

FINISHED FILE

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

JULY 28, 2016
ROOM 401
9:00 A.M.

IGF INTERSESSIONAL WORK / NATIONAL & REGIONAL INITIATIVES

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime 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.

>> Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us so early in the morning. We'll be starting in a few minutes. Please just get settled, and thank you for joining us so early for our special session today. Can you hear me? Okay. Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the IGF Intersessional Work / National & Regional Initiatives session. We know this is a newer session that replaced a settings that was cancelled, actually pretty last-minute. So thank you very much for joining us. We do have very illustrious speakers and moderators today.

First, I'd like to introduce Mr. Markus Kummer. He has several hats, but he's here as the Head of the IGF SA Secretariat. Next, we have Ms. Izumi Okutani, a MAG member and Policy Liaison for JPRS. I'm sorry, JPNIC. Next to her, two moderators, Rajnesh Singh from Internet Society, ISOC. Next to him, we have Chat, who you saw yesterday moderating our town hall session on the synthesis document. Chat Garcia Ramilo is from the APC, and she's the Executive Director. Now, Izumi will give us an update on what the MAG is doing.

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: Thank you very much for this opportunity. Good morning, everyone. I'm serving as a MAG member until this year from the -- from our region, the Asia Pacific region, as a technical community. And I'd like to highlight a couple of activities happening in the global IGF that's relevant for our region and have the opportunity to provide feedback and input to the global IGF. I want to take Janet for taking

this initiative and picking up this theme. There are three key activities that I'd like to introduce today. One is that we -- there's a lot of focus on intersessional work activity, so it's not just one time discussions at the meeting and stop there, but then have continuation on discussions on a particular theme.

And I'll touch a little bit more on what they are. The second is that there's a theme being suggested that is expected to have, like, a horizontal common theme to receive feedback from national and regional IGF to the global IGF. And the theme that is for this year, which is a continuation from last year, is Connecting the Next Billion Online. And then the third point that I'd like to highlight is there's a lot of discussions on enhancing collaboration between global, national, and regional IGF. And there has been a couple of specific suggestions on how we do this for this year.

And before I go into -- touch each of these -- the key activities -- I'd like to give a little bit of a context on what's happening in the environment around the IGF in recent years. So as many of you might know, there was a renewal of the IGF mandate last year in 2015. It needed approval from the U.N. to continue -- for the IGF to continue its activities in the coming ten years. So I think starting from around 2013/14, I think there was some needs felt that the IGF itself needs more improvement. I think many of you have heard criticism that IGF is just a talk shop, and it's just, like, you know, having discussions at one time at the meeting. There's no continuation of work on a particular theme, and there's no concrete, visible output.

So the MAG has started working on how we address this kind of issue from 2013 or '14, and these three key activities, and the ways that we try to address it. So fortunately, the mandate was approved, and we were able to have the assurance that we have the IGF continuation until 2025, for the coming ten years. But that doesn't mean that we stop the improvement. And it's actually the other way around. Given that we know that we will have the continuation of IGF for the coming ten years, U.N. DESA, the department within the United Nations that is responsible for the IGF has decided let's start hearing feedback from the key stakeholders.

What will be the kind of improvements needed for the IGF in the coming ten years? And we actually had a meeting in New York right after the open consultation and MAG meeting. I think it was mid-July. And this report released on the discussions there and what would be the kind of improvements needed. So that's the basic context. And then I'd like to touch on the three key activities. So first I'll focus on intersessional work. So, there are two areas of activities to it. One is what's called dynamic coalition. And this is basically picking any theme that would be of a common interest for certain groups of people.

And then they are able to have activities, have discussions on a common theme. So it can be ranging from something around human rights

or privacy, or, I don't know, on accountability on public policies or gender. But then to be more specific, a dedicating mailing list or other activities that each of the dynamic coalitions may have decided. If you actually go to the IGF global website, there's a tag that actually says dynamic coalition. So if you tap there, you can see the list of topics and what kind of dynamic coalitions exist.

The second intersessional activity is what's called the Best Practices forum. And, again, pick on certain themes that is relevant at the time. And the biggest difference between the dynamic coalition and best practices forum is that every year IGF picks what would be the relevant themes for, like, roughly four or five themes. So this might continue from previous year. But it might be a new one. So for this year, we have five themes. So just to, you know, share what they are, IPV6, IXPs, gender and access, the fourth one on cybersecurity, the fifth one -- this is a new one -- on anticorruption, given the Panama Paper was released.

So these are the five themes for this year. And then there will be output document produced out of each of these best practices so that people will be able to see what would be the best practices on each of the themes. And I think what's interesting about it is that it's not a negotiated document that actually requires people to make certain policies, but sharing the existing practices that have worked, or maybe that didn't work, but then analyzing the reasons why. And people can actually learn from what would be the good things that they can do when they consider, you know, implementing activities of these best practices themes.

So that's the basic idea behind it. And again, you can see from the IGF website, the details there. So please find them if you are interested. And then, the second activity for this year, which is, again, continuation from last year, is connecting the next billion and phase II for this year. So last year we actually had a similar initiative. And there was feedback received from several national, regional IGF on the theme of access. It was considered to be something that would be a priority, and that is in sync with the sustainable development goals.

And what was -- the focus for last year was to develop what would be the kind of elements that is needed for connecting the next billion? And the document was produced. And for this year, the work was to build on that previous year's work, and to see what would be the regional or national specificity around this theme. So this is really relevant to our region, the APrIGF, what would be any issues specific to the Asia Pacific region. And I think there are nine questions being asked, calling for comments, I think until the final comment period is around until the 31st of August. But there's a deadline being set for the national and regional IGF to provide more flexibility.

