

DISCLAIMER:

Due to the difficulties capturing a live speaker's words, it is possible this transcript may contain errors and mistranslations. Media Scriptz accepts no liability for any event or action resulting from the transcripts.

>>Komathi Ale: A very good morning to everybody, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

It's a pleasure to welcome you to the 2nd Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum 2011 and the Youth Internet Governance Forum.

Following the success of both fora, which were held in Hong Kong last year, this meeting will bring together senior government and private sector representatives, as well as the technical and academic community from across the region, to exchange ideas and shape the future of internet governance.

The event received much support, particularly from three hosting organisations: the Singapore Internet Research Centre, which is recognised as a premier Asian research institute for new media issues; DotAsia, a non-profit organisation with a mission to promote internet development and adoption in Asia; and, NetMission Asia, which is devoted towards promoting and

contributing towards digital inclusion and internet governance in Asia.

This event is also made possible by the kind support of the Lee Foundation, the Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore and Nanyang Technological University, including our sponsors: APNIC, M1 and Google.

Without further ado, may I invite Prof Ang Peng Hwa, director of the Singapore Internet Research Centre and professor at the Wee Kim Wee School of Communication and Information at the Nanyang Technological University, to deliver the welcome remarks.

Prof Ang.

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Thank you, Komathi.

Good morning, everybody. Good to see most of you, because this screen is blocking my view, actually.

I'm delighted to be here and glad to see so many of you, our distinguished guests, Ms Aileen Chia, the Deputy Director General of the Infocomm Development Authority.

Friends, please look to your right. You see some people in green, youth in green.

There is another camp going on that starts now, but they will leave us after the coffee break to go to

Nanyang Technological University, my university, where they will hold their own Youth IGF. It's an idea that came from Hong Kong, from Edmon, and we are following it up at this meeting.

I will mention some things about the Youth IGF as well as the IGF because some of you are new to it. The idea of having this rIGF came about because in 2005, there was a recommendation of the Working Group on Internet Governance that there should be a lightweight, no decision-making power body at the highest level of the UN, to look into internet governance issues.

This IGF was begun, the meeting begun in Greece and then they've had five meetings, one every year. The Secretariat is represented here. Mr Chengetai Masango, stand up so everyone can see you.

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: This meeting brings together government officials, business, as well as what we call civil society groups to talk about internet governance issues. The next meeting is going to be Kenya, Nairobi.

What we hope to do in this meeting is for the youth to a few people to do well to attend Nairobi meeting. So we are trying to spread the word about the internet governance forum.

The idea for our own Asia Pacific Regional IGF began

in Sharm El Sheikh, when I was talking to Edmon. I noticed that we were the last region in the world not to have a rIGF meeting. There were Latin American meetings, European meetings, even African meetings, but nothing in Asia Pacific which is, to put it mildly, a bit ridiculous, right? We have 1 billion people in China, another billion in India and then we have large Muslim populations represented in Indonesia and Pakistan -- altogether, my guess is almost half of the world's population. Yet, we had no such regional meeting.

Edmon and I began talking and then with the support of a big group of people from Hong Kong, led by Edmon, we had Jeremy Godfrey, the Government Chief Information Officer of Hong Kong; Stephen Lau, the Privacy Commissioner of Hong Kong; and then Charles Mok, the President of the Internet Society Chapter of Hong Kong, coming together to organise the first meeting.

It was Edmon's idea to also have the Youth IGF. As I was observing, as they are wearing green. By the time they finish, like the T-shirt, they will be a little less green to IGF.

I want to thank those who made this possible. First of all, some of you saw a lady looking a bit anxious. Her name is Yvonne Lim.

I observed from Edmon that he had a fantastic helper in a lady called Bianca.

Bianca, wave your hand, please.

Bianca is amazing. I emailed her at 2 am, I got a reply. Then I emailed her at 6 am and I got another reply. So I think she doesn't sleep and she may be a robot.

I observed what she drank, I took some of the water and I gave it to Yvonne.

Seriously, the DotAsia crew has been amazing. I want to recognise them for their support in many ways. Edmon, of course, the CEO; Ching Chao, who is not here; Pavan; Elaine Cheng and they came together to facilitate this.

For the programming committee, the program was put together with a big group of people again:

Keith Davidson; Cheryl Langdon-Orr, not here yet; Wu Kuo-Wei; Hong Xue; Izumi Auzi; Rajnesh Singh, who I think is not here yet, from ISOC; Herman Valdez, not here yet; and Goh Seow Hiong from CISCO.

I also thank the list of sponsors here. DotAsia has been a major help, of course, putting together this financially; the Lee Foundation also, where they contributed funds for this.

The Lee Foundation, for those who are not from

Singapore, they are big rubber merchants and they own a bank called OCBC and they have been supporters of academic and educational scene in Singapore.

The Infocomm Development Authority, of course, for their sponsorship. Infocomm has been doing quite a bit of work in some cutting-edge policies, building up, right now, completing this nationwide 100 meg broadband and escalating up.

APNIC, of course, Paul; and Google, supporting this as well; M1, which is one of the three mobile telcos and then my resource centre.

I talk a bit about the program. The program for today, we are talking about three important areas, IPv6, which is really critical issue here and then something that maybe many of us may not know, this is something called ACTA, anti-counterfeiting, intermediaries, so ISPs may be held liable for allowing people to download materials.

We will be talking about IDNS, which is a large part of it is invented here and we have some of the key people, Tan Tin Wee is here, he is hiding in the corner as usual. He's trying to keep a low profile.

I want to say that for this meeting, I hope that we will indeed have a robust discussion, because some of these areas are quite contentious and I really hope we

have a robust discussion and the young people to the Youth IGF will have a robust discussion.

What is a robust discussion? I have one good example from my colleagues.

The idea of a robust discussion is that we had this friend, a colleague also, new to our meetings, he came for one of our meetings and then when he heard our robust discussion, he said, you guys should stop quarrelling and everybody in the room is because, you know, we were having a robust discussion, it sounded a lot like a quarrel, but how do you know it's not a quarrel? Because at the end of it, the two who gave the most robust discussions said: let's go for lunch together.

I hope you have that, you have robust discussion. Some people who are not familiar with you guys, but then you guys say: let's go for lunch together.

