***

***

    >> KEVIN WONG: Thanks for coming everyone. We are actually still waiting for one panelist perhaps and people who are coming from lunch. So I think we can wait a little while longer.
    (Pause).
    >> KEVIN WONG: I think we can start. We have one more panelist. I think she is on her way.
    Okay. Welcome, everyone. I hope you had a good lunch and I know this is the last session before we go for closing.
    I'm Kelvin Wong from the ICANN APIC hub. This is a merged workshop. Just to make sure you are in the right place the title is Taking Internet Governance to Communities in Asia-Pacific: Need for a Sustainable and Collaborative Approach. We know the Asia-Pacific Region is home to more than half, I think close to four billion Internet users now, but we are a very diverse region. Something that I can't stress too much. And this creates diversity, means there is no single cookie cutter approach to engagement. And I think some of the organizations that is handling outreach and engagement and sharing our information to the wider community, understand that in different subregions and in different economies in this region we will have to use a different approach.
    So we are always looking for sustainable ways to ensure inclusive

dialogue and participation. And one of these ways is to empower discussions at the local level. Localized engagement that is. So I think we have some very good regional and local examples and best practices both from the panelists as well as I'm sure from the floor as well. And we very much like to hear from you because this, gentlemen and ladies, will not claim to have the monopoly of knowledge. In fact, they are here to learn from you. This is the objective which is like I mentioned to -- oops. Okay. Which is to share best practices, not just from the panelists. We like to hear from you as well. So get ready. We will have a long, slightly longer I think discussion at the end. So look forward to that.

   And we also hope to explore the collaborative mode, yeah, of working together between the different organizations. It is between organizations as well as working with the local community. With that I -- do I still have control -- okay. Can we go to the next slide?

   Okay. All right. So this is how it is going to be. Not go through in detail as you can see. Look forward to open discussions and right now we are going to ask you some questions now. These are the moderators. And we are very happy to have speakers, Sunny, Maureen and Leonid. I will let Satish say a few words on the questions as well.

      >> SATISH BABU: Thank you. I am Satish Babu. I chair the at-large organization of ICANN. This workshop has the broad objective as Kelvin explained of taking Internet Governance to communities. Now we see in two tiers, two phases. One is in taking Internet Governance to all the countries in the region and realize and recognize that not all countries are now covered. And there are significant gaps. And the second phase would be to take the Internet Governance in each country to the communities at the grassroots. This is even more challenging. As we have a tremendous diversity as Kelvin mentioned in the region, there are diversities of agenda and geography and terrain and development and culture and language. So these are actually quite formidable issues. And we have these five questions for you to provoke thinking on how we can accomplish these things.

   Can we continue to do what we have been doing all along? Is more of the same the answer to this? What is the role of the Government and the policy, policy frameworks to enable this objective, to achieve this objective? How do we break the silos? Now here we have a bunch of so-called IP star and (inaudible) institutions. Each of us operate in other own fairly narrowly defined domains. Is there some possibility of breaking these silos so that we can jointly accomplish this objective of reaching out to the communities?

   Yes. So how do we serve the underserved regions and countries? And what are the joint programs that we can undertake? These are the questions posed here for your reflection. Thank you.

      >> KELVIN WONG: Now we will move on to the speakers. We have a very short intervention and introduction of what we are doing. And

then we will open the floor for discussion.

So welcome once again. I'm Kelvin from ICANN as I mentioned. I am going to explain a little bit about what we do at ICANN, giving two examples. Some of you might have heard this before. Some of you may have be seeing this for the first time. Feel free to ask any questions at any point in time I suppose.

So first is community driven sharing sessions. I think some of us are here paid for by the company. Some of us are here through fellowships paid by the Government, paid by the organizer committee. And I think we are lucky to be here in this platform, APrIGF and it happens for ICANN meetings and other things as well.

But hopefully I think there is a wider community that is unable to participate in person in such meetings. So the readout meeting is a mechanism for those who are fortunate enough to join the meeting here to go back to the community and share what you have learned in their own language. That's an important point. You summarize. You make sure that you present information that is relevant to the local community. And you get a multi-stakeholder representation to share this information. And so you are not just hearing from one person or one authority. And this is some of the characteristics of a sharing session.

My next slide I'm going to explain a little bit more but I'm just going to share with you the main characteristics right now. Some of this it is not easy to accomplish in a sense that we don't need leadership from the community. A lot of people want it to happen but it doesn't just happen like that. You need leadership in the community to provide a venue, for example, and we are talking about logistics right now. But also to be able to get the wider community in one place so that you can do your sharing. And it is potential to grow the community and to get participation in -- I'm talking ICANN for now but it is actually IG issues. And it doesn't have to be limited to ICANN issues. So I'll call best practices sharing one. So I have been talking about the ICANN readout sessions. Like I mentioned it doesn't have to be ICANN. It can be about IGF or APrIGF. For this meeting you can go back and keep to these points and do a wider sharing with your own community, if you come from Bangladesh, India, wherever, all right?

So what is it? It is a community driven debrief. It is localized and conducted, of course, in your local language. And because you are part of the community, it is done by the community. It is not about ICANN going down to do it. It is done by the community. Because you are part of the local community you will know what interests the wider community.

And the topics are determined by the community. All right? So when? For this particular example in ICANN readout meeting it is held after every readout meeting, each session lasting about three to four hours. Who is involved? I mention a community leader, somebody who

needs to take charge of hosting such an event, main community partner. And debriefing is usually done by a set of multi-stakeholder partners. You are attendees of an ICANN meeting. And this has been practiced in places like Japan, China and India. So we have Izumi here with me which she is more qualified to talk about what happened and what's happening in Japan in terms of ICANN readout. If you have any questions I direct you to her and as you can elaborate as well if time permits.

So I can't see the next one. In terms of sponsorship this is an ICANN readout. So ICANN is involved in a way. We try to support -- I attend the ICANN readout sessions in Japan. We try to provide our perspective obviously. And also provide materials where relevant.

So this is No. 1. Just bear with me for a little while. I will share another of the initiatives that we have done to spread the word, making use of the community. One, the other one is a localization toolkit. It is a toolkit. It is a bag of slides that we have put together that is easily digestible. And we will guide the community to translate in to a local language. The idea is that results are limited and just so many languages in the world. And ICANN is unable to translate them in to all different languages, which is why we come up with this set of documents and some instructions on how to translate them and how to share with them, what kind of platforms you can share them with so that it can be translated in to different languages. Thus far, of course, ICANN we have translation in to the UN languages but this is really beyond that. And thus far for this particular toolkit we have help from the community and they have help to translate it in to different languages such as Bangla, Japanese, Korean, Hindi and, of course, in Thai, something that we manage to complete that. But with the help of ETDA, electronic transactions. Especially from ETDA today?

