ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
03 JULY 2015
N HALL
CLOSING SESSION
15:35

***
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 to 15 is brought to you by the
Internet Society

        >> YANNIS LI:  Just a friendly reminder.  We are going to
start the closing plenary shortly.
        >> LILY KUNG:  Welcome to the closing plenary of APrIGF
2015.  I'm Lily, one of the Net mission Ambassadors.  To begin
with, we will have a summary report session of different
sessions.  On the stage we have five volunteer rapporteurs, they
are called the steering group, to share short summaries and some
of the thematic issues raised over these three days.  Then we
will have Youth IGF share.  And more importantly discussion
summaries on the reporting documents.  After that, the host for
next year's APrIGF will make a presentation followed by the
closing remarks.
        So now let me introduce the five Rapporteurs.  On the stage
we have Thip Chomprang and Noelle de Guzman from the Internet
Society.  Sherly Haristya, from Nanyang Technological
University.  Jennifer Chung from DotAsia.  And Klee Aiken from
APNIC.
        >> DUANGTHIP CHOMPRANG:  So I'm the Rapporteur One

reporting on the outcomes for the enhancing multistakeholder cooperation, which has five sessions.  The first one is Democracy version 3.0 session.  Edmon was the Chair.  The session questioned whether the current Democracy, 2.0, which is the Democracy that we're living in, is still relevant in the context of today's multistakeholder approach and the arrival of the Internet.

Could multistakeholder replace current political consultation process, given the growing trends of political dissent and political distrust of the public towards the authority and Government?  Examples are the orange revolution in the Ukraine, Arab Spring in Egypt, Thailand, and many places in the world.

The session concluded by recommending that the Internet can be an important tool to engage broader base participation by citizens.  Act as a mechanism of accountability and transparency through a multistakeholder principle approach and multistakeholders should be anchored on advancing the broader themes of policies for public interest.

There was also a recommendation to develop a guideline or framework that people can aspire to, ie, a goal standard when embracing the multistakeholder approach.

The group concluded that multistakeholder approach can indeed be a tool for democratizing policy consultation and development in a bottom-up manner.

The other session is the session on Internet governance principles in relation to geographic diversity.  Discussion on the term and definition of multistakeholder approach was reflected in various language and cultures, such as China, Korea, Russia, Thai and so forth.  The group agreed to disagree on the definition, but not on the substance of the word "Multistakeholder."  Many countries do not have words in their language to describe multistakeholder, for example, the Russian language requires seven words to describe the word, while Chinese requires several -- more words to describe multistakeholder or multi-lateral.  Therefore, from a language angle, "multistakeholder" may become troublesome to translate, literally.

It was noted that because "multistakeholder" is highly contextual, for example, according to the presenter, Internet governance principle by the Space Administration of China, translates the Internet Governance Principle as peace, security, openness and cooperation.

It was agreed that the spirit of Internet governance universal principles, which transcends language or cultural expression, would be more effective.

The globally recognized Tunis Internet Governance

Principles of inclusiveness, bottom-up, transparent and multistakeholderism be embraced.

Broad groups of stakeholders, which includes Civil Society, Government, businesses, and technical, and the academia groups to be included in the multistakeholder scope.

In addition, the Armenia ISOC chapter shared that universal Internet governance principles which were adopted within the 17 core principles of its charter.

And last, but not least, apart from embracing the Internet governance principle, being open alone is not enough. We need stakeholders to participate interactively. Noting the culture of active participation, the APAC region is lacking and needs greater promotion.

The next session was on localizing Internet Governance Forum in Asia Pacific. The session discussed the key challenges to enabling a local Internet Governance Forum in the region and ways to tackle them.

Notably, the key challenges include the imbalanced representation of stakeholders, the sustainability of local IGF due to the lack of resources, funding and public interest. Relevance of Internet governance and basic understanding of the public. The lack of Government participation. And the coordination challenges, IE the bottom-up approach.

In APAC region, although many countries don't have a formal national IGF, but many do have informal forum or spaces where Internet governance concerns are discussed openly, the group recommends the following solution to address the challenges: Promote active participation of Internet governance participation.

Promote digital literacy education across the board and bringing forth relevant Internet governance issues of concern to the public.

Develop a dialog process to ensure openness, accountability and transparency, enabling deeper conversation and follow-up among the different stakeholders.

Bridging the different expectations and interests of various stakeholders, by conducting temperature setting and expectation setting catering to the different interests of different stakeholders.

Foster more sustainable IGF by providing capacity building to new stakeholders. Namely, policymakers and governments, rather than seeking them to just attend IGF.

Internet Governance should be more engaging and capture the public's attention. Therefore it should be a combination of both education and a bit of entertainment.

Lastly, a question was posed to all the speakers on how would Internet governance address the challenges of connecting

the next billion.  The full recommendation and strategies were -
- and foresight of what the future needs of the region will
require.

One is the focus on linguistic Internet and the promotion
of local content in local languages.

Promote nontext content to bridge illiteracy, senior people
and disabled users through audio and visual content.

Promote ubiquitous connectivity to rural and urban areas,
whether it's using WiFi, wireless and white space and so forth.
This applies to both developed and developing economies.

Support open and free content, especially using IDNs.

Preserve ccTLD, which is the heart of where the Internet
function in each country delivers Internet services as a public
good.

Promote Internet governance to those who are not yet
connected or disconnected to the Internet into the IGF forum.

Conduct -- start establishing a formal or informal Internet
Governance Forum in your country, and develop a Secretariat for
Internet governance in your country through open collaboration.

And the last session is the -- from the periphery to core,
the WSIS+10 review.  The WSIS+10 review 2015 was kicked off
since 2013.  But in 2015, the final preparations are already
underway.  This year the first meeting was kicked off in June,
with the WSIS stock taking, and more recently the July 1 and 2
InterGovernmental Consultation and informal stakeholder
consultation in New York.

ISOC reported no planning -- currently there is no planning
for religional WSIS review exercise in the APT region.  However,
the APT secretariat will table an agenda on WSIS review in
August, during the regional policy forum in Singapore on the 3rd
to 5th of August.  Unlike other regions, APT region does not
have an official process or mechanism to facilitate the WSIS+10
review.

That's all for me, Chair.  Sorry.  And I turn now to the
second Rapporteur, Noelle.

>> NOELLE de GUZMAN:  Good afternoon.  I'm the Rapporteur
for diversity and inclusivity.  I failed to note it down here,
but I have five sessions.  The first -- yes, I think it's
diversity and inclusivity.

