

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: Ladies and gentlemen, we have come to our last session for the forum. It's Nairobi and the way forward and it's chaired by Edmon Chung from DotAsia.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you and thank you for sticking around. This is the last session as mentioned and we are looking forward to Nairobi. I wonder if most people are going to Nairobi.

But I guess part of the reason who are here is that for those who are not going, we can talk about the IGF issues here and bring it over.

Last session, a lot of the issues that were talked about in the last couple of days were sort of reviewed and I'm excited to see that there has been a lot of interesting discussions and I think it's to echo the starting sort of setting the scene session, I think it seems like to me at least it has been a fruitful discussion.

It's sort of this session -- last session, a lot of

people talked about a call to action, what's next and I think this session is one of those, what next.

But before you get too excited about talking about the actual substance, we are actually talking about what next in terms of how do we talk about what we want to talk about, which is a kind of interesting thing and what I've learned over the many years talking about at ICANN and internet governance is that it is as important, I think, how we come together and how we talk, as much as what is talked about.

With that, I think I would like to just quickly introduce the panel.

Right next to me is Sala from Fiji and Keith, I think most people know from New Zealand, and Chengetai from actually from the UN IGF Secretariat and Sam from APNIC.

I think the session itself we're hoping that to cover to main areas, one of which is what we, you know, sort of open the discussion with the panel and the floor as well, how we see the UN IGF going forward, you know, from Nairobi and beyond.

The other part is also coming back to here, the Asia Pacific Regional IGF and how we see it going forward, and the relationship between us and the UN IGF and other IGF initiatives.

Speaking about other IGF initiatives, I think our first speaker actually will talk following from the summary of last couple of days, give us an update and summary from the Pacific IGF, but before that, I'll give the mic to Keith Davidson to give a short intro of our speaker.

>>Keith Davidson: Thanks, Edmon. I just really wanted to comment that it was coming out of the first Asia Pacific IGF in Hong Kong last year that it suddenly distilled in my mind the need for a multi-stakeholder dialogue in the Pacific. So without any keen volunteers around me, I had to sort of start the process and gather some funders and sponsors and work on getting a team and an agenda together and it came together with a hiss and a roar in April.

As the sort of chief enthusiast for the project of a Pacific IGF, I was really delighted that Sala, who was totally unknown to me prior to the Pacific IGF, came along and participated more fully than anyone would have believed in terms of her contribution to the debates and the discussions. So it's with great delight that we were able to facilitate Sala being able to come up to Singapore and provide us with an update of that IGF and I guess while it's a little bit retrospective in terms of an event that's happened, it probably does help us

think about the pathway going forward to Nairobi.

Sala, it's been a delight to meet you in recent months and I'll hand over to you.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Thank you, Keith.

First of all, I would like to start off by saying, I bring greetings from the Pacific and the people who are remote streaming right now from Cook Islands, from Samoa, from Tonga and it's probably evening their time, so it's a delight for me to welcome you and also to acknowledge the presence of our chapter leader who is in the room from Vanuatu Mr Andrew Molivarae and also I know there's a gentleman who is also from Fiji ISOC branch.

The Pacific is very rich in terms of symbolism, part of a lot of our culture and our heritage when we speak, when we relay things, it's tied up with symbolism so you see a picture of a conch shell and it's a call to action and if you note his introduction earlier on yesterday, he mentioned that Asia is so diverse and that the challenges and the context are quite different and such was the need, I suppose, and the visionary and foresight of people like Keith David son to birth the Pacific Internet Governance Forum.

So with that, I would also like to take this opportunity to also acknowledge the sponsorship and

supporters of those who help to facilitate and make the Pacific Regional IGF possible. There are sponsors in the room, APNIC, DotAsia, ISOC, APTLD, ICANN, InternetNZ, Packet Clearing House and numerous others.

>>Keith Davidson: And VeriSign.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Not to forget VeriSign, yes.

So if it weren't for the sponsors, the Pacific IGF would not have been possible.

Our place in the world, Asia Pacific, so where does the Pacific fit in?

I'm just going to briefly touch on United Nations categorisation for New York based member states voting power, to sort of bring some context.

Regional groupings and make up at the UN, particularly for New York based member states, differ from the regional make up that we are familiar with in our respective regions.

As of yesterday, the United Nations has 192 members.

The Asian group in total has 53 voting members, 11 of these votes are from Pacific island countries. The 53 voting members include Arab dates and Asian countries excluding Australia and New Zealand. Having said that this is just UN categorisation, for internet governance, of course, New Zealand is very much a driver in the region.

Occur bas is a UN member state, but it is not yet a formal member of the regional group, emp though they have indicated an intention to join the Asian group.

In total, Asia, in fact, holds 28 per cent of the UN voting block. That's a significant political clout and mileage right there.

I would like first to appreciate the context of the wealth of the multi-stakeholder process and representatives that are in the room in the capacity for impact.

So of that 28 per cent of the UN voting block, 21 per cent of those 28 per cent are actually from small island developing states.

In a sense, the Pacific despite being tiny islands scattered across the vast Pacific Ocean, is a strong block within the Asian group and are increasingly lobbied as a group of votes by countries who put forward candidates to seek support in elections within the UN.

Having said that, the Pacific in a heart beat.

Asia as we all know and is familiar to us is the largest continent in the world and is diverse as Edmon mentioned.

The Pacific region and those that were represented at the Pacific Internet Governance Forum constituted primarily of 22 countries and territories, so when I say

territories, I'm also referring to French territories, American territories and it just so happened that the Pacific Internet Governance Forum was convened in Noumea, in New Caledonia, which is actually a French territory.

Of the 22 countries and territories, 16 are actually independent nation states.

The population sizes in the Pacific are below a million ranging from 1,170 to 839,000 for some. Having said that, Papua New Guinea has 8 million, New Zealand 4.29 million, Australia 21.77 million.

I won't go into the birth of the Pacific Regional IGF as Keith has touched on that briefly, but I will mention this.

The Pacific Internet Governance Forum was strategically held back-to-back with a very strategic meeting as far as the Pacific goes. It was held in conjunction with the ICT energy and infrastructure ministers' meeting and also the Pacific island telecommunications association annual meetings.

In a sense, there were key players who were in Noumea at the time who were influenced by some of the discussions that stemmed out from the meeting.

In total, there were 86 participants who came from the Pacific to dialogue on internet governance issues.

A significant percentage, I think around about 90 per cent of them, were able to go to Noumea to be a part of the Pacific Internet Governance Forum, through the generous sponsorship of sponsors and partners.