Then I'll speak on their behalf. They have put in some effort to translate this localization deck in to Thai. And if you trust it you can access the link to take a look at what these slides may look like. I think I have overrun my time. So I will be happy to take questions now or we can pass the mic to the next speaker.

Izumi.

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: Good afternoon. My name is Izumi Okutani from JPNIC and I am an executive counsel from JPNIC. I will be speaking to introduce the situation in Japan. So I guess this is the slide covering APNIC. Yeah, right.

Yeah, I just want to share what are the community activities that is happening within Japan. And while the slides are not showing, so I just want to introduce I think four areas. So one is the ICANN readout session that Kelvin has mentioned. The second is on the number of resources. So IP address related matters. We share what's happening in the regional discussions to our Japanese community called JPNIC open policy meeting. And the third is the IETF, that's technical

standardization discussions. And we also have the IETF readout meeting. Fourth we call it Japan network operators group meeting. And this is a grass roots community of operators sharing operational issues within Japan.

So throughout these activities I would like to share, highlight in particular what we do in regards to JPNIC open policy meeting. So yeah, while their AP communities -- I'll skip this one. I just wanted to say that there is various AP communities. APNIC, APTLD, AP cert, APrIGF, covering a number of resources, domain name, security research or Internet Governance. Each active in their respective area.

So how much of these activities that we actually have like discussions within the regional level but when we go out to outside in global level how much of your voices are heard? So this is one question that I have. And TK discussions in Japan, I have already covered for a number of resources, JPOPM, network operators group. And the discussions here feed in to APNIC or apricot meetings. Any operational discussions get in to operational track or any number of resources, policy discussions gets discussed in APNIC. And then the third, IETF readout meeting and we have a research project, wide project and then based on the wide project work some of the standardization work has been actually, you know, being active in the IETF area. In the domain name area we have the ICANN readout meeting. And then on the policy development we actually have volunteer members running up policy meeting and people can discuss in our local language. And we actually make sure that the discussions in Japan will be shared in the APNIC community. So if there is a particular proposal being discussed in APNIC region we say Japanese perspective, we think like this or we submit policy proposals from Japan to the APNIC region. And that's how we work.

Interactive between Japan and the whole region. Let's take a look in the area of Internet Governance. We have a Forum called Japan IGF that we registered. And it constitutes an annual meeting. And we have another platform called ICJ, to have a sense of continued discussions. We have a dedicated mailing list as well as bimonthly meetings but this is still in the process of community building.

Some of the key activities and outputs by Japan IGF we have produced documents such as security documents. We also manage to succeed in getting 99 individuals to submit their comments in the global proposal on the INS stewardship and transition from the Japanese community. And then there are various engagements that's happening in the global level as a national IGF in Japan. And what I find interesting is that the two communities that I have mentioned, JPOPM and JNOG they are discussion based rather than simply sharing information. We have active members from Japan participating in discussions compared to other kinds of meetings which was more like our focusing on information sharing. So people tend to absorb information but not necessarily

maybe like become really vocal or active in participating outside of Japan. That's an observation that I would like to make. And I will stop here.

>> SATISH BABU: Now move on to Sunny.

>> SUNNY CHEN: Hi. I'm Sunny. Sunny from APNIC. How many of you actually know what APNIC is and what APNIC does? Or if you have attended the AP Star session, Paul actually mentioned about APNIC but he is my boss. And he just knows more or less about APNIC. I didn't prepare slides for this session. But I thought if you don't know about APNIC I will have some background information. Whatever we do for the community it all revolving around our vision. So but APNIC is a regional Internet registry. It is a non-profit organization and membership based. When I say membership based those that require the Internet numbers become members of APNIC to receive those numbers, Internet numbers, IPv4, IPv6 and other system numbers that we all Ace numbers. And we are based in Australia, in Brisbane and we operate our business from there but we manage the entire 56 economies in the Asia PAC region. All the resources that have been distributed to these members are well recorded in the database that anyone can actually go and find their resources and find who the custodians of those resources are.

So the activities and initiatives that we have are around this management of these resources and others as well in what -- how they can contribute to the community and how we can engage with the community. So we represent the technical stakeholder in the IGF, the critical Internet resources main theme. So our activities and engagement with the community mostly are towards the technical capacity building, technical infrastructure building in the region. But we also have as Izumi was mentioning the policy proposal. In the Asia PAC APNIC is the conference. It is the only venue where the policies for the number resources get discussed. There is no other event or conference where this gets discussed for the APNIC region.

That's one of the highlights of the APNIC conference where people come and discuss the policies. How do we do that? We actually provide fellowship to engage the community and we provided fellowships for the APrIGF. And we maintain the gender balance to have an equal voice in these platforms. Last conference we provided around 52 fellowships for the upcoming conference in September. We selected about 50 fellowships. We expanded our fellowship program to have the wider stakeholder groups to engage with APNIC and we introduced the youth fellowship.

And that means the students who have studies in the IC sector, in the final year of studies and they are going to be soon graduating and looking for jobs. So we provide fellowships for them to come interact with the experts in industry and also helps them to connect themselves with the industry as well. To look for jobs, look for opportunities. We also have professional fellowships where we focus

on developing their skills and knowledge in deploying technologies and also at the same time engage with the policy development process because they have the operational experience. The proposals that get discussed there have more in-depth knowledge for them to get engaged in those discussions. The other one we just recently started is we provide fellowships but we thought it is a one-off. We want to see how these fellows are doing out there. How they can contribute back to the communities between their own economies. So we started offering fellowship in this year onwards. Those who are taking the leadership in the community, those who are engaging locally we thought we'd give them a second chance, okay. So they can bring back exactly what Izumi was saying and they discuss in Japan and bring those communications and everything back to the APNIC conference.

   We can't replicate JPNIC in all these communities. We are developing leaders who can come and share their perspective from their economies. That's just one of it but we also do a lot of technical developments in the regions in terms of helping establish Internet Exchange Points in the economies. I am not sure how many of you know what an IXP does but it will reduce the cost for the bandwidth and reduce the latency and keep the local content locally that will have a good user experience within the economy. That's one of it. You might have met my colleague Adley in IGF. He is constantly getting involved with search in establishing search computer image response teams in the economies. And he also heavily engages with them as well in terms of sharing knowledge and helping them building best current practices. So that's another one.

