

## 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: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to start on our next session, which is summary of workshops that happened this morning and the whole of yesterday as well.

Could I invite on stage the chairs for the tracks for today as well as the chairs for the three plenary sessions that were held yesterday.

Chairing this session will be Ms Grace Chng from Singapore Press Holding.

>>Grace Chng: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the second last session of this meeting.

This is the summing up of all the plenary sessions and discussion Pams we have had for the last to days, yesterday and today.

What I'm going to do is we have 90 minutes, and there are 10 chair people here or thereabouts.

I will give perhaps each chairperson could give about 5 to 8 minutes summary of their own panel, what

they have discussed and then we'll throw open to the floor for further discussion.

We'll start with Prof Ang, please.

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Good afternoon. Apologies for some misunderstanding, I thought I was setting the scene, so it was the backdrop to people sort of -- you don't look at the backdrop, it's there, but you don't get it, right?

So I'm just going to be very quick in this summary, because I'm setting the scene or I was setting the scene.

Basically, the group consisted of Edmon Chung, Paul Wilson and Chengetai Masango and it was setting the scene.

We talked about the context of the IGF and then the context of the Asia Pacific Regional IGF, the reasons for this big forum.

The sense was that this was -- this area was an important area that tended to be overlooked, mainly because things actually worked, but then also and there was intervention from the floor to say that doesn't seem to be much by way of conflictsing, the sense is that conflicts are not really visible, there is a lot of tension in various issues, but things generally worked and so there isn't much by way of breakdowns that you

might experience, but the sense is the issues are there, they're significant and so we should meet to discuss them.

Very brief and in summary, this is what we spent 90 minutes discussing.

Thank you.

>>Kuo-Wei Wu: Thank you very much. Basically, I just like to summarise what we have the discussion about IPv6 and as you know, we have several of the presenters to talk about how the IPv6 program in their countries.

I just summarise for four or five points.

The first point is first of all, I think all of you know the IPv4 and IPv6 network, both of them, both networks work, but both work, both of the networks will be exist and run for a while.

So don't expect that eventually, we are looking for might be one or two years migration and v4 will disappear. That is not the case. So that means v4 and v6 will be running at the same time.

Second of all, I think it's very important is IPv6 continue need awareness, promotion and hopefully the government can provide some kind of incentive for the ISP, ICP to willing to provide the IPv6 services. Because as everybody heard, from yesterday, you know that developing or provide live IPv6 services is a cost

for the company, it's not a benefit.

But why we need to do that is because we need to future continue the development and also the innovation for the internet, not only for our generation, also for our next generation and next generation.

So I think that is the reason we need to continue to promote IPv6.

One more, another point, is the worldwide web IPv6 Day is kind of success. As I show you the number, just before IPv6, that is we checked that in the Alexa 1 million most popular website in May is only about 2800 websites provide the v6 services.

On the worldwide web IPv6 Day, June 8, actually the number of websites offer the v6 services from 2,800, jump up to almost 19,000, almost close to 20,000, although two days after, it drop down to 6,100, but still this is a big jump compared with May to June, you can see at least triple, double, you know, 2.5 times more websites willing to provide v6.

Finally, I just like to for this region and also hopefully we can report it to the IGF in Nairobi and to encourage every country, every industry, to continue to supporting and promote the IPv6 from the awareness to education and also, you know, inform those of the IPv6 successful, is not only our job, it's everybody's job.

I think everybody needs to make it happen, you know, and the success of the IPv6 is definitely not only for us, it's for our next generation. I think that is a very important point for all of you.

Thank you.

>>Hong Xue: Thank you. I'm the chair of yesterday afternoon first session, ACTA and other controversies.

We have a very distinguished panel, totally five speakers plus one discussing from the United States, Europe, four from Asia Pacific and look at stakeholder group configurations, three from business, two from academic, one from civil society. I say this is very much multi-stakeholder discussion.

With respect to contents, we talk about basically from go aspects, one is on specific legal initiative, such as US new legislative initiative, especially protect IP to use domain name system to enforce intellectual property rights.

Intermediary liability, which has always been a big issue for the development of internet, cloud computing and its impact on intellectual property.

Of course our focus of discussion has been on anti counterfeit trade agreement. We talk about the forum shifting from multilateral to plurilateral and also the local response to this ACTA negotiation process, which

is very much close, as the discussion mentioned, we have a couple of lessons learned from ACTA and the other IP controversies.

Lesson 1 is that most people agree the process for making IP law or policy should be open and transparent.

The secrecy of ACTA negotiation is really the wrong way to presume the IP interest and won't balance the whole system.

Lesson 2 is that internet property should be updated and refreshed.

Internet property was created after industrial revolution and international IP regime has been going on for more than 100 years.

However, we are now facing the new business model, new media environment and especially the new way of life.

In order to make intellectual property effective, internet, in our new social media environment, to make it relevant to our real life, and need to be remix, recreated. Intellectual property is supposed to protect creation and stimulate originality. It should be able to be created by itself. It shouldn't be stifled and refused to respond to new business and media environment.

The lesson 3 is that we believe intellectual

property is only a link of the whole social life, so it should be accessed in a wider context and take into account the impact on consumer protection, on business competition and especially on human right protection, including but not limited to privacy and free speech.

That is a few points we learned.

Thank you.

>>Subbiah Subramaniam: I was the Chairman of the session yesterday on essentially the topic in the afternoon yesterday on the fair and equitable deployment of IDN, now that it's getting into full swing on the internet, so that it benefits native communities.

Just as a sort of a preamble, the IDN was originally proposed at the first ICANN meeting here in Singapore 12 years ago and ICANN was not that interested at the time, but it took this long, finally after about 12 years, we are back here and last year, ICANN finally did launch a set of IDNs, ccTLDs and limited scripts and with some limitations as I'll discuss in a minute, and now we're about to go into a much larger potentially deployment of IDN as part of the new gTLD program that might be approved at ICANN in the coming week or two.

The point of the session was to ask the question, now that we are actually looking at a large-scale deployment of IDN beyond just what happened last year

and limited ccTLD area, are there any things in the policy right now, as it stands at ICANN, and as we are about to approve, are there things that might limit what happens to the way in which it gets deployed, so it affects native communities adversely.

Along the way, a lot of policy changes were made, discussed over the last, especially four or five years since ICANN's interest in them, but some of them were adopted, many were not, the document has become 2,000 pages, so we have lots of things hidden in places that could ultimately not benefit the community that it was intended for, at least IDN will arrive, but not in a form that may not immediately and in a direct way, affect the communities that were poorer and really needed it.