In the Pacific, there's an organisation called the Secretariat of Pacific Community, which holds the mandate to execute the digital strategy.

It was very heartening to note that the SPC Director General, Dr Jimmy Rogers, verbally welcomed the process. He openly and this is really significant, because they are the premier policy advisers to governments in Oceania, in the Pacific.

You can see some familiar faces up there. Paul Wilson there, Keith Davidson, the ICANN president, Dr Jimmy Rogers, the head of ITU and so it had some significant traction and one of the things that came strongly out of these gentlemen was that they all touched on the need for cooperation, both globally, regionally and locally. So they were declarations made during the meeting.

I just like to quote from Satoro:

"Individually, were one drop. Together, we are an ocean."

In essence, the summary of the discussions that took place during the Pacific Internet Governance Forum are

very similar to what's taking place here at the Asia Pacific Regional IGF. There was a strong recurring theme that there should be a multi-stakeholder approach to dialogue on issues in the Pacific, some of the observations were that development was sort of isolate and and there was a need to address this by bringing a multi-stakeholder approach, in terms of the creation of solutions.

Also, the acknowledgment that the internet is an enabler for development.

Bridging the digital divide. There were discussions on access. In the Pacific, we have unique challenges and this came through during the forums. For example, even though there's some jurisdictions that have legislations that stipulate access deficit, but act it is deficit is not actually given out and you would have heard from Infocomm in the beginning of yesterday's session, where they mentioned that it's critical that there is a light handed approach to regulations.

Some of the things that came out during the Pacific Internet Governance Forum was some of the challenges were regulators did not have the capacity, so there was a lot of heavy handed regulation which causes a lack of innovation and those sort of things which don't actually help towards bridging the digital divide and how issues

need to be discussed.

Of course, there were talks on public policy, in terms of engaging and creating strengthening links between local, national, regional and global strategies and the need to clearly identify and address the bottlenecks.

One of the things that came out strongly was the need to have a top down, bottom up approach. I think that was mentioned too by one of the chairs during his summing up.

Also, there was some exciting topics like critical internet infrastructure in terms of transition from IPv4 to IPv6, DNSSEC, there were presentations on DNSSEC and the role of stakeholders in the process.

Day 2 of the Pacific internet governance forum was quite animated. We had this blogger from New Zealand who apparently gets a lot of hits. I'm not sure if I remember correctly whether he gets more hits than newspapers. I'm not sure. But all I know is that he's like this really famous blogger and so he was talking about citizen journalism and another thing that was sort of raised during the Pacific Internet Governance Forum that we witnessed was the activation of the civil society representatives that were present. They also raised their issues in terms of filtering, issues of

privacy, security, rights of disabled persons and they've also committed to working together in terms of developing traction and engaging other civil society representatives from their respective countries.

In a sense, the Pacific Internet Governance Forum provided a platform to enable those connections.

Of course, there was a very interesting session on digital observatories, by a lady from Noumea, who actually works at the Noumea digital observatory so there were less lessons that Pacific island countries could take home in terms of how they would like to collate statistics and that sort of thing.

There was an interesting session also on e-waste in the Pacific. I think the gentleman who spoke on e-waste in the Pacific, I can't remember his name, my apologies, but he just recently will get awarded a medal during the Queen's birthday.

What's his name?

>>Keith Davidson: Lawrence Wimfa.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Lawrence Wimfa, if you are listening in, congratulations.

These are emerging issues, in terms of e-waste in the Pacific. He's from Wellington in New Zealand, so there are interesting lessons that Pacific the work he was doing in New Zealand and how that's actually had

a flow down effect on Cook Islands.

Also, we touched on critical information infrastructure protection, civil society collaboration and also the importance of the internet being accessible in Pacific languages.

I'm not sure if you all know, but Vanuatu, where Andrew is from, has the largest language per capita in the world.

Also, there were some interesting discussion on internet rights and the need for representation at the global IGF forum.

So there were key synergies formed, so do you recognise anyone there?

Can you see Miwa there?

Yes, she's smiling.

Can you see the first picture, the first picture is actually two ladies from Samoa. If they are streaming in, they can probably see themselves.

There were see synergies formed, as stockholders gathered.

If it weren't for the Pacific Internet Governance Forum some of these synergies were not have occurred ordinarily.

A notable synergy was the MOU signed between APNIC and SPC and SPC and net safe. That's going to create

a lot of mileage in terms of the deployment of the digital strategy in the future.

The challenges, what picture do you guys see? David and Goliath. You have a Sumo wrestler and a little kid. In essence, more or less, the Pacific issues are sort of like that, you know. The Pacific is often seen as a little kids or dwarfs and then you have monstrous challenges.

But quite aside from that, there are also other challenges, particularly in terms of activation in terms of Internet Governance Forums such as this and within of it is because of the high transportation costs in the Pacific, it makes it next to impossible to attend regional or global forums. A lot of the economies in the Pacific I'm not Zhao if you know, but countries like Solomon Islands, the economy has inflation is in double digits and that sort of thing.

So just makes it able possible for them to raise funds and other Pacific island countries as well.

The other key thing is that we would like to note in terms of challenges is currently, governments and private sector have yet to be fully convinced and because of the relevance of internet governance, perhaps maybe because it's a new field, I'm not too sure, but it actually affects the low prioritisation and I've heard

comments from colleagues who we have actually chatted with in terms of how come there's not a lot of input?

So that's actually directly attributed to challenges.

Observations and inferences, very quickly, there is a general lack of understanding and there needs to be capacity development in the region, so we welcome the synergies between APNIC and SPC and I know APNIC already has a strong synergies with Peter and they're running the PACNOC conference for network operators and trainings in July and that sort of thing.

One of the things that the Pacific Internet Governance Forum is sort of trying to hammer is the need for organisations to try to use their political clout or their influence to encourage the multi-stakeholder process.

I would also like to acknowledge those that are actively involved in capacity building in the region like Pacific Internet Partners and Diplo Foundation and DotAsia through sponsorship and VeriSign.

Other observations and inferences, one of the things that came out strongly was the absence of statistics that are relevant for good policy making.

That came out strongly and it was also a comment made by David satla from the world bank and also other

key stakeholders in the room who were petitioners on the ground.

The good news is the Pacific regional telecommunications and ICT resource centre is currently being set up, which is a project of the World Bank and the ITU and I think SPC is also helping out and it should be based at the ...

