

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE: EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
01 JULY 2015
HALL N
17:30
OUTCOMES DOCUMENT DISCUSSION

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.captionfirst.com

This text 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.

>> PAUL WILSON: Hello everyone. If I could ask you all to
take your seats, and we will try to have an interesting and
fruitful session between now and about 6:30. So we're running a
little late. So let's get started.

I think you know I'm Paul Wilson from APNIC. I'm here with
Edmon Chung from DotAsia. And what we're going to do is co-
chair this session, which is about the possibility of an outcome
document. Now, could I please ask those who are speaking, if
you wish to have conversation, could you actually take them
outside? Otherwise, it will be difficult. Please, if you wish
to have a conversation, please take it outside, otherwise this
will be a little difficult.

And if you can't hear me, then I'm not sure what I can do.
But anyway... thanks very much. That's fine.

So I'm here with Edmon and we will talk about the
possibility of some kind of outcome document from this meeting.
It's an experiment, because in fact the IGF process historically
hasn't been about making decision, it hasn't been about
negotiating and agreeing on outcomes. The IGF has been about
discussions amongst the people who come and the experiences and
things that people learn and take home with them. But over the
years, many participants I think have asked at different times

for the IGF to produce something, like an outcome. An outcome document that can be like the product of the event.

So this is, like I said, it's a bit of an experiment to see if at the APrIGF we can put down some statement of priorities and/or recommendations that can come out of this meeting. Because as I said this morning, this is only part of what is actually a global process. So there is the global annual IGF meeting and there are regional IGFs all around the place. And potentially it's useful to be able to feed information into the global meeting, and then back out of it and so forth. And a useful way to do that is possibly through an outcome document or a statement.

So we are not going to try and do this in one step, but actually in three-steps. So we have got this session now, one at the same time tomorrow, and then on the last day as well. And the important thing to do over the three sessions is to find out what we can agree on by a consensus process or a rough consensus process to find out what as a community we would like to say as an outcome of this meeting.

So what we have is a very initial draft document. It's a draft framework and a couple of points of priorities and recommendations. But it's completely a draft. It's just something to kick-off the discussion. And I think Edmon and I would like to talk about the form of the document and what is in it. What the structure is, anything at all actually about the document. It really is just very much an initial draft.

And what I'll do is hand it over to Edmon. We can talk about any comments and work out how we can take it forward and produce something over the next couple of days as an outcome.

Over to you, Edmon.

>> EDMON CHUNG: As Paul mentioned, this is really a new experiment. I'm, from the Secretariat group, quite excited about it, but also quite fearful of some of it. But so I guess the plan is I'll go through the current draft skeleton, and really to invite feedback from everyone on some of the substance issue, as well as the structural issue.

I'll go through what has been drafted as the structure, and we will seek input from the structural point of view, first. And then the document itself is actually structured into three main sections. And then we will go into each of the sections and try to get feedback and input into it.

So let's jump right into it. In fact, in front of you or if you go to the main -- the home page of the APrIGF 2015, you can click through to it. Or directly go to comment.RIGF.Asia to go to this document.

This is actually, the first page you see is more like a preamble or a disclaimer. I would like to call it a disclaimer

a bit more. It's just a bit of background that this is an initiative that started from discussions, starting from last year, some concluding comments from last year, in Delhi. And then this document being a kind of draft that we hope to develop over the course of the next couple of days. And it documents, hopefully, the consensus of the participants.

We understand that, even though we called it the Asia Pacific Regional IGF, we cannot be said to represent the entire region, which is very diverse. But what we can do is to contribute to the conversation as a consensus among the participants, and that's the idea.

So this is kind of the preamble. And I think going right to the next page. Kelvin mif you're up there and you can help me click over to the actual document itself. Or anyone who is controlling the projector, move to the document itself. Yes. We're there.

So this is the actual document. It's actually very simple at this point. It's structured in three sections. The first one is the introduction. It gives a very brief introduction of who we are, as this gathering. And also a little bit about the workshops from this event. So it is a very brief description, how many workshops were held, on what type of stream, and what type of topic. And so like 29 sessions over nine sub-themes in the cybersecurity trust, Internet community, and so on. And just a listing of all the items that were discussed in the workshops and work sessions. And this is the introduction. And just to talk about the observation and recommendations that we hope to put forward.