That was kind of the background to the session.

We had several people -- it was a large panel, we had a number of speakers, about six, and we talked about various different angles on this, included representations from China, Korea, Israel, Singapore and also APTLD, which is Asia Pacific top level domain name group, which is basically at the point the ccTLDs that have launched out of Asia, both the IDN and ASCII, so they had their view on this and also representation from Singapore.



The kind of difficulties relating to the issue at hand fell into two parts, two general categories. The first category was a bit more mundane, but still important and that fell into the category of the processes right now, because IDN is largely being -- previously it was done regionally by many countries, but now ICANN is taken over, so it's really an ICANN gain. So the question is in the last year of what's been happening in the IDN ccTLD launches so far, has there been any slowness in the process, has there been difficulties in the applications and so on and so forth, by the time they can get an IDN thing approved and put in the root. The processes that go on.

The two difficulties were pointed out. One I think aside from Singapore basically pointed out that the application process for the.sg versions in native languages that are used in Singapore took almost a year, if you work out all the different steps, they submitted it, it took three months, then another several months and then they get ready for the root, so there were all these steps and they took a long time, when it should perhaps have been a much more straightforward process.

The difficulty there was that the point that was made was not a lot of things were actually made aware early on, that they didn't ask all the questions and

then eventually kept asking the same things over and over again, took a long time.

The other thing that came up was the idea from the APTLD group, the variant process. Although the ccTLDs were launched last year, they were launched in a somewhat limited way, because there is the issue of different versions of the same word in different scripts. It's not a loose explanation of what variants are.

In many of the languages, it's true, but ccTLDs launches were launched with the idea that we will worry about that later. There has been lots of committees and there has been -- the issues are quite limited, two or three issues only, but they have been, by my count, several committees already and there are more committees and it has been taking a long time to get that right and it's still requesting on that was one aspect of the slowness.

The second and last category of what was discussed is broadly in the issue of when IDNs are going to be -- the remaining policy issues, if you read the guidebook very carefully, you'll find clauses and page this, that, that, deep down where things were written in one way before, but it's been changed because different people with powers, you know, businesses, trade marks and so

on, so they have changed things and the current version that is about to go has many issues like this, but I think the worst one is one which is intended to protect the incumbent registries, which is that the incumbent registries, .com, et cetera, and the gTLD space, are now protected for sound, meaning and also visual similarity. Early on, years ago, people agreed visual similarity should not be allowed across scripts, but not sound and meaning, but that has been changed back to the point where basically, if someone were to apply for a sound and meaning that is similar to a .com in some other language, there's so many words that have the same meaning, to some many different versions of the meaning that was discussed, so many different sounds like in Chinese, different thing that is could go back just to one sound, all that could be, just for a few thousand dollars, an applicant to get into the game, but then for a few thousand dollars, can be objected by the incumbents.

So nobody is going to apply for them, so this round, in effect, where a few hundred applicants are expected to apply of which only a small pool will be IDNs, because it costs a lot of money, so you are not getting too many applicants, so what's going to happen is the big incumbent registries probably won't even be competed

on this, because no one takes the risk, so they will end up protecting the sound and meaning versions of this.

Once that happens, when the other 500 primarily ASCII English deployments go forward, I mean they get approved over the next year or whatever, then they would follow the same game and the same rule and they will say now we're incumbent registries and I just applied for .sports, but now I can block anybody else from getting .sports in every other language or meaning thereof, .athletics or whatever.

What happens by default could be this round pegged at 200,000 plus or more, real costs are going to be much higher, which only richer, non IDN native people can apply for, will end up getting all the best concepts in the world. People have a few years to think about the concepts.

What happens is ultimately we may not really have another round later on, all the best concepts are taken by on in IDN communities. Sure it will come out, but it will be sold by largely we are money corporations back to these countries. This is the real danger and this was discussed in many ways and I myself on a personal note, having been involved in inventing IDN in the early days as one of the people and the one who coined the term IDN, I feel great, it's here, but it may end up

...serving the wrong comment. Again, some words were used by various speaker, this is some kind of reverse imperialisation of languages, but this is just all hidden in the stuff in there.

There's lots of stuff in the 2,000 pages that are hidden. They were written one way before, but they have changed. This is primarily the one that affects the most, in terms of the fair and equitable distribution of IDN. That's pretty much what we talked about.

>>Khaled Fattal: The session I chaired this morning was about the Arabic revolutions, their impact on the world, roles of social networks, lessons for effective and multilingual internet.

Originally the plan was to have speakers do presentations and what we tried to do in this session was not to make it into speeches but to try and make it interactive, so the plan had invited guests joining us from Lebanon, Beirut, Cairo, from Tunisia, I may have missed a couple of other cities, in the Arab world, basically to address the events that have actually led to the revolutions in the Arabic world and answer some of the questions that are vital to what we are here for.

Some of the questions we tried to answer were how effective was social media in these revolutions and why were they effective in let's say Tunisia and Egypt, but

by the time they got to the other regions and the other countries, they stopped being effective.

Secondly, how can these lessons be translated or utilised for a better internet governance, allowing the local community to have a greater say. Quite clearly, social media has actually played a significant role in expressing and allowing the expression of the interest of these people.

Another question that was raised was how that also changed local politics. We all knew that some of these dictators had been there for decades and they were unmovable.

Well, they got moved.

How did that change local politics? How did that impact on global politics? We also recognise that, for example, the US government and the G8 have agreed to dedicate new funds to aid the call for freedom and support of these revolutions.

The question that was also asked and debated was is this money going to go to these revolutions and help the calls of these people or is it going to go to the further extenuating circumstances of old regimes, new regimes and then absorbing the revolution.

All of this really factor into the format of internet governance.

If we are also asking ourselves how does that relate to what we're doing today, then comes the role of ICANN, the new gTLDs and one of the surprising things in the event was I asked in this audience for people to raise their hands, how many have heard of ICANN. I got probably like something like 50 per cent of hands raised, maybe the other 50 per cent was still sleeping, I don't know.

What was even more alarming is I asked: how many people have heard of new gTLDs? You could see the glazed look on some of the participants.

That's not really surprising, but when you factor that the new coming multilingual internet is about to arrive, if things move forward, you will not only going to get new gTLD this is ASCII, but in local communities language's.

