

Services provided by: FINISHED FILE

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

28 JULY 2016
ROOM 401
1400-1530
WS 27

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACHES WITHIN
REGIONAL AND LOCAL IG CONTEXT: DIVERSITY AND LINKAGE

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> Hello, everybody. Good afternoon. And our session is almost starting, but we are still waiting for the last panelist right now. And in Chinese saying: The good thing is always coming late. So please be patient for a while. Thank you.

So, well our panelists are just here right now, the saying the good thing is always coming late, yes.

Welcome to the multi stakeholder stake. Shall we dance? Okay. So please see the screen. That's the title of our workshop is the topic about multistakeholder. And I don't know how many participants here attended, if some participants here attended last year at APrIGF. Because we held a similar topic and in the last year we talk about the development of IG principles from the geographic diversity, yeah.

And this year, we would like to promote the dialogue. And the dialogue never stops at any time. So this time we would like to promote the further discussion on this regional perspective. So, let's start.

At first I would like to introduce the brief structure of this session. As the first one, every panelist will introduce themselves to the audience.

And at the second session, I would like to ask every expert to share some understanding of multistakeholder from their respective perspective.

In the last session, we will boost some dynamic discussion.

And in the end, the audience will be encouraged to have some interaction of this topic, okay?

Who is the first one? I think from my left hand.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: Hello, everyone, I'm from Russia, I'm general manager, but I will represent more Russian perspective on the issue. Thank you.

>> JIA RONG: Hi, everyone, my name is Jia Rong from Singapore. I cover the Asia-Pacific region. I am considered quite new in Internet governance, I think because I joined ICANN in 2013. Then I participated in my first AGrIGF in June. I am attended since then. But compared to some people in this room, I am a newbie.

>> DR.PATRICK HO: Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Patrick Ho. I'm from Hong Kong. I'm the Secretary-General of the China Energy Fund Committee which is an NGO, a think tank, although it is called energy, but energy as we take in the broadest sense of the world, anything that drives civilization to progress is energy, anything that sustains human development is energy. So for a manner, we work very closely with United Nations, especially the ECOSOC, the Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations. And for that matter, I've been appointed by the Secretary-General as a new member of the MAC committee of the UN this year. Thus we have been working very closely with various NGOs to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. And these are some of the objectives that we have in mind.

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: I'm Rajnesh Singh, or Raj as most people call me. I look over the work in the Asia-Pacific region.

>> EDMON CHUNG: From Dot Asia. I have been mostly from 1989 from ICANN. So my views are very biased from an ICANN influence. And from Hong Kong, as well, so very interesting development in terms of governance, in institutional development there in Hong Kong, as well. Thank you.

>> DR.NING KONG: I'm from China, and I work from the CNNIC. I often attend the ITF meetings since 2009. So I think I can make some comments from the technical community. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Well, welcome our distinguished panelists again. So applause.

[Applause.]

Through. And I feel very lucky because I am the only lady in the panelists. Yeah. And I feel very happy to and I know this year APrIGF invited quite a new youth here so maybe multistakeholder is quite new to the youth audience. In the first round of the introduction, I hope my panelists to introduce the multistage holder from your side, as concise and as simple as possible. To let them know what multistakeholder is.

And during the past year, we have thinking about the IG in the local content and local culture. And I have some inspiration during this year to share with you.

The first one is the debate. We know multistakeholder is mainstream of IG model, but there's still some different voices and different interpretations of the multistakeholder. And the most debates focuses on the terminology and the translation because it's a word which can't be translated exactly in different language. But anyway, in my opinion, multistakeholder is a model to boost the most effective cooperation.

So, shall we put our attention to this model and put our attention to how to make this model more effective.

And the second inspiration is actually in the last years, in the last three years' discussion, we talk about the content and the actors of IG ecosystem. We have a lot of contents of IG, such as cybersecurity and Internet economy and the impacts of the Internet on the society and culture and so on.

So maybe in the different fields, we can use the multistakeholder by different ways. And the mechanism is different.

On the other side, the different regions and different countries, when they use the multistakeholder to boost the IG process, they will use a different way. So that's my thoughts on the IG principles and multistakeholder. So shall we give the floor to our panelists one by one?

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: Hello again. As I said I'm from Russia, the country which fiercely denies on the official level multistakeholder model, multistakeholder-driven model and multistakeholderism and continually states that the Internet Governance issues should be assigned to an intergovernmental organisation associated with the United Nations such as, for example, the International Telecommunications Union or ITU.

But back a little bit, I will go backwards and remind especially the young audience that the term multistakeholder-driven approach was crafted back in the year 2005 when the global community had -- mostly intergovernmental community had a meeting in Tunis. And then they decided that there should be some working definition for that phenomenon of how the Internet is governed. And Markus Score who is not in the room but some of you might have noticed him. Markus Kummer, he was a Swiss diplomat at that time, so around 40 people, smartest and wisest people, were crafting that definition very thoroughly so that it could be accepted by all the nations. And at the end of the day, they came with a very general definition which meant basically that everybody, every constituency, every group, every stakeholder should play a certain role.

Like for governments, it's just to define the groundwork, the legal and regulatory framework. For businesses, develop the best applications produced by technical community. For users, try those

applications and to see which ones who suit their interests best. And for academics, to describe this process and to provide a foresight as to where these communities -- sorry -- where these processes would be developed further on.

