FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

ASIA PACIFIC REGION INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
MACAO 2015
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
01 JULY 2015
N HALL
9:00 LOCAL TIME
ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
DAY 1
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE

***

***

Live captioning at APrIGF Macau 2015 is brought to you by
Internet Society.

    >> KELVIN WONG: Hi. Good morning, everyone. Thanks for a
attending this session, the first session of APrIGF. We have
overrun a bit. So if you could just take your seat.
    Thank you.
    I understand -- I think the bus came late and so there
could be people waiting. So it's 20 minutes overtime, so we
will just start.
    Good morning. This is Kelvin Wong from ICANN. And I
support Professor Ang Peng Hwa in this initiative that we're
doing called the Asia Pacific Internet Leadership Program.
APILP. We first started this in APrIGF in Delhi, last year. It
was a pre-event. For those who attended, thank you. And I see
some familiar faces today again. So this year it's incorporated
into the full program of the main program of APrIGF. I'll be
running this for three days, same time, same channel. 9 a.m. to
9:45. Sorry, this is running a bit late today.

So the idea for this is to have young professionals and people interested in Internet Governance to come in and learn about a few things. We have several tracks in this program. We will start with a general overview. And we will give you a more in-depth into the domain name system and into the 101 of the Internet, how it works. And then we will also touch on some emerging issues.

So for today Professor Ang Peng Hwa will give us an overview of the Internet governance, history, important milestones and why you should be concerned and how you should react. And day two, tomorrow, same time. We will be talking about the 101 of Internet. And then day three we will talk about emerging issues, which is the transition. If you are keeping track of that, you know this is big in the milestone and the history of Internet.

So without further ado, I'll invite Professor Ang Peng Hwa to give us an overview of the history of the Internet Governance. He is with the School of Communication and Information at Nanyang University.

Well, if you are aware of things happening in Singapore and Internet governance, you will see the teaching and his interests in the Asian Wall Street Journal. Frequently there are interviews about the times. And his interests include law, communication, and touch on Internet law, policy, and social impact of media. And he is the Chair of this APILP.

Without further ado, I'll invite you.

(Applause).

>> ANG PENG HWA: Because you are so far away, I want to be near to you all. The energy, as you all know. So I'm going to try to race through, because we are a bit short of time.

The rule of thumb as a teacher, many students forget. You know, I had a professor who once told me that he was late to meet a senior Professor. The senior Professor asked him what happened to you, why were you late? And the young Professor, who became a professor, said he was late because he had to finish the class. He had to give the students all the lectures. And the senior Professor asked: How much of what you gave do you think the students remember? Of course, the answer is very little. So I'll try to finish within the time I have, without going over too much.

So this session is meant to be a primer to the Internet to give you a background as to the players and the issues, and why things happen the way that they happen. I will not blame you if at the end of this you don't want to be involved in Internet governance. You can see it's a high level of politics and not always fun and agreeable. But hopefully you can see that it's important.

First of all, there are rules and rules about rules. So the rules overall, rules about rules means who sets the rules? Why is the Committee set up that way? Who formed the Committee? Who formed the Committee that formed the Committee? What rules were there to form the Committee? So it gets interesting and complicated. You realize it's not just about rules, but also the processes.

Sometimes things happen and end and things are decided. Look at what happened this morning. The rule was that the bus would come at 8:30, but the bus driver came later. So then we started late and there are other consequences. What if there was a traffic jam along the way? What is the process to handle that? What if the bus broke down, what rules are there to handle this? So a lot of processes along the way that determine how rules develop. So not just rules, but processes.

And for the Internet, because we have programs, software programs, one of the lessons is that software programs can form rules, also. In other words, just by using a software you may or may not be able to do certain things, and that becomes a rule. Because you cannot do certain things, that is a rule. So the issue about governance is really not so much about rules, but more about this, rules about the rules. You see this along the way.

So why is it important? We go back to -- I'm wondering, I think you were all born by 1998. The dot com boon was taking place. I remember that six months later I started a dot com. It's still around. I didn't make money from it. In the process, I lost a friend. The company is still going on in Singapore, but I lost a friend. I said if Yahoo! can do it, I can, too.

There were two groups. It was this "pick a theory," and then the person must get on to this resource. And ITU was involved. Actually, I've since learned that in the discussion, ITU is like a second player. You see ITU mentioned a bit. One of the questions of Internet governance, is this standard? And the answer is that they look at it, it's not a technical matter. It's really sociological, legal, political, almost anything except that.

The ITU was the second player. The first player was UNESCO. But because the US was not part of UNESCO, the US moved it or just pushed it to the ITU. This becomes important, you'll see later on. Now UNESCO is taking a lot of functions about governance.

There was -- you can see in 1998, it took a long time to have this meeting. 2003 on the World Summit on Information Society. This almost failed. You must come out with some statement, and it almost failed because they almost couldn't

agree.

In the World Summit one of the big issues is this issue of who governs the Internet? Is it Governments? Is it stakeholders, which you hear a lot? In other words, for the first time you're hearing that rules will not be set only by Governments, but by companies and Civil Society actors. The first time they heard of this. The first time there was any mention at all. This was very new. And once you have new ideas, you know that people are taken aback, they don't know how to respond. So this is what we call a clash of a vision of Governments, is it traditional Government or a modern approach?