Then when the question was asked from the participants, by the way, I asked the same questions at an event six weeks ago, I was in Kuwait at an Arab media forum, which most of the satellite channels and news media was participating, also they weren't aware of what's going on.

The question here is would the new gTLDs and the internet coming in multilingual, how does that relate to the policies being governed by still remaining the laws

of one government, which is the United States?

Then the discussion was about this issue has been there for many years, it has never been properly discussed, so that alternatives can come and serve the local communities in a way that is more decentralised.

All in all, I think it raised more questions about the need to recognise that with the Arabic revolutions and the way they have changed and impacted on world politics, it is, it can be utilised for a better format of internet governance in the space we are trying to occupy and perhaps there are lessons as well in that format, when it comes to the mechanism of governing the internet through the new gTLDs and in local communities language's so that it's not centralised through the laws of one country.

Thank you.

>>Mary Wong: So it's interesting that the last two chairs spoke about some issues in their respective sessions with new gTLDs and ICANN, because I chaired the session this morning on ICANN and new gTLDs.

Unfortunately, due to lack of time, we were not able to get into some of the issues that were raised in these other sessions, but I will take the prerogative, as moderator of that session, to speak briefly on the IDN issue.



It did emerge from our session that it's very clear that the new gTLD program at ICANN is not just about IDNs.

IDNs form a very important part of the program, but it is much more than IDNs and so for participants here in the Asia Pacific region, in thinking about new gTLDs, the point was made that it's very important that we don't just focus our thinking, our plans, our strategies, our funding assistance and whatnot, on just IDNs.

Having said that, the IDNs continue to present a problem, I think it was mentioned in one of the sessions yesterday, that a variance is a huge problem and there is a working group right now that is talking about variants and given that some of that work on IDNs is ongoing, within ICANN, even within the generic name supporting organisation, which the main policy development body in terms of generic top level domains for ICANN, there are some uncertainties and certainly if you look back at the early recommendations by that body, in 2007 about new gTLDs, it's very skimpy on the IDN issue, because the technical work had not yet even got under way.

So IDNs remain an issue, certainly points about visual similarity which is what all the apply for gTLDs

strings or otherwise, will be measured by in part by an algorithm, in part through an expert panel that will look to see will the applied for string is confusingly similar to either another applied for string, an existing TLD or an IDN ccTLD.

That's probably going into more detail than people want, but it seemed that it was a good opportunity to speak off the other to presenters to my right.

With that, we then really went into some very challenging business and overarching issues for individuals, for consumers, for businesses, in relation to the new gTLD program.

Our session focused really on opportunities, challenges and lessons that we in the Asia Pacific region can learn from that program.

Like many of the other sessions, we had a very diverse and broad panel. We had five speakers, not counting myself, obviously, who were from North America, Europe and the Asia Pacific region.

We covered the gamut from academics and civil society to individual entrepreneurs and businesses who are going to be applying for new gTLD and businesses who are going to be providing services to applicants in the new gTLDs.

One point that was made after talking through some

of the opportunities, as well as some of the challenges and I'll touch on that in a minute, is that in terms of a rule making body and here we are speaking specifically of ICANN, in the broader internet governance context, several of our speakers felt that it is very important for that body to have a very light touch in rule making.

It's always tempting, especially in a new environment and as we have heard, there is a lot of uncertainties with the new gTLDs, to try to over-legislate, to overcompensate, to try and foresee every possible problem and find a solution and several of our speakers felt that that is not only a time consuming way to go, but that is the wrong way to go.

The other lesson that we thought we would draw from the ICANN experiment is to ask the question whether it has worked as an experiment in multi-stakeholderism. I don't know that we got full consensus from the panel, but the feeling generally was that it has worked up to a point and that certainly it has evolved and matured as an organisation. Everyone who participates in it as part of a stakeholder group is learning how to play in the sand box with other stakeholder groups, but the question remains as to whether some groups are more equal than others.

Certainly there was a question as to what role

governments have in a multi-stakeholder process, a question that's very familiar to everybody in this IG space and specifically in the ICANN space, with the new gTLD program especially, it has become very clear that governments do have a role to play, but that governments are also an interest group within the ICANN organisation and that they too have to learn to play with the other stakeholder groups and vice versa and that the experiment is ongoing.

Those were to of the lessons that we drew out of the ICANN experience over the last 10 years that we thought would be relevant to internet governance issues.

On the specific new gTLD program, all the panelists felt that it's quite likely and I think some of it was very hopeful, but there was certainly a resounding yes when I asked the question, do you think the ICANN board will approve the new gTLD program at a special meeting in three day's time on Monday?

That was an interesting question to ask, I think, and perhaps an expected response, which then bringing me back to opportunities and challenges question, there are questions that have to do not just with the implementation, I think everyone involved in the ICANN space will recognise that there are some implementation details that remain, but there are also larger

questions, such as what is going to happen to internet search engines? Today even we are looking for a brand or a company or an organisation usually say let's just Google it. If you have a .brand or a .generic that's not limited to the existing 21 top level domains, does that mean that the world of search engines is going to be diminished? What kind of business models are going to emerge in the new gTLD space in terms not just of marketing, but in terms of service provision to consumers across the world.

Finally, what are the measures of success? These are questions that ICANN has not yet asked itself, but if that program is to launch, then it's very important that the community as a multi-stakeholder organisation gets down to thinking about how do we measure the success of the new gTLD program, so that if and when there is a second round, we can take those lessons learned into that round as well.

That was our session.

>>Izumi Aizu: Thank you. Our session is very different.

It's the internet for disaster relief and recovery, followed by the recent earthquake and sue that my in Japan, but we also heard some cases from endee sha.

First we heard of status of relief works of providing internet and related services to the divested

areas, three speakers including myself gave brief reports.

Two are from the industry association and the internet community who went to the sites a few weeks afterwards to set up the satellite based or 3G based connectivities and also myself provided so-called pro bono platform that individuals gather together to fill the gap between the formal governmental relief works and the private sector or other NPO works.

The observation I could conclude or draw out of this is that the multi-stakeholder approach or framework is obviously in need. The government alone couldn't really deal with this massive destruction and relief works, nor any of the NPOs, nor the private sector alone can do the work.

Although the real coordination amongst these different stakeholders were not there yet, so there's a huge need, even amongst the IT or internet folks, in terms of very great need for that, without going into the details.