But, interestingly, that was labeled the working definition. We should be reminded at all times that it was just a working definition for that time, for that particular gathering, and for several years probably ahead as they thought at that time.

Interestingly, multistakeholderism is not Markus Kummer and his invention. Multistakeholderism is a very, very old thing and you might be interesting to know that it dates back to immediate evil ages when eye Scandinavian countries Sweden, Denmark were called a different way, so-called free cities in Europe practiced multistakeholderism, clearly. Just to give you an idea in Scandinavia there was something called Gadarna, all the people from all levels, the national level, could get together to discuss issues without any restrictions; and the decision was made by rough consensus. So people just discussed urgent issues.

In free cities, people were united in guilds, like I'm a locksmith and I belong to a certain guild. He is a Schumacher, he's from a -- shoe maker, he's from a different guild. What we had in common was that we would vote for a representative of our guild to sit on a City Council and to advocate our own interests, which should be consistent with interests of other guilds. So that was a perfect multistakeholderism.

Now, the discussion on multistakeholderism ignited in the year 2012 which the then ICANN's president Fadi Chehadé. For me it was quite unexpectedly the twist when ICANN started talking about only multistakeholderism at public meetings. So that was a little bit came as a surprise.

Anne then at that time that was that clear divide between certain nations which manifested itself in a huge gathering under the UN umbrella when some nations advocated multistakeholderism, some others were for intergovernmental-led effort in Internet Governance. And it ended up in a certain divide between these two groups of nations. It would prefer to say that the group which advocated intergovernmental-led Internet Governance was bigger than those who advocated multistakeholderism. It was interesting.

So then I just tried to realise, what was wrong? Why that divide was there? Was it East versus West? Western countries, democracies and so forth? One minute, okay? Or was it something else like, for example, authorities versus authoritarianism regimes, I came up with my conclusion to share with you. I believe that it's mature states which can afford -- oh here's Markus Kummer. That's the man behind this session.

[CHEERS AND APPLAUSE]

So I think that this is mature states who can afford

multistakeholderism, and newly formed states, young states, who still cannot believe in their forces so much and they cannot trust all the stakeholders, that is why they try to consolidate the process and try to lead this Internet government process. Thank you.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: I just want to have every panelist to have your short introduction within 5 or 6 minutes, yes. And I would like to make short comments on Leo's points.

I heard of one interesting word here. Hen saw. It's alliance in the Asian years of the Scandinavian Europe. I think some people know that in Chinese it's ((word)).

This is the new -- of multistakeholder. I think it is very interesting, interesting thought. And we can think about if it's nexus. Okay? So I will give the floor to Jia Rong.

>> MR. JIA RONG LOW: If we have time, can you also share about multistakeholder in Russian? Once I heard the story a couple years back, talk about the language issue regarding the definition of multistakeholder. In Russian it's very interesting. So we'll keep some time for that.

For me, my understanding of multistakeholder and how I learned it is not too far away. It's actually around the time of when the Internet was being conceived.

A number of graduate students in the 60s, they realized that their computers can talk to each other if you code them in a certain way. You code them in a way that they speak the same language, that the data transferred the size the same, and you have certain agreements on the standards of, okay, when I transfer my information to your computer, what port number should this be?

And these graduate students, they started writing this code. And the output of that very first code was called RFC1, request for comments 1. So those who are a little bit familiar with RFCs, if you've gone to an IETF meeting, the Internet Engineering Task Force meeting, still to this day, RFCs are still being used and it's in the thousands. It's evolving and changing as the technology grows.

So this RFC process that started way back amongst a couple of founders, one of them is Steve Crocker, who is the ICANN Chair of our Board, in a way, they agreed to use a model that is what we know as the multistakeholder model today. It is basically a model where there is a problem, we want to fix it. Who are the people who are interested in this topic on this issue? Let's come together, work out, do a request for comments, work out a proposal that we can have a common standard together on. And that is also the same model which we function today in the multistakeholder community.

So I'm simplifying things a lot, but I think that would help with simple understanding of what multistakeholder model is.

And it's really, when you talk about multistakeholder approach and Internet Governance, for the technical community, the multistakeholder --

[Technical difficulty.]

-- to come to a common understanding how this can be taken forward.

The last point I'll say on multistakeholder model is that because it is a model where different people come together to solve problems, it allows you to move the technology very quickly.

Now, if we were to sign a treaty every time we want to change a standard or technology, it will take very long for things to happen. But when you're just thinking of, okay, what should be that port number for email, what's the port number for browser? It's just a group of people who can decide on it. Let's just move forward without having to go through a very long treaty-signing process of agreement, that number.

So that's just throwing in the snippet that's food for thought. Thank you.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: Well, my approach to the whole problem is I think we should really separate it into different categories and levels of thinking. And just to clarify some points. The whole mattering about how to run the Internet? The Internet was really a very high tech type of telecommunication platform that was first, I wouldn't say designed or manufactured, but it was under the research and development of the United States defense department. It was first used as a military communication in the field with code name and all that. And the United States defense department put a lot of money and resources in developing these type of communications.

But towards the end of the Century, last Century, they decided that they should really civilize its use and really concert that military propriety into civilian use. So around the end of the Century like 1990, originally the whole gamut of administering this, of overseeing how to transfer its use from the government use to civilian use was overseen by the United States Department of Commerce. They have something called national telecommunication administration, agency. And it was under the public consultation, it then decided how to devolve this administrative power into the hands of civilians.

