

Internet Cooperation in Asia Pacific

24 Oct 2013, 8-9am @ IGF Bali

This document records the ideas and suggestions which were shared during the “Internet Cooperation in Asia Pacific” session which was held at the 8th Internet Governance Forum in Bali, on 24 Oct 2013. It represents the views shared by the group of participants present around the broad question on how Asia Pacific (APAC) stakeholders could strengthen collaboration to better service the Internet Community in the region.

This document is by no means a blueprint or prescribed list of activities for the region. Rather, it serves as the basis for work moving forward – a launch point for further discussion and consultation amongst all Internet stakeholders in the APAC region.

(A) Context of Discussion: Improving Coordination, Profiling APAC Perspectives

It was shared that communication and coordination amongst APAC Internet stakeholders can be improved. APAC should keep pace with the world as it moves faster, and APAC voices should be heard and taken into consideration in the global discussion on various Internet issues, rather than to accept the views of the more vocal communities without having provided some input. There is a need for the APAC community to sit together before meetings so that APAC stakeholders have the opportunity to feedback into the broader global discussion.

At the APriGF in Seoul in August 2013, a number of needs and concerns from the APAC region were raised. These issues were arranged thematically, cutting across the spectrum of stakeholders, and were documented and shared in a matrix (see [appendix](#)). They are highlighted as follows.

(1) Language Localization and Support

Localisation of languages is critical for regional participation in the multi-stakeholder process. Meetings and discussions currently are run mostly in English, which limits the participation of non-native speakers. The region could coordinate to ensure greater engagement by everyone, particularly within the Asia Pacific region, which is culturally and linguistically diverse.

Moving Forward: Efforts to crowdsource language localization could be explored, including collaborative efforts between regional organisations.

(2) Capacity-Building Efforts in APAC

Asia Pacific is a diverse region moving at different speeds, and we need to level our capacities so as to move forward together.

Moving Forward: Mapping out issues and activities (which has been partially done) would be a good start, to identify cross-cutting themes and discussion topics. A number of themes could be meshed and efforts concentrated to avoid duplication – such as APNIC and IPv6 education; APNIC, ICANN on APTLD on Security etc.

(3) Awareness of Internet Governance and Outreach

The Asia Pacific has over 1 billion Internet users, and this number is rapidly increasing each day. There is a need for the wider Internet community in the region to be part of the Internet Governance process, beginning with awareness of the current established community's work, as well as other Internet Governance issues.

Moving Forward: For existing institutions in the community to collaborate on outreach programmes, leveraging on common, cross-cutting Internet governance issues.

(4) Regional Meetings and Coordination

APAC has great meetings, and a great many meetings: APriGF, APNIC, APRICOT, Pac INET, APTLD. These established platforms should be made use of to harmonise calendars to coalesce and galvanize APAC voices.

Moving Forward: A format to share calendars would allow better coordination amongst the meetings, and would allow each meeting's outcomes to feed into the next meeting on the calendar, building momentum for APAC.

Selecting a number of key events to coalesce around could also be beneficial for collating APAC views around issues, which could then be fed into the global process (e.g. ICANN's global meetings). Formal or informal fringe meetings (eg a mini ccNSO, ASA, ALAC etc) on the side of established regional events (e.g. APRICOT, APNIC, APriGF etc) would help to tease out APAC themes by decreasing the language barriers, capturing the nuances of discussion.

Having these discussions feed into each other could also be a path to explore – for example having a meeting at APRICOT in February, which could then be continued or fed into the ICANN meeting in March, which could then be put up for further discussion at the Coalition meeting in Rio de Janeiro.

(5) Increasing Stakeholder Representation and Participation

There was excellent stakeholder representation at the APriGF in Seoul, especially from government. In addition, the business community participated as well – Daum, Weibo, Docomo- many large organisations were involved with the conversation.

Moving Forward: This is a great step, and should continue to be encouraged if the multi-stakeholder model participative model is to gain traction in the region.