The first session is:  "Can mobile Internet bridge the
gender digital divide?  Challenges and opportunities for
stakeholders."

In this session, panelists noted that women's see the value
in utilizing mobile Internet services and them for education,
health and economic opportunities, but there are high barriers
of increasing usage among women.  Among the factors identified
were the high cost of access, and also the lack of confidence

and trust, and inadequate service delivery.

But more importantly, it was noted that these factors were tied with other barriers, among them systemic, institutional, cultural and socioeconomic barriers that need to be addressed.

The session concluded that mobile Internet could help bridge the gender digital divide, but it's not enough.

The participants stressed the need for more data on how women use the Internet, and data at a more localized and microlevel, recognizing the diversity among various communities of women, in order to develop applications, content, and services that are most relevant to them.

There is a need to move through access to mobile through means such as public and shared access, and other modes that can enable access, regardless of whatever device that you are using.

The end goal, panelists agreed, should not be merely to provide connectivity to women, but to enable women to use this connectivity meaningfully, enabling women to better participate in designing the technologies that enable other women.

Similar points emerged at the second session. "Broadband infrastructure and services for the next billion users." Specifically, the session stressed that International connectivity is growing, but poor regulatory oversight prevents this from being translated into more connectivity and lower Internet rates for consumers.

Additionally, despite having the appropriate technologies available, licensing restrictions to prevent more radio spectrum from being fully utilized to connect underserved and unserved areas wirelessly through the Internet.

Participants agreed that there is a need to get the attention of Governments and regulators to encourage redundancy, more networks. And this means not only International links but also domestic coverage.

They also looked to a future where Internet infrastructure can be laid alongside or piggybacking on other public utility infrastructure, and where resources like spectrum can be shared dynamically.

The third session is "access to ICTs to further development. Assessing the importance of ICTs in the post-2015 development agenda." So this session focused on the revitalization of public libraries as venues for the community to access the Internet and ICT services for free, or a very minimal fee, also as a way of making libraries more relevant to today's needs.

This session we also saw new sustainability models arising from telecenters, which in some countries are now being converted to centers for nonformal education, skills training, and business centers. This is considered an important step in

making the Internet available to marginalized communities for whom the Internet access rates are still very high.

At the same time, the session also underlined the importance of content and applications coming from the decentralized sources.

The fourth session is "Universal acceptance.  Been there, done that.  Looking back to look forward."  This session discussed the continuous expansion of Top Level Domains and the importance of internationalized domain names and enabling local businesses, groups, individuals, and institutions to express their identity in their own language.  But the full adoption of IDNs is not that straightforward and there continues to be issues and universal acceptance.

The session called for developers, programmers, ISPs and other groups and entities to catch up on the these developments, and also provided updates on the newly formed Universal Acceptance Steering Group, which is now adopting specifications and good practices in Universal Acceptance.

The last session, "In your own words, how to help your local community understand and participate in Internet governance."  This session presented examples of how stakeholders from different sectors are mobilizing the broader Internet community and even those who don't yet consider themselves part of the Internet community to take part in Internet governance discussions.

Participants cited a number of challenges to broader participation.  One lies in what many perceived as the technical nature of the Internet, which may deter people who have a tdifferent background.

Another is a lack of understanding around the multistakeholder model, as well as a lack of local language tools to promote awareness.

There is an increasing number of capacity building activities being done across the region to address these.  One is the approach to the Internet governance issues in a way that's most relevant to certain stakeholders.  For instance, to get policymakers interested in Internet governance, stakeholders can focus on issues that align with their current priorities, such as the sharing of economy.   What is most interesting about all of these initiatives is really the cross collaboration that is happening with these actors.  And also between local and global organizations in trying to get more people involved in Internet governance processes.

And with that, I'll pass it on to the next person.

>> SHERLY HARISTYA:  Thank you, Noelle.  Good afternoon, everyone.  I'm Sherly.  I'll be reporting for the track three, which is Internet and human rights and also Internet economy.

So there are six sessions under this track.  I will be reporting first for the session on online tracks to "Freedom of Expression and religious freedoms."  The overall session discussed the challenges and trends of such threats from regional and also the country's outlook.

As Rapporteur, I pay attention that there is a key discussion that there is a process of developing the Jakarta recommendation, which took place earlier in June.  So this Jakarta process, which finally came up with the Jakarta recommendations, it involved over 140 people from Civil Society, organisations and human rights activists and also UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and religion -- sorry.  Expression.

So out of this discussion, there is an interest to put forward the Jakarta recommendation to the related -- to the related forum discussion.  The panel mentioned, for example, the IGF 2015 and also other related policy bodies.

And the second session under my track is "Human rights and governance in Asean cyberspace."  So in general we discussed about the Asean ICT master plan and the impacts on the community and also individuals rights.  And the panel explained quite clear about the elements of Asean ICT master plan.  And at the end of the presentation, there is a question and answer session, which there is an emerging and interesting discussion about access and connectivity from the perspective of human rights or from the perspective of economic and competition.  Which at the end of the session, the Chair concluded that, actually, that access and connectivity must be looked at from the perspective of human rights.

And the third session under the human rights track is "The C to L of Digital rights:  Consent, litigation and citizenship."  So this sessiob discussed about the challenges of only relying on tech-based solutions.  But tech-based solutions, it means that the concern that we provided whenever we try to use our success on certain Webs.

And because this panel tried to explain the weaknesses of consent solution on the Web Internet experience, so they then come up with the experience with public service litigation in different parts of Asia.  And they pay more attention that there is a need for -- like this, reviews, and it's important in terms of the advocacy.

And after the Internet and human rights, I also conferred the Internet economy.  There were three sessions under this track.  The first one is "Macao IGF, especially the ICT economy."  So this was the potential of ICT in Macao's gaming and hotel industries.  But also other possible future prospective industries.

And the panel also explained about some user authentication mechanisms and its limitations.  And there was also an explanation of IoT in China.  And the last presenter, he explained about the need of more communication and cooperation among the cybersecurity entities in Macao.

The next session actually falls under my colleague Jennifer, but it seems there is a conflicting schedule of these two sessions, so I'll be covering the session on "core Internet values."  So this session particularly caught my interest because it deliberated about the core Internet values.  So the panel named some of the architectural values of the Internet.  For example, Internet as dumb technology, end to end architecture, interoperability and openness.  And the panel and participants, they had an interesting discussion on actually who should remain the core Internet values and whether these values are alterable.

