

FINAL COPY
APrIGF 2017
Bangkok, Thailand
JULY 29, 2017
MERGER 4. TRADE RULES FOR THE DIGITAL ECONOMY: ASIA'S
AGREEMENTS AT THE WTO AND RCEP
1:31 PM

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.captionfirst.com

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

>> JODI: Good afternoon. We'll begin the session in about two more minutes. I think everybody's just wrapping lunch so thank you for your patience. All right. I think we're about to begin. Welcome. My name is JODI. I work for the -- This is a session on trade agreements, and before we begin the session, just show of hands, how many people here in the room have ever been in a face to face trade negotiation? Okay. None. So -- well, apart from our eminent panelists, who I'll get to in a minute, welcome. This is somewhat of a new topic, even for more.

So we'll try to keep it as simple, though given how complex the issue is, we'll see how the discussions go.

On my introducing my panelists now, on my left we have >> WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Thank you. I was requested last minute to join as one of the panelists could not show up. I work for the international institute for trade and development, which is a regional organization, created by the general assembly to support Asia Pacific on development issues so this includes all trade, trade and business laws, and treaties relating to digital trade as well as e-commerce related issues. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. On my right, we have Mr. Wanawit Ahkuputra. He has been -- he's fairly well-known in internet government circles, but on this panel, his expertise is incomparable because we are discussing a trade negotiation called the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, and Mr. Wanawit Ahkuputra is the chair of the working group on e-commerce. On his right is professor Ang Peng Hwa. Professor Ang Peng Hwa of course is a stallworth in IG circle. He also is closely involved with the negotiations that are taking place in

Singapore, which is one of the countries that is involved in these trade negotiations.

And we finally have to his right is Rajnesh Singh who does not need an introduction. He is the only one who's been in a face to face trade negotiation, apart from the other member on this panel. So we're really looking forward to hearing his views. Without further ado, so we're going to try and keep this as bit of a free discussion because the agenda here is to actually introduce people to how trade arena has become the new battle front for internet user rights. The world of trade agreements is changing rapidly, and for those who may be familiar, there are general distinctions between services and goods that are not as clear now in the digital context. So that's one of the first few things we need to bear in mind.

E-commerce negotiations are taking place in multiple trade formats. We have the RCEP, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership that I mentioned. The other famous trade agreement includes the Trans-Pacific Partnership or the TPP. There's in NAFTA and well the TPP and the TISA have been shelved for now. There are talk that these trade agreements that include e-commerce will be arrived. A lot of the signatures to the TPP countries like Japan and Australia are also members that are included -- that are involved in discussions in RCEP. So there's a bit of an overlap over there.

One of the first issues I think that everyone should be aware of is that when negotiators speak of e-commerce, and this comes from the WTO representative, this -- when they speak of e-commerce, not all of them are saying the same thing. So we need to one way of looking and understanding how e-commerce norms are being explored is to actually look at industry demands, which are fairly clear with regard to trade. So while you're here, buzz words like platform economy, the digital revolution, digital marketplace, internet of things or IT production, ICT services, these buzz words, a lot of these buzz words are flying around.

But they all boil down to a specific area, which is ICT governance which is now engrossed in the trade arena space. Also, it is important to flag off that telecom regulation is different internet nonregulation and global competition rules which are standard provisions included in trade negotiations generally.

So to understand where global companies are coming from, in October 2016, a bunch of these companies came together and sent a letter to the USDR, which is the United States trade representative, and laid down a couple of issues that they are trying to insert in as many global areas as possible, either through trade negotiations or through global standard bodies. And just to summarize some of the issues that they have been focusing on consistently over the last few years, the state minimum regulation of the internet. So no IT rules, no global competition rules.

E-commerce rules are of course supported by GAFA which is Google, apple, Facebook, and Amazon. Services rules commitments, technological neutrality, no regulation of new services, cross body computer services, they're also seeking to establish -- so the TPP had a really interesting provision where the apparent transparency an ex-, which included a right to comment on new regulations, which we see in the tobacco area

provides for a compendium of evidence that can be used in arbitration cases for national government.

So trade itself has goods that it's trying to regulate, services. And then you have investment and you have how international disputes are settled. And while on the face, it may not be apparent how these arenas could be used to enforce norms for internet governance at the national level, they do have an intersection and increasingly, companies are realizing that. -- and with respect to the specific areas that are commonly recognized in the trade agenda.

Another important -- so the USDR wish list published in October 2016 was fairly clear on wanting data flows to be free across borders. Prohibition of location of computer facilities or storage managing and processing of data locally. Enabling open and online and cloud platforms to not be accountable for what people put on them. And limiting prohibitions that governments can put on these platforms and companies.

Another letter came from the internet association which also expanded on some of these rights that they're seeking, so protection of copy rite with safe harbor provisions and exceptions. Custom moratorium on e-commerce being made permanent. There is a temporary one at the world trade organization at the moment. Eliminating forced technology transfers, in particularly for developing countries. So prohibitions on disclosure of source code for specific products, for platforms, or even the algorithms that operate these platforms. And they also saw the representative in the USDR office.

On the face of it, these look like really positive development. There is nothing wrong with cross body flow of information or seeking prohibition on locally mandated storage and processing of data. But as we see in these negotiations, there are various countries at different levels of development that are involved, and their agenda in negotiating these issues also varies greatly. So given that the TTP have fallen over, there's a push also at the WTO on e-commerce related issues. Discussions are logically -- so given -- I hope now it's a little bit clear why we're talking about trade because trade is the new frontier of internet governance. But even within the trade arena, a lot of developments have taken place over the last year.

The TISA and the TTP which were two large trade agreements have fallen over. So RCEP becomes -- RCEP at the moment is the largest mega regional trade agreement that is being discussed. The RCEP is not TFTA and the countries involved are unique with their own unique points. So for example, we have China. The narrative that China is pushing for is that it's committed to creating digital free trade zones, both within China and in the region. So you hear of initiatives of the one belt, one road. China has the agenda to push alibaba in competition with the GAFA. So there's that perspective to bear in mind when looking at China's role in these negotiations

We also have countries like Malaysia. So ALIBABA has already established a digital free zone and other countries like Singapore have an issue with that. So there's an interesting dynamic playing out between countries also involved that are competing with each other for data and flow of information. India has its own -- actually, just one more thing on China.

China is also about getting products and services into China and establishing an ecosystem for the digital environment for countries. So whether it's digital databases, financial and logistic regimes, they are seeking to create stable, economic and political systems while digital trade.