Now that we are looking at it, it was USA and the rest of the world. The US was concerned that if the Internet is run by Government, then, you know, they could take over the Internet. And you can tell it's all made in the USA, right? Internet is what, telephone? Invented in the USA. Computer? Invented in the USA. The Protocol? Invented in the USA. All invented in the USA. And they were concerned about the Governments would take over. So there was some validity that you want to preserve this whole ecosystem. So we can see a tension there.

And at the International level, when there is a concern, you kick it up to a Committee. So a Committee was formed to resolve that. And what is that? The IP addresses. In China there was a talk about how does a professor who came back to China and said that we are running over resources, the thing called Internet Protocol addresses. You know there is a limited number of numbers, 4 billion. So there was a concern about this. At first, we were the first region to run IP addresses. But the world does not understand this. So they held an event, and they were handing over the last allocation of addresses, the last lot. I think tomorrow we will talk more about this. They held it on Chinese New Year's Day. You can check it. So you can see people are not aware of this.

Secondly, the control for national infrastructure. I'll mention it and see how this plays out. And of course how the Internet is to be governed. So you can see pretty important issues at a high level.

So what is the issue about infrastructure here? The root zone problem. This is it. Looks good. Okay. So what happens is that when you call up, say, a Google, you call up Google, okay, it looks first for a dot com. It's like an address. You have a name, you have to look at the back, first, from the bottom-up address. Your telephone, your address, it's a Dot Com. It looks at dot com first. Then you can see that the dot com tells you the address of Google. So first you look for dot com. From the back. Then Google. Just like your physical address. You look for the country, city, state, your unit

number, street and block. So you read backwards that way. So similarly to this.

So the issue is this, that this root, in Macau it's MO, Singapore is this. HK, all roots. Okay? The whole zone area, there is a root zone system. This is all in hint of the USA. So you will learn about this tomorrow at least, gTLD.Com, you can apply, ccTLD, country code, gTLD, generic G. Top Level Domain.

Okay. There is one, in this zone, there is one hidden from hackers, roots and server, the server USA. If a country doesn't appear, then it doesn't exist. So TMO just changed from TP, something, to TL. It changed. So that the letters don't appear anymore. It's just like, you know, your phone number doesn't appear on a mobile phone company. It doesn't exist, in a sense. So the root zone system does that.

Major concern: Control of the root zone system. Okay. So, globally, there are 13 servers, but it's not what you call -- any kind of system. There are mirrors, so that this doesn't happen. There are 13 servers. And this is the job.

See, this is the desk of the President of the White House. It's a big desk, you see? So I made a joke, all of the servers are under Obama's desk. He is watching them. It's not true. It's not true. Okay?

(Laughter)

There, the server there.

Okay. So the problem is that this root zone and the root file system are in the hands of the USA. So now what happens to a country's Internet? So this is a true story. The news. Okay. This guy, you can Google him on Internet. This is 2004, ten years ago now. They were convicted for unauthorized serial parts. They run the dot Iq. It wasn't Hussein running it. So this was just before the war in Iraq. Is it coincidence or an attack to cut Iraq off from cyberspace just before the war? So this is a concern, you know, of people.

So they were in charge, 2002, okay, and the domain was given back to Iraq just after this Working Group report. Before it was made public on the ground that it was a stable, functional Iraqi Government. So the concern is that -- let's say China .Cn or hk or whatever disappeared. Technically, physically speaking, forget the law, but physically speaking, it can.

The second one, concern over Internet resources. I mentioned that there are 4 billion unique IP addresses. You know, every device has an IP address. So now they are created, I can't pronounce how many. The joke is after that it's a big number.

The issue is now a lesson. Because actually, the system

can cope. So, for example, India has only 32 million IP
addresses, India, population, you know, 1 billion. So there are
ways to manage it.

So, for example, that means that you may share an IP number
with somebody else at different locations. So you don't get a
crash. You can -- it means that some addresses are shared.
Somebody handles that. So this issue is much less. But still,
there is no question, there is a limit, compared to the IPv6.

Then the Arab world. I'll mention that. In fact, if you
know the new world information, the discussion was about how the
west was controlling the news flow in the 1980s. Of course, now
the Internet is replicating that, in the 1980s.

And then ITU's concern was that they wanted to get on the
Internet, because the Internet was booming. In the early '80s,
there was a technology called OCN. It's a smart telephone
network. If the cable broke, the system doesn't break and it
will go around it. It's a smart network. So now I ask you,
okay, you go by the clock to later. I give you technologies.
One is a smart technology. It's called a smart technology. It
notices a break. One is called a dumb technology. It just
sends the message. Smart and Dumb technology. I give you the
choice, which one would you choose? I have not seen anyone say
we want the dumb technology. We are smart. We choose the smart
technology. Correct?

The smart technology was cong. Asynchronous ATM, the
machine, not the money. It's a smart technology. But it's the
wrong technology. So you can see how things sort of happen by
accident. The Telcos, bet on the smart technology, but the
wrong bet. So you might say one guy is going around talking
about the stupid network. When it breaks, you just resend.
Okay. Then we will try to fix the network. So the network is
good. Okay?

So ITU wanted to come in, and of course there are concerns
here. So you can see the countries were concerned about these
issue, and that's why it led to this, DSIS. So a Committee was
formed. They were discussing the governance. The USA said you
don't know Internet Governance. So this was meant to be a
primer to tell people what the issues are, very quickly.