And because of these questions, one participant then came up with a classification of core Internet values as technical, but also sociological values.  But then the discussion emerged that actually there is a complexity between these two values.  That there is a possibility that the technical values within technology, it comes from sociological interplay.

And the other point of view from this discussion is that the core Internet values actually are not to be compromised and should be preserved as arising from the early Internet design.

However, one panel also reminded that we need to be aware of the possibility -- not to be slipped away from the core Internet values.  Because if we started to change from the real initial core Internet values, there might not be any way to turn back.

And besides that, the panel also brought up tracks to the borderless Internet arising of the (inaudible) borders raised by Governments, as well as artificial the borders raised by, for example, as offered by the Internet.org.

And the session brought up the question, at what point the Internet ceases to be Internet?  And also that the value of the Internet actually lies in it being global.

The last session was the "Manila Principles." So the Manila Principles is the roadmap for the global community to protect online Freedom of Expression and innovation around the world.  So it's not intended to protect the intermediary, but the end user of the Internet.  So probably we could go and check for the website, which is ManilaPrinciples.org, where we could sign to support the Manila Principles.

And also the discussion about some cases from Korea, India, Hong Kong and China.  And there was one view from the panel that actually, in the present time, that there is no Internationally

and legally defined explanation of what is Intermediary
Liability.

Thank you.

>> JENNIFER CHUNG:  Hello.  My name is Jennifer Chung, and
I'm the Rapporteur for track four, which contains two tracks,
critical Internet resources and emerging issues.

Also, due to a conflict of sessions, I have covered one of
my colleague Sherly's tracks and that falls under Internet
economy.

So in this session, this is session one, "building an
Internet for trust on a trustless Internet.  Involving
governance models for emerging block chain and smart track
technologies."  This gave an overview of the core innovations
and the emerging technical and policy discussions surrounding
block chain and smart contract technologies.  The social impact
of the trustless technology and what it could mean for Internet
governance if existing models can apply or if it's something
new.

The discussion also touched on how different jurisdictions,
such as the United States, Hong Kong and Macau, how these
different jurisdictions try to regulate this technology.  And
the evolution of a centralized fiduciary trust structure, backed
on the State, to a decentralized digitalized fiduciary trust
structure, which is backed by mats.

Panelists and participants dalso iscussed how the block
chain as the first of two layers is an accounting revolution and
the layer on top, the smart contract innovation, is a trust
revolution.  The session also looked at the opportunity to
leverage this technology to build an infrastructure across the
25 different markets in Asia to create a common
interoperability.

The output from the session will contribute as the AP
regional input into this year's IGF flash discussion on bit
coin, block chain and beyond, as well as drive participation in
Hong Kong's smart contract initiative this October.

So back to the two sub-themes that I'm actually Rapporteur
for.  The first of which is Internet -- sorry, critical Internet
resources.  So session 6 is "Issues and challenges of managing
country code Top Level Domain names in South Asia."  Panelists
from this discussion gave an overview of how the ccTLDs are
organised and managed across the jurisdictions in South Asia,
which includes dot AF, dot PK, dot BD, dot NP and dot IN.
Through the discussion it emerged that there is a set of shared
challenges and issues that can be broadly categorized into the
falling five categories.

Technological, which deals with the infrastructure,
security and stability.            The second one is legal,

which deals with issues regarding dispute resolution mechanisms.

The third is administrative.  And this deals with resources, costs, management, and customer service.

And the fourth is adoption, which deals with the penetration of the actual domain name -- sorry.  The penetration of the actual ccTLD.  Market strategy, and localized content.

And the fifth one is policy framework.  So there are differences in the privately or publicly run entities.  And there is a lack of multistakeholder approach in policymaking.

Suggestions raised as a way forward during the discussion included strengthening cross community, cross country, and perhaps cross regional collaborations.

The second session -- sorry, the second sub-theme that I'm Rapporteur for is emerging issues.  So this is session 28.  Net neutrality in the Asia Pacific.  For this particular session, I want to pay special Kudos to the participants and volunteer discussion leaders for stepping in for panelists who couldn't make the session.  And the volunteer discussion leaders and participants made the session a very engaging roundtable discussion.

So what this session touched on was the definition of net neutrality.  The evolving debate in the AP region compared with what is going on in the US, Europe, and globally.  And questions were raised on unlicensed spectrum.  Concerns were raised also surrounding zero rated services, especially in the region, in this region, in the context of promoting access to first time users.

Comparisons were raised comparing zero rated services to broadcast television.  And viewpoints emerged that this may not be desirable and could distort the Internet's egalitarian principles.

Alternate models such as the Sasha model or an equal rating model were suggested to advance access for the next billion users coming online, the majority of which will be from the Asia Pacific region.

The last session that I'm Rapporteur for is the session that concluded this morning, the IANA transition discussion.  So this discussion session came right after the APILP background and update session on the IANA stewardship transition.  It gave participants an opportunity to interact with panelists from the ICANN board, ICANN staff, and the IANA stewardship transition coordination group, the ICG.

So questions were raised on timing.  So why now?  Why does it matter to the AP region and why does it matter to the youth? All these questions were raised and discussed.

Clarifications were made regarding the ICG proposal, which deals with the IANA transition and the CCWG proposal, which

deals with the ICANN accountability streams, that these two proposals are separate and will not be merged into one; however, will need to be consistent with each other.

The multi-video statements principles were mentioned especially the statement on avoiding fragmentation of the Internet.

Additional concerns were raised regarding participation from both the youth and countries in the AP region in these processes, due to lack of resources or prior knowledge of complex political and technical nuances.

The session concluded looking at the IANA transition being something that can improve trust globally, and prevent fragmentation of the Internet that is the driving force of the global economy as we know it.

This is all from me. And I'll pass to it my colleague for the last track.

>> KLEE AIKEN: Hi. i covered track five. Cybersecurity and trust as well as openness. We had sessions on human centric information security and privacy in the IoT era. Internet openness and transparency reporting. Surveillance trends, challenges and opportunities in the Asia Pacific. Online safety and awareness and development of sustainable Internet for the next generation. And smart cities in Asia and the deployment of big data, privacy and security challenges. It's a very interesting and diverse set of sessions. If you'll allow me, I'll try to pull out some of the main themes rather than go session by session.

So what we were looking at in these tracks were security, privacy and safety. As you get more connected, there are clear benefits. Looking at the IoT, where devices have a presence that connect, communicate and compute, there are opportunities for health, for bettering standards of living, and even in the room now as well as during the sessions we have folks wearing health monitors on their wrist, folks tracking their steps back and forth from the hotel.