   Though we work in silos our organizations like, you know, but sometimes we do collaborate on some platforms and some topics. And the root servers is one of them that we have more with ICANN and we have in partnership with other root server operates to bring the root server instances to this region. So we -- actually some of these we actually fund them in putting the root services where the users are. So they are well connected and they are closer to the users.

   I have more time? Yeah? Okay. The other one that we just started collaborating is supporting the schools of Internet Governance. So we just form together and sort of came to an idea of jointly supporting the schools of Internet Governance and the governance academies through APAS where we look at proposals, requests coming from organizers of schools of Internet Governance and we support them wherever possible.

   Now we also heavily partner with local organizations because we want to work with locally there in the economy. So we look for partnerships who can assist us to carry the message back to the communities and who can be our sort of representative in the communities to engage the community with APNIC and backwards. So we do partnerships. And we have multiple MoUs that you can see on the APNIC website and partnership space. The MoUs that we have

partnerships with we have is very multi-stakeholder, not just technical communities.

We focus across other stakeholder groups as well. This morning Arul was going to say a few words in AP Star but the connection was not that good. So it got cut off. But I believe he wanted to speak on the technical assistance program we have. It is not just going and creating awareness and talking to the industry and asking them to deploy a technology but sometimes they need help more than that. So what we do is we provide a technical assistance. We go sit with them one-on-one and we actually look at their infrastructure. And we provide advice to them and sometimes we also provide training to them as well. So in terms of providing training to the community the capacity building part of it now we have a number of platforms. We do face-to-face trainings. We actually send trainers or we engage our committee trainer from the community to deliver the training. And we have e-learning platforms where one of our trainers does the course online. It is not computer based but it is actually a live course. We recently announced also have APNIC academy where you go and take a module and complete it and you get certified. That's to prepare you with the basic concepts of the courses. Then you can join the face to face to learn the advanced skills.

And now one last thing that localizing the discussions, localizing the engagement we help form the network operators groups in the economy. That's the platform where we support and we engage and this platform the local, bring in all stakeholders to discuss not only on the technical subjects but also on the Internet Governance as well.

Now there is Internet Governance schools coming up in economies and we are also supporting those initiatives as well as much as we can through APASA and through sending resource persons to speak in these conferences. I'll stop there. It is all what we do with the community and how we engage with it. I would like to learn from you what else can we do or how better can we do, what we are doing and I'll open that question to you later maybe when you ask. Thank you.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you. We will now move on to Maureen Hilyard who is from the Cook Islands.

>> MAUREEN HILYARD: All right. Okay. I guess I'm sort of -- to ask if -- Leonid might want to go first. I am a little nobody from the Cook Islands. I have a little NGO which -- the Cook Islands Internet action group. We are a little lobby group who spends most of our time hassling Government in to, you know, sort of like engaging in policy development. And yet they are not really interested or hassling our telecom who is a monopoly charges extremely extortionate fees for access to the Internet. My colleagues in the little NGO that I have in our little island of 14,000 people, we sort of like get together at our favorite little meeting house which is called Trader Jacks and it is just on the water front. A little bar. And I'm sure Jonathan's actually been there. And it is a nice little place. You

can watch the sun set. And we put together leaders that we like to
see and complain about things that are happening on our island in
relation to the Internet IT.

But this particular group is a member -- is an at-large structure
of ICANN. It is also a member organization -- the members of this
organization are also members of the Pacific Islands of the Internet
Society. We engage with others in the Pacific Islands chapter. But
whereas -- it is not face to face as we would have over a beer and
a pizza at the bar. So locally. When we are actually engaging with
the Pacific Islands chapter it is usually by e-mail on a mailing list,
which, you know, it is really amazing that you got -- I think there
is about 700 members, I think that ISOC has about 700 members outside
of the region and inside the region. It is really interesting to see
how someone starts off a discussion and the conversations grow. And
there are three that go on for ages and ages. Jonathan is one of our
key contributors to those discussions as well. And I think that one
of the things that because we communicate with each other and I think
this is the key thing, we are communicating messages to each other.
We are communicating information, the sharing. There is like what's
on top for people, what's happening in the -- in someone's country,
island. What's happening and the collaborations that are happening.

Everyone informs each other and it actually becomes -- it becomes
a little buddy network. And I think that sort of like really important
because one of the things that actually was commented to me was -- while
we have been here at this conference, was they said why does the Pacific
always get lots of fellowships. The Pacific always gets lots of -- got
lots of fellowships. And the thing is that we said well, I think these
people don't realize that the Pacific isn't just one country. It is
actually lots of countries. And also I think it is because although
I may not have personally met a lot of the people who are here, I
feel as though I do know them because we have actually communicated.
And I think that's what engaging people is all about. It is actually,
you know, sort of like really sort of making -- making that sort of
like really relevant and worthwhile contact with them. So that when
we meet it is like, you know -- really does make a difference. And
that working together we are actually sort of like developing
something really quite important for our region. And then, of course,
we get in to the ICANN system where within the Asia-Pacific Region
there are I think 53 -- 51 ANS structures just as the Cook Islands
society is. My tiny little NGO. But there are NGOs similar -- there
are at-large structures across the -- across the Asia-Pacific Region
that go from sort of like -- got 10 people in it at the moment active
to a -- alias in China which has millions of members.

And like I mean when we are talking about millions of members, some
of those members are actually part of organizations which are a little
bit outside of what normal ANSes do. But at the same time the way
we interact with our aliases is a whole lot different from the way

that we would interact with people within the Pacific Islands chapter or even on my island because we are actually looking at formal structures, formal organization. So, of course, Satish is the boss man of our regional organization. And we have got a leadership team that actually works together to try and find ways in which we can engage people from a whole lot of different economies, a whole lot of different interest areas, a -- there is just -- we are actually sort of like finding as we are trying to gather people together for our General Assembly in Abu Dhabi in October.

We are finding that some, you know, like -- we are not able to make contact. And, you know, has our communication with these groups not been -- obviously not been effective enough. So what do we need to do? So we are just sort of hoping that if we can get -- if we can get representatives from each of the groups along to this General Assembly meeting in Abu Dhabi that we can talk to them and say what are we doing wrong. Why aren't we getting more of your members engaging with us and helping us sort of like develop and contribute to the policy development that is part of the end user sort of purpose of the at-large community which is the -- what we belong to. So I guess it is sort of like this is three different levels that we are working on. And every level is requiring something different.