I have talked about regulatory challenges that the Pacific faces, inconsistent policies and laws, the need to be inclusive in strategy planning and research policy processes, and both on a national and regional level.

Again, I would like to drive the point that multi-stakeholder process is key to this and the Pacific Internet Governance Forum, believe it or not, is the first time on a regional level, that a multi-stakeholder process of that nature affecting the realm of ICT development and internet governments was actually activated.

Strengths. You know, the Pacific's greatest strength and I suppose Asia's greatest strength, is its people and a strong sense of community and social responsibility.

I would also like to acknowledge the work being done by SPC and ITU who have been working on equipping governments and policymakers to address these problems.

There you see pictures of faces from the Pacific. You see gentlemen from Papua New Guinea, you see kids from Kiribati at the bottom. Yes, we love our rugby. The World Cup is coming up -- and go Fiji, go!

Just kidding. That was just to see if you are all awake or not.

You know, I just like to say, at the end of the day, internet governance is not about technology. Yes, we discussed technology, we discussed standards, but it's about the people and we're here for the people and so those are faces of those who attended the internet governance forum that you see.

So you can see Maureen there, second row, Maureen, if you are listening in from Cook Islands and you see Malay from Samoa.

So with that, I would like to say thank you for listening. We had a pleasant Pacific Internet Governance Forum and it was the inaugural internet governance forum and it was just such a privilege to be able to have such a process and such a platform.

With that, Edmon, thank you.

APPLAUSE

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you, Sala and I'm excited to know that at least out of all the things, at least we have done one thing right last year, which is to inspire a Pacific

IGF.

Next up we'll ask Sam to give us sort of an update and her thoughts from the report of the CSTD meeting and then I'll go to Chengetai for him to talk a little bit about the I guess in the UN IGF Secretariat's point of view, of things in the future.

Then I'll go to a panel discussion and also open the floor for questions.

>>Sam Dickinson: I'm one of the five technical and academic representatives on the CSTD working group on IGF improvements. We have another two representatives here in the room today. We have Baher. He's another technical rep and we have a civil society representative in Izumi Aizu, so there's three of us. If I get anything wrong, they will tell me.

In terms of the CSTD working group, we have met device and we have had our mandate extended for another year. So we are due to report back to the CSTD meeting in May next year, which then reports back to ECOSOC in June, July next year, which in turn reports back to the United Nations General Assembly in October next year.

The reason I'm telling you this is because whatever improvements we report on, the earliest that they will be implementable within the IGF sphere is 2013.

Within the Asia Pacific region, there were three countries that submitted proposals for IGF improvements to the working group. China, which is not a member of the CSTD working group, but anyone could submit a report, a proposal, so China did.

India and Sri Lanka who are both member of the working group.

Also on the working group, but they didn't submit a written proposal, is Pakistan.

On our first meeting, back in February, there was a lot of distrust between the different stakeholder groups, we have government, business, civil society, technical, inter-governmental organisations.

Of a two-day meeting, we spent the first day and a bit arguing about the agenda of the two-day meeting.

We have progressed since there. We have built trust, so in many ways, it's very much like the IGF model, where initially there may have been a lot of distrust amongst stakeholder groups, but over time, the dialogue has enabled people to realise that we all want the same thing, we all want the best for the internet. They may be different things, but we all want the best.

With the extension of the mandate, we will only be considering the existing proposals that have come in.

The reason for that was just to -- we needed to box

off what we were discussing, otherwise we would be discussing forever.

That means that any discussion that we have today or at the upcoming IGF, there is a couple of workshops on IGF improvements, they can't officially be injected as new proposals into the working group, but what you can do is if you're interested, talk to your representative, ask your governments and they can inject support for various proposals into the working group.

One of the interesting things about the working group is the very diverse nature of stakeholders. Some of the representatives have never been to an IGF, some of the representatives don't really understand UN processes. So the proposals that have come into the working group are a mixture of proposals that for things that the IGF are already doing or for things that are requested of the UN that the UN either can't do or would find it very difficult to do.

For example, with the UN related proposals, there have been some suggestions that the UN should fully fund the IGF, but actually the UN is having financial difficulties itself, so that would be difficult. There's also the political issues of does one organisation fund this fully or do you want to maintain the multi-stakeholder method both in funding as well as

in participation?

One of the other issues that came up in terms of UN related processes is -- and this came up in a number of the proposals. People requested that details of the funding of the IGF be published and made transparent. Unfortunately, there are and Chengetai can tell you more about this later, there are limitations on how much information the UN can publish.

They may want to, but they can't.

There are a number of proposals that came out. I'm just touching on some of the larger ones.

There was a lot of discussion and there will be a lot of discussion on the concept of outcomes. What should the outcomes of IGF? We all agree that it shouldn't be a negotiating decision-making body.

But in terms of outcomes, some people would like to go further than the Chairman's report, the website, the transcripts, the videos. In particular, there was one proposal that the IGF -- it's an interpretation of the Tunis agenda, that initiated the IGF.

One of the Tunis agenda items talked about identifying emerging issues, zip to the end of the sentence and, where appropriate, make recommendations.

Some people say that an emerging issue is anything that we haven't reached a concrete agreement on.

So any issues in the global internet governance sphere that people feel dissatisfied with is perhaps a topic for policy recommendations, within the IGF.

However, they do recognise that getting consensus on everything is difficult, so that you could group things in terms of where there's consensus, and then a list of divergent opinions.

These sorts of outcomes could then be forwarded onto the appropriate policy making bodies for that issue.

One of the countries suggested that perhaps having more concrete outcomes would be difficult, because of the nature of representation at the IGF. Can you be sure that all affected parties are in the room when you're coming up with these policy recommendations?

Another issue that was a great matter of discussion was the composition of the MAG. There was one proposal to perhaps use the format of ECOSOC composition which takes different -- divides the world up into different regions and then allots different numbers of representatives for those different regions to ECOSOC.

What that would mean for the MAG is that Africa would get more representatives than Asia.

The reason for that is there's lots of countries in Africa. The problem is there's lots more people in Asia. The concept of representation is difficult. This

is not easy stuff to solve.

We haven't solved it yet.

There is also and this has been brought in as a proposal to the working group, last year, the MAG itself based on feedback from the community, put together a several improvement plan for the MAG looking at issues about composition and regular turnover to ensure that all stakeholder groups were represented effectively.

A list of just some brief issues that are also under discussion is improvements. There is a lot of interest in having a greater focus on development in the IGF, some people also wanted to link this to the enhanced cooperation process.