(B) The Montevideo Statement: A Brief Primer

As there was some curiosity and buzz around the Montevideo Statement, Paul Wilson, Director-General of APNIC provided a brief primer to all participants, explaining the genesis of the Statement. An informal meeting of a number of technical organisations about the future of Internet governance discussions reached an agreement on a number of the issues listed in the Statement. There was also the realisation that this agreement could not remain within the technical community, but needed to be widened in consultation with other members of the Internet community, in order to refine the Statement. Everyone is welcome to read the Statement and join the Coalition to discuss on the future of global Internet governance in Rio de Janeiro next year.

(C) Responses, Questions and Suggestions

The responses of the participants at the session are grouped and captured as follows:

(1) Thematic Stock-Taking Exercise: Suggestions, Comments, Questions

Suggestion: Regional Meeting Coordination. Collaboration efforts are good to have, such as between APNIC and ICANN; many issues can affect the operational communities, and not simply on the level of the ASOs, IANA, gTLDs – for example, there are privacy considerations about the WHOIS database. It would be good to have an overlap and create opportunities at regional fora for policy and operational communities to mutually share information.

Suggestion: Coordination and capacity building is a positive step to the region. Prof. Ang Peng Hwa highlighted his initiative to set up a “Summer School” training for Internet Governance in 2014 – interested parties can reach out to help or participate – tphang@ntu.edu.sg [Follow-up comment: “Summer School” has been trademarked and may not be available to use; “summer” may also be a misnomer in APAC.]

Suggestion: There are other capacity-building efforts such as DotAsia's youth camp, professional training exercises, MOOCs and free training online, as well as DotAsia's training in Beijing in 2011 – these historical efforts should also be captured in the matrix.

Suggestion: A suggestion for swapping DNS between APAC was suggested as a possible technical avenue to explore.

(2) Alternative Discursive Methods: Thematic Discussion Prevents Silos

Comment: Thematic discussions are the right direction to be going in, as they prevent silos from forming. Different groups should be coalescing around themes and topics rather than around stakeholders or registrants – impact on users should also be discussed.

There are two dimensions to discussions – via organisations, and through exploring themes and activism issues. However, there are silos and fragmentation which exist – the technical community is by definition siloed by topic, and are quite gender-biased as a result – eg APRICOT, APIX, APNIC, APTLD etc.

In addition, civil society organisations are also siloed across the vertical and horizontal matrix; we should explore how they can be involved in the areas would be beneficial to the process of discussion.

(3) Increasing Business, Civil Society, and Government Engagement

Comment: The question is now critical mass – how to go beyond the regular faces and get people from outside the community to participate, how to cross fertilise the discussions. APAC should leverage opportunities to converge in one place to rally around a collective banner, such as what the Pacific islands have done, so that ICANN and other organisations can engage with the region, which speaks with a single voice.

The ccNSO and the technical communities are relatively more engaged, as are a number of civil society organisations. There is a dearth of MNCs and big companies, and not all civil society is represented. ISOC is also doing a good job in reaching out to a number of civil society organisations, but many of the discussions are still technical in nature – issues like Internet access to the disabled, child-friendly websites etc are not being represented by civil society. More outreach to these groups need to be done to include them in the dialogue.

There is also currently no platform for APAC Government Advisory Committee (GAC) for government officials to come together to learn more about what is happening in the Internet Governance sphere. APAC needs a strategy to reach out to these organisations, as there are certain pockets (especially in the GAC sphere), which are critical to reach out to.

Suggestion: A possible avenue to explore is for these diverse groups in APAC to come together in a Summit-style event.

Suggestion: ISIF will be awarding funding for projects in Nov 2013; perhaps APAC could explore co-opting their awardees and fellowships in a formal reach-out.

Suggestion: A value proposition for the disengaged community should be put together to give them a reason to participate (i.e. the value proposition should go beyond the multi-stakeholder model as a *raison d'être*.)

Suggestion: There may be budgetary constraints, which prevent unreached communities from participating the Internet governance discussion. Out-of-the-box thinking could solve this, such as leveraging on existing government events and tagging on fringe meetings to them, rather than only using the current event list. Government officials may have limited budgets, which may make these “tag-on” discussions more palatable, and thus increase their participation in the dialogue.