India has its own strategy in these negotiations. As we all know, it's invested heavily in the ICT services and it's focused primarily on transferring personal and services since the U.S. has cut off some of these agreements that the countries had. So a lot of the personnel are trained and they don't have enough jobs. So India is pushing for the services aspect. And that kind of interfaces with what these large companies like Google, apple, Facebook, Amazon want, which is not to have global data localization. So for example would be coming from a perspective of trade facilitation on service agreement, free flow of data, no local presence if you're providing services across the border.

>> In RCEP, we also have an mixture of interests. Someone to push for small and medium enterprises, but it is not clear if the frameworks that are being pushed through trade agenda will actually benefit small and medium enterprises. And that of course impacts your local invasion and your local companies. So that's all something to bear in mind. Overall, we have four main concerns regarding e-commerce and conclusion of e-commerce provisions and trade agreements.

The first is rules that prohibit national regulation of digital -- rules that prohibit national regulation frameworks and platforms. The second concern is privacy and consumer protection and how that is being protected through these agreements.

Another issue that is not really been delved into too much is how strong state security powers are used to override agreements that might exist nationally or even between countries.

And finally, we have the e-commerce specific chapters that weigh in on really particular issues, whether it's transfer of data, locating computer facilities within the territory of a country, whether it's about source code disclosure or encryption standard. So those are some of the subissues within the larger framework that we are exploring. It is also not clear at the moment --

One thing I would like to point out is that the TPP had leaks or documents that were made publicly available. The RCEP, however, there have been very few leaks and we do not know currently what is being negotiated in the e-commerce chapter. So a lot of this is guesswork which we are developing based on how discussions have evolved in other trade agreements. It is not clear, for example, if e-commerce will exclude government data or financial services or grants or even government procurement. And how the exceptions will play out in these negotiations at the moment.

So very quickly, I want to highlight and before I open the panel for discussion, I just want to lay down the framework of some of the crucial areas that impact user rights, that are -- that we think are being included in the e-commerce chapter in RCEP. The first is no custom duties on digital products. And I'm going to talk about the pros and cons of each of these provisions that I list out.

So when we talk about custom duties on digital products, of

course it will promote digitalization. It will also support digital only products and the concept that a bottle -- and for digital products, the concept of bottle doesn't make sense, and this is a fairly common observation. But there are -- there's a negative side to it where it will reduce tax revenue for sovereigns. It's not technological nuclear and it will favor rich and established countries, **countries** from the west that are the main producers of these products.

The second issue which might be included in e-commerce chapter would be something called prohibition of Spam. On the face of it, Spam is a consumer protection issue. Apart from annoying, Spam is often used for crime such as fishing. And Spam and trade agreements will promote interruptible solutions. But this is already a problem that technologists have already solved by themselves. It could force countries into adopting technologically specific data solutions, and that -- and Spam laws could also be misused for censorship.

The third issue, which is off a huge interest, given how algorithmic accountability is a topic that has been raised in several panels, is no force disclosure of software source code. While this will prevent countries from facilitating trade secret misappropriation and IT companies made an investment if they could lose their source code, this contacting is used to gain an unfair advantage by illegally depatriating trade secrets. There are examples, like bot nets. It could result in more poor quality software that has bad doors or bugs. There are other more targeted ways to address trade secret misappropriation that are already in place and are being looked at in different forums.

Developing countries become a knowledge point. For example, China really wants to develop its artificial intelligence ecosystem and most of the components are really expensive to import. Having source code access would allow them to build these systems, but if they sign on to agreements that prohibit source code disclosure, the AI ecosystem overall could suffer.

Coming to the next issue, it's a fairly important one, which is service providers locate data locally. From the perspective of countries, this will prevent inefficient duplication of infrastructure investment. It eliminates locals for local censorship or interception of data flows. And would be prohibitive for small and medium enterprises and startups. It will of course also lead to laws and tax revenue, platforms centralized their **earplugs** and tax savings. So Singapore, for example is, developing where a lot of data localization has led to investment in the country.

It makes it also difficult to enforce local laws against foreign platforms. So not having data localization means governments can't seek a corporation from these platforms, and that is something that they're using to push for data localization in these agreements. There are legitimate reasons such as data protection to require local hosting, but it's a really -- it's the entire debate on data localization is fairly recent and lots more research is needed before we can actually decide whether storing data locally benefits users or it actually propels censorship or will it benefit the local economy.

And there are great arguments in favor and against both of those.

The next issue is the corporation and cyber security and legal immunity of internet service providers. So save our provisions are subject to capture by powerful corporate lobbyists -- or conversely, intermediary stake advantage of safe harbor rules to profit users. And this -- than possible within a trade negotiation context. From the country's perspective, harmonization of safe harbor rules will promote global freedom of expression. Predictable safe harbor rules facilitate global trade and cyber security is part of the enabling environment for trade that governments seek to provide.

And finally, the most important, apart from data localization, of course, is privacy protection, including transfer of data. Trade agreements are not negotiated by personal data experts so by allowing privacy rules to control, only to the least extent, free trade is being elevated above human rights, and this is a really big concern for user right organizations such as EFF. There should be a standalone international agreement on privacy, and though we are very far away from it, an absence of such a global legal framework for privacy is creating a push for including privacy protections through or exploding privacy protections through trade agreements.

So free flow of data must include some personal data, and trade rules from this view can encourage adoption of privacy best practices by also allowing data flows and data flows and privacy rules have existed side by side, but how this will be taken forward in these trade negotiations is something that we need to be aware of.

So I think I've done a little bit of landscaping of some of the issues. I'm sorry if I am burdening the audience here with a lot, but as you can see, that -- the trade arena is complex because some of the negotiating parties have different agendas. It's also complex because the issues are fairly technical, but political demands may actually push for nontechnical solutions. Without further ado, I would like to open the panel for discussion. I'll have professor Ang Peng Hwa -- no. So -- >> ANG PENG HWA: Okay, hi. How many of you associate trade agreements with internet governance? Show of hands. Okay, good.

I think not many of us do, and neither did I until quite recently, right. And it came about because I have two concerns. One is that coming from Singapore where trade is a very big part of the economy, I was concerned about the tearing up of the TPP, right? In the Singapore economy, trade makes up 160 percent of GDP, meaning that the revenue to go through is 160 percent. Of course, whatever is left is just part of the GDP, the so-called vary. But it's a big part of the Singapore economy. So I have some, you know, personal vested interest in trade.