The second section, which is on the number 1.1, is a part where we hope to document the priorities we think the Asia Pacific region should have in terms of Internet governance. And currently, the priorities are -- I've put down a few placeholders, with suggestions looking at the current -- the next billion people coming online is likely going to -- a lot of the percentage is going to likely come from this region. What may be the priorities for this region? And looking at the current placeholders based on some of the workshops accepted, one of which is digital divide, and one is the universal acceptance of IDNs, International Domain Names, on the Internet.

And the third section is intended to be, kind of a recommendation to the larger discussion of Internet governance. And currently we have, as placeholders, some of the -- describing the workshops that were held in terms of the diversity and the perspectives, diverse perspectives, and how perhaps that could be utilized or, you know, how the voice could be projected into the larger global Internet governance discussion. And also a placeholder for, I guess, the balancing between cybersecurity and human rights and development, which is

kind of the -- what we see from the workshops, the proposals. So all of it, currently, the substance is kind of based on the workshop proposals, and as a draft skeleton from, you know, that the Secretariat compiled.

So with that, I guess the first set of questions we're looking for, of course you can comment on anything -- actually, first of all, please go online and comment. Because the comment is open online at any time throughout the period. So please I encourage you to suggest wording or suggest online as well. But I guess the first part is to get a little bit of feedback from, you know, whether this kind of structure, very simplistic introduction priorities, recommendations, does that work? Is that something that makes sense or... are there other suggestions?

Actually, just use the mic and come line up at the mic.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. Hello? Can you hear me? Okay.

Hi. My name is Jac. I'm from the Association of Progressive Communications. I'm also currently a multistakeholder adviser for the global IGF.

And I was very surprised and quite pleased to see this initiative. I think it's very bold. Because as you know for IGF you always kind of shy away from anything that sort of says we're going to produce an outcomes document at the end of the process.

And I completely recognize the regional process is autonomous and runs and has its own priorities and ways of working.

So what I would like to know more is around how does the -- what is the processes behind it? Why outcomes document as opposed to, say, something like a document that outlines all of the key issues that are being discussed and different points of views.

Because I think -- I guess the worry is that we might spend a lot of time trying to -- which happens in most, I guess in most kind of like policy spaces and processes, things that -- you know some of us are familiar with, but we end up spending a lot of time worrying about what is in the discussion placeholder 1, 2, 3, and how it's placed in relation to each other. As opposed to a space that sort of facilitates multiple points of views from IGF placeholders, and IGF being a space to hold all of the contradictions. And sort of like being a space that can fan all of this out and present it as such. So that is I suppose my question: Processes, position, how this is doing, how this comes about, and how do we go forward from here?

>> EDMON CHUNG: I'll start and maybe Paul can add to it. So this is the process. You're in the process right now. And it's, as I mentioned, this is drafted based on the accepted workshop proposals.

So in response to what you said, I think that the idea came about in the summary discussion at the New Delhi meeting, at the MSG, the Multistakeholder Steering Group that helps organize the APRIGF. The idea was put out during those meetings in Delhi. And during the course of the year this was planned based on, as I mentioned, the workshop proposals submitted and accepted.

So in response to why don't we just document the discussions, so yes, we already do that. For the last five years there has been a report that comes out every year that documents each of the workshops. We will have a report on some of the items. And for the last -- Yannis help me -- I think for the last three years we had Special Rapporteurs that follow each stream and provide a report at the closing ceremony, and that is also documented. And then there is the, you know, an overall report that documents the participation and some of the issues discussed, and kind of incorporating the two areas that I mentioned. So each workshop has a report and then there are usually four to five Rapporteurs that help us summarize the multiple workshops under a same stream, that is discussed or actually presented in the closing.

So those are -- those have been done and those are very important. And this is not looking to replace it. But why this one is, of course, one of the issues, yes, we might be spending a lot of time talking about this, but this is also part -- this is a way to drive participation and pay attention to what is happening here and to try to get the participation. And maybe there might be some consensus some years or might be no consensus at all some years, or maybe a consensus to close it down all along.

>> PAUL WILSON: Just very briefly, what I intended in my introduction was to say that we will document what we can agree on. And if we happen to have a consensus on a lot of useful points, then that can be documented. If we don't, then there is a question about how to document that. And either it's not documented at all, because there is no agreement, or as you said, Jac, there could be a number of different views. And I don't see why that shouldn't be documented as well, if we want to go there. If there are a number of different views, it might become difficult if there are two different ways of approaching a particular topic, then that could be documented.