With the smart cities, with the massive urban growth in the Asia Pacific, there are clear benefits to creating more sustainable cities as well as improving the quality of life within the cities.

But of course with the positives of the growth of connectivity come challenges. This is where security, privacy, and safety come in. For security with the IoT and smart cities, we have devices continuously connected and sensors continuously connected to the Net. But they are built with a focus on functionality rather than security. So you have a flood of all these insecure devices that create multiple attack surfaces that can be exploited, and they are not necessarily being managed by

experts.  They are managed by people like me who have no idea actually how to properly secure their devices.  And some of them are critical devices.  You have heart monitors, a city's electrical systems.  And all of these can be accessed when you move to a smart city or to the IoT.

Also these devices can be recruited into bot nets.  And as we saw with the MIIT five-year Internet of Things plan, they are able to roll it out.  There are a lot of impressive stats,  but at the same time when you do a search of IPv4 connected devices in China, there were thousands of unsecure devices that came online through the Internet of Things plan.

In privacy, again, with the Internet of Things and Smart Cities, you have all these sensors collecting massive amounts of data, both personal and personal identifiable information, as well as secret data, as it was called. And we don't know what is being collected, what is being done with the data.  Is it being securely stored?  Is it anonymized?  And how can you anonymize personal data, such as your health statistics that you are sending to your doctor.  And can you opt out of this data being collected when you're walking through the city and the city is tracking you and tracking different transit paths and things like that?

And, of course, these are only in the passive concerns with privacy.  There is active surveillance that we learned about. One of the key topics we learned was fin phisher, where there's a mass surveillance being commercialized and sold through the region and world.

We learned about mass surveillance in Pakistan where legislative creep has led from security issues to becoming more mass surveillance issues.  In Singapore, which was characterized as a lab for mass surveillance and big data analysis. Thailand, where there is a Working Group to test surveillance equipment and see how it can be deployed within the country.  And Indonesia, where Telcos are including surveillance gear in their equipment.

And all of this was facilitated by a lack of legislation, whether it's legislation like Freedom of Information and sunshine laws that we talked about, or no controls on the tools and the selling of these commercial surveillance equipment.

And many have also cited that there is a lower concern with privacy in the Asia Pacific, which has really allowed Governments to expand their reach in this sense.

On the safety theme, we looked at things such as the uncivilized Internet, where cyberbullying or inappropriate abuse of content can have a negative impact on people's lives.

We also looked at a very interesting concept called virtual fast-food, where content online or certain applications online

or how you interact online are not necessarily unhealthy but they can be addictive or lead to  antisocial behavior.

So how do we address these challenges?  We looked into how we can address them and who should be responsible?  The Government?  Should they legislate to protect privacy or regulate for cybersecurity?  Block websites to protect the youth?  Should they be building accountability mechanisms like we learned in Hong Kong where there is transparency reporting?  Or is it the businesses responsibility?  Should they be on your side or have your back?  Is it their responsibility to build secure products?  And more importantly, is it their responsibility to continuously secure the products five years down the line, ten years down the line, when it's your washing machine which you don't replace every year?

And the question that was raised, is it businesses responsibility for the demand for the surveillance products that they are selling?  So there is the question there.  Or perhaps it's on the community and the users, you and me, to address these issues.

Of course, it's a combination of all of these things, we found, as with many issues.  But in the spirit of a bottom up forum like this one, a lot of focus was on advocating to not rely on the Government to fix these things.  But to focus more on the human dimension, rather than just the technical dimension.  Find human centric solutions.

And at the core of this is education and awareness raising.  We looked at quite a few initiatives on both fronts.  There is a 2045 human society study that Korea is spearheading to really build the human dimension of cybersecurity rather than just the technical.

The research youth Internet usage research by the National Child Youth Association in China is really looking at trends of how the youth is using the Internet so we can adjust and really understand how the Internet is affecting people as they grow up.

We learned how to teach safe Internet to the youth at the Child Palace in Guangdong, I believe.  We looked at initiatives to identify safe apps and techniques for privacy, especially in Hong Kong.

There was a push for regional networks for child online safety, really cooperating within countries in the region to build best practices and media packets to improve child safety.

A push to explain what surveillance is and to build understandings of what privacy really means, to overcome that apathy that many people identified across the region, as well as teach cybersecurity and cyber hygiene across the region.

So as a key takeaway, if I can, from all these sessions, is that for the cyber ecosystem to lourish, to be sustainable, we

need trust.  Trust that people's transactions are secure.  Trust that people's communications are private.  And if we don't, the people won't utilize these technologies.  So to ensure that, security, privacy and safety are critical.

So as we connect -- as we work to connect the next billion, whether it's to bridge the digital divide by connecting unconnected communities, to bring the next generation online, or to connect the next 50, 80 or 100 devices with the Internet of Things or smart cities, we have to ensure awareness and education, security, privacy and safety remain key priorities.

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you for your updates.  This year we have many delegates here representing different countries.  And we also find much more engagement of youth.  So now we will have a delegate of YIGF, Wilson and Pei Jing Yi to share their discussion outcomes, please.

>> WILSON LAM:  I'm here representing the Youth IGF to do the report back.  I'll skip through my part and jump to the participants part for the whole wrap up of the few days and the whole experiences.  Because as an organizer, participant sharing would be more direct on the YIGF experience.

>> PEI JING YI:  Good afternoon, distinguished guests and friends.  My name is Pei Jing and I'm a participant of YIGF, and I'm from mainland China.

I'm going to wrap up my fruitful four days in Macao.  At the beginning, I want to thank the organizer of this forum. And, actually, I am a totally new member of YIGF.  And the concept of Internet governance is totally new to me.  And the Internet governance situation in China is not as active as we see here.

From my perspective, most of the youths in China are not that familiar with IG.  And the awareness of NGOs helping Internet governance is very big.  And the awareness of youth engagement is even worse.

So as we all know, the Chinese network is highly governed by the Government.  And it's kind of sad that we are the majority of the Netizens and we are governed by a group of people from the Government.

I thought about this these days.  And the idea of Baidu TearBot comes to me.  TearBot is the biggest Chinese BBS forum. In the BBS, it's a gathering of a group of people sharing the same interests.  In a certain group, they have an organizer to keep everything in order.  And the organizer is a peer from the youths, and is passionate about the topic on the table.  And this inspired me.

