Good morning everyone. Could you please come in and take your seats.

>> Good morning. Thank you for joining us for the 2024 Australia, in Internet Governance Forum. My name is Annalise Williams, the Chair of the auIGF steering committee. We acknowledge the traditional owners of land throughout Australia and pay respect to elders past and present. We are meeting on the lands of the Wirandjeri people and are joined by Colin.

>> Thank you, good morning and welcome. It is my honor and privilege to be here. My name is Colin Hunter IV. I would like toing a knowledge this morning we are country. It is the home of my ancestors and also home to everybody here today. I wish to pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. Elders from all nations, especially all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community members joining us here today. We are part of the Coolan Nation. The country extends from the inner city of Melbourne, across to the Great Dividing Range, west to the Werribee River, south to the creek and east to the mountains. A big thank you to everyone who helped make this possible. Welcome and I hope everyone has a fantastic afternoon ahead. Thank you very much. Enjoy the rest of your day.

>> Thank you for that warm welcome, Colin. This is a fully hybrid meeting, with people participating remotely from all over Australia. So, I also pay my respects to traditional custodians of country wherever you may be joining us from. I extend my respect to my Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people joining us here in the room, or joining us online. On behalf of the steering committee, it is my pleasure to welcome you to the 2024 auIGF. If you have not done so, I would encourage those of you here in the room to log into the Zoom room. We have a lot of people participating online. You can engage through the chat if you are in the Zoom room. All sessions are recorded. They will be streamed to our social media. We have Auslan interpreters in every session. Captioning is available via the websites a auigf.au. Now, August. You may recall for several years, Australia's national IGF ran under Net Thing and we reverted to the auIGF name, for the brand recognition and embrace the closer association with the family. This rebrand cements our place within a large network of other national and regional IGFs and the global IGF. It is a demonstration of the committee support for the IGF model. As I'm sure you will hear over the next couple of days, the future of global internet governance is uncertain. The rapid adoption of the internet has brought widespread social and economic benefits, but it's also led to complex new policy challenges, like cyber security, privacy -harmful online content and there are still significant inequalities in digital access. Historical differences of opinion around how decisions are made and who gets to make them, are being debated yet again. Some governments think only governments can solve these problems. Others thing the multistakeholder approach works best. Multistakeholder forums like this one, allow diverse participation. People from government, the private sector, civil society, academia, and the technical community come together on an footing to share ideas about both opportunities and challenges and perhaps about some of the potential solutions as well. The theme of this year's auIGF is Connecting Local to Global. It's about 2-way exchange and connecting Australian policy dialogues to regional and global. It takes a conscious effort to make sure we are connecting and it can be difficult when the conversations often are taking place very far away. So, I would like to thating all the people who are helping to bring this conversation here to us today. Thank you to those who have traveled a long way to be here, or who are staying up very late to join us remotely from the other side of the world. I offer a very warm welcome to our friends from the Pacific IGF, as well as our friends from Internet NZ, home of Net Hui and we have representics from the Cocos Shire Council. I am delighted to welcome back our 2023 Indigenous fellows, Jenny and Susan. Great to have you part of the IGF community and contributorys to the program. We have an exciting two days ahead. You will hear from a broad range of speakers, on a broad range of perspectives, on a broad range of issues. We will be trying new things this year, too. The steering committee has publicly consulted on a draft position paper, and we will be testing consensus on the - testing whether there is consensus on the ideas in the paper. The paper is on our website. If you have not read it I encourage you to look in the coffee break before our first town hall. So, the auIGF is a welcoming space. Our goal is to encourage open dialogue and active participationment we encourage everyone to share your views and to listen to others. We ask that you do that respectfully and thoughtfully and in accordance with our code of conduct. Harassment of any kind will not be tolerated. If you have any problems or concerns throughout the next couple of days, please let me or one of the other people who have their hands raised now. We have a few people around the room. So if you have concerns let one of these people know and if you are online let your moderator know and we can help. I close with thanks. I would like to thank the members of the 2024 steering committee, all volunteers. It's been a pleasure working with you again this year. I would like to thank our secretariat support team from auDA and of course a very special thanks to sponsors and partners. Identity Digital, Verisign, auDA, Internet Australia, the Australian Government, APNIC and the foundation, ICANN, the Internet Association, GoDaddy and our media partner, Commsday. This wouldn't have been possible without your generous soup - support. We will be joined the honourable member first.

>> MICHELLE ROWLAND: Hi I'm my cell Rowland, Australia's Minister for Communications. Thank you for sharing remarks about the role of the area of internet governance. I understand people are joining in person and online from around Australia and beyond. I acknowledge the traditional owners of the many lands across Australia and pay respects to elders past and present and extend this to first nations people taking part. The Australian Government supports an open, free and secure internet. We have long advocated for a multistakeholder approach to internet governance. All stakeholders have a valuable contribution to make and must be part of the governance discussions and decisions to help achieve the internet we want which brings us to the importance of this forum. This year's theme, Connecting Local and Global, reflects the value of these important conversations at a local, regional and global level. In a time of rapid technology change, and a growing digital divide, the value of open and inclusive dialogue cannot be overstated. Our governance approach allows for community based decision making on policy and technical standards and management of the internet. Critically, this means no-one stakeholder group has a stronger voice. Instead, embracing the breath of expertise and perspectives in this space. Our government is working across multiple fronts to help keep Australians safe online. This includes addressing seriously harmful misinformation and disinformation which I'm pleased to see will be discussed tomorrow. The spread of this content at speed and scale threatens the safety and wellbeing of Australians, our democracy, society and the economy. Governments and regulators are grappling with this issue around the world. 80% of Australians want action. That's why we have introduced a bill to parliament that will hold digital platforms to account. Doing nothing is not an option in this space. The wellbeing of Australia's society and economy relies on a resilient global internet based on stable and secure technical infrastructure. We all have a part to play in protecting this infrastructure and addressing digital and internet nance governance. A multistakeholder approach protects rights of users and harness the benefits of the digital world. This approach underpins the growth and vitality of our digital economy and should continue to be employed as we face emerging challenges. The Asia-Pacific region is economically, linguistically and geographically diverse. But this diversity is not always represented in governance, organizations and processes. A diverse and representative system will more effectively address challenges, such as closing the digital divide. It will support our goal of uplifting cyber resilience and safety across the region. We are at a pivotal point for internet and digital governance. Recently, United Nations member states agreed on the Global Digital Compact, setting out a vision for a free, open, secure and inclusive digital future. Through this process, the international community made a collective call for safe, accessible technology, that is ek - equitably distributed. The UN will review the outcomes of the digital society 20 years after it was agreed. This will ensure it is managed into the future. The Australian government wants to keep the broader stakeholder community at the policymaking stable. Leading into the world summit, we will relied on continued engagement to develop robust policy and ensure Australia can effectively influence this process. Australia is committed to working collectively to close digital divides, and ensure a robust future for multistakeholder internet governance. I encourage everyone to get involved, collaborate and share their ideas the, for the future of the internet. Thank you.

>> Good morning. I am the Director of the Internet Governance Stream at the Department of infrastructure. Thank you to Minister Rowland for sharing her comments with the auIGF community and thank you to auIGF for allowing me time to share an update on what my team has done in the last 12 months. It's certainly been a busy year and a lot happenend since our last conference. I will start by sharing highlights from that past year. So, starting locally, we supported the IETF, hosted in Brisbane and worked with a foundation to support 12 internet standard ambassadors to attend. The IETF is a critical part of the internet ecosystem and had not been here for quite a number of years. So, we felt it was quite important to encourage as much domestic attendance as possible. We were working with the foundation and it was an excellent partnership from the first quarter of this year. Regionally, members of my team participated in the Asia-Pacific Intergovernance Forum and the APAC DNS forum and attended the policy and regulatory forum for the Pacific. We talked about digital connectivity challenges, upcoming UN processes and ways to engage more of the region in internet governance discussions. We also supported the Asia-Pacific Internet Governance Academy and are excited to see the launch of this next year. The net governance community is quite small in Australia. Focusing attention on growing the next generation of internet governance champions is an excellent initiative, so ewith're very pleased to support auDA's work in working with ICANN in running this shortly in Australia. Globaly as the minister mentioned, we also saw the United Nations develop the Global Digital Compact. My team was deeply involved, working in Canberra, to support the colleagues in the Department of For Affairs and Trade, leading negotiations in New York. We will certainly talk more about this later in the conference, but it was absolutely vital that we worked very closely with Australian stakeholders to ensure that Australian views and perspectives were reflected in the final text. More recently, we've also been involved in the ITU's World Telecommunications Standards Assembly, which just took place in New Delhi last week. This saw two weeks of quite robust negotiations, talking about the ITU's global standardization process. We made good progress in improving a range of key resolutions related to the internet and successfully maintained a bread of text, talking about the ITU's role in this critical part of the ecosystem. Finally, we also continued to deeply participate in the internet corporation governance committee where I am Australia's representative. Looking ahead to next year, we will see priorities include, as the minister mentioned, the 20-year review of the World Summit on Information Society which has the potential to shape the future of internet governance as well as the UN role on broader digital governance issues. I would invite anyone interested in learning more about this to get involved and participate in this afternoon's session. We also will commence preparations for the 2025 ITU World Telecommunications Development Conference in November next year, which will guide the development work of the ITU over the next four years. Much like the ITU's WTSA, this is another important multilateral meeting which touches upon the internet. However, unlike in the standard "ation - standardization space, where there is less need for intervention in standards, there is much to be done to connect the unconnected and we look forward to shaping the ITU role in this I have tall part of the system. This vital part of the system. Welike to engage across the Asia-Pacific and look to improve regional representation in global forums and we will look to conduct our routine review of the terms of endorsement for auDA. So, over the next few days there will be a lot of opportunities for you to speak with me and my team and learn more about the Australian Government's work in this critical space. We will have a booth, as many of you will have seen, just outside. You can come, grab a lolly and chat with us. At this booth you can see an updated version of our internet governance landscape map, which many of you provided some fantastic feedback on at last year's conference and we're also taking this opportunity to share some of our principles which guide our internet governance work as well. A clear articulation of what is important and why we do what we do, will be a crucial guiding start, particularly over the next incredibly busy year. We would like to discuss these principles with the community. Please grab a flyer and let us know what you any. Finally, the panels and discussion points of the rest of the conference, such as on the review piece, lifting the Australian voice, you will hear from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade about key international developments happening in 24 and 25 as well as the Office of the eSafety Commissioner who will speak more about the challenges of online safety. So, please, there's going to be a lot on over the next little while. We would love to get to know the community better and hear your thoughts and find ways to partner on a range of critical issues over the next little while. I wish you all a fantastic conference. Thanks again.

>> Thank you, Ian. Now it's time for our panel discussion. So, as the speakers make their way to the stage. The panel discussion will be moderated by auDA's CEO, Rosemary Sinclair. I will take this opportunity to note that this will be Rosemary's last auIGF in her role as CEO. She's sadly finishing up at the end of the year. So, I wanted to, on behalf of the committee, just to thank you, Rosemary, for your support and for auDA's support of auIGF and of Net Thing before that. Thank you. I will hand over to Rosemary who will introduce the speakers.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: I was saying that I will start where I intend to continue which is sitting down here rather than standing up at the podium. So, thanks very much, Annalise, for your introduction, for all your hard work, with your committee and secretariat bringing us all together for the opportunity to have really important discussions at a time when Ian has just outlined that this is more critical than ever. We're just hurtling towards the end of a hugely busy year in 2024. And 2025 will be equally critical to the future governance of the internet. I would like to reinforce what was said, is that auDA is incredibly proud to support this event. We are delighted to see our colleagues from the Pacific and new friends from the C ocos Islands join us. We are delighted this family of people interested in the internet and its governance is growing and expanding. The wider perspectives help our deliberations. Thank you in particular for coming on the very long journey that I now know this is from the Pacific and from Cocos Islands. We appreciate the effort you have already made to join us. Our dedicated community of people involved in this event is what continues to give this event strength and momentum and take us forward. I'm sure add you will have seen from the program, we will have some amazingly important and interesting discussions. The quality of those discussions is a testament to the strength of our existing community and you're starting to see the link between local and global as Ian described what he does with our discussions and ideas and takes them forward to the global community discussions. The multistakeholder model is critical to the global operation of the internet and it's very strongly supported as you heard from the minister by Australia. The Government really recognizes the value of this model. One of the very practical matters of demonstration is the fact we have government colleagues with us over the next couple of days. The multistakeholder approach involves the views of all stakeholders. It's underpinned the success of the internet from the very beginning and has supported the amazing global innovation and economic growth that the internet has brought. We heard that global internet governance is at an inflexion point. There are major things happening often far from our shores. We understand the tyranny of distance in Australia. We identify with our Cocos friends and Pacific friends. We're a long way from anywhere. In this room, we have the opportunity to discuss how we can connect those conversations connecting local to global. I said to our panelists in preparing I think we should demonstrate the value of the multistakeholder approach this morning through the lens of this panel. So, we're very fortunate to have a range of different views and I will clarify that in just a minute. And I've asked people to take a particular view and we have a small number of imimportant questions. We have an opportunity for a valuable multistakeholder process. In my concluding remarks, I will try to make those an example of finding consensus through constructive difference. The time today is limited, so my apologies in advance if my chairing seems slightly draconian on occasion. But I'm joined on the panel by some extremely well known figures in the Australian regional and global internet communities. All of our panelists are active individually in connecting local and global debates, discussions and developments. So, let me introduce the panel. Here with me on the stage, firstly, Professor Johanna Weaver. Johanna is the Director of the Tech Policy Design Centre at the Australian National University. She has an extensive back ground in cyber diplomacy and I have asked Johanna to represent views from academia today on our panel. Secondly, on the stage, with me, Ian Sheldon, who has just addressed you. Ian is the Director of Internet Governance at the Department of Infrastructure and everything else! That's the way my chair describes this department. Ian is a member of the auIGF multistakeholder steering committee and Australia's representative in ICANN's Governmental As As visery Committee. I have

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Our last panellist is Jen is from Dot Asia. Jen is also part of the Asia-Pacific regional Internet Governance Forum organizing committee and a couple of months ago we finished an event in Taipei which was multistakeholder in spades, amazing conversations. I attended a whole session conducted in Mandarin and enjoyed it immensely because of the support and style of the session. So that is Jen Chung and I have asked Jen, with her background across the region and stakeholder groups to take a civil society view on the questions that we are going to be exploring today. Thanks to Ram and Jen who are joining us late Sunday night from other parts of the world. A real demonstration of connecting local and global. With that by way of introduction, let me start by asking our first question. What does connecting local to global mean to you and why does it matter? If I could start with you, Jen?

>> JEN CHUNG: Thank you, Rosemary, for the lovely introduction and this is a really important question and I see it is a theme actually in this years auIGF. The first thing I would like to start with, because the Asia-Pacific regional IGF is one point of the constellation that makes up the 170-plus national, regional, sub-regional and youth initiatives that make up the broader Internet governance ecosystem. The first thing I want to mention is when I talk about these NRIs, there is actually no hierarchy of reporting up or down when it comes to these forums. The value of this network lies in its diverse richness of the on the ground impact and its ability to translate and champion global Internet governance issues locally. This enriches actually the implementation and impact of such policy shaping discussions we have at the global level to changing things like regulations at the national space and real targeted and meaningful capacity-building at the local level. Connecting local to global as Annaliese introduced at the beginning, it is a two-way relationship and it is enriching both sides of the relationship. When you hear about the NRIs being spoken from the lips of the UN Secretary-General at the 2018 IGF in Paris and you see the NRIs in the Knox of the recently adopted global digital compact for the future, you can make a case for this being in the original Tunis agenda para. 80 where we are calling for multistakeholder processes at the national regional level. Connecting local to global is extremely important and the implementation and realization of global trends and positions that happen at the local level and the success stories and case studies of these local national impact informs, reaffirms, shapes and humanises the global conversation. You could talk about a lot more of the impact of the IGF when you enrich it with descriptions of what happens at the local level. Maybe I will start and stop here with your very first question.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you, Jen. If we could now move, to you Ram. What does connecting local to global mean to you and why does it matter?

>> RAM MOHAN: Thank you, good to see you online, Johanna and Ian and Jen and thanks for inviting me to this panel. From my perspective, look at the industry and business and technical community point of view, really it involves ensuring that Internet policies and practices are both globaly consistent and locally relevant. That really is what underpins connecting global and local. There are a few elements inside of this that I would like to spend a moment on. One is multi-Ling wellism and cultural diversity is an important component. That ensures that Internet governance discussions and decision-making processes are inclusive of diverse languages and cultures. The second piece is local content and digital inclusion. We need to promote digital literacy and skills development and that can only be done really locally but when done properly locally, it has a tremendous impact globaly. The third part of that is data localization and privacy. The development of strong data protection and privacy laws that are local is an important and an enduring achievement that many jurisdictions have already done. What has not been done is how those data protection and privacy laws interact and how do you make them compatible with international standards? There are many cases, especially in the technical community, many cases where the community struggles with data protection and privacy laws that focus just on local issues, local jurisdictional matters and sometimes do not recognize the Internet does not really have a geography that bounds it. The last two pieces are cyber security and critical infrastructure. We do have to strengthen national cyber security capabilities to protect critical infrastructure and by strengthening national capabilities, you end up building a larger, stronger, more resilient global critical infrastructure system. Finally, international cooperation, we need to fast international cooperation and dialogue to address the challenges I listed above to make them work, dialogue is really the only way and dialogue leads to cooperation and so those are, in my perspective, the five key things that, if you can make progress on, will help make the local resonate globaly.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Ram. I am not sure that I could have planned a better segue to Johanna. What does connecting local to global mean to you and why does it matter?

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: Thank you. When I thought about this question I actually went back to what does local mean to me? As a country West Australian who grew up in a very small country town, so much of what I do and how I engage with the world, upon reflection, comes back to the values that I was taught in that small community. It was hard work, you always had to work hard, you had to look after your neighbors and you had a really healthy respect for the power of the environment. I think when you look at - when I think about global and local and local and global, the movements that have been most effective at translating local values into a global environment have all been systems that allow you to have resonance in what the values, what the underpinning motivating forces are, whilst transcending politics and so if you just bear with me for a second here to step away from Internet governance for examples. Think about Greta Thunberg and the climate change movement. Perhaps one that is a bit more historical, think about the international humanitarian law and laws of war, it was grounded in this idea that civilians should be protected. There is heaps of politics involved in climate change, there is heaps of politics involved in war but the principles, the global movements that are built transcend the politics and allow us to have impact. One of the other areas where we have had huge impact, where we have been able to do that is in Internet governance. There is principles that underpin the Internet and how Internet works that allow us, that are common, that allow us to have that global impact but it's hugely political, as well. It's actually the tension between those two things that, for me, when I hear "Local and global" that I am always looking to engage with. How do we keep the work that we do as Internet governance community focused on those areas where we do have commonality and away from the areas of deep political divide? That is, as we know, always going to be under threat and it's a really big challenge that we all have to be constantly grappling with and engaging with. I think the important messages of this is to recognize the value of local, to not give up on what it is that is your local identity, but to ensure that we are advocating for that globaly as well.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Johanna. Last view on our first question, let's turn to Ian, what does connecting local to global mean to you and why does it matter?