On a final note, I want to say that in your time here, I hope you also get a chance to explore Singapore. I think maybe this group might not be the group that go to this place called the Integrated Resorts. We call it Integrated Resorts, but in most place we call it casino. The reason is that the actual space occupied by the casino is 3 per cent, but if the casino makes 50 per cent of the profits, so depending on how you want

to look at it.

There is the art and science museum and they are having an exhibit right now.

Just a caution that this casino makes the most profits for marina bay sands. They say that many people have made small fortunes out of the car know, especially when they started with a large fortune.

I will say there are lots of things to do in Singapore. It's quite amazing, because we organised a large conference last year in Singapore and we estimated you could have spent five days in Singapore looking at the sites. You think there is nothing much to do here, but when you worked it out, you could spend five full days. It doesn't mean you should skip the plenary sessions, but there are things you can do.

One thing I would highly recommend is if you have not been here before, is to see the zoo at night, because the animals are quite clever. They come out at night when it is cooler. During the day, they sleep.

Of course, in Singapore, we are crazy about food. We talk about lunch during breakfast. We talk about dinner during lunch. We talk about breakfast during dinner. We are crazy about food.

On that note, I want to wish even here a good time. Food for the body and soul and a fruitful time together.

So have fun.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Thank you, Prof Ang.

The following speaker is from the Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore. May I invite Ms Aileen Chia, the director Director General Telecoms and Post, to deliver the keynote speech of enabling policies for the internet.

Ms Chia.

APPLAUSE

>>Aileen Chia: Good morning, everyone. Morning Prof Ang, director for the Singapore Internet Research Centre and to you, Mr Edmon Chung, CEO of DotAsia Organisation, ladies and gentlemen.

I am very happy to be here today for the opening of the rIGF 2011. This is indeed an opportune time to bring together experts and leaders from the private and the public sector.

Technical experts and academic communities to exchange ideas and like Prof Ang said, have robust discussions and gain fresh insights on internet governance issues.

This is particularly important given the pervasive and the profound changes brought about by the internet in the recent years.

Since the commercialisation of the internet in the 1990s, there are now over 2 billion users of the internet worldwide. In Singapore, household broadband penetration has already exceeded 80 per cent in 2010. In both fixed line and wireless broadband access subscription. Both have been growing.

More significantly, internet user habits have also changed, with the proliferation of smartphones and wireless devices.

A global research found that more than two-thirds of all mobile phones used in Singapore are smartphones.

This is a society where mobile penetration rate stands at 145 per cent.

This trend of accessing the internet anywhere, any time and on the move is here to stay and it's contributing to the huge growth in internet traffic.

In fact, from 2009 to 2010 alone, total international internet bandwidth used by telecom operators in Singapore almost doubled from about 440 megabits per second in 2009 to 830 megabits per second in 2010.

Indeed, we find ourselves in an era of exciting and exponential change enabled by the internet. This network of networks plays a key role in Singapore in our economy and our society today.

We use electronic commerce, e-learning for entertainment, communications, media and so on.

The Singapore Government has always recognised the economic and social benefits of the internet and has implemented key programs over the years to ensure that our citizens and businesses are able to exploit the advantages of going on-line.

For example, at the infrastructure level, Singapore has embarked on the deployment of the nationwide fibre to the home network or what we call NGN, next general broadband network, NGNBN, which will cover the entire country or 95 per cent of homes and businesses by 2012.

The NGNBN will provide ultra high-speed broadband access to 1 gigabits connecting homes, schools, businesses to the internet highway.

The idea also launched what we call the Wireless-SG in 2006, which provides free wireless broadband access with speeds of up to 1 megabits per second at public locations.

Today, there are over 7,500 WiFi hotspots just from the Wireless-SG network alone, all over the island, allowing students, tourists, businesses, travellers and internet users to go on-line anywhere, any time.

Our local infrastructure is complemented by our excellent global connectivity. Singapore today is one

of the world's most internationally connected countries with no less than 15 submarine systems landing in Singapore and it's still growing.

Today we have 8 terabits per second of submarine cable connectivity capacity connect us to the rest of the world. Many countries are quite surprised that this small little island has 15 submarine cables in Singapore.

While we have put in place a fiscal infrastructure to we have also not forgotten the soft policies. There are critical to encourage the adoption of internet broadband services.

One of the key policy frameworks underpinning the development of a vibrant internet access is the facilitation of competition. This will bring about wider variety of internet services, packages and lower prices for consumers and businesses.

Today, users in Singapore can choose from a wide variety of internet broadband services offered by various service providers, whether over the next general fibre network, ADSL technology, coaxial cables or mobile platforms.

Some competition among service providers has resulted in falling prices.

For example, a 100 megabits per second internet

broadband service over the NGN network today starts as low as S\$39. It was brought down by more than half, from about S\$70 to S\$100, for similar offerings over the ADSL island cable network, about one to two years ago.

Even with this wide range of internet broadband services and competitive prices, some members of our society may not be able to fully leverage the benefits of the internet.

Hence, we have implemented a series of digital inclusion efforts to equip disadvantaged and power the disabled and to engage the elderly.

For example, our new PC program aims to equip the poorer households with computers.

Students and disabled from the low income family can purchase subsidised new computers bundled with three years of free internet broadband access and software.

For the silver, we have our silver Infocomm initiative which aims to promote IT awareness and literati among senior citizens, this includes Infocomm junctions island wide which offer affordable Infocomm training and a customised curriculum for them.

By 2013, 100 silver Infocomm hotspots will be set up island wide to allow senior citizens to have convenient and free access to internet services.

You can see that some of the government programs and

initiatives that I have mentioned earlier are meant to play a key role in facilitating the development of the internet and ensuring that our consumer and businesses can reap the full benefits of connect to the on-line world.

It is in this context I would like to touch on the role of government policies and internet governance.

Singapore believes that a multi-stakeholder model is the most appropriate framework to address internet governance issues.

A partnership approach where governments, industry and civil society work together to shape the development of the internet. This will benefit all. Internet governance must be inclusive and responsive. It should not be the sole domain of the government.

Such a multi-stakeholder approach will serve us well. It will facilitate innovation and development of new internet services and technologies by the private sector and research and educational institutions and encouraging internet broadband adoption among our consumer a businesses.