When it comes to the Internet governance, I think it is a good idea that we should call up our youth self management organisations, which can help to establish and manage the

Internet governance in China.

This is also what I've experienced these few days in YIGF, a youth initiated program for the youths and by the youths, that enables us to participate in different workshops and enjoy different discussions.

We have been able -- we have been able to talk to different guests from different regions, which amazed me a lot.  I realized that the Internet is not just about technology, but it is also about some humanistic problems we face every day.  I am amazed how the Internet can promote cooperation of different stakeholders and connect people from different regions to combine resources and solve problems together.

I think the most important thing that we learned these days, I think this is the most important thing.

And we hope we can continue our participation in IG.  And, really, thank you for the four days and thank Edmon and other distinguished guests.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you.  So Internet is transforming the world our youth live in and know doubt there should be more youth engagement in the IGF.

So next I would like to invite Mr. Edmon Chung for the sharing of the outcome document discussion.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Hello.  Hello everyone.  This is Edmon.

So the last couple days we have, as I mentioned in the opening, we are conducting this experiment to try to come through with a -- come out with an outcomes document.

I'm still hopeful, in fact I am hopeful to call the experiment a success.  This was a first try.  We helped create a rough draft based on the received and accepted workshop proposals that were put out just before the beginning of this meeting in Macao.  And we started soliciting input and comments online as well as during the sessions here at the APrIGF meetings.

I will, you know, note that I -- I'll continue to call this, for the time being, APrIGF outcomes document or summary. And noting that we are still looking forward to some suggestions for better naming of the document itself.  But in any case, over the last couple days, we have received 22 specific comments online.  They are constructive and useful.  And many comments from the two discussions at the end of both day one and two. Most of you were in the room at the time as well.  And we were able to convene an informal gathering over lunch today and kind of a drafting team in formation is being put together.

So based on all those discussions and the comments received, I believe there is a rough consensus to move forward

with the document, especially by including an extended period after this meeting to continue to solicit comments on this open document before we sort of finalize it.

So with the rough consensus, hopefully we want to proceed. We would hope to proceed, to produce running code. And I guess based on -- also based on the discussions, the structure of the document, there was a lot of discussion about how a document really should be structured. I guess the -- just summarizing from it. I guess we will keep the preamble, which sets out the parameters and the limitations of the document and the purpose of the document, to keep the introduction with the suggested edits of course.

And then the key changes would be to do away with the concept of priorities listing and recommendations, and combine or collapse them into a listing of issues and concerns. So that's, you know, a change that is achieved over the last few days.

And ending also there is a couple of suggestions to end with a giving of thanks to the host and also a hint to hopefully continuation of this type of a document next year.

So this is kind of the structure that seems to be emerging. And we had a lot of discussion of course also on the process and importance of an open and traceable, actually, trail of how inputs were incorporated. And then from here, including discussion sessions as well as online comments.

Speaking of which the online comments I think we have reviewed it, and please feel free to review them as well. It seems, you know, it seems like they are constructive and could be incorporated into the document without too much of a problem. We are not seeing a lot of, really, conflicting comments at this time.

So with the formation, I guess, of an ad hoc drafting team formation, we are looking at hopefully to post this meeting, to come up with a draft zero, I could call it draft zero, in one week's time, which will be further circulated and put online to be incorporating all the inputs that we have received. And then going forward to post further for a last call for two more weeks, and hopefully finalizing and posting a document in one month's time after this. And that seems to also be about a one month time, also seems to be a building consensus around the room. We want to give a little bit more time for people to consider it. But we don't want to lose momentum for, you know, keeping it too long. Giving it about a month releases a little bit of pressure for too much text editing here at the Conference. But it also allows people to provide input.

So that is kind of the idea going forward. And then in terms of the substance, looking at comments from the -- the many

comments that were received, I've summarized it into --
cataloged it into ten items that were identified as issues and
concerns coming out.

One of which -- the first one is actually our theme this
year, the evolution of Internet governance.

Second one is bringing the next billion online and bridging
the digital divide.

Third one being open access and spectrum for WiFi for
development.

Fourth one being effective models for youth engagement.

The fifth one being preventing data based discrimination.
That is kind of related to big data resulting in discrimination.

Number six was, again, this numbering is just -- has no
relevance to the order.  I'm just listing them out.

Universal acceptance of Internationalized Domain Names and
e-mail addresses.

Seventh was building trust on the Internet.

And then eight was human rights and development on the
Internet.

Ninth was block chain and fin tech.  That is the bit coin
and those types of issues.

And, finally, the open process for producing outputs such
as this actual outcomes document itself.

So these were the ten items -- again to emphasize it's not
listed in any particular order.  I just put 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,
8, 9, 10, so that I could count how many were collected.  And
that's the idea, keep the preamble and introduction, and just
lay out these were the issues that the participants from APrIGF
Macao 2015 felt were issues and concerns on Internet governance.

So with that.  Thank you.

(Applause)

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Edmon.  So now we will come to
the question and answer question.  If you have any questions and
comments, please feel free to come forward.  Please be reminded
to mention your name for transcript purposes.

Now, I will pass the microphone to Edmon to moderate the
session.

>> EDMON CHUNG:  So I guess we have about 15 minutes or so
to have additional comments from any of the summaries from the
Rapporteurs, or, as I mentioned, the outcomes document.  The
items.  If you have more items you wish to bring forward, please
do so.  If you have any -- if the Rapporteurs did not report
your session correctly, please come forward and correct it.

And if you have any encouragement or suggestions to the
Youth IGF, please come up to the mic or put up your hand.

>> SIVASUBRAMANIAN M.  It is very nice to see the progress
that YIGF has made over the last few years.  There is tremendous

participation and very good output from YIGF.

But I think we should also try not to separate youth from the main IGF and try and have some sessions where there is youth participation in the main session, the main IGF, the main rIGF and main IGF.  So that we have youth panelists on our panels, and youth participants in the room.  And there is a confluence of views.  And I think the separation should go gradually.

Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments.  Indeed, your comment is very valid for the YIGF.  In fact, this year the YIGF has taken a new experiment.  We sort of took a 50/50 split between our own sessions and joining the APrIGF sessions.  So we engaged our participants to join different APrIGF sessions, like the Democracy and freedom for all, and surveillance trends, sustainable development of the Internet on your participation. And we just came from the ICANN session on how to engage our local community.

