>> I think we might start. I realise it's a bit early for some people but welcome to those who have made it. I'd like to first pass over to Daniel. Thank you.

>> DANIEL FEATHERSTONE: Yeah. Holly has asked me to do a brief acknowledgment of country. So I'd like to acknowledge the Wiradjuri people of the Kulin nation on whose unceded land we're meeting today and pay my respects to elders past and present. I'd also like to extend that acknowledgment to all First Nations people in the room today.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. First, let me get that in a better position. First of all, some housekeeping. There are rules of conduct. Basically they say everybody should be treated with respect. If you're not being treated with respect you will be asked to leave and hope that will be the end of it. When you are at the microphone in present, we ask that you give your full name and if you are affiliated with a company we ask that you notify that. If you're joining us by Zoom and we welcome everybody, of course, please in the Zoom indicate your name, your first name and your last name. Don't use any acronyms or anything. So we know who we're talking to. And with that I would first of all like to welcome the three people who have - I know what I'd like to do first is the session today, the first session and it's actually quite appropriate for the title of this conference, this conference is about connecting local to global and this session, the title is - If The Internet and Internet Connectivity were an Essential Service, what would it mean for its governance, funding and its rollout? There are two terms that are used there - essential service and universal service we're going to -- service. We're going to explore both of those. What is connectivity? What is required? What do we mean in terms of actually connecting the local to global? We have three people who are absolutely the right people to talk to. On my right Daniel Featherstone. A senior research fellow at RMIT and part of the centre for automated decision making and society. Which I might ask you to explain. More importantly, leads the mapping, the digital gap research project. There's a huge gap in connectivity in this country. Improving digital inclusion in remote First Nations communities. Before that relevantly he was general manager of the national peak body for First Nations Media Australia. I'm not going to even attempt the organisation because if I talk about it you can mention it, otherwise I will completely screw up the pronunciation. I couldn't say that. He has PhD on Indigenous media policy. The other two people on the screen, the first is Dr Gareth Downing. The peak body for communications and and he leads ICANN's policy team and membership funding. He has an interesting background in policy law and economics and regulation of complex markets. Some of the discussion today in the session will be about the complexity of actually funding connectivity in this country. Theresa is Telstra's chief consumer advocate. She joined originally joined in 2021. Been in that position. Before that we all knew her. She has had many years of working in telecommunications, consumer policy. I won't even list the number of committees that she has been on. National, international. She's got awards. And she has been as far as I'm concerned Australia's chief advocate for consumer and telecommunications policy for as long as I've known her which is a very long time. OK. To start off with I'm going to reask the question, the title of this has, this panel has two terms in it. One is essential service and one is universal service. I'm going to ask each of the panel members, are they the same thing? If not, what are they and what is important for connectivity in this country? I'm going to start with you, Daniel.

>> DANIEL FEATHERSTONE: Thank you. Throw me straight in there. So, yeah, I'm working in remote communities around the country and having lived in remote communities for about nine years, back in the 2000s, when the universal service obligation was a fairly critical bit of work to ensure people had a basic phone service in their community. In most instances that was a public phone in the communities that was maintained by Telstra. And delivered often by microwave links going across the country, strings of towers connecting out to, to provide the phone services which were then delivered with a copper network. That's all coming to an end but we don't know what's happening next. So that's universal service. Peep could apply for a phone in their house to get a phone under a universal service and that's how most people in remote Australia were able to get a phone. There was a requirement that universal service meant everybody could get a phone if they chose to. In remote communities we tried to get households to sign up to get a phone but they wanted a prepaid phone because many people were getting $5,000 bills. So that ended up leading to finding out that actually prepaid wasn't covered under the universal service. It actually meant it was universal as long as you could afford to pay for a postpaid service. So that's my history with universal service. We need to revisit what it will look like going forward. Essential service, power and water, are essential services. Communications I don't think still has been defined as an essential service. Should it be? Well, I don't know. It's one of those questions about is it just connecting to a dwelling, a house or a building, or is it connecting wherever you are whenever you need it? And so that for me would be an essential service and being able to access communications and the internet wherever you are, wherever you need it, at any time but also at any level of affordability. So for people who can only afford a prepaid service should also be able to access that as an essential service. I'll leave it there and let the others talk.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Daniel. Everybody has a communications device. That's where all their eyes are. In case you think it's not essential, at least in this room, you're kidding. Theresa, you're next. Thanks.

>> THERESA CORBIN: OK. Can you hear me alright? Good. OK. First of all I have to preface my comments today and my participation is as a chief customer advocate of Telstra which means I get to have an independent perspective from Telstra. So I'm not going to be pushing a Telstra line today, nor is anything I say the position of Telstra. That's pretty important for me to get off right at the beginning. And so just in relation to this, obviously I go back a long way in the policy debate and discussion and what consumers and customers perceive as universal is really different to what is actually reflected in our regulation. If you talk to peep about universal service obligation, they usually equate that to something has to be essential and it should be ubiquitous and we should all have. It they don't necessarily get too fixated about what the technology is. This debate has become or this discussion enour community has become even more heated as we have become more and more dependent on it, to do anything else. So the time has moved on since we first made the universal service obligation which really only focuses on our geographic element of where you can get the service. More recently it's been added we've had the Australian broadband guarantee and added an element that you can get a broadband service and the provider of last resort will be the NBN. But if you really talk to people, they don't just think it's about geography. They think it's about affordability as Daniel has already mentioned. They think the affordability shouldn't just be about the service but also about the actual equipment. And they also think it should be accessible and the only mention of accessibility in relation to the universal service obligation relates to the national relay service. And the only sort of part of our regulation that really sort of deals with essentialness is in relation to contacting emergency services. So we should all be able to use our phone to contact 000 and previously that was a fixed service and the focus was all on fixed services. The assumption is generally the spirit of that is mobiles should be able to contact 000. There's lots of debate about the edges of all of that as well and how it works in reality. So I guess the point is our expectations have changed. We really do consider that telecommunication services are essential but the regulation that supports it is not really properly there and nor is it really clear what the definition is. My personal view is it should be a lot more customer consumer centric and it shouldn't be so technology defined. And ultimately we need to have some kind of instrument that actually does move with the times because our technology is changing so quickly now. And there will be all sorts of people who wanted to talk about what the limits of universal service might now be given many of us are using messaging apps and we're relying on digital platforms for our connectivity and we want data when there's concern about the rest of the network. Anyway, that's probably my starting comment. Probably plenty of people in the audience who really want to get into this debate.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Gareth, you have a particular role in terms of understanding and delivering universal service. So first of all, what do you mean by essential and what do you mean by universal? Universal service obligation has ben died in to --