In line with this approach, our government policies on issues related to the internet seek to strike a balance between enabling commercial flexibility for the industry players and ensuring basic safeguards to

protect consumers.

I would like to illustrate this balanced approach with IDA's policy framework for net neutrality.

Following the debate on net neutrality in the internet fora, the arguments by proponents and opponents of net neutrality are both valid.

On the one hand, proponents argue that completely neutral internet access is necessary to allow innovation in service and content development to flourish and it's best for consumer interest.

On the other hand, opponents assert that blanket net neutrality rules would restrict network optimisation and stifle investment in network infrastructure.

For IDA, we have undertaken consultation on this issue and our policy approach that we have taken is a balanced one that allows consumers a reasonable quality of access to the internet and, at the same time, provide service providers and telecom operators with sufficient commercial flexibility to differentiate their service offerings to meet the needs of consumers.

Particularly with the deployment of NGNBN, we expect to see the deployment of new innovative next generation services that might require different performance standards for internet access. These include services like interactive television, content and applications,

e-learning, tele-health and cloud computers, amongst others.

We therefore take a pragmatic stance on net neutrality, which rests on three prongs. The first is to enhance and promote competition among retail service providers in the market to allow market forces to drive operator behaviours.

Competition can reduce the incentives of operators to engage in discriminatory practices that restrict consumer choice, in terms of what is accessible over the internet.

IDA's regulatory framework on interconnection and competition guards against such anti competitive and discriminatory behaviours.

The second prong is to increase information transparency for consumers to make informed choices on internet access services. Issues like traffic management or the discrepancies between actual and advertised internet speeds have often been cited as issues that affect internet surfing experience, but it remains opaque to consumers.

In the past few years, IDA has imposed requirements on residential internet broadband service providers to publish their network management practices so that consumers are informed and can better choose their

service providers based on their serving needs.

Recently, we mandated that internet service providers must measure and publish typical internet broadband speeds, in addition to advertising the theoretical maximum download speeds of their internet broadband plans.

We are quite heartened to see that some service providers have begun to do so and we encourage more such activities.

On our own IDA also regularly test and publishes on our website the performance of internet broadband services in Singapore, to help consumer navigate the variety of broadband service choices in the market.

The third prong is to ensure that consumers enjoy a reasonable quality of access to the internet. In this respect, IDA prohibits operators from blocking legitimate internet content. They also cannot impose discriminatory practices, restrictions, charges or other measures which will effectively render internet applications and content inaccessible or unusable.

In addition, IDA has since 2001, imposed quality of service requirements on fixed line internet broadband services including maximum latency prescriptions for local and internet network access.

I believe IDA is one of the first regulators, if not

amongst the first few in the world to do so.

Within this three prong policy framework which seeks to facilitate competition and put in place a minimum consumer safeguards, service providers and operators are free to innovate and differentiate their service offerings to meet changing consumer needs and niche user groups. IDA believe that is such a balanced policy approach will continue to facilitate consumers access to content and services on the internet, while providing flexibility for service providers and operators to differentiate their services for economic efficiencies and innovation.

Net neutrality is but just one of the policy issues that have arisen from the development of growth of the internet. There are various policy questions and implications related to the internet that grapple governments today and some of you will be discussing some of these issues over the next two days.

These include internet security, IPv4 to IPv6 transition, data protection, among others.

IDA will be taking the same balanced policy approach in addressing some of these issues and, very importantly, a consultative approach to engage and hear the views of key stakeholders before formulating our policy frameworks.

This outreach and engagement process is one of the key factors for the success in a multi-stakeholder governance approach.

On this note, I wish you an enjoyable and an insightful, fruitful discussion for the next two days. I hope besides participating in this forum, like Prof Ang says, do enjoy the sunny island. I hope it doesn't rain.

Have a good session. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Thank you, Ms Chia.

May I once again invite Prof Ang to present Ms Chia with a small token of appreciation.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Thank you, Ms Chia.

Prof Ang will chair the next introduction session, along with Mr Edmon Chung from DotAsia, Mr Paul Wilson from APNIC, Mr Peter Dengate-Thrush from ICANN and Mr Chengetai Masango from IGF.

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Good morning everybody again. This session is our plenary. What we are trying to do here is to have some inputs from the panel here, but also we have time for questions and answers after that.

So you are also free to ask questions and we hope it will be a lively interactive session.

In our panel, we are not able to have Peter Dengate-Thrush, Chairman of the ICANN board has been tied up in work and apparently the CEO is on his way here as we speak, but not able to be here on time.

Let me begin by introducing speakers. On my far left is Edmon Chung, who is the -- I think as you can see from his CV, what's the CEO of DotAsia, which, by the way, really recycles the profits back to promoting the internet in Asia. DotAsia would be any domain name with the last word being "Asia".

Edmon has an interesting background. Among other things, he won the most innovative award in the Chinese Canadian entrepreneurship in 2001. This is a dot-com sort of thing. He holds also patents on internationalised domain names, IDNS.

He has a background in engineering from the University of Toronto. I just learned that you are doing a PhD at Shanghai University of Finance and Economics. I would have warned you not to do that, you know?

Then on my left is Paul Wilson. I have known Paul for a long time and many of us know him for a long time, more than 20 years experience, involvement with the internet and more than 10 years working for APNIC, which distributes IP addresses in Asia Pacific. Among other

things, he's the CEO of the first privatised IP in Australia. Paul was inducted into the Australian Internet Hall of Fame.

Then in the middle is Mr Masango. I mentioned him earlier. What's the Program and Technology Manager at the UN Secretariat for the Internet Governance Forum. He's from Zimbabwe and also finishing a PhD and actually in danger of completing it. He's doing his PhD in information policy at Syracuse, where there is a group of people working on internet governance issues.

I'm going to ask Edmon to lead off and then after that, the speakers in the row.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you. In your email, I thought I was going last, but it doesn't matter.

I guess I would like to first of all start off by saying thank you to Peng Hwa and the team here for putting this wonderful event together.

We really didn't do as much as maybe we should have, but I think it's great to have everyone here in this meeting. I would like to thank especially as Peng Hwa has already, Yvonne, who has been really, you know, the one that -- Yvonne, thank you so much for actually putting it together.