Then from Google Southeast Asia presented their Google information or support works for the Japanese people, including the person finder, which was described as the most effective means to find missing people, your friends or relatives and family members. Also, they

published the satellite I manages before and after the quake, so that it gives some kind of very authoritative and very objective knowledge about the areas and then how to rescue or how to sort of recover, reconstruct.

But these are the technologies or services not invented there, but it was carried over from the other quakes, starting for the person finder in the Haiti earthquake or the Christ church's the disaster just happened a few months ago.

These are the sort of lessons they share with others. Also we heard from Valens Riyadi from APJII. Also he's the founder of APJII Foundation, which is a non-profit body, which was established after the relief works of the tsunami in 2004 hit in countries around the Indian Ocean, including Aceh of Indonesia.

They sent two people on the helicopters to go to the devastated areas and set up the WiFi. They put the terminals, the towers and set up the media centre, help the media, also prepared SMS code, sent editors to collect and disseminate and share information in a very comprehensive manner.

They didn't stop there. They tried to continue this works for the volcano eruption seven years later in Jakarta -- what's the name of the mountain. I don't remember.

50,000 people were evacuated. Not many people killed, but some casualties, I believe, so they started realtime live report using communication radio and relayed by several internet based radio streaming.

Hearing those activities from Indonesia people in Japan felt that we should have taken lesson or, you know, should have organised workshops from you guys, so that we could apply some of your skills and knowledge.

That sort of led -- his conclusion is the preparation is a must and you need an immediate response be activated and also use local resources. These are also very much pertinent to what happened in Japan. I agree totally. The collaboration with government, NGO, local society was, is essential, but also it is not easy.

Sometimes government is reluctant to give some extra space for the relief activities, to the engineers.

So and this is not longer confined, there is very few people, it is really required for many people working for the relief or recovery.

Then we had the decisions with the floor, the questions came about the role of SMS during the earthquake in Japan. There is different opinions or different observations depending on where you were if your mobile phones are still available or not.



If it's washed away by tsunami or two days after, there's no electricity, so how come you can use the SMS? In the meantime, in Tokyo, it worked relatively well, with a packet especially when the voice has some sort of regulatory immediate activation of the call being restricted.

That's the sort of normal practice for the telcos.

Finally, we have perhaps two lessons or conclusions out of this session.

First thing is very easy to say, be prepared.

Very difficult to do, actually.

We were very impressed with your work that continues and they started foundation, APJII Foundation, especially designed for the relief works using the ICTs, which has not been there in Japan or it's not there yet.

We'll do that.

But also you pointed out that we need exercise the disaster management, just not on paper, but in the real field work.

The second lesson we can conclude perhaps is by following some excellent proposal by Sala, the bottom line, that's action. So we agree to have some kind of mailing list discussion to have a regional multi-stakeholder partnership framework for the CIAP or critical information infrastructure protection, which

will extend to include the protection against natural disasters and at least we try to cover the Asian Pacific in the multi-stakeholder framework.

That's our summary report.

Thank you.

>>Zaid Hamzah: Thanks very much. Before I walk you through the 12 points that our group has agreed upon, I gave them to basic guidance.

The first point that I is that internet governance is a soft infrastructure issue. It's not a hard infrastructure issue.

So what's important for us in this session was not to identify a laundry list of issues, but to figure out what are the drivers, levers and enablers that could fundamentally make a difference with a little resources that we have.

The operating sphere that we were talking about within our group was cyber security, privacy and data protection. But because it is a complex area and I mention you can't really ... you have to focus on a few. The points that I am sharing with you object slides capture what I believe to be the consensus. There were no real disagreement on it, so let's start with the first one.

Co-regulation, no one dispute the fact that it is

a good model to adopt.

That's the first key principle.

Second, public private sector collaboration is key to achieve the desired outcome.

Just so you know, in our group we have Yahoo!, Internet Society, two academics and one lawyer from Taiwan. So I think it represents a nice spectrum of views.

The third again reinforces some of the earlier group's recommendation, is a light touch regulatory approach is key. So that you don't have hamper innovation, you don't increase cost to business and there is therefore a need to avoid a highly and overly heavy regulation.

Point 4, again, no one dispute this, technology neutrality is a must. It has to be a guiding principle in developing the internet governance framework across the region.

Number 5, there has to be balance between managing security risks and the free flow of information.

Conclusion number 6, you require both a top down as well as a bottom-up approach. If you only adopt one without the other, it will not work.

The group emphasised the need that security risk issues, privacy is something that the consumers

themselves must be educated. So the onus is not just on regulators, policymakers, companies, but consumers must be educated and the point raised by Rajnesh is even if you try to manage risk, et cetera, useability is a fundamental issue that has to be addressed. Again, the balance issue keep arising.

Point 7 was raised by. She says that when wrongs are done, offences are committed, you need to provide for both civil as well as criminal sanction. Again, a nice balance, a bit difficult, but you have to achieve.

So if you push the pendulum to either stream, it might be a little bit more difficult.

Point 8, there is a need for cross-border data transfer regulation. Again, this was highlighted over and over again. Someone has a problem in Fiji, another person has a problem somewhere, we are living in interconnected world, but there is a lack of a framework within the region for cross-border data transfer regulation.

I suppose they are looking at an EU type of set up within this. Even more critical in Asia Pacific, given the diversity of legal system, legal philosophy, so on and so forth.

Point 9, the principle that has been enunciated must

apply in both the commercial and non commercial space. Again, this is a point that I borrowed from Ethan, quite elegantly captured that whatever we do, whatever we look at, it must cover both the commercial and non commercial sector. I personally believe, I'm from industry, so I have always believed that you must reserve a commercial space for companies to do well, then they will help jointly protect the interests of society.

Number 10, there was a strong feeling that you need to avoid commercial lock in. In the provision of security application, creation of infrastructure, et cetera, we must avoid commercial -- I think this is a nice balance. You avoid commercial lock in, advance technology, neutrality, you provide a commercial space, but you ultimately must let the consumers have the choice.

Number 11, point raised by Raj, interesting concept he shared with us, he talked about an interoperable privacy protection framework. That's kinds of interesting, because when you think of the concept of interoperable, you think of something hard, hard infrastructure, but Raj was sharing with us the need to develop an interoperable privacy protection framework. Kind of interesting, but it is a bit difficult to translate, but not impossible to translate.

Lastly, a point raised by someone from Taiwan, technology is a potent force we need to leverage on. As a group, collectively, we need to leverage on technology to advance the consumer interests.

Thanks very much.