>> IAN SHELDON: Thanks, Rosemary. It is difficult to go last, potentially after such a fantastic set of participants on this panel. Representing the Australian view, the government view, this conference theme of connecting the local community to regional global processes is obviously a very important one for us. One of our key roles in intergovernance forums is to give a voice to the Australian community and take all that fantastic work and expertise that we have here at our local level and provide the deep fire power we need to have these global conversations. This is particularly important in multilateral processes, where we know that a lot of the multistakeholder community simply aren't invited into the room or are unable to participate on equal footing. Australia has a strong and dynamic Internet governance community and a deep and rich history of leadership in a number of Internet governance organizations but sometimes the issues that are deeply important to us, like a lot of the ones that Johanna has been discussing, simply aren't raised or discussed in the global forums. I think we can certainly do a lot better to make sure those issues are raised at the regional and global level by working locally to build and strengthen a lot of these multistakeholder connections and communities we have here in Australia. I think we need to develop and build some of those unified priority positions and we will be in a much stronger position to take those views outwards and globaly. The auIGF community can be a fantastic catalyst for these multistakeholder discussions and we should consider how we take some of the views and topics from here forward, up to the regional APAC level and onwards to the global one. I think just briefly, as some of the other speakers have discussed, it is also to bring that global perspective back to the local level as well. Governments have the responsibility, but also the privilege of participating in a lot of these global discussions, where we can have the opportunity to not just champion our views and perspectives, but they also afford us the opportunity to learn from how other countries are grappling with these issues, having a look at what works, what doesn't and finding how we might be able to adapt a lot of the global processes and other jurisdictions to see what might work for us here in Australia as well. Thanks, Rosemary.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Ian. I think that first discussion really demonstrates, in and of itself, the value of a multistakeholder view. We are sitting here in an Internet governance conference, you could have thought that you were coming to discuss a whole range of technical matters but already we are hearing words like humanize, cultural diversity, values, political divide, not in the room, not on an equal footing, so there is a whole richness of engagement that comes with using a multistakeholder approach to important discussions. That's all positive, let's go to question number 2. What's the biggest challenge confronting Internet governance through your particular lens, academia, civil society, industry, government and what's the key response you think we should take? Let's start with Johanna.

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: I will be greedy and I have one overarching challenge and then three sub-challenges. We always love a challenge and I like to get my hands dirty. The biggest challenge that I multistakeholder Internet governance community has is it is always at threat. It is always at risk, it is so fragile that we are always saying this conference next year is the point at which the shape of the Internet could change. But we have been saying that successively for the - since the Internet existed, right. That is absolutely true. It has been at threat at every single one of those points but when you're engaging with the community that doesn't understand what you're actually - the fights that are happening all the time, it creates the risk that you're creating an environment that is like the boy who cried wolf "But you said that last year and it's fine. You said this was the existential crisis, the ITU elections" but it was fine, we put all of this effort into it. That is the single biggest threat we have, is actually articulating clearly why it is always at threat, why we need to be engaging and also the benefit of the engagement. We need to be much clearer about articulating all that money we spent on the ITU election campaign, this is the benefit that came from that. Then the three subset ones that I will briefly touch on. One is we have a total disconnect between our narrative on open, free and secure. Open, being the free flow of data. Free being we have human rights online as we do offline and secure, that you can use the Internet securely. These things have been our mantra for a long time but our government policies don't always match, particularly around open and free. We have a lot of data localization policies and we have a lot of restrictions on human rights. Yet we still say open, free and secure is our narrative. That is really difficult when you are engaging in a global environment because it undermines what we are saying. I am not articulating that we shouldn't have an open, free and secure Internet but we need to address that disconnect in the narrative and if we don't do that, we will lose those middle ground countries and stakeholders that we need on our side. The second is the amount of investment that we put into Internet governance, particularly by government. I will use, as an example, the Department of Industry, Science and Resources, has an entire division focused on the regulation of artificial intelligence. Over 100 people working on this issue. I am not sure how many are in Ian's team and you do a fabulous job, but the amount of resources is disproportionate. Artificial intelligence won't exist or be useful if we don't have an open, free and secure Internet. There is that disconnect. The final thing I would say is the multistakeholder model. The idea of multistakeholderism is at threat. We are not good at articulating to those countries who want to control the Internet why it is not in their interests to have a state-based Internet governance system.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Johanna. Let's go now to Ram. We are looking for the biggest challenge, Ram and your response focus.

>> RAM MOHAN: Thank you. The intersection of geopolitics, Internet governance and emerging technologies that are shaping Internet infrastructure, I think that is the biggest challenges. If you look at this inclues and representation are crucial, we have to strengthen the collaboration among various stakeholders, especially across borders and sectors. That coordination is starting to fray. The multistakeholder model for Internet governance, we have some examples and we are continuing to work on it but there are emerging technologies that are upon us and shows emerging technologies are moving far faster than our current Internet governance mechanisms seem to be able to manage. As Johanna said, we certainly have the advent of artificial intelligence and all the work that is going on there but also in the domain space and the Internet technology space, we also have emerging new name spaces that use, for instance, block chains for identifiers. There is a rapidly evolving body of work, technology and really not standards but practices emerging in those areas. You take those emerging technologies and then you marry that with the (e) pollution of geopolitics and the insertion of geopolitics into how Internet is managed, you have a second component of the main challenge that is facing us. Let me give you an example. When countries now plan to invade other countries, or wage war against other countries, well before anything happens, they engage in cyber warfare. They make sure that the enemy countries infrastructure is weakened or shut down in a significant way. The way they do that is by targeting critical infrastructure. Just normal resilience is not enough. You need to be able to be able to endure state-based actors intervention in your country's national critical infrastructure. I am not sure that there is enough coordination that happens on a global basis. Some countries have woken up to this challenge, some countries, Australia is a great example, does quite a lot of work in the strengthening of its infrastructure, its critical infrastructure, but if you look at the world as a whole, the local best practices, local strategies don't yet translate regionally much less globaly. If you look at the Pacific Rim for instance, there is quite a lot more resilience yet to be achieved. The real challenge is not one challenge, the real challenge is that you have the incessant and steady march of emerging technologies, AI, block chain and there will be new ones that come through. You have that incessant march on the one hand, you have the strong desire of nation states to insert geopolitics to control critical Internet infrastructure and then you have the Internet governance processes, models that have stood us in reasonably good stead so far, but it's a question of how does that Internet governance model continue to evolve to manage these emerging challenges? I don't call them threats because this is merely normal technological and human and political and social evolution that is inevitable, right. What is really, I think, needed is dialogue and discussion on how to take the existing multistakeholder model and see how it can be applied to these emerging challenges. In the area of emerging technologies, both in AI and in block chain, we find also nations, governments, regions are trying to step in to pass regulations, to pass laws and, as at least in my own personal experience, often the laws, by the time they get passed, the technology has well passed it by. Then the laws stay for much longer than the technology actually demands. Thank you.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Ram. Now to Jen for the biggest challenges confronting Internet governance and your key response focus.

>> JEN CHUNG: Thanks, Rosemary. It is good actually speaking after both Johanna and Ram because they have actually outlined a lot of shared concerns that really face the entire multistakeholder community right now. For civil society, and I don't usually speak on behalf of civil society so bear with me, but I will give you some thoughts from the Asia-Pacific regional IGF point of view. I like very much the term that we always use on equal footing. There is a lot of discussions, particularly this year, that have further highlighted the power of sim Ries among within nation states, economies, stakeholder groups and these deepen a lot of the divides and effect and shrink a lot of the civil society space, that civil society organizations can operate and work in. This can be seen in the statements and also forms parts of its principle, the Sao Paulo multistakeholder principle and guidelines and you can see this in a broader sense in the participation during this whole year, actually more than one year - two years of the process. The civil society organizations at APRGF this year in Taipei talked about breaking down silos that exist within specialized communities, such as technical experts and civil society organizations that specialize in particularly advocating for different rights. How to navigate what this bottom up advocacy means for the various CSOs operating within the APAC space, so a lot of what Ram mentioned, breaking down the silos and repairing the frayed cross-stakeholder collaboration and cooperation is actually key to lead us to real multistakeholder solutions. Also, looking in terms of the process, during the GDC, a lot of the civil society organizations were looking at strategising an effective way to be able to go to and speak in safe spaces to give this actual contribution to the process and there is a practical concern about being able to meet physically at several global meeting this year and next year in a lot of the IGF space, civil society makes up a good amount of the attendees. At APRGF, the 2023 Brisbane meeting, it made up roughly a third of the attendees and for the global IGF, it made up 25% of the attendees at IGF 2023 so this has a big impact on the agenda setting of these particular meetings and this should reflect the interest that civil society advocates, institutions and organizations have in being able to meeting fully engage and give input into the WSIS Plus 20 process and there is a big question that hangs on a lot of our minds and maybe Ian has the answer, maybe he doesn't, maybe we are looking to see more clarity on how this can actually happen. This is one of the really big concerns that is facing not only civil society but Internet governance communities in general that are not part of the multilateral processes that somehow seem quite opaque to all of us.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Terrific, thanks, Jen for that note of practicality about equal voices and voices in the room. Let's move to question 3 and that is what tools and resources do we have as a multistakeholder community to influence global and indeed local debates, what is working well, what could we do better? Could I start Ram with you on this one.

>> RAM MOHAN: Sure, thank you so much. Let me speak from the point of view of technology and industry. The term corporate social responsibility has become a fairly generic one at this point on the global stage and there is pressure for companies to get specific about their commitments, to creating a better future. A vague global commitment, they no longer suffice and people want to know what real world projects companies are taking and the real world impact they will have. This is why global and local collaboration is important. Global companies often have the vision or the resources but they don't often know where to start or whom to engage with. A lot can be learned from local entities. They understand perhaps better than anyone the challenges communities are facing, the hurdles that need to be overcome to make a lasting change. In this area, particularly I would like to bring focus to digital literacy and the skills building that are tailored to the needs of local populations, as well as access to computing, access to the Internet and then meaningful connectivity, once people, these remote communities or underserved communities do get connected, what do they actually do with it? I think the evolution of the focus from corporate social responsibility to more specific environmental social governance factors, shaping our business practices, the industry and the communities we serve, that's a really crucial thing and the only way to really make that work is to start local, build something local and then see if that scales and then move it from local to regional, regional to national, national to global.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thanks, Ram. Ian, what tools and resources do we have to influence global and local debates? What is working well, what would we do better?

>> IAN SHELDON: To be effective in influencing the global debates, we need to work closely together to really clearly articulate what the priorities are as a community and what consensus-base Australian positions should look like. I honestly think the greatest resource we have is our community. There is a deep wealth of expertise and knowledge, both in this room as well as across the country. We have a very vibrant multistakeholder community and I think we can do well to tap into this. In that regard, I think we could probably do a little bit better at drawing all those into the conversation. I think, as we have just briefly talked about, I think we need to break down some of the assumed knowledge about participating in this space. We all tire of the acronym barrage and I myself have been responsible for using some of the acronyms without explaining them and that is endemic to the Internet space. 1 I think from a government perspective we can explain these processes better. We talked about multilateralism and we used that word a lot. Again, I don't think we do a particularly good job at explaining what that space looks like, what some of the norms are, the constraints, and how we can get our community more deeply involved in some of those conversations. So I think we saw how the community came together and we can learn what worked and how with can get better at coming together, articulating some perspectives and better at drawing others in in the preparation of the big issues over the next year. Thank you, Rosemary.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you, Ian. Jen, if we could move to you on what tools and resources we have to influence global and local debates, what is working well, what could we do better?

>> JEN CHUNG: Thank you, Rosemary. I think the very first thing is have a national IGF. We are talking at the auIGF so we are well begun. Also ensuring the participation is inclusive of the diverse concerns of the local communities. There is a phrase the NRIs like to use, no-one size fits all. So what is tailored and responsive to the local concerns is the best way for impact to be made and to be felt locally. The third thing is to understand that the participation of national local meetings is quite different to that of the participation at the global meetings as is just as crucial. There are many communities, many representations that will not ever find a way to get to the global meeting, nor would they be interested to do that, because they are very interested to talk about a lot of things at the local level. So, both forms of participation is participation and enriches the entire conversation. Giving you a point of view from the APR IGF, I think we need targeted outreach and tailored capacity building to those unrepresented, underrepresented and underserved. We don't have a silver bullet. We are trying to find a balance, but this is a perpetual process where the auIGF Australian community can look at as well as we are grappling in the global sense. The IGF multistakeholder advisory room grapples with what this means and how it can be effective. The important thing is to find the messaging that speaks to who you are trying to reach. In terms of the global reach, I'm interested in the process of the auIGF draft revision paper on the review. So looking to see success. So trying to find the right messaging and the people you want to reach and in terms of local impact this applies to, if you are trying to effect local legislation, and regulation and so on and so forth. So, one thing that is really interesting and I want to point to the research paper that the DNS Research Federation did on the auIGF impact is looking at success stories. Things like India's 2016 Free Basic Span, the implementation of the African Union's convention, actual legislation and regulation on community networks in I think it was Mexico, Colombia and Argentina. So things that local and national communities effected change on, this is valuable and important at the local community level and also for the global community to under stand the national regional meetings have a lot of value and a lot of enriching best practices and success stories that the global community can also learn from.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you. Now to Johanna on the tools and resources we have, what is working well, what can we do better?

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: I want to double down on what Jen said about having a national IGF. As someone who advocated strongly when I was in government for the re-establishment of the IGF and sitting here, I think it is important that we just, Annaleise referred to it at the start, I can see Cheryl - many people engaged in this. This meeting doesn't happen like that. The fact it exists, it is expanding, the community is growing is something we have to celebrate and continue into vest in. Then, for me to pick on what Ian made. You said community, I would say people. The biggest resource that we have is the people in this room and online and engaged in this conversation. If there is one thing that you can do is get someone else involved. If everyone in this room reached out and got one other person involved in the internet governance community it would have an enormous multiplying impact. So, encourage other people to get involved in internet governance. The third thing for me and Jennifer used the word solution, Ram, "impact". To me it is what is it we can do that brings forward solutions? This is, you know, getting people in the room is the first step. The next step is, what are the practical solutions that we can put in place to evolve the ecosystem to make it stronger. So, having the IGF, having people and solutions.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you, Johanna. Once again that is the most marvelous segue to question number 4. So thanks for that set-up. Question number 4 is, and it brings us back to local after a very rich discussion at the global level. It is, "What could the Australian multistakeholder communities' distinct contribution be?" Could I start with you, Ian?

>> IAN SHELDON: Thanks, Rosemary. I think there's two points for me here. Owe vents like this where the community can get involved in internet governance issues are, as we discussed a number of times, are quite vital to making sure we can bring those local perspectives to regional and global forums and I think one of the key contributions and key factors we need to keep in mind, as I said, is the Australian community are known as good people to work with. We have a very good reputation internationally, both in the multistakeholder space as well as the multilateral world. We are known for bringing well considered, moderate, sensible solutions to the table. We simply, I guess, know how to strike the right balance and chart a clear path forward on some of these very complicated issues. I think that is also due to the community, but also because of the processes we have in place, so, I think the second distinct contribution we can make is clearly demonstrating how multistakeholderism works. I think we have a very unique opportunity here to have those frank conversations domestically. I think Australians are frank. With know how to have direct conversations with each other. Let's work through these issues. Let's use the multistakeholder process to challenge and push the boundaries and make sure we can continue to deliver that frank advice globaly. There are many other countries where we just don't, they don't have those systems in place, where there are not those avenues, where governments are not interested or are less willing to talk to the community. I think we have a unique opportunity here to use the multistakeholder system but also evolve it and I don't think we should rest on our laurels. I think there is a lot more to improve the systems and institutions we have and let's work through the things while we have those opportunities and take those processes and showcase them globaly. Thanks, Rosemary.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Johanna.

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: For me, I think, Australia's distinct value-add, there's three words that describe it for me - the first is principled. The second is pragmatic. And the third is participation. So, principled, pragmatic, participation. Principled, because we stand for something and although we need to get better at articulating it, we have clear positions and here I want to really call out the work that Ian and his team have been doing, the work that auDA is doing in terms of convening the quarterly meetings. This forum - there's a lot of work going on in that space. We've really got a principled position we are engaging from and can stand and defend it. We're pragmatic. We are known in the international community as bridge build others. We're not getting in people's way, we're here to deliver outcomes. That is quite unique in terms of the way that countries engage and communities engage and it is such a valuable commodity. I used to say when I was engaging internationally with the former ambassador for cyber affairs, if only we could bottle the sense there is in the room when a delegation of Australians walk into a room - people want to talk to us. That is pretty unique. Sometimes we take it for granted. The third thing is participation. This is, for example, our friends from the Pacific who are here today, it is funding for events like this to happen, providing the funding for civil society to participate in these things and a call out to auDA and the work you do and the grants programs open. I think it is that principled, pragmatic, participation. You need all three, if you have one without the other, you don't have the same impact.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you, Johanna. Now turning to a global perspective on what could be the Australian multistakeholder con community's distinct contribution. Could I start with you, Jen?

>> JEN CHUNG: Ily start with something funny, first. Tim-Tams and Vegemite! That aside, I think the Australian community is extremely open and willing to work with many different stakeholder groups and many different communities to be able to build a truely multistakeholder collaborative process, especially for internet governance. It is so crucial right now to look at bringing these local issues to regional and global conversations. This enriches a lot of best practices, enriches the paths to solutions. I said it. There is no-one-size-fits-all, but having this rich tapestry of the different types of way communities around the world are able to reach and solve similar problems is going to help the global community as a whole. So celebrating these unique success stories and all the culture diversities that the Australian community can bring to the global table is amazing. Going to close again, with the Tim-Tams, love the Tim-Tams!

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you Jen. We love a good celebration. There is a meeting of the minds there. Ram will be our last contributory to our last question. "What could the Australian multistakeholder community's distinct contribution be?"

>> RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Rosemary. There is a lot of really great stuff that has already been discussed by the other panelists. What I think you could do, the Australian community in particular, could do, is to lead the way on showing how to establish 2-way collaboration with local communities. There are not a lot of work, of good examples of that. Last year at the auIGF we started up the Indigenous Leaders Internet Governance and Policy Fellowship. That is a good place where it got started. It starts to bring voices from witness Australia who are not fully heard or don't have a representation in these areas, at least it starts to educate them and bring them forward. But don't stop there. Build and Indigenous network operators group. We're working with the internet society, for example, to do that in North America. And I think that has tremendous potential, because you cans toer the - create a human centered network that builds for new and experienced Indigenous network professionals. There is a terrific example that Australia can set in this area and create an Indigenous advisory board. Bring Indigenous leaders to provide perspective - what are their learned experiences in governance? They have thousands of years of experience that is hardly captured anywhere. There is premen douse value in that local perspective, that perspective to be captured and then translated and then transmitted worldwide. The fora that the Australian individuals, Australian government organizations, know how to participate in, you have tremendous reach. The question is, can you lead the way, build that 2-way communication, integrate language as a key component? I mean, folks - by some estimates, out of 7,000 languages and dialects chosen throughout the world only about ten have substantial online presence. If you look at just Australia itself and you look at the Indigenous community, language is really what separates people in many ways and that is true. That is a local issue, it is also a global issue. So, show the path, show the way on how to bring an integrated language as a part of digital inclusion and then I think there are tremendous examples and the reach and the presence and the gravitas that Australia and Australians bring on the global stage will then be buttressed by the power of example.