That's something we can work on to see what is the input we can provide as the APrIGF. And the third one on strengthening collaboration

with national and regional IGF, I think I want to touch that later when it comes to discussing that part of the topic in this session. So that's all from me, and I think Markus, you might have something to add.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. It's a great pleasure for me to be here. I was hijacked into this session at the very last minute, so I have not prepared anything, but, thank you, Izumi, for providing this context. And maybe I'll provide some context to the context. First of all, as Jennifer said I'm here in my capacity as Secretary of the IGF Support Association. I take advantage of this opportunity to make unashamed self-promotion and encourage you to become members of the Support Association. And let me briefly explain why I think it is important.

We set this up -- I was working then for the Internet Society, and the Internet Society was the main sponsor for creating this. It has two aims. One of the aims is to show through the membership that there is support. Like you may have a museum or an opera in your city, and they usually have an association of Friends of the Museum, that's a similar way. It shows by joining that you are supporting. Membership fees are modest, \$25 a year. We discussed that when we set it up, and that was felt that was a reasonable membership fee. If you join as an association organization, we ask you to provide \$100, but obviously, you can also spend more.

And what do we do with the funds we collect? We support the global IGF, but we also -- and this is important for you -- the national and regional IGFs. We think it is important that they get financial support. We also gave support to the Asia Pacific Regional IGF. Last year we supported, I think, 15 of them. Okay, our contributions are not massive. They're fairly modest. But nevertheless, they can make a difference for renting rooms and providing fellowships. And by joining, you are part of this movement. And it is also the aim to be a link between them, and a link between the national and regional initiatives, and the global IGF.

Now, I said in my address yesterday when we started the IGF, this was not at all on the map, nor on the agenda. This was not planned, top-down, we need to have national and regional meetings. They just popped up. Maybe the first one in the UK, and then there was the European regional one, then I was invited to east Africa, West Africa, in 2010, HongKong, the Asia Pacific. In all the regions, they're really spreading like mushrooms. And why is that? And that's not central planning, that's just in response to locally-felt needs that people feel, let's get together and discuss issues of common consequence.

And in the same way that we just said there are other evolutions, I think you make it sound as if it was, in a way, a reaction by the MAG to some recommendations which can be interpreted that way, but I would see it, it was a natural evolution. The IGF over the years matured. To begin with, stakeholders were not ready to engage in

activities between the meetings. There was strong resistance. That's why the dynamic coalitions came. There were people who wanted to engage in a bottom-up way and do something. And now we're in the process of bringing all these initiatives a little bit more together.

The dynamic coalitions, the national regional IGFs, and the best practices forums is more of a central activity which is under the auspices of the MAG, which is different from the dynamic coalitions or the national regional IGFs. I was at this retreat Izumi mentioned, and I encourage you to read the report. It's a very rich report. But as always, a report gives just the flavor of the meeting. And when you're there, you get a little bit more of what is behind the lines. And, again, I noticed there were two tendencies -- there are those who would like to have everything a little bit more under central control or command, the dynamic coalitions or the national regional IGFs, and others say, hang on, wait a minute. Let them evolve and let them develop, each according to their own needs and also to the needs of the region they are in.

So we have these contradictory tendencies. And that was -- also goes back to when we held the first meetings of all the regional initiatives. There were some who saw them more as preparing for the global meeting, like a traditional U.N. preparatory conference, whereas others said, no, we want to discuss what is important for our region. And that was really a defining feature for all of them. The programs on the whole were totally different. A European meeting is different from a meeting in Africa where access is a main priority.

And I found it particularly striking in East Africa, the first meeting I think was in 2008. The access was the overarching priority. Then cable landed in Mombasa. Access was easier. Prices fell down, because Kenya had a good policy in place with competition. And all of a sudden there were others issues on the top of the agenda once you have access. So, there is a clear difference from region to region. There's no one-size-fits-all. And that is, I think, a good thing as well. Let me lastly also say, now we have -- and we mentioned that we have a ten-year program that allows for a bit of more better planning.

And that idea, I think, found strong echo at the retreat two weeks ago that many people felt there would be merit in having a multiyear program that you decide that year we do this, next year we do something different, and then you have time to invite relevant organizations that maybe have not engaged. I noticed trade is an issue that is bubbling up increasingly. It's also a workshop here. So if you want to discuss trade, then obviously you would need to invite people who know about trade, like the World Trade Organization, and you could say, okay, let's have a meeting in 2018 or '19 where we discuss trade agreements and the internet, and prepare for that well in advance.

And that is also something I would like to encourage all of you who are involved in national region national IGFs, instead of just responding to ideas that come from headquarters, so to speak. Come up with your ideas. Make suggestions. And it would be nice to see ideas

bubbling up that are dealt with at the global IGF that were coming from national or regional initiatives. The Asia Pacific regional initiative feels this is an issue that ought to be discussed at the global level. Maybe not this year, maybe not next year, but maybe the year after next.

That will be a very positive development, I would say. If you have a both-way interaction, not just top-down but also bottom-up. This year we have tried to invite you -- and I would also like to encourage you -- to subscribe to the various lists. As we mentioned, there are these best practice forums. I'm helping to coordinate one on cybersecurity, which is an issue which is of great concern, I think, to most regions. So please join this discussion, join these lists, and then also, obviously, we will have the session. We will discuss that later at the IGF in Guadalajara, where you will orchestrate a main session. I look forward to that. With that, I think I have more or less said what I have to say. Thank you for it.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you very much, Izumi, and Markus, and especially Markus. Literally I grabbed him walking into the room this morning. I couldn't pass up the opportunity to have Markus share. He was at the IGF retreat, and he's also obviously the Secretariat for the IGF SA, which he mentioned very thoroughly. I encourage everyone who does support the IGF movement to please, please consider joining, because, you know, your support really means a lot to -- you know, national and regional initiatives around the world, and especially, a big thank you to IGF SA, because they have sponsored this very APrIGF. So, thank you very much.