And it is in this whole process that generated the whole debate about Internet Governance. The Internet Governance is different than multistakeholders. Internet Governance come first. And it is actually in the Tunis meeting in 2005 that the concept of international governance of the Internet operations is really what's needed.

But it was towards I think 2012, in the meeting in Dubai, in the United Nations-sponsored national telecommunication meeting, that there was a debate about how we should go about forming international body to oversee this governance. And there was alluded to about colleagues before, there was debate whether it should be intergovernmental or multistakeholder. The multistakeholderism was really a concept that was formed at the 2012 in the matter of a few years it really caught fire and generate a lot of debate.

But I don't think we should let the tail wag the dog. We have been so much involved in debating how to do this multistakeholderism and who should be in it and all these minute duties of power sharing that we lose sight of Internet Governance, that we lose sight of how we use the Internet to really improve people's lives.

I think we should really go back to square one, go back to simplicity in how -- in discussing how we should use the Internet to achieve the sustainable development goals of the next 15 years. Number 1 of which is eradicate poverty, especially in Developing Countries.

When we look back into the Tunis Agreement, United Nations, the Internet community should really look in how to empower, to engage, to develop competence, to develop capacity building in Developing Countries to use ICTs to eradicate poverty. I think we should not lose sight on that and I think use multistakeholder, which is a toolbox, which is not a solution, it is a toolbox, meaning the solution is still ahead of us. The road is still a way to go. We should develop along the way to develop this final version of how we should do Internet Governance, which should be different from location to location, taken into consideration the local climate, local political situation, the local social norm and local traditional culture. And that's why diversity is so important. And that's why we're having this regional meeting of the IGF.

I think we should go from bottom-up and we should go from regional IGF, national IGF, into the international IGF. And that's how good governance come to be. Thank you.

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: Thanks. So I will not give historical overview like Leonid did. I can't challenge him on that. He's way too ahead. I will pick up on something my good friend Jia Rong said. Particular as we look at this region as well as other regions, as well. Of what multistakeholder means in the local language, how you would translate that. But I think Internet Governance suffers from the same problem, governance itself if you translate it into all of our languages, probably all of them, I don't know, it means you are ruling something, you are in control of something, you're regulating something.

So, however, typically we don't see Internet Governance as regulation. We see how we collectively manage this thing we have called Internet.

But, again, when you translate or you try to explain to people for whom English is not their first language or they don't have a good command of it, it becomes quite difficult. And I think maybe all of us face that problem every now and then.

In terms of how I see multistakeholder, over the last, I don't know what it's been, 15 years or whatever it's been that I have been in this space, not necessarily in the Internet world but in other things that I have been doing, what I see is an evolution of how things

are done today.

If I were to define what multistakeholder means to me, it means everybody has an opportunity to participate in something for the collective good of all of us. So if you have a stake in the thing, whatever the thing may be, multistakeholder is equated with the Internet world quite a bit, but these days a lot of other sectors are also using it. My family background is agriculture, and I can see some multistakeholder in there for me, and I have the Internet world and I see what's happening on that side, and various different stakeholders in that particular line of work, are getting together to reach a consensus on an issue. Really it is the opportunity to participate.

So I think what we need to do is not create barriers to this participation, and the barriers are many, languages are obviously one, cultural is another, I think Patrick mentioned social norms and cultural norms as particular things, I think need to find the balance and find the collective good is really for the whole world and not just for us. That's my whole thing, thanks.

>> So building on actually what Raj just mentioned, I mean language and culture, I think that goes back to your first point about governance and how people interpret that. I find very interesting because, yes, there's probably some kind of regulation, but if you have the ownership, you feel that it's a collective decisionmaking. So there is, in some cultures, there's no difference; in some cultures, there is a significant difference.

And going back to what Patrick earlier mentioned, I think the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, is definitely one area. I think each of us alluded to how the Internet is now expanding the entire society and how that really impacts our daily lives, really, and one interesting thing about, though, the SDGs I find, after reading through the very long document, is we -- before the SDG, we talk about sustainable development in three aspects: People, prosperity and planet. What's the SDG specifically added is peace and partnership. And one of the things that I think the world now understands is that without strong institutions, without strong democracy, equitable society, all these kind of things, the sustainable development work around the globe cannot work. And I think Internet Governance has a lot to contribute in that. We're working on a kind of global resource. And we're experimenting with a global collaboration in a different way than we had in previous decades or centuries.

So coming back to some of the things that in my experience in my introduction I mentioned very much biased by my experience from ICANN participation, and actually earlier today, there's a session that I helped put together, multistakeholder approach is really never meant to be monolithic. I think I'm stealing that from Adam or he was quoting somebody else. One size doesn't fit all.

And another very interesting thing is that we tend to think about

different stakeholders as having equal powers. That's also not true. The stakeholders won't have equal powers. It's a deferring powers based on the actual issue that's being discussed.

At ICANN or at IETF, at IGF, the right balance of power may not be exactly equal; but how do we manage those, the balance of power is one of the dynamics about one of the things about multistakeholder approach. And keeping that global kind of public interest as a goal. And looking at kind of the power bars of the different stakeholder groups, we probably should think about a current view who has a bigger influence and power? And a dynamic view, how it should change over time. Because that's another thing about the evolving Internet Governance and multistakeholder landscape is the pretty clear that that stakeholder group boundaries change. New stakeholders come into play. New people get online every day. And those are some of the challenges, I think, not only ICANN but when we talk about multistakeholder approach.