>>Keith Davidson: Thank you. My name is Keith Davidson and I had the pleasure of chairing the session on the IANA function review.

On my panel, I had a representative from the NTIA, the US government department to contracts out the IANA function and also someone from ICANN staff in charge of the IANA function, so both contractor and contractoree as part of the panel and then representatives from each of the constituency groups that actually uses the IANA function.

For those, there may be some in the room who don't know what IANA is. So just for the purpose of clarity, this fits under the IGF umbrella issue of critical internet resources and the IANA database is the core database right at the heart of the internet.

It contains all the entries for the top level domains, both gTLDs and ccTLDs and IDN TLDs. It contains the IP address delegations to various RIRs and so on. It contains a number of database entries for the internet engineering task force and others. It

coordinates the activity of the DNS, so it gives you a resolvable internet.

The database itself is published on to root servers which then allow you to assimilate IP addresses to domain names or as we put it in another way, surf the internet or send email or whatever you like.

The trigger for the session was probably that the US Government's NTIA issued a notice of inquiry earlier this year relating to the ongoing nature of the IANA contract that ICANN administers. There were more than 80 submissions covering a pretty divergent range of views and just in the last two or three days, the US Government has followed this up with a further notice of inquiry to seek to develop a greater depth and colour and more detail around some of the aspects of the way the IANA contract may be renewed.

I think consistent with the US Government's international strategy for cyber space, the NTIA is committed to the multi-stakeholder model for all of its work in internet governance.

There was a general indication that the US Government will renew the contract with ICANN for in IANA function, but that there will be some changes to the form and detail and fully reflecting some of the submissions made during the process.

I think the indication is as with the original establishment of ICANN, under a memorandum of understanding, that has transitions to less US Government role through the affirmation of commitments that applies today and the pathway is being laid to perhaps transition greater autonomy away from the US Government to ICANN and IANA.

The panelists highlighted those aspects of the IANA functions that are consistent across the IANA customer community and then some of the key differences. At one end of the spectrum, in the protocol assignments, the co-operatively developed service level agreements and reporting metrics that are working and useful to the parties to those agreements.

Further along the IP addressing community has a comparatively low level of transactions with IANA and the five Regional Internet Registries who then further distribute IP address blocks have their own clear development policy processes, both within and outside of ICANN, when appropriate.

I think their assertion was that they, like most of us, seek an IANA that is more exempt from government control and subject to tighter performance standards and reporting in some form.

The ccTLD community should be noted as being the



more disparate community that uses the IANA functions and with less than half of the total country code top level domains having any formal engagement with ICANN, and servicing their communities in diverse ways, it's more difficult to find a common theme amongst the ccTLDs, but there's a general desire for establishing performance or enhancing performance standards and reporting within IANA.

The gTLD community have more within ICANN, established policies than the ccTLDs and they did share the common view that performance standards and open transparent reporting is a requirement.

The general agreement was that there has been study progress and improved processes within IANA and cooperative development will see ongoing improvements. Some forthcoming issues such as DNSSEC key changing within the database will require some changes to accommodate much faster updates to this database due to some technical aspects of the way those things happen.

There is some pressure on IANA, not just with the new gTLDs, new IDNs, but also in terms of newer technologies such as DNSSEC.

There was strong consensus from the panel on the need to identify what IANA, what is and also what is not under IANA control and agreed that there is a strict

separation between the process that IANA undertakes and the policy document.

Other issues of some note were the SIG called potential transition of the .int top level domain away from ICANN. The desire to incorporate RFC 1591 as an acknowledged source of policies affecting delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs and the likelihood of recognising the role of government in relation to the operation of TLDs.

In summary, I think it would be fair to say that the NOI process has brought some interesting issues now receiving further consideration by this next notice of information and anyone who is particularly interested and fascinated by this topic can make submissions to the US Government through to 29 July and going forward, it seems probable that ICANN will continue to manage the IANA function under a form of increasing independent from the US Government to ICANN and there will be a greater -- there will be a requirement for greater accountability and openness and transparency for these functions, increasing objectivity and reducing subjectivity in decision making being a key component of the future IANA.

I think we were left with one audience member's question and what next? So I think what we have seen is

probably the pathway for the next three years of improving performance and increased reporting and so on and the and what next is the unanswered question that we should probably consider at a future stage.

Thank you.

>>Pablo Hinojosa: My panel was about international law enforcement and I think it went well. Were to share and memorialise and I'm thinking in general, how the proceedings of this meeting can be suggested as input to other regional IGFs, I just heard that there will be a Latin American and Caribbean one very soon. Also, input for the IGF in Kenya, that I think there is a lot at this table for that.

Back to the panel, Sharil Tarmizi from the Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission framed the debate with an image of three blind men in front of an elephant and how they shared the different impressions about the elephant from different angled.

The panelists of this session described the elephant of international law enforcement. She spoke from the angle of a governmental agency of a front line of enforcing the law when faced with cyber threats.

Prof Hong Xue from the Beijing Normal University dealt with the topic of enforcement from an academic point of view and Jordan Carter from internet New

Zealand shared about an example of copyright protection in his country.

Another dimension was the fact that Sharil spoke on international mechanisms and he gave the example of impact, these multilateral approach to cyber security within the United Nations framework.

Prof Hong Xue from the Beijing University talked about cross-border enforcement through internet intermediaries and Jordan Carter from internet New Zealand gave an example of how changes in copyright law are being applied and enforced in his country.

As the subject of international law enforcement got described from different angles, discussion started around the topic of copyright. Strangely, members of the audience agreed to contradicting statements. They agreed that it is nice to download music without paying and they raised their hands and at the same time, they agreed that artists should be paid for what they do.

So this started a good debate, framing the questions around international law enforcement.

I think this session made progress in understanding the subject by looking to it from a truly multi-stakeholder approach, government, academic and also application.

Different dimensions were discussed and were to

share those in the truly IGF fashion of multi-stakeholders.

Thanks.

>>Grace Chng: Thank you. Before I open this to the floor, I think Mary would like to add one point and then Mr Wu wants to respond to some of your statements.

>>Mary Wong: Thanks, grace, and I can't plead jet lag, so I will plead impending old age, that I actually managed to forget what might be one of the most important points that emerged from our session and that was the call from action. Izumi's presentation I apologise to my panelist and to my panelists here now.