I was thinking of, as I was coming over just yesterday, I was in an event in Hong Kong and was

a group of, I guess, highly powerful internet companies joining together to form what is called the Asia internet coalition. I'm not sure whether anyone from here was in that meeting, but coming together Google Yahoo!, eBay and Nokia.

I might have missed somebody, but some of the very powerful companies forming Asia internet coalition and one of the things that they are definitely interested in is internet governance and I believe some of them are here. I believe we'll hear from them today and tomorrow as well.

I think one of the things that's interesting is that a lot of them said about why Asia was, you know, so late in terms of the Regional Internet Governance Forum.

One of the things that was discussed in sort of the coffee break yesterday was Asia's basically so diverse, I mean, you know, what's the point of having a discussion together? China is so different from India, so different from the Pacific, so different from the western Asia side.

But I think from my perspective, what is really important for occasions like this is the information sharing and the experience sharing and I think that is a core part of the Internet Governance Forum concept.

I think when we talk about Asia as being really

diverse, I think that's definitely something that I believe in, but there is still value in coming together in information sharing and also one of the things about internet governance I think, you know, that's really one of the gems of which is the multi-stakeholder approach and that allows different stakeholders to come together and actually, you know, get a sense of how when they go back to their local jurisdictions, whether they're from the NGOs, how they can fight with the government and whether they're the governments, how they could fend off the NGOs and, you know, businesses, how they join together to form these coalitions against both.

I think this is the kind of the value that Internet Governance Forum brings and looking at some of the topics that we will talk about, I think and I I think Aileen mentioned, one of which is net neutrality, I think I was really impressed by a presentation by Geoff Huston from APNIC, I think, about a week ago, at the World IPv6 Day.

I think a lot of people don't really connect IPv6 and net neutrality, but as Geoff has always been sort of a doomsday -- saying for the last 10 years about IPv6 and the exhaustion of IPv4. We really forget about how important it is in terms of net neutrality and IPv6.

As IPv4 addresses deplete and are being exhausted, there actually is an increasing, I guess, interest and also tendency for service providers to become less net neutral and when you think about the they continue to use IPv4 and constrain the resources, net neutrality becomes a real issue.

One of the things that I was sitting there and listening to to Aileen mention about the situation here in Singapore. I personally do believe in somewhat of a balanced approach, but I had a pretty bad experience yesterday when I was just coming into Singapore, into my hotel and I realised because my internet was cut off twice, thought they thought I was using bit torrent.

In fact, what happened was after a long flight -- well, not too long, from Hong Kong, I had about 300 or so emails waiting for me and every time it popped up my Outlook, because of the large amount of, I guess, traffic, they blacklisted my Mac address.

This is something, I guess, when I actually spent a lot of time trying to figure out the reason, because of course the support person didn't really understand what it was. But eventually, it was because they suspected that I was using a particular application that they blacklisted my Mac address twice.

So I think these are some of the things that need to

be talked about. It's not something -- of course, it's just a personal experience, but I think it's sort of like a tip of the iceberg thing and that's the reason why net neutrality is so precious and something that we really should look into.

I was looking around at the agenda for the next couple of days as well. IDN, of course, is a big issue, big item and I'm actually very interested to listen to the discussion later today, especially as ICANN is rolling out IDNs, it seems like everything is going well and happening. There really are still a lot of issues that haven't been resolved. One of which is IDN variance. It's almost like pulling teeth, really, from ICANN for them to look into the issue.

I think overall, there are a number of items that over the next couple of days, I think would be important issues to talk about and I wanted to respond back to Peng Hwa saying about the youth internet governance forum.

In fact, the idea didn't come from me. The idea actually came from Bianca and the NetMission team. What perhaps what DotAsia and we did is really to throw them into the lion's den and participate at ICANN and IGF meetings and this is the kind of thing that came out.

I think a couple of things that I want to bring up.

One is that it sort of exemplifies this multi-stakeholder approach. We had a bunch of students join the IGF conference in Egypt and when they went back to Hong Kong, they decided, you know, we should have a Youth Internet Governance Forum in Asia. And that's what happened.

That's part of the bottom-up nature of the internet and that's sort of the spirit of the multi-stakeholder approach and the Internet Governance Forum.

The other part is also kind of interesting, I think, that in putting this together, they actually came up with a really interesting forum, so if anyone of you have any time, please do join them in their sessions, because in the Youth IGF camp, what actually happens is that when a camper joins the camp and when they go into the camp, they get assigned a particular role. They could become a government, they could become a business or they could become an NGO.

Through that process, learn about the aspects of multi-stakeholder discussion and I think that sort of one of the gems of the whole multi-stakeholder spirit.

With that, I think in general, DotAsia will continue to support, as our own organisation, our mandate, to promote internet development and adoption around Asia, we will continue to support the IGF and especially the

Asia Pacific Regional IGF. We sort of threw ourselves in to act as a Secretariat and I will continue to commit resources and our efforts to it.

As we go through this couple of days, I would like to invite you all back to the way forward session as well. I think this is with the IGF future of the IGF being still very much a topic for discussion and I think the way forward session I would like to invite you all back and after all the discussion in the next couple of days and see what we should do as a region and as a general participants on the internet to see how we should bring internet governance no ward.

Thank you.

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Our next presenter is Paul and Paul is going to have some slides to show.

I would add, I guess, on Edmon's point about youth meeting, I have to say that I was quite sceptical at first when I heard about the youth meeting, you know, because at the UN IGF meetings, it gets very heated, a lot of heat, not much light and I was wondering how can the youth really contribute? But as I gathered from the feedback and all, it went very well. In fact, I was teaching a course on internet governance and one of the conclusion is role playing is quite critical to the

learning process.

So next year, when we have our own Youth IGF again, I would recommend that perhaps we could have some of your youth from your respective countries come and attend the Youth IGF.

Right now, it's principally Hong Kong and Singapore. We have some students from outside of Singapore participating, but I think the idea is so good that it's sort of a waste if it's just confined to these few countries. I think it's good if you can spend it beyond Singapore and Hong Kong and really throughout Asia Pacific.

So I'm going to now pass on to Paul.