I think we touched a little bit on rough consensus. Rough consensus is another big challenge in terms of how we define it. As I mentioned, while we don't have an equal power for every stakeholder and perhaps necessarily so, we also don't have a good definition of rough consensus. It's definitely not majority Rule because rough consensus can actually be called by a minority and still be a rough consensus and still make sense and still be the right decision.

And those are some of the challenges that really challenges our views of what we call democratic or what we call good governance in some sense. Because we're talking about the situation where it's the right thing to do to not take, quote/unquote, the majority decision. Why is that? One of the biggest reasons, I think, is that we don't have everyone participating, first of all, and it's impossible to do so. And not everyone is interested in doing so. And that gives us a different type of challenge when we talk about representation. Representation, how stakeholder groups are being represented in councils and committees and boards.

And that brings us to an interesting situation in my other background coming from Hong Kong, which informs my view of this whole multistakeholder concept.

Hong Kong's legislature has a very strange makeup where part of the elected members of legislation are what is called functional constituencies. It's almost like a multistakeholder approach, some people would call it dysfunctional constituencies. So one of the things is that multistakeholder approach is taking the views from the different stakeholders, different interests; but how you then integrate it and how the system then takes that input and those views and be representative of those views rather than the number of people it represents is something that I think the future of multistakeholder approach we need to keep refining.

And when we talk about the issues that we want to regulate or

govern, I think one of the key questions we need to think about is, which I think is Batron likes to say government of the Internet or government "on" the Internet. And it goes back to the SDGs and some of the things. When we talk about ICANN and critical Internet resources, we are actually governing how the Internet works, off the Internet. That multistakeholder makeup would be very different than when we talk about governance "on" the Internet like cyber bullying, Copyright. Sorry and that's really the end. And that's basically what I want to say is that the important parts of it is to try to look at it as a changing dynamic and how we continue to improve it. Thank you.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: We can share the remaining thoughts to the next session.

I give the floor to Dr. Kong.

>> DR. NING KONG: I try to make my comments very short. Just as I mentioned, I come from the technical community. So I'm more familiar with the IETF working process. But to be honest, the multistakeholder, this term, is a little new to me. But when I totally understand the definition and the spirit of the multistakeholder, I think the idea is very familiar for me because just as Jia Rong mentioned, the working process of the IGF is really, really, multistakeholder. Not multi. Everyone. If you have an email address, you can join any Working Group you are interested, and you can provide your comments by the email. And the Working Group can really accept your comments if your comments really make sense. So that means everyone can have the chance to change the standardization of the Internet Protocol. So it's really good.

But to the terms of the multistakeholder, especially for the China mainland people, I think this term is a little -- it's hard to understand. We try to translate it very correctly. We translate it normally as (mentioned words).

These are Chinese words. Maybe the meaning is interest and a little related with commercial things. So I think the translation terms is not very neutral for these words. And I did talk with Edmon. Edmon told me that in Hong Kong area, they do have the very correct Chinese (words) for the stakeholder. So I think the challenge for us is not to try to -- how to translate the terms, it's how the explanation of these ideas, how to tell people that Internet is for everybody just as the mission of the ISOC.

And the key point for me, how to like the idea being told to everybody. And let everyone know that Internet can be open to everyone. Everyone can have the chance to contribute to the Internet. Thanks.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. Many thanks to our panelists at the first session.

I think they give us the panorama of the multistakeholder from many faces, from the different faces.

And I also think audience on site and remotely, they will

definitely have some comments or some thoughts on the presentation, the brave presentation. So I would like to open the first round to interaction here. You can ask any questions to our panelists right now. You can stand here or your seat. It's both okay. So do you have any questions?

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: While you are sharing those observations, let me respond to something that Jia Rong said. In the Russian language, we don't have that word stakeholder. We translate it in seven words, I believe. So it's the process which involves all interested parties in their respective capacities, something like that.

Anyway, what I'm trying to say right now, as Internet users, just to explain some different logic, for example, Russian government's logic, as Internet users, do you care much of how the Internet is governed, or do you care more of being able to certain surf the Internet? I mean, I'm just ask this question to the audience. And it's not just accidental. Because then we should understand that most Internet users do not give a thought how the Internet is gold. Your major concern is I want to be online at all times, right? So that's one thing. The other is step momentarily in some government -- I would put it like this, in some government shoes. The government is to govern. The government believes that we as the government know better what our people need and what we should do for them. Now, I want to see what is going on. Let's call it in my national segment of the Internet. Who is governing that? Mine our government people, can they do that? No? Who are those? Some engineers from some murky establishment called IETF? How shall I deal with them? I don't know them. What are they doing there? Who is governing them? Who is overseeing them? What if they do some wrong things with my national segment of the Internet?

By the way, does my national segment lies within the borders of my country? No? Where are the servers? In the United States? Oh then of course I know it's American plot against my country, of course. They want to shut down my Internet, which I would never allow them to do. So I better just put everything within my borders. And I will do my own Internet, whether I would call it halal Internet for countries or Russian Internet I will close the borders and make sure no one can do that. Think of this.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Any feedback should be in two minutes, all right?

[Laughter]

Okay. Any feedback to the comments from Leonid? Yes, please.