So the Working Group, I was one of the 14 people appointed
to the Working Group, and we were meant to what we call fact
find. Nonnegotiate. It means you don't make a conclusion, you
just find out what the facts are, what is Internet governance.
What are the issues? Who should be doing what? That's all we
were supposed to do.

So Markus Kummer, who is sort of leading this whole effort
now. A key player is Nitin Desai. He was the former Permanent
Secretary in India; very smart guy. And you can see he had a

big role because he put people together to have the agreements. Forty people. There were people like me around. And then there was a Cuban, I joke, someone from the other sideline, he plays chess, smokes cigars. So the people had to have an agreement.

What happened was we met in this place. It's a Monestary. It's one thing that we are doing. You are forced to interact. And I guess part of the interaction was to agree. So this was one trick to get people to come together and meet and talk and live together for a while.

So working definition of Internet Governance. This is if you Google it, you'll find this document, the final draft. The rules for the programs concerning infrastructure, translations, content. There was a meeting in Tunis. And again this is in the final report.

This is a definition of Internet Governance. The Internet Governance definition rejected the definition of ITU, okay. Remember ITU wanted to get in, because the feeling was that they will miss the dot com boon. And ITU saw the Internet as numbers only. They manage the mobile numbers, your country code, mobile numbers. So ITU, as I said, they felt that if they can manage the mobile numbers, then they can manage the Internet numbers. In the back it's all just numbers. So they could manage that. And so ITU wanted to restrict the definition of Internet Governance to just basically ICANN functions. Only ITU numbering. But the group felt it was just more than ICANN issues and more than just numbering. It includes Public Policy issues, spam, privacy, crime, security, and Civil Society.

And, in fact, although the ITU observers working group was active, in the end if you look at the report, ITU is mentioned once as a footnote. I mean, they tried, but ITU, it tells you the role that they felt that ITU had. Something there, but literally a footnote.

So the implications for Internet Governance is that it's multi-lateral; that means many countries. And it should be transparent, democratic, okay, public/private sector, International organisations, this is multistakeholders. So International, many countries, multistakeholders. Many players here.

I mentioned just now rules about rules. Let's emphasize the importance of rules about rules. Not just the rules themselves, but the rules about the rules.

The recommendations, the major one is that you recommend forming a forum to discuss. A small, thin Secretariat, at UN level, 3 or 4 staff. They can fit into an MPV, the Secretariat of the UN level can fit into the MPV. Doesn't make decisions, and it becomes low cost as a result. So what we are doing here at the International level and the result is the Internet

Governance Forum, the IGF.

Okay. Okay. So we met, now coming together ten times.
The next meeting is in Brazil. And, yes, a lot of us have been
-- I've been to all of them of course, ten, it's coming to ten.

I mentioned recommendations, too, that the -- the process
of Internet governance must be an International alliance, which
is code for the US should give up sole oversight authority over
ICANN. Hardware and software were invented in the USA. It's
only logical that USA has oversight. It doesn't mean rule, but
rules are important. Oversight, look over. Look over. It
doesn't mean you control. But oversight. And you can change,
actually, it means some authority to change. Right?

Sole authority, okay. Multi-national, many countries, but
oversight should not interfere with day-to-day operations.

Interestingly, the WGIG from ICANN is probably one of the
most transparent agencies out there. But from what we can see,
it's among them. So they recommended ICANN, but it's a US
company under the US Department of Commerce. So those of you
who are working in contracts, you must have three quarters. My
University to here. You have to take three prices and take the
cheapest price. This one is one company, one price. It breaks
basic rules about proper governance. One company, one quote,
one price.

So this is a technical problem. But our concern is that
it's under the US Department of Commerce; it's under the
authority of.

ICANN has been under something called a GAC. So the
governments are involved in giving inputs to ICANN. The trouble
is that this part we found to be the least transparent. So the
irony is this, the WGIG found that it's one of the most
transparent International agencies, but a Government Committee
that is part of this group is the least transparent part of
ICANN. So all the tensions, you can see all the tensions that
happen. So interesting, you know? Interesting issues here.

And in WGIG we say there is -- that no single Government
should have a preeminent rule. Notice this doesn't mention USA
at all. No? Okay. Some people are more equal than others, you
know that saying?

So why reasons for ICANN to be under the USA. Stability is
security of the Internet. Censorship of the Internet by other
countries. The XXX, there was an attempt to have XXX, and then
it was stopped by the Bush administration, and now it's back.
It's meant to be for pornographic sites.

Let me comment and wrap up now. What if the USA behaves as
if it owned the Internet? You see the USA owns it, but what if
it behaves that way? I've done a survey talking to people, and
most people say I believe it's quite nice. It's like they

invented it and they let us to play the game. But you have to be fair as a referee and they must not keep the ball. And the sense is that it's okay. Yes. It's okay.

But what if they behave that way? So you know that in the GPS, the global positioning satellite system, it's invented by the USA. What if in time of war they set it off 50 meters, and you target and it's off by 50 meters. So the Chinese and Russians set up their own system. It does the north to south poles. And the Chinese just started. I just downloaded this from the website yesterday. See it's in the version 1.0. I think it was launched in March of this year. And you find that Russia and China signed some agreement to make it compatible.

So you see that the space is limited, actually, you know? You hear horror stories of satellites crashing, why don't we just share the system? So it's this one result. So you have the US system. The Russian Chinese system, European system. Three satellite systems.