But one thing that is common in both trade agreements and the IGF is that it's better to what we call the draw than to walk. It's better to talk than to fight. So if you don't talk, then you fight. I don't know if this is a man thing. Ladies, you guys don't know. You either talk or fight. I don't know, right.

So I think that the trade agreement therefore, it's a way of, you know, keeping peace. So if you look at our world in the last -- since the second world war, right. So we've had more trade and we've all benefitted in many ways. And that in part is also what a war -- if you're trading, why would you go to war

with the guy you're talking to, right? So I think it's important therefore that we have this conversation about trade.

So I looked into the TPP, and I don't know if you know this, because I was surprised that the TPP had provisions for digital economy. So those were mentioned, right? No custom duties on digital products or no discriminative access on digital products. Facilitate e-commerce. So the customs forms have to be in electronic form. Digital signatures have to be recognized and their recognition of the signatures is quite recent. If you think back just even 20 years ago, people were asking, what did you mean? Scan in the document and give it to you? Right, it's a digital signature.

So it's quite -- it's been quite a new idea.

The requirement that there should be no localization of data. Right, in other words, if you say Facebook, under it TPP, under the countries that *drew*, they say they will not allow localization of data in that country. And Spam laws, that is again new.

Corporation to address cyber security to address privacy, again new. So it was a surprise. And when I mention to people, I give presentation to some officials in Myanmar, the first question was why do you trump the document? And of course we say, well, it's obviously crazy, we all know that. But was it that crazy to tear up a document that benefits your companies, right?

So what I'm putting before you therefore is sort of the need to have some discussion around trade agreement for the digital economy.

But I think it's also interesting to think about how we might fit this discussion into the IGF, right? Because the trade agreements are discussed behind closed doors. When I think of behind closed doors, I think of good food and fine wine. So, okay. So the food must be good, right? Why else would you have closed doors, right? Why else? But we say the food, right? It's secrecy, right. So businesses are involved in a business lobby. But what about civil society? That civil society of a role in trade agreement negotiations. And I think if you look at the reason that the trade agreement was thrown out by Trump was because the people were left behind. And if you follow our discussion here, you will see that in our discussions, especially from civil society groups, we are very concerned about the marginalized people left behind.

So I think therefore that the trade agreements that are being discussed could really use the input from civil society. But of course then the question is how do we do it? Okay, how do we get plugged in into the discussions of trade at international level? Right, international level, within countries. How do we get plugged in when we are small civil society groups meeting openly, no red wine or white wine, hot or cold water, okay, comparison, right.

How do we get plugged in there? So this is where -- I did some discussion. The thing about how we might get involved. And of course the question is why is it important that we get involved, right? Because by having trade agreements, we not only achieve prosperity, but we also achieve peace, right. Global peace, what every beauty *queen* will answer, what do you want for the world.

So we achieve that. But there's a cost, and the cost seems to

be people will be left behind. So if we can get involved, maybe we can achieve all the good stuff, prosperity, world peace, and we do not do it at the expense of marginalized people. So some dream, some thoughts for discussion. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, professor. Can I please ask Rajnesh Singh to now give us his perspective.

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Thank you for giving me this opportunity. So I haven't talked about trade in a very, very long time. It's from many, many moons ago when I was in a completely different life, when I was involved with the private sector so I was involved with trade negotiation. Nothing to do with the internet and telephones, it was about commodities, agriculture. So here we are.

So we have an overview of a landscape. And I was sitting here trying to listen and read, so that's why I was sitting like this. And what struck me was that, man, this reading and hearing, this is giving me a headache, so imagine how others must be feeling. And it took me back many, many years and I remember the same headache I had back then. There's a lot of stuff you don't understand that people say. The stuff you think you understand, but they think it means something else. And that's when we start negotiating on what we need to converge on, right.

But there's some other bits and pieces to it. And again, based on past experiences, I won't go into what I was involved in in terms of trade, but just some observations from back then which have not really changed in today's trade negotiations, either, as far as I can tell. Again, my caveat is that I'm not currently involved in any sort of this work, but from what I can read and see it, appears to be the same.

When you have a bunch of countries during multiracial negotiations, there will be 1, 2, 3, maybe four countries. Maybe a couple really big countries and then a lot of small countries involved in that discussions. The small countries have a few things THOOIPT sell to the big countries. The big countries have that leverage over the small countries because in order for them to be part of the agreement, they can push through some of their thoughts, their thinks, some of the things that were out before. For example, the telephone digital products and services. If those digital products and services are being made in the super big countries, which is more or less the case globally today, then there is a bit of inequality there because the smaller countries may never get to this stage. So where do they get their revenue base come from, where does the taxation revenue come from, et cetera, et cetera

So there's lots of parts of puzzles in my opinion. Is and some of those have remained for decades. The other bit is that, again, based on my experiences, when I went into those meetings, I was representing the business community delegation. That's before this multistakeholder model thing came into fashion. Today, we would call it semi ultistakeholder because it was the government and the business entity involved in the discussions, which seems to be true today, as well.

But when we're going to those meetings, talking to people from the other countries, be it government people or business people, they were not thinking about civil society or users or anyone else. They were completely focused on, you know, how are we going to ensure that my rights reaches your market and your

sugar can be sold in my market. Those are the sort of discussions we were more concerned about. So it's not as if there was no -- there was a desire to exclude people, but the feeling was that this is about rice and sugar. So let us focus on that.

However, the world has changed, particularly the digital economy in every country aspires to be a digital economy to be some sort of a knowledge society. And if you look at the trade that exists in digital services today, that's a large, large proportion of the world economy. So things are no longer the same, and I think what's also happened is these trade negotiations have largely been done by certain ministries or agencies within government. Although new things have come into play, you know, the multisector approach we have with the digital economy. Again, the thinking of those, and how do we address those negotiations, how we are going to those negotiations that mindset hasn't changed. I can also compare that to the telecom world, which I had links with as well as in the past.

Today, when there's a telecom related consultation in many countries, there's some sort of public consultation, some sort of open dialogue. Many have gone towards some sort of a multistakeholder dialogue. So but that didn't just happen overnight. That took many years of advocacy and influence and lobbying to some extent to get there. So I think the trade part of it is that's what's there. You've heard other panelists say it's a closed process, and I think to some extent, and again, with all this -- that is because that's how it's been done for decades, and that's all those guys so it's up to others around them and maybe themselves to realize that things are change, the dynamics are changing.