So I'm not sure what everyone interprets by an outcomes document, but I don't see it as something that is an imposed single agreement of single points that need to have a single answer to each one. It's about what we can agree on by conscientious. And if we can't, then we document nothing. Or as I said, we can document a range of views, in my humble opinion.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm (inaudible) with (inaudible). That's really the point that I wanted to make. Because at the beginning of the day, there were several observations. The cultural sensitivity. We have an expert coming online. And so my point here is that if you're talking about a priorities document, then I think what we're trying to do is synchronize the dialog, not control it, as most people who need to participate aren't here.

The point that you're making about whether or not you should or should not document the areas that you disagree, I would actually argue that documenting the areas that you disagree, in fact, perhaps is more important because that's the work that has yet to come for the billion who are yet to come online.

And so the issue is language -- I think this should be a living document, not just one off. And the recommendation is to license the document, that allows people to translate and build upon it. Again, the actual technical document would be the English document for pragmatic reasons. But you would expect this document to help synchronize the dialoge within our economies. The use of this document is internal to the region, not necessarily facing other regions.

So this is a useful point. It's a way to try to start a dialog and not finish it, and that way the recommendation here is to document basically all the points of agreement, the sliver of common agreement, but perhaps more importantly the areas that you disagree.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Please, if it's okay, I think approaching the microphone is the best way to share the time. Thanks.

>> AUDIENCE: I'd like to build on the points made by two colleagues here and also some of the responses which both of you made.

It seems to me that one of the goals is that we are trying to reach consensus on text which could be then captured in the outcome document. You differentiated that this would be a different exercise than the reporting process which has been happening for the last few years, in any case.

Fundamental to designing consensus I think is full participation. And if in your construction of designing consensus, if there is a thinking that just these attendees who are in these rooms for the next few days, that they are the ones that will have an input into that process, then I don't know how representative that is. Because we have to make it more widely known that there is an input seeking process going on currently that will get captured in this text of some form. You know, then you can have the community buy-in or support. The community has to feel it's open and people had the opportunity

to provide input and participate. So there are mechanism issues that we need to address this and be concerned about and really engage in that.

The second thing is the point, and I just want to build on that, I think one of the reasons that we look forward to this regional meeting is to come and exchange ideas and learn from each other. There is a reality of that. And because there is no pressure at the end of the day to think that we will be getting in a room and we will be actually looking at text, which we are going to in the outcomes document. The ambiance of a discussion-based meeting is very different from something that at the end of the day generates some kind of an outcome.

I'm not saying that there is actual tension in that ambiance, but there can be at times. We have to recognize that these are different goals, and how we are synthesizing that I think needs to be addressed at a construction level. I'm not saying that this is bad, I'm just saying that there are two ambiances that we are trying to merge. Again it comes out to what is our goal and what do we want to achieve?

Perhaps we could address those fundamental questions, before adding to this, it would be helpful at least from my perspective.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman. I would just like to comment that ten years ago or more, I was a Government delegate at the World Summit for the Information Society. And I clearly remember that one of the ways that the World Summit delegates collectively, the States collectively decided to address the issues raised by the multistakeholder community was to create the IGF and give it the mandate to go away and talk about not only technology issues, but also public policy issues.

And I think it would be perfectly justifiable to start our document by acknowledging we have this mandate. I agree with the previous commentator who said this is a regional document maybe for internal discussion in the region, but that's only part of the picture. We are part of an International -- intergovernmental -- sorry, IGF process. And that process is coming to an end or the end of its first life this year. And I think we have the obligation, morally speaking, to make recommendations to the big IGF so that we can justify -- we can give an end of term report to the big IGF, which again will have to give its own end of term report to the United Nations.

So I think we need to raise our vision higher and start off by acknowledging our mandate to deal with Public Policy issues. And if we feel we can make recommendations on, you know, ways of approaching some of these difficult questions that we have discussed this afternoon, then we should feel free to make

general comments.

Okay? Thank you. Kwik

>> AUDIENCE: My name is Kwik and I'm speaking in a personal capacity.

I wanted to jump in here and say that -- and say that I really encourage this process. I find it very useful.

I think Anki made the good point about people being potentially nervous if this is construed in a way that, you know, that this could potentially become a political discussion. But the way that Edmon drafted the disclaimer made me feel comfortable that we can have this discussion without necessarily feeling that we are cornered into a corner.