>> I'm also from Hong Kong. And Edmon's remark made me think about the international constituency. There has been a long discussion in the IGF about the limitations of multistakeholder models. And I think there have also been a lot of proposals for alternatives. And one of the main criticisms is really that we all

have multiple stakes. And we are everything at the same time. Most of us are technical experts, citizens but also professionals. So where do we actually belong and how do we reflect this did I havoring they? And how can we also switch between our stakes, that you have a stake in this issue and another stake in this. And you can also very easily have diverse views on difficult, on complex issues? And I think that is maybe the limitations of the stakeholder model that you always need to reflect one particular view or interest group. So what is the panel's thinking of alternatives for more advanced models of governance? Thanks.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: And so the question is to all of the panelists. Okay.

>> I guess just responding, just quickly respond. In my actually earlier, I'm glad that we had a little bit of that discussion. If you look at ICANN itself then, for example, you see actually the stakeholder grouping, the boundaries start blurring. Especially with new gTLDs. Governments are, registrars are gTLDs. And in that situation, you can actually see ICANN starting to evolve towards a situation where more and more issues are discussed across stakeholders, across eye cross community working groups are being formed, and they are -- they become the new norm. So what happened to be more siloed discussions among stakeholders and then build up is slowly becoming a bigger Working Group with all stakeholders.

And then what happens is that -- and then representation changes. The councils and committees and board becomes less of a policy discussion Forum rather than a more administrative and check box situation where the representation no longer represents the people that were elected from but actually try to represent the views and make sure those views were heard in the process.

So I think that's one of the interesting developments that we discuss but I'm sure others would add.

>> Let me also put in my 5 cents worth of it. I'm mostly from Hong Kong and I think the world about the benefits of functional constituency. I think it's the forerunner of multistakeholder model. And even I think in China, they start to have the multistakeholder model far back in 1949. They have this model. They have the model, forerunner of multistakeholder. They have this in the so-called political consultative service. (word) they have the people from every sector of society represented together. Not only by vote but by populations and populace but also by functions, by professions, by their locations and by their what they can contribute. They are called stakes. So Chung she, political consultation, is exactly what multistakeholder is all about. And we are just in the west rediscovering what the Chinese have been doing for the last 70 years. And because the key word, it's a stake. Who has a stake in this?

But then the other key word back in the question is the question in mind, is it for public good? Is it a global resource? We believe

that Internet is global resource and that's why it belongs to everybody. That's why we call everybody who chips in this, everybody who is involved, that's why we call stake.

So now the user, are they stakeholders? Of course they are because their lives, their everything is dependent on the Internet and could be easily affected by what we decide on the multistakeholder decision on the Internet Governance. And how could they be represented in the multistakeholder scheme of things?

But of course then you talk about equal footage, equal footing, equal weight, equal participation. That could never be materialised. Of course the people of interest will spend more time participating in the discussion and the decisionmaking. And the people, especially users, the general user like myself knows how to turn on the computer, how to use the browser, how to click on and send the email and that's it. I don't know how -- what are the decisions about IPs, process, IP protocols, routine, servers, locations, and data stream conversion, all these things, these are all decisions made for them. All these technical decisions are made for them. And they were not being briefed in how the decision made. And yet their lives and their actions are all dependent on what guide for them. And how could they participate in the whole process of decisionmaking? I mean that's the point. Are users stakeholders? I put it to you.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. I think Dr. Ho did a typical example for us. (word) in Chinese. I think it's a very interesting way to interpret in Chinese way, in Chinese culture.

And I also caught the key words of the multistakeholder is stakeholder. Who is the stakeholder? And how to promote the stakeholder to cooperate? That's the key. And that's the call of the multistakeholder. And anybody else? Yeah.

>> Let me try to state it. Basically actually the multistakeholder, everything is that you have to be just like you say the stake. Who is the stake? But very important, how to select this stake? It's recent legitimacy. If least stake is not legitimacy, it cannot represent least stakeholder. In high case is very different. In high king case, for example, the domain name, you have GTOD, you have gTLD, you have CCLD, you have registrar. All very clear. I'm talking about user later on. But I'm talking about the name registry and registrar. The member is very clear.

Second point, for example, like ccTLD is clear. It is running by the CC operator. And of course you are talking about IP is running by IR. IR is also a membership organisation. Anyone can join as an IR member that can speak out in IR. Even you are single user, you can go to IR meeting without paying any fee, you can walk in. If you don't have a cost to sign in, you can go to the email. You can go to the Internet current technology. Even you can send a text. Even can send a short message to explain your point.

And user, I agree, user is very difficult to identify., for

example, in ICANN, right now we have a Government Advisory Committee. How many governments is participating in the ICANN GAC? 164 countries. 164. And user, guess, I agree. User is very difficult. ICANN trying very hard to developing at large. I agree it is not perfect. If you ask me, I would prefer consumer association to join in to represent the user because the consumer association in many countries have much better representative of the user. But it is the consumer association can join ICANN or not? I don't know. We'd love to. We'd love the consumer association to join ICANN. But many consumer associations in every country, they found a thing to do like -- many things. And I wish in sooner or later the consumer association see the Internet in their consumer right. So they're waiting to join ICANN to present the user. And I think it will be a much better structure.

And again ICANN didn't run Internet. Too confused about it. ICANN can only to do three things. IP domain name. And coordinate server. Who run the Internet? Everyone. If you have a server connect to the Internet, you run part of the Internet.

