

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
N HALL
02 JULY 2015
17:50
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.

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

>> YANNIS LI: Hi everyone, this is the outcomes document session. And
it will be followed by the MSG meeting. We will be starting soon. Please
kindly be seated.

Thank you. We will start shortly, when our Chairs come back.

>> PAUL WILSON: Welcome back, everyone, to chapter two of the grand
experiment of trying to find a way of expressing something as an agreed
output, outcome, result, or otherwise of this session.

So it's great to see, actually, that after last night's discussion
there were quite a number of comments that were submitted. I think there
have been some discussions today and some ideas about how we could take this
forward in a way that -- I suppose in some sense, track back steps a little
from what we proposed yesterday and starts with the idea or the question
about what form or what types of conclusions could actually be drawn at all
from here.

But I think Edmon will take us through what we have heard so far from
the comments on the document. And we will take it from there ^{TM1}TM1

So Edmon, are you ready to take it from there?

>> EDMON CHUNG: Sure. Thank you, Paul. And thank you, everyone, for

rejoining us. I thought it would be a deserted room by now.

But I think it's -- I was just looking at some of the comments that were received, and also from the discussion we had yesterday, instead of me going further, I think one of the things that seems to become quite apparent is that it is actually -- the process of which and how we get here is really as important as the substance, especially in terms of this first or few, for the first few tries. And in terms of thinking about how we can actually produce a document that we can come converge on in terms of consensus.

I wanted to see if Jen is ready to give a brief summary or, is it a yes or a no?

So just to start off with a very brief summary of the comments that were received online, and then proceed forward to get comments in, too.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG: Hello everyone. This is Jennifer Chung, for the transcript.

And I just wanted to give a very brief summary on the comments that we have received so far on the outcomes document. It's very encouraging, actually. For the entire document we have already received 17 comments. And it ranges from, you know, pretty much just suggestions as to certain words and different meanings for, for example, the "Recommendation" word to be changed to "Observations," to basically, suggesting in the introduction that we concentrate on the spirit of why we want to have an outcomes document or a process of having such an outcomes document.

The paragraph that received of course the most comments is the current paragraph called "Priorities for the Asia Pacific region." Within those comments, we see a lot of different people who want to include different topics, such as the Universal Acceptance and the International Domain Names. And we received a comment from the YIGF participants and supporting incorporation of that into the regional IGFs. We received additional comments on the internet connectivity, which is now WiFi, some Asia Pacific companies prohibit private companies from operating WiFi hot spots. So these are the sorts of comments that we received on the actual topics that people wish to be included in the priorities for the Asia Pacific region. And Edmon did mention that we are now looking at possibly creating a process or looking to see if we can come together to decide if we want an outcomes document or a process for such.

So let me just hand it back to Edmon for that.

>> EDMON CHUNG: So thank you, Jennifer. Also, from the Secretariat, helping us to collate this work, actually.

So taking, as Jen was mentioning, I think it's very encouraging to see the comments coming in, you know, through the process, to talk about some of the substance. But I really want to kind of get the -- go back to where we were discussing yesterday as well, which is kind of take a step back and talk a little bit about how -- what the process might be, you know, not only for this time but also future instances that we could create in an outcomes document that we can agree to. So both -- I guess I just wanted to, instead of just talking too much, just open the line and to try to get some input on whether we should also document, whether we should also document how next

time around or you know in the future how we should actually do this, because we actually touch on that a few -- touched on that a few times yesterday in the discussion.

I'm just rambling on, because I'm hoping that somebody would go to the mic and get the discussion started. Because really, trying to get -- you know, going back to whether there is some substance that we think we can agree on, as well as whether there are processes or aspects of processes that this outcome, if we create an outcome document, that should be in place.

>> PAUL WILSON: Maybe as a starting point, someone who has submitted some comments on the document might like to say a few words to inform the group of what the contributions or comments were? I mean, this is optional. There is no need to do that. But it might be a useful way to start an exchange.

Is anyone prepared to say a few words? Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: I made a few comments already. I was not going to, but this might be something that we, as we say in the GAC, this is something that we did every time. So if you want to reach the document, I think you need to come up with the proposed text already by today. Because you do try to seek consensus by tomorrow, right? So maybe the first day you come up with the first draft, come in the second day. And you need to come up with the proposed text and people have to work at night, next morning. Otherwise we cannot reach a consensus.