>>Paul Wilson: Thanks very much, Peng Hwa, and thanks very much everyone for being here. It's a great turnout. I'm sorry to be standing up here and not to be visible to everyone here, but there is a group of APNIC staff down behind the screen here and they are all quite used to seeing me, so I guess they're not missing anything too much.

First, I would like to explain and to emphasise that APNIC, my organisation, is concerned with the quite esoteric and technical topic of IP addressing.

But it is a topic that fundamental, absolutely fundamental, to the operation of the internet. So

I hope you'll excuse a sort of professional obsession on my part with talking about IP addressing to start with and IP addressing related issues, but I will be drawing that back into internet governance topics by the time I finish.

The point about IP addressing is that not only is it essential, but the proper management of IP addressing is essential to the proper operation of the internet and there is a lot about the internet that we take for granted. The internet is a global single point to point seamless network that we all enjoy and we take that for granted. If you look at, for instance, the debates about network neutrality, the fact that we can have those debates at all is courtesy of what we get from the internet for free, because if the internet was very different -- and it could be very different under different address management -- we wouldn't even have the opportunity to talk about network neutrality, because the network, in its essence, would not be neutral and we wouldn't even be missing what we were missing.

But what I want to emphasise here is that internet addresses are critical and management of addresses are critical.

As critical as the addresses are to the internet

itself, there's a transition underway at the moment from IPv4 addressing to IPv6 addressing and that is critical to the future of the internet. Also, if we are going to preserve the internet that we know and love today and even as I have said I would say to improve it in future, the success of the transition to IPv6 is a critical event and a critical priority as well.

The success of the transition to IPv6 is actually a multi-stakeholder challenge and that's the emphasis that I want to place here that's quite relevant to the broader internet governance sector as a multi-stakeholder issue.

I hope you'll forgive me if I take us out of IP addressing, in fact, out of the internet completely for a moment, to -- and I would like to take you through an analogy I have for the IPv6 transition.

The idea here, bear with me, is that we I imagine that we're not here to talk about the internet, but we're here to talk about transportation, so we are here at a transportation governance forum, we are here to talk about a transition in transportation from gasoline to electricity in the vehicles that we drive.

At this meeting, we're asking: what's next after oil? Or we are talking about what's next after oil. We actually know what's next, and we are talking about how

to get there.

The audience here may be comprised of people who are involved with extracting oil, distributing oil, manufacturing the vehicles that use them, selling oil to customers, they may be people using vehicles and driving around or companies managing fleets, governments are interested in this and even the United Nations is interested in this topic, because we all rely on oil in our transportation systems.

But we know that oil is not going to last forever and we're starting to enter into a transition now to this next generation, which is also well known. It's a generation of electric vehicles. We are starting to deploy electric vehicles right now. We are starting to deploy transitional vehicles which are dual fuel vehicles.

So you may, at some point, be able to charge your car or to fuel it with gasoline. That transition is quite a complex process, because you're driving a car around, you're not quite sure whether you're going to be able to get the new fuel everywhere you go.

You have to be continuing to rely on the old fuel for some time, but this transition is going to go onwards, forwards, for some time, involving all of us in our different ways, whether we're drivers, whether we're

manufacturing vehicles, whether we're maintaining vehicles, we have all very different concerns, but in fact we need to come together to talk about the timing, to talk about the problems, the issues, how they interrelate.

The only people who don't need to worry, by the way, are the kids in the backseat of the vehicles, who can just enjoy the ride and trust everyone else to know what's going on. We hope the same thing is happening when it comes to the internet as well.

But of course, we have our eye on the long future and it's a green fantastic clean future, where the system that we're managing is going to be not only clean and green, but better in quite a lot of ways.

This is an analogy which I hope is fairly clear. We're starting with an old world of IPv4 addresses, we're going through a complex transition involving many, many people through an IPv4 plus IPv6 transitional period to our final goal.

The point here is that back to the business of internet governance, the problem is multi-stakeholder, the problem involves many people in their different capacities.

In terms of IPv6 transition, which I won't go on labouring, the transition is actually going pretty well.

We had a World IPv6 Day last week, in fact, that some of you may well have heard about and been involved with. But it was a successful event, in fact.

We're all hoping and working to make sure the transition goes smoothly.

But that transition is and to broaden a little bit here, that transition is only just one of the challenges in this very broad sphere of internet governance. In fact, the governance sphere is much bigger. But I would say the principle is exactly the same, that in this much more diverse and multi-dimensional sphere of overall internet management and governance, that multi-stakeholderism is that much more important.

I guess I hope we all know this. We know, I hope, that multi-stakeholderism is intrinsic to articulating the challenges, negotiating our interests and developing the solutions in this space.

We know that multi-stakeholderism itself is also a challenge in itself, because it is still a subject of some confusion, of some concern, of some threat. I say even some outright opposition by those who are not entirely comfortable with it, but I hope that what we recognise is that the internet, as it exists, as we know it, actually is intrinsically reliant on multi-stakeholder solutions and almost certainly can't

survive in its current form in this brilliant form in which we can have debate about network neutrality, for instance, it cannot survive in that state without a multi-stakeholder approach to its problems.

Speaking for APNIC, we do and we have for some time strongly supported this IGF process going way back priority IGF to the WSIS and the working group on internet governance. It was great to be part of the first Asia Pacific Regional IGF last year and to see the results of that meeting which were fed very meaningfully into the global IGF process and it's a real privilege to be at this meeting here to have seen the Pacific IGF, which I hope we'll here about in the course of these days, because from here, this event, as well as the Pacific one that is feeding into it, will contribute strongly and meaningfully into the global IGF which is coming up in Nairobi.

The global IGF is going to be an important occasion of course and many of us are still a little concerned that we don't know what the exact form of that meeting will be, even though it's coming up fairly soon.

Many of us have strongly supported continuation of the IGF, but not just in any form, we have supported the IGF very specifically for its goals towards the ideal of a true multi-stakeholder process and we'll continue to

support its development in that direction.

Recently, some of us participated in the United Nations CSTD process on determining improvements to the IGF and we took the same input into that. In fact, we argued very strongly that that CSTD process should itself with a multi-stakeholder process, because initially it wasn't going to be, but we were successful in that appeal and we provided, having been successful, we provided a delegate within the technical business academic grouping and participated in that process alongside quite a few representatives from this region, from civil society, from governments and so on.