I think we talk about how the regions are represented in the different fora, and I think this is a way for the Asia Pacific stakeholders to find a voice. So I agree that this could be used as an internal document for the region, but I think there is also usefulness in just capturing the flavor of discussions beyond the region as well.

I think to give people more comfort, maybe we can explain the methodology within the disclaimer portion that Edmon had drafted as well, so people know that this was open and people could come in through remote participation or be in the room. And it was a document that took live comments.

So I would just encourage everyone to embrace this. And even if there is disagreement, if you can capture the flavor of the discussion over the next three days, I think this is something that is very useful.

Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: So I do want to note that just because we're not taking notes, we have the Secretariat people taking notes of this.

And on the point of how we are conducting it, yes, I think it's very important that -- to note that this is currently, and has been for the last couple days, an open document. Yes, it's a very short time, I understand. This is the first try, again. And so feel free to comment on it, in the next few days. And also, I believe we still have the Adobe Connect room here, do we? Yes, we have the Adobe Connect room, which anybody can join.

Of course, again, you know, advertising it and outreaching and getting all the participation to come in, that is always a challenge. But the venues are open, I think it's important just as a note.

>> AUDIENCE: Hi. Okay. So Anita from the Foundation (inaudible). This is the second time that we are attending the APrIGF, from the Philippines. And I want to pick up on what Edmon said about driving participation using this outcomes document. I think it's important to have participation in this

APrIGF, because we are a very big region, but I don't think we were able to get that -- I mean, at least participation, that much participation from the region, in terms of APrIGF.

So I think -- I think we have to go back to why we don't have that much participation. So I'm not saying -- it's difficult to say that this outcomes document might drive participation, because we haven't talked about why we haven't had that much participation in the APrIGF.

I understand that it's just a new space. I mean, eventually we have to talk about that. And I think, number two, is with the multistakeholder group, I understand that the multistakeholder group actually wanted to push for this? I was in the last APrIGF, and I didn't really thought of having an outcomes document discussion. So I -- correct me if I'm wrong. But I haven't really received comprehensive documentation of the APrIGF 2014. When I say "comprehensive documentation," it's better to have like issues raised during the discussion, recommendations that have been raised during the discussion. So that might be also a better document to -- I mean, we should have a process for documenting the work shops. Because Rapporteurs are not enough. Usually you have to have like two documentation. The documentation of the organizers, where they should be the ones who are documenting it and making sure that the recommendations on the documentations are there. Or just a template for the documentation. Because I haven't really seen one. I haven't really seen one.

Yes, so I was trying to access the report or the minutes of the meeting of the MSG after the APrIGF. But I haven't accessed -- I can't access it. So maybe you can also -- so that we would also be able to understand what happened during that process. Yeah.

So there.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, please, Peng Hwa. And anybody else, this really is intended to be an open exchange of --

>> PENG HWA ANG: I like you a lot. But I disagree with you about comprehensive documentation. Because it's a pain in the neck. And worse, people won't read it except your mothers. Take it from experience as an academic.

So I suggest that we have a comprehensive documentation, which we have as a report, we do it every year. Make a report that people will read. We need a report that people will read. And given our attention span nowadays, two or three pages is what people will read. So this is on the longish side already for our modern age. So I think we need something short but punchy. And people will read what you're saying to say here. And this is the key point. People will read what you are trying to say.

>> AUDIENCE: I don't think it's not important. It's for

transparency and accountability. So we demand that from our Governments, and we should have it in the APrIGF space. It's already enough that you don't have that space in your Government. So I think it's better to have that in this space.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Allow me to respond quickly. I do think that we have a template for the workshops to provide the report back. So in case, just ask the Secretariat or Yannis directly, and we do collect that input.

Yes, we don't really have a very thorough analysis is really what you're looking at of all those reports and then creating certain outcomes.

It is difficult as I think Peng Hwa has mentioned, whether that is going to be fruitful and who the audience is. But I think it's a good idea and we should really, you know, take note of that. This is slightly different. That is, as Peng Hwa said, it's intended to be a document that hopefully somebody would read and short enough that doesn't talk about all the things that has happened. So that is the idea.

>> AUDIENCE: My name is Rohad Savajiva. This is my first participation at the regional IGF, though I have participated in the global IGF. And also, I did participate in the WSIS back in 2005.