And I only recommend a few things on the heading. I looked back to the IGF, they used the word called shared reports which might give it more easy, shared. Otherwise, if you cannot finalize in the meeting, I guess, they call it shared reports or shared summaries. And I think the name sometimes is also quite important, how we look through it. And I proposed some of the text that related to that spirit on paragraph 2. Because they also state clearly on the beginning of the shared summaries that were in IGF 2015, and the intention is quite the same, that they want to communicate something out.

I've been touching a bit on the terms, which may look stupid but that's how the GACs work. But we need to follow -- I think in the document, you know, you have acceptance groups. So you have been using a different term than what you state here. Like Internationalized, TLDs, or I cannot remember the exact word. But it's there in the comments. Two of the words that you use in the priority about EAI, and IDN. In the user group, you used different words, because EAI is IETF terms. But in USG you use the other way. It depends which one you choose, but you have to refer back. Because you start with, you know, acceptance. We might need to follow the terms of general acceptance. Because if you start to use the term of IETF, they don't understand.

But the term of EAI, and the IDN, I think it's more meaningful. I think IDN is nonASCII, something. I think those are the only two points I made. And maybe it's not relevant but you know the GAC always sticks with the words and terms. And I really encourage people to start working on the document if you want to come up with a consensus.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Could I suggest that in the third paragraph of the introduction, where was it, up or down, in the list of themes, can you scroll down again?

Or scroll back up? I can't see it now. There, there. Yes. Second paragraph. Sorry, somewhere in the second paragraph, where you're referring to nine sub-themes. Could you make some reference to access to information in the framework of national strategies, national information planning? So that you're urging the Governments that the multistakeholder group works with to listen to the concerns of the multistakeholder group.

>> AUDIENCE: Okay. Allow me to ad --

>> EDMON CHUNG: Allow me to address just this first.

So point taken. And I think it's a good input. I think we will take it down, first, and rather than do live editing, we have the ability to do live editing, but I think it's much more important to take in the inputs first at this time, perhaps. But also to ask when live editing might be useful as well.

>> AUDIENCE: Hello. My name is Jac, and I'm with the Association for Progressive Communications. I just wanted to say it's really fantastic that, you know, that you've sort of taken the input and conversations from yesterday and reflected about it and sort of thought about ways to move forward from there. And thinking -- and instead of coming to the point of view that process is as important as actually the content. And I really, really would like to commend the team on this.

And saying that, I would like to, if we can, spend time thinking about that case, what would the process look like? And how can we all also contribute to its creating -- how can we all contribute to articulating the process that is able to produce a robust document with input from -- you know, with enough time and opportunities for input from multistakeholders, whether present at the current physical states or remotely.

And I think that the manner in which the document is actually published right now that enables comments and input is actually a really useful place to start, just to say that actually there is this space and that we can enable comments on this and comments not just in terms of what's actually written in the document, but also in terms of what the document should contain. And how should it be organized and what should it be named as?

So as a comment was put earlier, maybe -- I don't know if it's a Chair's summary, because that is slightly different. It does feel more like a kind of community document where everybody puts an input and, yes, and sort of comments.

So one is like okay. Not just in terms of the content, but also in terms of what should be in the document. How do we organize particular things? And then secondly, I guess how else can we encourage participation into this, whether it's in the mailing list or whether we do like quite a serious kind of like a tweet out, maybe don't give ourselves such stressful deadlines as well. Like in 24 hours you must have a document. Ask for everybody's input. That could be quite stressful. But we could say okay, we would like to have a document one month after the IGF, for example, and let's

give this timeframe then the actual attention to it can happen, make sure we reach out to all stakeholders, make sure that we are telling people again and again this is what we would like to do. And then to have a sense of what will we do with this document, where will we share it? How will it be useful to us as a community?

>> EDMON CHUNG: Can I quickly respond? Stay there so I can ask a couple questions. It's useful input.

You mentioned a couple things, participation and various channels. Online channel, and of course physical space here.

A couple things, what should it contain and how should the document be organized? So that presents a very interesting question. I think we can say that, you know, that that is -- actually, that particular point is very important. But let's say we implement it next year, how would you envision that particular part to happen? You know, I think that is perhaps the crux of the thing.