Essentially, as many of us know, there has been a a sense that Asia Pacific engagement and participation in a lot of these governance processes has not been as broad or as deep as perhaps in some other regions and the ICANN context it's a historical happenstance as it were, because of the internet and because of how ICANN was set up and technical issues and so forth. Be that as it may, the call to action in terms of the new gTLD program, especially in light of the IDN issues, is for greater constructive engagement with and from the Asia Pacific region and panelists made a couple of suggestions as to how this might be accomplished, at least as a starting point.

If the new gTLD program is approved on Monday, that will kick into gear a four month outreach and communication period by ICANN and that will be a perfect opportunity for interested participants, whether as a consumer, a business, a policy maker or an individual, to try to engage in two fashions at least, first with your local policymakers, including those that might participate in ICANN, and secondly, with regional groupings and corporations and associations like APTLD who might be able to represent views or at least be some kind of intermediary.

But also thirdly, as an individual, to participate in ICANN policy making.

So that call to action seemed very timely in view of the ICANN meeting starting tomorrow, but I'll now conclude that one other suggestion made by our panelist Cheryl is that a very specific way that Asia Pacific participants can engage in a very important aspect of the new gTLD program is in participating in and providing feedback on an ongoing effort as to how to provide assistance to developing countries given all that we're heard about the expense and problems with applying for a new gTLD.

So I did want to end on that and thank you, grace, for letting me do so.

>>Kuo-Wei Wu: First of all, actually, I thank Mary and also Cathy, talking about IANA and I'm the chair of the IANA committee.

So first of all, as mentioned about Singapore took almost nine months to go to the root, I promise you, I going to find out what is the procedure, what the problem is, but I probably talk to the Choon Sai about that. Don't forget about Keith also mentioned about it.

Really the ownership of IANA is not ICANN. Remember, it's NTIA, it's United States, it's a Department of Commerce.

As you know, we are facing the IANA contract by some time of September, you know, so if you not happy about that, and sometimes because ICANN process in several cases is because when we are finished all the process, we need to pass into the NTIA process and NTIA will go into the US Government and in that case, I wish you can put your comment and put your critics into the NTIA open comment, actually it's open right now. You are welcome to do that.

Second of all, I also like to mention about actually Mary and some of you already mentioned about. ICANN is not only for domain name industry. We need to take care of many of things, just as Mary also talking about it.

IANA we also need to deal with domain name and IP

and also the root server and at the same time, the stability issues.

This is whole thing, it's a whole space. So if anybody tried to do something, you know, remember ICANN is not a full technical body. We need to double-check with IETF to make sure that technology is capable, available and workable. If the IETF told us that it's not -- that is a problem, then we cannot go on.

Just give you one simple example.

You might be talking about like variants. You might be talking about variants is a simple issue, but actually the IETF in the IAB continue warning us. The variant, if you are not going to take care well, there will be really make a trouble for our loose server. You think about if the D name, if D name put into request to the server, you will find the server traffic will jump not just 10 times, hundred times. It's a million times. That will be dangerous for the stability of the internet.

So I like to mention to all of you the internet is not just a domain name. The internet have many components that are put together and to make it work.

So if you want to do something, double-check the technology available and tick nothings reliable and technology is really workable.



That is a very, very important.

The final I want to remind you, if you watch television or media, in G8 in Paris, in France, the government like to enhance their influence into the internet governance and ICANN is a multi-stakeholder mechanism. If we strong believe it, then we must demonstrate we are responsible, we are accountable to the government. If we cannot do ... well, then you will see the government will come in very soon and very quick and then what you thought about, those of the expectation will be dangerous.

So I will suggest all of you, you know, not just request, also look what you request is really take the responsibility for the whole community, the whole community for the internet, the people now and our next generation, we are making the trouble for ourselves and also for our next generation too.

>>Grace Chng: Thank you. That's very good advice. I like to open the floor to questions, if you could just go the the nearest mic to you, state your name and fire away.

>>Lim Choon Sai: I just want to respond to Kuo-Wei's comments. Yesterday, when we shared our experience in implementing IDN ccTLD, we are sharing our experience in the process controlled, but certainly it's not a complaint or deserve the case and we do understand

that it's two different entities, ICANN and we fully understand that they have to perform due diligence. So we accept that.

But our suggestion is perhaps applicants could be made known to say that, look, you have to prepare to deal with two different entities and some of the questions asked could be similar and we prepared to provide the similar answer to the question they ask.

So that is what we are trying to say in yesterday's chairing.

The question I want to ask, we have heard our esteemed personnel panelists have told us a wide range of issues confronting internet and ICANN today.

We all know that gTLD, new gTLD program has taken us four years of debate, protracted consultation, discussion.

We hope it's coming to an and or close to come to the end.

We all know that IDN issue has been we have asked for more than 10 years. I think many people have told us it started in 1999 or earlier. I ask a question at a very high level, very broad strategic level overarching issue that having dealt with new gTLD and IDN issue, what should ICANN focus on as a priority going forward? I think we have heard what Kuo-Wei is

not just dealing with name, they are address issues, there are technical issues and we all know that they -- a lot of issues concerning us is cyber security, enforcement, the address issue or name issue or competition issue and governance issue among NTIA, IANA and ICANN. Perhaps I can ask in the opinion of our panelists, what do you think, at the very high level, what ICANN show fuss its energy or effort on as a priority going forward, having resolved the gTLD and the IDN issue. Thank you.

>>Keith Davidson: I think to me, the next stage will be a cleaning up stage. There is no doubt, as we go forwards, that IDN TLDs lots of new gTLDs is going to cause a lot of confusion and provide a lot of opportunity for new and novel ways to scam people and disrupt and so on.

I think we all go forward in the full and certain knowledge that that's what the internet does. It is a disruptive technology. So I think probably by necessity for ICANN and others to sit back and then start to address the issues of security and stability that arise from this, so that we can attend to an orderly clean up to make the internet more safe and secure than it is today.

>>Grace Chng: If the panelists could keep your answers brief

and short. Because we want to answer as many questions as possible.

>>Kuo-Wei Wu: Your question is well taken. Chong say.

I really like to find out the procedure to make the whole process can be more tighter. Finally, I just like to answer that issue is I like to repeat again and again, the current problem of IDN, as you know, is only work for URL. Even the email doesn't work, although we are doing that the working group in the IETF. So we need more people to make the application available for IDN. We need a lot of technical people participate in the IETF to make the IDN work more than just for URL.

