

FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM  
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:  
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT  
MACAO 2015  
3 JULY 2015  
ROOM 1  
09:00

LOCALISING INTERNET GOVERNANCE: MAKING MULTISTAKEHOLDER  
COLLABORATION WORK AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL  
MERGER 2

Captioning Provided By:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
800-825-5234

\* \* \*

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.  
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided  
in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may  
not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \*

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

>> MODERATOR: Good morning, everyone, this is the last day of  
the sessions. Thank you so much for, thank you for coming to this  
session. Today is the last day so there are key topics that will be  
covered and one of them is Localizing Internet Governance in the sector  
of the Asia-Pacific, and we have a list of distinguished speakers  
from all of the regions in Asia-Pacific starting with the person  
Akinori Maemura who will be joining us. He is the general manager  
for the Internet development part at JPNIC. Hasanul Haq Inu is next  
to me. He is the minister, Ministry of Information Government of the  
People's Republic of Bangladesh. And next to him is Mr. Rajesh from  
Spectra Net, and he will be speaking from South Asia perspective.  
And next to him is Ms. Lianna Galstyan and she is from ISOC Armenia  
and she is the board member of the ISOC Armenia chapter. Thank you  
for being here. And Armenia is part of North Asia.

And next to her is another young lady, her name is Nito and she  
is from the Foundation for Alternate Media from the Philippines, so  
she will give the southeast region perspective. And next to her is  
the gentleman his name is Leonid Todorov and he is from the Asia region

of Russia and Russia is actually part of Asia-Pacific, and because Russia is huge it covers both Europe and Asia. He will be speaking about Asia and crossing over to the European area of Russia.

So he will be sharing interesting perspectives from various paths that he carries. We have a comprehensive list of speakers who I'm sure will provide a lot of insights and also to share their perspectives on Internet Governance in Asia-Pacific, and I would like to give you a bit of a background why we have decided to conduct this particular topic, and thanks to the Armenian chapter who also proposed a similar topic on Internet Governance Forum that we decided to merge the Armenian proposal with ISOC's proposal for this session.

So the hot topic in Asia-Pacific is if you look at the number of national IGFs in this region, you will see that actually we have a very low number of national IGFs. Compare that to, say, for instance, in Africa or in Europe or even Latin America there is a great deal more activity, and also there is actually a formal Forum that allows different groups of stakeholders interested in the Internet policies and Internet Governance issues to go to a place where they can share their opinions and share concerns in their communities.

In Asia-Pacific we have this particular one which is called the Asia-Pacific NGO Forum, and it is, it is actually the only regional Forum that allows all of us to be here in one place to discuss about things that matter in Asia-Pacific. So we do have governance. We do have private sectors here. We do have Civil Society talking about things that matter in Asia-Pacific. But, again, the voices in Asia-Pacific is quite under represented not just within the IGF but within the region itself, and I think one thing as a member of the MSG is how do we fully promote people to participate in the regional IGF in Asia knowing that a lot of countries still don't have that local platform. So this discussion is focusing on how do we actually encourage more stakeholders in our region form their own groups. It doesn't have to be in the IGF Forum, but a Forum where Internet Governance policies can be discussed.

So the difference is they will be sharing best practices, some of the experiences, their views on challenges and also perhaps we will be doing a bit of breaking the norm by also questioning whether Internet Governance is actually a relevant platform for this region. And that we will do at the end of the presentation. So we will start off with five minutes presentation from the different speakers and if we could start with honorable minister. We will start with perhaps -- are you ready to be the first speaker? So whenever you are ready to start. Before you start, I will just like to mention that the presentation of each of the speakers is on what are the key challenges of developing a local IGF in your country or in your region.

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay, again, can you hear me? I am really not sure. Okay. Thank you very much. I confirm my voice is heard

with the captioner. Thank you, captioner. Good morning, everyone, my name is Akinori Maemura. I am working for Japan Network Information Center and I am involved in a lot of coordination activity in Japan and I'm involved in APNIC Executive Council. I ask you to accept my sincere apology that I cannot make myself available in Macao. I originally planned to come to Macao and I have to change my schedule and I am right now in New York at 9:00 p.m., but I'm happy to appear on this session.

So this session was originally merged three sessions into one, and then my part is a little bit larger than the IGF scope. Let me share my presentation. Can I do that? Let me try. My original idea was to showcase the Internet coordination setup in each country. Are you seeing my slide right now?