So Internet is not run by a single organisation. It is running by everyone.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. Many thanks to comments. And I think at least we have three things here. The first one is what is who is the stakeholders? And the second one is how to make them work together? Because if we can see stakeholder just means different representatives from different groups, that's not the true multistakeholder. It just means the different people. So when we talk about multistakeholder, the most important is how to make them work together and make the multistakeholder to deliver the results. And the third one is sorry I for got it. So we just have to finish this round and go to the second round.

And here I want to make some change of our formality here. Because I inspired from Jia Rong's questions to Leonid. So in the second round, I would like to ask our panelists to propose some questions to each other. And you can boost some debates between the different panelists? Okay? I think maybe it will be dynamic and interesting to the audience. Who will be the first?

>> Since you're very strict on timing, I will keep it. So Jia Rong, how do you say multistakeholder in Vietnamese?

[Laughter]

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Before that, I have to ask you to make the comments very, very short, within one minute.

[Laughter]

>> JIA RONG: I think in Vietnamese is evolving language you could use the same word exactly. So it would be multistakeholder.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. Who will be the second one?

>> Well, that's a question probably to Jia Rong, as well. So at ICANN, the board is elected by several groups of stakeholders. Yet another part of the board is elected through the so-called

nominating committee, which is a black box, we don't know who applied for the board and how those boards are selected. So my question to Jia Rong is: Isn't it time to get rid of that nominating committee and announce direct elections of board members by all the people who are at ICANN and those who want to join in?

[Technical difficulty.]

So this is my best way of answering the question, because it's really not up to me as a staff to raise it. But, Leonid, you raise a very good point. I think if there are --

[Technical difficulty.]

Global direct election was tried. And probably some will say failed spectacularly. But it's easy to understand a number of the seats were supposed elected by anybody who has an email address.

The winning candidate has the one that has the most candidates. So that makes it very difficult.

And the other reason I think as Jia Rong mentioned, try to get new blood has experience but not necessarily in the ICANN community to contribute to building what we need in terms of ICANN. Rather than asking the question of how the board, number of the board members are chosen, maybe the next question should be how the CEO is chosen. Shouldn't that be elected?

And recently when you look at the United Nations Secretary-General. Not election, but the process is much more open. But kind of direct voting by the whole world population. Maybe those are some institutional changes that can happen. And there is this accountability work stream, too, that continues to think about how we can create better accountability.

And I want to end with something, in terms of multistakeholder features or structures, one key thing is a continual update or continual revamp of the system itself.

ICANN now, some people say 3, 4, at least we've gone through many iterations in terms of the constitutional structure. And that is one very important part of I think the multistakeholder approach for Internet Governance because the Internet moves so fast.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. So I give the floor to Dr. Ho.

>> DR. PATRICK HO: Actually I have two questions for the panelists, especially for Leo Ned, Jia Rong and Raj because you come from three very diverse international organisations.

As for the question what is really the stake and what is the stakeholder? In my opinion, I think that may be the stakeholder, the term, is not very accurate term because the term maybe people who think that don't have the stake, that he has no interest with the Internet, he should not have the opportunity to connect with the Internet? I don't think is correct. Because I think Internet nowadays, infrastructure is just like the water just like the air. So that means even not the Internet users. That means maybe in some very poor area the people cannot connect with the Internet. But the

Internet more or less affect their real lives. So how to think about this kind of people? And how to get the opinions, comments from these kind of people, especially some very weak people and maybe some people that they don't really want to connect with the Internet. They really enjoy their current lives. How to think about this?

>> Let me just put my one minute, okay? I just want to challenge the world stakeholder because it is a euphemism for interest groups. If you have an interest in it, you are a stakeholder. So do we want the Internet to be controlled by interest groups? We're talking about governments. Government is interest group. How about big corporations? How about technical people whose livelihoods depends on the technical know how and the successes of the Internet? These are interest groups. How about the people affected by the use of the Internet, the users. Typically the users could careless. They know details. They have no called interest, not benefits, interests. But if you draft the consumer council, in Hong Kong I run so many of these advisory committees. I know the people who are at large have the least interest of participating. They won't show up at meetings. They don't have anything to offer. They are just sitting there and you call that representation? So I think there's something there for us to talk about.

The second point I would like to put to you is something called representativeness. Should we use elections? A lot of times elections will not be effective. So in many of the situations we cannot really cast votes and put it into true election. We use appointment system. Appointment system is typicifisation. Assuming that the whole group is uniform, homogeneous, then we pick one representative one of the whole lot.

Just like my wife buy oranges. We cannot have a whole bag of oranges to vote which is the best. My wife pick the best looking one and taste it. If it tastes good, assuming that the whole lot is good, so she bought the oranges. And that means that we choose, we pick one that typifies, that has all the typical characteristics of the whole lot and have him or her represent the lot. Meaning that her views, her behavior and the decisions will be representative, quote/unquote, of the whole lot. But would that really give us a legitimate way of making a decision? The problem of legitimacy really kicks in.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: I'm very happy to see our discussion have a broader scope and go up to the philosophical level. Yeah, it's very, very great.

And I saw Asha raise her hand from ICANN? The microphone? Please.

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: I'm on the ICANN board and also a proud Hong Konger like yourself.

I have two comments to make. First of all Dr. Ho, your first comment, your opening remarks in the beginning of this panel really

struck a chord with me because you said something about multistakeholderism being a tool, a means to an end. A toolbox. And I couldn't agree with you more. While I'm a big believer of multistakeholderism, I think we also have to also remind ourselves of the ultimate aim or the objective of using multistakeholderism. It is to have a more inclusive way of including as many different people as possible to govern the Internet.