>>Khaled Fattal: From your question, I think if I were to take one component of it in the way you ask this, like we answer it from a high level, I think it probably would help to give you this analogy. Imagine you were just first time trying to make a serious dish, you are trying to cook and you have started it and you are halfway through, but you have already started mixing the ingredients and then you discovered if only I could have done this from the beginning or prepared this better.

This actually remind me of some of the processes that we have been involved in in ICANN especially with the new gTLDs and IDNs, primarily because looking back at the last 10 years and where we end up today, there

are a lot of things that could have been done better had there been, if there had not been a first time at doing it.

So answer your question, I think perhaps the process itself is trying to make it so centralised within ICANN could have been much better, rather than making it so centralised as a one size fits all, especially within the new gTLDs and then how that relates to IDN. For example, just put it in perspective and I'll keep it very brief, for the last 10 years, we had the first four years of from 2001 to 2005, that was the world summit on Information Society. To paraphrase that, the US maintained control of the net and that moved forward and this is as a result, we ended up with IGF, which is a body that is meant to be on in decision-making process.

But then it also required ICANN to internationalise itself.

Along the way, the purpose of internationalising itself was to try and generate IDNs for those communities to make ICANN international.

We ended up with fast-track, because at ccTLD level, it was much more deployable, because the policy at at a low level. When you try to do it on a generic level, it became an amazing soup, which is very difficult to

make and this is what we ended up today.

Now the pressing problem here is for the last couple of years, because of the pending opportunity for applying for new gTLDs in asking for opportunities, ICANN today is under severe pressure to approve something because it has promised to approve it sooner and earlier and earlier and now credibility is at hand. But in the process, if you ask yourself, is it serving local communities, is it really addressing issues correctly, we go back to the issue, the --I was half cooked and now we're trying to look at how to improve it, so perhaps the processes should be improved so that maybe, as the comments earlier on, we serve the future generations better.

I think would be ideal point to start.

>>Grace Chng: I think the panelists all have comments to make, but before we do that, can we take some more questions and then we'll come back, if you have time.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: I would just like to direct this to the chair of cyber security panel. Basically, if you could just go into your summary, because this is a question because I understand this is going to the Nairobi, just the need for categorisation and also some sort of, you know, synergy in terms of I don't now how you're going to do it, because I'm mindful that this

forum is not only for the panel, it's a forum that's supposed to take the collective views of the region and so critical to the discussion I think is categorisation as well as some form of synergistic mechanism, whatever that may be, in terms of getting people to share information. Whether that's a mailing list, I don't know, but something like that.

>>Izumi Aizu: I was preparing to respond to Mr Lim's question first or that one. Taking my hat as member of at large of ICANN this time, I don't think the introduction of new gTLD and IDN is sort of a solution, rather it may be opening up the can of worms. I don't know.

I'm working on the gTLD as well, the geographic TLDs inside the gTLDs which has a lot of common issues with the ccTLDs as well as IDNs. Things are getting much more complex and chaotic.

Do the users interests be sort of are they more well protected or well preserved in new gTLD IDN era? We don't know. We may have much more confusion. Are we giving equal sort of rights and opportunities to explore the use of these domain names, via the region, by, I don't know, east and west culturally? We don't know. What if your IDN Arabic companies, some IDN taken by Latin America or whatever, do you feel you are

comfortable with? So we may face a very complex areas and likewise, the introduction of IPv6, are they really well sort of beneficial to all on the equal basis or do they have somebody taking advantage against others? We don't know.

So these are the areas of more challenges coming up, as internet is coming much more complex, do we need ICANN more complex body or sicklar sort of solution by the government? That's another area.

So ICANN go on and on, so we don't know. It's a real exciting challenge waiting that requires new generation people, not the old timers like those on the podium.

>>Mary Wong: Choon Sai I guess I have two answer, one is.

Specific and substantive, I think I need to say that I'm not speaking on behalf of the GNSO council and nor can I speak on behalf of any group on ICANN, except the one I'm perhaps more familiar with, so I be just speak as a participant on the GNSO. I think on the substantive issues, launch of the program is just the start, there's certainly a lot of implementation issues, not just details, but issues that remain and by issues that remain, some of them go outside of the launch of new gTLDs, like the IDN issues we have talked about, the working groups that are doing IDN work on variants, one



character and so on. There is also the developing country assistance issue that I spoke about earlier, those are just two large issues that go beyond the new gTLD program.

Then, that feeds into my broader more general point, which is that I think ICANN needs to take a good look at how it operates, both internally and externally.

Internally, would be in terms of participation of its various stakeholder groups, that there is a serious effort, that even if not everybody can be equal all of the time, everybody needs to have equal access to one another, to the GAC and to the board.

Certainly the Asia Pacific engagement on that score I think needs to be improved.

Secondly, ICANN, I think, in this regard, everything that we've talked about the substantive issues, the procedural issues, goes back to the affirmation of commitments that it signed with the US Government and in that respect, accountability and transparency, security, stability, all those issues, they're ongoing working groups and teams looking at that and I think that if we have a breather from the new gTLD spectre that's been hanging over us for four years, that we should have some kind of constructive die log about it and in that vein, the cross community working groups that are starting to

emerge from across ICANN, the GNSO, the ALAC and participation from the CCNSO and other groups, it is not clear how they work, there are some folks within ICANN, I'm going to say in this audience, that don't want cross community working groups, they want silos in ICANN because they're more comfortable. That's disastrous for the multi-stakeholder model. I think that's something we need to look at.

Finally, externally, in terms of ICANN's legitimacy with other organisations, other bodies and including the people that could refer to who don't know who ICANN is or don't care, I think ICANN needs to do a better job in that respect as well.

>>Grace Chng: Can I take one more question from the floor before I return to the panel.

>>Mohammed Ibrahim: I'm Mohammed Ibrahim from Somalia.

I was interested to hear that the world is complex and is getting complicated. I don't know why it took ICANN to find out now.

But the good news is that only get more complicated and more complex, so might as well get ready and come up with different policies.

But I did want to go back to the IANA issue, that's really the issue or the comment I want to make.

Yesterday, I was happier, from the comment from

Singapore, today I'm not very sure. Get little bit watered down. I'm from Africa, I'm very blunt. I think IANA, there is room for improvement. That's really just hopefully, we'll do this submissions and I will encourage everyone to do submissions, positive, negative, whatever.

Thank you.

>>Subbiah Subramaniam: I have to bat for the home team, I'm Singaporean. Now I'm going to put this in more dip lat I can terms before I get to my point.