Oh, I'm quite not sure if my slide was shared. Did you see that? And I right now lost the voice audio from Macao. I cannot hear right now. So let me go on my part of the speech. So my original idea was showcasing and comparing the setup of -- all right, audio is back. Can you hear me?

>> MODERATOR: If you could pause to start sharing your screen because our screen is showing that you are not sharing your screen.

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, I know. That's fine right now. Let me finish my part of the speech. So the idea was, again, that to compare the setup of the Internet coordination structure in each country, so I suggest that we will do that in the future, and I am happy to facilitate the comparison and the showcasing, such a setup, and let's do that.

So then I should answer to the question, what are the challenges for the local IGF? I, unfortunately, I am not a part of the coordinator group of the IGF Japan. That's, that's an IGF activity in Japan, but I cannot represent the IGF Japan, but I, in the JPNIC I am doing another activity which is called IGCJ, Internet Governance Conference Japan. And that's another activity for the Internet Governance.

Through this activity I repeatedly feel that it is very difficult to raise awareness for the Internet Governance in the broader community in Japan so what we are trying through the IGCJ activity is increasing awareness and sharing the knowledge and the information about the various Internet Governance agenda. IGCJ is one meeting in two months or something, and we have already had several meetings, so each time we gather 30 to 50 participants to the IGCJ meeting and we deal with a lot of agenda, but the main focus is the INS transition.

So every time we update IANA tradition, and as well as that we have to share some sort of IG agenda, for example, intellectual property, the Cloud or data privacy or network neutrality. So still that kind of, that agenda is just the phase of the education phase and not many people can discuss this topic. So right now we think that still we need to continue the effort to get more people involved, get more people to come to such a Forum, and get more people understand

various agenda, and then have them discussed.

So it is a long way, but I think we need to try again and again, and to have the increased base of the Internet Governance discussion in Japan. And that's all from my point. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: How long, just one question. How long have you been established?

>> AKINORI AMEMURA: I established last year in June. So that's just after the IANA transition was announced from NTIA, and then the JPNIC has been doing the IP address and the domain of things which is very important, resource management for the infrastructure. So we start that meeting with this agenda. Then after that, the JPNIC change our mind slightly to have the continuous activity and to have that meeting as the continuous activity, and named it IGCI to handle a lot of agendas. Am I answering your question?

>> MODERATOR: Please stay online, because after all of the presenters are done, we will have a discussion. Thank you.

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: We go to the next presenter. This is an ad hoc platform to address the IANA transition. This was in June of last year, but it served as (Off microphone). We will now go to Rajesh.

>> RAJESH GEM: Thank you. I am Rajesh Gem. We are familiar with IGF process. One of the issues in setting up in India, we have access group about two years ago, and it was expected to meet regularly, but it is not able to meet regularly. That is number one. Number two, there is no Secretariat who literally coordinates and does the activity because like IGF we actually meet two days. Similarly that sense of ideas should also meet three months of this IGF and follow up giving the national IGF inputs to the pre-IGF and have it presented to IGF.

Now, IGF's main objective has been to bring people together from various stakeholder groups, but one thing which, there has to be a funding mechanism. It will not be as productive, and there has to be coordinating of activity plus the process. Now, basic objective both current and multi-direction. Face to face we think it is very very important. And this should be so classified and not hide behind issues and that is equally important.

Another thing which we are finding is that in this policy if IGF says that we should be able to discuss policy and write policy with us both public and private. But when we run policy makers like we have here, now, for them we participate and develop a meeting is very challenging. We should ask them, because they understand the need of the people. They present the need of diplomacy. They know how to run and drive it. We should be able to ask them what do you need from Internet?

This question needs to be asks of them. Because whatever the policy maker says. By asking them what do they need from such Internet.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, that's also very clear, so there is a firm in India basically to address some of these IG issues and it was clearly stated.

Thank you. We move to the next speaker, Lianna Galstyan from the Armenia chapter.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: I am a board member of ISOC as well as representing the ISOC Armenia in ICANN as a certified structure. I am also a member of the initiative group apply to ICANN for their meeting ITN which has been done a year ago. The application was sent to ICANN a year ago. And just two weeks ago we had signed an agreement with ICANN so the process will start very soon.

I would like to say that I am also ccTLD manager so the one case as we are kind of policy makers in the domain system industry, and as ISOC we are a technical community. As for the meeting about the IGF, I remember a question by Armenia as a chapter being so functioning for so long period for already 20 years, we didn't know to have IGF and for this year, we will have our first IGF.