I read recently that EFF had some sort of consultation just this month, maybe. Where there were people from those negotiating countries who came in and sat as observers. Again, correct me if I'm wrong. Please know that's a step forward in my opinion. They may not say anything or offering opinions, but at least they're listening to the concerns. So I think that's something we can try and push a little more. Let me stop there because I'm sure others are -- and I've probably spoken too much. Thank you

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. That was beautiful. And it is in fact -- **transport** of course is a main issue. And just to fill you in about the consultation at EFF organized. So we had a really -- we have a contrast of sorts. The RCEPs are so trade negotiations go in rounds and these rounds are held in various countries, and obviously depending on which countries they're held in, their host organization will frame the process. So the 18th round was in manila and the organized workshop on intellectual property and focus on that chapter. For those of you uninitiated with RCEP, the IP chapter for RCEP has been leaked and we wanted to discuss the specific provisions that were overlapping with TPP because we have prior experience of weighing in on these issues and how they were problematic in the TPP context. The experience in manila was actually really -- it's actually how it goes mostly. We went through the process of booking a room, for of inviting negotiators and at the last minute it, so happened that a private community event clashed with our consultation and very few negotiators showed up.

So again, we are working -- organizations are also trying to intervene in these processes. There's no official schedule that is released for us. And things were a bit more interesting. Actually, all credit to Mr. Kupatira on my right here who as the WECP chair assured the negotiators turned up for our negotiation. But the host country did not. And again, going through the process of inviting and with the limited resources that civil society usually has it, might not always be -- it might not always be possible for us to create the space for policy dialogue in the trade area. And of course there is a need to open up these talks and let us go for more public consultation. I'll stop at that and ask to bring in her perspective.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So I think, you know, I was listening in on two other sessions this morning. One was on bloc training and I think the other was on transparency of algorithms and how it plays a very important part in -- at least from me in my perspective, I'm coming from digital trade. But the aspect that I found missing from those two conversations and also to some extent from my peers on this floor is there is no legal and regulatory framework, a global one that addresses these issues.

And that's where I think this space has not actually had a lot of let's just say I don't like the word intervention, but at this point I would say intervention from any perspectives of internet governance. And to the point of PENG HWA was saying how do you relate trade to internet governance and suddenly you found yourself in this space, it's because officially something very important happened in 2015, as we all know, which is the UN sustainable development [Gomez](#) 2015 was voted on universally by both developed and developing countries. But what you didn't know is also a representative within the legal community and these legal communities are people that draft treaties, international treaty law and business laws also negotiated for a tax within the 17 goals to ensure that future treaties, international laws that regulate the world's trade systems today also adhere to sustainable development goals.

So yes, it's great to have bilaterals and multilaterals and all these mega treaties, but do they serve a bigger purpose beyond -- that is livelihoods, it's about empowerment, technology transfer and all the other things that matter, like climate change.

So I was actually in a meeting for three weeks looking at ways of how can the legal community work towards this aim? And there's a lot of very honest -- honest discussion around this topic, which I won't have the time to mention here but I will give you an update of what other areas they're attacking and maybe these are the areas we can help them as much as possible.

But coming back to the space I'm working in, which I want to actually share with you the importance of trade not just to Singapore. 70 percent of the world's trade agreements, which are [preferential](#) trade agreements, reside in Asia Pacific. 70 percent. Okay. Which means to say that this reason, Asia Pacific, within the definition of ascap, that includes Asia, southeast Asia, far southeast Asia and the Pacific where our economy is led by trade. And there is a decoupling effect between developed and developing countries in the end of 2014. If you go back to some of the statistics from all the big banks, you'll see that because of this very anti-globalism sentiment

and populism from the developed world, a lot of trade is happening in south region. The south south region includes Asia Pacific, Africa, and Latin America, yes?

So the percentage of trade only in Asia Pacific, out of the entire south south, 85 percent belongs to Asia Pacific. So in other words this coupling effect means that this region has to some degree of a political will to wags a lot of the agendas on treaty agreements related to trade. That's one.

Two, in the end of 2016, for the very first time, we have a cross regional paperless trade facilitation agreement, which was facilitated by ASCAP for the Asia Pacific region. Again, the first in the world. And with various other creative things happening in this reasoning region.

So I wanted to let you know that the space in terms of trade and legal frameworks, although hasn't caught up with the rest of the conversation on internet governance, but it's pretty open at this point. The other thing I also want to let you know is that because of this interregional trade that's happening in this region, there's also an increase of investor dispute cases being invested in states. Meaning -- and this is mainly where investing companies and most of them are yeggs companies investing in Asiaen companies themselves are now having disputes. Basically that means there are a lot more revision on looking at how all these international treaties, regional trades, need to relook at how they want to do things in the future.

So how does digital trade work here, as you were saying inif you look add gats which is under the WTO's definition of e-commerce or digital trade, there isn't actually one. There isn't one. And they are looking at this. So you have WTO that's probably over a decade ago. You have one central role model law and e-commerce. That's also written some 10 to 15 -- ten years ago. So there is a broken -- for my users when an obsolete number of treaty and agreements out there, working amongst us, that is not doing sufficient work in this space. So a lot of the list of things you're talking about, a lot of these lawyers and supreme judges are using very, very broken treaties in order to do judgment or arbitration when it relates to trades. So I think they need a lot of help.

And one reason I'm mentioning this is that the sustainable development goal that UN is pushing is pushing for microand small, medium sized Pazz to actually put e-commerce, entrepreneurs or business owners. And you have broken treaties that address these issues. For instance, the definition of e-commerce is one. The others are secure transaction. The definitions are not -- does not allow small and micro medium sized enterprises to secure loans because they don't have collateral. So even the definition of secure action is a digital trade world is very broken. There's no universal legal framework on digital payment system which would allow payment across, you know, crows the world. So what you have is fluctuating is a beautiful invention, but it's still going to have all these legal framework and needs to figure out. So again, these layers of issues around how do you actually address dispute legal issues and dispute resolutions between different parties, they're not actually addressed at all, which is something that the legal community is actually waking up to, to this.

And as for the TPP on the e-commerce chapters and various other RCEP, for instance, also looking at e-commerce chapters, I think it's a beginning. But I think there's a whole a lot of issues that is not just technology. It's also legal issues and where do you build trust? How can trust be embedded within these legal framework and regulatory framework? This is also another issue that we need to consider. So the other areas that they're also working on is on smart contracts and how that can help enable digital trade. So I'm sorry, might I give you a lot of -- I might not give you a lot of answers, but I'm giving you what is a shot list of things that the legal community are working on. And this is important why?