With that, I'd like to go to something that Izumi mentioned. And she touched on very briefly. And this is the policy options for connecting and enabling the next billion, phase II. Now, just a brief review, last year we used the APrIGF synthesis document resulting from the Macao meeting as a contribution from our region. It's not representative of our entire region, because we have a very diverse region. But it was just, you know, part of the contribution. This year, as Izumi mentioned, the MAG re-confirmed the importance of this intersessional work. And so the policy option for the connecting and enabling the next billion is now into phase II.

And there was nine guiding questions issued in the call for public input. There is a deadline originally, but for the national and regional initiatives, there is no deadline, because the MAG and IGF secretary realize the initiatives will be held later on, and they want as much input as possible from us. I know maybe not everyone has had a chance to look at all of the nine questions. I do have the first three on the screen, and I'd like to pass over the mic to our two moderators, Rajnesh Singh and Chat Ramilo to see how we would like to start the discussion going on what is important to our region, and using these guiding questions as, you know, a jumping point to what we might want to say as an input into the global IGF.

So, Chat and Raj, thank you.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: I tried to pass the buck and ask Chat to do this. Thanks for attending this session was put together on short notice. I'm glad the room filled up a little bit. Thank you for coming in. It makes us feel good that there's people listening to us. As Jennifer said, these nine questions that were put forward which input is being sought for -- what I'd like to know is that -- and I'm not sure how many of you have seen this before or have had the opportunity to study the questions. But if you have, or you can also quickly read it now, I think there's some fundamental questions that these ask.

When I was reading through these when this list came out, number 1 resonated with me a lot. It says how do you define or understand the theme of connecting and enabling the next billion. It's not just about the connecting. As Markus said, once the cable landed in Africa, they had access and other things boiled to the top. At least to my mind, I think there's an access issue here. But there's also a question about what happens next when you do have access, and things start building up and boiling up in some instances.

So that's one thing that sort of resonated with me. Of course, a lot of work has been done across the regions and countries within this region as well as outside. And I think Markus also mentioned earlier the fact that, you know, a lot of these issues, topics, technology means different things to different people. And there's also the issue of context. For example, in Taiwan, access and connecting people may mean something else compared to somewhere that they don't have the infrastructure -- or they have recent infrastructure rather than a developed infrastructure.

So these are the questions that came up to my mind. Jennifer, could we put the next slide on for the next set of questions? Out of these three questions, the second one, again, was an interesting one for me. What does meaningful access mean? It is related a little bit to what I said before. Once you have access, what is it that you do with it? There's issues of cost. Can people afford the subscription packages? And if they can't -- again, I'm talking about largely developing and emerging countries, but as well as some of the more developed countries.

Because there's people at every social starter level. And be it a developed or developing country, you also have people who cannot afford the access. Australia is an example. Where I live, there's a part of the population -- Australia is known as a wealthy country -- who cannot access the internet because they cannot afford it. So, I think meaningful access is also an interesting question to pose. And then, of course, there's the question about the SDGs. Again, I'm not sure how many of you have had a look at the SDGs. There's a fairly lengthy list.

But one thing I think is for certain, to achieve a lot of those SDGs, the internet and ICTs will play a strong role in helping us achieve

those. Next slide, please. Out of these, number 1 really resonated with me. You know, for some of us who have been working in development for quite a number of years, you know, there's a lot of good will that goes into doing projects in a lot of countries -- developing countries around the world. The intention is good, but often the project actually fails because either it's not sustainable or there's not followup, or they don't support it into the future.

So I think -- you know, it's always good to talk about the positives and how good everything is, but I think it's very important as well to try to identify what failed and how do you ensure that mistake doesn't happen again, or how can we do it better next time around. So, again, that really resonated with me there. And then, of course, success stories are also important. We'd like to share some of those as well. So at this stage, I'd like to pass it to Chat, if she's got some comments.

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: So maybe I'll just add that barriers are not only around -- enabling the next million is not just about access to the infrastructure. There are many. This is one of the things we've seen now. There are many other barriers that need to come into the discussion. For example, barriers because of discrimination. And there are many barriers because of security considerations. So I think all that has to be part of the conversation. And it's been discussed, all day yesterday. I'm sure there will be other discussions happening here.

But I think those kinds of -- Markus was saying, from ten years ago, it's quite different, so the buyers have probably changed. There are many barriers that have -- when there's more access, there's also new barriers that have developed. So we need to also look at that in the -- in discussing or in the input around these questions. So I think at this point, we want to invite others to -- you know, to be part of this conversation and see what the issues -- what other points or issues you're looking at.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: And if you could just introduce your name and your affiliation.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello, I come from Indonesia. I would like to mention about the bias, as the Google yesterday and the keynote speaker was speaking about the phone, people are accessing more, especially in Asia Pacific through mobile phone rather than through PCs or cable. So that will be something really serious for me, because the smartphone or the mobile phone has different characteristic with the PCs. And the early adopters of the internet connection is coming from the PCs. People could not read books from the very small mobile phone. It's almost impossible to do it.

We have Kindle now, iPad or tablet, but it's impossible to expect people can access meaningfully as the same like people have access to others. So I would like to suggest, perhaps, some interventions on that. How to make access for the mobile phone more meaningful, especially for the late adopters of the internet access. Thank you.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: So just to clarify, you're talking about being able to actually do stuff using the mobile, right, as opposed --

>> AUDIENCE: There should be specific interventions if this will be a policy document. There is to be specific intervention for people who have access -- the first time they access internet is through mobile fine. Because the quality of accessing the mobile phone is different than when you have access in your PCs or laptop. So that is a different quality. So I think there has to be specific things to do for the government in Asia Pacific, for example, or the government that has people more accessing through mobile phone rather than through PC. That's my point. Thank you.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Any other comments, questions, feedback? Not enough coffee this morning, I suppose?

(Laughter)

>> RAJNESH SINGH: No?