I think that in this sense we wanted to do a theme in the right way. What is IGF? It is a kind of a multistakeholder theme so that every stakeholder, every interested party being involved in IG discussions. But in this sense, if only ISOC Armenia organized the IGF, that would be only participation from one stakeholder group. And we in this sense, we would not keep the spirit of IGF. And that's why we wanted to have the organisation which will either be itself a multistakeholder. And we have created a national Internet Governance counsel with participation that members participate, Government, NGOs, we have technical community, we have business sector, and academia involved. Mass media is there. We also have representative of Ombudsman office, so that too will have Human Rights support if there would be a need for that.

So we really have this Council, multistakeholder, and that was the challenge, I think, for this period to build up this group. And now, when we have it and we have the participation by the Government and by the whole community, we are going to have our request for IGF in September. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you.

>> I am from Foundation for Media with ICT policy. We have been working -- we are a non-government organisation and we have existed for 27 years already even before the Internet has come in in the Philippines. So for the past maybe seven years the FMA has been involved in Internet Governance issues and we have been attending Internet Governance Forums, global and we actually started in the Asia-Pacific region of IGF. And we realized that we really need national IGF because we believe that the IGF should really have an approach. So right now, just early this year we started doing or we started providing a space or initiating a space where different stakeholders can come together and talk about Internet Governance.

It was actually driven by Civil Society and by each sector. We were able to get someone from the big Internet, I mean, organize it with a major company in the Philippines and we have been also working with the Government office who has been also working on ICT or who in is in charge of looking at ICT in the country.

So these or this initiative actually can be the nature of a series of collaboration amongst stakeholders in the Philippines. We don't have yet an IGF. We have started the process of making sure that different stakeholders come together and talk about the future of the Internet and about the governance aspect of the Internet. We have some problems with governance in the ICT because we don't have a dedicated department yet. We are still optimistic that we will be able to push this forward as different stakeholders are really, they really show their care or they really show their concern on Internet Governance. So I'm happy to see we have all women representing Civil Society and also from the Government and technical community from the Philippines here in the Asia-Pacific regional IGF.

And it's a good thing because I think more women are being exposed now in Internet Governance discussion. And I think it's important for local IGF initiatives to come together not just those local IGFs that are established formal process and formal structures, but also to encourage those countries or those organisations or those spaces that are just new that provides -- those spaces that provides multistakeholder discussion on Internet Governance. So I know that in Indonesia, there is an ID which is also a space where different organisations come together and talk about Internet Governance. I know there is one in Thailand. Thailand is initially being together with some friendly Government institutions and companies who are also interested in talking about Internet Governance in their country.

And there are a lot of countries in Southeast Asia who are also interested in this. So this is a good platform. The Asia-Pacific region is a good platform to provide national IGF initiatives. Not just the formal one, but informal and encouraging those attending from their own countries to start having local discussion. The local -- we always say that it's one of our -- but it's also time for us to walk the dog and do it locally. So thank you.

>> MODERATOR: May I ask for a couple more minutes?

>> LEONID TODOROV: I'm from Russia and I will be speaking, having my Russian. I would kindly ask for some extra minutes because I want to show you some video, but not right now. Let me start with quite unorthodoxed question. What time is it now in Munich? Here it is 6:00. 6:00 in the morning. We are just talking to you in this room but I would mention how many young people are right now crossing the borders of Iraq and Syria to join Islamic state? Dozens if not hundreds. Here with us in this room, why have they opted for joining Islamic state? And that's the question we should bear in mind when we talk about IGFs, about national IGFs about regional IGF.

So what we are missing in this picture is that those young people who should be attracted, who should be somehow engaged rather than spending, wasting their lives and their vigor for what is really sinister and wrong and dangerous for the world. I want to discuss here competitive advantages of Islamic states, let's say, marketing and communication policy. We need to ask ourselves how can we find and add value to our IGFs? And my answer, for example, for the Russian IGF, we are trying to establish ourselves as a platform and bottom up. We are multistakeholder-based for sure because we have representatives of the Government and Civil Society and the community and academia, and business. We have 500 to 800 people in the room for the opening and they are staying on until the end of the day.