The enhanced cooperation process is a separate parallel process in the internet governance sphere, but it's a government only process.

There's issues there about the IGF being a multi-stakeholder venue, versus this enhanced cooperation government process.

There was also a suggestion that the IGF become a watchdog for other bodies in the internet gov fans sphere. So that what the IGF could do is request reports from other internet governance bodies, asking if they are embodying the principles of WSIS and then

disseminating information and reporting back on how other internet governance bodies are doing, perhaps to the CSTD.

There is also a suggestion that perhaps instead of the IGF being an annual event, that it be distributed throughout the year. So that there would be the matic meetings, that there would be on-line discussions, that there be little working groups that work on background documents, that then lead into the main event.

Just from practical issue, I don't know we'll find the time from anybody to get involved in that sort of activity. It's a really good idea, but it's an improvement that requires people's time and money, from organisations to commit to that sort of thing.

There's also discussion and it kind of showed the different levels of development within countries. Some countries really wanted to focus on the IGF as a venue for global internet policy development discussion, whereas others really thought that the capacity building element is still the primary goal, because so many parts of the world are still not understanding the issues enough to be able to participate in the policy process.

One of the things that's relevant to this session in particular or this meeting is there was a lot of agreement that there needs to be a stronger link between

regional and national IGFs and the global IGF, in terms of Regional IGFs reporting to the global IGF and global IGF being in contact with the Regional IGFs.

This brings up something that's important about the various proposals for improvements to the IGF.

It's great to have that link, but it links to another proposal which is about the IGF becoming a more concrete outcome type organisation.

If you at the global IGF are going to come up with recommendations for global internet public policy, if as bill direct was saying yesterday, you want to be a governance maker, not a governance taker. If the regions want to be involved in that, that means that you're going to have to discuss those issues at the Regional IGFs, which would mean a change in the format of the AP Regional IGF, the Pacific Regional IGF.

In looking at improvements for the IGF, it's important not to look at them as standalone improvements, they have interactions.

So, for example, if you read the 121-page summary of the proposal that came in, and I have in the last couple of days, again, the elephant in that document, the elephant in that document room, is ICANN.

It's not mentioned by name many times, but there's a lot of mention of the need that IGF needs to solve the

problem of internationalising internet management.

The improvements is not just about IGF, it links to ICANN. There's also references to interconnection costs, which links to discussions in the ITU.

So what is happening is that if someone perhaps is not happy in another governance venue, they're using -- they could possibly use IGF in forum shopping to find another venue for their particular issue.

I think that's a reasonable summary. If you have any questions afterwards, please ask, but that's just.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you, Sam. So processes, funding processes, outcomes processes, MAG processes.

I definitely am OK with processes and I think the next speak, Chengetai, will talk about it and in in that perspective from the UN Secretariat.

>>Chengetai Masango: Thank you, Edmon.

First of all, I'll just talk about the immediate future of the IGF and that is concerning the IGF in Nairobi. I'll just give a brief overview, for those of you who don't know too much about it.

The 6th IGF, which is the first and second cycle since the IGF mandate was renewed in December, is going to take place at the end of September 27 to 30, in Nairobi, Kenya.

It will be held at the United Nations offices in

Nairobi, which is a very nice place, if you go there.

The main theme of the meeting is internet as a catalyst for change, access, development, freedoms and innovation.

At the moment, we had 113 workshop proposals and we narrowed it down through the MAG selection to 77 workshops and those have just been put up on our website, so if you did make a workshop proposal, you can check on our website now and see the status of your workshops.

They range through all the five main themes, which I won't go through.

Then we'll also have open forums, the IGF Village and poster sessions for people who just want to share information and the IGF village is for organisations who want to showcase their internet governance related activities for a non commercial nature, of course.

For those of you who cannot come to the IGN in Nairobi, we have made great efforts for the remote participation. All events will be webcast and there will be live transcription.

We'll also be using CISCO webex as our remote participation tool.

Also very interesting is for those who can't make it is remote hubs, which we have used extensively for the

past three IGFs, where people can gather together in a room, usually at universities or other institutions and have a mini-IGF, which can feed into the main sessions. We do have time for these remote hubs to come into the sessions while they're following on-line and participate remotely.

If you have any other questions about the IGF in Nairobi, you can ask me later on in the question and answer section.

For the next stage, with the IGF, there has been loads of discussion. At the moment, I'll just touch upon. At the moment, we don't have special advisor or an executive coordinator. We are waiting for the secretary general to appoint a new special advisor, which he will do in due course, and for the executive coordinator, since the United Nations as I mentioned on Monday is a slightly bureaucratic organisation, there has to be some processes that go through before it is advertised. The post is advertised and it is going to be advertised shortly, I hope.

They say that the process is moving on.

As Sam has just said about the CSTD, we also have the MAG and the MAG has to work out its self renewal mechanisms. CSTD report is going to be ready 2012, at the end of 2012, hopefully and implemented 2013. But

the IGF has also got its several improvement mechanisms. After each year, we have our taking stock session, where people come in and put in their views and views for improvement, which we take on.

Also, throughout the year, anybody can submit a paper with any ideas that they have and we do listen to all stakeholders. It doesn't matter who you are, you can be an individual, a government, an institution, please just submit anything to the IGF.

Apart from the -- in the Nairobi IGF as well, we have a space for interregional dialogues which regional and international IGFs can come together and communicate and share ideas, because it's also very interesting, I have been to Regional IGFs in Africa, East Africa and I have been to the EuroDig, the European IGF. There are similarities, but there are also differences in focus of what issues are important to the different parts.

Starting from next year, I think we have to work on other mechanisms to get IGF-like events to feed into the main IGF at an early stage, so to set the agenda and issues that are going to be discussed for the Baku IGF which is going to take place next year.

One other issue for the future of the IGF is also funding. Funding is always an issue and I'm sure the

organisers of the regional and international IGFs know that, especially in this global economic climate, funding sources are few and far between and that's one of the issues that we have to work at.

The IGF mandate has been renewed for another five years as I said and it should and in 2015, which is in line with the WSIS review process which is going to be a wider WSIS review, reviewing what has taken place in the 10 years after WSIS and then there is going to be another decision whether or not to renew the IGF mandate again.

Thank you. I'll just leave it to questions.

I think that's best.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you and, yes, it seems to me, hearing from Chengetai, slight bureaucratic process waiting for a head. But in the meantime, I think we're excited here that at least participation technologies are being pushed forward. I think that's always important remote participation and getting people involved.