The second one, the joint strike fighter. This is interesting. This is supposed to be the most -- it looks like something from Batman. But this is real. This is real. It's a $40 billion project. The source code was handled in the USA. And first the USA said we will not give the source code to the UK even. And they are supposed to be buddies, right?

So let me tell you this interesting anecdote. Malaysia bought Soviet planes. And people asked why did you do that? And the Prime Minister said if you buy American planes, you cannot shoot at Singapore. But if you buy Soviet planes, you can shoot at Singapore. The planes are designed that you cannot shoot at another friendly country. So if the two planes are facing each other, the weapons will not hit each other. So this software means that if the UK and US go to war, for example, over something, the UK plane will never be able to shoot down a U.S. Plane. Maybe the US can, but the other way it cannot happen. The UK said we spent $300 million on this plane. If we cannot use it, we will walk out of it. So the US says okay.

So now they have what is called operational sovereignty over the planes. So if the US behaves as if they own this, then countries say no, we don't want to be part of it, which is actually the issue with China now, right? Can China walk out of the Internet? Can they say we have a big enough economy, Ali Baba is the most valuable Internet company, can we just set up our own Internet? Technically, yes. Technically yes. And the biggest losers -- 17 American. Chinese are two, Ali Baba -- three of them. The rest of them are American companies. So we try to keep the Internet together. In the interest of many companies, we try to keep it together.

The third one on coordination. There are various parties

involved, and ITU is just one of the entities. It's not the entire thing. So you see a lot of alphabet soup coming up, which shows you why at this IGF you find a lot of alphabet soup coming up.

So coming to the final, second final slide. So the importance is that you need national and regional coordination. Friendly policy, and so forth. So the IGF is -- the IGF is part of the initiative to keep the Internet together. You are part of it. Best practices, discussing ideas, making things work. So the idea of regional and national coordination.

So in summary, we have time? Nowadays there is much more awareness of Internet governance, and people are becoming more aware of the importance of these issues. But the issues still need to be resolved. IP addresses, there are limited numbers. You find even in India there are ways to get around it. You find that it's not any longer a concern. IPv6 you use for schools, using IPv6. So it's different technology to overcome the issue. Some of them worked out, some have not.

Some issues are phony, the big one being of course what we call the "E" word. Edward Snowden. It was discussed a lot, and you'll see that there are implications for what has happened since. So the US is trying to rebuild trust. So one of them is the INR transition. One way is that they are taking part of ICANN, they will give things to the International community, and in a way it builds trust. Think about how to build trust. Something happens. How do you build trust? One way is to act against your own self interest, meaning that you do something to sort of hurt yourself. So instead of holding everything together, they are saying well, you take part of it. So the IANA transition is part of the building of trust.

Most recently, they also have laws to, what do you call reign in, to pull back the intelligence agencies. So the agencies now, for the first time in 40 or 50 years, there are some laws that would stop what they are doing. It's another way to build trust at the International level.

So these are the issues that I think you should discuss as to how do you move from here and what are the implications for all of us here who are not from the USA? But how do we get it to pull together so that things work better for the Internet and of course for us.

Okay. This is it.

Okay. Thank you.

(Applause)

Although i know it's ten minutes over, I cut ten minutes of time, but if you have a few questions... yes. Okay.

>> AUDIENCE: Thanks. From the last slide and also the question that, like, what if, like, the USA behaves as if it

owns the Internet, can we replace the USA with any Government?

>> ANG PENG HWA: I don't think that there are people who want to replace the USA with another Government. The issue is how do you have it at the International level. So the IANA transition, it will be interesting to see how this plays out. Because it's one part. It's a small part. But it's very, very complicated. It's turned out to be very complicated.

But it could be that IANA transition, I think you are covering it later on, it would show you that -- it will give a hint as to what needs to be done. If this small part is so complicated, what about the bigger part? It could be a template for a bigger move for ICANN.

>> AUDIENCE: I would like to comment on a couple of things. First of all, you have to understand what is IANA transition is, what the IANA operation is.

If you are talking about USA owning the Internet, can you precisely say what does that mean? Because IANA, I was in charge of the IANA Committee for two years as a Chair. Actually, IANA is only doing the bookkeeping stuff. If you know the IANA function, basically IANA does three things: First of all is protocol maintain, second is location assignment to the IR, and number three is doing the naming, bookkeeping things. It's making the top label to making the IP address, and also who is the manager and who is managing these things.

So, basically, this is the function of IANA is -- I think before I was Chair, the previous -- the previous Chair is an IETF Chair, and he is a Norwegian. And he met the IANA operations. And he is just doing regular procedures. So if you look at these IANA functions, I think symbolism is much more important than the operations. I'm not pro to US Government, but, you know, and also many of the ICANN board is not US, you know, citizens, you know.

So I think right now, I think the people are talking about an IANA transition. It's much more like symbolic more than really the functionality. And if you know the Internet well enough, US Government, if they want really hijacking everything, go through the IANA route, it's kind of stupid. Because there are many ways to do it right now. Many ways they can do it.

For example, a lot of people like to use the Facebook. And Facebook is open to everyone. Even the CIA. They can cull any kind of information you have from Facebook. That information is much more than IANA can provide.