So we have just one day event every year. It's our sixth IGF was in April. Most importantly I think we should understand that we should make this event interesting, engaging, and, I'm sorry to say this word, entertaining. We should sell this event, because there are so many distractions in the world. To do that we start with very compelling, for example, headings for our sessions. Like a session for technical issues, we could rephrase a little bit, the famous song and we share the same technology in brackets regardless of ideology. People like that. It sets of tone of the discussion. Not we Russians against the whole world, you know, we are under sanctions now. But where are we on the same page. How we can cooperate and how we can build a better and more sustainable technical platform for Internet.

And we discuss Human Rights as well, and we discuss many other issues but we have an enormous privilege of being in between western certainly correctness and I would say oriental columnist low profile. That has given us our oomph and you can see a representative of academia yelling at the Government representative. What kind of stuff we are talking about. You shouldn't talk like this.

So, in other words, it's an open-ended event and most important some of my colleagues just said, it's also inclusive in the sense that we try to bring together people not only from overseas, but the Russian speaking environment, those countries who were part of the Soviet Union and who still come to our events no matter what, even Ukrainians are there. And we share the spirit of collaboration and the spirit of communication and proceed pursuing the same having sustain, open, free and unrestricted Internet in our country.

So every country in our region is there. I will tell you one thing, this is not about policies and so forth. I believe that a great deal is what I call for myself info-tainment or edu-tainment, and you can just show this video to better understand how can we engage people who don't, you know, in some kind of education about all of this. If you could do this.

Thank you. It is in Russian with English subtitles. You will see it. I'm sorry. Before this. It was five years of Russian IGF.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much, that was very enlightening,

entertaining and to the point. Now, I would like to invite Hasanul Haq Inu.

>> HASANUL HAQ INU: I am the chairperson of the IGF of the Bangladesh. This chapter was born in 2007 with multistakeholderism. The Government now passed a comprehensive law on ICT. And now to combat certain things the Government has come up with two or three adopting cyber law and we are trying to reduce. (Garbled audio). The people are not involved in the whole Internet process. But there are special aspects, legal aspect. So actually this multistakeholderism is not like this in limited practice.

So because local Internet Governance needs to interpret Government, and it needs to be the community, the lawmakers and the Internet users. The local Internet Governance need to be equipped so they can interact with each of these sectors. Internet illiteracy is one problem. The lack of laws to govern cyber, the Government and non-government person is another problem. And there are technical challenges, legal challenges and atmospheric challenges. They are not aware of the local challenges at the localized level.

And ICT receives another challenge, and how to go to standardization of equipment and how to go, how to develop content in the mother language. That is another thing. And as we already discussed there is Net Neutrality, privacy, intellectual property rights these are the topics in grassroots level Internet user. So my position is that let the International Governance Forum equip local IGF with technical and legal knowledge so that local IGF can tell the people. So capacity building of the idea is very important and localized IGF, generalized IGF and international IGF are not corroborating literally. That is a problem.

So the members are coming to the meeting, sometimes the regional meeting discussing this level, but we need continuous collaboration to build capacity with the members of the country. That is important. And here at the moment, across the water in Bangladesh also and the other countries is control and rights how you manage it. That is a major debate we seek publicly. So these are the areas why we need to collaborate to localize and properly put to the Government and lawmakers.

And to educate the Internet users. So my proposal is that the IGF, they can give us the sources at the national level they come and give lectures and educate us about this total issue so that the IGF can collaborate with the Government and lawmakers, educate the end users, the Internet users. So localize, how to overcome the obstacles, how to enforce your rights. These are big issues.

So if you can find a sheet and support is with the lawmakers and the people it will collaborate. We have no solution to this question as yet. Thank you very much.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, sir. Some of the recommendations you mentioned is going to the panel discussion, so it's actually a good

opportunity to, as an introduction to our next part of the discussion is actually to pose some questions back to our speakers. We have heard, just take a minute to do a short wrap up of what was said by all of the speakers here. So we have two types of Forum, the so called, the more formal Forum as in the international IGF, and the informal Forums where basically you form your own groups to come together as stakeholders to discuss Internet Governance issues.

So what I'm hearing from these speakers is in Bangladesh you have a national IGF, Japan has one, and Russia has one. And countries that don't have, like Armenia, you are forming one, the Philippines doesn't have one yet, but it also working towards one with the different groups of stakeholders in your country. So looking at this, you can see that regardless whether you have a formal platform, that there is somewhere in the community itself a space by which you can actually address these issues, but some of the issues that were raised at least in the challenges of how do you create the visibility regardless of whether you have an IGF Forum or not in your country, because there are a lot of topics in the Internet Governance space that public are interested in. In the case of Japan, you have IANA and other issues of interest.