>> So I think there was a specific question, do you observe any regional specificity or local specificity. So, I mean, I think this example that there's a trend, especially in case of late joiners for the connectivity, you should think of focusing on the wireless or mobile more than PC, something that would be of an interest. Or maybe within our region, like, the Pacifics, they might have, like, you know, their own unique issues, because they have the islands, and it's difficult to have the physical fiber connections. So this would be the kind of themes that would be, you know, really relevant in providing feedback to this work, I think.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: So just on that, I've got -- I'll speak while you walk up to the mic. The -- you know, I've had a longstanding rant about accessing websites using a mobile device. The number of websites that still do not understand that this region is mobile first, and that if you want people to come to your website and use it in any meaningful way, you need to render that website for a mobile device. Try accessing a site that is only displayed for PC or a large-screen thing using a mobile. It's very hard to use them.

And it's amazing. Even -- I'll give you one example. Quantas, the Australian airline, their website is terrible. They've tried to fix it but it's not there. There's another one that's not far behind. And if you want people to come to your website and buy and do stuff on it, I'm sorry. But if people can't actually read what's on your site, how will they engage with it? That's one. Number 2, there's a language component, particularly with over half the world's languages in this region. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello, yes. I'm originally from Russia. I work for Asia Pacific top level association. And I would like to highlight on question seven about some examples when ICTs do not bolster development, and that concerns quite a big territory in Eurasia, which is known as ex-Soviet part, and some Asian part of that. We can see that ICTs -- I mean, the wide spread of ICTs and the internet in that area didn't

help those countries, those nations to ensure -- I mean, a sound socioeconomic development.

And I would say that, you know, back in the 1930s, one of the wittiest Soviet authors at that time dropped in his -- you know, like writers do -- they do some notes for future reference, or for future books. He put something like, radio, radio. Everybody talks about radio. There will be radio, and there will be happiness. Here we have radio but no happiness. What I mean is that ICTs by itself is a very powerful tool. But at the same time, we should not underestimate the institutional environment in which this tool is deployed.

And this is very important, because sometimes we tend to absolutize this instrument, and we think that well, once the internet and ICTs is there, the civil society is there, the government is much smarter and wiser, and open and transparent, which doesn't happen, actually, simply because people are human beings with all their prejudices, and customs, and longstanding traditions. So I think that we should pay more attention to the interconnection between ICTs and that enabling environment about which we are talking at all times, and we should invite those governments and those nascent civil society organizations, not just in that part of the world, but also in some others, to think of ways and means of building institutions, contemporary institutions, modern institutions, or to revise current practices which may not be consistent with the challenges of our days.

It's a very hard job, because it's really easy to make a revolution, but it's really hard to do a consistent and persistent work in convincing someone who seeks benefits from nontransparent -- I mean, closed, whatever -- modus operandi like from many governments in that particular area and some others. So that was just my comment. Thank you.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Thank you. Any other feedback? Yes, ma'am.

>> AUDIENCE: Good morning. I'm from the Philippines. If you could just refer to the first speech of the guide questions, which was, like, the pickup from I think -- I apologize, but we came in late. But I would like to basically connect my comment to what Markus earlier mentioned about the trade agreements and how do we connect the issue of connecting and enabling the next billion. It's good that we had the discussion on TPP yesterday, although I think that was the only session for the entire APrIGF. But I think we have to also recognize, as someone who's pushing for connectivity, how it also has negative implication to displacement of people.

It's like, how do we also try to balance human rights versus connectivity of people, and development? I think as someone who's in the decision-making -- or was in a very good position to influence policies, how we as advocates would also influence agreements like -- I don't know, like TPP, who we know would eventually really -- will have negative implications also to poor and marginalized people. So when we say connecting and enabling the next billion, who are we talking

to? Who are the next billion? Is -- are we referring to the class A and B, or are we referring to the class D and E?

And if that's the case, we cannot just look at the issues separately, but interdependently. And I think that's something that we have to look into in the next coming years, how trade agreements will have really negative implications to connectivity and to the lives of the marginalized groups. Thank you.

>> Of course, TPP was such a super secret closed meeting, no one knew it was happening. So I think there's a lot of dismay with the process. Unfortunately, with a lot of countries signing up. You know, with trade agreements, I think it also goes both ways. There are negative implications for sure, but there's also positives, as well. So that needs to be on the ballots, as well.

>> AUDIENCE: My voice is not very good. Can you hear me? Okay. Let me try. I think there is an opportunity for technology to provide free access for everyone. But the problem is, what kind of free access internet you are looking for. If you think about it, if there is a free SS internet available in Taiwan, provided by Google or Facebook, I don't know how the people in Taiwan and Philippines -- how you are doing with that. First question about that. Second, who is more accountable? Is Google or local telecom? Who is better? I think it's not a simple question, but we need to understand.

When we say we want to reach the next experience, what about open up your regulations, allow Google to provide free access for everyone. And Google did that in New York City. And do you want Google to do that in the Philippines, or whatever countries? And you will see the teleco will be facing a huge challenge. But, again, that doesn't mean Google isn't necessarily bad. But the question is, who will be the better? A global company, or a local company?

>> I just want to echo what was said, that's a really good point. Thank you for that comment.

>> And maybe to add to that, I think there are also other models, I suppose, in terms of community access. I mean, there are models there already that are becoming much more -- you know, they're more community organizations. Or it's not simply, I think, just a national model. There could be community models as well where, you know, you can, in fact -- that can lead to empowering of communities. And there are models there. So it's not just the one -- it's not just mobile. It's not necessarily just a mobile model that is being rolled out, you know, by companies.

>> AUDIENCE: Of course. I just take an example, you know. Yeah.

>> AUDIENCE: One week after Thailand -- I wanted to mention that I've been proposed to -- in New York. Again, government have been overlook. And as I experience working in internet, it's a most complex public administration. You can write a whole theory about it. I've been studying. It's a most complex public policy issue ever since democracy in Greece, because you can look into the power we

use -- electricians. They are not -- to the end users, to the community. Healthcare, nothing. They open the hospital and they are closing now. They don't care.