I guess that in essence sort of like to open up the panel, but I would like to get Keith's thoughts, I guess, on some of the items we talked about, MAG, the funding, how the regional ties into the global and just generally your observations and how we move forward.

>>Keith Davidson: Thanks again, Edmon.

I'm reflecting, having come last week from an internet governance symposium in Oslo, Norway to the am IGF here, returning home after ICANN to the New Zealand first IGF and thinking three Internet Governance Forum events in one month covering half the planet or the whole planet, depending which way you travel, you know, it shows the extraordinary impact of initially the global IGF, which didn't lead to a lot of local or regional internet governance discussions for a year or two. It took I think probably by about year 3 of the original mandate, then a few countries started to cautiously move towards having an incountry IGF and so on.

Now we're just seeing this flourishing mass of local forums dealing with more local and subregional and regional issues. That to me demonstrating quite clearly the success of the multi-stakeholder non-decision-making nature of having these forums.

There is clearly a methodology by which participating, listening to experts on subjects and saying that's applicable in our country or that's not applicable or that's interesting or that's not. You know, provides a wealth of usefulness as opposed to the normal structured treaty organisation discussions to create some form of global policy and so on.

I think there's a clear demonstration that the planet is adapting to multi-stakeholderism well.

But conversely, I have a little bit of fear for the global IGF and not particularly enhanced by some of the issues Sam raises and that is the changing nature of the UN's motivation for the global IGF and the possibility that it may be multi-stakeholder, but not equal participation. That to me is a very real fear, that part of multi-stakeholder, to me, equals equal participation. Governments, businesses, academics, individuals, civil society, come together to discuss on an equal basis.

I guess to sum this up in really to sentences, my fear is that if it doesn't remain the robust multi-stakeholder model that it has become, then the fear is that the multi-stakeholder groups like ICANN and ISOC, could potentially walk away from that environment, if governments are given some special place, you know, and that to me would ruin what is an absolutely perfect model as I see it now.

Perhaps the message we could take from that is to all strive to work forwards beyond Nairobi to ensure that the true aspects of open equal access, multi-stakeholder, non decision making are ensured, so that we can continue to share knowledge and develop

policies applicable to us.

Thank you.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you. Interesting. So multi-stakeholdersism and this non-decision making, so concept. I think those are two really take home items and I guess with that, it's interesting. I wanted to focus, I guess, on the non-decision nature and I think it relates a lot to what we're doing here and I think Sam mentioned and also Chengetai mentioned about how the regional meetings could feed into the global discussion and therein lies an interesting dilemma, it seems, and Sala mentioned it in our last session, about what we discuss here and how we take it then to the global IGF. If that's not called an outcome or what are we calling it and what should the dynamics be? Because I think Sam actually mentioned that some of the things we might have to talk about in the regional and then feed -- I think everybody said to that extent and feed into the global discussion.

How could that take place while we talk about on in decision making and that might be an interesting question.

Whether anyone wants to respond.

>>Keith Davidson: I guess the concept of non-decision making is non-binding treaty type decision making, as opposed

to generating a methodology by which you feed up to a global IGF and generally have agreement that this is -- that spam is a bad thing. Having a principles discussion that child pornography is a bad thing and so on, is not inappropriate, that's not binding anyone to doing anything, but it's agreeing a set of principles from which you can take back in country and deal with as appropriate.

>>Edmon Chung: I guess that's interesting, so building a set of -- I really wouldn't say consensus, but at least a set of shared understanding of different issues is really at the core. I wonder if Chengetai or Sam has anything to add on the item of how, I guess, the regional meetings could feed in and how you see that going forward.

>>Chengetai Masango: I totally agree that one of the main strengths of the IGF and the value of the IGF is building common understandings of issues and also getting peopling from the other side, well, from different stakeholder groups to contribute to the meeting and they can understand each other and come to a common understanding.

At the moment, as I said, for this year, we have made space for regional and national IGFs to participate in the Nairobi meeting, but I think during our planning

meetings as well, we should have a specific section for the national and Regional IGFs and invite them early on starting from November, in fact, this year, November, and then February to come in and help shape the program from the very beginning of the annual meeting.

>>Sam Dickinson: One of the interesting things about Regional IGFs is the ability to use more localised languages. The global IGF is limited generally to the six UN languages, so one of the great advantages that the Regional IGF could do in terms of taking messages back to the global IGF, is having the discussions in the local regional languages. I think that is a great strength that we could build on.

>>Edmon Chung: Interestingly, we are using English here, which reminds me of, I guess, Sala's point earlier, that the largest number of language per capita, Vanuatu. So this is definitely something we need to improve on.

Sala, you mentioned a question earlier, I wanted to get some clarification on that, because I think it was completely skipped over by the earlier panel, but you mentioned something about how we would take on the security issue. I forgot. Did you want to ...

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: I think one of -- I'll just answer Edmon and also just sort of add a little bit more onto the dialogue.

In essence, one of the things I mentioned was I requested that the panel, when they are reporting to Nairobi, that it's critical that they take the points that were sort of extracted from the audience as well, because part of having a regional forum is that in itself, it's a representation of views and perspectives, however diverse they may be.

Having said that, I just like to, if I may, add onto the existing dialogue. I think one of the beautiful things we are witnessing with the Internet Governance Forum model is that everyone is an equal player, whether you're a government or a multinational or whether you're an NGO or whether you're a business or a domain name registry, everyone has a say and has a capacity to come in a -- come into a non-threatening evening environment and begin to dialogue.

I think Pablo mentioned in his presentation whilst he was summing up and he actually alluded to a very beautiful poem. He didn't have time to read the poem, but it's actually about the five blind men who are looking at an elephant.

They all saw different aspects of the elephant.

I think if you notice the discussions as diverse as they've been, both in the global, regional and subregional level, because everyone comes from different

context and different industries and different components of the cyber environment, we all have different views on issues.

So the strength of the current IGF model where everyone has an equal say is that you know you're able to come out from -- I'm not say that everyone is isolationist, but I'm saying we're able to see beyond ourselves, see beyond our interests, see beyond our industries and help to connect the dots and work together and trusting that there are activators, that there are catalysts who come to these forums who can go back and make a substantial difference.

The danger of giving power to any one person within an IG forum, like as Keith was alluding to, if you sort of give certain players a lot more power, political clout, the danger is there will be people who will feel threatened and who will sort of run away and that sort of thing and we don't want too much. Just thought I would throw that in.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you. Actually, with that, I would like to open the floor and if you're interested to make a comment or ask questions or your thoughts on way forward, please go to the mic.