I'm a little worried about the word "recommendations" here. I hope you thought this through. In the ITU, the word "recommendation" is equal to a final decision.

Now, when I speak here as a speaker, I'm concerned that I don't -- I, in the spirit of IGF, I don't actually contradict and try to debate what other people say, even though I disagree with them. Because I think this is a place of sort of general discussion of ideas. Now, if I thought that this was going to be a final conclusion, and a direction, or a reflection of the opinions of, God forbid, all of Asia Pacific, I would adopt a different attitude as a speaker. Because the way I see it, I speak. There is a summary document coming from the session. This summary document feeds into this final document. So I'm a little worried about this word "recommendation." Perhaps you could have more neutral language at least in your first iteration. Because I'm not recommending anything when I speak here.

>> AUDIENCE: What is a recommendation for that?

>> AUDIENCE: I don't know. You see, you can make this so bland that it has no meaning. But bland it down, is what I'm saying. Sometimes when I was negotiating for the Government, that's what we used to do. We blanded down so that everybody can accept it.

But is that really what you -- the way you want to go?

>> EDMON CHUNG: Two things, one, yes, that's a good recommendation, to not use "Recommendation."

Okay.

(Laughter)

The other thing is, I want to clarify, this is -- this document does not try to incorporate the other summaries. So the workshop sessions are independent. This is a separate session that we try to, you know, see if we can agree on certain priorities. So I want to make sure that the workshops and those summaries are not related, you know, are not kind of feeding into this.

I was saying that the placeholders I put here are based on what was received. But the actual discussion here does not feed into this document. I just wanted to make sure that that is clarified.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. My name is Chadra (inaudible). I'm also from the Association for Progressive Communications. It's also the first time I attended the APrIGF, but I've been attending the global IGF.

Just building on what has been said now, I guess one of the things that could help us is to then think about the process -- if you're looking at this, and we're inviting, we're inviting direct contributions, text, no? This is what we're looking at. To clarify what happens to that. I'm sure there might be differences, there are different opinions around the text that might come in. Now, how do we summarize that? And do we discuss that then when it's summarized? What is the process in doing that? Because I think in spite of your rough consensus building that we might want to do.

The other thing maybe it would help if we -- if it's not recommendations, then we are looking at what are the concerns that we have? What are the critical concerns that we have in the region at this point? You know? That could be something that might be helpful in terms of just stating what it is that we want to document.

I think probably there will be less contentions, because we might have much more common ideas around what are the current concerns in the region.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Kenny Huang, a board member of the APNIC and also a Board member of ISOC Taipei chapter. But today I speak in my personal capacity.

First of all, I really appreciate this process. It's an evolving process. Today is the first day of the APrIGF. I think after three days, I think we will have more opinions, everything will be more concrete. And I really appreciate that kind of effort can be sustained and here and in the future at APrIGF meetings.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Sorry to take the floor again. And it's also

my first APrIGF. And I'm sure that -- and I also don't have -- I'm sure that, Paul, you have a lot more experience than me, and Izumi as well, and I'm sure people in the room have more experience than I do about the IGF process.

So just sharing some information -- I guess I'm putting my role as information sharing. I think this is really a fantastic initiative in terms of what it's trying to do, which is to really create a platform for sort of like, you know, very directed participation and discussion around what are we concerned about as a region, as an IGF community in Asia Pacific? What are we concerned about? What did we come here to talk about and what are the things that we would like to see documented, as these are the key concerns that we have in this year's APrIGF. And starting from the workshops, it's a really great place. And then sort of creating this platform for further comments and input is also fantastic.

It's also a very difficult -- I think it's raising a lot of discomfort -- not really. Like questions, I suppose. It's because, A, it's a policy -- IGF is a policy discussion space. So in policy discussion spaces, you get sensitive about terms, right, outcomes, recommendations. And then the recommendation to drop "recommendation" is a fantastic recommendation.

So there are a few things that are happening at this year's global IGF that I think I can share to help see where we can plug some of this work in. One is that there is definitely interest to link more discussions that are happening at national and regional IGFs at the main sessions at the global IGF. So whatever this document ends up being, it will be great to see how this can link to that. So that is definite direct linkages.