The internet open up, what every government afraid is to fuel the mechanism or the way to control the other system that need equilibrium all the time between the administrative, but in the national loop. Government is the key. And that, I propose. We have to advice how they organize. I always laughing when I heard that in the UK, the first time someone introduced me, he came from the Ministry of Sport. And someone used to mention this on ICANN 50, as well. That the ministry that involved in internet is almost half of the ministry.

Some of them cannot even tell the names, like the UK Ministry of Sport, Art, and Culture, with internet. In Thailand, Ministry of ICT, Science, Technologies, E-commerce. We have eight departments from four ministries involved. It needs to be organized. And what I propose to you, you need to come up with recommended structures how every government is work. I look through the trade facilitation and everything, have been discussed because, in fact, there is a recommendation, national trade facilitation, by the UNC, recommendations. And these have been part of it.

Everybody know what they're talking about, trade, how they're organized locally, what is the structures. And I think internet could be able to recommend how the national internet should be organized. And then when we're talking we know exactly to whom we need to discuss. Because when -- inside in the ministry, everybody all over the place. Some is in IGF before, now we have taking over. Some is -- those are the issues, the structures of the government. It might not be in this IGF, but the government has to find some way to coordinate on this issue. But it's not so clear so far, which are the platform recommended to discuss. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Can I comment? Yeah. Actually, that is a very good point. The government have to involve, you know, because right now, for example, like the TPP, or, like, you know, internet governance issues. In many of the government in Asia Pacific, it's not sufficient enough to do a response there, or it's not involved deep enough. So I really agree. In the next APrIGF or after, we have to do our best to invite government people to participate in APrIGF, to organize them, you know, and to do the dialogue, and sharing talking to the, you know, participant in the IGF to understand the issue we are talking about. So, how we can sell it is to make government smarter, you know.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Okay. Thanks for that. Being mindful of the time, I'll just hand over back to Jennifer, who's going to move to the session on NRIs now, I think.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG: So, thank you, everyone. And thank you for such a spirited discussion so early in the morning. I realize a lot of people may not have had a chance to have coffee yet, but please don't -- you know, stop giving your input. And one way to do

that -- because if you haven't had a chance to look at the nine questions, these the questions are in our synthesis document. Go to the synthesis document commenting platform, put in all your thoughts. We really appreciate all your input. I'll have at the end of the slide, you know, the URL for the platform.

But mindful of the time, too, I'd like to turn to the second half of our session, which is discussing the national and regional initiatives. I don't know if Izumi would like to say a few words about that?

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: Sure. I just want to highlight a couple of key activities around this theme, and perhaps Markus has additional words around what was discussed at the IGF retreat on this topic. So, I think there has been in the past of talking about, hey, we should enhance collaboration between global, national, and regional IGF. But then this year, I think there has been a couple of specific activities. First, there will be a main session at the IGF in Mexico on national and regional IGFs, how we do it and what will be the topic is still under discussions among this group that, you know, of the national and regional IGFs that can register and subscribe to.

But I think the idea is rather than focusing on the specifics of how the administrative issues of organizing it, maybe discuss common issues that would be of an interest across different national and regional IGFs, or each of the national and regional IGFs would share the theme that would be a priority. These are the kind of ideas that are being off-loaded and still under discussions. And then, I think there's an ideal to have a more smaller sub-session that will -- for each of us to exchange on what will be the facilitation, how do you actually organize it, what are the issues that -- and what are the challenges that you're facing.

This is more for a sub-session that is not a main session. And it's more relevant directly for the national and regional IGFs. The main session is welcome for, like, everybody, the wider audience to join us in the discussion. That's one activity. The second activity is there will be a booth -- a joint booth to be set up for the national and regional IGFs. And there will be a brochure to be handed out. So I think each of the national and regional IGFs are able to respond to the questions. And then the response to the questions will be reflected in the brochure.

So I think this is something that APrIGF can consider so that we will have introduction about us at this booth for the leaflet to be handed out. And then the third one -- this is the point that I really want to hear your feedback today -- is on whether or not and how to enhance collaboration between the global, national, and regional IGFs. I think Markus has touched that there are mixed opinions around this. So if some feel that, hey, we're totally independent, so there's no need for collaboration at all with the global IGF, we have our own theme, we have our own issue, and there's no need to connect -- and

there are different opinions where people feel, hey, we want to be able to provide the feedback to the global IGF on what's happening in our region, or in the local economy, or hear what's happening globally so that as a reference of our discussions in our region.

So, there seems to be a different discussion around this. And there's also an idea being floated on, maybe it would be useful to have cross-regional or national exchange of information. So, for example, APrIGF might want to exchange information with what's happening in the African region. So that was something that was mentioned as well. And lastly, I think there was also an idea on whether IGF Support Association can financially support participants from the national and regional IGF. This is still an idea level. Nothing has been decided. And I think Markus probably has -- can add a few words on whether you're willing to hear feedback from the people here, or what's the status of discussions on this topic.

So, some highlighting the key points of issues being discussed, and I hand over to Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, maybe last thing first. (Chuckling) Fellowships. It's part of our statutes or articles of the association of the IGF SA that we can provide fellowships, but so far we have not done so. But the idea has been floated. Maybe we should sponsor representatives of the national and regional IGFs to participate in the global meeting. But this is something we would have to discuss internally first.. The second issue, I would like to repeat what I said earlier.

I would like to see the communication between the various levels not as a one-way street, but as a two-way street, that information comes up from the top down to the national level, but then at the same time, that it comes up from the national through the regional to the global level. And there is no hierarchal relationship between all these initiatives. I think communication, if it is effective, has to be two-way. Lastly, the cross-regional cooperation is an interesting idea, just to pick up on what was discussed earlier, trade issues.

