –be it peers or seniors; local, regional and international exposure, new insights, knowledge and more autonomy (activities, issues). The youth really appreciate experience they have in process.

How can reaching more youth, and then stimulate them to participate more meaningfully and influence the process? Internet governance discussion is very overwhelming for some people. Modify the workshop format into more engaging (roundtable, informal discussion), not only panel (and talking heads).

--

Report on WS 57. Internet Policy Impact on Wildlife Environment and Wildlife Friendly Practices

The Internet can be used for enforcement of policy for ecological conservation, in line with the SDG goals of Peace, Prosperity, Planet and People. The Ajitora initiative in tiger conservation has been a notable initiative in this regard.

Apart from tracking illegal traffic and trade, the Internet can also be used for enforcing industry guidelines, if adopted. For instance, 15 leading e-com companies pledged zero-tolerance towards illegal online trade in endangered species in 2013, leading to a significant drop in trade.

The Internet permits the tracking of illegal products also from the market side, including tracking advertisements of illegal products. This is particularly important since social media is also being now used for illegal trade. It is notable that youth are also participating in conservation efforts, awareness building and action.

--

Report on WS 27: Multistakeholder Approaches within Regional and Local IC Context: Diversity and Linkage

- Regionally and locally, the awareness on Internet governance is very low, so consequently, it's tough to communicate what Multistakeholder model (MSHM) is and why this is the emerging Internet governance model. A few of the barriers are language, culture, and political context.

- MSHM should not be looked as an end-goal, but the way to achieve what we want for the Internet.

- It's generally difficult to convince some AP governments to adopt/subscribe to MSHM, but we should be able to effectively explain it to them – in a manner that will also show how this will benefit them. We should be able to also bring in new (and young) stakeholder groups; we have to make people realize what their stake/s is/are on the Internet.

Report on WS59: Democracy 3.0: Accountability and Representation in the Geographical Constituency and Rough Consensus (i.e. Multistakeholder) Model

1. The Multistakeholder Model (MSHM) of IG is still work in progress, and as it evolves, it may acquire a higher agility of decision-making, higher inclusiveness, more checks & balances, and internal capacity building processes.

2. Diversity is a desirable characteristic. There was some divergence whether we should limit it to a "golden mean" as it slows down decision-making, or if it should be left unconstrained.

3. Rough consensus works well with homogeneous groups. For heterogeneous groups, it may need to be tweaked.

The workshop ended acknowledging that the MSHM has made significant strides until now, and that it holds promise of contributing to a new, more participatory & efficient democracy.

###