



APrIGF Macao 2015 Workshop Summary Report

Date: 2 July 2015

Time: 14:00 – 15:30

Workshop Title: Developing IG principles with geographic diverse perspective

Reported by & Contact Email: Liyun HAN, hanliyun@cnnic.cn

Gender Balance (approx. number of female vs. male participants): 3 females and 3 males

Moderators: Liyun HAN, Policy Executive, Dept. of International Affairs, CNNIC, AP Region

Panelists:

Ms. Nan CHU, Information Consultant, Dept. of International Affairs, CNNIC, AP Region, Technical Community, Confirmed.

Mr. Edmon CHUNG, CEO, DotAsia, AP Region, Technical Community, to be confirmed.

Ms. Lianna GALSTYAN, ISOC AM ALS Coordinator & Board member, ISOC Armenia, AP Region, Civil Society, Confirmed.

Mr. Leonid TODOROV, General Manager, APTLD, AP Region, Technical Community, Confirmed.

Mr. Paul Byron WILSON, General Director, APNIC, AP Region, Technical Community, Confirmed.

A brief summary of presentations

Title: Developing IG principles with geographic diverse perspective

Summary:

During the last 25 years, the endeavors in producing principles of the Internet Governance never stopped. Especially in the recent years, many global Internet communities have confronted increasingly public problems and have also faced with conflicts when they use the ICTs, as well as promoting Internet Development. Accordingly, in order to solve the present problems and to build up a relatively effective and a legitimate Internet Governance ecosystem, we have made a lot of effort on reaching a universal principle to regularize our behavior in IG. Nevertheless, the process of proposing and achieving consensus on principles is one of the most complicated ongoing endeavors. What's more, it has not yet reached a full consensus and it may never do so. This does not mean that the efforts are vain; on the contrary, discussing principles is crucial to any governance process especially when diverse actors and stakeholders are involved.

So far, besides the basic consensus reached at WSIS, the various stakeholders including global Internet organizations, countries, the technical communities, and other academia have made substantial attempts on proposing IG principles. However, it is notwithstanding difficult to extract a single set of principles from all the proposals. But, this does not mean that the efforts are vain; on the contrary, the workshop aims to proposing a thought-provoking question for discussion, “ Is it more reasonable that we should respect the diversity of understanding the principles, and the most importance is to promote the common but differentiated principles as well as the relevant explanation and understanding?”

In this workshop, a roundtable was organized with distinguished panelists from different communities and regions. The workshop discussed why and how to interpret the principles from the diverse regional perspective, which includes followed issues:

- What are the efforts have done on proposing the IG principles?
- What are the broadest consensus and the most intense debates on these?
- How to regard the governance environment (such as the region, geography, culture, and language factors) influence on IG principle interpretation?
- How to understand and implement the principles from the diverse regional perspective?
- Is it necessary to develop regional IG principles?

A substantive summary and the main issues that were raised:

The workshop constitutes four sessions.

During the first session of warm-up, the Moderator, Liyun Han firstly introduced the themes of four sessions and each of the panelists. She pointed out the importance of conducting this dialogue, which provides a platform for understanding the diversity and respective practice during the IG principles development. Moreover, the proposing process of the IG principles is inevitably affected by the IG governance environment and different cultural values, the region-analyzing model should be encouraged and introduced to develop the IG principles.

Liyun then pointed out that in current diverse context and environment, it is probably possible that the same principle might be interpreted differently and different expressions of some principles could actually indicate the same thing. Therefore, it is more reasonable



for people to respect the diversity of understanding IG principles in the different governmental environment, among which the most significant effort is to promote common but differentiated principles due to respectively explanation.

The second session is **Brief Introduction of respective IG principles proposed by the diverse nations.**

Firstly, Ms. Nan CHU, an Information Consultant from CNNIC introduced IG principles development in China based on her experiences in technical communities. She mentioned that when Chinese President Xi Jinping visited a Brazilian Council in 2014, Xi said China would like to cooperate and work with the world under a specific Internet governance system, which has three characters: “Multi-lateral”, “Democratic” and “Transparent”. Chu Nan then explained these three characters one by one. She compared the definition of “Multi-lateral” with “Multi-Stakeholders”, and brought an idea from Chinese Prime Minister “Internet PLUS”. She explained the idea of “Democratic” as a need to share mutual respect, the foundation of cooperation is to have equal basis. Thirdly, “transparent” refers to the public have rights to know the process of Internet Governance, and the access needs to expand to all kinds of parties and organizations. Followed by this, Nan also pointed out that China is currently facing two big challenges: The development in different areas inside China is imbalanced; the ongoing developing Internet Industry is confronting the new upgrading. Lastly, she summarized the ultimate goal of China is “Inclusion”, which is equal and sustainable development.