But just one more thing about the at-large community organizations that are sort of like a part of our regional organization is that, you know, like we get opportunities for fellowships and to actually bring people in, just as we have done with our Pacific island community to come to this Asia-Pacific Regional IGF. And I think that it is through organizations that we sort of like partner with APTLD, APNIC, the Internet Society, all very important organizations for helping us sort of like engage, communicate and form, educate, train. So yes, I might just leave it at that.

>> SATISH BABU: Thanks, Maureen. We now move on to Leo of APTLD.

>> LEONID TODOROV: Yes. Let me share with you some very quick observations I have just made while doing some kind of sociological survey for myself, looking across the room while others were speaking. I mean my fellow panelists were speaking. Out of some 50 people in the room ten were deeply in their computers and another eight were very much in their cell phones. Two were -- would fall asleep occasionally. Four are trying to make some notes but three of them dropped that. Probably desperate to make any sense of what is being told here. Quite interesting and we will be talking about, you know, how to spread the word, how to engage the community. Oh, now nearly everyone is just -- has his or her eyes off the computer except for one gentleman who is really, really committed. So anyway, APTLD stands for Asia-Pacific Top-Level Domain Association. And that's quite a big regional association. One of four regional associations for the Country Code Top Level Domains. We have 56 members and they are spread between the Baltic Sea and New Zealand. It is quite a

diverse community. We are different by form of incorporation because roughly half of our members are Government structures, Government owned. Some are private. Some are NGOs. And they are way different. But they are doing basically the same thing because well, actually our mission is sort of tricky because on the one hand we are custodians and guardians of a given country's identity online which is the Country Code Top Level Domain.

On the other hand, many of our members are engaged in some kind of commercial activities because registrations in certain countries are not for free. So some of our members live on that money. Still, you know, this dual purpose is kind of a tricky thing to follow. Anyway, I found some interesting irregularities, if you will, in our operation. By definition we are engaged in some kind of Internet Governance activities by default I would say. Many of our members are also engaged in some kind of, you know, very specific activities which correlate or directly relate to Internet Governance. For example, many of them are engaged in some kind of Forums which they created and promoted in their respective countries. Whether it is called Internet Governance Forum or something different, but still I mean the essence is there. Some do Internet Governance schools. And some do as you heard readouts and some other activities and go to local communities. They do a lot of outreach and awareness raising campaigns.

I found an interesting irregularity which lies in the recognition of the fact that the bigger the registry, I mean the bigger the member is the more it is involved in some kind of Internet Governance related activities and vice versa. Our small members probably have no manpower, no capacity to do such things. Yet another interesting thing is that the more Government owned the member is the more it is committed to deliver some kind of technical stuff which means, for example, you know, doing some awareness raising campaigns about IPv6 because that's also part of some of our member's job because they also deal not only with names but with numbers or something else or DNSSEC, et cetera.

The less Government owned the member is, the more it is keen to reach out to communities, to some kind of NGOs to partner with them. To launch and promote some kind of private initiatives. That's very interesting point. I also found out that there are some interesting exceptions. For example, some of our small members, like Armenia and Nepal are up to their local IGFs.

In the case of Armenia even Internet Governance school. And vice versa, some big members do not do that at all. So it is a kind of very diverse and very microscopic picture. We are diverse not only by the form of incorporation and scope of activities but also I would say, if I may, idealogically because for certain countries and for certain ccTLDs, for example, those ideas that are promoted within the Internet community or let's say more broadly within the Internet

Governance community are basically foreign. Simply because the cultural code or the political tradition dictates otherwise.

   I would just give a very simple example. In Russia where I live we don't have a concept of community. So whenever you guys tell community, it is lost on Russians. I can understand. That I am more like cosmopolitan. We don't have the concept of neighborhood. Likewise if you tell me stakeholder it is lost on me. We don't have stakeholders at all. I'm sorry to say that. But that's just the fact. In other words, -- oh, you see. That's what I would call engagement. So in other words, with different cultural codes it is not that easy to deliver certain ideas and to preach, if you will, certain values. I would come to that issue of preaching later I guess of certain values. Because they are foreign and cannot be accepted, just by default.

   So with that I think that's probably it because I will, of course, highlight on certain specificity of some of our members and the community itself.

   But the last point I want to make is that we, of course, we team up with all our partners across the region with APNIC, with APRALO. We do have a lot -- some projects together or some initiatives together. So we team up when it comes to Asia-Pacific Regional IGF or some other educational and awareness raising activities. Thank you very much.

      >> SATISH BABU: Thank you, Leo, for the very thought provoking intervention. Before we open up the floor for discussions I would like to take two minutes to talk about one aspect of APRALO that needs to be highlighted. Many of you are either young individuals who want to get in to the domain of Internet Governance. How do I become part of APRALO which is asking for at-large structures which are actually NGOs. So the good news is that APRALO is now open for individuals also as members. If you are an individual without any affiliation to an NGO you can still become a member of the ICANN at-large structure, I mean at large -- ICANN at large which represents the interests of end users.

   Well, the ICANN is rather narrow. It is numbers, names and protocol parameters, but still there is a lot that you can do in that space. And if any of you who are not an NGO and you are wondering how I can participate in the ICANN process as an individual you are most welcome to join APRALO as an individual member. Please refer to our website. Look for APRALO and you will get more details in how to participate. With that I would hand over the floor to Kelvin to open the floor for discussions.

      >> KELVIN WONG: Okay. Thank you all the panelists. I think we -- before this session we agreed that we will all only take five minutes but I'm glad that we have a consistency in breaking our own limit set time frame. So I think we are all good.

   So what we can do now is to break for coffee and everyone leave the room or we could have a very interesting exchange on what is the

best practice in your own economies. And you could ask questions about
what we just presented. So your choice. If we could flash the
questions up there. I guess those are the questions.

   So the floor is actually open. The panel presentation is gone.
Yeah.