And we have participants sharing their own works in the University, how to make some creative content by HTML5 technologies, to promote issues and awareness on important issues.  And how to see the application on Internet governance issues.

So, indeed, we will be trying to incorporate more youth panelists in future APrIGF sessions, and we will work on that.

Thank you for your comment.

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Chad, from APC.  Thank you for the report.  It gives us a great sense of what has been discussed, especially since we are not able to attend all of the sessions.

But can I say that there were other side events that happened before the event itself.  And one of them was the gender and Internet governance exchange.  And we have the -- this is the first time that we have done it.  This is an event that the Association for Progressive Communications and the Foundation for Media, alternate -- alternative -- sorry, I know them well, okay?  In the Philippines organised.  And how many did we have?  12?  So we had like 12 participants who spent two days, talking about Internet governance and the relationship around gender issues and women's rights.

Can I just ask them to sort of like stand?  Because I think they really participated and brought, you know, issues within the different sessions.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> EDMON CHUNG:  Thank you for sharing that.  Thank you for sharing that.  And I guess I will from the Secretariat take a note on that.  And maybe next time we should have some report

from the presessions as well.

>> AUDIENCE:  Thank you so much.  I'm (inaudible) from (inaudible).  I also joined the (inaudible) team.  So here I can -- I can see lots of women over here for reporting purposes as Rapporteurs.  At the same time, during the side events, I found there were very limited number of women that joined as panelists and coordinators.  So I would like to request you from next time to increase the participation of women in the panel or as the -- I mean as the coordinator.

So thank you so much.

(Applause)

>> EDMON CHUNG:  Thank you.  We are doing quite well here in terms of gender.  (chuckles) I understand.  I think that's very valid.

I note that there is a remote participation question.  So can I ask Lily.

>> LILY KUNG:  There is a remote question from Srajukanumuri. Can we deployment one stop portal linking or resources or knowledge base from all countries covering IG open wireless models, HR, local content, et cetera, such that all multistakeholders use these KMbots to get connected to the world of Internet without government red tapes and monopolistic Telcos net neutrality issues?

>> EDMON CHUNG:  Thank you for the question.  The question was whether we can deploy a one-stop portal, having all the resources and knowledge base, a number of things.

So I guess that's a grit idea.  Probably not this particular platform from APrIGF to do, but that's certainly a good idea.  If you wanted to add to it...

>> I think APrIGF would be a great platform.  We have a Web Page.  We could link everyone.  I mean, there would be different resources, by topic.  I mean, ISOC has quite a great deal of resources, but not everything.  We don't cover a few of the topics that they mentioned here.  But it's reasonable for us to link that.  Paul, I'm sorry.

>> PAUL WILSON:  I just thought I'd point out that there is a one-stop shop for all of this information and that's called the Internet.  Sorry, that's a bit facetious.  But that's a huge breadth of information that's being referred to here.  And I think it might be unrealistic to think about it all in one place.

But there is something I want to mention, which is a website called the friends of the IGF.  And friendsoftheIGF.org is a one-stop stop for the full archive of the IGF meetings.  And that's a place, for the person who asked, to find at least the topics that he or she is interested in, what are the IGF deliberations.  That is something, too, by the way, that could

be open to us for submitting all the records of this meeting and even past meetings, to make sure that the APrIGF is also included and available to people in that one-stop shop concerning the -- which includes all the IGF information.

So that's something for us to think about. Thanks.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Paul. And I guess a note to our Secretariat to see how we could, you know, provide the materials and resources that we have been collecting to the friends of IGF.

>> ASHA HEMRAJANI: Asha Hemrejani from the ICANN board.

First of all, I want to say I am very grateful for this opportunity. Thank you, Edmon, thank you all the organizers for giving me the opportunity to come and attend this event. I really learned a lot, because I'm new to Internet governance.

I wanted to make a few points. I liked Siva's idea of merging the Youth IGF and the main IGF. Because I felt that the questions from the young people in the audience during these three days has been most thought provoking, amongst the most thought provoking ones. You have you got me thinking a bit more about what I'm supposed to do as part of the ICANN board and what my role is. So I really appreciated that.

And I really support the idea of the outcomes document. I think that's a fantastic idea. One of my things is to increase the Asia Pacific involvement and exposure in this -- in the Internet governance field, and I think your paper, this outcomes document, will go a long way to helping us achieve that goal.

So thank you so much.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Asha.

Do we have anymore questions or comments? Please.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you very much for the nice wrap-up of all that was done in the last two or three days. And listening to all of your wrapping up summary statements, I believe this morning we discussed about the preparation for the next WSIS+10 review, which will be in December in New York. And I think that's quite important for our region, for this Internet governance and for the future Internet usage for our aboriginal people.

So I think we should not forget to prepare for that important event in a most efficient way, in collaboration with some organizations such as APT, APAC, and APNIC and others. It's just that I would like to remind all of us that we should do something for the preparation for that important event.

Thank you.

>> EDMON CHUNG: Thank you for the comment. And we will take note of that. And also, I guess, I guess from the Secretariat perhaps proactively to reach out to APC or to APNIC to take what we have done here to those foras as well.

I think we have a note that we're overrunning a bit.  So
seeing no further questions, thank you once again, and please
give a round of applause to the Rapporteurs and the Youth IGF.
     (Applause)
     >> LILY KUNG:  Thank you Rapporteurs, Edmon, Wilson and Pei
Jing.
     As you may know, the next APrIGF is going to be held in
Taipei.  so I invite Mr. Kuo-Wei Wu CEO of the National
Information Infrastructure Enterprise Promotion Association to
say a few words, please.
     >> KUO-WEI WU:  Thank you very much.   I think it was a
wonderful few days in Macao and the APrIGF Macao meeting.  It is
the end of this week, and we are looking at the next meeting.
     The next meeting will be held in Taipei. Actually the day,
we are still working with the MSG group to figure out what is
the best day for all.  Right now, I think it's very possible to
be the last week of July.  The reason is because I think the
ICANN meeting will be in June.  And as I know the APNIC meeting
will be in September.  So if anyone has a comment about the
date, please let us know as soon as possible.  Because we need
to reserve the venue, so we can have a precise date for
everyone.
     And so, basically, I think Taipei is, right now, as I know,
we are looking for a couple of the possible venues.  One venue
might be at University.  And right now, most of the University,
the bandwidth is really tremendous.  As I know, the Government
tried to upgrade the University bandwidth access.  It's up to
100 gig.  So if that is up to the 100 gig, I think it would be a
have good working environment for everyone.  So that is the
first thing I'd like to let you know.  And, of course, Taiwan
already has 4G.  It's in operation for more than a year already.
     And, also, we are talking with the telephone company and
it's possible for the 4G SS be in the venue.
     And of course in Taipei, because of the subway it's very
convenient to almost everything.  And the venue, we are looking
around, actually, it's walking distance to the subway, I think
it's 7 or 8 minutes.  And once you can get on to the subway, I
think you can almost reach any place in the Taipei city.
     And, of course, some of the people say, you know, that it's
-- that a couple of the landmarks is the 101 building.  And of
course many people like to see the culture.  There's a Paris
museum, it's really nice to visit.
     And I think, basically, it's -- well, I don't know what
does that picture mean?  Oh, I see.  I think this is basically
it's a video from the city Government.  But as I heard, it will
come out in the last, you know, when I finish the presentation.
     Okay.  And this is also the -- and the meeting venue, you