This is also relevant in Europe. But there's a trade deal on the discussion between Europe and the U.S. which is similar to the TPP, and similar concerns have been raised. And that might be an interesting topic to pick up in a cross-regional exchange. And on that issue, I have a past as a trade negotiator before I moved into this space. And this is what I like to call a clash between two cultures. It's the culture of government -- they have a tradition, and you rightly said, trade. There's a long, long tradition of how to deal with it. But that was before the internet came.

And when trade touches the internet, then you clash with the internet community, which is used to a totally different culture of openness, transparency, and involvement. And I heard trade negotiators in Brussels say, what's the problem? I mean, we have been as transparent as never before, gave press briefings and invite people for briefings.

But that's not the transparency the internet community is used to. And that is the basic problem here. The internet community is used to coming early and making their comments early on issues that are of concern to them.

But if you do that in a trade negotiation, you will never end. You will never get the deal. And that is a problem that is not easy to be solved. But I think it's a good discussion to have. And it might be an interesting discussion for cross-regional. Thank you.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you so much, Markus and Izumi for providing that very useful background and setting the scene for this NRI discussion. I'd also like to point out that we have the IGF Secretariat focal point for the NRIs actually in our Adobe remote virtual meeting room. So, Anja has joined us. Thank you so much, Anja, for waking up -- yes, it's 4:00 in the morning for Anja. So, if you have any questions at all, any input at all, you are very welcome to also contact Anja. Thank you again for joining us. I'd love to pass on to our two moderators to open the discussion.

I know there are a lot of people from national initiatives around the room. I'm sure you have a lot of input that you'd like to give. So, thank you, Chat and Raj.

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: I was going to ask people, if you can -- especially those of you -- maybe we can have a show of hands, who are actually involved in national IGFs, or organizing them? There you go. So perhaps we can have them come up and just give your thoughts around the kind of inputs, and the kind of participation. And also to respond to those questions around relationships between NRI and global, and also the cross-region. Yes. Go ahead. (Laughter) I'm sure people will come.

>> AUDIENCE: From Thailand. So I was sponsoring the NRI in Thailand in the past two years. Before that, it's also one year before. I am one of the -- thinking that we should have a connection between the local, national, NRI, for two reasons. I think one of the issues that why government would like to go in there. Initially, after the government department started to look into this, like, political movement, because there are a lot of human rights issue aspects. And there are several stakeholders around the internet. Working with locally, a contact, is all volunteer. I do see that this must be, that this kind of discussion should take place in the local.

But it should be open to everybody. So that's how we step in and we try to help facilitate this to happen. We sponsor and we nurture it to be growing. But the problem is the problem of administration killing them, because they're just a volunteer. They just want to arrange the meeting. They don't want to write the report. They don't want to do all this stuff. And I've proposed that, is there a way to register or list in the list of NRI, would have a benefit that they can have, like, an accredited or whatever, so in that way the sponsoring organization locally will know who is actually linked to the regional,

who is linked to the global platform, and having a way to organize themselves, making a report and open, like, the intention of having internet governance locally.

They should open to all, not only -- we also participate and we push the blind, for accessibility. And that proposal even go to this IGF in Mexico. We want to have the openness to every community. And I do support that. If there's a link, and if the regional or global could be having a way to accredit them is like reward the committees who are arranging it, and we can be sure it has been protected. The government should be supporting this, not it has become a politics mechanism. And that's my idea. Thank you.

>> Very interesting point, thank you. So you're saying that you would need some kind of acknowledgment for the work, and the effort from the global and regional IGFs. That was a very new and interesting point. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: From Russia. This time, obviously. Well, we do have our IGF. And there has been just recently the 7th edition of that. Now, it may also be recognized as a kind of cross-regional IGF, because it's for the most part of Eurasia, because people come from Mongolia and some other parts of this huge continent. I must say that as such, the event is sort of special, because we manage to reach out to all the strata, and all the stakeholders, except probably the government, because -- well, the Russian government is there, but, you know, I mean, I wouldn't say they're supportive, but at least they don't interfere at all.

And we feel absolutely privileged to enjoy 100% freedom, you know, in whatever we say. So the freedom of expression is there. And sometimes we allude that we are like dogs -- we are allowed to bark, but the chain is there. So, at the same time, I'm a little bit confused, because my understanding is that basically, the national IGF's recent experience have been recorded and put on paper. And we have someone in the room. And there is a volume, actually. The volume you can -- I would refer happy. Do you have a copy with you? You do. Yeah. Okay.

If you could just -- where? At the reception? At the reception. So there is a book, actually. A most recent book about national IGFs in Asia Pacific and the history and the modern state, and probably some outlooks. And, well, I would just refer everyone to that book. And everything is recorded there. So, I don't mean to say that we don't need this session, but at least we have some definitive source. But seriously, if you talk about -- please do. No, here is the man to tell you more about it.

>> AUDIENCE: This short book, if you want to buy. And probably this might be a good place. If you see -- you can see the -- you don't have to buy, okay. You can get the website, internethistory.asia. It's fairly obvious. Here you see the internet governance and the regional activity, but we didn't write on the APriIGF. We asked several people, and they said yes. And on the due date, no article.

(Laughter)

>> AUDIENCE: And I repeated twice or three times, then I just give up. Then ask countries -- not just IGF, okay. Internet governance of any country. And the country, I ask several. And we got a good volunteer from Russia and Taiwan, Kenny Wong, and Indonesia. The rest of them, I contact about 20 or 30 people. Either they say yes, or they say, I'll think about. And it's really important to write, even one page is okay. Then if you see five years later, ten years later, 20 years later, oh, yeah, that's the sort of status where we stand.