Actually, just before that, the reason I have sort of picked on this particular issue is just earlier,

I got a note from the floor and I'm quite encouraged by it for sure. No years in a row, we have a statement coming out from the civil society of south East Asia and last time I remember we were from DotAsia also helping organising this and we were criticised for not giving enough time for the floor.

So I wonder if anyone from that group, that just sent this statement, that would like to just come in and talk a little bit about the statement and you wanted to mention the statement and also going forward and how we can improve here.

>>Victor: This is a joint statement, so I just read it.

Firstly, we applaud and welcome the report by UN special rapporteur on freedom of expression, Mr Frank La Rue, at the 17th session of the UN Human Rights Council, which affirmed human right in the internet. Nothing the important role that the internet played during times of political unrest, the report affirmed it as "an indispensable tool for realising a range of human rights, combating inequality, and accelerating development and human progress". We, too, agree that there is enormous potential in the internet in all aspects of human development - from economic and social, to commerce, finance, business, innovation, mobilisation and the attainment and exercise of freedoms.

Since --

>>Edmon Chung: I actually apologise for jumping in. If you could summarise it a little bit, it might be easier for everyone. But I understand it's a joint statement, but if you can summarise it, it might be easier.

>>Victor: Basically, this statement is for ... security and based on south-east Asia perspective.

>>Edmon Chung: Did you want to highlight a few items?

>>Victor: While international human rights laws allow the State to impose restriction on freedom of expression, including those in the internet, however, these measures must meet, (a) the test of the principles of predictability and transparency as it must be provided by law; (b) the test of principle of legitimacy as it must pursue the purposes of protecting the rights of reputation of others and to protect national security or public order, or of public health or morals; and (c) the test of the principles of necessity and proportionality as it must be proven necessary and proportionate in addressing the problem.

For internet privacy, we highlight that while users can enjoy relative anonymity on the internet, states and private actors have access to technology to monitor and collect information about individuals' communications and activities on the Internet. Such practices can

constitute a violation of internet users' right to privacy, and undermine people's confidence and security on the internet, thus impeding the free flow of information and ideas online. Thus, it is in the interest of all for states to adopt effective privacy and data protection laws in accordance with article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Human Rights Committee's general comment No. 16. This includes laws that clearly guarantee the right of all individuals to ascertain in an intelligible form whether, and if so what, personal data is stored in automatic data files, and for what purposes, and which public authorities or private individuals or bodies control or may control their files.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you.

I wonder if there's any comments or thoughts.

You still have?

>>Victor: No.

>>Edmon Chung: No, I think at least in the context of this discussion, I think it's encouraging to see that meetings like this can catalyse the coming together of people to put these joint statements together and I guess it comes back to in terms of the activity itself, what type of outcomes or not. We should think about in terms of format and going forward.

I don't know whether there's any feedback. If not, then I'll go to Raj.

>>Rajnish Singh: Two points I just want to comments. They are not questions to a the panel as such, the first one being Chengetai you mentioned that you've trying to get the out puts of the Regional IGFs a bit earlier in the planning process, as you shape it and I think that's a very important step that you are taking.

Basically, I do believe that just feeding the outputs of the Regional IGFs during main global IGF is perhaps a bit late in the process. So if you have the input a bit earlier on, you can help shape the agenda, which will make difference on the day of the IGF as such.

Second point is to emphasise what was said earlier about the multi-stakeholder process. I remember the first IGF was in Athens in 2006 and during the opening plenary session, there were not enough seats in the room for everyone and I remember a sense of panic amongst the delegates saying does that mean we will not be able to sit in the room and hear what's going to happen as the session start.

From what I recall, there was some sort of preference system as well, who got tickets and who didn't.

So it's good to see that that has evolved over time and now it's become open and I do hope that we continue with that truly multi-stakeholder process, because if we don't honour equal voices, I think the whole concept will get very polluted. So I would hope that we continue on that basis, that we remain transparent and open, to all points of view, we shouldn't also shut out a point of view just because we don't like what that organisation is saying and it should be a true forum where we can dialogue, discuss, debate and have a drink afterwards.

Thanks.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: I would like to comment on the format, from what Raj mentioned. I think it's OK to have diverse perspectives, especially given that IGF is multi-stakeholder process.

I think what's key and what should be considered in terms of reporting on the format would be to note the point of view, the diverse points of view and note the positions.

>>Edmon Chung: With that --

>>Baher Esmat: Just sharing some of the experience that Sam had already spoken to, two quick observations on the work of the CST working group, it was interesting to see members of the working group and other people who want

to see the IGF improve, that those people have never participated in IGF before. It's also interesting to see discussions about IG issues that ... had addressed like six, seven, eight years ago. This takes us to maybe the issue of mistrust, that Sam had pointed to. There is still a stakeholders need to do the work to build more trust at regional national IGFs are in my view, excellent venues to build this kind of trust.

The interesting thing about national ideas is that we could reach out to people who don't go to IGF meetings, but they still go to national meetings.

Because I think we are at a point that we need to talk to people who do not attend the IGF, because those who attend the IGF I think are happy with the IGF, but we need to talk to those who do not attend the IGF and see how we can take the IGF to the next level.

Thank you.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you. It's very interesting that we have people that we have never participated trying to improve. It reminds me that a conversation I just had about us having a chef that doesn't know how to cook, bake for us.

Any comments?

>>Izumi Aizu: As one of the civil society members of the CSTD working group and just following what the other

speaker said, it's very difficult amongst the civil society to have a good coordination, amongst the members of the working group to begin with, but also amongst the civil society participants, because I'm co-coordinator of the global internet governance caucus of the civil society and one thing is that unlike some others, most of the civil society organisations or individuals have very limited resources, namely funding, and although they were in the some of the working groups, there were some special funding from the Secretariat to the civil society members, if they are from the developing countries and I'm not. So I'm not ...

And that also is the issue of the whole participation of the civil society so the IG processes, which of course in ideal world, there can be more resources, more extra funding and it relates to the level of participation of the Asia Pacific civil society to the IGF. They're used to more participation for the WSIS process, from the NGOs, but the region, but sort of degree of interest as well as support are not as much as it can be.

Of course, we can blame ourselves, that we haven't really done good organised work, so we are not pleading for any sort of external help per se, but we have to make the case where your or our support really works for

the benefit of civil society, but also the society at large, but it's been like that, so in the second round, beginning with Kenya, we are not sure how we can improve ourselves, but these are the charges we share and we would like to hear if you have any advice, thank you.