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you to all our papists. I have a sign unhappily saying that my time has come to an end, which means our panel has come to an end. Please join me in thanking the panelists for our opening plenary.

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: Can I jump in. From an outsider's perspective, I want to acknowledge the amazing contribution that Rosemary has made. We've really seen auDA leaning into internet governance conversations and supporting the community. That is due to your leadership, your passion and stamina. We will miss you very much and, Keith, you have big shoes to fill!

>> ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Thank you very much.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you to our speakers and particularly Jen and Ram for giving up your Sunday evening to join. We appreciate that. It's now time for Morning Tea, which will be served just outside where we came in. We will be meeting back here at 11:45 for the Town Hall. So, again, if you haven't already, I encourage you to check out the position paper, and there's also alongside the position paper there is a food for thought paper, just to start generating some ideas about how we could go about evolving the multistakeholder system and processes and institutions. So, see you all back in this room at 11:45 for the Town Hall. Thank you. (Morning Tea Break).

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Could I ask everybody to come inside and take their seats, please. We are about to begin. We are about to begin our Town Hall. Thank you to the online people for your patience. We are a little late getting started, people are enthusiastically chatting after morning tea. We have popped in the chat the draft position paper, so hopefully you have had a moment to look and think about that. We will start a discussion and this is an opportunity for plenty of interaction with the audience, so when it is time, you can stand up behind the microphones and contribute. I will hand over to Keith Besgrove now, to start us off.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thanks, Annaliese. For those of you who don't know me, I am Keith Besgrove, amongst other things, I Chair auDA's general advisory Standing Committee. I am also a member of the steering committee for this event. This current draft that you may have already had a chance to look at is the work of a small drafting committee that was drawn from the members of the steering committee. It reflects comments that we received during the consultation period, prior to the commencement of this meeting today. We think it may be the first such statement coming out of an IGF, if it goes ahead. One question that some of you may be asking is why are we proposing to have an output document such as this? As you have already heard from the earlier speakers, we find ourselves in a time of constant review and efforts to change the multistakeholder model into something else. Just saying we like the multistakeholder model the way it is seems to us to be unlikely to be an effective strategy going forward. We think it is appropriate to add our voice to those of others involved in the many review processes which are underway that we have been hearing about already today and that will be unfolding in the next year or two. We want the document to firmly endorse the desirability of continuing to utilize multistakeholder models and processes when determining issues of Internet governance. But we acknowledge that the growing use and complexity of today's global Internet creates pressure for change. These pressures must be acknowledged and taken into account in any strategies to evolve Internet governance mechanisms. The purpose of today's Town Hall meeting is to introduce the document, to seek initial feedback and to give you an opportunity to reflect on the nature and content of such a document and its potential role as a product of this auIGF. We will have a further opportunity to seek feedback from you tomorrow when we come to consider a more final form of the document. A key question for us is whether such a document should simply remain high level in its sentiments, or whether it should also contain some more concrete suggestions for a way forward. In this context, we have provided a food for thought appendix to the output document, which could also be incorporated if there was support for such a process. I might pause there, Annaliese, do you want to talk about the poll?

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: We will be - I am not sure if we are able to get that on the screen. It is at the bottom of the Town Hall page, is that correct, Mike? It is on the screen. Grab the QR code now, we will be polling to see how people feel about the paper and we will do the same poll again at the end of the second Town Hall tomorrow as well.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. This is now your opportunity to give an indication of your thoughts about the document. It is being shared on the screen in front of you, if you haven't already had a look at it and you can view the whole document in the link from the program for today's event. If you would like to come and make some comments of whatever nature they might be, we would ask you to come up and use the microphones which are present around the room. We also have someone moderating the chat to identify if there are particular questions coming in through that means as well. I will pause there and see what sort of thoughts or comments may be in the room and hopefully there will be one or two. Don't all speak at once. Perhaps while you are gathering your thoughts, I will talk a little bit about the additional food for thought document. In developing the main document, we did, in the drafting group, have some conversations about whether there should be some specific thoughts put on the table and reflecting my former experience in multilateral conversations and engagement with diplomats. I said what we could do is put together what is known in the trade as a non-paper, which is a collection of - it is a quaint diplomatic speak term that means a paper that has a collection of ideas that no-one is prepared to own up to and it's often used in multilateral gatherings. For a while, it was our non-paper, but it's largely been drafted by myself. I am to blame for the ideas in the additional document. Let's think a bit for a moment about whether this auIGF wants to actually have an output document. I personally think it is a good idea. We don't have any grandiose notions of how much impact it might have, although sometimes ideas being expressed by a group of people can travel a long way. I think it is certainly worthwhile to have on record some of the collective views that we think should be common across the room. I will pause there. Jordan?

>> Hi, everyone, I am Jordan Carter from (INAUDIBLE QUESTION) To break the ice and show that you can indeed follow my example and come to the microphone. One of the common criticisms in the multistakeholder Internet governance environment, particularly the bits that don't have decision-making responsibilities, they often end up being talk-shops and you can have an family radical conversation at an event like this and everyone wanders off and happily travels along to the next one a few months later and has a conversation and has a conversation and happily trails off and then there is a conversation and a conversation and half the time people are on the risk of being driven mad by that process. We put up the idea of saying why don't we write down in a distilled form some ideas to test for consensus. If there is a consensus, then this can stand as something that is not about a decision per se, it isn't about subverting the nature of an IGF for a national one like this one as a space where people don't have to negotiate text or come to decisions in a formal way, but just provide something that has got enough buy-in to be tabled as a document that was discussed and had some buy-in at this kind of event. It provides ammunition for the people in multilateral environments, like Ian and Briony and the other government officials here, to say there was a discussion, it isn't claiming to represent the whole Australian community. It isn't claiming to be a definitive output of the Australian Internet governance community but it is something to point to, it is something to agree with or disagree with, to be stimulated by and so on. A modest step beyond the talk-shop. Thanks.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. We have Col Brooks.

>> I am from

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Sorry, Paul, before you start, can I ask everybody to get the QR code because we are going to shift away from this screen and look sorry, Paul, go ahead.

>> PAUL: Having a document out of a gathering like this is a great idea. It provides an example to those who don't have faith or a good view of the multistakeholder processes that an outcome can come out of those in a relatively tightly manner. It's important to have a straw-man at the beginning. The nature of the deliberations, if you start from a blank sheet it takes an inord inantly long time that we don't have. So it's having a position where people can have an initial position and adjusting, is a great idea. Having a paper that can be represented as a consensus view of the room and the different stackholders at tend, the end, provides a powerful role model for multistakeholder processes and the critics of those that the compromises that get made to create a single document are worthwhile and are costed.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Cheryl.

>> CHERYL: Sorry, my voice is not at the normal level but I think the microphone will pick me up. I will join my previous speakers in saying I think auIGF should have something like this output document. Again, I don't think we should over-expect or undersell the importance of going through the process and picking up on what Paul has just said, the fact that it is a starting point and something that now the wider community assembled here for this important conversation and that is where I might depart from Jordan slightly, I think there is value in talk-fests, telling stories and having conversations is a vital part of what we do, has enormous effects on building trust and understanding and that should not be underestimated in things like internet governance. I'm happy with the odd talk-fest but I'm supportive of getting something tangible out of this type of activity. I think it is more of an opportunity for a national initiative to do this and to come out with at least an insight into some of the Australian view on these topics. In terms of the questions, I think we should certainly push the envelope and give some proposals for the evolution that is involved around internet governance. It's been static for too long. Part of that evolution must be appropriate resourcing which means appropriate globaly for internet governance and the conversations that happen at that annual cycle, but do not forget the importance of actually resourcing this. This is done on the smell of an oily rag. It is ridiculous that industry, telecommunication companies, internet service providers, etc, who benefit from the internet, the network of networks, and should be involved in internet governance, if they can't give a damn to be here and have a word, maybe they should be tied for some dollars to make sure the words are shared by those of us - you know where I'm heading, Keith. I will stop but I could be back.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Can I remind speakers to say your name and tell us where you are from as well.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: One here.

>> ALVIN KLEINE: I'm from CSE. I have a comment on the introduction. There was a line talking about multistakeholderism which involves the private sector among other things. The background of that, my particular comment is that I run into a huge argument with one other friend in the industry about whether ICANN multistake holderism is include the private sector. Mine is no, hers is yes, there's a lot of hybrid sector in terms of register. My perspective if we talk about banking sector, cyber security, all these people are affected by the problem and should be involved if multistakeholderism really needs to be working well and in a lot of the multistakeholderism processes, I think private sector as a general term maybe is involved but are we having the right (hybrid) sector involved? When I read this particular paragraph, I don't really understand what that word means and if we are to encourage, the wider community involvement, maybe we want to be more specific that, what is the sector we're talking about, would be my comment, thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: My colleague, Annaleise will respond to your question. Thank you for it.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Alvin. I was talking about that very issue in the coffee break with someone about the need to make sure that when we talk about multistakeholder it is multidisciplinary. Susan, we had that conversation, to make sure it is multidisciplinary and everyone who needs to be in the conversation is part of it. I think very often people and organizations don't even realize they need to be, these conversations are taking place, let alone they need to be in it. We will flag that, if someone from the secretariat can note that comment, perhaps we need to think about how we are clear about bringing in all voices. I think I have been, Blondine, is there something?

>> BLONDINE: We have a comment from Patrick, "Are documents necessary in turn for the community. Those documents become artifacts that speed into other processes especially for those who do not attend development of documents at events for whatever reason. The development of the artifact also attract greater participation and they can be used as a risk of opportunities for a multistakeholder audience.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:" Thank you.

>> HOLLY: Internet Australia. I want to point to the internet that are identified. There are a couple. Absence of coordination between different internet of governance bodies. I think everyone in the room knows everyone in the room. I think there are probably more people out there that are not talked to or aren't talking. Policy areas and in the conversation that I was having during the break, there are a lot of organizations.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Holly, can you point out to the room that you are talking now at the Food for Thought paper as opposed to the...

>> HOLLY: I went for the Food for Thought paper.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: I know that, I wrote it.

>> HOLLY: I know you wrote it. I thought it would take umbrage! I appreciate absence of coordination and in the break was the need to talk to a lot more people and then we have to go and say, what are the proposals that come out of that - I think first it's a wider group and not just people in the room and lack of strategic direction is a conversation that I would very much like to participate in, the direction - what are we aiming for? When we say we are going from local to global, I think we ought to go from global back to local and what are the barriers for local participation in the internet, internet governance, internet policies, who do you listen to and how do you expand the conversation beyond this room?

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you.

>> JOHANNA WEAVER: Johanna Weaver from the Tech Policy Design Centre. I want to firstly commend the organizing committee for preparing this document and scheduling this discussion at this point in the conference. And then the session to revisit it. It's so powerful to put this upfront. My overarching comment on the document is we can be more ambitious. It is, I think, something that government will find incredibly useful to reference to it and say, this is what the multistakeholder community in Australia is calling for, so, don't be shy and don't hold back on particularly the action points. What I would say in terms of the WISES 20 action points in particular, on the dot points around the Australian Government encouraging full participation, I think it is important there and this is an example of what I mean by ambition, to say that the Australian Government fund multistakeholder participation. That is what we want, whether the Government will be able to do that, is another question, but to have it on the record that that is what the request is of the community, because the plus-20 will be a fight about multistakeholderism and having a strong Australian multistakeholder delegation will really have an impact. Let's not shy away from that. I also think - this is building on my comments from the panel - that we should add a dot point in the call to action as developing a really clear one-page narrative on the value, what is the value of the multistakeholder community? If we don't that before we go into WSIS, in a way that not just the people in this room understand but a way that the countries sitting in the middle that are questioning the value of the multistakeholder model, if we can't sell that to them, we will lose the conversation and the debate at WSIS. Put a direct proposal for this IGN. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: One observation I would make, I'm old enough to have been involved in the original WSIS process, when I was in what was then called the National Office of the In Information Economy. The Australian Government then funded the development of civil society and its participation in both the WSIS events. There is a precedent for government paying for this. It was a very important aspect of Australia's engagement in the first WSIS process that it deliberately funded participation. I can't remember by how many but there were a number whose par tation was paid for so they could participate directly in the process.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Before we go to you, noting we have 20 responses to the thoughts on the position paper. We will be asking this question again at the, in the second Town Hall, this is not a commitment, this is how are you feeling about it now? If you are happy to fill out the survey, share your thoughts, thanks.

>> Internet Society Accessibility Standing Group, a global organization. A number of points. Following from Keith's comments about the first WSIS in Tunis. One of the paragraphs related to persons with disability. That seems to have been lost in some of the reporting since then. I need to make that comment, that that was there initially and it would be good to see vulnerable group like persons with disability, Indigenous voices and so forthwith that lived experience being included. I also support Johanna's and Cheryl's comments about resourcing and what Keith said - that resourcing is so important to be able to, on a number of levelless have people with that experience from their local communities, from their own experiences, to participate. At the moment, if people are trying to go to an IGF there is support from developing countries but if a person is from civil society from a small non-profit that has something to contribute, the funding from the IGF, this is an opportunity for Australian government to assist with that. I also wanted to comment on the Food for Thought paper and some of the suggestions about an internet governance program-plus, how that would look. And we also see some of the ideas about the various make-up of the groups, dynamic coalitions, for example, and the policy networks. Some of those have done a lot of work and I've been involved in the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, for example and been a member of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group. So I have the experience of sitting on that, going through in a lot of detail, doing detailed work about deciding on particular workshop proposals, etc, etc. And that MAG is composed of a lot of people from a cross the world from a lot of different sectors. I think that their time could be used in a much more productive way apart from selecting workshop proposals because that is a very intense process. I am putting it out there that the MAG could probably be redesigned in some way, so, that's just a very specific comment, thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. I would make the observation that the series of comments we have received so far strongly reflect the depth of knowledge and experience in the room. So, it's always a pleasure to see so many people with such diverse and sometimes lengthy backgrounds in this subject matter.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Just to the point there and Johanna's about funding. The Australian Government is a financial sponsor this year. We thank them. Our sponsors, we do have, we do run on sponsorship, so, thanks to all our sponsor, I want to shout out, if there is anybody else in the room whose organization would like to sponsor us next year, come and talk to the committee.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Great. Yes, over to you.

>> SUSAN: I'm Susan, Beates, and I grew up in a very remote community in far north-western NSW. I grew up in extreme poverty and I now come with a huge sense of privilege, not living back home where I'm from. I'm still very connected everyone at home is living in that same level of poverty. We though, do have internet access, but it's - I will talk more about that later this afternoon. I thank you nor the document. Thank you for everyone's comments. I think I concur pretty much with all of that. I was interested in the document. I don't think there's enough cry teak in the -- critique in the document. I think it has to be solid in terms of the evidence of what's come before and what we think of in the future. I think it needs to be more active as to reactive, because I think there is a thread of that throughout it. We need definitions in terms of the multistakeholder and what Alvin from CSC said earlier, that there needs to be an understanding of what multistakeholder is, we were talking about that this morning. I think it's not just disciplines. And, you know, governance and organizations and their agencies, it's about communities of people as well. So we are thinking about the entire population, not just the organizations, because social entrepreneurship is now a huge way for Aboriginal people to look at making some money, since we were not born into generational wealth since our lands were stolen from us, that's one way for us to think about economic independence and without fair and equitable or even equal internet access and the way the internet is going with the loss of our knowledges globaly, including nationally, we need more of that voice and when we create documents like this, if we could have - Jenny and I are both in the fellowship - if we could have been involved in part of that process in creating that document, I think that would have been an asset to you as well. I was about to mention values, just as Johanna said that, I thank you for that.

>> SUSAN: Before I walk away I want to acknowledge the people of the Coolun Nation, the traditional custodians of these lands and acknowledge that heed lands were never ceded. I want to acknowledge especially these lands, as in all lands around Australia, were places of learning. That is how I see my place here today. I want to learn from everybody. I hope we can all learn from each other. I want to acknowledge all of my Indigenous fellows that have come from other countries. Thank you, and thanks for our invitation here.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you, Susan. Do we have any other people woe want to come to the microphone? Yes? Could you tell us who you are?

>> My name is Rose, I'm from Internet New Zealand. While I think it is fabulous there is a paper to consolidate your thoughts and something coming out of the forum, I guess what I wondered is the conversation that was had this morning particularly from Graham was how processes keep up, so section 3 particularly feels like an incremental approach rather than what you need in the future, for what the future will bring, so, I think it would be better to be bolder in that space, which is probably rich coming from someone coming across the ditch and asking the Australians to be bolder because we're a little bit further behind you, but yeah, I think it's a really good start, but I do think the paper itself could be quite a bit bolder in what you want to see given our changing context, etc.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Just as a personal observation, I never think of New Zealand as being behind Australia. You only have to look at the way New Zealand runs rings around us in selling primary produce sometimes. That suggests that is not necessarily true. I would just like to respond to Johanna's comment, suggesting we should be bolder in what we're saying. At a very simple level, before we resume tomorrow afternoon, if you could share a few sentences with us about what you have in mind, I think that would be very helpful. This is not a static document. We will probably do a bit more work on it afterwards. The general sense in the room seems to be that we would like to have something of this sort. There seems to be quite a lot of comfort with most of what is in the paper, some legitimate criticisms of where it doesn't explain things well enough, given the way that we were able to put it together, very haphazardly over six weeks all the criticisms are certainly legitimate. If you have ideas for enhancing it, please just give us an email, with a few thoughts. We don't expect to finish editions but if there are ideas you think are quite important to have in this document send us an email or a text or whatever, but give it to us in the next couple of days. Next, yes, please.

