ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
02 JULY 2015
14:00
N HALL
SESSION 14
DEVELOPING IG PRINCIPLES WITH GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSE PERSPECTIVE

                              ***

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

     >> LIYUN HAN: Hello, everybody. May I have your
attention?   Yes.
     Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. And I'm very excited
to be here. I am Liyun Han. I'm from CNNIC, and I'm the
Moderator in this afternoon for our session, the workshop,
developing IG principles with geographic diverse perspective.
     Okay. Let's talk about Macao firstly. And this is a very
beautiful city. And our many thanks to APrIGF, ISOC, and to the
organizing committee, and many thanks for my fellow panelists
and all the onsite and remote audience.
     So let's start. First of all, I would like to introduce
our excellent panelists. Starting on my -- starting, the lady
in the white coat, firstly. She is Antonia Chu from CNNIC.
     And next by is Paul Wilson. He is the Director of APNIC.
     The next lady is Lianna Galstyan from ISOC Armenia,
coordinator and board member.
     And Edmon Chung. I think everybody knows him, because he

made a contribution to APrIGF for many years.

And next guy is Leonid Todorov, General Manager APTLD.

Applause for my panelists.

(Applause)

Let's move to the session today. We will discuss the IG principles from the geographic diverse perspective. And I'll give the brief introduction of this session. Firstly, including why we proposed this dialog and what issues we are going to talk about and how we conduct the dialog. And in this session we would like to open the dynamic dialog between the presentation and the interaction with all the audience onsite and remotely.

First of all, why we propose this dialog. Because during the last 25 years, the efforts in producing the principles of the IG never stopped. We can see this timeline. I listed some declaration and guidelines and reports here for your reference, but not all of them. We can see from -- starting from the IAB efforts in the year of 1989, and to the last one on the slide, some initiative in 2014, we can see many efforts from many perspectives which are at the global level and some are the regional level. And some IG principles produced by OECD and by the multistakeholder statement and NETmundial and so on. And we will go further.

But it is difficult to extract a single set of principles from all the proposed and again the full consensus. Why? Because we can look at this slide. On one hand, IG has very complicated content. It's a complicated ecosystem, including many spheres, such as infrastructure, acceptance, culture, and others. So we can't do -- I would like to -- I would like to see. We can't do or it's very difficult to extract a single set of principles.

And on the other side, we have many actors involved into the IG ecosystem. And the different actors, they have the different emphasis when they develop and promote the Internet governance.

So after that, I would like to introduce a special or a new prospective models to the analysis of the IG principles. Like global and regional interaction model. Because what we have done, what we are doing, and what we are making efforts is to produce universal principles in all of the world. But maybe perhaps we should go back to the regions and go back to the diversity to introduce the environment of Internet governance and more geographic culture to look at the IG principles. Maybe there is a balance, a better balance for our understanding.

And the next page, where we first -- well, when there is dialog, I'll give you an example. Like the left paradigm is if we talk about some principles, they can be differently interpreted in the different culture and different content. But

when we talk about the different things, maybe they indicated that same principle on the right hand.

So, therefore, I'd like to put forward a potential clustering, such as: Is it more reasonable that we should respect the diversity of understanding the principles and promote the common but different with a geographic perspective? That's why we proposed this dialog.

And, next, what issues we are discussing in this dialog? I listed some expected topics here, but it's not limited to. So these topics and the clustering are just for your reference, and for further discussion -- for free discussion in the last session, the free discussion session.

So how we conduct the dialog. I think the agenda is very clear. I'll introduce the two presentations from the national level to give some brief introduction of the IG principles proposed by the diverse nations. And after every presentation I'll give the floor to my panelists and the audience here, to challenge them and ask some specific questions.

And after that, in the session, too, the voice from the Asia Pacific Internet organizations will be heard here, and we can go further from the national level to the regional level.

And after that, we can conduct some free discussion to talk about what principles should we develop for the diverse perspective. Okay. That's the introduction of this discussion.

So, firstly, I would like to invite my first panelist to give the presentation.

Antonia?

>> NAN CHU: So good afternoon everyone. It is a great honor for me to be here and also to be the first speaker in our session.

So I will go straight to the point. Since we are talking about IG principles development, I'd like to share with you some ideas about how the principles are developing in China.

So back last year, in 2014, the President of China, Mr. Xi Jinping, when he was paying an official visit to Brazil, in his speech in the Brazilian -- yes?

>> PAUL WILSON: I'm very sorry to interrupt. We just noticed that the Web cast is showing the wrong set of slides. So on the Web cast we're looking at a different presentation from this one. So if we could fix that, then the people on the Web cast will see your slides instead of the other ones.

You're working on that? Thank you. Sorry.

>> NAN CHU: It's fine? Okay. So let's get back to our presentation here.

And when our President Xi was paying a visit and giving a speech in the Brazilian council, his speech, he mentioned about this, about this Internet governance system. He said that China

is willing to cooperate and work with the world to work under this Internet governance system which has three characteristics.

The first one is multi-lateral. The second one is Democratic. And the third one is transparent. So here I will explain the three characters one by one.

So the first one is about multi-lateral. I believe that most of the people, when you see this word, "multi-lateral," people may wonder what is the difference between multi-lateral and multistakeholder, which is a term we usually talk about now? So, actually, due to some historical and cultural reasons, in China we don't have the word "multistakeholder." We don't have the direct corresponding term of "multistakeholder." So when we have to talk about this in Chinese, we actually break this word into two parts. The first one is multi, which means many. And the second one -- the second part is about a stakeholder. And we actually translated it into Chinese, more like an economic term.