You know, at this particular time the Secretariat pulled together what was there and put out a sort of throw it on the wall and see how it went. So, next time around, how do we go about the process of creating what it should contain and how a document should be organized?

>> AUDIENCE: I would imagine -- I think this process is great. To start it from like looking at the proposals and then trying to figure out particular things.

And then I think also the multistakeholder group could play a role in terms of also like helping to think this through and think this out. I think that's a really good space to actually begin the process, but also to open it up beyond the MSG as well, to anybody in the community who might be interested to contribute in the process. That would also be helpful. And then to work towards particular deadlines and make sure that community -- I guess, yes. Does that make sense?

>> EDMON CHUNG: That makes a lot of sense.

So if you allow me to summarize. Then we're really talking about that this time around, the general approach is probably good in terms of basing it on the workshop proposals received. So next year probably what we should create is not so much a document to start with, maybe a few bullet points that summarizes the things. Put that out and get comments before the first draft of a structured document, which in that case if we put it in, you know, a few bullet points, then that, then the comments could be focused on whether the structure and what it contains, is correct. Before a draft of the text is put out. Does that make sense or should we just go with a document and go directly into it?

The main question is whether it should be two step points and then document process, or the whole document and then, you know, we work on the points and the text together?

>> AUDIENCE: I'm a bit lost. But I think -- I guess the important thing is to make sure that at every step in trying to frame and decide on something, what is the process behind it and whether adequate attention has been given to participation. That's the only thing you can go by really.

And whether this comes first, that depends on whether or not the process is robust enough to hold it, I suppose.

No? That would be my two cents.

>> AUDIENCE: You talked about coming up with the bullet points as a starting point and then using a mechanism, asking for workshops, using the same process. What would be the selection criteria of those points? I mean, is there some kind of -- I'm guessing, like why would ABC make it to that list and not or -- or why not XYZ? So is there any objective criteria or is there any mechanism through which you get to input as to what are the issues that will make it to that list?

Do you have any thoughts on that? How do you come to that?

>> EDMON CHUNG: Can I turn that question around? What should be the criterias in your mind and how should we go about it?

>> AUDIENCE: I think maybe in terms of the forum here, in terms of having a discussion held maybe today or tomorrow, in terms of thinking through what the top issues are. I think what is happening at the global IGF at this time is that they are trying to do a deliberative poll, and it's still up there, but it's still being discussed. So I think there has to be some kind of a deliberative mechanism which we use in the balance of the 1 and a half days here to surface that short list. What you are surfacing is a reserve list of sorts, right?

And then you can use the mechanism of the workshop proposal invitation process to surface the reserve list and get opinions from the community, agreements, disagreements, conditions. But in terms of surfacing that, there has to be some kind of a deliberative process which is more than just the Secretariat deciding that this is something. So maybe we can use the balance of the one and a half days which we have here and maybe everybody in the room can contribute to that process.

>> PAUL WILSON: How does that deliberative process work? Could you be more explicit about that?

>> AUDIENCE: So I'm just hoping as we go through this document, and I've not seen that, I'm just hoping that there would be some kind of a menu. Because you seem to be suggesting that there is a list of things, bullet points which we could surface. And I'm sure as we scroll down, it's just my assumption, I don't know. But then that could be -- when we come to that point in the document, we could have an open discussion around that. That could be a starting point.

>> PAUL WILSON: I don't think we have got a list yet. So the first step is obviously to put together a list, which could be simply a poll of suggestions. And I guess some of them have come in the comments, sorry I haven't been able to review the comments yet. But are you suggesting that we should file the list first just by simply opening the floor to those those who want to suggest particular things to put on the list whether they come from the workshops or what whatever?

>> AUDIENCE: I think there are two ways. One could be this document to start the conversation. The other is the summary report where you will have key takeaways from the workshops. Because there are contradictions in

those workshops, and that's the reason for having those workshop, right? To have all points of view on the table. And workshops are not a place where you start getting to rough consensus. It's not. Because it's supposed to be discussion based.

The point is if you start getting into that discussion, the risk that we have in terms of surfacing that reserve list, is that we will just spend the balance, one and a half days, focusing on text, which people want to pitch, which is a a very different ambiance from the scope of IGF, it gets into a bit of a NETmundial type of model, where people were just focusing on text, instead of discussions.