>> I come from Internet Australia, Electronic Frontiers Australia but I speak on behalf of myself. Having recently gone to the Asia-Pacific IGF and the Digital Rights Asia-Pacific Conference held as a side event before, I want to highlight, there was something we can, one of the documents talked about the IGF being a safe place for dialogue. That is not actually necessarily true. I think there's a number of ways that plays out, whether it is, you know, whether it's potentially putting an individual or family at risk, or whether it's just in terms of reputation, especially when civil society are raising issues and civil rights activists. I would like to see whatever the output is. This is great, by the way. I think as a concept, that we can build on, I think it is great. I think it leads to us having these dialogues for something tangible that stakeholders can understand where our overlaps are, what our mandates and agendas are, so that we can better direct our time, I guess, and our resources. That's good. I just feel that, I wanted to say that, because speaking to the things that are occurring, if you don't feel at risk, if you feel that you can say what you are doing, possibly we need to have a closer look at some of the things that are happening in our region. I put in a Zoom, I think, the current state of human rights in the Asia-Pacific region. It's not looking great. So, I think that there are some things in here that we could put, constructive and practical things, in place to facilitate IGFs in the future, that can have a greater participation from a greater number of people and it would be fantastic to have a no-wrong-door type of environment in the future where people do want to come in. I certainly have been welcomed to the IGF over the last year and a bit, by Annaleise, and the APINEC family, the Internet Australia people, Pablo who I am now seeing in person for the first time! Prior to that, I was not involved, though I was very interested, I didn't know about these things and I know that people do get involved. I know fellowships are offered but they are usually one-offs. They're not paid. Civil society groups, myself, I pay for myself to come to these things because I want to make sure that my mandate is for people, not for my own empire building, I guess. But there are those constraints. I think it would be great to see that highlighted in whatever output document.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, and a reminder this is an experiment, we haven't done anything like this before. The email address for, if you have specific thoughts or feedback you want to send to us, it is info-at-agigf.au.

>> I'm Briony from the Department of Trade in Australia. These documents are incredibly useful for when you're trying to tick figure out what to say. I can't tell you how many submissions I have plaigiarised representing Australia on the floor of the United Nations. Tell us what you think, because it's incredibly helpful. I don't think I am talking out of turn if I say because this process is so, has so much history - 20 years, you said, Keith - I don't think there is anyone in government or very few people who have been around to see that evolution of these processes and we actually need your help, you have been, without giving anything away, there may have been a request to the National Archives to get files to help us do this, because it is, in fact, in paper instead of electronics, the work that went on in 2005. So, please help. Please tell us what you think. We cannot always agree as government, but that's not the point. We want to know what it is, we want to know your corporate knowledge, your history, because that is what helps. With the Food for Thought paper, I find it really helpful to see the options set out. What would be wonderful is to know where they came from, what did you think? Did they come up before and fail because of some country or interest playing a part? That nuance really helps us. To the other point, is that this is not in isolation, so, thinking how the internet governance neckisms fits in what with what is going on. We had people talking about the global internet governance structures taking place. There is more of that going on. Tell us how this can fit in, with all of the other things going on, multilaterally, multistakeholder, across all the different digital governance mechanisms and make sure we're maintaining relevance in these forums. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. I am happy to give you more back ground outside of the room on where some of these ideas came from, some of them have quite a history. That's as you can probably imagine. Sandra.

>> SANDRA: Good morning. The I have on today is just as an internet citizen -the hat that I have on, a user, someone who worked in civil society back in the civil society in the 90s and with our first internet connections thought this thing would change the world, it did. We thought it would be nor the better. Sort of was for a bit. I'm mindful, one, Keith, when you said you were part of the first WSIS discussions and the feds funded a bunch of organizations, it remind I was with the interactive media in the 90s and I have a feeling my awesome friend Libby Jefferies were funded to go to the WSIS. She might be, Briony, be in the archives. It seems like I have some recollection of all that time ago. So I wanted to acknowledge the Government's support for this WSIS, all those decades ago. My general statement here is to plus-one on the document. I have voted my initial reaction and I would love to see how it progresses over the next day or so. The only other comment is I would like to plus-one on what Johanna Weaver says. I think it can be more ambitious. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you.

>> SUSAN: I wanted to ask if we could possibly look at a more collaborative approach to inputting the feedback, instead of email individually, if we could put that document on to a share drive and everyone can see everyone's suggestions and the conversation will evolve, the dialogue expand and that makes it more and we can collaborate and participate before the document is finished.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: I think we can do a Google Doc or something. Yes, we will refine how the process works. Is there anything in the chat, Blondine? We are at time? No.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: One other thing. In making any comments on the Food for Thought document. And I wrote some long standing frustrations on my part. Let us know if you think it's worth including those ideas in the broader document or keeping it as an attachment. I appreciate any thoughts act, about how useful that is.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, everyone. We will put the documents in Google Doc and make that available. It is lunchtime, see you all back after lunch, thank you. What time is lunch? 1:30. Everything is outside. Lunch will be where we had Morning Tea. (Lunch).

>>

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Welcome, come in, take your seats. Good afternoon. This is session 1.1 What's Happening in Internet Governance? Come in, take your seats, thank you. So, 2024 was a huge year for internet governance. And 2025 is shaping to be even bigger and locally around 5. 4 billion people can connect to the internet and it's become a critical part of modern life. The development and widespread adoption of the internet has been underpinned by the multistakeholder governance approach. This approach was formalised 20 years ago when governments agreed on a role for non-government stakeholders in governance of the internet. That was at the World Summit on the Information Society. You will hear more about that over the next couple of days. Certainly this afternoon. The agreement on a multistakeholder approach was very reluctant for some of the governments, even back at the time and debates of the proper role for governments and other stakeholders has continued ever since. Some governments like the Australian Government, are strong supporters of a multistakeholder approach but other governments think that governments should be the primary decision makers. As the importance of the internet to our societies and economies has increased, so have the debates about how it should be governed. These debates are increasingly influenced by geopolitics and shifting global power dynamics. We are joined by four experts to explore the key developments of 2024 and think how they may influence the digital space post 2025. So, let me just introduce our speakers. I will start at the end of the panel. Mercedes Page is a policy expert with a particular focus on global digital governance, with experience in think-tanks in private sector and government including at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Next to her is Pablo Hinojosat Director of Engagement at the Asia-Pacific Information Centre. They are responsible for allocating internet number resources in the Asia-Pacific. Next we have Jodi Anderson who came from Wellington. Thank you. She's the Internet Governance Policy Lead at InternetNZ, the manager of the dotnz country code top level domain, her back ground is environmental and intellectual property law and worked on policy for the New Zealand Government. Finally, we have Briony Daley-Whitworth, from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia's lead me negotiation yayor on cyber to, to the UN, on cyber security and cyber crime. So I will ask all the speakers to address, give their thoughts on what happened in global internet governance in 2024. Just thinking about what the highlights were from their perspective, and whether there were any significant wine wins or loss west need to know about what those events in 2024 might mean for Australia and for the world and for the future of internet governance. There will be time for plenty of audience interaction. Think of what you might like to ask the speakers as they are speaking. Pablo, I start with you. You've been involved in regional and international internet governance for many years. One of the key advocates toer the technical nor the technical community in these processes. What are your thoughts?

>> PABLO HINOJOSA: Hello, very happy to be here, it's a really good group of brands. I see new faces which is fantastic. I will talk about internet governance in 2024. That's with a perspective saying that there have been some years where you can find some convergence, people seem to agree and work towards some defined direction. The fact is that 2024 is not one of those years certainly. There's been a lot of movement in the internet governance arena, probably more than past years, particularly in the multilateral arena, at the UN and Briony can tell us much more as she has lived this up close and personal. The cyber crime convention was adopted, then the Global Digital Compact which we talked about as part of the Summit of the Future and the surface, the text of the global digital compact doesn't look that bad, but there are some overarching issues that are concerning. That's particularly on the process side of things but also as well how much internet and internet governance is diluted in the wider framework of digital issues and altogether the way into the concerns about AI governance and more stuff. The IGF in Riyadh is coming soon in December, which will be quite unusual. It will also be interesting. There is a lot about the of this and the WSIS and particularly the renewal of the mandate of the IGF. And that brings for 1,000 time the question of the value of the IGF, whether it is worth continuing and whether it is outcomes of oriented, whether it should have decisions or not, etc. So, all these processes in the multilateral arena have raised a lot of potential concerns from different stakeholder groups including the technical community. We were able to follow some how. We did not have much say and certainly no influence, neither in the process, nor in the outcomes of those conversations. The WSIS process 20 years ago was very interesting from the viewpoint of that process because it was more open to the participation of experts, more welcoming to the technical community and different stakeholder groups and as things started to shift towards more formal multilateral processes in New York, this became less inclusive, hard tore follow from our perspectives and definitely not welcoming to our points of view. On the other side, on the multistakeholder side, there's been quite a lot of work as well. We mentioned the meeting in Sao Paulo, ten years after the first one and it came with best practices or multistakeholder processes. They are really good to have but they didn't even have a mention in the Global Digital Compact or much attention on the other side of the fence. Another interesting development is that technical community coalition for multistakeholders was created, a fantastic development. It comes with heavy investment, mostly by top level organizations like InternetNZ, auDA and SERA from Canada and the UK. It's a new development and it's a new way to create these collective action that is much needed. Also, in the multistakeholder, the technical community, we can see a refreshment of leadership ICANN, all have new leadership, and response as well back into this notion that happenend in the iSTAR which was created mostly during the WSIS process, because there was coordination and collective action towards the technical community, can have a say in discussions and decisions on internet governance. We can contribute to them with expertise and with some knowledge to inform better the decisions for them how to affect the global stability of the internet. So there is no convergence between this multilateral world and multistakeholder world. I think something that is very important is to find these interfaces and these dialogues where one can reinforce the other. I will leave it there to hear from the other panelists. That is the convergence or divergence.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Pablo. I might go to Briony. You've certainly been closer than most to the action. What can you share with us?

>> BRIONY DALEY-WHITWORTH: I will share many stories from the UN. So, I have two messages and two examples that I would like to share. The first is, it's sort of growing on what Johanna said where we are talking about the existential risk to internet governance. We we've been saying so long there's a proliferation of cyber and tech processes across the multilateral system. I cannot tell you how real that feels, particularly this year. I started doing a similar job five years ago where we were focused on two things. Now my team cover 16 separate processes in the UN along. That's the reality we're living with. The proliferation is real. One of the reasons that we're seeing that is going to the point that was made about geopolitics earlier this morning, we are seeing that these forums, ideas, digital governance, internet governance, data governance, AI, it is not just in the technical bodies. Everyone is interested. Everyone is interested politically so much more than they used to be. We are seeing digital governance writ large out of the basements into almost the eye of soron of multilateralism. One of the issues we see - this builds on Pablo's point - when you get that geopolitical interest that makes the stakes rise for states and you see an increase this leaving out stakeholders and increase in the politicization of whether or not stakeholders should be in the room. That makes it very difficult to continue to have stakeholder community discussion. That is the overarching thing I have seen the most in the last year-and-a-half and two processes have been mentioned and I'm very much in the coalface of these. The first is the Global Digital Compact. For those who have not been aware, the Secretary-General of the UN is very, very focused on digital issues and has been for a very long time. He has pulled together various different groups to talk about expertise in what we can look for about digital governance writ large but very focused on connecting people and narrowing digital divides and how the digital infrastructure landscape can achief the 2030 agenda of sustainable developmental goals. This has culminated many projects into what he called the Summit of the Future, which occurred in Leaders Week, when all 193 member states of the UN, all the leaders, Prime Ministers, presidents, come to New York for a week at the UN. We had Summit of the Future. Part of that Summit of the Future adopted this Global Digital Compact. The Global Digital Compact aimed to provide a roadmap for a positive digital future for everyone, trying to articulate a digital technology landscape focused on inclusivity, transparency, international law and equality. Not all of the compact was positive. I had the pleasure of being in some of the negotiations for this in July. I sat there through this internet governance chapter we were negotiating. It was a closed room, just states and some UN agencies, no other stakeholders in there. We were talking about these chapters, these paragraphs on internet governance. And a group of countries started to try to include things around content regulation, regulation of TikTok, critical infrastructure regulation, within the paragraphs on internet governance. I wish I had had this. Everyone needs to get one of these from Jamie or Veronica. I was like, excuse me, has no-one here heard of the three layers of the internet? We are not talking about regulating TikTok, we are not talking about undersea cables when we talk about internet governance. That goes to the issue where we politicise so much of this. The people in the room negotiating that, do not understand the internet. I am not a technical person but I knew this. And that, I think, is what we need to do in order to connect, is really that education piece. I know that out of, auDA visited New York to try to create some of that education in the negotiations, so there were a couple of people receptive to this message but it's a low baseline, we really need to do that education to keep it - to make sure that the people in the room actually know what is as stake and what is important to defend and why. So, we have seen the GDC - not everything coming out of it is necessarily positive. Throughout the negotiations, it didn't create too much of a foothold in the text, but it was very much a focus, that this is part of a multifaceted effort by certain states to advance that effort they are doing to exert greater state control over the internet and over digital governance. One of the things that they are using to do that is the multilateral system itself. We are seeing a lot of efforts to centralize a lot of these issues within the United Nations and really trying to institutionalise that. So, that is something that we are watching very much in the implementation of this compact. The other big thing, I will quickly note, that happenend this year, is that we negotiated and agreed - fingered crossed it passes the general assembly in a month - a Convention Against Cyber Crime - why does cyber cram - crime matter for internet governance? The initial draft and whole process was put forward by Russia. In 2018 the initial draft had an entire chapter on internet governance and that chapter pulled the entire internet governance mechanism into the United Nations. We went into these negotiations with a lot of criminal justice priorities but also a very defense pryty, priority of getting rid of that chapter. Luckily, we did. So the final outcome is very much a targeted convention and criminal-justice focus and does not have anything about internet governance in there. It really respecteds and upholds existing data juristiction and law enforcement jurisdiction and a lot of international legal principles we have interpreted in the digital age for a long time. So, that was a success. I think the lesson learned from that is that that was a Russian initiative. We did not want a convention, but we engaged very strongly to make sure that it was something that actually helped fight cyber crime. I think that that is what we got to in the end. It does provide a road map or a model for others and several countries who want to push national agendas through a multilateral system and so we have to be very, very careful about watching that across all the digital issues, because we are seeing the multilateral system as a whole really coming to grips with technological advancements while they are being dealt with in a 20th Century governance structure and that inability to connect is what is really going to be the focus of the multilateral system for the next five years, I would say. We have AI, data governance, cyber security, autonomous weapons system space for the structure. You might be seeing treaties on this, whether you like it or not.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Briony. Might go to you next Jodi, who is a relative newcomer to the international internet governance world but it's fair to say you have taken to it with gusto. You've been very much involved in the technical community coalition that Pablo mentioned. What are your thoughts?

>> JODI ANDERSON: Thank you. It is lovely to be here. I mean, I thought Pablo did a fantastic job of crossing everything that has happenend in 2024 and thanks for digging down into the GDC and some other things. I will pick up a bit on the GEC and also as Annaleise mentioned, this new Coalition that we put together. I think that the thing about the GDC, as Briony said it wasn't the perfect outcome or process but in a way it served to show the threat we of been talking about is real. The problem with internet governance and I think Johanna touched on it this morning, is that it - she touched on the fact there is always a risk and we need to develop better narratives to get that across and why we need to stay consistent on it - the other problem with it - and I think you touched on it a bit here - is that the threats to internet governance - it's like little battles being waged across the bigger war and those battles happen in all sorts of places where you don't expect them to happen. They happen in places which are, can be quite boring and they happen in places that are under the radar and they're always happening and move around, which is quite, it's quite a different, a difficult narrative. It's difficult to get people to care or understand because they are - the battles are often waged incrementally and it's changing norms a little or creating a little precedence somewhere or an inroad somewhere else in spaces that might not look relevant and so it's all these little battles and I think what the GDC firstly did is it brought it out into the open - it was easier to talk about the GDC than these tiny battles - but it showed really, I think, beyond doubt that the countries that do want to control the internet, do want to bring internet governance into multilateral spaces, are well resourced, well co-ordinated, do have their narratives to convince the other countries sitting in the middle to come to their side. So it may have done us a little bit of a service in that way. In a funny way, it might have done us a service in terms of the timing. There's been a lot of criticism of the GDC. None of us liked the fact that the GDC was happening the year before WSIS. There was a lot of, why can't we wait until WSIS? These are the same issues. Let's wait to WSIS and talk about them properly in a proper multistakeholder process. One thing that it did was, happening a year before WSIS, is that it galvanized us all to a certain extent. It rallied us and forced us, maybe, to think about these things and collaborate a bit more. So, that, I guess, leads me to the TCCM, because there were many reasons that this coalition was set up but one was the recognition of the risk of the GDC and the risk of WSIS as these big battles on the horizon and the recognition, just bringing in what I said before, of the fact that these battles are being waged all over the place and it's impossible to keep on top of this stuff if you are working alone. It's impossible to understand what is happening everywhere, understand how all the processes work. It's impossible to be at all of the places. So, it is critically important in this space to collaborate. It's critically important to find your friends. It's critically important to get together with others and not just within your stakeholder group, but also across stakeholder groups, to work with like-mindeds and others who are trying to achief the same thing you are trying to achieve. So, the coalition came out of that understanding of the risk and came out of that, I guess, the recognition that the technical community specifically as a stakeholder group did not appear to have a way to get together and work together on these issues. So, a group of CCTLDs - auDA, InternetNZ, Nominate, SERA - got together at the beginning of last year and a little bit of cudos right now to auDA, who put together an amazing internet governance roadmap which you should read if you haven't, which really, I think was a huge part of where the TCCM came from. Just set up a coalition. Right, we are going to bring together members of the technical community, we are going to share information on the processes, we are going to figure out, together, how we are going to engage in these processes. We're going to support each other to speak to our governments - because, of course, these are multilateral processes, the GDC and WSIS - we can't necessarily speak straight into them - we certainly can't negotiate into them, so, a really good way of influencing them is to speak to our governments. So, this enabled us to support each other to have those conversations with our governments. Also, we did joint statements. We figured out what we wanted to say. We appeared at the stakeholder input opportunities for the GDC, such as they were and this year, I think we have drafted six or seven joint positions, whether some of those weren't directly into the GDC, they were published elsewhere, but we are a coalition of ccTLDs, regional internet registers and others committed to defending and strengthening multistakeholderism and decision making and dialogues about the internet. We have a website, ttcm.global. Look at our Statement of Purpose. The way we win the battles and the war if there is a war to win, because it will just keep going, is to do things like this, to collaborate, to step into the gaps, to develop the narratives, to resource the people and to work together. Thank you.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Jodi. If we win, there's always something. Thinking about what Johanna said, it feels like the boy who cried wolf. We're always saying, something is happening, something is happening, I think that will probably continue to be the case. There is always something happening, but I think it's probably fairly safe to say that if we lose this multistakeholder governance approach internationally, we will never get it back. I think it is, we need to continue to pay attention to it. I will go to Mercedes now. The world feels a little unstable at the moment. There's a lot happening. What governance of the digital world?