can see that there is a couple places we are looking for.  And
one of the venues is good is because we don't need to do the
wiring.  They have a table, every table, and they can fill for
about roughly 250 people.  And everybody table, every seat, you
have a plug.  We don't need to do wiring at all.  So it will be
much easier for everyone if you bring a computer with you.

     And we also see a couple of the very good hotels.  There
are two hotels nearby.  It's all walking distance.  One is about
five minutes and another one maybe it's about ten or fifteen
minutes by walking.  And another one is for, you know, the
cheaper price.  You can see in here.  Actually, it's a dormitory
provided by the National Taiwan University.  And that hotel is
actually quite good and very spacey and very convenient.  And
it's incredible.  It's a student dormitory.  They have a gym,
you can do the exercise.

     And, of course, a lot of people like to go to the middle of
Taiwan, there is a lake.

     And so how I can play the video?  Can you put on the video
for us?   You are coming?  Thank you.

     So... because the PowerPoint I prepared is a different
version to the University, so we need to switch in a different
Microsoft office.

     (Video)

     You can see the Taipei City.  The city is roughly about 3
million people in the city.

     The subway is everywhere. The subway is actually very cheap
and very convenient.

     (Captioned video)

     >> KUO-WEI WU:  And another one.  Another one.

     And of course a lot of people go to Taiwan for food.

     (Video)

     Actually, in the lunchtime, I was briefing some people
about what is Taiwanese food.  As you know, it's a very
combinations.  I think Taiwan basically, if you include in
aboriginals, it's more than 10,000 years.  But after
aboriginals, then the Chinese came from Ho Kin, the southern
part of China, and so you can have Ho Kin food.  And after that,
the Dutch, actually, it's the Southern Dutch Company that came
to Taiwan.  So you also have Dutch food.  And after the Dutch,
actually, there is the Japanese come to Taiwan for almost 75
years.  So actually Japanese food is very popular in Taiwan,
too.  After that, then you know there is the Kan-Ti-Wan move
from China to Taiwan.  And they bring almost every province of
the food into Taiwan.  And so you can see in Taiwan, the food is
a mix with all the Chinese, Japanese, Dutch, western food.  So I
think it's -- if you like to try the food, you will enjoy it.
And of course included in there, Indian food.  I just mentioned

to the people, right now, in Taipei city, it's more than 10 to
12 Indian restaurants there.  So I think -- I welcome you to
Taipei.
    Thank you.
    (Applause)
    >> LILY KUNG:  Thank you.  So I'm sure all of us are very
excited to visit Taiwan for the next conference, especially for
the food.
    Now I invite the local host for Macao 2015, Mr. Holmes
Leong, CEO of Internet.Asia, to say a few words, please.
    >> HOLMES LEONG:  Thank you.  Good day, all.
    Thank you, Mr. Wu.  We will go to Taiwan this month.
    Okay.  Thank you for all of your participation to join us,
APrIGF 2015.  Thank you for the speakers who did a great and
wonderful job for well preparing their speeches.  Last but not
least, thank you for our group who contributed their hard work
throughout the days.  Can I suggest Cotta Ming, Carmen, Becca,
Mandi, Cara, Becca and Angie.  This is our staff.  Thank you.
    (Applause)
    And also, DotAsia, the Secretariat.
    (Applause)
    Macao is different, this local government.  Within the
period of this International event, I believe that most of you
have a very good try in gaming and unforgettable experience in
Macao.  Please enjoy yourselves and we hope we will see each
other in the very near future.
    Thank you.
    >> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Mr. Holmes Leong, please take a
seat, first.  I'd also like to invite Mr. Edmon Chung,
Mr. Wilson Lam, and Mr. Paul Wilson on stage for the closing
remarks.
    So now may I invite Mr.  Edmon Chung, CEO of DotAsia
Organization Limited.
    >> EDMON CHUNG:  Thank you.  And I hope you all had fun.
And hopefully you have beaten the house at this casino.
    Over the last three days, you know, this particular APrIGF
has been actually quite a number of breakthroughs.  There were a
total number of 26 workshops, including one that was
spontaneously created.  And one that turned into kind of an
unconference style, which is quite exciting.  So including the
26 and the outcomes document discussion, opening, closing, and a
number of events, there were a total of 34 sessions altogether.
And this particular year, we have had a much more diverse number
of speakers.  And the number of overseas participants, actually,
reached to about 150.  And this is more than -- you know, almost
double what we had at best in the last few years.  So that is a
very encouraging trend.  So more participation.  And especially

from Government representatives as well, we had a total of 24
Government representatives from ten countries and territories
coming to participate in the panels over the past three years.
And that's very encouraging.

     And also in terms of youth participation, we had more than
30 young people coming from Thailand, from Hong Kong, from
China, from Taiwan, and from Macao of course.  And this is also
a breakthrough.  In previous years, usually mainly coming from
the local host countries.  But this time we were able to bring
together really different people from -- different young people
from around the region.

     So I also think that the integration, this is a full -- the
first time, as Wilson mentioned, half, half integration.  I
think it was very successful.  And I think that should go even
further as Siva mentioned earlier, especially with the APILP.

     And of course I'm excited about the development of the
outcomes document and looking for your continued participation
on that.

     So, finally, let me give a few thanks to a number of
sponsors.  I want to highlight a few of them that really made
this event possible.

     APNIC for supporting the formalized fellowship.  This is
the first time we have a more formalized fellowship program and
thanks APNIC for the strong support there.

     Google for their continued support for the whole
initiative.  Especially Internet Society, that you know every
session you would see that live captioning, actually, brought to
you by the Internet Society.  Very, you know, very grateful for
their support there.