But at the same time, there are countries where Internet Governance is still not as visible. How do you get the public to be interested in your Forum and interested in this topic? That is one of the main challenges. How do you, the approach, how do you get those, that process in place once you have that space to get everyone involved? And, of course, other issues are how do you engage the Government in a way that they are also productive? In one case the Philippines was mentioning most countries in Asia, there isn't a dedicated Government agency that actually has a mandate for Internet Governance, so that that in itself is a problem.

How do you go find someone who will be listening or participating in these Forums? And the other piece that Bangladesh was mentioning was how do Governments basically get engaged in a way they are well informed enough to be part of that discussion? And to do that, they actually need help, there has to be help that may come from the APrIGF Forum. And funding was mentioned as another point of challenge and how to include that.

So I'm posing now back to the speakers here, the first question here is what would be, for instance, suggested to improve what you have already listed just now as the challenges? Firstly, if you had Internet Governance in your country and if you don't have it, how would you go about to actually formalize an IGF in your country? And if you think there are other models in this region or outside this region you think would be examples that we could adopt here in Asia. So maybe we can start with Mr. Maemura.

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: It's key to engage the various stakeholder. I can raise two examples. One is the data privacy.

Data privacy was being discussed in the cabinet Secretariat and at the time I think that was because the Government think that they cannot set up the act without hearing the stakeholders' voice. Then there is a large Study Group to discuss how the data privacy laws should be. It is really big. I think that there is a big move for Governments to meet the private sector and various stakeholders to get into that role, get into the legislation.

Then IGC itself, it is basically run by JPNIC as the Secretariat, and the coordination of the programme is now involved similar people other than JPNIC. And JPNIC just serve as the Secretariat, but in the coordination group, we have one Government officer, and then they actually really, really support big supporter to the IGCC. IGCC activities are run not only by private sector, but the Government is involved to a certain degree in running it. So that's the Japanese situation. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: (Garbled audio).

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: That's what I was saying.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Let's go to Mr. Rajesh, what do you think the improvements? I know we have listed a few in terms of participation.

>> RAJESH GEM: As I said before, it is very important that there should be a group of policy makers as a subset of that, this IGF. When the policy maker comes to such a meeting, we say that he should also come so he should be able to share and participate their concerns. The second part is once again there has to be a formal process of while in this IGF they commence the policy making additions and they there should be a response back from the policy makers saying this cannot be or this needs further deliberations. So presently like in India, the meetings, the follow-up action is rather weak. The next time in the meeting we meet again, the same issues crop up again, the same thing is discussed with the discussion and, for example, net neutrality, it is interpreted differently different context.

Now, net neutrality is one subject, there is no simplification is another subject. Now, if local businessmen is not in business of Internet, then that business sector is getting hurt. So as we say inclusiveness is vital, but the business community should be a bigger business. And, of course, the inclusiveness process, it depend, as our friend told, it is a process. And there are different issues. So if we have a two-way dialogue between the discussion of policy makers, that could help.

>> MODERATOR: I think the one thing you said is that the formal process, I think about how do you, how do you create a dialogue? Once they are there in the platforms, how do you create a dialogue by which that dialogue is productive and that there is sort of a process in which there is feedback between the different stakeholders and the policy makers or building accountability in terms of how do you follow up and when the next meeting comes along, how do you deepen that

dialogue, continue the conversation rather than coming back to the same problems or discussion which basically does not move along those governance issues?

And I think to put it simply, how do you bridge the different conversation and the dialogues in the interest of different stakeholders, given there are so many topics in India like Net Neutrality, equal access and other things that are very important for the Indian community? And that's well said, sir. Next.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: I would say the models, coming to the models preparation, I have been a member of Southwestern European Internet Governance which is an initiative and a part of organising team of EuroDIG for a session. I have seen the same process with multistakeholder and transparent and they for topics of interest they call for organizers to make the sessions, they take into account the balance between stakeholders, between regions, countries, between taking into account the gender balance. So look at the APrIGF. It's the same process. We have mostly the same thing. So in this regard the principles and the same process has been implicated. So we have the link between the same processes.