So it just depends on what we want to do.

>> AUDIENCE: Chant from APC.

It's not easy.

I think maybe that is what we need to decide, is exactly the top -- the -- what is it that we can, in fact, realistically, agree on. Because we have, you know, a small amount of time, there will be workshops. We will only have one more session, I believe, tomorrow. And I guess time to put in comments.

So my sense is that people can continue to put in comments; that's always good. And then from what we have then to make a decision around the process of, number one, we need to know what it is. What is this animal? What is this document? What is it really? Is it a consensus of what we have agreed on? Is it principles? Is it issues we're concerned about in the region? Is it about the process of maybe developing or growing a robust multistakeholder Internet governance forum in the region where we have participation of all multistakeholders? Because you can also just have that as a principle that is important for the region.

And that's a good thing, I suppose. So it could just be limited to that and then have a summary and then build on for the next years.

I think we can -- yeah, but I think we also need to be sort of practical in terms of what it is really that is doable in the time that we have. So I do think it's a great start, but then to break it down, so that we actually do not come away sort of confused about what we're doing, right?

So I would suggest, number one, is to just -- I would suggest yes continue with the process, with these comments.

Secondly, I think we really do need to define a process of when then will this document end? A month from now or is it in this session?

That is a, you know, we just need to decide that.

And then thirdly, if that's the case, if we say okay, within a month we will have a document, then we have a little bit more time to decide what the actual document is.

In terms of participation, I think there has been suggestion around who can participate. How we can widen the participation. We are a room full of people. People here can then bring in their other stakeholders in the process. But I think we can move more than -- I think if we go on to the text, I think we're going to be in a bind. You know, it will take a lot of time -- it may look simple, but we have been in these processes before, where

we look at text and it does take -- I think a long time to actually agree on the text and all the differences. And I think the debates will come once we focus on the text.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm from ISOC. Even when we talk about the workshop, somebody, sometimes it's very difficult to agree on a summary and very difficult to find time to write the summary. When you talk about an outcome document, it requires elaborate efforts. And sometimes the agreements are not so easily reached. I don't discount this exercise and this exercise must be taken. But as a preliminary step, we can think about publishing the proceedings of APrIGF, which is basically a collection of corrected transcripts of all workshops and all sessions published in a document. That would be the primary step. And the secondary step could be that each workshop coordinator could be asked to highlight portions of the transcript that they think is important.

They could come away with a consolidated summary of the overall position from APrIGF; it would be a logical systematic exercise. And even the outcome document, depending on the time that we have, if you take a week or more after the IGF, it would be even more effective.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: I think I hear a number of open questions here. We are looking at purpose, process and content. And overriding is some sort of idea about what sort of timeline we want. Because if we feel we can take a year, then of course we could do quite a lot. If we feel we could take a month then that's somewhat restricted, obviously. If we feel that it's worth focusing and concentrating on something by the end of tomorrow, then that's a different matter altogether. And I think I would be interested to hear some comments on any of those four issues, the purpose of what we're doing, then how we would actually go about doing that to produce the result and what people feel is an acceptable timeframe. I've heard a month as a timeframe that we could work to. I think I also heard a question about what we can do in the remaining day and a bit that is available, which may also be an unrealistic timeframe.

>> AUDIENCE: Can we read that again for the record? I'm trying to understand how we could make it work. And it looks like it's not that difficult. Because the consensus did not mean face-to-face only. That's a good thing. You don't need to.

But I look into the definitions of the meeting, and it's been explained to me about the MSG whether the -- because I think first in the content, you have to define who is eligible that is coming here in the meeting right? Because if you reach a consensus, whether it's quorum, how it's being comprised and whom because in this case you can even go for a third of the words. And if you are locked only into the MSG groups, that is easy. You don't need to count the whole APrIGF. One month should be fine, I think. I did not look to -- I think the process is very easy from when I looked into the principle because you don't need to have a face-to-face for consensus. You also have the MSG, you have already specified how the MSG will be counted and can work.

That all looked very easy and only to look at the principle and I think one month should be acceptable. And the only thing we need to talk is content, how you select the content and then who would draft. And I think if -- there is no need to be face-to-face, you can work online. E-mail or whatever stuff. So it's easier than what I'm used to.