>> MERCEDES PAGE: It's pretty bleak out there if you look at the global strategic landscape. On top of that, it is - even without that broader landscape, it has been such a big year for global digital governance processes, I feel like everyone in the room must be tired, even if you are just dealing with it on a surface level. When you add the geopolitical layers on top, it becomes more intense. To build off Briony's point, more broadly around the world, as everyone would be aware, if you turn on the news, we see the rise and growing influence of authoritarian countries like China and Russia who are openly challenging the global rules-based order. That might sound very Meta and high level but as part of this, they are promoting an alternate global order and part of that is very aggressively promoting a vision of Internet and global digital governance that prioritizes state sovereignty. They do that for two reasons and one is that they do that to protect their authoritarian models of governance at home to secure their own power and also to challenge the US western model and present themselves as the alternate leaders. From my perspective this year, we have definitely seen how they have managed - they, I am talking about China and also Russia, have been able to leverage the multilateral system successfully to advance their agendas this year, to slowly but inclimately reshape the global digital order in their interests. When I talk about the global digital order, I am talking about Internet governance processes and also some of the other forums and initiatives that Briony was talking about. From my perspective, the biggest take away for me was we all knew that the GDC was coming and it would be contentious. Despite this we still saw the huge support that China in particular was able to marshal around some of its positions and the support it was able to get through negotiating with groups like the G77. The G77 represents 138 countries out of 193 in the UN system. That is a huge block and they might not agree on everything, certainly some of the countries within that block have very different positions on even the GDC itself but they negotiated as a block and that gave China a huge amount of leverage, even if, as Jodi and Briony have mentioned, they didn't net Airlie get everything they wanted out of those processes. As well for me, the idea that some of this messaging has been successful, despite the pushback, is certainly a big take away for me, particularly as we going into WSIS. We have also seen some of that messaging stick with like-minded democracies that are strong advocates for the multistakeholder model. There is an acceptance that nation states need to have a stronger role in Internet and digital governance issues. We are seeing that not just in Internet governance processes but more broadly. Briony spoke about the UN cyber crime treaty and how that was a hard fight to include elements that, in the past we have absolutely taken for granted, like the concept of human rights, which are enshrined in the UN charter. That was all up for grabs. Yes, while we had some wins this year, they have to be seen in the broader context of the geopolitical landscape which is not going our way and these Internet governance processes are literally at the coal face of this geostrategic competition. The reality is we don't have the votes in the multilateral system. Australia and other like-mindeds are in the minority and as we head into WSIS and into the future, it is going to become a really hard fight moving forward. That is a bleak note to end on, sorry, but, yeah.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Mercedes. I want to note we have talked about authoritarian governments wanting greater control but we all need to be aware that it is not just authoritarian governments that want government control, the vast majority of the world's governments now do want a greater role for governments and there are many reasons for that. Often for developing countries, without the resources, they see the UN as a one stop shop for solving their problems, so definitely supporters of a multistakeholder approach are in the minority but the threat is not just from authoritarian borders. I will open it up for questions now from anyone. There is microphones here if you would like to ask the panel any questions, you will have to come and stand behind a microphone. We don't have roving ones. Invitation to the panelists if you wanted to ask questions or reflect on anything that your fellow speakers have said, feel free as well. I might start now. Reminder to please state your name and organization when you take the microphone. Thanks, Ian.

>> IAN SHELDON: Department of infrastructure. I have heard the panel talk about multilateralism and the broad threat that this poses, I have a lot of conversations with technical community and other parts of the Internet community and a lot of them say "So what, it is a bit of paper with words on it, what does that mean?" I have a technical job to do, I run the Internet, the UN, Geneva, New York, what do I care about those resolutions or agreements or treaties? What's the actual threat here from your views, in realistic tangible terms outside of language that may be difficult for countries who support the multistakeholder model to accept. Are you able to place this in terms that the community maybe able to tangibly get their head around? Multilateralism is a weird space.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Who wants to take that, why should people care?

>> It is a really good point, in one sense, yes, they are pieces of paper. Some of the things that are getting proposed more broadly in some of the digital governance discussions, but they all sound promising, so - sorry, I am going to focus on China. China is a very loud vocal advocate for the concept of respecting a country's right to development, sounds great, I agree. When they talk about right to development, what that actually means is over the years, China has used that in different UN forums to basically craft a position where a country has the right to develop and then respect human rights. It puts all these preconditions on what are international legal obligations, saying they don't have to respect human rights until they've developed. They also - similarly, they use language around respecting a country's unique circumstances. Again, sounds pretty positive on the surface, right, all countries are different, all countries have different cultures, histories, values, etc. Again, it is coded language around basically let that country whatever they want and no-one else can put any obligations on them. There are examples of - lots of different phrases which on the surface sound really fine but actually have been used to degrade or erode certain provisions under international law. It is really difficult to try and tangibly be like why should we object to this certain phrase, or to this and that? Also, just before I hand over to Briony, we have to see how these processes, or these agreements aren't just happening in isolation, they are also complimented by a raft of different actions on the ground that basically are creating these digital - these regional, or country-specific ecosystems which adhere to these standards, these norms and how they work into basically support what's happening at a multilateral level and once you have socialized - if you are exporting all these tech solutions, you're building the digital infrastructure in different countries, they're creating standards on the ground as well as socializing these concepts around of course, there is a nation state and they have the right to stability and to provide security for its citizens but it is like all that coded language about what that actually means in practice and it is not great if you are an individual. Briony, did you want to?

>> BRIONY DALEY-WHITWORTH: Mercedes was able to talk about the coded language because a lot of that is stuff that I am not allowed to say what Australia's position and reasoning is on. What Mercedes said, but I think the point you make is a real good one, why do we care about this? I have been told that my job is moving words around on a page. Yes, but I would suggest that they are quite important words. We almost broke the cyber crime convention because of a semi: And it was like a Russian and an Australian and Algerian walk into a bar and figure out where to put it and we are all OK. I have a presentation I can give you one day if you're interested on that one? That last point that Mercedes made is the really important one, it is about what actually happens with these negotiations, these documents that you negotiate. It is the interpretation and the bringing that back and the implementation of that into practice, into custom and into the domestic legislation policy, law and that's what we see. The reason we see so much of that is because there is so much capacity-building money and national interests associated with that language in these documents. You will see countries putting forward a resolution on AI and capacity-building and that is so that they can get their capacity-building program through the UN so they can give their money out to get certain other countries to adopt their AI. There was a US and a China resolution on AI this year in the general assembly, so I could be talking about anyone. The second point is I don't go to the United Nations, Ian doesn't go to ICC AN. We don't go there and agree to something and say bring it back and say we have agreed to this, implement it. This thank is not how it works. We figure out what it is that Australia needs, I talk to ASD, I talk to home affairs, all of the departments and stakeholders and we figure out what we need ought of these documents and we go and take those positions forward. We're not taking anything - we're not going to bring something back that we can't agree to in those negotiations. When you are seeing what is on these pieces of paper, you are seeing what countries national practices are already and that's why shaping it is so important because we want to make sure what countries are bringing to those pieces of paper are what we want to see in those pieces of paper too.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks for that. I see a comment in the chat about what can we do in 2025? I will ask all of the panelists to speak to what we need to be thinking about or what the Australian community needs to be thinking about but I will take a couple more questions. We are almost out of time. Go ahead, Keith.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: It is more a comment than a question. The sorts of conflicts that brie Briony and Mercedes have been talking about have been in place for quite some time. I don't believe they are going to go away, possibly in our life times. When you actually look at the recurring pressure to give the IT - the UN through the ITU a much greater role in Internet governance issues, where does that come from? Yes, it comes from Russia and China advocating that sort of thing but they have a great many allies, many of those countries rely on the ITU for technical assistance. They see the ITU as the natural partner and many of these governments are not coming to this issue with nefarious purposes, they simply can't understand why the ITU doesn't do this already, as it does for a whole range of other communications and things. It is important for people in this room to understand that a lot of these governments aren't doing this because they are bloody-minded, they are just genuinely of the belief that the ITU is the more legitimate organization to be responsible for issues of this nature and they can't fully grasp why it hasn't already got that responsibility. The second thing I would say is we are just going to be involved in pretty much an endless conflict in this space but part of that arises because many countries just don't really support the notion of ICC AN being a nongovernment organization with so much power and influence and when you look at the role of government in ICCAN, it is purely advisory. That sticks in the claws of many countries. That is in large measure where the original conflict arises, it is not going to go away any time soon. Thank you.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Keith. That is an important point to make. It is also important to note, I think, that the governments themselves don't agree on some of these critical issues. If the governments agreed, then things perhaps might be - it might be easier to find a way forward. Next question, thanks, Joyce.

>> My name is Joyce Chen and I am asking this out of my own individual interest.ly do a quick poll of the room, the question we are asking here is what is happening in Internet governance in 2025? As we know, the renewal of the IGF is up for discussion and it going to be one of the outcomes for the WSIS+20 review. If I do a poll of this room, who thinks that the IGF will be renewed in 2025? A show of hands. Good and who thinks that the IGF will not be renewed? We are all so positive, what are we doing here? We have seen in many elections, political elections that we often get blind sighted when the results do come out. I don't want us in this room to be thinking there is no way the IGF is not going to be renewed, right. My question for the panellists, for Mercedes and the rest of you on the panel, what if we fail? Then what?

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Who wants to take that, Mercedes?

>> MERCEDES PAGE: Thanks. Just to take the IGF part of that first. It is a really good point. I can absolutely see a situation where - sorry, I don't see a situation where the IGF isn't renewed. What I do see and which I think is far more likely, is that - which many people in this room have been working on this in the past year, is a situation where the IGF is renewed but duplicate structures and overlapping processes are also initiated. I know there were funding commitments that were rolled back in various drafts of the GDC, I believe, at one point there was a commitment to fund the IGF but now it's gone back to a voluntary basis. I think that's probably the worse case scenario for next year is the IGF gets renewed but we don't see any follow-up commitments to help strengthen the role of the IGF and to enable it to actually maintain its position as a meaningful forum for the multistakeholder community. On the what happens if we fail? I don't have a great answer to that. I think, as Keith mentioned, as Briony and everyone else has mentioned, we are going to be in this fight for a long time. Worse case scenario, is that we have to start thinking about OK, we are seeing fragmentation across the board, we see it at the content layer and we are increasingly seeing biofocation at the logic layer and we are seeing fragmentation at the infrastructure level, in terms of who builds it, who provides it and who pays for it. If we take the assumption thatting from mane station is here to stay, we have to realistically think about how do we actually adopt - adapt to that situation? Everyone in this room is a proponent of the free and open Internet. We probably wouldn't be here if we weren't. If we are faced with the reality that we will see a more fragmented digital sphere, what elements do we need to be focusing on to maintain some level of interoperability into the future? What are those main standards, protocols, other elements of the architecture that we need to be focusing on that so we aren't completely creating isolated regions? When I say creating isolated regions, I don't think we are doing that, I think other countries are the ones pushing for it but what can we be doing to conserve and to direct our energy? I don't know if any of that makes sense and it is probably not the best answer.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Mercedes. I might - Pablo, I might ask you to - coming back to the question that Ian asked for about why does anyone care? Mercedes has mentioned fragmentation. What does all of that mean?

>> PABLO HINOJOSA: I wanted to say, in regards to Ian's question, my view is that it mostly has to do with legitimacy. The legitimacy that different actors have and there is still a prevailing notion that the most legitimate body in the planet is the UN and the multilateral arena because states are represented there and sometimes states represent people, sometimes not. Sometimes states represent their internal stakeholders when there are aggregation of or consultation before the states are represented there and that is a very good thing, such as these. Sometimes not. The fact is that those documents are the most legitimate we can get. We have struggled in the technical community to say "Hey, we are legitimate as well" and basically the response are like "No, you are not" and it is "Yes, I have a say because we know how this thing works and you don't" and probably we should get to talk in order for you not to mess up with this and then we all live happily ever after. The fact is that once again it is like "No, you are not legitimate, who are you?" The private sector based on whatever jurisdiction representing some sort of communities is not legitimate enough. When you are saying "What do these words mean?" For us it means a hell of a lot because that's worth - ours is action but if they don't correspond, then you have an Internet Fran mentation as simple as that. fragmentation. The question of failure, failure for the IGF to get renewed and failure of our calculation not to fight for it. If it doesn't get renewed, we won't have any other space left where we can say "If you do this, you are fragmenting the Internet more and more and you can break it". The last point I want to make is for the last 20 years or so, the technical community have said multiple times, if it's not broken don't fix it. We have said in years before, we can live in the private sector, trust us, we get this and the Internet can run with the collaboration of communities, with the support of the network operators, don't worry, we have it covered. Don't take over because you will mess it, it is all good, but clearly, as the geopolitical things start to get intense, the challenges and the risks that operators are facing are not within the remit to deal with them by themselves. States are creating offensive cyber security risks that are beyond the collaborative efforts of incident responders in the technical community to deal with by themselves. Hence again, point of if multilast Cal and multistakeholder doesn't get into a room and start talking with each other and the techs start to reflect and there is some legitimacy transfer, we're not going to me Tane focused.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: I want to put to you what we can do in 2025 to prepare? I want to ask everyone quickly, who cares about Internet mentation, why can't we all just have our own Internets? What do we lose if we do that -- fragmentation.

>> JODI ANDERSON: I will have a go. The fragmented Internet will only deliver a tiny portion of the utility of the current global Internet. I think that is the basic thing. If you think about the Internet that we have that we use day to day for everything, that disappears. I think that's probably the scenario. I challenge everyone, when I am talking about this, to live two days without the Internet. It's impossible because everything has moved onto the Internet it is not like we have kept the things that worked without the Internet so we can go back to them, we haven't. That is just the bottom line, is our lives will change and we're not just talking about not being able to watch TikTok. We are actually talking about things that are fundamental and important. There's another piece to it as well, this isn't fully developed in my mind but it came from a question that somebody said to me. They said "Yes, but if the Internet fragments, we'll be all right won't we, because we are be in the Fran piece of the Internet with Australia and Canada and the UK and US and others and we will be fine". Leaving aside the fact that our Internet isn't going to work very well anymore, I have moral issues with that question. It is like saying we will be all right because we are on the arc and watching everybody else in the world drown. No, it is not cool.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Jodi. We only have a few minutes left soy am not sure we will get to that because we have a couple in the chat already. I would ask - there are a couple of questions in the chat - I will ask the speakers, or whatever wants to respond "What can we do to respond to the threats that we're facing? What can we do in 2025 and beyond as the Australian community to prepare and engage?" There are a couple of questions that we won't get to in the chat but perhaps you could reflect on these as you think about your answer. Sharon has said "How do we build trust?" And Miko has said "How do we as consumers and stakeholders stay vigilant on the changing dynamics of the frame works of principles of Internet governance?" Anyone want to respond to that? What do we need to do as the Australian community in 2025 and beyond?

>> JODI ANDERSON: I have got things to say. I actually think a lot of it was said at the session this morning, for those who were there. I think as a community, Australian community and the global Internet governance community, we have got to, firstly, figure out what our narratives are, we have to be able to tell the story better. There has been stuff that I have heard today which is fantastic. How do we get it down and into a way of telling these stories that is actually interesting to people? Makes them understand how important it is and makes them understand that this is an ongoing - these are ongoing battles, it is not going to stop. It happens in places that might not be very interesting but it is important. What is the value of the multistakeholder model? What will happen if we lose it? The second thing is this idea of resourcing of government, of people, of building capacity, Internet governance communities coming together in a multistakeholder way to figure out what are the problems and the solutions and all of that sort of stuff and living multistake holderism and walking the talk. This is a fantastic forum. Props to the Australian Government, Internet governance team who are reaching out to the community on WSIS. Jealous, just quietly, not happening in my country. I just think getting better at telling the stories, resourcing the work, raising it up to the consciousness of people and actually showing how it's done so people can follow.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Jodi. Does anybody else want a final word or observation?

>> BRIONY DALEY-WHITWORTH: I might jump in on a couple of the points that have come up in this conversation and I think the point that you made Pablo about if it ain't broke don't fix it, is a really good one. We have been on the defensive for a very long time when it comes to Internet governance and that has worked for a while. I think back to what Jen Cheng this morning said when she said she noticed there was a paragraph from the Tunis agenda that was copied and pasted into the Global Digital Compact and I can tell you that is not what we set out to do but that was the only thing everyone could agree on. You cannot get rid of anything if it is in the UN, it stays around forever. It's an example of inertia. We have both this idea of inertia and the punch line to my joke about an Australian, Russian and Brazilian walking into an Irish pub in New York to figure out a cyber crime convention, the solution we came up with is to go back and do what we have been doing for the past 20 years, no-one wanted to do that but we all knew how it worked. That is the inertia side of things and that is why I think there will be an IGF coming out of next year. What that looks like, I don't know. We have that inertia. The other side of the coin is the other bit we have been talking about and Mercedes has focused on, which is that geopolitics focusing on digital governance everywhere. How they play together I don't know the outcome. I have learned to not say publicly what I think it will be. I think we have things we can do. Mercedes mentioned the 100 countries in the middle and Keith, you made this point as well, where you have these countries who just want the internet to work, to have economies that work, they want to have digital literacy. They want to have sustainability, they want to have sovereignty and stability and that comes from internet governance among other bits and pieces. What we are dealing with, as you said, Jodi, a battle for narrative. What these countries want is substance, not politics. They want solutions, not posturing, and that is where this community really engages so well and that is where we are walking the walk, because Australia can come out there and provide the solutions and work with those countries on those issues and build that trust which so important because we need to think of this as a point of evolution in governance writ large and intergovernance won't be allowed to stay in its corner, internet governance. As we try to look at what AI governance is writ large, I'm using internet governance as the model for. That I want to make sure it survives so we can use it as the model for data governance, AI governance and everything else.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, we are out of time. We need to make time for the next panel. I think this is the beginning of,or middle of a conversation. There is much more to say. We didn't get to the questions. So Caleb if you are here for the coffee break or drinks, you can hook up to the speakers then. If we didn't get your online question, send it through to the secretariat and we will try to pass it on to the relevant people. Join me in thanking our speakers, Mercedes, Pablo, Jodi and Briony.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Could I ask you to resume your seats, please, we might get under way. Do we have our other two speakers available online? Two more panelists coming in. They are coming from overseas. I hope we haven't lost them. This could be a short session!

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Just testing my audio, can you hear me now?

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Welcome back to this next session. And our focus is going to be on WSIS+20. We have had a session where we've been talking about recent developments. We will now dive more deeply into WSIS+20 specifically and then after Afternoon Tea the third of these related sessions, we will be looking at where to, next in future. We have three speakers. I have, unlike Rosemary this morning, I don't have a long list of questions. I have asked each of our panelists to focus on two things, given that they have a very diverse range of back grounds here and involvement in these issues. The first one is, I've asked them to focus on what do they think will happen through the WSIS+20 process? What are they expecting? Then, what would they like to see come out of WSIS+20? I'm happy for them to do those separately or to bundle them together. Then opportunity for questions. I will start with William, William Lee is the System Internet Governance with the Department for Transport and Internet Governance and the Arts. He is an experienced policy practitioner working across policy and legislative topics including international mail, ecommerce, urban transport infrastructure, transport and intergovernmental affairs at state and Commonwealth levels for which he has my deepest sympathy! William, over to you.