So the model can be implicated in different regions, and the same thing is happening here. And that is what I can say there are model settings, there are rules are the same in the whole world and I'm sure at the regions there is the same thing preparing the IGF. So it is the participation. Medical me so when we were asking about registering the IGF initiative because there is a formal process and you have to have it. I think there is a series of the meetings, et cetera, et cetera, so there is that in the United Nations. And you think it's easy, but it's difficult. The whole space is what they were trying to ask, how do you make sure that there is, I mean, it's progressing, the space is progressing, how do you keep track?

In the context of the Philippines, the Internet Governance and ICT policies relatively under developed discourse. For us, that's not the objective to have like agreements, but the important thing is to just have a space, to just come together. It's very important because not all people would really think how, I mean, governing Internet. So that's important.

And also just talk and basically what is Internet Governance is, what are the issues that are being discussed in the country, and what are each stakeholder's views on specific issues? So that's where we, that's, I think it is important as of the moment. Where we have been convening multistakeholder already, we have been holding like multistakeholder privacy, for example, and there are differing not interests, but same interests, but differing context, you know.

For Government, it's important for, privacy is important for them because there is a law, and they want to protect privacy, but they don't know how to do it. So there are lawyers and public interest lawyers who can help them and Civil Society advocates who would be

able to inject some input into the conversation, and that could be adopted. So I think just cultivating a space where people can talk about Internet Governance issues is very important.

And as at the moment, that's what we are focusing on.

>> LEONID TODOROV: Well, thank you. I'm afraid I was just bringing some business perspective, but I believe it's important to establish a brand of the national IGF and the regional IGF. Once you have your unique identity, that will help you generate a certain awareness, and that would help establish, propagate some things which would help create some consistency. So in April there will be the Russian IGF and we will be discussing various issues, plus to make it more attractive to sell it, you got to find some very good speakers, and then from that point you can journey to sort of engage the Government, because the Government is already, they are already aware.

Well, there is an event, it's a meaningful event. For them it's a dual purpose exercise. One is to take the temperature in the room. So what is on? What is really interesting? What really is the community concerned about? And, second, well, minister, you may disagree with me, but we Government people are human beings and to be for a moment in the limelight it's also important whether it be Prime Minister or minister. So to be going in a direction of let's say Civil Society or technical community, it's deeply important to them. And we are very keen to push their button cautiously to keep them engaged.

So yet another point is to build a legacy, and I have an excellent quotations here. If she can live with her product prefer that perpetually adds value to the lives of others, she has not only success, but a legacy. So adding value every time, you know, elevating that level of awareness, level of expertise. Then people will be naturally attracted to you. Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: (Garbled audio). The most important thing is you want to stay new, but you want to make sure there is a balance of representation, different voices and so forth. That's a very important point. To the Philippines, you were mentioning about, yes, you need to have that space and the space to recognize different views and basically create that visibility of the different stakeholders that need to come to participate and create this meaningful space, and to create unique identity. When you do a platform, be it an IGF formal platform or a non-formal platform, it's basically equal participation for everyone. You want the Government, if the Government wants to speak, then they should also do their homework and be part of the conversation, measure the temperature, but as someone who is actually organising IGFs itself, you need to bring something relevant to the table that is important to those conversations. So the last one, which is very important because the whole idea of why we are having this session is as you know, the development programme is coming to an end the end of this year, and

the new agenda which is on Sustainable Development Goals is looking at connecting the next millennium agenda.

So I would like to address this question back to the speakers in the context of developing an Internet Governance Forum in your country in your local community, what would be one key recommendation. I will start with Maemura. I note that Japan is the exception. Who would be your reflection given that you have connected most of your connected most of your population already?

>> AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. So as I said, Japan has a quite high ratio of broadband, and it is a bit not very popular topic in Japan, but still we have not, we have not only the northern area, but we have the marginal area. And in the marginal area, sometimes there is no understood and the interesting phenomenon is that in quite urban area, there is a quite high penetration ratio that was smart Forum, but, for example, once we, once we are away from, for example, Tokyo, and going to the neighboring prefecture, then the Smart Phone penetration ratio has a huge drop. Smart Phone kind of thing is, I do think it has such relationship between, an important ratio with the Smart phone, but it is something that is happening in Japan. So how to connect more and more people in Japan is not that easy.

So that's what I felt now in my own observation. And I don't think this is an answer to your question, but just for the information for the panelist. Thank you.

The technical and economic problems are not small. The idea of Developing Countries is to, the major problem will be ICT literacy. That is the end challenge with my understanding. If you can do that, then everything will be all right. If you can give a mobile phone, but they do not have the ICT literacy then it's useless.