>> PAUL WILSON: We have a suggestion to take a month, to allocate a month to this process. That actually means within that time deciding on our and being clear on our process and assembling the content.

So does anyone have any thoughts about that as a general... timeframe?

>> AUDIENCE: Is there a timeline. I know we want to use this as a basis for submission or sharing with the global IGF I guess, is that the plan or not? Or this is just for us, our region?

>> PAUL WILSON: I'm not sure what the question is, sorry.

>> AUDIENCE: Will this document, at the end of the day, once we publish it, as in sharing for the region itself, will this be used at the global IGF in Brazil?

>> PAUL WILSON: There is no formal submission at the global IGF. So it's a document that is simply an agreed output of some kind. And it's available. And I would hope it would prove its use by being referenced perhaps by people in the room here. These are regional people for whom it has some reference to take it and reference it in the global IGF discussions.

That would be -- the fruit would be in the use of the document.

>> AUDIENCE: So there is no timeline, is what I'm trying to get at, apart from the fact that this could be useful for the APT PRF meeting in August which I could carry. I don't know about the other stakeholder, but that's something that I could carry.

>> PAUL WILSON: I have a sense myself, that there is a certain need for urgency in terms of the recency of the experience. And there is no point of taking six months to do something as an outcome of a three day meet, one month should be enough.

>> AUDIENCE: I agree. One month is great. So at least as one stakeholder who could possibly take this and use it in something else. I think one month is great, because I'll need that in the end of July, actually.

>> PAUL WILSON: Yes.

>> AUDIENCE: I think there is a first question. The question is what type of animal this is.

And then I think we have 1.5 days to figure that out and to agree on it. What type of document do we want to have? That's number one.

Step two is give us about the timeline. So I'm thinking maybe after we agree on what type of document we want to have, then after maybe a week we can have a summary of proceedings, like what the guys earlier said, so that we can based on -- I mean, based on the summary of proceedings and based on what we want to have or what we want to include in that document, we can, you know, add our inputs already. And we can have like maybe a more developed draft.

And then after that, we can open it up, like for a month or two, maybe

three weeks, I don't know. But maybe we can have a staggered, staggered timeline. Like after maybe two weeks or three weeks, thinking about these things, then we can have like a draft -- a version 1. 1.0. And then after that version 1.0, we can go back to our stakeholder groups again and then we can have a more robust discussion around version 1.0. And then version 2.0 and maybe a final version.

I don't know. So from what I got from her, that she wants to bring it to a meeting. So I think maybe we can just say I'm bringing like a version 1, but I have a rough summary of what we want -- a rough summary of what we want to have already. And then there is a version 2 and 3 and 4. Just a thought.

>> YANNIS LI: Sorry, just a reminder, please state your names and identify yourself before you speak, for the scribe record. And also, just a time track that we did run over in other sessions. But this is important. So the Chairs have to decide on the timing about when we want to run this session until.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Were there some other hands up? Please. Come forward.

I'll have to ask the speakers, please, if you want to speak, it's useful to come up and talk. You don't need permission from anyone to line up at the microphone.

>> AUDIENCE: My name is Ramen Chima, global director with access. And I just wanted to add a separate point to what others were talking about, in terms of process. I think you were talking about inputs going into the UN IGF itself. I just wanted to flag as many people are aware, that is a particular document that is under consultation for the IGF meeting, which is the document and policy option, connecting the next billion. And I wanted to stress and flag that it's something that people might want to look at. Maybe people don't want to provide a formal input as part of the outcome process. But that's something that should be flagged for people because the issues that are being discussed there affect most of the people in this region in particular. So I think some things like that were discussed in the Latin American community as well, with the Internet Governance community and that might be something that we want to focus on in terms of flagging for people when outcomes come out of -- when the discussion comes amongst people here. In terms of whether we want an outcome document and what we want to put there. I don't think that we should not make people aware of the fact that there is that one particular document there. And we should consider whether we want to take part in that at all formally through this process or individually. And if so what people would like to see based on discussions there. Just flagging that, really. I just wanted to mention.

>> AUDIENCE: Could I make comment on the circumstance? Two things. I already put it in the comment. But one is I'd like to have this document mention about Youth IGF, which is nothing there at the current draft that you find, if I read it correctly. Because it's a very good asset of our APrIGF.