>> The way the current is defined is based on under the service that is delivered. It's been reference to voice. That's not a terribly useful part of reference in and terms of our ability to engage. What I'd say is different between the USO and essential services of a concept is USO is, its focus is on two things. Access in a general sense and infrastructure sense. And it's really the focus has been about obicidising the access and connectiskty at the most basic level and affordability in a more general sense. The affordability aspect is about geographic equality across the country. And so really what we're talking about there a much more limited policy perhaps than is necessarily appreciated. It's focused at harminising prices between city and country for people that are using copper landlines. That's not real contemporary as others have raised. Essential services are a bit more complex because it starts to draw in a few other things. We talk about access and connectivity and generally start to bundle ideas of relifability, consistency and the network doesn't drop out all the time and you have a functional usable service. I think the other thing that comes in which is not kind of commonly touched on is pretty much every framework you have something deemed as an essential service, there's a couple of unique legal features. So, one, is you have a really strong framework of consumer protection. And that has ben established through direct regulation in a variety of context, energy and water are good examples, because there's an acknowledgment people need to have access to their services to facilitate engagement in basic daily tasks to live their lives. Society and culture more broadly. So there is that consumer framework piece. And the second component which I think is interesting and something that we don't think about in telco too much compared to other sectors and I think it's an area there's a huge amount of work to do is in the context of responding to natural disasters and emergency. And where that's different is in the energy and water context there's often clear legal protections that are afforded to and priorities are afforded to, energy and water providers that are not afforded to telcos. An energy provider can in certain states and territories, after a natural disaster, it has priority access to go in and fix the infrastructure. That's not necessarily the case with telco. And I think there's something in that about the rights and responsibilities that are afforded to these other services are different in a legal sense. And that's really important when you have a crisis and you do need to get in there and get things fixed and telco lags a bit behind all on that front and broadly speaking the telecommunication sector doesn't really have the relifability framework that you'd want to see out of a service that provides the basis for the entire economy at this point in time.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you all three of you. I realise all of us are talking about, four of us are talking about a framework. Not everybody has lived and breathed for the past 20 years. So the term universal service actually refers to very simply the provision of a telephone, a voice service for connectivity. And it has never been defined as a digital service. It is something that must be recently accessible and we grapple with what does it mean? The licence conditions that used to go with Telstra that provided the service had a lot of other aspects to it that have been lost in terms of the current structure. Or the current structure, all it does is say there must be connectivity and then there's no actual provider who must provide service. So taking on from Gareth and his analysis, if you were going to have a legal framework, what would you add to the fact that what we have now is just the provision of connectivity, not service? First of all, where would you start with connectiskty? What do we mean by universal connectivity? And you're perhaps the best place to start with that as to what's missing? Universal connectiskty in a huge land with lots and lots and lots of sand and trees.

>> DANIEL FEATHERSTONE: We had the rollout of NBN with 100% of Australians would be able to access a broadband service. The technologies were mixed, where there were fixed line within urban areas, fixed wireless in regional areas around regional centres. And then 93% of the country were going to get satellite delivery as the way of ensuring that everybody could access a service. OK. All good in theory, assuming all of those services are able to deliver pretty much the same thing. But unfortunately that hasn't been maintained and we haven't been able to keep that same level of service delivery via the satellites as we have been able to continue to grow the speeds and the quality and reliability of services in fixed line and fixed wireless. There's constant work going on to expand the fixed wireless networks and to provide what was originally going to be fibre to the premises which became the multi-technology solution and so we're still trying to catch up to get back to what was the original model of NBN. So where have we got to? We have got a satellite solution that enables anybody to connect if they can afford a post-paid service. In the remote First Nations communities that we go to there's about 3% of households have a Sky Muster Service as a post paid service. There's quite a number of communities that have Wi-Fi that uses Sky Muster. And is a shared free Wi-Fi hot spot or Wi-Fi mesh network but very few households have the affordability to pay that monthly bill to be able to get what is effectively their primary means of internet access. More likely, people are getting mobile services and using a prepaid mobile because they can afford to pay for the recharge the data. And so in our surveys we've got about 80% plus of people have a smartphone or a device that they can connect to the mobile network, even in communities where they don't have mobile coverage, there's about 670 of those. They still are using a mobile service because they can use Wi-Fi calling. 99% of those people are on prepaid. So this is across 12 communities we have been visiting around the country over the last three years. 99% of people are now using prepaid mobile as their primary means both of voice and data. So the idea of broadband to the home is not the way that people are connecting. People want an affordable services, so they're using prepaid and want to be able to connect wherever they are. People are very mobile and move back and forth between communities, between houses. They want to be able to access services anywhere they are. What is the means of access that people are using and how are we building upon that? This idea of focusing connectivity on a building or a dwelling, I think we have all moved beyond that even in urban areas, but particularly in remote and regional Australia, most people are needing connectivity when they're travelling and working and wherever they are. I think that's where we need to be thinking more broadly now about what connectivity means and where we need it and how people are able to access those services.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Daniel. Teresa, should pay phones - if anybody still knows what a pay phone is - should pay phones be part of the obligation?