The other thing is around the intersessional work that is happening. We are trying to have discussions around particular current issues or current policy areas that require, you know, more intense conversation, to see what are the different stakeholders doing in relation to this work? What has been best practices so far? What have been strategies that have been taken and how has it worked? How has it not worked? How can we learn collectively from this process? Document the conversation, and really engaging multistakeholders to participate in this. Document it well and then produce a synthesis document out of this long conversation.

So it's quite a long process. And we have more time this year than last year, last year we had very little time, apparently, and it's the best practice forum.

There was one session organized here, it's how to connect the next billion. And that's a more less contentious way, which is to see how can we facilitate a conversation for multistakeholders to really gather intelligence, in terms of analysis, in terms of strategies, in terms of concerns, and how

can we document this and how can it be useful both as an articulation of the key issues in the region as well as to help each other to also figure this out. Like we all come into a particular area, particular issues area from different points of view, no? So how can we use that as a way to help us move forward?

>> PAUL WILSON: Are there any other contributions?

I'll just point out again that the draft document such as it is is available online and it's possible for anyone to lodge comments on the overall approach, on the overall document, and on the individual parts. So it may even be that the word "Recommendation" in that paragraph, whatever number it is, is really not appropriate and that comment can be made.

I think the question that I have is whether -- if we agree that there could be or should be some words, some statements, some outcome that can be agreed from this meeting, then, under what categories are we able to derive some common words? So we have -- currently we have priorities and recommendations, and they might not be the right sorts of forms of words that we want to use. Maybe it's a statement of concerns, which is more like a compendium of concerns that may not be shared by everybody, but may be acknowledged as concerns of many.

There may be, if not recommendations, then I don't know what the politically correct or safe, was it watered down wording, could be. But these things could be suggested. And maybe since we're coming to the end of this session, in terms of the time allocated, some of us could sleep on this and come up with some suggestions to bring back via the online system, and then that will enter into tomorrow evening's session. That's a possible way forward from here.

Edmon?

>> EDMON CHUNG: I think that's a great way to direct it. At least we -- it seems like we have at least come to one consensus, which is probably not to use the word "Recommendation." Which is a good start, I think.

But we do have a few minutes. If we could ask for a round of input, you know, or comments on a little bit of the substance, not to cut off the queue or discussion about the structure, but issues of concern or priorities or issues that perhaps should be in for the next couple of minutes. That might be a good idea as well.

So if you have any ideas on issues of concern, issues of priority, please also bring it up as well.

>> AUDIENCE: So I have a quick comment from a gentleman behind me. So he had a suggestion, to change "recommendation" to "observation." Which can be considered, if you all agree, then we can probably use observation as a term to kind of put that point forward. So that's one thing.

I just wanted to -- I mean, I think in general, it's a very good initiative. I think most of us agree. And I mean, whoever doesn't agree we also respect that. So that's fine.

The point what I wanted to make is we have to make it very concise, so that everybody can take it away. So why can't we have it maybe a polling based solution. So probably we can come up with a list of observations, what we are talking about, and then probably where the other participants can say okay, this is on my priority list. So then we can give a quantitative number to a priority. I mean, just kinds of make it precise, concise. Because when we make it very subjective, again it's a daunting task for the Secretariat to compile it and still achieve that essence of the report. So I think that can also be looked at.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: That seems like a good idea. So you are suggesting a survey or something that could go around and serve as a poll. So I think that's a good idea to include.

>> AUDIENCE: I just wanted to clarify something. So we're talking about language already. We're going to push through this this document. I just want to ask if this will really push through. All right.

>> PAUL WILSON: I wonder, do we have... do we have a consensus on production of a document?

Do we have strong opposition to production of a document through this process that we have embarked on? So this is a show of hands for strong opposition.

No?

>> AUDIENCE: (Off microphone.)

>> PAUL WILSON: Please, take the microphone.

>> AUDIENCE: Asha Hemrajani. This is my first Asia Pacific Regional IGF. I've never been to any IGF. I'm very new to this. My question, which was something that I asked you the first day we met, yesterday, what is the difference between this and the summary document? Because I didn't get the difference.

And the second thing I wanted to ask was about the comment that this young lady made here that this could be input to the IGF in Brazil later this year. Would it be both documents that would be submitted as inputs? Both the summary and this?

But before I conclude, I wanted to say I'm very, you know, I'm speaking on my own behalf, I'm very encouraged -- I'm very supportive of this idea. I think it's good, because it will help us crystallize our thoughts better. But I wanted to understand the difference between the two documents a bit more and whether both would be submitted.