The record is very important. And the internet is beautiful, okay. Once you write article, it's there forever. Okay? It does not matter, five years later, you can revise. Then we have two version. 2015 version, 2020 version. We can just go all the way. But this recording is very important. And we volunteer, this one. Not just with the internet governance, but everything. And we did a lot, five years. So please do volunteer to write what's the internet governance in your country. Even one page is okay, because then later you can revise. The internet is beautiful. You can revise anytime you want, okay? And if you volunteer, I will give this one copy as a bribe. (Laughter)

>> So there's incentive there to write one page. Not too hard, right?

>> If I may comment, Raj, on that. I think it's a very important point. I think if you just have a meeting without any archive, the meeting has not taken place. And the authoritative source is really the IGF website. You have Anja on the call. I don't think she has audio connection. But she is the one who traces them and who keeps the record. And we as IGF SA, we just recognize those that are listed on the IGF website. And what she needs as IGF secretariat is a contact person. She wants to have a document that there is an existing website, and there is a report of the last meeting, so that proves that the initiative is alive and well.

And I think that is important, indeed. And for us as IGF SA, if they're listed on the website, we can consider giving a contribution. You may have seen the flyer we published with a map of all the initiatives, and those we have supported. It is really impressive, all the work you have been doing.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you very much. I'm from Nepal. And I have a few questions about setting up a new domestic label. And we're working on a new first time Nepal IGF in this year. So I want to ask if you can respond on it. What are the best practice model of setting up how to include government agencies and civil societies, and best combination? What are the differences of MAG and secretariat running different organization as secretariat, and various organizations coming into the MAG? And, again, coming into the MAG from the government side as well. Any best model or best practices out there that we can have in a country like Nepal, developing countries having democratic

influence, from administrative or logistic point of view? Thank you very much.

>> Okay. Did you want to say something? You as well? Just one second. As a response to that --

>> After maybe. Because what I was going to ask is part of his question.

>> Okay, fine.

>> AUDIENCE: First, do we have, like, a regular session of APriIGF? Because I didn't see this session on the program and brochure that I was given. So I think's not regular. A regular session, right? First time.

>> Yeah. This was put together at really short notice.

>> AUDIENCE: But I think we should have this session on regular basis, because I think it's really important to know other country's initiative and practice in terms of internet governance. So there maybe we can find a best practice in our region, like said by another . . . Yes. (Laughter) And then maybe we can put together our efforts in our region, and best practice -- maybe we can find from our commonalties. And then we can go to share further with, you know, global community. That's what I was -- thank you.

>> Excellent suggestion, I think. I think that's a good example of how our region can actually feed into the IGF, you know, based on the initiative. And that really has strong synergy with the activity of the professor, and we can share those who haven't shared yet, their practices of how we have set up the IGF. And Nepal, you can pick and choose, what seems to be relevant to your situation.

>> So what I was going to say before was, the best person to answer your question is probably a couple of great initiatives we have in the region. And there's one in Australia as well. And I think maybe you want to talk about the Indonesian experience?

>> Yeah, I have to comment, actually. One Indonesian experience and the other for Nepal. I think Anja just sent us an email, the national regional initiative at the IGF, we have a manual and toolkits. The manual is the basic principles of IGF and how you can have it in your country or your own region. So that's a developing process. I think that's good for us to have access to that. The second one is about Indonesia. So, Indonesia has just renewed its MAG IGF. So we have the multistakeholder advisory group Indonesia Internet Governance Forum recently.

So there are five people from five stakeholders, just three weeks ago. And in Indonesia, they're planning to have their own IGF in October. May not be relevant with the IGF global at Guadalajara, but we will start. I would like to highlight what they were saying about the secretariat, or it's difficult to write the report for volunteers, people have spare time to do it. That's really necessary if possible for the NRI initiative to have toolkits on managing volunteers. That would be good.

So we know how to do it, and how can we have appreciation towards the volunteers. The second one is language. There is -- we are Indonesian speaking, we don't have the confidence -- I mean, my kids now know, but, I mean, the generation that we have now, not many people are able to speak English. And it's really difficult for them to engage in the IGF global discussions and then have to relate with the context. So I don't know whether we have some volunteers, I heard a lot of initiative also can have many volunteers to translate at least the main documents to several languages if necessary, to Tagalog, or Indonesian. That might be helpful for the national or regional IGF. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I would like to share a small -- you know, some story that happened. During the -- recently, we had Sri Lankan IGF. So, Sri Lankan IGF -- in Sri Lankan IGF, what happened was it was initiated by one of the Internet Society Ambassadors. And he made the forum open. I was part of it. I'm from Nepal. I'm one of the ambassadors. It's like the collaboration. Internet is all about collaboration. You cannot limit it. And I was also part of it. And I even did a presentation out there. So, it's how we see the world.

It's how we are going to collaborate. So I think the possibilities is within us, within our networks. We come to all these meetings and we meet so many people, and we go back and we do that thing. So this is the main thing to do. This is the main challenge for us to utilize. There are people. There are resources. And we have to do something. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from Pakistan. In a country like Pakistan, it's not so easy to bring to the table. So for that purpose, we came up with a solution. Last year we had our first tradition of internet governance. And this year, we are planning in a different city. Our motive to rotate the school is just to get the knowledge about internet governance, that people should know what actually is going on. But most of the people in our country, it's like -- they mix it. They think that it's something related to the government.

To introduce technology within the government departments. But we are working on it. So, to bring our stakeholder table, we are introducing this school. And we are inviting reps from those institutions. I think this approach in our country is helping. And I hope that this will ultimately go for our national leader. Thank you.

>> We have one more speaker, and then mindful of time, I guess we've got five minutes left or something? Yeah. Seven. She's counting.

>> AUDIENCE: Yes. I'm from Japan. Maybe can explain in more fluent English, but I try. In Japan, there basically are two kind of initiatives for IGF, national IGF. And one is from the ISP Association. One is from the internet resource. And the first one is an annual conference for reporting what kind of activities are going on in the internet governance. And the second one is a bi-monthly meeting, usually on a specific theme, which deals with the topic for one meeting. And the

main obstacle, or main hurdle for us is how to make it a sustainable meeting, and how to make it a continuous effort.