>> THERESA CORBIN: It's funny you were going to go there because I will go there anyway. I still love a pay phone. When I see one, particularly when I'm out in a remote area, I go and test it out and check it's all working. So many of you probably don't know that the pay phones are now actually free. I've done a bit of work to try and get them changed in name from pay phones. We have a way to go there. You can call free anywhere in Australia, mobile numbers as well. You can't make international calls from them. You can make them but not for free. That's why the debate about whether they're pay phones or not still. From some of them you can send a text message and also some 3,000 of them. There's still over 14,000 pay phones in Australia. And they're partially funded through the government, through the universal service obligation and some 3,000 of them that have Wi-Fi as well now. A significant proportion of those are in remote First Nations communities and they're very, very widely used. The usage of pay phones has gone up, not surprisingly. And people go to me why are they still important? Most people know that sometimes they forget their charger and their phone runs out of battery or there's still places that don't have coverage. But they're pretty important for a lot of people dialling and contacting critical services. Last year alone over 300,000 calls were made to 000 to call lines like 1800 RESPECT and other critical services that people need when the situation is really bad. The other situation that quite often the pay phone will come back on or be still connected during a natural disaster. And so they get used quite a lot as people are recovering and as the network has come back online in many situations like that. I'm a big advocate for keeping pay phones, especially in a country like Australia. And I would like to see the functionality grow and evolve. And the Wi-Fi enablement be expanded and Telstra is expanding it to another 1,000 pay phones over the next 12 months or so which is very good. But also I think that we need to, this brings up the point that what one person perceives as being essential, another person may not perceive as essential and they may want something a lot more advanced. In moving towards expanding what is on offer, you can't rule out the older technologies that still need to be there for some people. And some people still want a cordless phone or a connected telephone at home. And we need to have the backwards compatibility for that kind of thing as well.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Gareth, I will take advantage of some of the stuff you've been doing. You know a lot about the legislative framework which I'm not going to go in to right now. But if you in lay terms could talk about what a service should look like in connectivity, and in a few words, what would it look like that doesn't look like now? How would you achieve the term connectivity as it were an essential service as opposed to the USO?

>> I think the most important thing here is the framework. Picking up on for example I might focus on broadband because probably the easiest part of the framework will look at it in detail. There is a really unique opportunity following the most recent statutory undertaking from NBN Co to start to regulate it like it is an essential service. The delivery of the USO and connectivity should be prefaced on what our community needs. A service should reflect fundamentally what the capabilities are that we're chasing as a community. If you want to run a livestream and do education, attend a conference like this one, get access for remote healthcare and so on, those are what you would consider to be core and fundamental capabilities to a service or to connectivity. And you take that kind of input and the community input and you use it to define what the service parameters are. The way we've done it in the past is probably the wrung way to do it -- wrong way to do it. We have said let's have a voice service and it will deliver these things. We need to start with what are we trying to deliver, what does the consumer or consumers want? What is the component of this that sutributable to the government because it's not commercial and what component is cost recovered from consumers? I would start with the NBN and begin that journey which is just kicked off. Because you can then have really frank conversations about what will it cost, what is it like, and so on. Transferring NBN in the long term makes the most sense. We need have sound transitional arrangements. In terms of getting to an outcome which is fit for purpose into the future, everybody two to three years, NBN will have a major revenue reset and will have to reset their service standards and will have the opportunity to redefine what their services actually are in terms of the service parameters and that provides a mechanism. They have to do community consultation as part of that as well and the community more broadly. That provides a unique opportunity to actually continually redefine services to reflect what people actually need and what they want. In terms of moving forward in an essentialist service context. That's a very rare thing to have. It's how it operates in other sectors, like water, and I think that's a really good opportunity to kind of have that contemporary consumer tick, what that definition of basic minimum service is.

>> Thanks very much U first of all, I'd like to take a quick break. Are in any questions 'cause we have used the discussion a little bit about the legislative framework that maybe people aren't familiar with and some terminology that may or may not be understood. Have I got any questions? I knew we could trust you.

>> Just a quick one. Paul Brooke from internet Australia.

>> Thank you.

>> Pickingings up on your comment about the Sky Muster service being the service that was intended for remote Australia yet the affordn't issues mean that they're not actually using nit that way. When the NBN came n it basically doubled the cost or the price of a lowest-level broad and band internet service. It used to be $15 for the phone line plus $30 for an Internet service on the. Now the lowest you can get is around 80 or 90. how much would that affordability issue be helped if the price. -- help fundamental the host level on Sky Muster around the $30-$40 rather than 80, 90 or 100, or whatever it is.

>> I love lit -- love it. I said he can't talk.

>> Look, yeah, obviously affordability is all - you know, everyone that is their different level of affordability. There is actually a $35 original Sky Muster base, the 12.1 service that you can go and buy with - I don't remember how many gig of data, I think you get 15 gig of data. 12 mega bits per second one, one megabit per second up if you're trying to use that nowadays to do a video conference, don't worry about it. You're not gonna get much on that service.

>> Intended to provide a phone line.

>> Yeah, it's basically a phone line nowadays. What we know is that even at the $60 sort of starting joint, most households in communities still had issues because they were being Ford additional data beyond the 75 gig of data they were paying for. We have larged share households all sharing a service and their needs have gone up significantly, particularly post-COVID, with the amount of streaming, gaming, everything, TV services don't work in a lot of communities. So the - all of the data goes on to either the mobile network or a household service. So people were paying for that $60 weren't paying $60 they were Diking -- paying $200 to $300 because of the additional data. It's not just about the base figure, it's about whether data is being charge additional to that and what people's contemporary usage is. Having a fixed unlimited data is a critical element and it's taken no-one until star link came in to be able to -- and it's taken until star link came in -- NBN. We have closer to 100 megabit down unlimited data service for about $99 which is great. That's a significant step from where we have been in the past. We don't have the issue of that extra data cost. But having that being able to come down to more around the $50 mark I think would make a huge amount of difference in terms of affordability for households. At the moment, the alternate is to pay for a star link service which is $139 a month. I'm sure we'll come back to Leo's.