I think actually a more critical one is not the IANA office. To be honest, from my personal technical background, I would say the most critical is actually who owns the new Silver A (ph). The new Silver A is much more critical. But new Silver A is not right now in the IANA function. It's a contract

between the US Government and Verisign. And the US Government
is saying if the IANA transition happens, the US Government is
waiting to hand over the contract with Verisign to the new what
they call the IANA office. It's what the US Government says.

But we have to see when the transition really happens. Is
really Verisign waiting to give it away? You know, this is not
only the US Government problem. Actually, Verisign is a big
company. They have a lot of peoples, you know, and they have
many people in Washington, D.C., too. So they see. I think
from my position, I think the Silver A is more critical than the
IANA office.

The second thing is you're asking about, you know, what
about the US Government and hand over to any Government? I
think from the year 2000, I think many of the people here
participated in WSIS from 2000 to 2005. The majority of the
people, I think many people don't agree that the Internet should
be solely controlled by Government. There is a reason why we
have multistakeholders, and that's why the IGF continues using
the multistakeholder model. If you ever participate in the UN
system, or like we did in the beginning with WSIS, we had
nothing to say, because the Government represent us. We had
nothing from the Government point of view. And I think later
there is interest in these things.

And so politically, right now, no matter in ICANN or in the
IGF, I think the people would like to look for the new model
called multistakeholder. It's a -- maybe a possible or
potential better model than the Government owned, like the UN
systems. But you never know. You never know. And so this is
the first thing, it's from the community, in general, the
community, thinking about maybe multistakeholder is a possible
or potential better model than the Government, the UN or
International Government system is.

Secondly, I think one of the realistic issues, because the
IANA right now is owned by the US Government, because any time,
when the ICANN or the IANA office, actually, it's a country arm
from the US Government. So when the transition is going to
happen, actually, the US Government in their statement clearly
defined this transition cannot go to any Government or any
International organisation. That's the position of the US
Government. No matter you agree or not, that is a US statement.
And, of course, if you want to say something for the US
Government, I think the US Government would say you don't want
the US Government in charge, then any Government cannot be in
charge, too. But of course maybe you buy that, maybe you don't.
But, somehow, there is a kind of a current condition or current
-- the US Government requires. If you want to make a transition
happen, then it cannot be owned by any Government or any

International organisation. It has to go to a multistakeholder
mechanism model.

So I hope that answers your question.

>> MODERATOR: Yes. Craig is one of the Vice Presidents of
ICANN.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm ICANN staff. I'm based in Singapore.

Just to hand on to what Kuo-Wei has said, the transition
away from US Government oversight, one of the preconditions that
have been set is that it cannot be transferred to another
Government or even a consortium of Governments. And I think we
have on Friday, at 9 o'clock, 9 o'clock to 9:45, we have a
general overview of the IANA stewardship transition. And from
9:45 onwards we have pure discussion on what a future model
might look like if we are going to move away from the existing
model.

And I think this is a very meaningful discussion, because
right now the global conversation is going on on what a post
NTIA or US Government oversight model is going to look like.
Right now, as we will be discussing on Friday, the different
models will be explained. But probably a final proposal will be
-- will go up to the ICANN board around the September or October
timeframe. So having a discussion on Friday is actually pretty
timely in terms of looking into what might happen in the future.
So that's one comment.

After the comment, I actually have a question for
Professor. So this relates to the developments with dot iq.
You mentioned the fact is that, you know, this could be a
coincidence or it could be something more than just a
coincidence. I would like to know if you think this was a
coincidence or if there was something more.

Because my memory of the US war with Iraq, it was a pretty
decisive one, given the asymmetry in military might between the
two countries. So if it was a -- if you think that's a
coincidence, I'd like to hear that. If you don't think it's a
coincidence, what was the strategic calculations from the US,
how did the removal of dot iq help the US win the war? And if
the removing of the dot iq did nothing to help them win the war,
because military was the only thing needed, what was the
relevance of removing the dot iq? That's my question.

>> ANG PENG HWA: No data. You don't make a firm
conclusion. That's why I tried to raise that issue. Besides
what I saw, one other data point, when I presented this to the
audience, all of the time they stand. It was not seen before.
As far as I can tell, I searched, the information came from the
UK. So the news -- it's almost like a black out of this
development in the USA. Again, is it coincidence or not? So
it's like X file, the truth is out there. We don't know. So it

seems more than a coincidence. It seems to me some calculated thing.

And typically I would say that if you think of it from the point of view of war and you try to cover all the bases, so my take is that probably take over sort of the whole of Iraq, take over the online space as well, and then go from there. And I guess to be fair, there were some grounds, I mean, they found some grounds. Although I would say they look at it, unauthorized computer sales. It seems like they were not really critical in the sense that like they are selling memory chips. They are not selling weapons, you know, just computer parts. They are not authorized to be sold in Libya and Syria. So beyond what you saw, it was not covered in the USA and the timing of it was such that it seemed to lead to a conspiracy theory.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you very much, professor, for your comprehensive and extensive explanation regarding this issue.

My question is: From the people of the Asia Pacific regional countries, what do you think are the most important issues regarding this Internet governance from our regional Point of View? So that's a very important issue for us to do for the future, coping with this Internet governance issue. This is my question. Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: I guess it would really vary from country to country. But one overall issue of great significance is IPv6. Because there's clearly a limit to the number of IPv4 addresses. The technology has made it possible so that you can actually use, although there are only 4 billion IP addresses, more than 4 billion people can use it. I'm told the technical number is 200 times. So you can use it 800 billion devices can use the 4 billion IP addresses.