We're kind of efficient around here, as you probably now in Singapore, so from our timeframe perspective, the time it took is probably not something we're used to here in Singapore. We get things much quicker.

Secondly, as an example of that, as you may or may not know, Choon Sai is our host for the ICANN meeting that's coming up next week. It was supposed to be in Jordan, Singapore jumped up very quickly and got all this going very fast and we got in and we should thank him for it, but that's the pace we try to do things.

So now from that perspective, what it took ICANN perhaps longer.

I want to get to the broader question. I'm going to take him at his word and say -- I'm going to take it as a much longer view question that he's asking.

OK. IDNs are here, we have issued, we have to work it out. There is ICANN, we have to figure out how to work with each other, but how better do we work with each other. What is the multi-stakeholder model. That is the Internet Governance Forum. ICANN, IGF, alphabet soup, who knows who we are, nobody cares or knows. It's the only real institution that is around. IETF is volunteer, nobody turns up, it depends on the economic cycle. So the public, to the extent that they know we exist, think we are the answer. So what are the public's problems? The public is not worry abouted it or whatever, but the public is not particularly, the public is not about to jump up and down .sports or something something didn't arrive. Maybe their script or language, but what is the public's issues on a day-to-day basis in look at your friends, spam on email, 99.9 per cent, it's unusable. Has anyone noticed with Facebook and text ing and everything, email use is going down?

So everybody is off to Facebook, Facebook becomes the internet, essentially.

The issue is what is the end user -- we need to get past all this. It's not about domain names, IPv6 running out, technical issues, it's our business to get it right, but the end years experience is what we need

to solve and we should ask ourselves not whether all these very important things like IPv6, IDNs, we should ask our families at home, what would you like your internet experience to be better? Is it email killing you or is this doing that or is the spoofing and hacking and losing your credit cards is important? We should be forming the group, we should take the lead. I know it's not in the mandate of ICANN, it's numbers and this and that, but who then takes it? Industry we waited, it hasn't done it. If we don't solve that problem, sooner or later, a big 16 or a big 32 are going to step in and the real issues are the ones that the people are complaining. We need to move onto that. That's my point. What's the next stage higher up?

>>Keith Davidson: I think I need to beg to differ with those comments. ICANN has a very narrow mandate of administering the DNS. If it cannot expand from that mandate. The question we were asked specifically was about the future of ICANN and its future. So it's future issues are not to solve spam or other such things.

For many years, many people came to ICANN with those sorts of issues and I think ICANN was very relieved when the Internet Governance Forum was established, because it gave those groups the opportunity to discuss what the

real issues are. The challenge now is to you to establish leadership on anti spam for the Asia Pacific region or whatever your specific issue is, in this forum, not in ICANN.

>>Grace Chng: Can I take one more question from the floor, it will probably be the last and then we'll need to wrap it up.

>>Aiz Bawaz: Thanks Grace. Thank you very much. I'm quite reluctant to ask this question, but I think that the imposition by the ICANN make it impossible not to take it up.

My name is acy, I'm Singaporeian and I completely disagree with you, Subbiah, and question one thing is that half the coin is always your proposition of Singaporean proposition. What if you thought about the question of one issue, number 1, the anti spam, that kind of confusion, that kind of contradiction, which is the brand, made in Singapore, for the world. Makes no sense at all.

My real stance here is the question of that on the basis of multi-representation here, this is a lot more confusing, my learned friend from Somalia was saying that exactly, in the words of Leonardo, simplicity and beauty and we miss the point.

The question here, we have today's session, for

example, I want to talk of the obvious and of course, the obvious is commonsense, but of course at the same time, common knowledge.

We have security. You were saying about spam. Nobody addressed the issue, not spam. The Nigerian exploitation become globalisation and pandemic right now. What happened with Singapore police force? What happened? Nothing. They are free to do and they are free to operate. What are we talking about? There is ... let the public, you are asking the public expectation. It's as good as ICANN or it can be the otherwise. The question here, the invisibility becomes something, that's why I say in the early morning, you know, you prompted us to challenge you and the incumbent have to be challenged in the right proportion.

My question here in this issue is a question that you bring proposition, supposition which is several serving. That is ICANN. Where is W3? None. What happened? Why is no W3? We have a lot of this. None of the W3 communities are here, except when they are presenting. When you are not presenting, gone. You Meng Google, Yahoo!, why are they here? Several interest. The question of that, the essence of substance is conscience. Does ICANN have conscience? ICANN can't have conscience because we have conscience

and we can do conscience so the question here, the community at large, being different and government, it's the biggest group taking advantage of ICANN money making. The question is accountability is not there, governance is not there and the question of really respectability isn't there.

How far can we go? This is 2011. I don't know, I have problem of monopoly in Singapore. You are making another monopoly internationally. So how do we move from here? Grace, please, because we also expect it to be on in monopoly and I leave it to you, because as I said here, the question on that, please, I do respect, because if you say ICANN, I have limitation, then open up for better capability, but if you says that my excuse, that is my excuse forever be, then I don't think that we can move from there.

Thank you.

>>Hong Xue: This section could be named Dr Lim's session.

We are all responding to your wonderful question. If we must make a sequence for the issues of our rarity of issues in front of ICANN, I like to make the sequence like this.

Number 1 is security and stability. ICANN's main mission is technical coordination. It cannot make internet operation safe and stability, it is basically



fail its mission and IANA is very critical function. So I suggest the further research on the governance of IANA, whether the current regime is really serve the purpose of stability and security.

Number 2 will be accountability regime in ICANN. ICANN, like the other panelists presented is very much an experiment. Especially on governance. It's more the stakeholder regime is very much new, which is back to global governance and it's not a shareholder regime, neither is it government, there is no election, so to whom ICANN is accountable to is accountable to stakeholders, but how to. This is very much relevant to the legitimacy of ICANN. ICANN is observing the global critical internet resources. This is very critical position and we need to see a clear cut accountability system to oversee this resources.

Internationalisation. I hope ICANN can still persistently presume to go, including to implement internationalised domain names as soon as possible. Number 4 is new gTLD. This is about market competition and users choices.

>>Grace Chng: Any more comments from the panel? If not, thank you very much for your participation. I think I sense a great passion among all of you and as well as the panelists for the internet and I think that's good

I think going forward we will be able to solve many of the problems.

Thank you for your participation, as well as the panelists, thank you.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Thank you very much. May I please invite Prof Ang to present Ms Grace with a small token of appreciation.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now have a short coffee break and we'll be back for the final session at 4 pm.