>> Oh, yeah.

>> But, yeah, affordability is tri cool if we are wanting people to get on board -- is pretty cool. The fact is somebody has to pay that bill so it still relies on knowing that you've got that money in the bank on that day of the month.

>> I have two faces that would like to chat through the screen that would say, "We have lots to say." Can we have something from both of you. Go ahead

>> It's an interesting question and I think it goes beyond - and I know Daniel's a real expert on First Nations communities. This goes rural, remote and regional Australia. It actually hits cities and metropolitan. Affordability NBN is not particularly good. I think it's fair to say that, yeah, services have become more expensive at some of the entry points. Part of that is the commercialities of delivering these services. It's a mixture of both the NBN wholesale cost but also the fact that you're now delivering these services in such small volume a retail standpoint that the margins have become, in some instance, not particular McAdam tractive A lot of these offers exist on paper and NBN point to that and say, "We have these things you can buy." But they're not attractive from a commercial standpoint so. A lot of the cheaper offers respect making their way into the market because and because it's not where most of the market S ACCAN is support of broadband pricing and we've been advocating for this in half a decade since NBN introduced wholesale bundle Bryces in 2018. Effectively the way pricing is -- pricing is done at the moment, we would refer to in economics as postage stamp, it hits people in regional and metropolitan areas just much. The way in which the pricing is done to donees supposed to be at equivalence nationwide. It's not just an issue from a regional stand point, it's a significant issue in the cities and lot of people in the cities have not really been able to keep pace with the cost of these services and we're seeing an increasingly significant problem of affordability particularly for low income households. They think is something we're going to have to go to focus on going forward because it's really - it's been a really good project in the sense that overall service speeds and performance have improved but from an affordability standpoint there are a lot of point who are finding it extremely difficult to afford NBN services and will continue to find it difficult unless there's some form of relief brought forward.

>> Thanks. Teresa.

>> So, one of the things that frustrates me the most when I think about, you know, affordability, availability and accessibility is that over time there's been a real commercial drive to become more accessible. We've got more option there is. There's been a real commercial drive to improve where we're connecting. Whilst we still have a long way to go as far as connectivity being metro and rural equivalent, we have come a long way. As far as affordability goes I often feel we've gone backwards even though I know we've got competition and there are cheaper options out there. I do feel that because we have to have more devices we have to have more options for connectivity and we have to do more with it that, in fact, it costs us an awful lot more these days am it's not just a fixed home phone that we all share in one property. Our children, once they reach a certain age, have to have a land set as well and maybe an iPad and maybe a laptop. The average number of devices that are connected in our household goes up and up. That eels even in households where people are really struggling financially. They'll cobble together what they can to get what technology they can - in order to just basically do what they have to do in life. It's because we've had a few initiatives recently that have assisted but they don't go far enough. We have the student - school student broadband initiative, which is excellent but it could be better. I think that we need to really look at how it could be better and expanded. It shouldn't just be that it's assistance for somebody who hasn't got a broadband connection at home already because most people will go without food. We know this from the research. They'll go without all sorts of other essentials in order to stay connected. We have seen the reality that there are cheaper options for different kinds of devices but most people only know about Apples and Samsungs and they want those to keep up with the Joneses. We also have some really good data now to show that it's single parent households that are the most disadvantaged. You can actually look at this data over a long time using the data that's available from the Australian digital inclusion index which is funded by Telstra but it's put together by Daniel's team, and - at RMIT and it's a really great, rich source of data if you haven't already looked at that. Different commercial operators are doing different things to try and assist. Telstra has got a few different programs to assist. But ultimately what we really know is having a fixed service at home, not just a mobile. People choose to have one device and one connect because that's what they can afford so they choose a mobile. But know when you have children at home you're much better to have a fixed broadband connection. I think ultimately the fact we don't have a low income broadband option from NBN and in that particular - that's got a reasonable speed is a really big problem and I really wish someone from the government would address that.

>> Thanks, just a question, do we have any -- Teresa. Just a question, do we have any questions online that we should be answering? Yes or no?

>> No.

>> Good, OK. Fine w can keep going. What I'm noticing about this conversation, which is interesting, we're talking as much about price as we are talking about physical connectivity. We're talking about the relationship between the two. Particularly with price, what I'm hearing from all three of you is there's a huge difference between pre-paid and post-paid. Do you just want to have a little think about pre-paid and post-paid and what that does to accessibility of communication services.

>> Yeah, maybe I'll start again.

>> Very briefly.

>> Yeah. So, basically, what we see in remote communities particularly is that most people are buying a $35 voucher or pre-paid card which covers them for generally a Ford night from one pay cycle to the next. And that gives you 15 gigabytes of data. The equivalent if you were getting a post paid service would probably be less than a third of that price and sometimes generally you'd be getting closer to an unlimited data for megawatt much more money than that. So, really people are paying a premium rate because they're on pre-paid data. Because of their affordability of not having that reliable income to move to a post-paid service. So that for me is one of the big challenges of the pre-paid. It gives the flexibility for people who are on low income but it means they're paying a premium and rate to be able to have that.

>> Thanks. Gareth, anything to add?

>> Gareth: No, I think I'd add this is a really long-standing problem and it's been documented for an extremely long time, Daniel in particular has been working on it and so have others. Unfortunately I think it's really sad to say there's hasn't been as much progress on this as we'd like to see. We'd like to see more cost effective pre-paid options. What we'd like to see - again from a commercial standpoint I can understand there's not a huge amount of interest from what I can see in developing low-cost products for the market. As consumer demand increases and there is a need to have more data, sure, the unit cost of data has fallen and therefore theoretically prices have fallen. But what we observed is there's a pretty solid floor to the market in terms of pricing and cost in term you can get. What we'd like to see is a lot more products targeted at the lowest cost for pre-paid and for post-paid.