Raj was saying about, so, will trade ever be on equal footing? Definitely not because you have bigger players and smaller players and how do you negotiate in a way that makes sense? So yes, the legal community will try to ensure that treaties are in such a way that no given country, at least is given a fair chance, you know, on trade negotiations, but still. If you have a legal system where a supreme judge of a particular country or any country understands the principles of sustainability within trade -- trade treaty treaties adhering to internet governance and civil society's concern, what you will have is perhaps a better way to govern indirectly internet governance rather than using what we call letter of -- letter of the law, but while the dispart of the law. And I think that's one area that we need to provide, Your Honor, a lot of education to these Supreme Court judges because they determine how these model law will be written. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. That was really helpful. And it's interesting that you talked about dispute settlements. So TPP had a provision where foreign companies could arbitrate and sue national governments and it is expected that the RCEP would also include a similar provision. And for a big country like India, this is really interesting because currently in international arbitration code, about 40 percent of the cases are against the Indian government, for example. So when you bring in those -- these hard statistics and you isolate them and then you see how the internet governance issues could also go in a similar way, it is really frightening, actually.

But before we move on, I would now ask our main man inside to answer a few questions for us. First off, how he thinks these negotiations are developing. I need he's not at liberty to really talk about specifics, but given his expert ease in this area outside of the trade arena and his perspective of multistakeholder dialogue to be included on governance issues, it would be interesting to see if he could highlight, especially for civil society, what could be some of the avenues where we could actually intervene what support is needed from users and how we can -- what are the steps that we can take to open up these processes.

For example, how can we put some pressure on governments to actually make text publicly available, whether there is scope for national consultations or multistakeholder consultations? As Mr. Singh mentioned, a lot of these are developing and to isolate that and have a different part chapter through trade agreements. So how do we see that balance developing? Over to Mr. Ahkuputra.

>> WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Good afternoon. I try to catch up some

of the issues. A few points I like to lay down what is trade agreement is about. So and in our chapter, it is different than trade. Negotiation working groups. So I start off, this is our nine rounds from the 12 -- 19 rounds of -- so for us, it's nine. And we start working with communities since the Auckland round. This have been five even already so it's not a closed door. We really try to push for multistakeholder discussions. That's what I like to address from our working group. So we are 17 of us representative country.

So then put everybody in. So from the experience I have on one in 60 countries sitting in the same room and trying to find a consensus. And going to the RCEP in the beginning it's quite a challenge because the agenda is quite very big. And I have to tell that, sorry, that we can keep our text inside. There are no leak from the e-commerce working group. So she was upset because the other IP working group was leak. But I only can tell that the text that she mentioned is not that much difference from what discuss in the room.

And how it's relate to IGF. IGF start to discuss about this trade agreement in Mexico, I think. As you remember, the room is full with people. People are sitting on the floor and standing. They listen to TPP at that time and then we have to followup working -- workshop, two session. So this the first time that this year having a trade agreement.

I recall -- interests in this work. How it's affect the IGF, how should we plan, very precisely. You go back to the study of -- available online. Ecap published a paper about the regional trade agreement of Asia. We have 90 regional trade agreement, midor small one. And one of the interesting issue is that we normally call Asia things that -- in the trade agreement.

I show you the top five, and then you can see how its affect the IGF community. First, it's use of international standards for paperless trade. And what does it mean? And that's how the electronic authentication, electronic signatures, edocument kick in. Then we followed international standards. And what available on our hand is that according to all these PPIs and the world of cognition is that on the on the other hand the serial society talk about bloc change and bloc contracts. So I cannot mention how I didn't tell going to go. But that is.

Second is ecertificate and electronic signatures and electronic certificate. Have been 40 percent mentioned and there is 90 RTA. Electronic exchange law for electronic transaction that while we mentioned about -- and hope you're aware that this year, they published a new documents about that reflect on federation, the transit services, how the indication should rely on, whether it's a trust model, trust model services or claim services. So that's law becoming out new. And technical accommodate to breathe that power. Their power, the authentication to go for the cloud services, for durations, how we have the open identity.

The four dizzy customs and esubmission of everything. So this is a tough 45 that more than 40 percent mentioned. So it's really to you because you are in technology. Everything is based on the internet, even the first chapter of every trade agreement, including in the chapter of transparency or this morning I heard somebody mention WTO facilitation agreement that reached the EIF because intrigued to force first in the world, if you are interest how it affect you, please read it. Because

every country binding with that already.

It's WTO trade facilitation agreement so 21st of February this year, more than 120 -- I cannot remember the exact name, 24, I think, because new country. Rectifying. So now it's already first the global trade agreement that reached EIF in the history of WTO. 21st of February, this will be enforced as we're sitting here on the 22nd of February next year.

For example, first chapter, publication of all import/export services. Declaration process have to be published over the internet. Make it available in English. Okay for a country using, this is not a big issue. Imagine Thailand. This might took us for five years down the road to make that. Otherwise, if you want and how to enforce, how entering this mechanism. So if you ship the goods in and the customs say, no, no, we want this kind of document, and NITS not stated in the publication. So you go to the dispute. Simple as that.

So this will boot up the internet users, the way that the authentication of a server might be in place. So you try to read that. It's available online. Half of it is about digitalization of the trades. There are opportunities, and there is the rooms for you to see how you specific, you as in this internet space that the second issues, I like to address. The trade facilitation agreement, the regional trade agreement, it's all Goetsching and affect the internet. Good or bad way, I don't know. It's up to you. And I should say that it's not about talking about the text.

If you are not disclose the text, I cannot discuss about the detail of the text, but I'm not coming from the mod, so while sitting there, it's because I know the subject matter that is discussed. And the topic that you have mentioned, is not really far from what is discussed in the room. Burt I would like to tell is we don't go into detail. The chapter of e-commerce is different than trade and good and services because they're back in about a tariff, and what it includes and market access and all that stuff. E-commerce, we try to frost the e-commerce because there are difference between LDC, least of men country, especially NASA, and a country that already developed.

For example, the law is in 1996 even though they have the second revisions in the 2000-something. Right? But not every country is comply with this law, including Thailand. Because if you cannot catch up with what it mentioned, then the chapter of provision to the state there, that every country have to try to catch up with what it mention. And that will help the community. Like for Spam, why we need to mention, because the mechanism is different from one country to another. Some country have the Spam act. Somebody don't. So how the world reach the abilities when you have the problem? Because everybody know that Spam is a fundamental of cyber security trick because they start and then they go to fixing, bot nets.