The problem is that, and I'm hearing this, in the west, they are not really building IPv6 compatible devices. I'm hearing about this. I'm hearing a lot of this from people. Some of it is that they are not building it compatible IPv4 to IPv6. So that's an issue that needs to be resolved.

Some issues that seem to be unique -- so this is a somewhat technical issue. Some seem to be unique or more common to us is online behavior. So if you look at it, the number one country in the world for cyberbullying is China. 6 percent of people say that's number one. Number two is Singapore at 33 percent. India, 30 percent. So it's sort of the Asian sort of countries. So why is it more in Asia than the other countries?

Cyberaddiction seems to be prevalent in Japan, Korea -- especially men, sorry, guys stay at home and don't go out. Food is given to them under the door, and they don't leave for a year or more. Why is this in Asia? You don't hear of this

phenomenon in the west, Australia or the US. You don't hear
about it. So there are some issues that seem to be this
behavior.
     Gaming is big. I know my daughter plays until 3 or 4 a.m.
you know. So there's something that seems unique to Asia that
we should pay more time looking at it. In a sense, this is
governance issues, because in Korea you try to stop the games at
midnight. Can rules be formed to set some International
benchmark to say you cannot play it for more than two hours at a
time? How do you enforce that? So some Internet governance
issues.
     But we need to go. Okay. I think we need -- okay, all
right.
     >> AUDIENCE: I think a couple things, from my personal
experience. Particularly, for example, like those are very
fundamental of a structure. You know. As IGF or WCIT or ICANN
issues. I think the Asia Pacific people, we should be more
active. Because right now, for example, if you look in the
ICANN meeting, it's open to everyone. If you try to measure how
many percent from the European and Asian, I'll tell you that the
Asian would have most of the population, but sorry, I think we
have less than ten percent. And many of the people say well, I
don't speak English well, so we fail to use English to talk in a
public forum. But it's not true. Because in the ICANN public
forum we have a translator. Realtime translator. So you can
speak in Chinese. As I remember in the ICANN public forum or
even in the IGF meeting, look at the French people. They are
always speaking French and they don't care about English. In
the Spanish, they always speak in Spanish. And why we don't
just go there and speak in Chinese? The problem is that we
don't even want to stand up to say our voice. You know, and
this is I think first -- we need to think about what's happening
in the Asia Pacific. You know, we have the most population
around the world. The big one is in China and the second one in
India. But our voices are very tiny. Very little.
     And, for example, like this is one thing, you know, even in
the very fundamental issues we don't dare speak out in our own
voices. And no voice is stupid. Any voice is fine. And I hear
many people from the U.S. or from the European, they say -- they
speak in very stupid, too. So it's fine. You know.
     And the second one I'd really like to comment over here the
summary. They say distrust of US after snowden. Actually, did
it affect the US trust country to country and particularly the
US Government. But what is really sad is if these symptoms
continue to expand deeper and deeper, actually, as the Internet
people or the networking people that you know, the fragmentation
comes in. It's really bad. If the fragmentation happened to

the Internet, I'll tell you that the Internet would be totally different than what you see today. And the Internet would be of no value. Because with us the fragmentation, the US people only talk to the US people. The European people only talking to the European people. So the whole evolution of the Internet in the past 20 some years would disappear back to before the Internet. So what do we want? So I think we have to be very careful to not make the fragmentation happen to the Internet. That would be a very great tragedy.

>> The first issue about the IGF. There is one flaw that happened after the Snowden. The Brazilian President, in speaking in the United Nations, I think, I urge you to listen to what she said. That was the first time in the main plenary of the United Nations, main hall in New York. One leader complained about another one. And after that, the multistakeholder in Brazil, CGI.BR, runs the first NETmundial. It's the first Internet governance that had been bottom-up. Four thousand organisations doing online principles. I think that was the first of its kind in the IGF principle. That has been a bottom-up approach. Four thousand people. I think less than ten Asian countries were at that meeting. Fifty ministers line up in the queue to speak. Even the secretary of ITU said this was the largest ever that they could see. I do see that part of the NETmundial principle is interesting, if you are in the Internet governance.

Second, I think only two things left. Second is I'm also the (inaudible) I accept the fact that we are the least transparent groups of the ICANN. But we are changing. There are a lot of things that the Government needs to change. And it's not easy, I'll use this word, to move an elephant to dance; it's not easy. Especially if he, in general, have really loose structures. The European or the Commonwealth, they have the Commonwealth, and I try to develop ways to discuss the topics.

And the last one, I'd also like to mention about the INS, because -- as part of the 19 members who are working there, I'd like to tell you that the load of work is marvelous. It's 4,000 working hours. We have conducted 600 meetings, 3,000 e-mail exchanges. We are attracting -- if you go to the website, they are tracking all the members how much they participate. I can reach 50. So you can imagine that you have to wake up at 2 o'clock in the morning, have a meeting until 8. Starting from 7. Starting from one model to another model. It's a big study. So if you really want to study, I think you have to read all through how they came to the last Model. So it has been a -- quite a discussion and meeting there.

So it's great that you'll have the IANA discussion on Friday. So then you understand where we are today and what is

ahead on the accountability issue of ICANN.

>> ANG PENG HWA: A lot is going on in the whole process,

>> AUDIENCE: First of all, Professor, thank you for this interesting lecture.