>> Teresa, anything to add?

>> Teresa: I noticed the Australand and interpreter has their hand up so just checking that... -- Auslan.

>> It's all OK? Yeah, all good.

>> Teresa: OK, yes. I do have something to say. Look, pre-paid has been very much focused on mobile hasn't it? We'd really like to see an NBN pre-paid product. I know Daniel in particular has been advocating for that for a long time because of the flexibility and control it enables people... Also people have become used to nit a lot of communities and they feel quite safe using the pre-paid option. In the days - although we don't have them anymore of excess data charges people became familiar with pre-paid. It is important to have affordable options and that's something I advocate for inside Telstra. Where I have had some success we have managed to get what is called a top up. It's a program Telstra runs with info exchange. You can now contact one of the charity that's working with info exchange or - that includes Anglicare as an example or you can also contact Telstra directly and ask for payment assistance. If you're a pre-paid customer then you can get - there's $180 top up once a year, 70 gigs of data, and free phone calls and sms for six months. I wouldn't be one to say that that could ever possibly be adequately enough, but - because people's usage would be different all the time but hopefully what it does do is get people out of a tight spot and it's important that everybody knows that as Telstra customers they can actually access that.

>> Thanks, Teresa A away from affordability now and into the technology. I I'm not sure everybody here would be reading the regional telecommunication reports that every happen -- every three years in this country but one of the things that has been a constant over the years has been could you please expand the network in terms of the actual FBIer and get it out as far as it can so we can stop having wireless communication and satellite. Is that something you'd be looking forward to?

>> Look, one of the main places where we see this is needed is across the top partings of Australia where we have monsoonal weather conditions. So we're - where the NBN Sky Muster is a primary service, during that wet season it drops out. Basically as soon as there's heavy cloud the signal drops out and people are without an internet. This is happening constantly through wet season. People are losing signal for seconds, minutes, hours, days, depending on the length of those - during a cyclone. A cyclone's coming, that's when you need your internet connectivity, your TV and radio services are also coming in via satellite. Nowadays, the phone lines, the mobile back haul is via satellite, you've lost all of those services at the key moment you need to be able to connect and access information. So we need much more reliability of our services in the northern part of Australia particularly but just generally I think fibre connectivity is a much more robust infrastructure. Obviously it's expensive to roll out and so the ways that we deliver those services in those remote areas where there's small populations need to be fit for purpose.

>> When you say "Expensive", is expensive to do - why is it expensive not to do?

>> I'll -- oh, you're tapping into all my pain points here. Yes, of course, I think I would love to see fibre expanded on. We know there's a lot of fibre out there already that Telstra have rolled out previously and used for service - you know for the delivery of phone services that could be built upon to expand further and provide more fixed wireless and other network into remote areas. I think basically the more terroristial infrastructure we have the more reliable and sustainable it is. We are always going to be paying a premium rate for satellite services.

>> Teresa. You're text.

>> Teresa: I don't know how much more I can add to that.

>> That's fine.

>> Teresa: I completely agree. I would like to pick up on the issue of network resilience because one of the things we haven't covered yet but is really important is the interdependencies between other essential services such as energy and the reality that, you know, if the mains goes down then that impacts on people's connectivity at home and also, you know, the network that is - it's trying to connect into O we've got a lot of work to do on that as well. It's interesting that circles back to what Gareth was saying earlier about in being a different set of requirements for energy and because it is deemed an essential service and it's critical. But at the same time it's ultimately energy that often is the reason why in a natural disaster things continue come online quickly again. There's a lot of work going on to build more resilience into the networks but, you know, ultimately, I think that it's interesting that even where there is fixed sect are connectivity, NBN now has it trucks they'll bring into an area when there's been a natural disaster and they can get in. And they will offer a Sky Muster service for people from that truck before the rest of the fixed services get online. But, yeah, I think there's a big conversation that's still going on there, and there's a lot of work that still needs to happen.

>> Gareth, after you, back to Daniel but Daniel, go ahead. Sorry, I promised Gareth next.

>> Yeah, I think there are some things we can be doing in this space. I think we need to accept there is a lot of technology change happening and a lot of technology change on the frontier na will come over the next years and over the course of the decade that we need to start integrating into the way we think about these issues. At the moment we have a blackspots program. It's great, focused on extending accession or coverage to the country that are not well accessed or served. In the next 10 years it is quite likelily, don't want to be -- be overhyped, 10 years, question will have direct communication from sat Lowy Institutes to mobile phones which means the coverage issue we all experience when going into regional Australia will be less of an issue. What that mean, if we invest in more terrestrial infrastructure that is focused on expanding more to mobile coverage, first of all it takes about five years for a mobile tower to be built. Once it's built, the infrastructure on it will last for 10-20 years depending on conditions and weather and so on. The towers themselves last longer. The radio infrastructure on the top has to be changed more frequently to ensure compatibility going forward. The question really is at what point do we start to pivot our investment away from expanding into - expanding coverage which frankly is less likely to be a really significant problem in the way that it is today in five or 10 years time and when do we start putting that money into the longer term assets we actually want to have in place to deliver the reliability and resilience benefit want for the community. I think that's an important conversation that hasn't really kicked off but to be honest it's something I think we're gonna have to start talking about it because it doesn't make a huge amount of sense from a government funding stand point and a community standpoint, we put large sum money into an incremental expansion in coverage which we're not necessarily going to get for at least five years when we could be putting the money into the same communities to be giving them more resilient back haul, fibre and better infrastructure and services generally. I think that conversation is a really important one but I personally would be starting to look at what programless so to do we have on the table and what can we co-fund through the organisations like NBN Co, because we do own it to invest in the fibre infrastructure, flowing will last for decades to to come and with some government co-investment and funding these projects may actually stack up. I think that's something we need to started thinking about. We are getting towards a pointed where, you know, further investment in terrestrial infrastructure for coverage expansion we're probably starting to get towards the tail of that. We're potentially going to lose those benefits in 10 year, it will take five years to build it. You're talking Bo it a five year coverage expansion that maybe subsequently removed as a benefit because you've got... That cover affect I think there's something we have to consider about how do we balance the program of investment to make sure we're getting the most we possibly can for community.