So when we talk about this multi-lateral here, the multi-lateral we are talking about is more than just what we usually know. As you can see in this slide, you can -- we can divide it into two dimensions. So the first dimension is what we typically -- is the typical meaning of "multi-lateral," which means involving more than two nations. But we all know that Internet is about people and netizens, or people, they have their nationality. So we can't ignore the nationality of netizens. I think the Snowden incident is a very good example. If we ignore that, some cybersecurity issues may pop up and it will bring about very bad consequences.

And the second dimension we are talking about here is more -- is a more broad -- from a more broadened perspective. The very purpose of the multi-lateral, the broadened multi-lateral we are talking about here, is to bring everyone into Internet governance and let everyone participate.

It actually shares the same spirit with multistakeholder as well. So you can see under the -- under multi-lateral, this term, the character of it is interconnection, sharing and governing together. And so under this multi-lateral system, in China, when we are doing the Internet governance under this multi-lateral system, both individual and enterprises can play a very active part in this -- in this system as well.

For example, I'll take the company Alibaba as an example. We all know that Alibaba is a new company. When it was first established by Jack Ma, it was only a very small company with a few people. But now through the years of development and expansion, now it has become one of the most important, famous, and influential enterprises in the world. And we have not only Alibaba, but also with some other successful Internet companies,

such as Baidu, Tencent and also Huawei. Now these companies are becoming more and more influential. And they have a very active part in initiating some very good projects, as well. And, also, they are working together with the Government. And they are very actively driving the Internet innovation in China as well.

This year, the Chinese Government, our Prime Minister, Mr. Li Keqiang, first mentioned about the concept of Internet+ in his Governmental report. So this was the first time the term "Internet+" was written in the Governmental report. And this concept, Internet+, was proposed by the Internet industry in China.

So besides multi-lateral there are two other characteristics of the Internet governance system proposed by the President. The second one is about the Democratic, which means we need to share mutual respect. We need to have equal basis, and also agree to disagree. That's the foundation of cooperation.

And the third characteristic is about transparent, which means during the Internet governance process, the process itself needs to be transparent and everyone has the right to know what is happening there, and where it's going. And all the necessary information needs to be public as well. And also the different parties get involved in this Internet governance process need to be accountable to the public as well.

So followed by this Internet governance system, the Minister of Cyberspace and Administration of China, Minister Lu Wei, proposed the Internet governance principles in China, which is peace, security, openness and cooperation.

So following these four principles, China is trying to do the Internet governance in China and also in the China local Internet governance industry as well. But now we have to admit that we are facing some problems or challenges. So here's the largest two of them.

We all know that China is a very large country. We have the largest Internet netizens in the world -- number of netizens in the world. But we have to admit that China is a large country with a large population. The development in different areas inside China is imbalanced. We have some mega cities like Beijing and Shanghai and Shenzhen and so on in the east side of China. But we also have many undeveloped areas, in the areas in the west or in the north of China. So during these under developed areas, there's still a lot of people can have no access to the Internet. So one of the most important tasks for China is to build up the -- to do the infrastructure construction, which is letting more and more people to get to the Internet and enjoy the benefits brought by the Internet.

And the second challenge is about the Internet industry.

Even though we all agree that many Chinese enterprises are doing quite well nowadays, but we have to admit that the Chinese Internet industry is just taking off. It's still developing and is in the very early stage. We need to do more to make it keep being prosperous and also for sustainable development as well.

That is why we also need to focus on industrial upgrading. That is why I mentioned earlier our Government has mentioned about Internet+. The aiming of Internet+ is to bring the Internet industry, go on developing, and also make more and more Internet companies doing -- becoming larger, expansion, and becoming -- play a more important role in the world as well.

So the ultimate goal for the Internet governance in China is about inclusion. This inclusion, we mean equal and sustainable development. And we would like to cooperate with the world in order to do that. And we would like to share some experience and learn from each other and try our best to work with the world and to achieve what we call the equal and sustainable development.

So that is all for my part.

And following my presentation, here I have a question and I would like to invite everyone here, and also our panel here to think and to think and discuss. So the question is: Rather than following, just following my presentation, while we are keeping the focus on pursuing some universal principles, would it be better if we put more emphasis on sharing our best practice for principle evolution and inclusion, which means equal and sustainable development?

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> MODERATOR: Many things. So should I ask you to stand here for a while. And I think it's a very clear and excellent presentation for the IG principles proposed by China. And maybe in this presentation you can see more information about explaining the hot issues relevant to the multistakeholder and multi-lateral theory. Because I think it's not the hottest issues only in this session. I think in all of the world, they are very concerned about the things.

So may I suggest you to ask some questions for this presentation?

>> AUDIENCE: Can you hear me? Okay. Asha Hemrajani.

You hit upon the subject that I was going to speak on in my question. So you mentioned, Antonia, in your presentation that multi-lateralism shares the same spirit as multistakeholder. I would like to understand why you feel that way. And if you do feel that way, why not use the word "multistakeholderism" if they are the same.