So the technical community has to solve this problem. So they have Smart Phone at a cheap price. So that is not a problem. The problem is ICT literacy.

>> INDIA: I think one key accommodation will be that the user should feel that Internet is good and safe to use. So that would mean, and, of course, the issues of language comes. Initially in India with some statistics, 10 to 15% only can use niche text for Internet. So first thing is in education, the Internet is good. It has to be push factor. The second part is that learning how to use Internet safe, as a medium should be safe, but how the user uses it, and the user has to be told that information. Back up is there, but what he is getting and what he is storing will not disappear with time. And the important thing is that Internet should develop non-text which is multimedia. There has to be more focus on audio and video communication and education.

So in audio means that if I can ask a question from somebody, I should get answer back in audio and video and not as a text, because text, there is implications of the text, younger population is more

used to text, keyboards, older generation is not.

>> LIANNA GALSTYAN: As for me I think the open and free content development would be the recommendation and in this regard as the previous panelist talked, the language issue, that is to say the IDN. So the content development and IDN will be the key factors to bring more people to the Internet, and in this regard, as the IDN most people will have the greatest part will be the Asia-Pacific region so that they are the most diverse users are from this region and this from my region will be the next, that would be my recommendation. Thank you.

>> LEONID TODOROV: For every person that spoke on this issue, I would add that I believe there should be that strive to preserve, nurture and solidify the capacity of ccTLDs in all of the country because ccTLDs have long proved that local domain registries, natural centre of gravity, if not nucleus for many processes, and they, you know, they are exercise very important, I would say function in preserving the Internet as a public. And as such, it should be retain or solidified so that they could just keep up doing that very important societal and social mission. Thank you.

>> PHILIPPINES: There will be challenges in terms of this space if you want to also talk about connecting, and connecting the unconnected or sometimes the disconnected, because. That will be a point of contention because there really are a lot of debates already going on. And it's actually good to have those discussions in the Internet Governance space. So I think, so it's important to still have that space as I said. And you are going back to the Internet Governance to registering and the Internet Governance initiative, I think the APrIGF is a good platform to encourage each country who are attending, but to give information to each country that are attending that they can start, they can initiate an IGF initiative and maybe help them with the requirements of what to do and how to do it, and continue talking about localizing Internet Governance.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you so much to all of the speakers who have done an amazing job on giving me one recommendation, and shall I read that, because we are running out of time. So the one recommendation that is important an IGF Forum to address the next million. In Japan talking Smart Phone, but talking digital divide as well. You don't have ubiquitous coverage outside of Tokyo, and what I think Tokyo and as we continue to grow, what we continuously need to do is that every user needs to be connected to the Internet at all times. That's now, so even for Japan, that will be the challenge, although they would be connecting to the new users.

As for the rest of us who are still working on connecting the next million, the recommendations include the next level will be local content, local languages, and for a lot of the countries in Asia, a lot of illiteracy or disabled people as well as people, aging societies, non-text content will be of great value in video and audio

format.

Bringing in proficiencies in ICT literacy as well as in safety is the biggest concern, yes, because we will be the largest region of Internet users in the world. This is the region with the largest number of languages and vernacular languages so even the non-text content where vernacular languages to preserve their culture not just for communication and very important is the ccTLD. How do you preserve them, keep them as what we call the catalyst to insure that the Internet continues to be public good, and that it stays neutral for everyone, and, of course, to say that the space of Internet Governance is not for those who are already connected. It is also for those who are still not connected or who are disconnected completely from the space. How do we draw them into this conversation?

And I think I would wrap it up by saying I think APrIGF the Asia-Pacific regional Forum has a role to play how we continue to support having national IGFs in each country, be it formal or informal, and how do you bridge the different needs and the different stakeholders to come together as a region address some of these key issues? Definitely we can leverage from one another. With that, I would like to end this session, and I would also like to maybe allow for one question from the floor. I'm so sorry that we ran out of time, but is there any question from the floor or from the remote? Anything from the floor?

One or two questions you would like to pose to the speakers? Wow, this is an extremely efficient, if I may say so. Thank you again to the audience for taking the time to listen to us, and thank you to every single speaker here. Thank you so much from Japan. And we will continue to talk about this outside of this room. So, please, keep the Internet Governance conversation alive. Thank you.

(Applause).

(Concluded at 10:30)

\* \* \*

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.

\* \* \*