(4) Language Localisation; Ensuring Good and Effective Outputs

Suggestion: In our plans for the future, APAC should ensure that there are good and effective output documents that help capture the momentum of the suggestions. These should be made more accessible – distribution via paper; digitally; in local languages. These should be made available to anyone representing their constituents in the APAC Internet Community in any platform, to give the APAC community something to engage others in our community, both within and without the APAC region.

(D) Next Steps

This document will be sent to stakeholders, particularly those who could not take part in the above discussion, for further comments and views. A draft document curating the discussion would then be worked out, which would help to form the basis for further the discussion for the APAC community to chart its direction for 2014 and beyond.

APPENDIX: Slide Deck

The story so far...	
Key topics	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement – a multi-stakeholder process Identify needs. Any others? 	
Language Localization	Regional organizations (e.g. regional NICs) to work together on language localization projects.
Capacity Building	Leverage on well-established processes/groupings in the region for training
Awareness Building; Communications	What can ICANN, APNIC, APTLD ISOC etc offer? What can the community offer?
Regional Meetings	Partner existing regional groupings/forums (APTLD, APNIC, APRICOT etc) to harmonize calendars. Use existing platforms to discuss issues and feed Asian input into Policy Development Process
Increasing stakeholder participation	Governments – GAC, among others Businesses – SMEs? Users?

Horizontal & Vertical Themes									
Any others?									
Capacity Building									
Outreach prog. (roadshows / talks)									
Regional Meetings	Language Localization	IPv4; IPv6	Internet governance	Security	New gTLDs	IDNs	Others: IXPs, Root Servers, WHOIS	??	???
Consultative events - Roundtables									
Gov / GAC									

Date	Event	Horizontal	Vertical	Stakeholders
Nov-Dec 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connect Summit and ITU Telecom World @ Bangkok ICANN @ Buenos Aires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outreach Gov 		
Jan 2014				
Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APRICOT@Bangkok 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultative Roundtables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDNs DNSSEC New gTLDs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ccTLDs ICANN SO/ACs
Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICANN49 Singapore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Meetings GAC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICANN-related issues 	
Apr				
May				

Capacity Building									
Outreach prog. (roadshows / talks)									
Regional Meetings	Language Localization	IPv4; IPv6	Internet governance	Security	New gTLDs	IDNs	Others: IXPs, Root Servers, WHOIS	??	???
Consultative events - Roundtables									
Gov / GAC									

Date	Event	Horizontal	Vertical	Stakeholders
June 14	• Communicasia @ Singapore			
July				
Aug	• APNIC @ New Caledonia			
Sep				
Oct				
Nov				
Dec				

Montevideo Statement

7 October 2013

Montevideo, Uruguay – The leaders of organizations responsible for coordination of the Internet technical infrastructure globally have met in Montevideo, Uruguay, to consider current issues affecting the future of the Internet.

The Internet and World Wide Web have brought major benefits in social and economic development worldwide. Both have been built and governed in the public interest through unique mechanisms for global multistakeholder Internet cooperation, which have been intrinsic to their success. The leaders discussed the clear need to continually strengthen and evolve these mechanisms, in truly substantial ways, to be able to address emerging issues faced by stakeholders in the Internet.

In this sense:

They reinforced the importance of globally coherent Internet operations, and warned against Internet fragmentation at a national level. They expressed strong concern over the undermining of the trust and confidence of Internet users globally due to recent revelations of pervasive monitoring and surveillance.

They identified the need for ongoing effort to address Internet Governance challenges, and agreed to catalyze community-wide efforts towards the evolution of global multistakeholder Internet cooperation.

They called for accelerating the globalization of ICANN and IANA functions, towards an environment in which all stakeholders, including all governments, participate on an equal footing.

They also called for the transition to IPv6 to remain a top priority globally. In particular Internet content providers must serve content with both IPv4 and IPv6 services, in order to be fully reachable on the global Internet.