I understood in your slide you had individuals and

enterprises can also participate, when which is the basic --
which is what multistakeholderism is also about. So why not use
the word "multistakeholderism," which is really the more
accepted method of Internet Governance right now world wide.
     Thank you.
     >> NAN CHU: Thank you for your question. I'll talk about
some of my personal opinions. I just mentioned that the word
"multistakeholder" is sort of a new word for Chinese people. We
don't have such a word that we used in the past. And it's just
newly come to China, in these maybe more than 10 to 20 years.
So it's really a new concept for us. And I think to some
extent, considering our history and also our culture, we are
more familiar with the term what is -- what we call "multi-
lateral."
     So -- and also, we think that "multi-lateral" has a broader
meaning than "multistakeholder." So it shares -- it has -- it
contains more meanings and also is more inclusive comparatively
speaking.
     It's just -- maybe it's just due to the geographic
diversity problem. So that is why I think it's a point. So
that's why I think it's a point worthy of discussing here in
this -- on this stage and also under this theme of this session.
     >> LIYUN HAN: Okay. And I saw Leo raise his hand.
     >> LEONID TODOROV: Yes, I'm from Russia and formerly from
the Soviet Union. So I lived through many isms: Socialism,
capitalism, Yeltinism, Putinism, whatever. So I'm very
sensitive to these things. Because I understand that sometimes
a certain terminology may be used in a very peculiar way, either
to solidify certain stances or just to cover some hidden
stances.
     Just to give an idea, in the Soviet Union when I was young,
for whatever panel like this, we would have a lady who milks
cows, a man who was a harvester, let's say an industrial worker,
a teacher, an engineer and a communist party boss. Wasn't it a
real multistakeholderism action? Just think of this.
     I don't think that we should get stick to these "isms."
Rather we should go deep into what exactly we want to denote or
how to say that. It's not about definitions. It's all about
the substance of the process.
     We will of course elaborate on these tomorrow and the day
after tomorrow. But again if they use this word "multi-
lateralism," I don't care. As long as they are on the same page
with me and you and people in the room.
     For us, multistakeholderism, Russian, takes seven words to
translate. Sorry, I cannot just reach out to the people saying
let's be that as multistakeholder based as we could. The
audience simply wouldn't understand me. But I can try to show

certain examples as to how it works, how we can put it to use for everyone's benefit. And then it may work.

Thank you.

>> LIYUN HAN: Thanks for Leo's comments.

And I would like to further explainate these topics. Because just as I -- what I mentioned in the introduction, that's why we are sitting here, to promote the geographic diverse perspective. Because I think the principle is a guideline to guide the behavior in Internet governance. But if we ignore the environment of the regions and just a pure discussing the IG principles, the IG principles is invent or in (inaudibe) here. So that's why we start this dialog.

And I saw here. The gentleman, yes?

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you, Antonia. Very nice presentation.

I'm Kish Park from Korea and working for (inaudible.) And I think this topic we are dealing with at this moment is developing some Internet governance principles with geographic diverse. But I think the word "geographic" is not sufficient for us to deal with this issue. It's more closely related to the more cultural or historical background. So I think the simple word "Geographic" is not sufficient.

As she mentioned, this kind of substantial recognition can be closer related to some historical background or culture. Because in Korea also we have some association named Korea Internet Governance Association. But even Korean experts, they are saying the word "multistakeholderism," yes, they can understand. But it's very difficult for us to use or apply some the practical procedures to classify some groups in Korea regarding some Internet governance related experts into several groups by the multistakeholderism criteria. It's very difficult for us to do in Korea. So I think this issue is very closely related to our cultural and historical background.

Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Any response to the questions?

>> NAN CHU: I think your point is very good. And actually I think that actually the Korean and China shares a lot of similarities in both culture and also in history as well. So I totally agree with your point and I think, indeed, from this presentation I just -- my emphasis is trying to explain why we feel more comfortable with the term "Multi-lateral," yes, than "Multistakeholder." So this is more close to Chinese culture and the Chinese kind of thinking, way of thinking.

So -- well, I think, yes.

>> MODERATOR: Sorry for interrupting you. Because we have other presentations, and the statement during the following time, so we will leave the discussion session, okay?

So I gave the floor to Lianna, please.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you very much. My name is Lianna Galstyan. I'm from the Internet Society of Armenia. I'm the board member of ISOC Armenia.

Personally, I'm a member of Internet Society from 2000, so it's already 15 years. And the reason I'm a member of ISOC is it's motto that "Internet is for everyone." And it's reflecting the belief that it is access, that the Internet is a fundamental public policy issue. So that was -- everything has started with this principle, with this motto, that the Internet is for everyone. And I still appreciate this very much. And not only me, but the whole society.

Just a minute. I want to link to the slide. It's not going...

So I will tell a little bit about Armenia and the Internet governance principles. How we approve that, what was the history of it. Everything started with 2012, when -- with the WCIT conference, where Armenia along with the other 54 countries was against the transfer of some Internet-related issues control to ITU. During the preparation of our position and the position of the country for this conference, taking into account that we were against the transfer of control, the Internet Society of Armenia, as a consultant to the Minister of Transport and Communication of Armenia, proposed an alternative solution for local Internet governance. It was suggested to create a permanent Internet governance council, a permanent body, with stakeholders of Government, private sector, NGOs, technical community, and academia.

Later, this proposal was sent to all the Governmental bodies, to NGOs, business, got their feedback, and then this draft has been sent to the Government for approval. And then it was done in 2013. And then almost a year later, in August 2014, the IG principles were approved by the Prime Minister of Armenia. So now we have 17 internet Governance principles. I'm go very fast through this so that you know what principles we do apply.