As the second speaker, Ms. Lianna GALSTYAN, the board member from ISOC Armenia and the Strategic Engagement Director of APNIC gave a short speech. Firstly, she made a short introduction of Armenia. After that, Lianna presented 17 Internet Governance principles in Armenia, which are: Providing people with Internet access、 Supporting the system of domain names、 Supporting DNSSEC、 Human rights protection in Internet、 A security in the framework、 Privacy protection and identification、 Innovation、 Protection of Intellectual Property、 Preventing copyright violation、 Supporting development among end-users、 Supporting establishment of local exchange centers of Internet traffic、 Supporting regulation only when it is necessary、 Development of Internet numbering and addressing system、 Child Online Protection、 Supporting free and open content development、 Network neutrality、 and supporting open standards.

The third session is **the voice from the Asia Pacific’s Internet organization.**



In the beginning, Mr. Paul Byron Wilson, the General Director of APNIC illustrated his point of view on regional perspective of Internet Governance principals. He interpreted the definition of “region” firstly, saying that regions are indeed defined differently for various purposes, which could result from geographic or cultural or economic or even religious reasons. Mr. Wilson then proposed a word called "Microcosm". A microcosm is a global thing, and a region is a “microcosm” of a global scene. Mr. Wilson took APNIC as an example; he said that APNIC region is defined graphically from administrative convenience perspectives. Therefore, the engagement with United States serves as a type of geographic political and regional differentiation. Mr. Wilson believed that the regional Internet registry system is one of the administrative conveniences, and IP address policies are managed on a regional basis from regional communities. He agreed that not to put more emphasis on regions or try to project too much in terms of differences at a regional level, and not to expect much difference at that scale. He also raised the form of participation. In the end, Mr. Wilson regarded APrIGF as good for exposing things in the region.

The second speaker of this session is Leonid TODROVE, the General Manager of APTLD. In his opinion, the Asia Pacific region is very wisely diverse in language, but more significantly, diverse in cultural code. As for the western society such as UK and USA, they share the same legacy, ranging from historical, cultural, and religious perspectives. Whereas for Asia, each country has their own typical tradition, and their government plays a significant role respectively. Hence, Mr. Todrove considered that it’s hard to say this region is entirely multi-stakeholder based or not. He then raised a question about possibilities of Civil Society organizations to involve in developing Internet Governance principles. Secondly, he pointed out the interplay of stakeholders in this region is quite different, and took the different successful pattern between Alibaba and Amazon as an example. Finally, he concluded that the different sets of Internet Governance principals are based on each countries tradition.

In the end, Mr. Edmon CHUNG, CEO of Dot Asia Organization (the organizer of APrIGF) made the last speech. He found it interesting to look at region as a kind of microcosm of the global Internet governance discussion, however indeed, there is some difference, like Mr. Wilson and Mr. Todrove have mentioned. Mr. Chung, from his point of view, believing that the fundamental thing is participation, and there are diverse participations from different stakeholders. Afterwards, he explained how to participate as well as get it started. Sometimes, the assumption on participation is overly optimistic, while it is actually hard to get in. For instance, when people talk about IG, it is easily to think about ICANN or IGF, they allow anybody to walk in and participate. But just by being open itself may not be enough.



He believed this is something extremely paramount for Asia Pacific region to understand, because just being open could be pretty intimidating for people to participate in.

The forth session is the **discussion** by all panelists and participating audiences at this panel, with respect to **how to develop IG principles with geographic diverse perspective**.

Five Speakers have demonstrated their opinions on diversification of geographic IG governance and clearly illustrated of “multi-lateral” and “multi-stakeholder”. Some of the misunderstandings between these two words are probably come from geographic diversity problem. And maybe it is better for us not stick to the definition but to think beyond these two words, and go deep into what exactly we want to denote and find out the substance of the process. As for the term “Multistakeholderism”, it might be difficult to translate it to any language, but we all understand the fundamental concept behind this: different parties, different interested groups are gathering together to discuss the same thing from different angles. “Multistakeholderism” is just one of those instruments which should help us reach that final destination. Therefore, it is important for everyone to look at the essence rather than sticking in the language meanings.

Conclusion & Further Comments:

The principle of Internet Governance is a guideline to direct common behaviors in Internet Governance, but if we ignore the environment of the region and just purely discuss general IG principles, it is still hard to reach a common consensus. When we talk about geographic diverse, it's of great importance to really consider whether we can agree on core values of the Internet or not. And the form of participation in developing IG is beyond any group or a company or a country, it is the ability to test out some of our thoughts. Although there are many different principles from regional perspectives, the ultimate goal is still to use regional concept to understand IG principles and better implement IG principles.

In conclusion, the Internet as a global phenomenon, a global infrastructure, shows that there is not much depends on or that varies vastly according to conditionings in particular. There are countless and infinite ways to divide Internet communities, we should better look at diversities across regions and issues and the core values while implementing IG principles. And if we do so, a genuine open platform will be started, misunderstanding can be fully discussed and the ideas of Internet Governance could be better implemented in particular regions and communities.