>> WILLIAM LEE: Thank you, Keith. Good afternoon. It's a struggle to follow on from that previous panel. I think we had good discussions. I think that this panel picks up on that next 12 months and what WSIS+20 will start to look like. I think it's probably really useful to start that the internet has changed a lot in 20 years. I guess, users' expectation of what the internet does and is as well. My background prior to joining this role, I was heavily involved in international mail and thinking about this panel, it's kind of astounding to realize the peak of letter mail was in 2008. After which wrote WSIS, the rise of traditional letter mail was still increasing for another 5-6 years in Australia. Last year, we saw 12 million terrabytes of data transmitted over the NBN in one quarter. 93% of us used it to access news, half of us to access health services a third of us used it to work from home and 16.8% of our retail spend was online. So that shift over the last 20 years is real, and in a sense, WSIS in its traditional sense is almost a vintage antique. I think that is a really useful piece of context as we dive into what to expect next year. I think as we heard in the previous session, these will be complex negotiations. The internet is a weird beast in the UN system this that there isn't a foundational treaty. WSIS is the closest thing we get to a treaty in the internet governance context which puts a lot of expectation and pressure on the WSIS process and given the fact that this will be only the second time we've reviewed the WSIS framework in nearly 20 years, there's some pretty high stakes involved. I know we've heard about high stakes a lot and that is a repeated narrative. I think genuinely at this time, we're opening that Pandora's Box and seeing where the conversation lands. Countries are becoming more and more invested in the outcomes for internet governance. They weren't necessarily present ten years ago when we did WSIS-plus-10. This time around there is a lot more pressure on the UN system. The digital divide, which has become the latest butword, digital divide, it is increasingly prevalent and increasingly front of mind as more of our economic and social value moves to a digital space. The fact that people are still unconnected from the internet is a real challenge or sore spot for a lot of governments. That will be a key issue in WSIS-plus-10, closing that divide or at least offering everyone a pathway to closing that divide. The other thing we can expect is around the WSIS action lines. So there's currently 11 of those WSIS action lines and they're very much issues based but I think we will see new WSIS action lines to be put forward for consideration, or changes to the existing WSIS action lines. AI being another one of these latest butwords being one of them. Coming back from ITU standardization Assembly last week, we already saw an effort to insert a new WSIS AI action line through the ITU process. That's already on the table. We haven't even started negotiating yet. The other thing is Sustainable Development Goals. We talk about them a lot but they are fairly abstract in our day-to-day thinking. They are probably a series of colorful boxes on websites for the most part. They are really important and focused by a lot of people. We are not exactly tracking where we need to be by 2030 but I think WSIS+20 is inherently linked to the delivery of those Sustainable Development Goals and we saw that in the GDC negotiations, that linkage being drawn. The SDGs only have five years to run. The WSIS action lines, conceived pre the sustainable development goals are up for renewal so there is a synergy between those streams that I think we will see play out in the next ten years. Then, briefly, in terms of some of the goals and some of the things that I would like to see, and I will speak personally here as opposed to offering the outcome of the Government's negotiation when we haven't started that yet, but I think we need to see a path for the internet of the future. This is the opportunity to lock things in and take things off the table in other conversations. That is looking to quick wins. What can we do quickly, to make immediate improvements as well as the long-term structural and governance reform pieces I think are important for the sustainability of this multistakeholder model we all champion so hard. We probably need to move past declaratory statements and that feels odd saying that as a government representative because we're very good at producing declaratory statements. We need to think what are the concrete actions, what are the things people can walk away from the WSIS+20 negotiations and say, "I got something out of this process". If all they got was a new word for the same thing, they're probably not going to be seeing WSIS+20 as a win and the conversation will simply pop up in 2026 negotiations on something else. I think the other thing we will hopefully see out of WSIS+20 or that I would like to see is thousand we can connect the dots between the different communities. We know that there are multiple conversations happening at the same time. We know that there are lots of different duplicative processes, both within the multilateral community, within the multistakeholder community and within other communities and I think that WSIS+20 creates an opportunity to join some of those dots together in a way that we perhaps didn't think about 20 years ago. Then, finally, I think the other thing to think about is the IGF itself and IGF reform. That is a big, complicated beast. I don't profess to have all the answers. I think if we want the IGF model or the multistakeholder model to succeed, we need an IGF that is strong and reputable and continues to be into the future. So, whether that is a sustainable funding model, whether that is governance reform, whether that is ways of working - whatever that looks like, IGF needs to be able to stand on its own two feet in a multilateral environment as well as a multistakeholder one and to be able to defend the values that we're talking about here. I think now is the opportunity to get that long-term reform for IGF and the IGF model locked in and as a stretch goal, I would love to see the IGF mandate uncoupled from the regular reviews of the WSIS so that we take away some of the geopolitics around IGF verses WSIS and the WSIS action lines. I think there's potential to consider that. I'm not saying that will be the outcome we land on. Having a think about, I guess, being provocative and thinking about how we can make some fundamental changes, I think, is the opportunity WSIS+20 presents itself. Those are some of my thoughts. They are not government positions but I think they are things to be thinking about in terms of when we approach developing those positions and having conversations across the community to be thinking how we can and, I guess, take forward a really proactive agenda instead of a merely defensive one and say that everything is fine and working 100%. I don't think that will be the narrative that wins at the end of the negotiations. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Now I am going to basically go through all three speakers and then we will open it for questions. Our next speaker is Christ Buckridge, who is coming into us from amster Dame, I believe. Chris is an independent consultant, analyst and commentator in the areas of internet governance and digital policy. He worked for more than two decades with regional internet registries, starting at APNIC in 2003 before joining RINPC where he would lead the engagement with the multistakeholder community, particularly on public policy and internet governance. He's worked closely with the intergovernmental institutions including the International Telecommunication Union, the OE C D and the UN and actively engaged the institutions at agencies of the European Union on a range of policy initiatives including NIS and NIS-2. The EU Security - Cyber Security and issues and he serves as a board of the ICANN Board of Directors.

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I am coming to you from Venice.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: You said you were changing cities!

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Thank you for the introduction. It's a pleasure to join the Australian IGF and see so many friends in the room. I think I have basically chickened out when it comes to your first question, Keith, of what to expect this year. I think what I found over the years is, I'm not very good at making those kind of predictions. I will focus more on what I think should happen and maybe what I would like to happen than what I think will happen. So, we will see how that goes. I'm also going to come at this from two slightly different perspectives. First - I will dive into this, as the technical community representative here - as you were noting in my bio, my career over the last two decades, it's been as a member of the technical community, working with regional internet registries and now more recently involved with ICANN and some other groups. I think WSIS is a really interesting space for the technical community because it is really a great achievement on the technical community's part. I think the technical community in the outcomes of WSIS and the agenda and in adoption and endorsement of a multistakeholder model, the technical community had a really significant influence on that. The open, inclusive, bottom-up governance approach that the technical community had been using already for a couple of decades at that point, the WSIS in 2003, 2005 was formative for the way that that went forward. I think that when we look at the achievements of WSIS, or the practical outcomes of WSIS over the last 20 years, particularly nor, for the technical community but I think for all of us, one thing is that WSIS brought us the space to develop that model, that open, inclusive approach to governing the internet and digital technologies. I think that is really remarkable looking back, that we brought those two decades of having that multistakeholder ideal at the center of how the internet is governs - aspirational at the time, though it didn't always work out that way, but the fact it was there, that we could point back to it has been really significant. I think we don't want to underplay that. It brought us that time. It didn't buy us time to stop evolving. That is something we need to understand going into this review. It's a really timely review because of that. The challenges we are facing in the context of the internet and digital technologies have obviously changed really significantly. I think that is something that all stakeholders need to acknowledge and be ready to engage with as we go into this discussion. I think re hear - I am paraphrasing - but there is an argument that comes up in relation to AI, that it's not new, we've been doing machine learning for 20 years and iterative growth and nothing to see here. You know, in a technical sense that is kind of true but I think we need to engage with the idea that the impact and the societal importance of these technologies really are quite different now.ive think William was talking about that. You said, he was really pointing to the huge social impact that these technologies are now having. So I think there is a need for us to look at what that means for governance. So, is the multistakeholder model still fit for purpose as the ideal for go Verning needs -- for governing needs? I think the answer is yes, there is value in the open, inclusive bottom-up approach but there also needs to be innovation. There needs to be, perhaps, we calibration in looking at, for instance, the balance between open innovation and safety or security. That's going to look very different depending on the societal impact that your decisions will have. We need to engage with that change. I think we also, if we are to be serious about continuing the multistakeholder approach and model, we need to be looking at the broader idea of multistakeholder governance and I mean, we can look at that in different industries, different sectors. A lot of them use multistakeholder governance to a certain extent but look different to the current internet governance model. I think there was a recent study by the Rand Corporation, I think, on AI governance. It was looking at difference governance processes that could inform AI governance. I think it looked at nuclear technology, encryption, genetic engineering and the internet. Some of those are very much not particularly multistakeholder, though even something like nuclear technology had elements of multistakeholder governance in it. Again, I think Jans Volter is looking at the environment, health, they had a conference this year, which were looking at food security and their understanding of multistakeholder governance. Again, quite different. Not really recognizable to someone involved with internet governance but an important model, important background and context to consider here. Now, I think in the UN, there's been a lot of discussion around multistakeholder relation in relation to the SDGs. In that con text been concern around potential capture by big business, the lack of inclusivity or representation by the global south, usurping national sovereignty of governments, particularly in the global south - those are real concerns we need to address, so we need to be ready to engage with those discussions. We're also seeing a lot of new potential governance structures and ideas coming out of the UN itself. Particularly out of the Global Digital Compact. So we will need to integrate things like this new office that will be in the Secretary-General's office, dealing with digital co-operation, a new scientific panel on AI a global dialogue on AI governance and this new ccTLD working group emerging on data governance, I think people have been enthusiastic about the recent look at how that could look. I think going back to a technical hers peck tive, we have continued over the last two decades to evolve the technical community's own governance models, building on the multistakeholder approach, but finding ways to deal with or mitigate the concerns about inclusivity, transparency, and representation of different groups including governments. Certainly, we are seeing models like ICANN and the RAR processes, constantly evolving in how they bring those different groups in, how they help to facilitate that. And evolving ways of working across other different stakeholder groups as well, making sure that different parts of the community are talking to each other, able to engage. I think the technical community in WSIS -this is coming back to what I would want for WSIS - it needs to be ready to get in the mix. It needs to bring the idea west have developed over the last two decades and we need to make the case as to why a multistakeholder approach is right for internet governance. I think that is a really important thing. We can look at these other areas, other vectors that use multistakeholder governance, but I think there is quite distinct argument for why a multistakeholder approach is right and necessary and important for internet governance. So, we need to be ready to make that. So, the other perspective I wanted to approach this from is the Internet Governance Forum, and so I'm part of the Internet Governance Forum, MAG at the moment, co-chairing MAG's working group on strategy and strengthening the IGF. I think this is a pivotal moment nor the IGF itself. William noted that there is work to be done in the IGF in First thing to note as an advertisement is there will be several discussions of this in Riyadh at the IGF in December. The main session which we're organizing with members of the MAG and leadership panel leading, there are high level sessions and numerous workshops. There is going to be a lot of digging into what all of this means for the IGF and the Global Digital Compact and its follow-up means. What the WSIS+20 process will mean. We also have a vision document which has been developed and it is still in a draft form but which lays out some quite specific goals for the IGF community in the WSIS+20 and one is to lead a conversation on affirming the mandate of the IGF which is there in WSIS, in Tunis, in the Internet governance section of Tunis but part of what we need to do there in affirming that mandate, is affirm the broad interpretation and scope that Tunis gives to Internet governance. Not allow Internet governance to be siloed off as a niche aspect of digital governance. What we also should look to do is provide a greater institutional presence for the IGF. What we have noted here, one group is UNGOIS, United Nations group on Internet society which is a group of UN institutions and we also need to be pushing for institutional presence and engagement with this new office in the Secretary-General's office and with other branches of the UN. Particularly promoting the complementary collaborative relationship between the IGF and the WSIS forum which also happens every year. It hasn't really been there over the last two decades, there has been siloing going on there, perhaps a bit of a competitive nature. The two distinct and unique events should be seen as complimenting each other, should be seen as both parts of the same Internet governance, digital governance discussion. We need to look at how we do that. The IGF is looking to engage with the Secretary-General and with the UNDSR, the organization within the UN that is driving the planning for the WSIS+20. Most who commit to engage and be an active participant in this but also to call for some principles behind the process, drawing on what was discussed at WindoWoW and the guidelines that came out of that and pushing for participation, inclusivity, transparency of the process and a multistakeholder approach -- hopefully that is well received and it is something we can build on. To close here, what I want here out of WSIS+20 is a process which is a serious discussion for all of us on the challenges that we face now, hopefully a holistic strategy to face them. Ideally, not dominated by geopolitics and also not dominated by cynicism about formal governance that can often come from other non-state actors in these processes. Thanks, sorry, Keith, I ran a little long.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: That is OK. Chat, I will go to you next. Chat Garcia Ramilo became the executive director of APC in April 2017 after several years as the organisation's Deputy executive director. She's worked as a gender and ICT consultant for the Canadian international development agency, the international development research center, the World Bank, UNFM and the United Nations division for the advancement of women. She is also the board chair of the center for Migrant Advocacy in the Philippines. Over to you, please.

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: Thank you, Keith. Good afternoon to all. I thank William and Chris for laying down what WSIS+20 and what the expectations and what we would like to see. I want to build on that. Maybe background about what APC is to give it context. APC is a civil society international organization. We have about 70 plus members everywhere. We have been around for a long time. We have been part of the WSIS journey from the beginning, from the presummit - from the presummits in Geneva, to Geneva and Tunis, IGF and I think one of the things that we have - we are learning about is the Tunis agenda, as well as what did come out of the World Summit on the Information Society and with an acknowledgement that the situation has absolutely changed and there are much more challenges for us as we move on the WSIS+20 review. We were part of a civil society recently network and we went on and reviewed what are we seeing, what have we seen in the last 20 years and how are we approaching the coming review? That is to look at the different changes - absolutely the big changes that we have seen. In relation to governance, participation, as well as the issues that we're facing. With respect in relation to several things that have come up here, and one I want to relate to what William has said on the digital divide. What we have really seen in the last 20 years is, while the issues of - the increase of digital inequality and that is absolutely one of the things that we expect and we would like to see addressed in the review. Digital inequality, in the sense of not only inconnectivity, but that is a huge part of it, where we still have absolutely, in some places in Africa, for example, there is no connectivity but in many places, the inequality has really become worse and there knees - that needs to be related to the sustainable development goals and the development agenda that we are looking at everywhere. It has to be a thorough understanding of what digital inequality looks like now, what are the kinds of barriers and inequalities that have been created from 20 years ago? That includes a lot of issues in relation to gender justice, a lot of issues that has come out of misinformation, disinformation, the rights and abuses that have really been generated. I think the inequalities, not only the connectivity but overall, just the question of justice, the question of rights and what we are looking at, in terms of what has really been challenging, when it comes to the exercise of rights. The prevention of rights and what many, especially women, are facing. In relation to digital equality, what the expectation really is that there needs to be much more concrete commitment in relation to looking at not only what the market provides, in terms of connectivity, but in fact more investment in public infrastructure. The market is bottom in relation to providing connectivity with the model of the market, mobiles providing connectivity has not reached what was supposedly the providing connectivity for most people. Mainly because the hard to reach places are places which are no longer profitable. The model, and this is also one of the things that we'd like to see in the discussion around inequality, is the models ought to be more looking at the digital infrastructure and the Internet infrastructure as public infrastructure, to really increase that. I think that really needs commitment from government and from state actors. In APC, one of the things we have been doing is looking at complementary connectivity models and community-centred connectivity, where there is in fact not only providing the connectivity itself but the connectivity that provides looking at livelihoods, looking at management, looking at resources and looking at sustainability and the impact on the environment. We want to see models like this, that can really prosper in the discussions because I think William you were saying, we only have five years in sustainable development goals and we are very far from it and it will need to have concrete commitments.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Could I interrupt for a moment, when you talk about complementary connectivity models, what does that imply? Does that mean the connectivity is just part of a broader funding package? I am not familiar with the term?

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: We call it complementary because it is not to mean that it should be to replace what the market provides, basically that is what we're saying. I think we want to emphasize that because it is not - all of this can contribute. I think at the moment there is a real focus on market solutions, technical solutions and that is what we're trying to say here. It is a very big - for example, one of the things that came out of WSIS+20 - there were two things that came out of WSIS+20 after 20s, right. One is IGF which has come through for the last 19 or - 15 years now but the second was financing. Financing for connectivity, the financing mechanisms and that is one of the things that has not prospered. This is what we're seeing here, this area is what is really needed if we are to move forward significantly. Something like the broadband commission, which we feel that has contributed to understanding of recognizing that broadband for all is really a significant, important and quite essential for development. That's the kind of thing where one of the things I think, in terms of the agenda, if we want to talk about and in this sense, states, governments are very important in this discussion. To come to governance now. The second thing is governance. I want to just say one of the things that we have seen in civil society is the challenge. Everyone has seen this. We participate - civil society participates in all of the IGFs, inasmuch as, in many of the forums and processes, but one one of the things we have experienced is it has become more difficult, it has become siloed, fragmented and it is harder and harder to actually follow those processes for an international organization like ours which has a little bit more resources and smaller organizations, we have members in many countries and everyone also participates - many participate in national IGFs and it is not easy in relation to really significant meaningful participation in this process to follow all of this. One thing in relation to governance is to see this process as one, much more connected, much more clear, in terms of the connection which in the agenda etc. But also in relation to participation, what are the pathways for participation? We have seen a - it has be - and the members have said so, it has become harder to participate in consistently. Everyone who has participated in IGF or in the Internet governance processes can relate to you really need to be consistently involved to be able to understand and to even make realistic, meaningful proper sessions, proposals and to really contribute well and those are the kinds of resources that are needed to be able to make use of the space and really engage in multistakeholder processes. I think to that point, an expectation that there will be more space for the diversity of stakeholders that have emerged because of the - as we all know, digital has become - digitalization has meant there is so much more stakeholders and one positive thing that we have seen with society, there is so many more that have come to us that who have not been involved at all in the issues of Internet governance and we want to know what is happening, why is this relevant, what are the kinds of things we need to look at? What are the human rights implications? I think for us there is a real interest that we can tap into and that means connecting to other issues, whether it's violence against women, environmental impact and different kinds of issues. Those are the two issues that I would like to start with and would love to be part of the conversation about what else other people in the room are thinking of, thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thanks, Chat. I will throw it open to questions now. As before, if you have a question, if you could come up to the microphone, please. Does anyone wish to ask a question?

>> I am Jenny Fraser. I am wondering if you are going to be documenting or archiving a publication or something to mark the 20 years?

>> KEITH BESGROVE: I am not sure that I can answer that. I wonder if anyone from the government or would be in a position to respond to that?