The first one is providing people with Internet access. That is what I like most. What I started with, so that Internet is for everyone.

The next principle is the system of Domain Names. We -- we took this principle as applying to create favorable conditions for the population of Armenia and Diaspora and the residents of Armenia to register their domain names in dot AM. Since for 20 years we have already our domain names in Armenia, and lately ISOC Armenia is a manager of dot AM as a manager for ICANN domain. And just in the Buenos Aires meeting we have a contract with ICANN, and the Armenian IDN has been delegated and the Internet Society is the manager of Armenian IDN as well. So

this is one of the principles to support the system of domain names.

The next one is support of DNSSEC distribution and IPv6, to encourage and motivate the acting operators and Internet service providers to use DNSSEC and IPv6 in their networks and domain name protocols.

The next one is human rights protection in Internet. And in this sense, we have invited a representative of Armenian Ombudsman Office in our Internet Governance Council. One of the participants, one of the members of this Council is a representative of ombudsman office.

We have a security as a principle to ensure security in the framework of all the Budapest Convention, national law, Government, public cooperation, collaboration with CERTS, involvement of the community in this process, of course.

The next principle is privacy protection and identification. Now, that is to support the technologies allowing to maintain the protection of privacy along with providing the opportunities of Internet users to be identified according to law requirement.

And the next principle is innovation. We do support the implementation of innovations among ISPs and end users.

The next one is protection of Intellectual Property. And here we have to ensure both national legislation and best practices of WIPO to support the users and public initiatives towards protection of Intellectual Property, to prevent copyright violation, to support netiquette development among end-users.

The next principle is support of establishment of local exchange centers of Internet traffic.

I will go to the next principle. It is Internet regulation. Surprised, Huh? We have this principle. But, actually, Internet regulation is appropriate to apply only when the existence of Armenia Internet sector is in danger with no regulation. That is, we support regulation only when it is necessary.

And the next principle is development of Internet numbering and addressing system. That is to use the current practice of numbering and addressing system.

And the next principle is Child Online Protection, to protect children, avoiding the limitation of adults by involving operators, NGOs, schools, families, and community in this process.

Next one is support of free and open content development. To support the dissemination of information free from copyright protection.

And the next principle is network neutrality. Here we

have, as a principle, all computer ports and Internet Protocols are open, and information source and destination with any content in the Internet is transparently accessible. No filtering except when there is a problem in the operator's network. And all protocols have equal priority the

     And the last principle we adopted is open standards support. So the development of Internet is based on elaboration and use of open standards, allowing all interested parties to join the current operating system. Open standards usage is a priority for Internet development projects, except national security related cases, of course.

     This is the end of my presentation. I tried to briefly present all 17 principles we adopted. Of course, the Internet Governance Council of Armenia is guided by these principles. And we have action items. And one of the action items of this council is to organize the Internet Governance Forum in Armenia. So in September we will have our first IGF, RMIGF. And we will bring all of these principles. We will try to bring the principles implemented in the country.

     Thank you very much.

     (Applause)

     >> LIYUN HAN: Many thanks to Lianna. So any comments from our panelists?

     Firstly... okay.

     >> LEONID TODOROV: Leonid Todorov, for the record.

     You know, Armenia and Georgia are probably the most advanced post Soviet states in terms of developing a very comprehensive Internet governance agenda. And by strictly abiding to these IG principles, I think they set a perfect example for many other post Soviet States. You know, so I really -- I really envy the level of sophistication and comprehensiveness our Armenian friends have displayed so far.

     So I think that is one of the most important things when a nation can, I would say, easily, relatively easily, embrace the, I would say, the most advanced set of Internet Governance principles. And more than that, to put them into practice for everyone's benefit. This is a small nation. We don't understand it, but they are doing really great Internet wise and Internet governance wise.

     Thank you.

     >> LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you very much, Leonid, for your kind words.

     >> LIYUN HAN: I saw Paul first. So I gave it to -- okay.

     >> NAN CHU: Congratulations to the Armenian chapter. Wonderful stuff. You've been -- this chapter has been formed very early on in the year 2000. So did I hear you right that you said your first IGF is going to be held this year?

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: Yes.

>> NAN CHU: So why did it take you so long? Just curious.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you for your question. The chapter of ISOC Armenia was formed in 1993. And we have been involved in Internet IG process deeply. Actually, we are the registry, ISOC Armenia is the registry for dot AM and now IDM. We are, on the other hand, as a technical community, we have good cooperation with the Government, with business, with other associations.

We, for a long time, we have provided a platform for our individuals, for all users, to have discussion for all the things we need to do. But it wasn't a time for a dialog like a forum. We weren't a part, officially a part of the IG. Actually, we did the same thing within our country but not as officially announced as an Internet Governance Forum. We do the same. We do the content. We do the essence. We provide the platform for people through different seminars or conferences. But we didn't call it a forum, an IGF. So now we are part of this globalization and we realize that it is the same thing. And we are part of this multistakeholder thing, because ISOC is a member of the IGC, Internet Governance Council. And besides being a member of it, we are the Secretariat of IGC. So providing the transparency of all the communication, et cetera.

And we have done that with the effort. We communicated with our Government. We brought up all these principles to be approved by the Government with all the participation of all the stakeholders.