So what Spam is talking about is normally what are the mechanism required to stop the Spam is known factor. So we get this issue from the communities. Okay, a government might try to minimize it or it's have to be up in our this way, basic thing. Try to have the same level of measure, so then that will foster technology provider and we don't go into detail of that create discrimination among country and that is all about inside the e-commerce chapters. But it's off interest of every country. Our work group is the groups that people ask, that

what you can do now, because e-commerce can come across country issue. I can recall cross considerancy between working groups or I have a nightmare. She tried to catch up with me, running around the meeting room. Imagine 580 of us sitting in different working groups and then we don't have wine in fact in the rooms or just having a water and coffees and I can get rooms.

But I have to work with IP groups and I have to work with the trading service and product. And one other thing I like to mention, this is interesting. I did not disclose about the text, and I would like to share the wheels to the community.

When we talk about we don't charge at the custom duties on electronic transmission -- for digital products. What happened if you transmit the electronic -- and it transform to be goods? Because it happen with the treaty printing technology. Medical supply, construction materials, you buy nuts and bolts for your toilet, kitchen, some plastic that you can use the treaty. And the whole time, you have to manufacturing, butput in the box with the bolts. And now the world, you can order it. Either you go to the outlet that they have. And then the electronic transfer, mission trembly to be a goods. So you have to see that where we live is changing now. So the beauty, that will be discussed this year. I think it's this year, right? Yeah, we have a tough time discussing this issue, especially in the medical area because the company of human being is very expensive.

This is the example that the changing world and the -- discuss in the room, we try to outreach to understand that what will help to frost and balance between country, eliminate the difference and we are difference than the other because there are no thing to exchange, no cake, nothing to exchange among us. It's only the role of the government. Could we create the -- frosted, the e-commerce of men. Like we need to work in these groups, working groups, and then this year, it's publicly known, we try to close the asset. But it's the communities that need to see that how could you benefit from these agreements.

And I don't think about below fight or not.

But one last I think I like to mention is that these are the problem of the communities. You have to look into every aspects of the story. In 14, happened two years ago, and that announce etrade for all initiative. So will that be an ecommerce I heard that Jack have been making an interview and is that e-commerce will never access his indire. I used to speak to Steve Cocher who invent the internet or -- when he said Thailand -- future of internet, he said there would be no more internet. And what he share is that at that time, I am bond, maybe you not.

When the kid, when you go to the department store, there is like -- electrical. The iron that are electrical. Because at that time, there is a changing between manual and electric. What Steve mean is that the DY's used to be -- have to specify whether it's connect to internet or not. But now everybody can assume that it will connect to the internet. The commerce is not the term that we're going to use anymore. E-commerce. We don't differentiate between the manual commerce and e-commerce. But the deep meaning of that, you have to look, e-commerce is a mess.

No standardization, return policy. You name is, it's a mess. It's a Mickey Mouse, and it's like -- Alice in wonderland, maybe talk about e-commerce. All the big player have that. Think

about the trade. Everybody know -- how the claim process is done, is that in 100 years.

So that how etrade for all will -- e-commerce. And that's by -- I can name it, the publicly -- become advisor to -- there are a lot of talk in the UNESCAP. So the market is shift from working. And you can see that to frosted is me with that mechanism we'll achieve to trade. Or how we standardize that is me have a chance to access the international market without the gateway. The challenging, please do read electronic world trade platform that launch in where, do you know? Anybody know where electronic world trade platform will launch? Malaysia. But they're handling mainly payment, the free stone fulfillment. The key point is fulfillment.

If you want to chip your tree that you grow at home and sell on eBay, you need a lot of document to support that legal tree, whether it's taking from the well, you need to take a document, whether it's free of disease or we call SPS certificates or what it's established. That will help. And that I want you to have a look that there is a player that getting in, into the space, and the defragmented of the technology that we're going to face. We're very much tied in with the business provision that he created. It's not the technical perspective anymore. It's not the basic e-mail that you have a choice to use. Think about that, that's how the trade agreement go all the way to create the defragmented because it go up to the application level.

It's not only a basic service anymore. What are the difference between googles and the other? So it's just a basic service. Sending e-mails, sending messages. But when come to the business perspective, dealing with the SME, that will be a deep, defragmented that I do see and that is still challenge whether that is the direction to go. That need in a civil society community to think and that the trade agreement, but why they have e-commerce chapters.

We also discuss about that in the room, that should it be the etrade or should it be something else, and that I like to bring to you. I mean, we hardly need a community to work. We open up. She can move prove that I try every possible way to next round and might be a last round would be in Korea and there's some approach from the author NGO to discuss and answer about the issue of location and the other thing already.

So I could answer some of the issue that the floor might have. I cannot brief you articles buzz it prohibit. I cannot disclose the text, but some of the technical term that are of your interest, how it's affect you or how it's affect IGF in general, whether it's create a discriminatory about the agenda or about several things, but the agreement will affect you or not. I think I am ready to answer.

>> PAUL WILSON: So one question that I have actually is about how competition is being probably approached in these trade agreements. Not specifically to RCP or the text but generally from your understanding how this competition is playing out in this area Wanawit Ahkuputra I think in e-commerce, we don't have that passion that much because -- politically, there's no discrimination on the internet. And there's also still -- one of the challenging we face is that what is mean territory? What is mean parties? Because we don't know. As with the case of Thailand, you only have 70,000.TH. And even the internet jurisdiction is there. So 75 percent of the culprit is reached

outside Thailand. So how this thing works, how the enforcement will be done, it is still blur. And that is the internet bring to us.

How could we prove that a transaction conduct in our jurisdiction? How we prove in a court that, okay, we bought this on the.com and then how could we prove because a service is not resized in our country, as well. Right. So there are a lot of challenging there that I think that -- that's why context of competition is still very blurred. What does it mean? And we use the domain experience I have, help to -- how could I say -- clearly define to not include some of the subject that technically cannot be sold, as you say.

>> PAUL WILSON: So speaking of subjects that probably should not be included, for example, issues like domain names, how will we know that business and private interests are -- are enrolled in some of these discussions. For example, at the meeting of the business community in India did organize a series of interventions and get together with the negotiators. How -- is there a scope to involve organizations such as ITF and I saw, that work in the domain space and to include them more in these trade negotiations or do you see agreement has reached a point where such interventions is -- it's a bit late for such interventions now?

>> WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: I think it's quietly in the process until we see what will be the advised from the TNC, the trade negotiation committees, whether we extend the negotiation. We try to freeze or all the text that we already have in hand. And some there's an issue that we still do not have the stakeholder that are coming in to discuss or we do not have a chance to discuss that.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. That was really helpful. Did you have something to add on?

>> Yes. So just two points. I guess pertaining to the points, yes, there are issues under jurisdiction, there is one that's clearly the market in terms of what legal frameworks could. But on the other side of it is also the issues of enforcement which we've raised and so here is where I think the group -- I'm not saying that the other solution, but I think that they do realize these issues, although they are not very clear on all the issues, after all, they're all judges and lawyers, but they do understand that there is a need to actually bring in other stakeholders -- if this model law, which would also include some of the points that you were saying about some of the better provisions in TPP that could be used as an example of what would sustainable and inclusive and a balance and fair treaty look like. And that's one area that can help. Because when there are disputes for arbitration, sometimes the law is always given as a referral and therefore it can be what we call -- I wouldn't call it a gold standard, but it is a best practice in which governments and arbitrators can look at to give a more balanced and a fairer judgment on some of these concerns.

But the bigger picture here, I think, is also, okay, we're looking at the technology, we're looking at e-commerce. All these are great staff, but we also need to understand that the competition aspect, which is something that is clearly not written in any way in any treaty but it's actually an agenda of different countries that come together in a room to negotiate for trade.

So having some sort of a sustainable treaty framework will help to some extent I hope provide that balance. But competition is very complex. I think yesterday, I joined a group on IPR and business competition industry and how the industry is moving, how the technology is moving, and it's also broken. So competition also needs to be put somewhere within the legal framework itself within the treaty framework, within the, you know, the international laws that govern them. And that again is still very new. And unfortunately, more advanced countries tend to have the more sophisticated lawyers who can actually speak the language and right the right treaty verses versus developing countries that don't really have much sophistication to understand those words, as well.

So here's where the capacity building, at least I'm not doing a marketing pitch for my organization, but that's one of the roles that my organization that I represent, ITD, is doing, is to provide policy makers, governments in Asia Pacific the right tools to understand how this works, how do you negotiate them, how do you go into a rule and how do you look at these clauses and how you interpret them? And this is the only assistance at least at this point that I see is happening. ANTAP which talks about etrade for all is very development focused. There isn't, you know, the other aspect of it, the more complicated aspect is not covered. I don't believe it's pushing for paperless trade because it's part of, you know, all of our free trade agreements. But also because they want to push for single window in Asia Pacific. So it actually works to what single window which of course works towards the new trade facilitation agreement.

I also wanted to mention that not all countries in the world are WTO members. But those who are WTO members must exceed within the new trade facilitation agreement within the deadline and within the conditions which are given categories A, B or C. And those who fail will be disbarred. In other words, you no longer become a member. So it's very clear cut. What it's trying to signal in all the countries, especially developing countries, because this is to the advantage of developing countries, is that this is requiring developing countries to assist developing countries by giving them market access if you comply within these particular requirements. I think there are 12 provisions within them. And they all work towards Asia Pacific having a more open trade and interregional, you know, activities.

So I'll leave it at that. So business competition is still a new area that needs to be incorporated within the treaty agreements.

>> PAUL WILSON: Right. Any questions from the audience? Yes.

>> Hello. Thank you for the insight for sharing. I have one question for the panel. I'm curious about does the digital economy change like the trade law? What I mean is like for example, Google as a network and people join the network and have sort of benefit from that. But Google is also a multiple, but I know like my limited knowledge like tell me that if in the free trade, multiple will have sort of punishment. So I was just curious about does the digital economy change like the free trade law? Thank you.

>> You have to differentiate between -- we talk about these countries do not understand -- even duty is custom. Local

taxes, local tax, it's up to you. How I you imply your tax. That's it. There are no international local tax, except that. On the other hand, we have international tax holiday kind of the place that you don't need to pay tax. But there are no harmonization of how the local tax should be imply. So some country require iteration of that local entity and then they try to -- but -- discusses state -- that have their own taxation scheme, how they like to implement or that you use with holding scheme or using the GST, I didn't tell up to them.

It's up to the country how they impose a tax, and we don't have that in the trade agreement.

>> PAUL WILSON: Any further questions?

>> I would say that generally speaking, not particular to that district economy affecting a law. The general -- is that the off line rules would apply online but then there would come a time -- so if you look at, say, even e-commerce, you have this motion notion of intermediary liability immunity, meaning that you are immune if you take certain actions as an intermediary. This is kind of novel idea. It doesn't exist in the off line world. If you are intermediary in off line world, you are responsible. You put up a bulletin board. Somebody post something illegal on it, you are libel for that. But online, you are -- the best practice is to immunize such a person because the post can be in the thousands of millions, even. So you immunize them and act on assembly, particularly upon notice.

So the answer is that off line rules apply online, but sometimes there's a need to amend the rules accordingly. Yeah.

>> I have a question. I really can let us know how might civil society contribute at this stage to the RCP or the revised --.

>> I should say that part of the problem we have with working with private sector in the e-commerce. It's different than the IP. You normally have this kind of people dealing with the pharmacy and drugs and this specialist or that. E-commerce is like, oh, what a place. And that are the problem we have. That's why we try to facilitate with any NGO coming in, like that electronic foundation have something to do with e-commerce because there are no book on the ecourses stem. Because it is all over the place. So I should say that I feel free to send what we call on paper to all trade negotiation or you can address this issue with your TNC of the local, yeah.

>> Just one second.

>> I'm not sure if the question you refer to as in Google and Google being probably the biggest player on the planet, and we're doing free trade in Asia and opening up all of our markets and basically it will be eaten up by Google. Is that what you mean?

So there's a lack of a few thing. One is harmonization within the treaties themselves. And second, there's no anti-trust law in this region.

So I think that's something that the new model law will also need to look at how to help developing countries within this context. I hope that helps.

>> I'm with taxes nonpublic policy team. My question is a bit on -- link as bit to the hard question about how does civil society engage in these processes. We've not seen a succession of international trade treaties, and whenever they try to discuss technology issues on the e-commerce or I would say electronic services site, they've been controversial or they

fail. And sometimes not due to just because of that. You had -- on the counterfeiting side, but again talking on on many of these aspects, as well.