>> WILLIAM LEE: Happy to take that, Keith and thanks for the question, Jenny. A lot will be captured, a lot will be archived, so to start, in terms of the WSIS+20 process itself, the review lives across a number of institutions who will all write reports. All of those reports are then sent to the negotiations in New York for consideration by the review process and then there will be a report and a new outcome document at the end of next year. In terms of tracking all of that, one of the things that we will be doing as the department is tracking all of that information and making all of that information available to the Australian community. On our web site at the moment, you will find some information about the WSIS+20 process. There is an opportunity to sign up to a mailing list where you can - where we will be updating everyone who has got an interest in the WSIS process about where we are in the conversation and opportunities to contribute. We also have a space on our web site where you can contribute a view at any point in the conversation to help us. We will also be standing up our own little multistakeholder group of Australian community who want to share their expertise and insights and there is an opportunity to express your interest on that web site as well. There will be lots of information and reports produced by us, produced by all of the UN institutions that make up the WSIS and the UN itself and we will be making sure that all of that information can be found. I don't promise it will be easy to read because there will be volumious materials, as all UN processes are, but we will at least try and make it available and where we can, easily digestible.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Other questions? I think we have one in the chat?

>> We do have one online. It is from Kiki. "Did I hear correctly Chat talking about work with community centers? I am interested in that in Australia also".

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: Yes, thank you for the question. Yes, the work we are doing on community centered connectivity and part of it is really - it is something that we do, supported by the British/UK development aid plus also the Swedish government. It is really providing connectivity and we have those in several countries. One is in the region it will be Indonesia is one country and here I think we are now working with 17 villages and we have worked also with the Indonesian government departments to be able to provide training for people to run community centers. I can talk to you more about that and there's also information on our site but I also wanted to say, to just say a little bit - say something about documentation of the process itself. One of the things that we came up with as a preparation for WSIS+20 and it is a special edition on something we produced as a monitoring of the implementation of WSIS and this is called the Global Digital Compact and if you are interested -- global information society watch and we have 18 editions or more and the latest one is on the review itself and we intend to document and more around analysis and positions on what comes up with the review in the coming years and including GDC etc.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. We have another question.

>> I am Albin from CSC but representing myself. I just learned in the WSIS process, the private sector is represented by ICC basis. I just wonder how much Australian private sectors are actually involved in ICC basis and exactly how they get involved?

>> WILLIAM LEE: I am going to take that one on notice, and feel like a politician for a second, in terms of how many Australian businesses are involved in ICC. To your broader question, part of the challenge with New York, UN processes is that they have very strict participation arrangements and criteria and there are very few what we might call sector members, or community groups that are permitted within the UN structure. I think we are all hoping, and Chris might have something to add on this point, we are hoping that the WSIS+20 will be multistakeholder and will be open and will enable a more open process than the UN is normally used to in its New York negotiations but I don't think that's guaranteed yet but I think if we just revert to the default of how the UN works, some of those really strong peak bodies are probably the way in, or as I think I have heard already the opportunity potentially to join country delegations such as ours is another avenue. I don't know - I am tossing you into it, Chris but I don't know if you have any additional thoughts on that one?

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I had my hand up and you said pretty much what I was going to say. I don't have any insight on how many Australian companies are part of ICC basis. I know they do a very good and conscientious job in representation here. To your point, I would say we don't know how multistakeholders, in this process, if you are keen to be involved or engaged, these sorts of groups that have already got a foot in the door can be really useful and are probably the way to go. I would say that - the ICC basis for the private sector, I am sure others and ICCAN are engaged with the community as well and I think just there are options out there and I would encourage people to take them up.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Any other questions from the group? If not, I have one myself of Chris. You mentioned in your discussion, I believe some Rand Corporation assessments looking at other governance models. Did I get that right?

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Yes, you did.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: From your reading of those, were there any that struck you as better or more efficient than the IGF mechanism? Are there any that lend themselves perhaps to some helpful adaptation? I say that as someone - I would like to see some evolution of the IGF. (LAUGHS)

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I think the other examples you used and there were successful and they are very much decisional and the IGF is not that. It is quite distinct there. The example - one example that is explored in the paper a little is the example - I think the point that it makes is there were very aligned incentives for both the private sector and government for a long time and when those incentives diverged the model they had really didn't work any more. One of the points in relation to WSIS which I have been thinking about or trying to develop a little, that what I called remarkable alignment that came in 2003 and 2005, I think came from very aligned incentives of people understanding that connecting to the Internet, using this open Internet was immensely valuable and really the primary driver. I think that is true now as well but I think in some sense geopolitics has undermined that unity of purpose. I think there is certain countries or geopolitical entities which see value in digital technologies but maybe not in the global open aspect of it and think there are means for them to take a more nationalistic approach to a global network of network. That is something that the technical community particularly, but also the private sector, can really work on in building that narrative and that argument that says the value you see here lies in the global intra operable nature of this technology and we need to be very careful not to put that in jeopardy.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Yes, a good point and a number of speakers today have emphasized the need for us to find ways to better articulate the value of the multistakeholder approach and to try and tees out perhaps more forcefully than we have done to date, just where that value lies -- tease. Certainly where that longer term value lies. I will give each of my speakers the opportunity, since we have a couple of minutes, any concluding remarks you would like to make, Chat?

>> CHAT GARCIA RAMILO: Thank you. I couldn't agree more, in terms of emphasizing the importance of the multistakeholder approach. I want to say that I think there are definitely improvements that can be made, in the sense of that it is to the tokenistic. After 20 years of experimentation, that is the kind of - I do think, as Chris talked about geopolitics, I think there is a real frustration and maybe questioning of global governance and it is not only because of the multistakeholder - if that is failing, it really is because of the context we're in. I do think that we need to really illustrate that there's genuineness in the multistakeholder approach if we are to - there is challenges to it and those challenges in many different ways we apply then. That is an important thing - it is really important for us to get all of us together to find a way that it becomes - I guess we were talking about it earlier, the multistakeholder, so that it can really respond to the fundamental challenge that we are facing and not only - not being tokenistic and now - how would I say it - like a mantra that we believe in, that we do recognize where it has failed and how to strengthen those. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Chris, concluding comments?

>> CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I don't think there is a huge amount more that I would say. I put in the chat there is a link to a list that is facilitated by ICCAN which is discussing the WSIS+20 and that is another useful source of information. ADA is the technical Coalition for multistake holderism, so a useful resource for people who are keen to follow. I said I wasn't going to say what will happen? I think a very safe prediction is this is a complex process and keeping track of the different moving parts is hard enough for those of us who have our head in the game all the time. If it is not your bread and butter, it really - there is a real challenge. Hopefully, those of us who are more full-time on this are able to provide the right information and formats to bring the community along and provide that information because I think having an engaged community in this is really important. Thanks.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Lastly a man who definitely has his head in many of the moving parts.

>> WILLIAM LEE: I think building on what Chris and Chat both talked about around participation, really important. I think the stakeholderism we want out of this process will rely on multistakeholders throughout the process itself. I can't promise it will be inclusive or easy to follow but if we aren't active, aren't vocal, generating that positive narrative and those positive ideas, the process will overtake us and I think if that happenend, the best outcome will simply be to renew what we have, but if we want to see reform, to see this model thrive and be a model for other means of governance, then we, as a community, need to be the ones that shape that. All I can do is encourage you to think about how you can get involved, how you can start conversations, how you can use your networks, both within Australia and within other countries, to spread the conversation and to shape the narrative over the next 12 months, as we go forward. Thanks, Keith.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. I would like you to show your appreciation of our three speakers. Thank you very much.

>> I think we are now at Afternoon Tea. OK. Thanks, Chris. (Afternoon Tea).

>> JORDAN CARTER: We are going to kick this session off, ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon, my name is Jordan Carter. I am from the.au Domain Administration Limited. I am the happy moderator of this panel and this high energy phase of the afternoon, where there are a number of our colleagues enjoying at high volume the sausage rolls outside in the foyer. We know we have got what it takes to make a compelling session, so we will do that. I also want to acknowledge at the opening the kind sponsorship of what we are now all calling the department of infrastructure, for - who are the sponsor tags to this session. To just give a brief opening remarks, we have adjusted the way we are going to take this panel. We were originally going to do three rounds of comments on three questions to tease it out. We have a sense that the audience has had a lot of teasing out and people would like to be sharing their thinking about what we should do. The title of this session, is lifting the Australian voice in Internet governance. It is about what should we do? To raise this voice and to what end, what are we actually trying to achieve here? Each of the panellist will have a chance to offer some thoughts on this and then we will go into hopefully your thoughts about what we should do. The panelists may editorialise on that. Panelists I will give you between three and four minutes. Susan will have a bit more time as leading speaker. At the end of the session, no matter what is happening, unless it is a fire alarm, at 4.52 we will stop and give them 90 seconds to offer a final thought or two. This is the last session in this room. The session at 5.05 next-door is getting a sense of what is happening in the Pacific region. I hope everyone here will flow over there later for that. To make a note that this session is part of a thread of sessions today. We had the opening panel and we had discussions about what is coming up in Internet governance in 2025, what happened this year. We have had a deep dive into the WSIS+20 in the last session, which is something that may or may make your eyes glaze over. This is a chance to think about all the things we have heard today and go what do we need to do and what is it going to be about that we're doing it? With that, I will throw first to Susan Beetson, who is one of the First Nations fellow and over to you.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Thanks everybody. I am Susan Beetson. I grew up in a community called Brewarina, which is a far north-west remote community 1,000km west of the coast. I am really interested in being here, mostly because what's been happening - firstly, I would like to acknowledge the Kulin Nation and all of those communities who have had a long association with these lands. I want to acknowledge that sovereignty was never ceded. These have always been places of learning but also I want to acknowledge the role, or the disappointing role that Internet governance had in the Yes vote turning out to be a no. That is why I am really here, is to look at disinformation and misinformation that spread across the Internet. Mostly, for me as an individual from a remote community, being part of a much larger community, as a knowledge holder and as a part of a kin network that has considerable knowledge, that is sacred to us and what that means for communities all around Australia, when the chief scientist says "We need to go out to these communities, we need to collect all of that information and bring it back for the benefit of everybody" and my stance on that is that it's the last thing we have left. Our children were taken away, our languages and a lot of our cultures were taken from us for a time, from some people, our land was taken away and the last thing we have left is our knowledge and there is nothing on the Internet today that is protecting our communities from those knowledge being data mined and excavated. We don't have any generational wealth because of that and now this is the last thing that we have, that Aboriginal people in communities all around Australia are now currently looking at entrepreneur - digital entrepreneurial ways of looking at our information and com odd knowledge that we have. Some people don't like that idea but if that is what we're doing, we have a right to do that. -- comodifying. There are other ways to do it that are much greater and can find significant returns that look at perpetual royalties, which is one of my research ideas around digital rights management or NFTs and bitcoin that we can develop ways that we can identify the originating computer that it came from and ensure that there are repayments made back to that community. So we can allow younger people to share the knowledge they want to, but if it does happen, then there is some way of money getting back to those people. That's the reason why I am here and I have listened intently this morning and this afternoon, all of the presentations and I think, for me, what's missing is Indigenous value systems from Internet governance, the way that Indigenous - and I say Indigenous - I get into trouble if I use that word at home. We're Aboriginal and we're not Indigenous. That's another way of colonization taking over and calling us one group, which happened in a terrible way here in Australia. Indigenous knowledge is considered a term globaly, so I use that term and Indigenous data, Indigenous value systems, or Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous value systems, our ways of knowing, being and doing, our perspectives need to be considered, even in governance. Ram said this morning, talked about our ways of governance over all these years. We have to think of it in terms of reciprocity as well, as a twoway thing. When Jenny and I and Rory were taken on as Indigenous inaugural Indigenous fellows of Internet governance Australia, we sat down and looked at how that works for us and that needs to change. We need to work out a way to do that. We're working together to do that. Before we bring on an elders council, people, it needs to be an elders and knowledge-holder council and when we do that, it will be a place that is a safe and sacred place, where, when anything is done about us, it's done with us and that we do have a voice in all of the processes that happen around our - the environments in which we're working in, the environments that we play in, the environments that we want to progress in. In remote communities, there are so many of us that don't have access. Then there are many more that have access but it's not available in the way that it's available to everybody else. For me, the most important thing that came out of this morning was the funding. We need more funding. It was actually this afternoon when Chat was saying there is not enough money - more money needs to go around to these communities and we talk about equality in everything, it's true, more money needs to be put into the infrastructure to make it equitable so that we actually get an equitable share, not just an equal share of the money. Because to put the infrastructure into remote communities, it's all non-indigenous people who are getting the money, it's not Aboriginal people who are getting the money, it is non-indigenous people who are getting the money and they charge 10 times or multiple times more, so either we look at those people who are doing that and they charge equally to people in remote communities, or we spend more money in remote communities to put the Internet in and make it accessible in ways that are available to us. Am I overtime?

>> JORDAN CARTER: I won't interrupt you. About seven minutes.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: I think I will leave on that note and hand it over to Annaliese.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Susan. I think I will be brief. We have pivoted on what we were going to do. I wanted to focus on one of the questions and take a couple of different angles, which was what are the priorities for Australia's Internet governance community to focus its attention on regionally, international and nationally? The point that Susan made about the role that Internet, or Internet governance may have had in returning a no vote on the referendum, I think it's important to have - when we talk about Internet governance, the conversation around things that happen on the Internet and then there is another conversation around how Internet itself and how the governance mechanisms for the Internet - I think IGFs, forums like the auIGF bring together both those conversations. It's important to have space to hear about the use of the Internet and things that happen on the Internet and we do have a session on misinformation and disinformation tomorrow. But it's also important to have the conversations and think about the global governance system for the Internet and what we can do to support that and strengthen it and maintain it into the future so that we do have a globaly interoperable Internet. Both of them are priorities, from my perspective. We do need to strengthen the discussions here in Australia and part of that is making sure that we have a viable structures around it, so a committee that isn't just relying on one or two people pulling together this event, that it is a community thing and it will survive long into the future. Funding for the national IGF and for the Global IGF is an ongoing discussion, and I might just leave it at that because I do want to hear from the other speakers and leave space for audience participation. Pass over to Ian.

>> IAN SHELDON: Thanks, Jordan and thanks Annaliese. I want to pick on the stronger and governance piece. We have merged the guiding questions that we had for the session all into one. For me, just listening to my two prior speakers, what I would like to focus on is the depth of conversation but I think stronger Internet governance means having those frank conversations. Let's go deeper. For 20 years we have skimmed across the surface of these conversations. We have used a lot of the same talking points. We have talked about a lot of the same things and now is the time to push deeper, have those real discussions where we can be frank and open and honest about what is important to us and then finding ways to take those core values and champion them at the global stage. A lot of the issues here in Australia find very common ground with a lot of the challenges that we hear at the ITU in the development sector. A lot of the discussions we are having there, we should be looking to leverage and learn from our local community a little bit better, tap into that deep long history of experience and find ways to get better articulating our values globaly. To my mind, that means getting clearer and stronger about what we are talking about when we talk about Internet governance but also making sure those processes for conversation are deeper, more robust and importantly honest because I think if we can't be honest with ourselves, domestically and here in Australia, what chance have we got to influence that global discussion? Thanks, I might leave it there.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Joyce over to you.

>> JOYCE CHEN: I got the same brief but I have much longer remarks than my fellow speakers so strap in. We have talked about the UN processes, we talked about the Global Digital Compact and the WSIS+20 endlessly. For the past few hours, that is really all we have talked about. I won't labour the point. My key takeaways so far, at least for the past year, we have been doing very well actually, I think, Australians have been doing well, especially in the global arena. I recently came back from the ITU, world communications, standardization assembly, WTSA conference in New Delhi. I thought the Australian government did very well in terms of representing your interests when it comes to Internet-related resolutions. I will put that out there that good work is being done, that let's not forget that, in terms of representing Australia on the global arena. More can be done regionally and more can be done locally and I am sure this panel will touch on that, in terms of building our community here. In terms of what I think Australia should put its focus on, I have noticed that there tends to be a conflation of ICCAN is Internet governance and I can see why. The structure is very obvious, you know where you are as a stakeholder, you know where to go. The rules of engagement are generally clear but I think there's a lot of focus and emphasis in that space already. There are actually other processes that are happening that also need engagement that I feel the Australian community could do more in. For example, building standards at the ITF and having local representation there in that space. There is also participation in APEA on policy development and processes. We are considered part of the Internet governance space. Very importantly, there is the inside net coordination policy or ICP2 review that is looking at the criteria for establishing new regional Internet registries, so in effect, APNIC is looking at the criteria for establishing something like ourselves. That is ongoing, that requires community feedback and it would be nice for us to be able to pay attention to some of these parallel processes that are happening, that are ongoing, just as a lot of the air in the room is taken up by some of the very important discussions about the GDC and the WSIS+20. There is a lot happening right now. At the region there is the APRIGF which is our regional counterpart to the Australian IGF and I welcome you to join the regional IGF as well, we need a lot of people from Australia to join us to strengthen the community, provide leadership. There is also a need there. With we take for granted that Internet exists and it will just continue to exist. The transition was a wake-up call for the community but since then, I have noticed that the interest that's gradually died down. My take away from this is we all love a little crisis to get our act going. I want to touch on the fact that Australia has historically had a period of disengagement in global processes. That has come to the detriment of your community building. That is just a fact. The question that we have as a panel is how are we recovering from this and how are we taking the steps to rebuild our community? Your being here is really important and we want to hear from you as well what your views are in terms of rebuilding. Multistakeholderism, people are the life blood. We have talked about stakeholder community and I believe Johanna said it is the people. People are the life blood for multistakeholderism. In my mind, building next generation is absolutely key and that is one of the priorities I feel we need to think about a lot more seriously is building that next generation. Internet - the Internet, Internet governance is itself kind of an aging process. No offense to people here, but I will say it is an aging process and people are aging out. We are not really making that connection between the people who are new to the room and new to the processes and those with years of knowledge. We need to do better at connecting them. Just being real here. We need to take the time to understand all the history, the historical context, why do we talk in the way that we talk? Why do we use words in a certain way? There is a lot of to be transmitted and I see here the relations with what Susan said earlier, there is a lot of this knowledge-sharing. Do we speak in one voice? Do we speak in a multiplicity of voices? Is that OK? We need to discuss that a lot more as well. I had more in my remarks but I will stop here so that I have something else to say later on. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Joyce. Thank you all for those points. A couple of things that I took from the talk altogether, there is a need for depth and honesty. Something I have noticed in this Internet governance moment since the very beginning of my time involved 21 years ago now and I am also part of the greying crowd, is very good at ducking the question and we are best to ducking the question when we can define it as being slightly out of scope or someone else's problem. Given the world's changing importance of the Internet and the claim of Internet governance being about the Internet itself and all of the uses of it, got to stop ducking the questions and that's going to be super uncomfortable and hard for lots of us. It involves grappling with difficult emotional questions. It involves grappling with much wider social and political issues than some of our more technologically minded. We are never going to have what anyone might describe as an inclusive digital society if we don't do that. That is one of the great values that forums like this can be part of, is maybe sensitively putting the difficult upsetting, the issues that you don't know what to do with on the table in ways that we can start to at least understand together. The second is this question about resourcing and supporting real and genuine participation and I also heard a thread about building and evolving the structures and ways of doing what you might call Internet or digital governance. I am only saying those to hopefully provoke you further, people in the room, and online, to offer some thoughts about those questions. I never read out the questions that we had developed to structure this session. They might help you to structure something. We were going to think about what does stronger Internet governance in Australia look like? That being the title what are the priorities for Australia's Internet governance community to focus its attention on? What lessons from the past are critical to shaping our future role? These were the questions we started to think about and also the obvious one for the title, like what should we do to be lifting that voice? The floor is open. I know it is 4.26pm and you have just had sausage rolls. Hopefully, we can get a few questions.