        >> (Off microphone).
        >> KELVIN WONG: Yeah. There is a mic there.
        >> Who is GoDaddy?
        >> It is kind of a joke but why isn't GoDaddy at the head table?
Could you elaborate?
        >> The question was what's so special about you guys?
        >> Can I answer?
        >> SATISH BABU: Yes, please.
        >> LEONID TODOROV: Just because we are handsome, wise and
experienced.
        >> SATISH BABU: Well, maybe you should clarify that.
        >> KELVIN WONG: One of the aims of this session is to share some
of the practices that we have. Some of us with organizations that
do a lot of engagement and outreach and we may have one or two things
that we like to share to kick start this discussion. And also the
second point is really to think about how to collaborate between
organizations as well. So I think there is some things that we could
share here in this panel as well. Maybe you go on to the next one.
        >> Paul Wilson from APNIC. I thought I would respond to that
in terms of the usual understanding of the multi-stakeholder process
which was outlined by -- in the Internet context outlined by the
Working Group on Internet Governance all those years ago. And they
observed that the Internet has got this multi-stakeholder governance
process and they discovered a set of groups being Civil Society,
academic and technical, governmental and business. And so
those -- there is -- through what's happened since then, through all
of the Internet Governance discussions at IGF there has been an
assumption of those four stakeholder groupings. And they have
had -- four different groupings have had very different ways of
organizing and different levels of presence. So the most active and
best organized of that group of four, of that set of four I would
say in my opinion is Civil Society and Civil Society has for many
years had all sorts of traditions of interaction and interchange and
so forth on all sorts of international and national levels. They have
got a long tradition I think of exchange. The technical community
as well has been pretty well organized. Governments only to some
extent and mostly through inter-Governmental processes but I have
to say the business community of which GoDaddy would be one is not
organized in the same way at all. They have had some consultative
processes. They have gone in to IGF, first WSIS and then IGF and they
have some consultative processes that have gone in to, for instance,
OECD and these sorts of things. But I agree with you if what you are

saying is that the kind of business community is not well represented here and would be great if we could do something about that because I think there is a lot of stuff that they could contribute and also probably also hear. So it is a good question. I'm not trying to answer it. I'm pointing out that they should be channels.

The APrIGF recognizes business stakeholders on the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group and we should be striving for balance as business. There is so much distance here and the business case isn't clear in participation in this environment. I actually did have another question, but I will just quickly mention it. And Leonid, you can decide whether to answer it in due course. And that's just to take you further on the idea that Russia doesn't have the idea of neighborhood or community.

So I ask you what you have done about that, because, in fact, linguistic differences in this region in particular are huge. And the amount of interpretation that's necessary and the amount of misinterpretation that's possible is just endless. So there is a big communications challenge there. I want to hear discussion about that as well.

        >> (Off microphone).
        >> I'm Sdrib. When you look at the whole atmosphere in the Internet ecosystem until today the thing that we are lacking is representation. When IGF happens a lot of people from Asia-Pacific are not there. And I believe, I strongly believe, we talked about it, that these Forums are for us. We need to collaborate in so many ways from the agency side. Yes, we need more fellowships. We do understand funds are needed. But we have to work on that. Collaboration is a must. Even at a local level for your information I would like to put in what we have done at an individual level. We have established this website called learn IG, learn Internet Governance. Where we have set up a blog post website where all the IG informations are there. And we are working, we are not just working at an individual level. We are collaborating, you know, Sri Lanka IGF happened. I was there online. We tried for funds. Fund was not available. Seriously funds were not there. We collaborated remotely. So things can be done. We are not pushing people to that level. I think the fellowships are just going in a very different way, right? It needs to be pushing right away where people like young people who are doing something, you know, they should be encouraged. Thank you.
        >> SATISH BABU: Thank you. Can you have a business --
        >> Why should we have questions all the time?
        >> SATISH BABU: Yes, please.
        >> Speaking as a member of the community. I totally agree with Leonid. I think if somebody has raised a question or asked a question, it should be answered first rather than just adding all of them. It just lost the track. I totally agree. I wouldn't ask any question

unless the question has been answered yet.

>> SATISH BABU: We have a question right now.

>> I do have a question but I'm not going to ask --

>> SATISH BABU: Okay. Let us hear from (inaudible) now. Please go ahead.

>> Answer the question.

>> SATISH BABU: Because then we have to go back one step.

>> I think dialogue --

>> SATISH BABU: Don't feel we should answer all questions. We are running short of time. That's the reason why we accumulate. Then we will go back to your question first.

>> LEONID TODOROV: It is not my question. It is rather an answer. I would agree with. There was 650 registrations for this IGF. And we could see how many pages are there still unclaimed. And I would certainly agree with you, and that corresponds to the first question and what Paul is asking. Are we doing the same stuff over again and it corresponds to that survey which I just mentioned, the results of which were announced. We do the same thing and the right way. And it includes collecting all questions and then give all the answers. So I believe that what we really lack is culture of genuine dialogue with the community. And I also believe that we tend to preach instead of coming to the people and asking what people feel every minute and -- well, at any moment of time when we talk about Internet Governance. Think like this, I mean we talk about ourselves, I'm sorry, I will take just a minute, as a global community. We are still 4,000 people. 50 fellowships a year for Asia-Pacific IGF. For 3 billion people it is not a decision. Something should be changed fundamentally in the paradigm in which we operate and that should be sought from the community. What can be done better or what can be done in a different way. My suggestion, for example, I'm sure the room will be packed, absolutely, if you have Kanye West and Kim Kardashian here. Why are they not here? I can pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to get Bill Clinton to speak at a San Francisco meeting. The Kardashians can do it for half the amount and the room will be packed. They are something to tell you. They are celebrities and opinion makers. Much more than us handsome, wise and experienced sitting before you. Thank you.

>> KELVIN WONG: Anybody else who wants to answer the questions that was raised before? Otherwise we will go on. Can I make a suggestion that we are not making more suggestions on this panel. This was a joke. So --

>> LEONID TODOROV: I would like to give it to him first. Just a second.

>> Okay. Thank you very much. Firstly my name is Ashkar. In 2013 or 2014 I have just ordered ISF because of some of my innovation. And APNIC just introduced me with the IGF movement. And today disability is now becoming one of the largest discussions in IGF.