     ICANN, especially on the remote participation, the support
for the Adobe Connect rooms.

     IGFSA, it's a new organization that supports the IGF
movement.

     The Government of Macao, different branches of the
Government of Macao that helped feed us every day at lunch with
great hospitality as well.

     CTM and MTEL, and especially CTM which helped us with the
Internet connection here, very strong and fast Internet here at
the event.

     And of course, the local host, Holmes and his team.  I
won't repeat that.

     And, finally, I would like to especially thank my
Secretariat team, who is already scrambling to support the very
important and accelerating work at the ICG.  The same team,
there, that is making me look good from the Secretariat. So
please join me in a round of applause to thank Yannis, Jennifer
and Kelvin.

(Applause)

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Edmon.

So next may I invite Mr. Wilson Lam for NetMission.Asia to share with us their experience in organizing the Youth IGF.

>> WILSON LAM:  Thank you.  Most of my closing remarks was finished by my fellow Youth IGF participants, so I'll be very effective in length.

We always think that YIGF is a great platform for youth to join the IG discussions and to experience what IG discussions really is, and that's been one of the core elements of engaging youth participants across Asia.  But this year's YIGF, we come here with one question with us:  What is participation?  And we believe that youth should not be just making presence.  We want them to be part of the IG discussions and actively contributing their ideas.

And with that in mind, instead of having our own sessions, we sort of took a 50/50 split between having our own sessions and joining the APrIGF workshops.  So we split into small groups and jumped to different tracks of the workshops.  And throughout the four days of YIGF events, we had small group discussions with distinguished guests.  Simulations and card games.  We even let our participants to plan on our own ides how to help engage their own local community and on how to contribute to them to engage in more IG discussions.

Therefore, this year's YIGF is about a series of experiments that tries to redefine what youth participation is and to try to bridge the gap between youth voice and policymakers.  And we will be looking forward to try to incorporate our youth panelists into our workshops.

And also I would like to thank the APILP teams for having the three days of sessions to help build the capacity of YIGF participants.
And I would also like to thank you all of the APrIGF participants for your kindness and generosity to talk with us and to reach out to us, to inspire us on different topics of Internet governance.

Finally, to my fellow YIGF participants and NetMission team, I would like to say job well done.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Wilson.

Now I'd like to invite the Chair of APrIGF Multistakeholder Steering Group, Mr. Paul Wilson, Director of APNIC, to give us a final closing remark.

>> PAUL WILSON:  Thank you very much.  I'll say firstly, Edmon, I did beat the house this week.

(Applause)

I beat the house in the only way possible, which is by not spending a single pataca in the house. Sorry to Macao for that. But I did spend some pataca on beautiful food and some local experiences, which I'm sure are much more genuine Macao experiences.

But back to the meeting. I really hope that everyone here has had an interesting and useful three days at the APrIGF. I have. I've, personally, I was able to attend quite a few discussions, but not nearly the full range. So it was fantastic to see the report backs, and I was really quite impressed, amazed by the amount of content that we managed to cover in 30 plus sessions, just in the last three days. And I think that is a remarkable effort by everyone here.

One thing that did stick out this week was a particular discussion which was lively and interesting, and it was about the very word "Multistakeholder," which is actually central to the IGF and to this whole event and the whole process that we're involved with.

The question was whether we should try to find a substitute for that word. I'm actually one of the first to agree that "multistakeholder" is a term that doesn't translate well. And to be honest it doesn't translate well in English, either. It's pretty difficult and not many people really love it. But it's a completely new word, like, say, "snow" was in the Pacific islands. And so of course it's hard to translate. But it does express something important and something that's new, and it's all about how and why the Internet has succeeded with the many different stakeholders and stakeholder groups able to participate in the Internet without anyone having dominance or control, with everyone having an equal footing. So I think after ten years of using the word, clumsily, maybe not entirely comfortably, I really do hope we might finally be getting somewhere with it.

And actually, I think we may be, because back in my home in Australia, I recently heard a reference to taking a multistakeholder approach to the governance of our electricity supply networks. So we may be getting somewhere in terms of the Internet model being used elsewhere as well. So I think instead of changing the term, I hope with this event we become more comfortable and not less with the meaning and the real life of multistakeholder governance of the Internet.

That's a very specific point. It's one that stood out for me, and I hope that ever one has had at least one of your own highlights. So I'll finish.

To conclude, thanks again to the hosts MONIC and MNET and the Macao government. I do want to particularly thank the APrIGF Secretariat not just for this event but for all the

events leading up to it. Yannis Li and Jennifer Chung especially.  Also, Kelvin and Edmon who worked so hard for this event.  Thank you so much for this week.  Let's have a round of applause.

(Applause)

I want to acknowledge the youth participation here.  I tweeted earlier that there seemed to be a large majority of young women in the youth contingent here and I think that's a fantastic thing.  So hashtag women and tech, and all of that, it's really good to see.  Congratulations.

(Applause)

Thank you.

And to everyone here, speakers and panelists and attendees alike, thank you very much.

I have one final request, which is to fill in the survey, which you should have received by e-mail.  And if you haven't, then it is or it will be linked from the APrIGF website.  But that is going to be really important to take your inputs and your ideas to improve the event in future years.  So I hope you can help us with that.  But thank you for that, in advance.

I think for another year we have achieved something here at APrIGF.  We have done this as part of the global IGF process, which is continuing in other places during this year in the tenth year of IGF.  So whether we are all, and I guess we're not all going to make it to Brazil this year, I think we can all know that we have been part of a global process and be proud of that.  Proud to make a contribution, which will help to ensure that it continues.

And so on that note, thanks again for being part of it. Thanks.

(Applause)

>> LILY KUNG:  Thank you, Paul.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the organizing Committee, I'd like to thank all participants for your support and participation.  It's very exciting to see Internet viewers from all over the globe getting together to learn and exchange ideas in the Internet community.  We hope to see all of you again in the next APrIGF in Taipei.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> LILY:  So there will be a cocktail session after this. Everybody, we will have a cocktail session at the Seasons Restaurant.  So after three days of work, let's enjoy drinks together and mingle and meet people.

And just a reminder, we will have the first shuttle bus at 5:30, if those who are really tired and you want to go, you can go first.  But of course I encourage you to stay with us for the

cocktails.  And then we will have the second shuttle bus later at 6 o'clock.
    Thank you.
    (End of session 17:25)

                              ***