>>Sam Dickinson: Just building on from Baher's comment about people who go to IGF and people who don't.

It's probably been said in many venues, but there is a divide between the government representatives that go to internet governance meetings like the IGF, ICANN, regional internet recommend industry meetings and the government representatives who go to CSTD, ITU and other UN related meetings. That one that is come to internet governance related meetings tend to the ICT ministries, whereas those that go to CSTD and those sorts of events, UN related events, tend to be the foreign ministries.

They have very different views and offer don't talk. So this is where it becomes very important as members of your different countries to be approaching your governments, to let them know what you think, to be encouraging them to talk to each other, between different departments, so that if -- it is often the case that the ICT ministries have one view, that they express say in the GAC at ICANN, but other representatives from that same country present

a diametrically opposed view within a UN forum. So that is one thing that we can all do to help bridge the gap, get our governments to talk amongst their own departments.

>>Edmon Chung: Getting governments to talk between departments. That's going to be, I guess, a challenge, all around.

I think as mentioned about funding as well. This is one of the things I wonder if anyone want to add, but I see another question.

>>Andrew: From the PISOC, the Pacific chapter of the Internet Society.

First of all, I would like to thank Sala for the presentation of Pacific IGF and also Keith for driving it.

It was an awesome events, but what I wanted to ask was already mentioned by a few other speakers here and some has just summarised. We have a problem of having the top level government people to know about IGF. For us in the Pacific, there is a lot of countries who are yet to develop their national policies and I believe it is important that these governments have representatives in future IGFs. I'm not sure how we can do that, yes, of course, we can do that at local where some of us can approach the government, but I believe if it's going to

be in the name of UN or something, then maybe the governments might think about it. So this is a challenge where I want to raise as well, that this is happening in the Pacific region.

Thank you.

>>Sheela Awat: I think one of the points you have just highlighted is the disjunct between the government representatives that attend a forum like IGF and those that attend something more structured, like the UN and they offer have diametrically opposite views about similar issues.

One simple solution, then, for the organising committee of IGF, would be to invite the non representative government department to sit on your panel. It's the simplest solution to get them involved in this dialogue. Because if you rely on each of us to go back to our respective governments to bring that view forward, that's not going to happen soon. Wouldn't be that be obvious suggestion?

>>Edmon Chung: That's interesting. Chengetai, goods luck on that. But I have Sala and Sam.

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Very topical indeed. First of all, one of the things that I mentioned during my presentation that I didn't have time to go into was that the government in the Pacific still and telcos have yet

to be fully convinced of the relevance of internet governance to them, believe it or not. The thing is, how do we build capacity, how do we do that? There's so many ways to skin a cat, I suppose, but one of the ways that what is this is something that I tried to do after the Pacific IGF, was I understood that because internet governance is like in Fiji or everyone in the Pacific, if you tell someone in government or who writes policy, internet governance, they're like what's that? I guess they understand governance, but when it comes to internet governance, it's really like you are talking about aliens or something.

Therein lies the challenge and doing very good work in terms of building capacity. One of the things that we did very recently, I think it was last month, we hosted the inaugural cyber security workshop in Fiji and I understood that there were key stakeholders even within Fiji, we had live remote streaming and I think it was the first time done, it was done in the Pacific, in terms of an actual workshop, we are a little bit behind the rest of Asia in that sense.

What we did was we brought industry stakeholders, people from aviation, energy, Inland Revenue, customs authority, all sorts of people and they were sitting in the room and they were like, OK, so how does that affect

us? So one of the challenges that we had to do was sort of we've waved things in such a way to the get them to see that it affects them and again, I would like to relate it back to Pablo's poem, the five blind men and the elephant.

One of the tractions that we found at the end of the two-day workshop was that people began to understand that if they could actually identify with the issues and because of that, we were able to get their buy in and this momentum and like people giving their resources, people wanting training and that sort of thing.

I think similarly, a similar approach can be adopted in terms of internet governance, but the thing is you need catalysts, you need to identify cause and catalysts and you can't have catalyst without an IGF forum, so this is one of the reasons why the Regional IGF forum is critical, because you are bringing together a bunch of people who talk about the issues, discuss it and you are trusting that these people go back and educate, create awareness and do stuff.

Yeah, I agree with you.

>>Sam Dickinson: I think it is important to send invitations to the opposing department and often that's done, but within the hierarchy of government ministries, usually the foreign affairs ministry is the senior one, so what

they want goes. You also have the issue of often the foreign affairs representatives are the ones based in Geneva or New York. They're not going to travel to something like IGF. They don't have the budget. We also I'm not going to name the country, but we did have the experience in the CSTD working group where we had a representative from the foreign affairs and we had a representative from the ICT ministry of the one country attending. The ICT ministry was more supportive of the multi-stakeholder environment, whereas the foreign affairs ministry had a stricter government based perspective. Because the foreign affairs department is the senior department, that was the view that was in the majority expressed by that country at that events.

>>Edmon Chung: For affairs trumping everyone.

>>Chengetai Masango: I just wanted to say for the suggestion of us inviting, yes, we can try, but as Sam said, the invitation usually lands on the desk of the foreign affairs ministry, not the ICT ministry, because that's the way protocol dictates that it gets sent to the foreign affairs ministry. But we can both try, we can try from our end and you can try at home as well from your end.

As we also have at the IGF Secretariat, capacity building, a fellowship program, together with the Dipler

Foundation and I don't know if you know, Fital Patal and also Andu Mangal. They have been through this fellowship program and if anybody has any names of government representations from especially from LCDs, least developed countries or even in the Pacific region, we can consider them to come to Geneva for the fellowship program and learn more about the IGF and IGF processes.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you. I think that sort of brings us to sort of a close and you have a burning question.

>>Aiz Bawaz: One thing, very simple. Thank you, for the observation and ... respectable observation. I have a simple thing for request and one is is to Sala and your kind of your gesture about the comment about the elephant and the blind man. You are very kind, but you have forgotten that you ... one drop in an ocean analogy. That's good.

The other thing, my word of caution very much is with regard to CM or the road to Nairobi. We do understand the audience of the world would expect what to be in Nairobi and coming to be. Those who couldn't make it, like me, perhaps maybe yes, maybe no, but I think that we don't mind it ourselves is what I can, by expectation, supposed to be.