>> PAUL WILSON: It's important to note that there is no submission system. There is no process by which we would submit something formally to the next IGF. It's really the production

of something that is available, and can be noted by whoever wants to do that. It's not a formal system of inputs or outputs. And I don't suppose that's what anyone has suggested in linking together the national, regional and global IGFs. It's about production of something that is -- whether it's an outcome or an output, it's something that is simply available after this meeting. And so I hope that if something is made available, then it would somehow be taken note of and it would be used. But it's used for some purpose but it's not a formal submission from one to the next.

>> AUDIENCE: My question is could we consider it as a submission?

>> PAUL WILSON: Both would be -- would be outcomes or outputs of this meeting, and both would be then available to be used as relevant in different parts of that IGF process.

>> AUDIENCE: Okay

>> EDMON CHUNG: Just adding to that. The global IGF, if you will, initiative, there are links to documents that, like, for example, every year we produce a report which is the summary report that Asha you alluded to. So the difference there is that kind of document, the workshops and what was held and what was done and what happened in the different workshops at APrIGF. This particular document is about, as you said, and I think Kwik really mentioned it really well, is to see if we can crystallize something to synthesize the voices from Asia Pacific region, you know, and that's really the idea for the initiative.

So it's not -- it's not quite the summary of what was discussed in different workshops. Rather, it's, you know, a separate document that tries to synthesize the voices coming from Asia Pacific -- from this event, correct. Correct -- thanks for correcting me. Yes.

>> AUDIENCE: I was at the MSG, not the MSG, but the MAG for the global IGF.

And to some extent, I disagree with the discussion whether it should be "Recommendation" or some other word, or whatever. At the end of the day, whether it's -- say it's translated into Cantonese or Hindi or Japanese or Korean, do we see real difference? We say about diversity or including language in this document. And if you stick too much on the very fine sort of differences of letters of the lawyers, are we all lawyers? I don't think so.

Quite often the IGF global also got some problem of wording, or especially more of the intergovernmental negotiations. There, yes, a word is very important and you have to really agree and you have to make a lot of negotiation. But I don't think this one is like that. It's more of the spirit to see -- to recognize the differences of the positions and diversities.

So somehow if you can make it as a preamble or footnote or end note of that kind of spirit, that is a very strong property or attributes of our region. Despite all the diversities, we are still fairly peacefully co-existing, with some exceptions I don't mention.

So I really ask you to work in spirit not too much on the letters.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> PAUL WILSON: Well, that's a very nice perhaps a final statement with the evening, Izumi, especially with the accolades that you got.

So if we can leave it at this point, and again, at this point, barring any remaining comments of course.

>> AUDIENCE: I just wanted to add something that we were discussing at one of the workshops about watching technology. We are still at the early days of this discussion on watching technology. We are not sure what it's going to amount to in terms of outcomes. We know that potentially a virtual currency on top of this technology can power the economy of the next billion. And we know that we are trying to solve the problem of achieving distributed consensus on a distributed network. So it sounds like there is some overlap there in objectives.

So I think I just recommend, actually, no. I have an opinion I can -- my observation is that (laughter). I don't know what word to use anymore. I think the Internet governance body should look at the technology and work with the groups that are working on the technology on the other side. And I think there is a potential for a lot of cooperation there.

So that's it.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you for your observation.

Is there -- are there any other remarks before we do close for the evening?

Well, thank you. The opportunity to make some comments of any kind on the document are there. And I think we should know how to find that. And any further thoughts that you would like to bring back to the same session tomorrow afternoon would be very welcome.

So please let's adjourn this session until then. And have a pleasant evening.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: (Off microphone.)

>> PAUL WILSON: I think "pushing through" is a word that concerns me. I don't think we would have any agreement or consensus or intentions to push anything through. So if we could "create" or to "agree" or to "allow" would be a nicer way to put it.

>> YANNIS LI: Thank you everyone.

This is just a reminder. The shuttle bus has already arrived. So please proceed to the entrance and then the bus will be waiting for you. A reminder about tomorrow's shuttle bus will start at 8:20, the first one. And we will have a second one at 8:40 a.m., from the hotel to the University.

So please enjoy the evening and please do join us tomorrow again and I'll see you all tomorrow.

Thanks.

(End of meeting 18:28)

This text 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.