>> Thanks, Gareth. Daniel, you wanted to jump in and I stopped him. Go ahead.

>> Daniel: It's all go good. I wanted to go back to Teresa's point about energy and the importance of power reliability now that everything that the NBN and all of our other services require power. So basically what we see is there's outages in communities that we visit 245 that are up to two weeks. Sometimes they're -- they're network outages but more often than not they're power supply outages and this is the work being done around resilience. We need redundancy of power and network coverage. When I talk about redundancy, we have for instance the Torres Strait reliant on a single fibre optic line that runs up to the top of Cape York and has microwave linkation cross to each of the islands and any break in that fibre optic takes out the rest of the whole network. Any cloud cover in the middle of that links across the island takes out the rest of the network. We need redundancy to ensure people can still access and is was and services and emergency information regardless of what the delivery system S we have got all this way without talking about Leo's sats? Are we going to avoid this

>> You've got two minutes go, for Leo sats.

>> Where Gareth was going is direct to device is coming. Already use a little device and send a message from my phone anywhere I am in Australia. It won't - I can use my phone to make a 000 call, it goes via Apple in America and can get emergency help from anywhere. This is coming on your device very soon. If you can afford the right device. It will also be if you can afford a post-paid service. We know direct device is coming over the next few years. You'll be able to message soon, you'll be able to make a phone call probably in a few years' time. But it - is that gonna be available to everyone or only those people who can afford the right phones and only those people who can afford a post-paid service? They're things I'm really worried about. We are gonna start putting eggs into a basket that may again increase the digital divide in the same way other programs have.

>> We've got about two minutes. I think that was part of your wrap up?

>> Daniel: I wanted to touch on one more thing which is this concept - we've been talking about what is universal service. In the United Kingdom, they've been talking about this idea of a minimum digital living It builds on a financial model but it basically talks about -- what do you need nowadays to be able to do everything you need, communicate online and access all of services, access all your streaming, everything. So, they've come up with this model working in Wales as a starting point, of how it's not just about the infrastructure. This is talking about all of the devices, the skills, all of the knowledge you need to be able to confidently and safely use the internet and do all the things you need online. I think it's a really interesting concept. We have a similar thing we use within the Australian digital inclusion index about how we measure affordability having a bundle of services but I think this is taking it to the next level. Universal service isn't just about getting infrastructure to the house or to the person. It's whether people have the skills, the tools, the support systems to be able to connect safely and confidently and do all the things that they need.

>> That's a big ask. And I'm not sure we're there but working on it. Teresa.

>> Teresa: My final comment is gonna be another question out to people to think about o right? Is that ultimately even if we have everything we want as far as connectivity goes, we still haven't dealt with capability and we still haven't dealt with the fact that everything changes all the time and as people get older they find it harder and harder to stay connected because of what they're actually capable of doing. We need a massive shift in relation to how we design apps, how we provide services, how we provide safety and protection for people against scams and all of that is also about making sure that an essential service is actually fully available to everyone.

>> I like it. Gareth.

>> Gareth: Yeah. I think my final comment would be we need to do something about affordability. We have gone through a really serious cost of living crunch over the last year or so. People are doing it extremely tough and we get pretty consistent feedback na NBN in particular is not affordable. Picking up on a comment from Teresa earlier, single parents are the least well off from a financial standpoint and we have to think about what are we doing as a society if we're setting ourselves up for a situation where young children can't access the services they need to get an education and to get ahead. I think it's really important that we focus on affordability and that is advanced as a priority because there's a lot we need to do, not just on prepaid, not just to make sure there are affordable services in remote, rural and regional communities but more generally to make sure NBN lives up to its promise of raising the digital capability of the country by ensuring there is a concessional broadband offering.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to thank all three of you. I think we have only begun to look at the issue of connectivity from local to global and haven't quite maxed the global yet. Sorry, the local. We're still working on. So we'll get there eventually. We don't have any further time. We're over time. But I'd like to personally thank all three of you. Thank you, Daniel, Teresa and Gareth. And thank you, everyone.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you for being here. I introduced myself previously but my name is Susan Beetson. I grew up in a very remote community in far north-west NSW. And I now come with the privilege of having just submitted my third degree in IT. And that's my PhD. You'll be calling me Dr Beetson hopefully soon, instead of Deadly Beetson. I want to acknowledge the traditional custodians of these lands and all the mobs that have had long associations with these lands, of the Kulin nation, and anyone from any of our Indigenous cultures that have lived on these lands as well. We have been displaced, removed, disenfranchised and many things experienced through settler colonialism. And we now, some people even from my own community very clearly Aboriginal but have no idea who their people are. And they say I'm Aboriginal. I have grown up to embrace people and to embrace the fact that we've been displaced. I was very lucky to have grown up on my grandfather's, great-grandmother's country. I'm one of the very lucky ones. Also problematic in some of those as well. But very grateful. I have said previously that I acknowledge this has always been places of learning. We continue in that today. I've got to learn so much in this forum and I'm grateful for that. But before I move on, I just want to acknowledge the Indigenous peoples in the room. And your elders and thank you for being here. It's a great privilege to have you here. I'll hand over now to Jenny. To introduce herself.