Yes, I agree with that term "multistakeholderism." It's really just, just continuing the discussion about a term, it is very difficult to translate term. But I do agree with the idea that everybody understands what we are going -- what we are talking about. We understand the essence of it. That the different parties, the different interested parties are gathered together to discuss the same thing, from different angles. However, we call this process, or this notion, "multistakeholder," it's really difficult to translate. But, well, in a term we may have some ways -- some words for it, just to explain the idea of it.

But I would refrain telling the term "Multi-lateral" because it has a different notion, I think. It has a different definition; already has a different definition in that sense.

So now we have, we are a part of IGF. So maybe it took us too long a globalization part, but now we are.

That is my answer to your question. Thank you very much.

>> LIYUN HAN: Thank you. So I saw Paul's hand?

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. And congratulations, that looks like a very comprehensive framework that you have and I

really hope that as it's implemented and as you work with it, you'll be able to report back into meetings like this and the other IGF events about the lessons learned. The successes and maybe the not so successful aspects of implementing in terms of regulations and court, you know, legal interpretations and so on. I think that would be very informative.

My second point was actually to ask about the term again, "multistakeholder," because what you described, it looks like a healthy and comprehensive multistakeholder kind of approach. So I wanted to know specifically whether you have a word in Armenian that you use, a word or a phrase, and how that would translate into English.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: We try to translate it very close to the English one. That is "multi-" it's the direct translation, which means many. And "stakeholder," very close to that one. So when we translate it back, it's almost the same. It's a new word for us, so that a stakeholder, it's like kind of taking bones or a stakeholder like in Borsa, or something like that, so that for people in Armenia, a stakeholder, it's like something corrected with money, with shares. So this is one of the words in Armenian that you translate.

But when you're speaking that different actors are interested in some general thing, then it's coming back with the idea of multistakeholder. So it's very close to the English translation, but it's difficult to understand from the first point.

>> LIYUN HAN: So next, should I make some comments on these issues.

Because when we talk about multistakeholder, we separate the two words in this integrated words. "Multi-" means many, yes. It's the same in Chinese language content. And the "stakeholder," I think, is more familiar with Chinese people. It's more like economic notions in Chinese understanding.

So what we used, got used to using is the multi-side. Yes. Just like, you know, a square cube. The cube has many, many edges. And that's multi-side. So what we are doing, what we are practicing is the same thing.

But anyway, our session is not to -- is not going to talk about only -- only talk about "multi-stakeholder" and "multi-lateral" or "multi-side" or any other translation. Just to use these, just inside this example to explain why we propose the geographic diverse perspective.

So shall we finish this session and move to the next session. Okay.

I think the first presentation is from Paul.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you very much. Thank you. I've been asked to speak on a regional perspective on this topic, the

Internet Governance principles.

To be honest, though, the question that occurs to me is what is the meaning of region in this case? Why are we talking about region in the first place? And seeking something common throughout this -- within a region. What do we mean by the Asia Pacific region? I think even on this panel we have different definitions. The APTLD serves a different region from APNIC, serves a different region from ICANN, for instance, which uses UN definitions.

We look at the APEC region, for instance, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation. And if we take other regions, if we take the far west of Russia through to the other extent, I think the region covers 18 hours across the globe, and that's a very different region. So clearly there is no single definition of the Asia Pacific region. And the point about that is that regions really are defined differently for different purposes, which could be geographic or cultural or economic or even religious, actually.

So, speaking from APNIC, I'd be talking about the APNIC region. But the APNIC region is defined geographically from a point of view of administrative convenience, actually. Since 1992, when the IETF called for a regionalization of IP address management, they stipulated only that the regions for risk management should be geographic regions of the world and roughly a continental size. That gives us five different regions. There could be more possibly in the future if there is a consensus of a community to split a region. But that's where we are at the moment.

They are strictly geographic regions. For instance, APNIC serves Guam and American Samoa for which might otherwise have been included with the United States in another type of geographic political regional differentiation.

The reason I think for the regional Internet registry system is one of administrative convenience, so simple to reduce the load on the central registry in the US to divest the responsibility to a small number of regions. And for 20 years that worked actually very well. Its helped us to divide the work. Helped us divide services according to large time zones, recruiting resources, and people and skills that are applicable to the regions that we're serving.

Now, that's very administrative and practical, and there is a not a great deal of difference between the regions in that sense. And you might expect to see differences between the regions in some sense, at the level, for instance, of policies. And that is the IP address management policies, which are formulated on a regional basis by the regional communities.

So we have each got separate regional policy processes that

happen bottom up, driven by individuals and companies within the region. The regions are very diverse, so you might expect diversity between the regions. But that doesn't happen so much at all, because of the diversity within the regions as well. I would say each the regions is kind of a microcosm of the global scene, where we have in each region, really, a range of languages, a range of economic circumstances, and geographic conditions and so forth. So we don't actually see a much substantial differentiation at all in the policy outcomes in terms of IP address management.

We see some difference in some cultural senses. There is a sense in which I suppose there is an early Internet mode of fairly individualistic participation in discussion, where individuals themselves are free to speak up, to argue, to be exposed to a group, in a public situation, which actually doesn't suit very many people around the world.

So you might think that would create some substantial differences in the outcome. But it actually doesn't. I think all of the REIs tries best through its policy process to implement and substantiate a real bottom-up participatory way of creating policies, which is suited to the cultures that they deal with.