Breaking the divide between life, business,

technology and in your journey, we would expect to do more right than wrong and I think it is fair to expect that.

Only one request, which is ... I remember in 2004, when Vint Cerf apologised to me first, as the father of the internet, then I say to him, he have to announce it to the public and he did, with regard to the redelegation of the ... problem to Kofi Annan and since 2004, nothing has materialised. And Ban Ki-Moon ...

In Nairobi, can you expect that if the address, in whatever form, instead of just leaving it up there and I think that those who couldn't make it would ... it is important for a simple milestone that we think that we are not expecting too much.

If you could voice it good enough, that's about it. Thank you very much.

>>Khaled Fattal: Thank you, Edmon. First of all, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to close with a short comment. Rajnesh made a comment about his observation from 2006 in Greece and he was worried about are we going to have some space?

If there's a message that I think we need to draw from our event last two days and IGF in general is we need to make it valuable to those who want to participate. We have seen over the years how decision

makers have stopped attending some of the IGF meetings. We get middle management decision makers, but we have not getting the serious top decision makers, for example, like you get at the World Economic Forum.

The reason for that is because maybe the international community or the business community or the general public first have not grasped the concept. Second, they have not understood the value of where if they were to attend, they can influence or make some significant change.

When we listen to the observations like the government is in the department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or is it the ICC ministry and who knows about all this? I think if there's anything we can draw from this experience is we really need, after six years, to bring something that's tangible, that makes people to wants to be able to recognise it, if they bit into it, they can grab manager. Without that, it's going to be very difficult to take it to the next level and actually champion some of the great, if you want to call it, concepts or ideas or presented solutions.

Another point that I think Sam she made earlier on, which I think is also very significant is in terms of making the next event perhaps something far more far reaching. For example, in of the discussions about

internet governance, it infers talking about ICANN, but it doesn't really mention ICANN. It's like we have become too civilised. We don't want to offend, we don't want to say anything controversial, because we don't want to sound as if we are going too far to the right or too far to the left.

I think it's time to call it for what it is, because this is at the heart of a lot of the issues where they have not been addressed. This is probably one of the closing statements that I would like to add and if there is any value today, please use it. If not, you can throw it into the dustbin of history. Thank you.

>>Keith Davidson: I think I'll try and wrap up a couple of little bits of the last two questions and that is that there's no excuse for not participating in the global IGF, in so much as the quality of the remote participation is so high and I'm not talking about the quality of the video or anything else, but the fact that you are encouraged to be part of the room and the discussion is foremost in the minds. There is a moderator, a remote moderator in every room for every discussion whose job it is to encourage people who haven't been able to make it to Nairobi, to have their point of view put.

I think the common theme of several speakers was

about the whole concept of how do we get engagement and inviting special people on to panels.

It is conceivable that there are a good many people who do not want this forum to succeed, that they are much more satisfied with dealing in treaty organisation forums and they don't want to see this succeed and I would venture to suggest more of those are Geneva based civil servants than in country civil services.

There may be some people that it is impossible to induce into participating in a true multi-stakeholder forum, but that's no reason for us to not continue to try and I think with compelling purpose and go forward, we will get there.

Thank you.

>>Edmon Chung: Thank you and as usual, I have failed to keep time and we are over running for 10 minutes about.

But I think that also speaks to that the abundance of issues and comments and interests of the issues that we're talking about.

That sort of leads into, I guess, I mention next year, I actually promised Peng Hwa I would spend a little bit of time talking about that, but I ran out.

I guess with all the discussions we just had in the last two sessions, I think it's safe to say that at least I hear a general inclination to continue having

these Regional IGF meetings and certainly from DotAsia, we will continue to support and I'm sure from APNIC and APTLD and many other Asia Pacific region organisations as well.

But we are and we need to look for hosts. One of the things I was looking at just the statement from the civil society folks, saying that we had the first one in Hong Kong, the second one in Singapore, both of which doesn't really have that much of an issue of digital divide and we should find somewhere better.

If anyone knows that where we can take this meeting next year, please --

>>Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Come to Fiji.

>>Edmon Chung: OK, we have our next year. That's great.

That's a good suggestion, let's go to Fiji next year.

I guess with that, please join me in a round of applause for the panel.

APPLAUSE

>>Edmon Chung: Also, I would like to please join me in a round of applause for the host this time from Singapore, Peng Hwa and of course Yvonne.

APPLAUSE

>>Edmon Chung: Also all the staff here, so big round of applause for them.

APPLAUSE

>>Edmon Chung: And with that, actually, I'm not sure whether you are going to close it, but please go ahead and a round of applause.

APPLAUSE

>>Komathi Ale: Thank you very much. May I please invite Prof Ang onto the stage for the closing statement and to present a token of appreciation to Sam Dickinson and Sala.

>>Ang Peng Hwa:

APPLAUSE

>>Ang Peng Hwa: Just system quick closing remarks. Just three points. First, again to thank the supporters, we have the Lee Foundation, the IDA, of course, APNIC, M1, Google and of course Edmon and DotAsia.

I want to say also that we will definitely put up a statement of some kind to the IGF, based on a summary of the comments that were made in the last session, as well as this one.

Then for planning ahead, I guess we haven't really discussed, but I think we should find out where we can open up avenues for people to put up agenda items, onto rigf.asia website. For planning our meeting and maybe Sala will continue this, there are two parts. One is the programming of course and this is where the inputs

will be helpful and the other one is logistics. In Asia, we tend to provide food, but if you look back at the five IGFs, the two that had food were in Egypt and India and you have to find your own food.

It reminds me of I was talking about Sala mentioned the elephant twice and I'm thinking about these five men, they are probably not ethnic Chinese, because they would feel the elephant and they will decide which part is the mostedlytious. There won't be an Itious of what does it look like. We don't care. Just what it tastes like.

This is there is a secret to making this work and Yvonne and the issues of the water, this special water that Edmon passed to me and then I gave it to Yvonne and that's how it works.

So thank you all for your support in many ways, this thing could not have been put up by any one centre. There's clearly a lot of support from various groups here, Keith, Paul, Rajesh, various people here. ... ^ so many people give support. Thank you all.

Any number of you at Nairobi, I'm attending there, Yvonne is going to be there. We are going to bring the Youth IGF, the meeting tomorrow is going to close and we are going to select the best four performers, we have a criteria, and bring them to Nairobi with us.

Then of course I look forward to meeting you all at the next Asia Pacific regional IGF.

Have a good weekend and good time in Singapore and see you all next time.

APPLAUSE