>> JENNY FRASER: Hi, everyone. I'm an artist and I'm here at this conference because we received fellowship last year, in Indigenous internet governance and they invited us back. And I'm happy that we got to experience or witness the discussion yesterday as well. And I'd like to acknowledge that we're on the lands of the Kulin nation and thank their ancestors for their good custodianship over such a long period of time and their spirit world for allowing us safe passage here for all of us. I have run an online gallery for 25 years. It's called Cyber Tribe. And I was just finding my way in the dark and didn't know what I was doing at the time but in hindsight that has by-passed the museum and gallery sector in Australia. And the whole agency of the art world is to pretend that they're making you a star. So this has not gone down that well in Australia because gatekeepers like to have that little bit of power over you. And so the Aboriginal art world has been very, Aboriginal art in general has been very influential internationally. Lot of people know what that is but they don't necessarily know what Australian art is. So to add more, this is just to give you a brief example. Some research that I did over time in that 25-year period, at one stage there was $1 billion being made in Aboriginal art. And there were five Aboriginal curators around Australia. So when say Aboriginal curator, people that are working in the gallery museum sector, employed in those institutions. And now there are more. Now there's a few more. Not too many. But there's still not many Aboriginal curators with purchasing power. So they have a job but in some ways it's very tokenistic. Anyway, that's just one example. I live in the Northern Rivers. I'm from Queensland. That border was never meant to separate people. That was created in 1859 and my granny was given as a courtesy to the British native police officer after a massacre. So I know all these stories and I know that border between Queensland and NSW is actually our tribal boundary. So it is marked by scar trees and riverways. And it's not meant to be something that you can use in a pandemic to keep people away from their country. There's many other things that we could talk about. We might get to some of them today.

>> Hi. I've been gratefully very humbly asked to be a part of this by Jenny and Susan. I'm also an artist. And I'd say a lot of my practice has been informed by Jenny's, particularly around the digital space. I am doing my PhD in creative practices. It initially had a very virtual focus, particularly because I'm from northern NSW, a part of New England, and that country has, was one of the places in which experienced aggressive, colonisation here was aggressive. However, it is called the New England because of its similarities to England and its ability to people were able to bring up pretty much half a million stock in the first 10 years, outnumbering us significantly. And there's been a lot of perceived loss ipregards to culture. And I did see the virtual space as a place in which we could revitalise and see a resurgence, particularly when I was researching this, it became, there's a lot of mob in this space, Indigenous people globally around the virtual in particular, and there's a lot of thinking around how the virtual, the internet is a frontier but it's also a place in which is land-based. It is created from land-based thinking. Therefore the ways in which we operate within that space can be Indigenous. And it doesn't have to be Western or capitalist either. So I see that as a really awesome place in which we can still work within. However, what happened to me, the more I became interested in the virtual, I felt like I was being further removed from country. And therefore I wanted to recalibrate my relationship with country and focus on it. So it kind of accumulated into me now wanting to do a 100km walk on country. Because I can still do that. And I have the ability to still negotiate access. Whereas other people, particularly Indigenous people globally, don't have that opportunity. We see that in the Pasifika as well, the Pacific. I feel like I'm just rambling a little bit now. But I think there's so much that can be spoken about in regards to Indigenous knowledges and the internet, particularly around governance. I think if the internet was governed through Indigenous ways of being and knowing it would be an incredibly safer space for everyone. I think for me in particular, if I was to see the internet as a place where I can practice my Indigenousness, I could see it as a place, see it as quite maternal. In that the way in which I have grown up, there's been, and I think it can be a way in which we can govern these spaces as well. It doesn't have to be a capitalist hellscape. It can be an incredibly beautiful place. And we've seen that as well. I think we see extremes, where we see deep fakes which are really harmful but we also see the internet as a place of great resistance to the settler state. If you think about all the that have happened in Australia, that wouldn't have happened without the internet. We have a lot of power, and self-determination in this space. And we can honestly show other people how to be the same.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: We mentioned yesterday with the yes vote turning out to be a result of no. And the misinformation and disinformation and lies, untruths that were shared and the political agenda that took over from our rights as a people to have a say about things that involve us. And governance and a nurturing governance talks about from our matriarchal lineage is critical for us to think about in terms of how we can influence governance in this space. And that's what I mentioned yesterday, a collaborative space with the document rather than sending an individual approach. If we can share the responses, it's much more dynamic and we can all, it's like sharing your homework. We think that's a good thing. I've done that work with children at home. And children get to talk about their families and their culture and children get to learn things from their elders, from each other and ask at home. And so it's much more dynamic and far greater outcomes and I think that's the same here with the document. When we do documents like this, if we can create a draft, put it online, and let us all contribute and then everybody in this space, if it's a public document, can then hopefully, maybe it needs to be password protected, or protected in some way, but if it's not meant to be that, then we can all share and even ask people beyond us to contribute as well. And that to me is dynamic and important.

>> I just wanted to give an example. I've been doing a lot of reflecting because I'm trying to put together a publication for 25 years to mark that. In the past I've all a role in some advocacy. And a lot of the time, there was a lot of discussion about intellectual property over time, how the internet was a bad thing, especially not good for Aboriginal artists because you could take things offline and go and print it in Bali and then sell it internationally. So I used to accommodate that by making my images really small, 300 pixels across, as one way of not being able to steal things easily. But now these days peep will upload their whole high res file. They have a Facebook account or whatever. So over time, it got a bit dull talking about intellectual property in every advocacy meeting. I always thought do we have to keep talking about this? That was just something that was in my mind. Being respectful with my words but my judgement was why do we have to talk about intellectual property every meeting? It just drags the discussion. We're not talking about other things. And now I feel like we didn't talk about intellectual property enough because AI is here and they were right the whole time. So I'm just saying if I can recognise my ignorance and my judgement, then maybe other people can as well and just allow elders and people with more experience than me, in the tech space, we might think that we're able and skillful but we don't know everything and in the past we could do all the roles in the '90s when we're making a website, but now things are very specialised and we can't do all the roles anymore. We have to acknowledge that. There's different specialisations that are way out of our scope. And that includes listening to people who are the knowledge holders. So I just want to put that out there, that I know it's a difficult space. But it just takes more compassion, thought and it's just literally acknowledgment. If Quay acknowledge country, then we can acknowledge the knowledge holding space in itself.