Because we just gather 20, or 30, or 40 people in each meeting. And they are not very newcomers. So that's one of the trial we are trying. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. I'm chair of program committee of KR IGF since 2013, and we have the KR IGF in September 23rd. One of the challenges we have in my thought is the lack of participation. And what is the need for us to organize this IGF, kind of, event. Because Korea is not a big country. And you have plenty of similar kinds of forums and conference which is held by academy or civil society. So, really there are many similar forum. And people who are interested in specific issues can attend and have a dialogue in other places.

What is difference of national IGF, which have once a year from other, many similar kind of policy forums? So, I think if we identify the need -- specific need to organize the IGF, we cannot attract people to participate in the national IGF.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm Ellen from Internet New Zealand, we do the New Zealand National Initiative. I just want to put forward, having been involved in NRI coordination work, that I think strengthening linkages is important, and that I think it would be useful to clarify that it's about two different kinds of linkages, one between the NRIs and one between the NRIs and the IGF, and that how it operates at the moment with that main process -- both of those things get dealt with, sort of, together, and that there's actually something that many of the other NRIs have talked about, that support of idea-sharing and thinking about the challenges of learning an NRI is something that all of us -- it's a very lonely business in that there's one per country or region, and that we share challenges.

And the answers will be different for everybody, but that there is support to be had with those linkages, and that that's very important, I think, from the discussions with other NRIs. But that equally important is the substance of the discussion, what are the key issues and what do we want to bring forward. And that I think both of positive work we can do on both of those things are diluted by, sort of, trying to do all at once together. And that a bit more thinking about those two separate, sort of, needs or things would be really useful.

I think in terms of the Asia Pacific region, we have -- I really appreciate this space. And there are further spaces today to talk about it, because the issues will be different. The beautiful thing about NRIs is they're bottom up and you see the different issues, but then you see issues that are alike but have different perspectives. And I think that as a region, we have a lot to bring to the IGF in terms of content, to talk about both shared and not-shared issues, but those different perspectives and how to bring them about. We have a lot to learn from each other and to connect as well. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thanks very much. I think we need to end the session shortly. I'll ask if Izumi and Markus have any closing comments.

>> Thank you, everyone, and thank you for structuring the different perspective issues. One is about collaboration between national, regional, and global IGF. One is about how we exchange information about organizing each of our national IGFs. And the third is about maybe a common theme that we have. So we have three segments that, you know, it's worth continuing our consideration and discussions. For the immediate action point that's relevant to the feedback to the global IGF, there is actually a report from the IGF retreat that mentions it.

And, you know, some of the feedback that's here, maybe it's worth adding it as a specific suggestion. So, Jennifer, I don't know if it's relevant for me to share the quote of that part of the IGF report and all for additional, like, feedback? It doesn't have to be about what's already written, but additional feedback is certainly welcome. So that's something that I'd like to ask everybody for attention, and then keep in touch online.

>> Along the same lines, thank you very much for letting me be part of this discussion. I thought it was a very thoughtful discussion, and I would strongly encourage you to visit the IGF website, to read the report. And there is an invitation to give comments in a blog form. And there are many thoughtful comments, I think, that will be interesting for other readers of this website to read. And then it will be a more formal consultation process on the report. But as a first step, you can share your thoughts in a blog form, and I think that will be beneficial to all the other NRIs, from region to region. Thank you.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG: We had a nice message from our technical team. Because we started a few minutes late, we have a few minutes of grace time. I know we want to continue this discussion, not only just in this room and with the remote participants. We do want to receive your input. And I really want to call attention to, we are having, actually, organized by the NRI focal point Anja and the NRI coordinator, there will be an NRI call this Friday. And I believe it is 14:00 UTC, so it's going to be 10:00 Taipei time.

So if anyone is still awake then, or, you know, finished with dinner, please do join this call. And on this call, they will -- we will be talking about this main session, trying to finalize the topics that we want, as NRIs, to bring to the main IGF session in Guadalajara later this year. And there will be discussion also on the development of a toolkit. I know a lot of people today mentioned the challenges facing organizing a new national initiative, how Markus and Izumi, and a lot of people in this room also mentioned, there's no one size fits all solution.

So it is actually very important for us to, you know, come up with this resource to help others, you know, grassroots level, bottom-up development of people who want to organize within their own country

or economy a national initiative. So please do join this call. And all this information is available on the IGF website. You know, if you want to be listed or if you're concerned or confused about what the criteria might be, I urge you to reach out to the secretariat focal point. So, thank you very much for attending this really early morning special session, because we really did, as Raj mentioned and Markus mentioned, and actually, this was actually a session that was put together very last-minute.

But noted that the input from participants in this room, that this session is actually very valuable. So we will absolutely try to continue this session in the APrIGF events in the future, to have a space for NRIs to discuss, to have a space for us to reflect what we discuss in this region back to the IGF, whatever channels, whatever ways, whatever inputs that we think is most appropriate to come from this region. And, of course, we don't presume to speak for everyone in the region, because we are a very diverse region. So any individual input you would like to give, I urge you also to go to the IGF website and submit your input, because there is a lot of call for inputs out right now, as Izumi and Markus mentioned.

There is the report from the IGF retreat that is out for public consultation. There is also the nine questions that we need to consider as, you know, as a region, what we want to do about the, you know, policy options for connecting and enabling the next million. And obviously there's also the NRI initiatives, what we want to say at the main session. There's a lot of work we need to do, a lot of input from everyone around this room. So if you have any questions, please do email the secretariat at this email that's on the screen right now, and thank you so much for attending.

(Applause)

(Session concluded at 10:36 a.m.)

This text is being provided in a realtime 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.