This has a remarkable effect for a community. Secondly I would like to just say, you know, peoples' individual experience sometime could become a model for the globe. While I got the ISF issue award we just invented books, which books are accessible for all. My daughter was in class. One day she came to me and asked me please papa, read the books for me. Again and again she came to me and bring her print books. As a blind father I never ever able to read her books. Sometimes I became very angry with her, just go to your mother. In the time I am thinking what I can do which would be benefitting my daughter, same time my community, blind community. I just invented the tooks and have text and audio. That means nowadays my daughter sit with me. I can read book for her and I can listen and she can read. Blind children can listen and their parents can read. So this is the innovation as recognized by the ISF. You would be very glad to know this year we have earned WSS prize for that. This is the contribution by the community like APNIC. Thank you very much and thank you.
    (Applause).
        >> SATISH BABU: I'd just like to clarify what Ashkar said. Systems innovation fund we have, what is here actually Jonathan Brewer is one of them from Pacific also received it. So the round for the ISF applications is still open. If anyone is interested in what Ashkar did and others innovate something for the community you can go and apply for the grant. That's all. Thanks.
        >> Speaking as a member of the community I have a question from Kelvin. It is -- you mentioned about the localization. And content has been translated in to eight different languages. So what is the uptake and how it is impacting the community? Actually working or not? And what is the measurement tool you have and why it is still eight languages? I hope you got an answer. Thank you.
        >> KELVIN WONG: I'm not sure it was eight. But okay. So what we -- we are really trying also hard to see what is the metrics that we could use. Frankly we will see in the process on what is going to be the uptake. But what we are doing, what we know is when we work with some of these stakeholders they could be fellows. They could be LSes. They could be community members that is friendly to us. We do ask them to come back to us. Let us know how your event went, if you actually translated this -- the toolkit and you actually used it in your event. So I think we have one or two cases where it was actually used and the slides were used in an event. But it is also not just for the users, for the people who translate the slides. In fact, the slides are in an open -- in a public arena where anybody can use the slides. For example, the slides that I mentioned just now, that is translated by EDA which is a Government agency in Thailand. It could be used by -- it could be used by one of you, any Thais in the room that wish to introduce about the IGF program. And that is a bit difficult unless they come back to tell us that they used this and this has worked well for them and this has not worked

well for them.

   So this conversation needs to happen as well. And we will be happy if we could access the link where we shared the localization toolkit and give us your feedback on whether it is useful for you and if you'd like to bring it to your communities. Thank you.

      >> IZUMI OKUTANI: In response to Ashkar's question we had quite a number of initiatives related to, for example, ICANN area on localization. So, for example, it is a bit technical but like big technical changes in their root DNS or like what we call name collision or universal acceptance. The key is that we actually pick certain topics based on grassroots where we felt the local community really needs to know about these things, not just the people who attend ICANN but there may be technical people and specific actions should be taken. So we have prepared websites and not just word by translation but any additional information that is needed to be explained in the Japanese context and try to have a face-to-face meeting to share that kind of information. How effective that is, if taking a local person to take that initiative, obviously that will be a good like, I don't know, parameter on whether you think that this is worthwhile enough thing to take effort on that thing, might be one way to make a judgment and whether certain initiatives or topic of localization will be useful.

      >> SATISH BABU: Thank you.

      >> Thank you. My name is Jaron. I'm from Singapore and speaking in -- as a community member of the Asia-Pacific Internet community. Now I have a couple of observations which I would like to make a comment on relating to our colleague and the gentleman wearing the green striped shirt. First of all, you didn't want to use the mic and you wanted to shout across the room. The first point I'd like to highlight for everyone here there are remote participants. So there are people at home listening in to the connection. If you speak without the mic they cannot participate. So I'm hoping that, you know, it might be the first time that you are attending this session but I think for everyone in the room also this is the first time you are attending, I hope that you can respect people that is joining us remotely. They cannot join us here. And I think that's one very important point that we should all know which is about the need to communicate with each other and the need to provide access. We talked about this many times here. And to have effective dialogue then we need to think about the people that's not in the room. So I hope that everyone could just take note of that.

   And I think that's quite important seriously. The other point I want to make also is the question of NDRs. Where are these people on the panel. I want to highlight one point. Do you know who organized the APrIGF, who are the people who organized APrIGF? It is partly the local host who has done a good job of putting everything together in the venue but it is this group of people that are part of this

group called the MSG of the APrIGF. Every two weeks we do a call that's led by Paul who is the chair of this MSG. Every two weeks we do a call and spend our time discussing what should be in the program, who is going to be the host, what are the requirements for it and which countries are we going to go to. Form a fellowship committee to decide who is going to be the fellows and decide even the rules for determining who are going to be the fellows who is coming here. Reach out to various people, invite them to come. Spend the time also to find or who can help to connect the remote participation, spend the time to do training, help the people here in the room and understand about Internet Governance. Who are these people.

   No, I'm not thanking these people. I'm telling who are these people who are spending the time to work. If you don't use the mic, the people in the -- the people in the remote participation wouldn't be able to understand also. Why I am saying all these things is because these people are actually nobody. It is people who feel that it is worth my time putting in the effort to organize this so that people can have discussion today and are they from big organizations? They are the Googles, Facebooks? No. They are people in the panel, people who are sitting in this room in the audience also. So what I'm saying is that this is the beauty of the multi-stakeholder model. That anyone can participate. Not just because I'm with a big organization or I'm with a Government. But because that I feel that I can play a part and I'm from -- I'm a student. I'm from Civil Society. I'm from a small SME. I can participate also. The point that I'm making it doesn't matter actually who you are. But they have the heart to want to help, to foster this dialogue with everyone in this room. What I'm saying is that on the one hand you may feel that they may not be qualified to speak. But on the other hand I think the beauty of the multi-stakeholder has allowed them to give them a voice to help promote this dialogue. So it is not about thanking them but about sharing within this room this model that allows us to have this dialogue and encourage you to join us and to be part of this community. Thank you.

   (Applause).

        >> SATISH BABU: Thank you. That's a very nice piece of explanation. We appreciate the fact that it is a group of people who volunteer their time, the multi-stakeholder, the group. Who organize this whole event. And we have to respect the fact that there are norms which have been laid on the floor, for example, on how to speak and when to speak and where to speak that we must abide by.

        >> I told you no microphone for you. I told you.

        >> I don't believe you can have a hand behind the microphone. Okay. I think first of all for those questions, I think -- I think about for more than 20 years I participate in ICANN, from 1998 until now, almost 19, 20 years. And you are right, there is a lot of people actually participate with their own time and their own resources.

I remember when the first time I come to the ICANN first meeting in Singapore and actually using my own -- all my money to fly there to understand what's going on. And after almost 19 years, to be honest, in this Internet Governance, no matter what organization are on the stage, it is a long history. And I think might be something we should do is a lot of newcomers, it is very difficult to understand these structures. To be honest, even I was an ICANN board member for six years. A lot of people still come to me and ask which meeting I can go in while this is closed door. That is not open to the other person, you know, something like that. For example, a lot of people like to ask. It is a cross meeting. And I think many of you might be in the neighborhood with what is an Asik. It is so important in Internet structure. I think for many of the people over here you might have a new server but you don't know how to operate it. And you don't know how important they are, particularly for the newcomer. I think for the organizations sitting here I think maybe we need to make the most of the information or terms is more easy to understand by the general user.