We made views very clear, that, again, we support the IGF, we support improvements to the IGF, while it continues to strive towards its original mission, which is that of a true multi-stakeholder process.

With those words, I'll only say, again, it's a real privilege to be here and thanks very much to the organisers. It's great to see so many familiar and also new faces in the audience and I'm really looking forward to two days of interesting discussion, more so actually to two days of genuine interaction, which I hope will engage and actually involve all of you.

Thanks very much.

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Thank you, Paul. Third speaker now is
Chengetai Masango.

>>Chengetai Masango: Thanks very much, Peng Hwa. Good
morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to say I'm very happy to be here in the
Asia Pacific Regional IGF to see a regional IGF in
action and also particularly the youth. I'm very happy
to see the youth there participating in the IGF.

I was asked to talk today about the history of the
IGF and the IGF process and then tomorrow I'll go into
more detail about the future.

The IGF, the internet governance forum started off
through the WSIS process of the World Summit of the
Information Society. It was seen as the internet being
a bone of contention, the internet was up and coming
economic activity, was gaining on the internet and
governments began to take notice and they wanted a say
in how the internet was run.

Also, the WSIS was also dealing with the digital
divide issues.

The WSIS summit was into phases. We had the Geneva
phase, which happened in 2003, in December, and the
Tunis phase. In the Geneva phase, when they were
discussing, they found out that there wasn't a real
definition of what internet governance was.

Also, what issues fell under internet governance, was it just the issues dealing with naming and addressing and the root zone files or was it a broader discussion that needed to take place?

The WSIS summit asked the Secretary General, then Kofi Annan, to form a working group on internet governance, which Prof Ang was a member of.

Its main activity was to investigate and to make proposals for action as appropriate on the governance of the internet by 2005. That's the Tunis agenda.

It was asked to develop a working definition of internet governance, identify the public, the broad public policy issues that are relevant to internet governance and develop a common understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of governments, existing international organisation and other forums, such as the private sector and civil society in the developing and developed countries.

The working group of the internet governance met. They came up with this report. The report came up with this definition.

Is it up on the screen? No. I'm read it out to you.

The definition of internet governance was:

"Internet governance is the development and

application by governments, the private sector and civil society in their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs that shape the evolution and the use of the internet."

That was the working definition that the working group on internet governance came up with and it was adopted in the Tunis phase.

The working group also set out a number of issues that of certain that came under internet governance, issues at that time were internet connection costs, privacy, security, access, which we have seen developed through the Internet Governance Forums, the meetings that we have had.

The mandate for the Internet Governance Forum is set out in paragraph 72 of the Tunis agenda. Broadly speaking, it's to discuss public policy issues related to key elements of internet governance, in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and the development of the internet.

The IGF was set up at the root level. There is stakeholders which are governments, civil society, the academic and technical community, the private sector and inter-governmental organisations.

All these were supposed to interact on an equal footing, which is quite important, because this is one

of the rare times in the international arena, where governments have said: OK, we will engage with all these other communities on an equal footing.

Also, the Internet Governance Forum has an advisory group, a multi-stakeholder advisory group, which are representatives from each of these sectors and they are chosen by their sectors and their names are submitted to the Secretary General and the Secretary General approves the names and appoints these people to the multi-stakeholder advisory groups.

The job of the multi-stakeholder advisory group is to come up with a program and schedule for each of the meetings of the Internet Governance Forum, which we have had five of, which I'll go into in detail.

Then there is the Secretariat, which is based in Geneva, Switzerland.

We have three meetings roughly a year in Geneva, setting out the issues at hand and planning the schedule and program of the main meeting.

What is the Internet Governance Forum?

As I said, it's a platform for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue, it is based on a soft governance approach. That means that the IGF can shape public opinion, but it has no decision-making power.

People come to the IGF, exchange ideas and then go

back home to their home institutions and effect change that way.

Also in the regional and internet IGFs, they operate differently, but I'll get into that a little bit later.

The main job of the IGF is dealing with policy coherence.

Much of the IGF deals with international factors, because it's the internet, but as it is the internet, national policies are important and making an enabling environment is a key factor to allow for the development and deployment of the internet.

There is a need for policy coherence on all levelling, international, regional and international levels.

There is the national IGFs which discuss at the national level, they feed into the Regional IGFs and then this can be fed into the international IGF.

Strengthen weaknesses. There is different views on this. Some people see that there is the lack of decision making as a weakness, but others see it as a strength because people can discuss freely without thinking that a decision will come out of it and they have to keep to their position.

But others want the IGF to produce concrete results, which is part of the debate that's going on now,

especially affecting the CSTD.

As I have mentioned, national and Regional IGFs, since it's not up, we have the Regional IGFs are Latin American and Caribbean Regional IGF, East Africa IGF, West Africa, EuroDig, there is a Commonwealth IGF, of course Asia Pacific IGF and there is a whole range of national IGFs, from the UK, USA, Rwanda, Finland, Russian IGF. I think the latest one was the Icelandic IGF.

We have had five IGF meetings during our first phase, which ended last year.

These meetings are usually four days, the first meeting was in Athens in 2006. We had about -- we expected 800, we had over 1,000 participants and then the meetings have been in Rio de Janeiro, Hyderabad, Sharm El Sheikh, Vilnius last year. This year, it is in Nairobi.

Last year, we had about 1,400 participants. So the IGF meetings are going from strength to strength, showing that people do see value in the IGF.

Next year's meeting is going to be in Baku, Azerbaijan.

We travel around the regions to give people in those regions a chance to come and visit, because people, of course, in Latin American find it difficult to go to

Europe or to Asia. So in Rio de Janeiro, we had a lot of people from South America, et cetera.

Another interesting outcome of the IGFs, which was not planned, is the dynamic coalitions, which are coalitions of multi-stakeholders, such as -- I'll pick an interesting one. We used to have a big debate on spam, but that has disappeared from the scene. But for example, we have had privacy, you know, a coalition on privacy, so we have countries such as France, the World Bank, Amnesty International, joining together to form a dynamic coalition on privacy. There is Internet Bill of Rights, where we have the government of Brazil, ISOC, Italy, IP Justice forming together to discuss issues on or come up with an Internet Bill of Rights.