Second as a European, I'm supposed to say something really stupid. So I want to apologize to you guys for us, you know, stealing the show. Because we are starting asking all kinds of questions. We adults. It's just because we are so passionate about the Internet governance.

And now my question is to our esteemed lecturer. We have young people here. Some from Macao, some from the Asia Pacific. I'm not sure. Just in a few words, what would be your key message, how to keep them interested and enthusiastic about the Internet governance issues as we adults are.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. So I would say that for advice to you guys, I would say that, you know, one of the things that I observe is that there is so much of what we do is affected by our upbringing and culture. I mean, it sounds like a blase thing. I come from Singapore. We are a small country. We call it a red dot. A small country. You can't do much. So the Singapore Government approach is that if you want something, you participate. And they don't participate because they feel they couldn't do much. Because they are too small. You know? What can you really do.

But from China, I can make a difference. China, you are big. So those of you from China, you can make a huge difference, simply because of the size of your country.

I would say that -- having said all of that, one of the things that I've done is I agreed to sort of look at Internet governance not on Internet per se, but look at principles that evolved. So one of the principles that is evolving and affects all of you young people more than any of us going forward is how the world is to be ruled in the future. How the world is to be governed in the future. So some of the principles on Internet governance -- because Internet governance means that it is the weak governs the Internet. Everybody, even the US Government is weak, think about it, on the Internet. So how does a weak governed Internet influence the Internet? So I took some of the principles and I applied it in the Singapore context in some sectors where the Government wants the regulation to be very, very light.

So a typical day of business. So the Government wants the business regulation to be very light. And I'm in a consumer association. How do you as a weak consumer affect this regulation? So you see that in my research I applied it to the

business context. Perhaps in the same way you might be able to
do that in your area. How do you as a weak person, it seems
like you can't do much. But most of the things, things can
happen. You can have an influence in business.

So I'll say at two levels. One is immediate in Internet
governance, and in your area, if you're from a larger country,
you can have a big impact globally speaking. From a small
country, some of the principles that you have here, you can
apply it in another Context.   >> AUDIENCE: Thank you
for an informative lecture about Internet governance. I heard a
lot of Internet governance through ICANN. But it never occurred
to me to go back to the definition. Just now you said about
UNESCO was played a role in the preliminary stage of Internet
governance. I wonder how big a role does UNESCO play in the
current discussion of Internet governance and the -- about the
IANA transition? Because I, frankly, I never heard that UNESCO
played a role in such a discussion.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: On a day-to-day basis, we think of our
lives. On a day-to-day basis, when was the last IP addresses
caused you a problem? When was the last time that IP addresses
caused you a problem? Or spam? When was the last time that you
thought your privacy was invaded? So on a day-to-day basis, our
user Internet is affected by such issues rather than other
issues of Internet Governance, which is what we are talking
about at this level. So on a day-to-day basis, UNESCO's role is
a big part. It's about user Internet. Most of us, the problems
are about the user Internet. Not the IP address, not the
accountability issues. So on a day-to-day basis, UNESCO has a
big role to play. And there are some events, freedom of
expression, some of the issues are around (inaudible). There
are some programs where on your phone you get free use of
Facebook, Facebook is free, but nothing else is free. Should
you have that or not? Right. How to stop companies from
banning users from using Skype, for example. Some countries,
Skype is still not usable. It's blocked in some way.

So on a day-to-day basis, the things that UNESCO is
interested in, it has a big part to play.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you for sharing all of these
interesting views. So many of you, many of you are from Macao,
Hong Kong and Taiwan and China. I'm from Tokyo. I'm from
Japan. I'm from Singapore.

Now you mention about the global multistakeholder as a
pervasive principle for the Internet governance, at least
globally. So two questions to you. Why these multistakeholder
principles are not really exercised and implemented at a
national level? In some countries, Japan, Hong Kong, et cetera,

I don't see participation from the Civil Society or any kind of footing from the global sector and the Civil Society. So while we are very busy and enthusiastic, talking about global multistakeholders, that is not there in Singapore or Macao or Hong Kong. So the question is why that is so.

And the second question is, is it going to change or not?

>> ANG PENG HWA: I'm interested in this subject. One of the correlations I've seen, is that when there is a censorship, there is a weak Civil Society. And if you look across, I'm not sure about all of cases, but certainly many cases that I looked at, censorship is present, Civil Society is weak. So that's one reason why Civil Society is not opertionalized at the local level.

Another one is the history behind this. So in the '90s, when I did research, I met somebody while traveling, and I said I'm learning policy about media. And his first question was media for Government? Because the thinking was that only Government has such policies. But the world is complicated, so that what we are realizing is that Governments don't have all the answers. Or at least researchers can give some views of other countries, what is happening. So in Singapore, we are being incorporated into the policymaking. And of course where appropriate, "See I told you so" you made this mistake and you should back off and why is it a mistake?

I'm with the Internet Society in Singapore and we organise talks to tell the policymakers these are issues to look at. One big one is Uber. So I got a law firm to sponsor dinner, two tables. The policymakers were there, and people were talking about the policy issues around the Internet.