So I suppose my point here is really not to actually place a whole lot of emphasis on regions or try to project too much in terms of differences at a regional level or to expect much difference at that scale. And I think the the Asia Pacific rIGF is good for exposing things in the region. If you look at this region and others, I think you'll find that the discussions are about similar issues and there is a similar great diversity of opinions and viewpoints. So much so that, as you saw in the closing session yesterday about the outcomes document, that we really do have more or less the same approach so far at least to the idea that we could come together as a region that we could produce something that is representative. And that's not a trivial matter.

I think the Internet as a global phenomenon, a global infrastructure, shows that there is not much that depends on or that varies vastly according to regions in particular. There are many, many different ways to divide the Internet community, if you like, which they could be geographic or political or religious or even national. But I think those are many intersecting ways of dividing the community, and you'd really want to drill down into those quite specifically to look at how Internet Governance principles might vary. And they might well if you try to divide the Internet community up by gender or religion or by political affiliations or such like. But geographic regions, I really think not so much.

I think that is not to say that we shouldn't drill down and
actually look at first diversity across principles of --
approaches of principles across different subdivisions. But I
think while we're doing that, it's actually important to really
consider whether we can agree, really, universally on core
values of the Internet, which I think needs -- this was
something that was referenced in the introductory presentation,
I think these things are not one or the other. I think we have
to look at diversity across regions and issues as well as the
core values. And those two studies can move along both I think
at the same time and actually inform each other very much.

So luckily, the next session, one more session this
afternoon will actually be on core Internet values. And it will
be interesting to see how this one and that one might interact
with each other.

That's all I have.

>> LIYUN HAN: Okay. Many thanks to Paul. As Paul
mentioned, the next session is the core value of Internet
Governance. I think the two sessions are arranged very
interesting. Now, because when is the induction and the other
is the deduction. So if you are interested in this topic, I
suggest you to participate in the next session and get more
discussion on these issues.

And I propose another thing, just the time of every
statement. I urge you to stay to the five minutes for every
presenter. Yes.

So Leo?

>> LEONID TODOROV: So hi again. Well, rarely I agree with
my fellow panelists, but, well, I very much appreciate what Paul
has said.

Let me just add a little bit to these. That would not be
that APTLD's perspective, because I'm quit new to the job.
Rather, some reflections. Immediate reflections. First of all,
indeed the Asia Pacific region is very diverse language wise.
But most importantly, we do not have a single cultural code.
Blessed is Europe, plus the United States. You know, they share
the same legacy. Historical, cultural, you know, I mean,
religious, whatever.

We are so different. And yet, we have something which is
more or less typical of this region of many nations at least,
and that's -- this is the region where Governments traditionally
play an usually big role. And they shape the public policy
agenda and the civil life for the whole country or for the whole
community.

And from this perspective, I believe it's really hard for
me to imagine, well, whether this region is enough
multistakeholder based or not. This is a very interesting

question. For example, it was just a few days ago when we heard the Minister of Telecommunications of India speak at the ICANN meeting. He said a very interesting phrase. "From now on, India has embraced the multistakeholder model." So does it mean that the new era started exactly at very moment he said so? Shall we take it for granted, from now on India is completely a multistakeholder based country, and their IG principles will be in full consistency of what is so typical of Europe and the United States and some other countries? Interesting question.

Another question just for you to contemplate. Like I talked to some Governments, and I said look, you know, there should be some Civil Society organisations involved in developing IG principles. They said oh, for sure. How many Civil Society organizations would you like us to organize? Well, we will do it overnight. Just like that.

So my message is do not buy the wording, do not take the wording for substance. That's why I'm so adamant to say "multistakeholderism, multi-lateralism," come on, let's look into the core values or principles. We will be discussing hopefully for the next session.

Now, a couple of other points. So the interplay between major actors or stakeholders in this region is different. It was brought to our attention, Jack Ma and Alibaba and stuff like that. Well, let's just briefly compare the success of Alibaba and Amazon. Mr. Bezos built that from scratch, thanks to his talent and vigor and vision and whatever marketing efforts. With Mr. Jack Ma, I'm not so sure. It's not accidental that Chinese companies sometimes are reprimanded for that lack of transparency. So are they indeed -- I mean, genuine stakeholders in the process? I don't know. Simply I don't know.

I'm more or less aware of what, let's say, Mr. Zuckerberg is doing, but I'm not so sure about Mr. Jack Ma.

So again speak about the very specific interplay, multistakeholderism, back to that question. We have a registry, Don Hollander who is here and he was running at APTLD before me. We confirm that we have a one man registry, I mean a small Pacific island, which is a sovereign country and there is just one man running that registry. So does he qualify for multistakeholder based registry or not? Just tell me. I don't know, simply. So this is a different state of play.

And finally, back to diversity. We understand that in this region we have different sets of Internet governance if not principles, but then traditions. We have China, we have, for example, Japan. We have Armenia. We have Australia and New Zealand. And in all fairness, when my Government, the Russian Government, used to ask me, if you could just give us a couple

of best practices, then usually I say that the art of copyrighting is the skill of copy stealing. So I usually sort of replicate, I would replicate some Australian policies, and sell them to the Government.

And we also have the Arab States, which are not present here. You know, simply not present here. And they have their own IGF, with their own set of principles, which we cannot sort of impose on them. They have those of their own. Yet, we do have a lot of things --

>> LIYUN HAN: Leo, sorry for interrupting you.

>> LEONID TODOROV: A lot of things in common. Thank you.

>> LIYUN HAN: I don't really want to interrupt you. But the time is off.