Access to knowledge, there is Google, Council of Europe, Electronic Frontier Foundation. All these people who have quite different views on access to knowledge coming together to see if they can see some sort of common ground.

I think on the whole, they have been successful, because from my point of view and I'm sure from the point of view of those of us who have been to IGFs, Athens we had a lot of cat calling and names and people shouting at each other and as you saw the development, people really began to listen to each other and talk and

see that both sides had a point and come up with solutions that took into account the views of both sides.

The original mandate for the IGF was for five years, which was in 2005. It ended in 2010.

For the last two years, the UN Secretary General was requested to hold formal consultations with IGF participants on the desirability of the continuation of the forum, which we did in Sharm El Sheikh and it was decided to continue the IGF and the mandate was renewed by the General Assembly for another five years. This is until 2015.

But with the caveat that the CSTD working group, that's an ECOSOC Commission -- these are all acronyms that you're not really familiar with, but the Commission for Science and Technology Development, set up a working group. We have members here. I'll just call Sam Dickinson out. There are members of a working group on improvements to the IGF and there are various issues that they are discussing. Developing country participation. They're discussing how the MAG is formed and they are looking into the financing of the IGF. They had initial mandate of one year and they reported back to the CSTD last month in May and they had failed to come to any resolution.

The CSTD resolved to extend the mandate for another year and they may come up with a resolution next year.

To answer your question, for this year at least, the IGF is going to remain as it has always been with, of course, tweaks, several improvement tweaks, as we go along, but we have to wait for the report of the CSTD next year to see what they advise.

Also, the IGF, there is the vacancy of the Chairman of the Special Advisor for Internet Governance, he stepped down at the end of last year and his position has to be filled.

Also, Mr Markus Kummer, who was the executive coordinator, stepped down in January and his position still is to be filled and the process is ongoing, as the United Nations is, I would say, you could call it a bureaucratic organisation, a lot of forms have to be signed and advertisement of the position has to be approved by various officers, but it's slowly making its way and it's going to be advertised, hopefully, in the next month.

I'll stop there and we can talk about the future and tomorrow.

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Thank you, Chengetai.

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: That was a quick overview regarding the IGF.

Some points about that.

I happen to teach a course on internet governance last semester and I gather that just other course in the world, so two courses in the world, the other one is a friend of mine at a university in Canada, McGill. We traded notes on how to do it.

One of the things that we sort of agreed on roughly is to say that internet governance is rules about rules. The way the thing about it is that you know the internet is not owned by any one particular country, but has a large -- in a way, because it's controlled by an entity in the US.

So an example of internet governance issue, would be Facebook. We had our Singapore general elections and a number of politicians put links regarding their campaigns on Facebook. What is there to prevent Facebook from saying I don't like this political party and since I own Facebook, I can now decide to axe this political party from Facebook and ban this person. What is there to prevent that?

I note also that government is looking at using social media, for example, emergency planning, you connect to Facebook or SMS and so forth and you connect and use it for emergency planning. What is there to prevent any one party, the owner of the website or the

service from cutting you off? An issue came alive with Iraq, which is why in part Iran is looking at cutting itself off from the internet. In other words, having its own private Iranian specific network, let's talk about that in the media. In Iraq, the domain name was taken off, so you couldn't register .iq, before the war in Iraq before 2003. It's available on-line. Search it, you will find it.

So in part, this IGF is to discuss such issues.

We don't ordinarily think of these issues, because internet works and to the credit of the US, they the US talk about soccer game, created the pitch and lent us the ball. We are playing and then we all happy doing that.

Then, of course, somebody want to take away the ball. What happens?

So there's some concern about that, which is why we are having this discussion.

There's also a dilemma as I think all three speakers have alluded to, on the one hand, we all want action, the only places you talk about it is the university. I belong to a university. We are happy to talk and talk. In fact, the actual why aren't you acting? You are just talking. We are very happy with theory.

But governments are not like that. In most part,

not like that. You want action, but if you look at action, it's very difficult to agree. Look at trying to form the IGF or another five years. The economists reported that the only reason they agreed to disagree was that the lights were going to be switched off at midnight. So they have to agree to disagree. It was that bad.

If you want action, and people -- governments generally find it hard to agree, how can we act?

We have seen some rules about net neutrality. I guess the most classic example would be ISP or, in fact, telephone companies own ISPs who then block Skype, because Skype takes away revenue from their business.

Net neutrality, there is a case where you guys, you are disadvantages the consumer. This should not be allowed.

I think Ms Aileen Chia alluded to that, that telcos who own ISPs, you are not allowed to indulge in this kind of discriminatory behaviour.

Are there other sort of areas where these rules might benefit consumers that we are not really aware of? Edmon mentioned IPv6 for example. There are many aspects of internet governance in fact, the issue is creeping up and we may not be fully aware and certainly for me, as an academic, its is important to discuss them

at this stage.

I hope that you'll kind of deal with these issues, some of these issues anyway, in a more significant way.

I want to add that also as the group also planned this program, I realised that we seem to discuss more substantive issues in this IGF compared with last year's.

Last year's was almost looking at giving input to the IGF to decide whether to move forward or not. In this meeting, we seem to have accepted the IGF should continue, part 1. Part 2, sort of like what is next? So we discussing more substantive issues. If you look at the issues, for example, you day 2 we try and talk about we can leaks, try and talk about the Arab revolution or the spring revolution in the Middle East, North Africa. We are looking at IANA, which is the internet address space awarding body and there is a call for whether we should be having this contract, what kind of that should be. Then of course on copyright issues.

So quite substantive issues this time around.

Given that backdrop now, I want to give time for anyone here to raise questions or raise comments regarding setting the scene for the conference.

Questions or comments to anyone on this panel.

>>Zaid Hamzah: My name is Zaid. I'm a technology lawyer, as

well as a writer.

If you really look at the subject very closely, what internet governance is all about, it's really a reflection of what life is all about, really, politics, the socioeconomic development, then there is the technical side, but what I wanted to ask the panel was this. There seem to be consensus on a global basis that these are the parameters, these are the things that we should do, these are the things that we shouldn't do. I don't see this as a major conflict that's arisen so far.