So in a way, kind of prepping the people as to what to watch out for. But I'll tell you that Civil Society is not so easy to look at. Because there is a lady from South Africa and we were just talking about this issue of Civil Society. And someone from Civil Society, said you know, it's difficult to make a move in Civil Society. You know you are right. People all say you are right. But at the national level it's difficult. And this person from formerly from the national Congress agency, said what do you expect? It's difficult in Civil Society. So if you want to be Civil Society, you expect it to be difficult. But you must still push. If you think it's right, you must still push. So this way, if you want to be involved in this space, you have to push a bit. You have to be part of the change. So it's not for everybody. It's not for everybody. Maybe I'm a bit different. I'm a bit weird. A lot weird. But I push definitely. So you have to do some pushing. But the world will change and I think Civil Society has a very big role to play.

One final comment. In Singapore, Governments failed.
Governments cannot agree. Businesses failed. So the Civil
Society is stepping forward. They are saying okay, hey, boycott
companies. I won't say that we are very successful, okay? But
we feel that we made some difference. Because some areas --
Governments fail, companies fail and Civil Society has a part to
play. Maybe you're not surprised.
        >> We are out of time. So one comment and then the last
one.
        >> AUDIENCE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Ruby from
NetMission. And we initiated the youth program for the APrIGF,
and this is called Youth IGF. And we want to have some time to
prepare more youth to get into the real IGF discussion in the
future. And also, we have participants from Hong Kong, from
Taiwan, from mainland China and also Thailand. And to respond
to that -- yes. Yes. Of course, we are passionate about IGF.
And we attend this workshop and want to know more about what is
IG and how the IG discussion runs. And also from my experience,
every -- almost every adult sees there is youth in this IG
discussion.
        And while there's youth and really great to have us, but my
question is, what is the next step? We come here and how do we
sustain this process?
        >> ASHA: Name is Asha and I'm also on the ICANN board,
like Kuo-Wei. And I want to address your question and the
excellent point that this gentleman at the back made about how
to inspire you.
        So sustainability is very important. Sustainability in
maintaining young people's interest in Internet governance is
very important. I think you're the one who mentioned China.
And you also mentioned China as well.
        I would -- I want to address two points. First, I don't
agree with you a little bit, Peng Hwa, on Singapore being too
small and therefore we have no contribution to make. I think
every single person's voice counts. So you may be from a small
country, but you can -- your voice can be heard.
        China was what you mentioned. China represents one sixth
of humanity. India represents one sixth of humanity. But we
don't see that kind of representation in ICANN meetings or even
in ISOC. So I would like to see more of that. So if you want
to talk about sustainability of involvement, be more involved in
ISOC activity, in ICANN activities.
        And the other point is in addition to Civil Society, many
of you when you graduate, many of you young people who are here
for the Youth Internet Governance, when you graduate I'm sure
you will join corporates, right? There should be also a lot of
representation from corporates, from enterprise in these

meetings. Because in addition to Civil Society, corporates and enterprises also have a lot to say when it comes to their role in Internet governance. So I would like to see more Asian representation in that area, and that might be one way of making our interest in Internet governance more long-term and sustainable.

Thank you.

>> I'll try to make it short. I think the Internet governance is a very big issue. Many issues, too many issues, actually. Even us, we cannot touch every issue. That's impossible. So I think if there is a chance, I would really recommend to use IGF. In the very beginning, you should spend at least maybe three or one morning session, afternoon session, make a brief, like a -- like what Peng Hwa is doing is bridging the history of the IGF. You have a global picture first.

They say you have a fundamental, what is Internet governance and how it started, and what is the issue being discussed? What is the scenario? What is the current status? And then you have a much better picture to see in particular topics.

For example, I was in your session yesterday. Even the security is a huge question. It's not simple issues. You know, security is not just a word. It's actually to mean many things.

Even security I think you can run a whole week's session without limit. So I think -- I would suggest that you use, first of all, you spend at least two or three hours, or one morning session, afternoon session, just understanding the whole picture. Instead of before you go into the detail, just look at whole picture first. Because without the whole picture and you go into detail, it's difficult to understand what we are doing. So I think that's one thing that I would like to comment.

The second thing I would like to say to Asia, I think from my experience, I think most Asian countries have a problem. Most of the time our people always try to rely on the Government to do something for us. It's wrong. The Governments belong to us. If we don't have an opinion or -- if we don't try to be involved, and just rely on the Government, I don't like to say it, because I always jokingly say the Government also can be very evil. You know, so don't rely on the Government. We can say something for ourselves, you know, and tell the people what you feel instead of just "oh, this is a problem. So I wish my Government is smart enough or good enough to solve the problem for me." I don't think that will happen.

>> So we will hand it over to Kelvin. Can the owner of car number MM 96-56, there is someone driving here -- car number MM 96-56. You are parked in the reserved lot. So change your car. Car number MM 96-56. If you are here, please shift your car to

another lot.

    Thank you.

    >> Thank for staying now. We ran over by 45 minutes. So stay tuned. Tomorrow same time, same place. We will have the basic talk. 45 minutes. And you would have heard from the speakers here as well on Friday. Same time, same place. We will be talking about it in our transition 2011 and after that, the discussion will follow.

    Separately, on Friday, 2 o'clock, we will talk about what the speakers touch on, which is how do we get the community to know more about IG discussion, how to get Asian voices out there, how to share more with your community. So that will take place at 2 p.m. so stay tuned for that.

    A round of applause for our speaker, Ang Peng Hwa.

    (Applause)

    >> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. Thank you.

    (End of session 10:35)

<div align="center">***</div>

<div align="center">***</div>