And I participated yesterday with this game thing. No adults were

there, other than myself, if I recall. You know, it was fun. But also, giving sort of a more, in a long-term perspective. Because the earlier, the youth guys are joining the industry or whatever, and they may come back. That kind of, you know, healthy ones needs to be shared more globally. That's why I want to put it.

I don't have any text.

The second thing, much more diplomatic, I would like to see some of the praise to thank the local hosts and other teams that made this possible for maybe the ending part to make it look nicer. But also from the very bottom of my heart. It's very difficult to run a conference like this. And we really should be thankful, too. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> AUDIENCE: I'm hungry so I want to -- I have to get out of the room soon.

So I want to make a suggestion. No action point, right? Can I do that? Okay.

Number one, I think that we have enough suggestions. A month, five weeks. It can be six weeks. The spirit is that, I'm hearing, is that we want to have more time to, in fact, decide what this document is, what it contains, that's one.

Secondly, we want it to be an open process and have as much contributions as possible from multistakeholders across the region. So those are the two things that I'm hearing.

Thirdly, and I think that's great. That people then can use this document in whatever way they want to. And it will be helpful in terms of advocacy or bringing it to other forums.

The fourth thing is from Raman who says one of the issues -- actually, there is an opportunity to input directly into the IGF, some of the global IGF process around, you know, the next recommendations around the next billion.

So I think all that is useful and I would like to suggest, then, to move forward is for us to then, in terms of process of how we get to that point, is to suggest that, number one, is to set up a Committee. We -- a drafting Committee, if you'd like. And if we could have volunteers for that drafting Committee. It's an open process, because there's work to be done. We're thankful of course to the MSG, to the Secretariat, doing all of this. But I think you need help. So that's my suggestion. Set up a Committee. Get people who are really interested in this process to volunteer. To then decide -- to then develop that, to, you know, to decide more around that process.

Because you need steps. It will take a little bit of time for that Committee then to meet. Sometime tomorrow. And for the session, this session at what time? 5:30, I can't remember now. To say okay, this is the process. That's my suggestion.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, Jen. Thank you very much. It's nice to have a concrete suggestion, thank you, especially at this time of the evening.

Could I ask for a show of hands then who would like to join a drafting Committee?

Who is available with time and energy?

Okay. So I'd suggest a meeting at lunchtime tomorrow to do that and to then also talk a little bit about the next steps to bring to the meeting tomorrow evening.

Okay. Thank you very much.

Will we make a meeting time or put a -- maybe a table allocated at the lunch area tomorrow.

>> YANNIS LI: We could do that. Could I suggest that if you are interested in joining the draft Committee, send an e-mail to the Secretariat so we can better coordinate this.

>> PAUL WILSON: The address for the Secretariat?

>> YANNIS LI: SEC@APrIGF.Asia.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Or just go grab Yannis or Jen and give them your email.

>> AUDIENCE: Can you repeat that?

>> YANNIA LI: SEC@APrIGF.Asia. The transcript is correct.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Once we wrap up the session here, why don't we send a note to the MSG and to the discuss list, to, you know, to tell everyone about this.

>> PAUL WILSON: And for that matter, if there is anyone here who is not on the discuss list, then can we have the address for that as well, if you wish to join?

>> YANNIS LI: It's discuss@APrIGF.Asia. If you would like to subscribe, just send in an e-mail and ask to be a subscriber and I'll add you in.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Okay. Thanks again Chat, for helping us with the proposal. Is there anything else then before we close the meeting?

Well, if not, then thanks everyone, and please if you are hungry, then go and eat. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> PAUL WILSON: The night isn't over for some of us. If you would like to stay on for the MSG, the multistakeholder steering group, it's an open group, so if you would like to stay you are welcome to stay. But we will start the meeting shortly, just down here. So if you are not staying, then please vacate the room, go and have some dinner or whatever you'd like to do. But we will be using the room for the MSG, starting very shortly. Thanks.

>> YANNIS LI: The bus arrangements. The first one, the bus actually, is 6:30 p.m. but I'm not sure if it has gone. I have to check with the local host. But then the next bus is at 7:40, which is after the MSG meeting.

(End of session, 18:43)

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.