I think Leo threw out many challenges for the staters. So I give the floor to the audience.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. Just let me be brief, because regarding your intervention.

I didn't want to say about the kind of some linguistic interpretation matters or translation matters. What I want to say is if substance is different, in that case the description, language, it should be different.

For example, Eskomos, they have many, many different words to describe kinds of snow. But some people living in some countries very close to the equator, they do have only one word to describe snow. So if substance is different, then the language needs to be or should be different. That was what I wanted to say.

Thank you.

>> LIYUN HAN: So any comments from -- yes?

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. I wanted to make some quick comments. First of all, Lianna, congratulations on your excellent presentation and for sharing with us the principles of IG that ISOC Armenia has been espousing. I think definitely, to echo what Paul said earlier, it's definitely a best practice that I think other countries, both from the break up of the Soviet Union and Russia itself could learn from.

On the -- I take your point about the difficulty in translation. But before I come to the translation part, I definitely could not agree with you more, Leonid, about that we need to look at the essence as opposed to the word. That's very cosmetic, you're right. The essence is of importance here. But it's still good, it's still a good practice, it's still the right way to go to start off by using the right word.

I don't equate the two. I think "multistakeholderism" and "multi-lateralism" are very different. I believe multistakeholderism is broader. Antonia, you had a different opinion. You were saying multi-lateralism is broader. I would

like to understand why you believe that and to learn from you.

But coming back to the translation, I don't think it's an issue. Thirty years ago, forty years ago, there was no such word as "Internet." And look, it's a commonly used word today. Twenty or ten years ago, there was no such word as eCigarette and now it's in the dictionary. As soon as it made it into the Oxford dictionary, eDictionary, usage shot through the roof. I'm very against smoking, but I'm saying that once it becomes more commonly used and enters the dictionary, the translation will not be an issue.

I want to understand why you think "multi-lateralism" is more broader and more inclusive an "multistakeholderism." I'd like to learn from you.

Thank you.

>> LIYUN HAN: Okay. Many thanks for the comments from the audience.

Next I'll introduce our last speaker, but he is also the most important speaker, because Edmon initiated APrIGF. That's why we are sitting here to conduct this dialog.

Thanks to Edmon.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. And I guess that puts me into a category where I don't mind painting a big target in front of me and let people shoot me down.

So -- and I think I can start there, actually. That's -- I wanted to segue into what I want to talk about. I think I agree very much with all of the things that Paul has mentioned. And one area that I think is interesting is to look at the region as a kind of microcosm of the global Internet governance discussion. However, of course, there is some difference.

I mean, but the question on diversity and the importance of embracing that diversity is something that I think the Asia Pacific region, in a way, is blessed to have. And the other way, I guess, Leonid mentioned that the European or the US situation, they're blessed to be more homogeneous, for lack of a better word. And we are more diverse.

But the part I really want to focus on, rather, is -- besides the, you know, the -- I guess the hard principles that we talk about, or I guess China and Armenia has mentioned, I think one of the fundamental things is about participation. There is a fundamental assumption, actually, in all of things that we talk about, is that there is participation. And there is participation from the different stakeholders. That is, however, something I think that really needs to be thought through a little bit better.

Participation itself is a two-way street, I think, in my experience, and the experience I guess with the Asian Internet community as well. And Liyun just mentioned about this

particular conference. I can't say I started it, but I'm one of those people who helped get it started.

But without starting it, you know, how do you participate to get it started? It's kind of like a chicken and egg situation, and you've got to break that chicken and egg and then somebody or some group of people needs to kind of first get it started. And don't mind, as I said, don't mind painting a big target on itself and being shot down. And change as we go forward.

And I think one of the things about this whole Internet governance discussion is the assumption on participation is sometimes overly optimistic, you know. The participation is actually hard to get by. And I think participation is actually a two-way street. If you can't get it, you know, if you can't get some sort of substantive issue at hand, you can't get the participation you want. And so it's, you know, it reinforces itself.

And especially in Asia, I think the importance of capacity building and the importance of, you know, the -- cultivating a culture of participation is sometimes as important as, you know, the actual act of the, I guess, act of the coordination and Internet governance itself.

So I think that, you know, I tried to give a chart and say -- I tried to keep it short and say that we look at Internet governance areas, like you know ICANN or IETF or IGF, you know, it is open. It allows anybody to walk in and participate. But just by being open itself may not be enough. And I think that this is something especially in the Asia Pacific region is important to understand. You know, just being open could be pretty intimidating for people to participate in.

Paul touched on an issue of the form of participation, the mode of participation, whether it's an individual or representing a group or a company or a country. You know, I think it's even beyond that. It is the ability to -- it is the, kind of the culture and also the ability to test out some of your thoughts as well. And I draw on the persons that I have working with children's rights groups that talk about how children can participate in general governance situations. What happens is that just by putting, you know, kids into a, let's say, an assembly, that doesn't work. Because they don't know what to say. Before they get into the assembly, they have to have some, you know, a process that they can explore what they really think about, in a very different way than we do. You know maybe they play a few games to figure out something. I think that may be a missing part.