And of course the TPP falls into the larger organizations, arising now from the globalized -- developed -- I'm curious in this process of trying to if GIJ a larger community, as you said, e-commerce is so wide, how can you engage? In many senses, it's been some of the same trade negotiators. Have any lessons drawn from the previous discussions you're trying to channel now? In terms of this controversy around development of trade norm in the space, is anything from the previous treaties that you think is useful to bring into this discussion? And the comment I would add, just briefly on the fact that the UN is increasing getting word with this, or process through, you know -- and elsewhere, and they have a more historic connection with -- of course the STGs and also the rights ecosystem. Again, taking that into the multilateral trade negotiations that are happening, any questions -- not about specific text but lessons and practices and the soft political norms that are being created by the negotiators? Hard questions.

>> Okay. I know. I would say that have been discussed with a lot of trade negotiator. It's a carrier that is closed. This is seems to be very first when you start to engage with community for them there if you like. Normally, they sit behind closed door. They have a local discussion. Whether they do or not, we don't know. When they sit in the meeting room, they say we want this and private sector want that. It's not like -- or the community themself oppose a paper to us. So this is a discussion dialogues and that add a difficult what some of the NGOs said, this is the first time they do see the multistakeholder kind of starting from the discussion, but it's a long way to go, I should say, for the trade.

>> There's also if you think from the other aspect of enforcement and you have all these arbitrators and also judges, that's -- affects is based on being neutral and involvement. So if they get involved with impartial groups, they'll also be sunny as not being impartial. So how do they thread on this very delicate thing? I had this heart to heart talk with several Supreme Court judges who also believe that some things they're seeing is for instance monopoly. They don't like that.

But you can't write the treaty in a way that favors only developing countries, as an example. So I mean, I don't envy the judges and arbitrators who need to do a fair job. Where what sort of guideline can we provide them and help them? I think that's the role that we need to give -- you know, I don't know what it is. It has to be in spirit rather than in the letter of the law, and we need to help them

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. Anymore questions from the audience? I don't think the mic is working. One second. Can somebody put the mic on? Thank you.

>> I'm so happy and so delighted to have these wonderful opportunity to stand right here and to give some comments on the topic of e-commerce. I am not very well educated, as other people, in this meeting place. My highest education is just only high school, but I'm very interested in the knowledge that we are now discussing in this forum. I would like to know more about e-commerce, everything in human life has two ways, positive and negative. We have badness and we have the light,

okay. We have black and we have white. I would like to know more about the down sides and the up sides of e-commerce, according to your thought of your excellency on the platform. Thanks a lot indeed for this wonderful question.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. I think that's a good lead to closing the panel and summarizing. So what do you think are the benefits, the darkness and the lightness aspects of including e-commerce in trade agreements?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: Thank you. That's a very hard question and you've woken me up, too. Look, I would invite you, sir, to visit some of the websites of the organizations here and others to get a -- if you search on the internet, you'll find lots of articles and so on about the pros and **canes** of e-commerce. Obviously, the great thing it facilitates is it's far easier to use in a way. But for that to work, there needs to be so many other things in place, different jurisdictions, different markets. There's a standardization in the e-commerce space. So every big property, every small marketplace is doing their own thing.

So it would be nice to have a level of standardization so that you as the consumer, we as the consumer, know where to go for recourse, et cetera, et cetera I won't take much more time. I will say that in terms of what we discuss here today, it's been an interesting discussion. As I said, I've come back into this place after a long time so it is refreshing. Some things remain the same, as I said before. Some things haven't changed. The gentleman asked if we've had any learnings from the past. I would hope we have, but sometimes I think we haven't.

People making the same mistakes in all of these negotiations. Maybe it's because the negotiators have left the field and the new ones come in and start to reinvent the wheel perhaps in a manner of speaking. But getting back to the RCEP and other things happening, I really think it's now -- as I said before, dynamics have changed. New models of consultations and governance have come about. And I think from the trade side as well, I think we need to look add that process, which means including multiple other stakeholders. There are some challenges. Who do you invite to those negotiations from civil society or other sectors of the community? That's actually a very hard question to answer. If you don't invite one, does the other get upset? And then what is your standardized manner of doing that? So there's some other questions I think that need to be addressed, but the point being the process needs to be far more open that it has been. Closing negotiations, they may have their own merits, but I think in today's world, it's high time we move on from that

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Because I'm a professor, I see 50 shades of gray, not just black and white. And second, coming from Singapore, trade is a really big thing. It makes the light more efficient. Things are cheaper, better, more useful, last longer, because of trade. We get things at the price. And e-commerce helps that. That's why e-commerce is good. There's the down side of course. The down side is that we are experiencing, there is this divide. So people left mind are really left behind because they're not as efficient. They stay as inefficient. And that's why I think we have to try and close that gap.

>> You're next

>> WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Yeah, I think it's hard for me. We should not confuse between e-commerce and the internet. People can choose to be sustainable. E-commerce may not be the answer for that. Commerce is about producing thing, exchange to the money or exchange in the other farm. But lately we have been promoting and being recognized in the nation as sufficiency economy SEP which SEP, how internet, giving and to achieve the SEP, that's more important in how you share information to the farmer, how to grow thing better, and they can capitalive. They don't need the money. They can leave. How to improve the education, the health. You don't need an e-commerce in that. And I don't want to confuse between commerce. Commerce is not the answer, especially on -- the first goal is not giving the answer to eliminate the problem, but internet can. In other forms of the technology aspect and how could it help to eliminate the problems and we don't want to confuse this. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: So we are really out of time, but the professor will talk to you after the event if that's okay.

>> So I think I'm for e-commerce because I'm seeing so many statistics saying that it is good, but there also is a darker side to e-commerce, and that darker side of e-commerce to me is more of the platforms that -- so we bring all these people online so they can have, hopefully do something good for themselves and for their society, but they're also working on already existing platforms that may be very big players who will continue to be bigger and bigger and take a bigger part of the market share. So I would like to promote that we have localized platforms that actually allow all these new, innovative businesses that have come online to also be native to Asia Pacific and not just have global players. Then we don't have a voice in this space. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. So with that, I would like to call the session to an end. Thank you so much for being here. I understand it was post lunch and it was a difficult topic so thank you for not nodding off. We are available here for the next day for any kind of civil society engagement in the trade area that if you're looking for. My name is Jyoti for the electronic foundation. Please find me, have a word. And thank you again for your time. Enjoy the rest of your day. Thanks.

[APPLAUSE]

(Session concluded at 3:10 PM)