   For example, I participated in one of the sessions this morning the IPv6. As we know the IPv6, basically the technical people might be concerned. But general users they should not care. When I get on the Internet it is IPv4, IPv6 that is not their business. All they need to know is that I can access the content I want or communicate to someone easily. So I think we have to be careful, for example, that IPv6 as an example. What you want to talk and making really successful and moving around. You are not going to talk to, you know, most of the people. They might be interesting to hear. But they are not really the person in care. So I think that is one of the examples. And in the past several years, actually I was a full-time job. So I cannot do anything. But this year I -- I retired last year. I have more time now. And I would really suggest that you are growing -- whatever the national, local IGF from yourself, you know, and it is not expensive. It is not expensive. The first Taiwan IGF this year in June. We spent roughly about $4500. And half of that is paid to the conference room. I know you told me the time has come. Okay.

   And I just want to say interesting issues, so the people willing to come. For example, shared economies is a very critical issue in Taiwan. Like Uber. It is fighting with text driver. So we put that one in to the Internet Governance issue. A lot of people interested and come to understand what is going on. And I think it is important is Internet Governance you can choose the topic or issue. It is really close to the user. And they begin to understand oh, okay, then what is the process to make a decision. And then that is something I think is much easier for everyone to participate in to the Internet Governance. It is just a term.

        >> SATISH BABU: Thank you very much. Leo would like to respond.

>> LEONID TODOROV: I agree. That should be about people, for the people and going under their skin and touching their nerves what they to care about. And to bring it -- to make it an agenda item. And to be provacative and unorthodoxed and get rid of these powerpoints. Just question and answer. We will make a lot of sense of that.

>> I'm Jeffrey from the Philippines. This is just my experience and I want to share it with you. This is my first APrIGF. I never expected this one year ago. It comes to me when we were awarded by ISF in Mexico. We were doing ICT communications for disaster. Then for the past eight months a lot of things changes with our organization. I was invited to Stockholm to present also. I was invited to this one. And just recently I also e-mailed and I was fortunate enough to meet Vint Cerf. He recommended me to PCI and just recently about two months ago the Japanese Government and NTT told me can you create something for a conference in your place. You are always hit by disaster. As I'm speaking again two typhoons are coming in to the Philippines. And this Forum is very important. I met a lot of people. Even Lito. I never meet him. He is a Phillipino. He is really something.

   So I was able to organize an ICT disaster conference this coming September 20 and 21. Good -- okayed Silvia to fly in from Australia to go and then NTT Japan is joining. So what I'm sharing here for just one year the thing that I did in my community was to provide communications during disaster. That's it. I never ask for more. I spent my whole life in an NGO helping people. So this is my share. I think this is a very good time and a good venue to share everything.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you very much for sharing your experiences with us, Jeffrey.

   (Applause)

>> SATISH BABU: We will move on to the next question.

>> I'm Millie. It will overlap with what others said. To start off what he achieved in just one year of being interactive with these platforms, I certainly appreciate the openness and the beauty of the multi-stakeholder program. But my concern is that there are certain things within this ecosystem that go against the openness. And I will try to elaborate how. While the multi-stakeholder program or approach is beautiful and it does work -- that's why we are all here and I'm able to speak, but the context and heaviness bodied with it goes against this openness. Because five people don't understand. Right now I can ask randomly and five people will not fully understand what the multi-stakeholder program or approach is. So what I'm suggesting is as much as we are focused on linguistic barriers which I do understand are so particular to this region especially, there is a very big contextual barrier that we are facing. Especially with the newcomers who are trying to get in to this space, and reference to all the fellows and the different capacity building programs that

are happening. So if that can be addressed at some level which also talks to the point that Paul said the lack of communication. I am a communication person myself. I write for a living. And we sincerely lack a particular platform where we can contribute in a simple way. Today as a communication level we are in the most evolved age as we can be. I can speak to anybody across the time zone, across physical distance. There are people who are listening to this right now.

   So I totally don't agree to why are we failing at this particular level and we are discussing ICT. That's something that has changed in communication. I don't realize why we are failing at this particular aspect. We haven't done enough to put together an amazing system that just drives communication apart from like chatting in the coffee sessions and at the conferences, but what beyond it how do you communicate back and forth after you are not here or when you don't meet all these amazing people.

   And the last thing, I promise, is I do talk a lot, sorry. So the last thing is a lot of stuff has been done in terms of regional initiatives and national IGFs, the various fellowships to bring in more people. A few people to address questions about funding, but my problem is not with how much. My problem is how impactful are we. There is -- a lot of that is done at different levels, regions, countries, organizational community level. Technical have their own things, social or human. Are they talking to something at the end of the day? Are we coming to something that works for all of us? Everyone is doing it in their own way and everyone is producing a lot of important documents. Why are we not seeing it out there in the world? Who knows what IG stands for or what APRALO and why is that a problem. That's all I wanted to raise.

       >> SATISH BABU: Thank you.
     (Applause)
       >> SATISH BABU: Before I ask my panelists to respond on this, the Q and A is closed. We are four minutes to the close of the meeting. Anyone like to respond to this?
       >> SUNNY CHENDI: So when I finish my brief notes, that's what I said. We are representing all these organizations here. We can collaborate among ourselves and discuss how we can engage with the communities. But here we are with the community and we want to know exactly that. How can we do better at what we are doing and what else can we do.

   So just to address that one, the last point you made, Millie, is that we never thought when we introduced the blog on APNIC website that it will be so successful, that you can look at the hits, how many it is receiving now. That's where APNIC, we share what is going on at APrIGF. It is going to go on the blog as we speak. And that's how we share with the technical community. This technical community is one of the communities that they don't get much involved in the

IG space. They are networking guys and they sit behind the desk. And we share with them what happened here and that's just one example that I can share with you.

>> SATISH BABU: Yes.

>> KELVIN WONG: If I can add on to what Sunny mentioned, how impactful all this, this problem, this issue has been discussed at MSG and we are thinking between organizations and to have a global view while -- on how some of them, fellows it is something -- it is an issue that's close to my heart, I am helping to run this Asia-Pacific academy that we will get use from around the region to participate in a five-day workshop. So what I have been doing is really to get the alumni in to a mailing list and to share where they have been and what they are doing. And then we share back with them all opportunities for more participation and fellowships.

So I have been tracking and I am very happy to see that last year's alumni, eight of them are here in the APrIGF conference. And I think it says a lot, too. So this -- what we are trying different organizations, I'm sure are trying ways to keep track but how impactful it is, I don't mean to sound too negative but in the end how impactful it is is really up to the fellows as well. There is only so much we can push. And we try to select the best people but up to you fellows. How impactful this will be depends on what you do after you step out of this room.