And I guess, you know, one of -- I guess Paul mentioned about the -- and I like to mention this as well, as an

advertisement to a later session, which is the outcomes
document. It is an experiment and it's exactly the kind of
experiment that I think is trying to have a little playground.
I know that the IGF side is -- hammering out some document is
maybe not the right approach or maybe not the right timing to
put out the approach. But for us, maybe this is a little
playground that we can test with as we test our own
participation -- methods of participation within the community.
     So I guess I'll kind of stop there. I think participation,
as I mentioned, is a very important aspect.
     And I'll end with a note on everyone's favorite topic, it
seems, which is the "multi-lateral" versus "multistakeholder,"
if I may. As a person speaking Chinese, I somewhat -- I guess
because there is a cultural difference coming from Hong Kong, we
do find a relatively easy way to describe a multistakeholder
approach in Hong Kong at least, in Hong Kong, in Hong Kong
Chinese, as Dots Afrenza. It basically means multiple people
who have a part to play in a certain thing. And that, I guess,
you know, is being used. And I -- in Hong Kong in many ways.
     And I think, you know, but I go back to the point that I
think the name doesn't matter, really. You know, in many cases
the issue, the substance of it is important. Language itself is
arbitrary, but language is important for communication.
     So one particular point is that multi-lateral, because this
particular word is defined in a sphere that is very close to us,
which is global collaboraton, you know, in that case, global
politics, I would suggest that we move away from that. Just
because to avoid the confusion. Finding other -- the
translation, all that part, I think the substantive part is that
they are different. And multi-lateral is already being used and
it's well-defined. So I guess that is probably not a good idea.
     And I agree that I'm more western brought up or some way.
But there are, you know, ways to describe it in Chinese, I
think.
     Thank you.
     >> LIYUN HAN: Okay. You have a good timer. Just within
the five minutes.
     Okay. I'll give the floor again to the audience. Do you
have some specific questions?
     Yes?
     Thanks.
     >> AUDIENCE: Yes. We need a social anthropologist to help
us with this. But the word that keeps popping in my mind is
everyone is trying to bridge this gap and everyone is sincerely
trying very hard to come up with something we understand.
     I guess the process towards multistakeholder might be, at
least from ISOC, we see it as a process rather than as an end

state. And so some of that requires social engineering, to some
extent. So most of us who are in the Internet community, I
think it's easy for us to be acquainted with how that works in a
very organic way.
     But for structures that don't have that culture, I mean, I
would take the case of Kaizen in Japan, which originally was
from the US anyway. I mean, the -- not Kaizen itself. TQM.
Sorry. I know I'm going to get killed by the Japanese. But Dr.
Demming, he chose -- he didn't work in America, so he had to go
to a place where it was most easily bred, and that culture was
Japan, and a whole lot of things happened after that.
     So not to take it literally from the TQM discipline, but I
guess some degree of social engineering, and maybe the IGF
platform could be that mutual friendly space where we help each
other social engineer, going towards whatever it is that we need
to become.
     I don't know if that helps. But I find that I know the
culture that I come from would take some time to get, what do
you call, the broad based participation and everyone involved.
It would require some degree of social engineering.
     I've said my piece.
     >> LIYUN HAN: so I give the floor to Leo. But before you
start, because we started a little late at the beginning, around
five minutes, so should I ask the audience to let us get five
minutes more? Okay. All right.
      >> LEONID TODOROV: Well, just a quick comment. You just
mentioned that multistakeholderism, that process -- should I
take it like it's a process or that it's a final destination of
our journey?
     >> AUDIENCE: It's a process.
     >> LEONID TODOROV: So it's a process. For me, it's not a
process, I believe. Because this is rather an instrument. I
don't think that multistakeholderism, per se, is a process. And
let me just explain why.
     I think that what ISOC put for themselves as that ultimate
objective, the Internet for everyone, right, and everywhere, so
that's what we are just -- yes.
     So multistakeholderism is just one of those instruments
which should help us reach that final destination. And then I
guess I should caution against revering so much that instrument.
     You know, sometimes I believe that -- I'm not talking about
Asia Pacific, but, for example, for us Russians and perhaps for
some other nations, sometimes that emphasis on
multistakeholderism, those -- I mean, the sacralization of
multistakeholderism, if you will, is kind of contraproductive.
Because we believe that you cannot revere a shovel. It's just
an instrument. You should put it to use. Rather you should

show the benefits of using that instrument or any other instrument which would help you reach that final destination.

Thank you.

>> LIYUN HAN: Well, I really don't want to finish this session, because I think there will be more further discussion on these issues. But time is up.

So I just want to conclude and give some summary of this session. I think -- I would like to appreciate all my panelists and all the audience onsite and remotely for participating. And I remember at the session, one, Antonia and Lianna gave us the brief introduction of the IG from the national level. And they explained the multistakeholder and the multi-lateral or other terminologies with the interpretation in the language.

And yes, and in session 2, I think Paul proposed a word called a "microchasm" am I right, yes? A microcosm of a global scene. Because a region is a microchasm of a global scene.

So what we are doing and what we are talking about is not to produce so many different principles from the regional perspective. Just want to use the perspective -- the regional perspective to understand the IG principles and implement the IG principles. Because principles is a concept and a philosophy thing. If we -- if we don't -- if we don't use it, principles are just principles. Am I right, yes?

And after that, Leo raised what we are -- yes, it's focusing on the concept, the concept, rather than the terminology.

And after that, Edmon proposed starting, starts, is very important. Because it can open a platform for us to discuss and to make more further information for all of us and to eliminate some misunderstanding.

So that is the purpose of our session. And thank you for all, again.

Okay.

Thank you.

(Applause)

(End of session 15:30.)

***

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.

***