So I just wanted to say I really appreciated that comment that you made. So this isn't a question.

And the second comment I had is related to what Leo just mentioned about the selection of board members. So as a matter of disclosure, I did go through, I was nominated through the NomCom route. So I'm not going to say that that's a good route because I came through that route, but I wanted to remind you, Leo, of the comment you made in the previous panel that we had this morning about the same 3,000 or 2,000 people being in the IG space. And I think this is one way to get new blood as Edmon mentioned.

I think we do have an issue in terms of not being able to involve more people. I think we would all like to see more new blood involved in IG. And this is just one possible way. Thank you.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Who want to respond? Raj?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: In response to what Ning was saying, I think, okay, so let use the word aspire and be part of the multistakeholder model. But there are some practicalities that come in the way.

I think Patrick said that? Maybe not everybody want to contribute. It would be kind of a snowfall for them, they can't understand the jargon and go back again.

The other thing is you can't enforce people to engage in the discussion if they don't want to. And why they do not want to engage in the discussion? Maybe for various reasons. It could be language, no time, no money to come and attend the meetings and participate. So there's multiple factors that come out there.

Earlier today I was in a discussion with someone else and a similar sort of thread came up there that how do you get more people involved in the discussions? How do you get them to participate? And perhaps the only real way to do it is using that representative model where someone would typify the sort of consensus for a group of people which would then come to meetings such as this and other meetings and then you could take it further.

Also made a great comment before that if you look at our meetings, for example, I think most of the meetings in this community at large, you can always contribute in some way or form, mailing list, SMS, as you said, and so on.

So the opportunity to participate is there, but not everyone takes of the opportunity for various reasons. That's why I said earlier for me multistakeholder is giving people the opportunity to participate. That doesn't mean they will participate, nor does it

mean that you force them to participate, but the opportunity's there.

>> Thank you. I would just use one example to illustrate because what we are saying now is a little bit abstract so I will use effective example to illustrate what is stakeholder and when do you think you become a stakeholder and so on. And this is also a little caveat to start.

Little advertisement for the next session 4:30 which is on IDNs. So let's take stakeholder now and you think I'm a normal person. Everyone in this room is normal person. And we're using the Internet day-to-day, we can speak English, right? Image you cannot use English and you think oh I do not know how to use dot com, so I cannot go on Facebook, Internet. I am not stakeholder.

And then finally one person comes to you and says the Domain Name System doesn't need to use English anymore. You can use your own English. So what if I speak Arabic, for example, so now Arabic, you can type Arabic on the URL link and you can find the page you want in Arabic, everything is in Arabic. Immediately you become a stakeholder, right? Because you are able to do that.

Now, the step from using English to Arabic doesn't happen in a vacuum, is not boom, it happens like this, you need different people who know the language well enough, who know how to code it to create that system that allows for Arabic use in domain names.

Now, where do you find these people? We just shout out and say, hey, who's interested? Do you want to join? It's not that simple, right? You have to make the effort to go and find the right interests, well enough to be able to decipher what letter can be inside the domain name and what cannot. And then you need people who know the Code as well and policies related to the language, the education system, how is the language being used? Bring all these people together and find what's the best way to allow the use of the Arabic language the script to be used for domain names. Now that's only step one.

Now, step two. Okay. We can now use domain names for these, but where are the companies and the users who will put content onto these pages? We need to find those people, as well. Finding the stakeholders, making them understand they can use it. And only when you realise actually can use Arabic for the Internet, then you realise you have a stake in it. So that little stake, as much as we don't have a better word for it, but what I'm trying to illustrate here is really that at different points in different time, different points in time, you realise that you might have a stake or two in the Internet that you're using, even if today it might not be relevant for you, but tomorrow it doesn't mean it's not relevant for you anymore. Technology evolves that you could be more inclusive and you could allow for you previously with no stake in it to have a stake today. So that's something that I hope to just share.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. I saw the audience is very active to join in this discussion. So I'll give the floor to --

>> My name is Rinalia. I'm from Malaysia. I'm also an ICANN board member and I am the one who is elected by the community of individual Internet users around the world. And I want to make two comments.

One is I've been engaged in multistakeholderism since 1998. And since then, there is always agreement that it's a great thing, that we need to do it and it's beneficial.

However, the frustration about the multistakeholder process itself has not dissipated. And we continue to be addressing it to see how can we make it more effective? And there is some improvement, but I don't think we're there yet.

I just also want to address the point that Patrick Ho made about end-users because I come from that community. And I see the challenges that end-users have in engaging in these different communities, whether it is ICANN or numbers community or at the engineering taskforce. I can tell you that the primary barrier is actually having the vocabulary to be able to engage effectively. And I think what would work, because I had seen it before, is to have capacity building programmes that actually support these end users to prepare them to understand the issues and to go in and engage. Even if you were to make them a representative of a group to go in with the authority to engage, that's not enough. They need to have that learning. Without that, and unless they're real toy put aside significant amounts of time to do it, nothing will happen. Thank you.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. So do you want any panelist to respond to you?

>> Actually I'd like Edmon to talk about some of the capacity building efforts you've initiated in your organisation in this area because I think I see good in that. And I think it is having a beneficial effect.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for giving me an advertisement section.