It's in fact not so politicised, there are no deep divide. I mean, I'm sitting next to CISCO, for example, then we have Yahoo!, and everybody seem to be agreeing on the same thing.

I think the room for conflict is almost not high at all.

I would like to ask the panellists, if you were to ask -- if I were to ask you to name one single defining problem that you would like resolved today, what would that be? Just among the three of you. Thanks.

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Can we hold the questions in case others questions or comments from anyone? We will gather them and I will ask the panellists to respond.

OK. I'm going to ask the panellists to respond.

>>Edmon Chung: I was hoping to build off you guys, but thank you, chair. I'm fine.

No, I think you raised some really interesting questions. I guess, you know, what you mentioned about there seems to be a general consensus about what's good and bad. In certain ways, maybe we can agree, but there are so many things out there and when you talked about that, it really reminds me of one of the things that Vince keeps coming back to is that internet is sort of like a mirror of society. If there's some problem with the internet, you don't go and break the mirror. Don't go and fix the mirror, fix society. That's the kind of thing we're talking about.

If you talk about whether there are -- there are certain things on the internet that, I mean, there are certain things that are exemplified or amplified on the internet. One of the things, for example, that quickly comes to mind is an issue like, for example, child pornography seems to be a universal evil.

But when you think about the internet and how that sort of amplifies the issue, you also look into at I think it was one of the IGF conferences, that I was told by a researcher, I think somewhere in Scandinavia, but the study came back and said the majority of what is called child pornography was actually uploaded by

children themselves, so in those cases, what is the issue? Is the irof child exploitation or is that an education issue for or it's a general societal change in terms of values and how people see themselves.

There is things that might seem at first sight to be universal good or bad, that could be quite different when you look into the details.

That, I think, one of the things that is valuable about the Internet Governance Forum is precisely that I'm quite surprised that that was raised and that's some researcher actually did some research on the internet and found those results and those are the kind of things that is important for the ongoing dialogue, even as we look into the policy development or the policy discussion and then the policy development locally.

That and you asked the question about one single issue.

It's really difficult to answer that, but from my perspective, IDNs is obviously the most important issue for me. DotAsia, right now, is working on IDNs and the actual implementation, there is still a lot of obstacles in front of us and I think as we see a lot of IDNs being deployed, don't forget that there's still a lot of policy issues that still need to be in place for IDNs to be universally accepted. That's from me.

Thank you.

>>Chengetai Masango: I will just take a broad issue and say access. Getting the other half on to the internet.

IDNs is part of it as well, because they --

>>Edmon Chung: I thought you would say that, so I picked that.

>>Chengetai Masango: Great. My main concern is access for people, yes.

>>Paul Wilson: I think it's a good question. I think it also comes down to an issue of the nature of the IGF itself, as a non-decision-making forum.

I think there's a tendency to look at IGF and say what are the outcomes, what are the disputes, what is the black and white and which side wins? But the value of the IGF is actually in the non-decision-making nature.

As Markus Kummer said, it's not a decision-making forum, but it's a forum where decision makers go, so that doesn't necessarily mean the only value is examining a dispute and arriving at one side or another.

But that said, I think there are plenty of issues and we have heard a few now and we could probably go on talking and debating for quite some time about which issues are most critical and most important and what's the right and wrong and I guess we'll be doing that, to

some extent, for the next couple of days.

For the particular issue that I would name, I think, coming back to the core responsibility of APNIC as an organisation in the internet governance sector, is we are a part of the ICANN model, we rely -- we pre-date ICANN, but ICANN has come along and we now rely on it to provide us with a number of services, broadly speaking, and the ongoing process of internationalising ICANN and making it a truly independent and community driven body is one that's going to be again on -- it's going to be under discussion for some time but even that one is not a black and white discussion and people have called, in the past, for an immediate change to ICANN and then others will say do we really want that? Maybe ICANN is not ready for that. It's an ongoing discussion as well. But that's one issue that I name.

Thanks.

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Taking the prerogative as Chairman here of this panel, I will disagree with Zaid about the -- no rebuttal discussion; we don't have time.

I will say that we have a lot of issues which are conflicts, depending on how you look at it, one would be at operational, meaning at internet level, that most of us here are dealing with.

But at the highest sort of political level, there

are major conflicts. I give two examples. One is the GPS, global positioning satellite, where we have actually, in our ...

We have a US GPS unit. It's probably a US system. The Soviets have their own system, because in the event of a war, the US may teak the software so that the missiles miss. The Sovients use the US GPS, then it might miss.

The Europeans also have their own GPS, believe it or not. The NATO allies, the other half of NATO or whatever, they have their own GPS. China is apparently looking into its own GPS. So that's one example.

The other example that I give when I talk about this is a joint fighter jet that the US is developing, a really hi-tech jet. The interesting thing is that the software is such that the US allies will never be able to shoot at another US ally.

I learn of this because Malaysia, the then Prime Minister, said that the jets that they bought from the US will never be able to attack Singapore. The missiles will not fire. You can aim and press the button, nothing will happen. It's software. Now you don't have control over this so-called critical piece of, in this case, hardware.

So when you look at the internet now, how critical

is it? I think to most of us it is very critical. You put systems on-line. Let's talk of how maybe in the US, they have actually some terrorist group tested hacking through the utility system and there's some brown-outs in the US. I don't know, some friends in this area tell me this has actually happened.

We are now putting the telecom infrastructure on the internet as well. Who has the right to cut that off? Who is able to stop the missiles from firing? Who is able to tweak your GPS, so you are just off by 15 metres and thereby you miss your target?

There is sort of high-level political conflicts that they are trying to resolve and part of what we are doing is to ensure that just by talking, by meeting, you are more likely to come to agreements than to come to disagreements.

Better to talk shop than kind of fight, physical fist fight breaking out.

So in other words, a lot of room for discussions, as Paul has said, a lot of room for different views on looking at priorities.

On that note, I'm going to close this panel and thank the panellists for speaking.

Join me to thank the panellists.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: I would like to invite Prof Ang to present our panellists with a small token of appreciation.

Thank you all for your attention. We will have a short coffee break now and continue with the first plenary session in half an hour's time.

Enjoy the break.