>> Hi, Frank Mills I, am one of the visitors from the Cocos, I am pleased to be here. I have spent probably the last 20 years working in some of the most remote areas of Australia. I don't notice a great contingent of people from remote areas of Australia here today. I am just wondering if there has ever been any work done around how do you capture that audience and how do you get them to come along and bring their knowledge, wisdom-sharing, in terms of Internet governance? I think you're missing a very valuable audience and I certainly know from Cocos' perspective, we are only too thrilled to be here because it has opened our eyes immensely, so thanks for the opportunity.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Does anyone on the panel have a - yes.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Part of what Jenny and I hope to do is to look at wider participation from all over Australia. We need the resources to do that, to get those people here and some places, I know where I am from, it is actually two buses before you can get to a train or a plane. It costs a lot of money and to hire a car out there is not the same as hiring a car in the city. It takes - they charge you - and you can't hire a car from the town - from the community you are from, you got to hire it from the next few towns on, five hours away and then they charge for every kilometer from the time you get the car. It's money. That is the first thing we need to pay for the actual cost of people getting here. The other thing, when we ask about people to share their governance structures, that's traditional knowledge, so if we're going to do that, that is a knowledge that should be paid for as well, if it's adopted and the intellectual property, the Indigenous cultural intellectual property should remain there. With that community. So if it is shared and paid for, for example, a nominal fee, and I don't mean a $50 gift voucher, then it should always have whose knowledge it was that shared that and not where you can - if you can't fit it, it won't be, it is always assigned wherever it's used, or replicated. Sponsorship to bring community to these big cities and often when we're talking about elders, it is a support person. I brought one of my elders to Adelaide and then sent him home on his own. I came with him but then sent him home on his home and he had hardly ever flown before. I think he had flown twice before as in there and back and then he flew to Adelaide with me but then it was Melbourne, sorry, and then when he was going back and I put him on the plane on his own, he actually got off - it was a direct flight because we only booked him direct flights because he was nervous and so the flight was canceled and he had to wait on his own at the airport and then he had to get off at Adelaide and he couldn't get back on and he thought he could get a bus. The only bus was an $8,000 bus fare. This is what I am talking about. You need support people with people as well because they just don't fly. If we really want these knowledge and this input, we need to be able to pay for it.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Annaleise?

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Susan. I wanted to add, there are a lot of people who aren't here as part of this conversation. I did want to acknowledge that this is a community pulled-together event. The steering committee are working on a volunteer basis. It is put on with donations. Again, thank you to all our sponsors, we couldn't do it without the sponsors but it is a limited budget we are working with. Over the last few years we have been working to have a fully hybrid meeting. I really encourage you all here to let your friends know, your colleagues know, that these conversations do take place. Ewith, we would really - I think word of mouth is important bringing new people in. There is only so much a social media post can do. I encourage everyone to tell your colleagues, friends, anyone who might be interested that these conversations do take place, they are open to anyone to participate. There's no cost to participants to turn up. We do want tone courage new voices in from remote areas but diverse, different communities as well, and different groups, all need to be brought in. So, we do rely on people sharing the message to help us get it out there. Thank you.

>> JOYCE CHEN: Actually, a question from me, to Annaleise. I recall last year when Australian IGF was still called Net Thing, there was the Indigenous Leaders Governance and Policy Fellowship in part with Identity Digital. Perhaps you can share more, what is going on, is this happening?

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Susan is from the first cohort. We also have Jenny. as well. So, a decision was made not to try to bring in new fellows this year, but to continue to work with the fellows from last year and help develop a program for, a fellowship program, but Susan and Jenny, they are part of the auIGF community. They have a session tomorrow that has been organized by Susan, so, you know, last year's fellows are carrying over to this year and are very much welcome to continue as part of the community.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Yes. That's what we are doing. We are developing a model between us and auIGF. We will be doing more of that this year. That is what will come out of this year.

>> JORDAN CARTER: As another contact point, in our committee, if you want to get 1,000 people from around Australia into a 2-day event to tease these issues out, then you will be genuinely, we will support everyone who needs support to get here, real support, meeting all of the costs, the budget, as a back of the thing, $2-3 million, maybe more. The budget for these two days is about $60,000. So, that gives just a sense of the resource gap and why it is unlikely to be anything other than government money that could bridge that gap. That's not said to be defensive. That's said to try to look at the scale of what might needed.

>> I'm from the Disability Standing Group. I appreciate what you are saying about the lived experience. These are the voices we need to hear. From my perspective as a person with a disability, I'm part of the aging set. So, I've been around internet governance for quite a long time. I 'm very keen to ensure there are more persons with disability in this space who can at success, lift the Australian voice and internet governance when it comes to accessibility to digital services for persons with disability and I run some disability leadership training and I'm very keen to see if there's a possibility of doing something similar in Australia. So, we have a diversity of voices from the disability sector, too. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Are there any comments from the panel? There don't have to be, by the way.

>> IAN SHELDON: In short, I think we would be quite keen to short, as we discussed over coffee earlier today. Thanks.

>> Alvin again. So I want to share some of my experience in encouraging community to participate in internet governance and want to see if Australia can do more on that. I've been trying to encourage the private sector to pay a lot more attention to internet governance and we hosted two events, one in Hong Kong, one in Beijing, the Beijing was one two weeks ago. The reception was overwhelmingly well. So the participants said that, "I don't know why this is the first time we hear about this." They find the issues very relevant to them. My conclusion from this experience is that there is a demand from the wider community to understand internet governance, but that we are not able to translate our conversation into something that they could understand and participate in as well. As we all know, WSIS and ICANN and all the acronyms, people don't understand all this and not only because of this. If you just talk about WSIS, it is an important issue. It has little relevance to a particular person or organization in Australia. It doesn't impact them directly. It's way too high level for them. This kind of high level discussion does impact them in some way. We need to be able to find exactly what are the relevant points and extract those points and talk to them and if we are able to do that, I think they will be really interested. For example, you know, I would say that ten out of ten times when we talk about the disclosure policy, ICANN is in discussion, when we talk to cyber security experts inhouse about, do you actually want to see who are behind the cyber attacks and able to deal with this, ten out of ten times they will say, "Yes, I find that really interesting and it's really core to my problem", but the way that we discuss this particular issue, in the ICANN community or in the IG community, we just use terms that they don't understand. So how do we build relevance is a really core issue and I think we also need to do a lot more outreach into the wider community as well, in the right way. Then we will be able to see them wanting to participate. I honestly really am hopeful because I see that people can be very engaged. To close off, I want to say one more thing. In that particular event, one of the participants was, is from a large internet platform. After that he asked me, "How can I join and talk about internet governance? I want to participate because this issue is really important to me" and they are an internet platform, and so I told them about the TCCM and as soon as I tell them about it, oops, he asked me, alright, that's interesting, how can I participate? I have no idea. I don't even know if this is something that we want them to participate in either, so, once again, I want to say that interest is there, the demand is there, but how do we bridge that gap, is something as a community we need to think about. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Any quick responses from the panel. Susan?

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Yes, I think that was really valuable. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people here in Australia and Indigenous peoples globaly, and really, everybody has a way of communicating with people who don't know about something, so, we call it "yarning" south of the Capricorn, further north it's considered something, yarning is considered gossiping. It's a way of sitting down with someone and having a two-way dialogue about a topic and eliciting that information, so that you understand what that person knows about it and then you can deepen that understanding and so it's those deeper stories that will help to get people involved, for us, anyway. I think it is for everyone.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Joyce.

>> JOYCE CHEN: Thank you, Alvin and for trying to fight the good battle with the private sector, which I imagine can be very difficult. It did get me thinking that sometimes it's a matter of those who can, need to take on that responsibility. I don't think that we have this romantic notion that, when we say "inclusive" everybody needs to have a voice and have a say and participate. I think that is literally impossible. I think it is more practical and pragmatic that those who can be in the room an are in the room need to have that responsibility of carrying the voices of those who aren't. I think that's the point. So, you may not be able to participate for whatever reason, whether it's, you know, resources, time, bandwidth, lack of understanding but few you are in the room, you should try to carry their voice. That is the important thick, I think.

>> I think when we talk about multistakeholders, stakeholder basically means that there's an interested party. If we want to get more people to participate, we have to identify who has a stake in this kind of conversation and then we have to, if we identify who has the stake, it is certainly not everyone, then we have to have a strategy of out reach to those who have a higher stake first. I would critique this as something we haven't done. In general, when we do outreach, we tend to do generalized outreach for everyone. That's the thing. We did haven't a target. We didn't have a particular, we didn't identify with a stakeholder and then focus on them. I would think if we are to be even more effective to lift up the Australian voice, then maybe we have to be a bit more focused on the stakeholder as well.

>> JORDAN CARTER: To add another note. There are tensions between this idea of carrying the voice of other people and the integrity of those voices and making sure that in the room you have enough people who are connected broadly enough to bring all the voices to bear when we talk about the internets of all its uses, unavoidably one way or another pretty much everyone around today is a stakeholder or a beneficiary or victim of the way the system works. Before we come to you, one online commentary.

>> Yes,ly do my best to carry it correctly across. A comment and question from Melody. "I think it is just important to talk about engagement outside of the auIGF event. How can we increase participation and continue discourse throughout the year and how can we sustain interest once the event is over?"

>> JORDAN CARTER: Who wants to tackle that? Ian, do you have an opinion?

>> IAN SHELDON: It is something I picked up in the last couple of conversations we've been having over the last hour. I think we need to get better, we come together and we talk about the internet. I think we need to get better at using the internet to have our conversations. I don't think we do out-of-session engagement particularly well. It's an issue that we see at ICANN, across a whole range of fora. I think we like to meet face to face, it's only natural, human to talk about difficult issues face to face, but I think we need to get far better at using the internet, having those asynchronist discussions and lowering the bar on participation. If everyone is engaging online, it means everyone can engage on equal footing, so we're not shutting those out that don't have the means to attend in person. The time zone issue is one we grapple with regionally and internationally. I think we can get better at progressing work and having frank conversations, asynchronisly and online to discuss the issues outside of these point-in-time meetings.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Ian.

>> So, a little neuro-slice of the brain. I can't read my notes at this point of the day. I think that is part of what all of this is. Before I go into this, I recognize Chris' commentses about the cynicism and I don't - if I'm honest, I am a cynic, but the two components of strong bottom-up community-led governance, is shaping the geometry of our governance network but also the shape of this. And this department of whatever you are called have been amazing. I genuinely think that you have that part pretty nailed. Have always felt welcome. Even in times where I had various things on to be able to express myself, I cannot believe I'm using a mic to say these things. That goes to show, I guess, a growing level of comfort, to be able to say those things. So, on that, I want to address some points and then if you could slot them into wherever it relates to, that will be great, everybody else. On cost, there's a difference between the cost of a ticket, I guess, and the cost of participation. So, whether or not you are online or not, being here, obviously there's all those travel costs and things but also the work that we put aside. This is where I get to. This is part of why I can't even read my notes because I am currently working on those things that I couldn't shove in my double week last week or put off until Friday or the weekend to catch up on. So, I have to engage in this and that at the same time. I know there's people who couldn't attend because they did have to work. If we do - then we miss out on that, so there is a cost. I think that is something. On cost, I would love to see the fellowships - I heard it a few times here and elsewhere - we have these fellowships. I would like to see paid fellowships that are longer and that people can get paid to develop those ideas or the things that they are doing to evolve this ecosystem or the things that we're doing, because ultimately even though we say "civil society" and we use that because that's the language of internet governance and I guess the international thing, we're talking about people, community here, our community groups and all that kind of stuff and none of this is new. The disparity between what a not-for-profit or an unincorporated organization thinks is the smell of an oily rag is definitely different. To that, my positive around some of the things that Australia does is - I really love the tech policy design centre's report on, cultivating the tech policy ecosystem and recognizing that we have a political system that has disparate departments that make policy and decisions completely discorrected. We're not. Susan, you spoke to this, about the way of being and doing and holistic and I would love to see the principles of interconnectedness on all these things because our online life is just - it's just an extension and, you know, there's not really a disconnect. So, with that said, it's still really hard to hear about the famous oyster shucking at the tech policy, whatever those things are, when we're self-funding to be here. The opportunities that auDA have are really great and I will join others in thanking Rosemary, some of the things she has done have also contributed to me engaging in this space. We're still, I guess, going through competitive tendering to do projects rather than using those funds to collaborate on things, on shared concerns. I think that the IGF is a great place that we can discuss these things to carry over in either before hand to bring here or from here over. I went to a program this year, thank you IEA and I listened to things that I had no idea what they were talking about. I connected these dots, they should be up here and down here and having heard about how satellites, connectivity is so essential for our remote areas but are also interfering with Aboriginal astrology. OK. I would love to see how we take those stakeholders, the technical community, the community groups and have more tangible conversations. So, then lastly, on lifting the Australian voice, we are a multicultural, multilingual country. I can't see how we can't lift our voice. The time zones will never resolve, and Ian's team, Brazil, don't volunteer for the Brazil thing. How you do that, but I think if Australia takes that, we've got so many resources - if the Asia-Pacific region has a stronger voice, has a stronger presence, has stronger representation, it will get easier because then we can leave some of the other stuff to Will and you guys. We can go to bed. So, lastly on the multicultural/multilingual thing and acknowledging I would like to speak to you more about that, Susan. I wasn't sure when you were talking about the ingestion of data whether you were talking about the written history from the colonial perspective being ingested and then reused through the AI or whether you were, I think maybe both, talking about the ownership of your data and what you are producing. I am, for me I'm a white Chinese Australian, fourth generation, whose family were impacted by the white Australia policy, who had to undergo the dictation test, who, as a race, we hold history of biometrics in Australia through the fingerprinting that happenend through passports. While that may be gone, in our constitution, Section 51(26) still allows the Government to make laws for people of any race that they deem fit and that worries the hell out of me if our laws, our policies, are being brought into these closed-box algorithms and then being able to influence the outputs, if people are using those for professional purposes or otherwise.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Sorry. I need to wrap you up. We need to wrap the session.

>> Good job. I congratulate you for inviting us to go deeper, having those conversationless, because that's absolutely where we need to be, from here and from the voices that we heard in Taipei from Asia-Pacific. So, thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. How ironic to be meeting together and to adapt a session that one only one hour long. I will give each of the panelists in reverse order to the beginning the chance to make a comment or two. We will ruthlessly stop in seven minutes, so please, keep your comments brief.

>> JOYCE CHEN: I'm glad I did leave remarks to the end. I want to close by saying I think Australia has a great opportunity to be a nexus for industry, for people and for political power. I hope you underthesty mate the -- underestimate the privilege you have, such a critical role in convening, gathering people, being an opinion leader, and just taking people with you. I had a conversation with someone about how different internet governance is in other countries. People are persecuted for having these conversations. They get arrested in their countries, for talking about these things that we're taking for granted. So, not to put a lot of pressure... On all of you, but I do think that if you have the resources, you do have some obligation to help those who really can't help themselves, right. So I want to bring that message home very strongly, thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Ian.

>> IAN SHELDON: No pressure. Look, I will use my last one minute to double down. I'm from government, I'm The department of infrastructure and friends! What I want to say is building on Joyce's comments, there is a very unique opportunity to come and engage with us. We are in a lot of conversations globaly. You heard us talk about this repeatedly over the course of today. Please use us as a resource. Come talk to us. Ask us the questions that are in the back of your mind. Work with us to help us explain multilateralism, what government might be thinking or balances or how we consider issues. We are genuine partners and a core part of the multistakeholder community. So, please, use the opportunity and work with us to strengthen this work that ewith're all doing together, because, like Joyce said, that opportunity doesn't exist in a lot of other countries, in a lot of other regions and I've certainly has criticisms aimed at myself for encouraging the community - go talk to the government and the community going, "My government doesn't want to listen to me and make it very difficult for me" and if this community has those relationships, come, bring all those great thoughts and feed them back to us. We will take them all and develop far better talking points and briefings that we can take with us to the UN and through this multilateral conversation. So, my team is here. Please, bother us as much as you want over the next day or so. We are very keen to listen and talk.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Annaleise.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Jordan. Briefly, I think we should be considering this session here is the start of a conversation rather than seeking any solutions out of this. We do - it is part of the broader conversation that we will be having, the thought piece on, associated with the position paper in the Town Hall about how we evolve and improve multistakeholder governance processes here and internationally. Briefly, we do need to do some thinking about how we - as Alvin was saying, when we get down in the weeds, it doesn't mean much to newcomerless - newcomers, so we need to have those conversations in an open forum among experts that bring many years of experience and we need to bring new people into those conversations, so how we go about translating it into terms that mean something to newcomers and bring new voices in we need to think about. Funding. It is a problem for every national and regional IGF and certainly nor the global IGF. I don't think we can expect governments to just be the ones who pay for everything and in terms of what is in it for the private sector, why might a private sector stakeholder want to get involved, why might they want to pay for it, I think it's perhaps up to us as the multistakeholder community to develop that value proposition and sell it to them. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Susan.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: I think Susan.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: I think we need to do better at defining who the multistakeholders are and have those represent. We need - I liked the idea that was mentioned earlier - I think - about connecting the old with the new. In our communities, old is really solid, because we do come with the knowledge but we don't have - not all of us have the insight to what's happening in the future and I think we need a lot more proactive strategy work done. I think that's some strategists involved will be really good. I want to mention the idea of inclusive. For us we find inclusive a racist term because it actually requires us to drop off all of our edges and come into something else that already exists. It's about assimilation for us. Something that's more embracing and that makes you think about opening your arms, it means that helps you to think about extending the systems and the governance structures that are already existing. So we're not saying create new ones, we're saying develop what is already there and extend those to embrace us. Storying, storying, storying is what will get you the depth of knowledge that's required to better understand what's happening from a local perspective, a regional perspective and then what works. We say from remote communities, if you design with us, if we can be part of that design, then we will design a system that embraces all. The same thing happens from community of people with disability disabilities, or varying abilities, I normally like to say. I should leave it there but proactive strategy I think needs to come in as well for future.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Susan. Thank you all for an incredibly fascinating and you have to say unpredictable dialogue that we have had here. It is a classic example of a session going in ways that were not necessarily expected at the beginning but started to dig into those deeper conversations that we know that we need to have. Thank you all. Give yourselves a round of applause. (APPLAUSE) Thank you all. Next-door in three minutes is a chance to hear from the Pacific Island about what has been happening in the Pacific region. The room is the same size as this one so not everyone will fit in there but please do try and the drinks function will commence in the foyer in front of us - behind you - at 5.45 regardless. If you can't fit in, watch it on your device, have a break, grab some sunshine and see you at 5.45, thanks very much.