Actually, well, speaking about capacity building, I think it is definitely one of the most important challenges for this Internet Governance and multistakeholder model. From Asia, I guess, from dot Asia we have been supporting a lot of youth to come to these programmes at ICANN, at IETF, at IGF, as well. But one thing that we have learned, actually, and related to some of the items that Patrick has mentioned is that in order to get new people to participate and get younger people to participate in a meaningful way, you can't just throw them into the discussion. Yes, the doors are all open, what we call multistakeholder, the doors are open, the mics are open, but if you just rush there and start talking, it doesn't really contribute to the process.

What we've learned over time is the training programme, role playing programme that actually initiate them into the discussion, let them understand what is going to be discussed, especially, for

example, at ICANN. What are the key sessions of discussions going to happen? Let them discuss among themselves first and try to come up with their own recommendations and then go to the bigger discussion.

So I think the capacity building, a lot of that can be learned from that experience, as well.

And actually Jerome and the ICANN APEC hub team has been experimenting a little bit with this concept, as well, is trying to get the Asia-Pacific participants to ICANN to gather, to convene, and to discuss certain issues that are actively being discussed at ICANN as a breeding ground, a testing ground of some of the arguments and then taking it to the larger discussion. I think that's one of the things that we learned that is very useful.

The other thing I think about capacity building is that the multistakeholder approach as you said is understood to be really good, but it is somewhat challenging for especially Asian cultures. We talked about cultural differences. And a lot of people from the Asian community are -- defer to authorities. And they're not comfortable going out and speaking up in that capacity and also in the international Policy Development Process, they usually defer to the government.

So the UN model is what the Asian countries have started to know how to, quote/unquote, play the game, but suddenly this multistakeholder model is thrown in and suddenly the businesses, the Civil society, which is not as strong as bringing up policy discussions from these countries, are required to do it or else their voices are not being heard. So that's another challenge from the Asia-Pacific region I think specifically in how we do capacity building for businesses willing to send people out to these Forums and to these discussions and also building up civil society in these areas to actually come and contribute. That's going to be a huge challenge ahead of us, too.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. I understand the one minute is so difficult for our audience and panelists. But please do make your comments very, very short. Thank you.

>> Okay. I'd just like to go more deep in particularly the stakeholder issues. I use the example to say that (something) create a problem in Taiwan. And the government talk to Uber and taxi driver. These two interest groups, right? But why government didn't ask consumer? So in that case, multistakeholder can help. Suppose the government should invite consumer to ask why you want to use Uber? You don't want to use the taxi. Why you only asking from the two interest group? But I didn't mean interest group have no right to explain. Of course interest group is part of the stakeholder, too. But the problem, the key point in the multistakeholder, all the interest groups, including consumer, should have a channel to voice, to speak out, to explain what their view and what their opinion is. And government have to understand the balance to solve it.

>> Let me have my one minute, okay? I agree with you. Let me play devil's advocate. The multistakeholder process is a good will process of democratization of the whole Internet Governance to the people. Whereas democracy is ruled by the people. But the multistakeholderism as it stands today with the stakeholders are ruled by the interest groups. The interest groups, Rule by the interest groups is minority of the people, is just as bad as Rule by the governments.

So without the people, without the consumer, we're defeating the whole purpose of the multistakeholderism. And this is really the difficulty of multistakeholderism is without the consumer. Without them you cannot say it is totally representative of all the stakeholders.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Okay. Before that, I know we are multistakeholder participation. So please allow me to borrow five minutes from the coffee break. Is that okay? Okay.

Do we have anyone else to propose the questions? No?

So what about our panelists? Yeah, okay.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: I have a question to Raj. Raj, if ever Mr. Putin, would there be any three reasons you would put forward to convince me that multistakeholderism is not as bad as I, as Mr. Putin, would think?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Say that again. I'm a multistakeholder.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: I'm Mr. Putin. Why should I believe that multistakeholderism is very good?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: It's got nothing to do with oil supplies to Europe.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: Forget oil.

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: From Mr. Putin. That's a tough one, man. Well, the other one is I know Russell Bays. So that will not work out, either. I don't submit shocks. That's not going to help, either. What would you say to Mr. Putin? I don't know. That's a great question.

(audience comment not on mic)

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: That's rational belief. Mr. Putin is a rational way, in a way, in his own sense.

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: What you'd want to try to do is convince him that multistakeholder processes will help with whatever his objectives may be.

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: What if his objective is to invade yet another country, then what? M all tie stakeholder is also good for that? Multistakeholder process is good for that?

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: He can liaise with people and talk with people and say I am going to go invade this country, is that okay with you?

>> MR.TODOROV LEONID LVOVICH: I can buy that.

>> MR. RAJNESH SINGH: I'll stop there. Someone at stake. It

looks like you don't want me to come to Russia. That's very obvious.

>> DR. HAN LIYUN: Great. I love this session very much. And I think the time is always flying. And we know the discussion -- we need more time and space to bring the discussion to a broader scope, but today we have to finish it, I know. I should obey the laws and rules and orders of our organising committee.

And in the end, I would like to share two sayings here. One is there is -- readers' eyes. So multistakeholder, everybody has understanding of multistakeholder in your mind.

And the other thing is Chinese saying. It's said that the oranges grow up as the oranges in the south of the river, but when we put the oranges in the north land of the river, they are not the oranges. But we still have the oranges in the northern area, why? Because we can make some change to planet.

So how we explain it, the multistakeholder, maybe we can boost another discussion in the next year's APrIGF. Thank you for your listening and participation.

[Applause.]

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