>> SATISH BABU: Yes.

>> Julie from CNNIC. Some of the thoughts might have been mentioned before, but I want to speak it out. We have been talking about cooperation like all the time. Like three or four years ago my first involvement in the Internet Governance issues we are calling for cooperation and collaborative efforts. But today we are still doing the thing. That means collaboration or cooperation is still not enough. But I have been wondering what's the ideal picture that we are trying to seek or what's the ideal situation. When we talk about community or talk about multi-stakeholder I agree with you. You can -- anyone can be part of the community. Anyone can be left out of the community. So when we talk about cooperation, we need to always break it down in to parts. Like we talk about the public and private sector cooperation which is obviously key for us. But we need to break things down. So very little suggestion for our discussion, maybe for the Internet Governance Forums. After all the discussions, all the Forums we know that we come up with reports. But I mean in addition to the reports why can't we come up with some, you know, problem lists or action items or to-do lists so that we can -- we know that for specific things like IPv6, like IDEI we know we have a lot of challenges ahead, but we don't know how to solve them. Why don't we come up with action items so we know whose voice is still absent in this Forum and who can do the outreach. I know that most of the people sitting here are very experienced and capable persons.

They can do the outreach work. Let's do this very little thing. Maybe this will be helpful.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you very much, Julie, for the suggestion. We pass it on to the respective organizations. Yes, please. Be very brief please.

>> Very brief. Yes, the good practices should be replicated elsewhere. Perhaps to local context, Governments in certain countries do need to be involved not as the primary person but as the driver. In terms of what more needs to be done, perhaps the current capacity building should continue. I have benefitted from the ICANN fellowship and even from the APrIGF fellowship. And I do believe the fellows elsewhere are contributing in their own way. Some in to the limelight and some do not. They are definitely working. Some kind of collaboration in terms of having updates on what they are doing would help. And even ICANN or APNIC have been benefitting from fellowship. And when you are looking at underserved regions perhaps having the IGF, Afghanistan had their IGF, those are good capacity building initiatives and people in those communities are really active. Perhaps there could be mentors who can help them. They might be able to channelize them. It is the support which they get in terms of information which can mobilize societies.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you for those comments. Sunny will make a very brief comment now.

>> SUNNY CHEN: I wanted to make one last comment from myself, from me. We like to see unity in the community. Sometimes it confuses us as well as organizations when we want to support initiatives outside and activities in the communities. For example, two groups starting two different Internet schools of governance, we get confused who do we support, who do we not support because if we support one and the fingers will raise from the other side why we are not supporting us. Unity in community is very important. That must be really where you should start working on. Not divide the community but bring the community close to each other and work as one. Thank you.

>> SATISH BABU: Before I go to Maureen I will take the last question.

>> Sorry. It is from a remote participant, Mr. Sanin. A comment. In the APAC region we found out AP and IC working for more than 14 years in technical support. With their support countries came from kilobits to gigabits level. Japan is always a good example and -- but also an exception. And also a question for the honorable panel. One why Asia is lacking behind in Internet Governance talks. And two is fellowship is the only key to bring more active people in IG activity.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you. Maureen, please respond and I'll also -- we will also respond and close.

>> MAUREEN HILYARD: Actually I didn't mean to be responding to that particular question. I was going to respond to the suggestion

of how we actually keep contact of our fellows keeping in contact with each other. Most organizations have alumni. And it was something that was actually discussed at our meeting, at our MSG meeting yesterday. We are building up a really strong network of people who, you know, we are not actually keeping in touch with. Once they -- once this organization -- once the event is over they are lost. We need to -- we need to keep them. We need to keep them engaged and we need to keep them really active and support their activities within their -- within their communities. Alumni would be really good. But the only thing is that alumni needs to have someone that's actually organizing it. It does need to have some sort of like organization as well. So it would be like tossing up as to who is going to take that over. That's the only issue that I see.

>> SATISH BABU: Thanks.

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: I would like to respond to some of the earlier comments made about how can we be effective and how do we get people from our region to be more engaged in the Internet Governance arena. I think having an active local community within the respective economies is important. That's important in terms of information sharing. Not just language translation but explain things in a local language. Maybe the word community is not exactly like just word to word translation. But let me understand the nuances and based on not just stop there, have a discussion Forum and then bring it back to APrIGF or any other appropriate Forum. I think that is really a good way of doing it. And I think that fellowship certainly helps people from those economies who discuss locally to bring their voices back to the regional or global arena. I like the point that Julie has raised, list specific action points. Not like in a way that you should do it but maybe state as an observation on areas that would be really helpful for like an action to be taken. And I think we do have a synthesis document as APrIGF. So per areas maybe there are things that we can be more conscious in listing them. So I think very useful inputs from the participants. Thank you very much. And I think we can continue to improve ourselves for a better Forum for the APAC region.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you. And I agree with all those points. I would like to say many of the questions raised, especially the last one, is fellowship the only thing we can use going forward. It is one of the many instruments that we have at our disposal and that includes IGFs and training programs and meetings like this and SIGs. As we go forward we can be more and more capacitated. That's a way to look at this. And now I call upon Kelvin to make the closing comments.

>> KELVIN WONG: Not really a closing comment but as a panelist and responding to the last question whether only fellowship is the only sort of tool we have. Well, trying to get more people in Thailand, for example, to understand more about Internet Governance. Maybe

somebody will have a good idea of having an APrIGF in Thailand. Isn't
that the best way to do it? If you look around we don't really have
too many Thais in the room, right? So my point is that we need two
hands to clap. We have done -- we moved this here. APrIGF isn't here
now. It is a great opportunity for the locals to understand about
more Internet Governance issues and to take part in discussions. So
while there could be various reasons why we are not seeing that so
much, but my point is that we need two hands to clap. And we need
community to come and we need to tell us what we can do better and
to make sure it is more interesting for you so you like to come.
        >> LEONID TODOROV: One second, just to answer that question,
why Asia is lagging behind in terms of the dialogue on Internet
Governance. I have been to the European Internet Governance Forum.
That's a complete bore. You know why? Because they have all the
issues solved. Multi-stakeholderism they got it. Governments very
sympathetic, good. Participation and inclusivity, done. You have
six speakers in a row and they are in full agreement with each other.
That was terrible. So you got to feel really blessed. We have got
a lot of things to discuss and to -- to talk and to decide on. So
I think that we should be very optimistic about that. Thank you.
        >> SATISH BABU: I have to close the session. This session is
now closed.
     (Applause)
                              ***
          This is being provided in 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.
                              ***