>> It's critical to know that, to think that. I do see this as, you know, still the frontier, particularly because of AI. And, yeah, I think Indigenous protocols around how to engage and how to relate with each other is a way in which we can develop a very robust framework that is responsive to everyone, as much as possible. And I think a lot of that has got to do with prioritising and centring country. Which is fundamental part of how we think, is by centring country. And if we do that in the development of governance, in the internet, I think, yeah, a better space. I don't think, and another thing is as well, I think there's a lot of fear in working with black fellas in regards to our culture knowledge but in regards to guilt. There's a lot of fragility. I think in regards to making this happen and coming together, it's about being vulnerable and being OK to be wrong. Rupture and repair. We can do it together. It's hard work.

>> That's really important. Fragility or a sense of feeling a guilt about the past or just frightened about the future or the present.

>> Three people out of the five voted no. So, it's really important, that's - you know, that's what we're holding on to here. And for us it's like, I walked around for the next month with my head down too frightened to look at peoples eyes because I thought that you wanted to have a say over my life, my grandchildren's lives and all of my family's lives and my friends. So - that's what we live with everyday. So, I understand that it's complex, but it's about having courageous conversations. It's really important that we - that - you know, non-indigenous people be courageous and we don't want you to feel harm.le we have felt enough harm. We don't want to put that harm on to you. We might get angry, we plight get accused of being the angry Black woman but we're just frustrated. We're not angry at you, we're at the -- angry at the situation, queer angry at the structural race everyone. When it comes to the governance we need to make sure - if anyone doesn't know what settler colonialism is, then just go to Wikipedia, have a look at what that is. It's really simple or Wiki media might have a space there as well but just go there and look it up. It's really simple to understand. That's what we have lived with our entirely -- entire lives from not being allowed to live in the community before 1967, for those of my age and... Now I have told everyone how old - not quite. I was five then, six almost. So, now you know. To being allowed to live on the outskirts of town to then being able to slowly - over time - and things change and I know things change and I'm a big embracing of change which is why I'm an IT person. I'm a big - I believe in systems. I do believe in system bus I believe in systems of nature and I grew up where the fish traps are outside the town of the fish traps, the oldest man-made structure in the call, what we call (SPEAKS INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE) It's a fully regenerative system. When you look at that, that actual Lyn tails a whole lot of logic around computer science. When we look at holding fish in bays, it's holding charge in batteries. When we filter our fish into the different sized pens according to the different sized fish that's selective processing. I could name a hundred parts. It's actually from nature, it's from Aboriginal peoples watching nature. When we talk about our governance systems and our ways of governing, our nuturing systems we're talking about regenerative process, not sustainability. Sustainability sustains us in the moment. doesn't think about the communities downstream or upstream. We think about regenerative processes. That's the way we work as Aboriginal peoples. That's really important and you just have to think - so my ethic and my way of understanding the world, being a child walking at nine months of age being my father's shadow until I was almost six, going to school, and that's what I observed was patterns in nature. And him just talking to me 'cause he was a man who liked to talk. Until he told me I had to shut up and listen to everyone. (LAUGHS) So - I'm a good listener but I Leigh Matthews -- hence, I'm a glad talker but also a good listener. I should let Jen have a say. Jenin someone something I wanted --

>> Jenny something I wanted to talk about was an international master class we had once. I had an example - these stats may not be correct but there and basically there is a biological connection of Indian people from Indian continent and Aboriginal people from Australia. That's recognised culturally as well. So, I starteded to think about this and wonder - like it's obvious that the digital uptake of Indian people have been very prolific, and a lot of Indian people are in the IT sector, so if one in 12 Indian people have the same DNA as Aboriginal people then why don't we have the same capacity or agency as Indian people? Basically it's because we're a minority in our own country and we live with cultural apartheid. But there's a myth. Like, in the '90s they put out ads from Telecom, which later became Telstra, there's a myth, you know, like we can drive into the desert with our American friends and tell them all about the amazing mobile net digital access that you can get in the deservered. Do you remember that add? We do, Chucky, we do. I thought you might not remember 'cause it was 30 years ago. So I've got it here to play. Basically...

>> You bought a new mobile phone?

>> Yeah, and I'm not real sure how to work out.

>> Well, call Telecom mobile net.

>> Oh, yeah, 7:00pm on a Sunday night.

>> The Telecom mobile as 24-hour customer service around Australia.

>> Who -- where do you get 24 hour service from a mobile company?

>> We do.

>> That was a famous catch dry. There was a lot of different ads they mutt out with that, we do, scam chucky, we do. Basically they're saying - you know, this Telecom company is amazing and Australia is really ahead which is all not true and it's - they're saying, you know, we have access to phone call centre service but really in the desert or even in other mote areas as well, even in the rainforest where,ly -- I live, I don't have phone reception now. So, it's very - there's this binary opposition between, you know, what you can get in Sydney in the city and what you can get in other places a, and - yeah. So I'm also wondering, like, Melbourne has a racism problem with Indian people but they're not in this space. I don't see them at this conference. It's a free conference so why wouldn't you turn up if you're in this space anyway? These are all questions and how I think about the world as a bigger place, they.

>> Yeah. Yeah, I think - I just wanna take it back to something like you said earlier in regards to, you know, young mob back in Brewarrina, just saying, you know, I'm a Black fella from Bre and most Black fellas would know what you mean when you say that. But for them not to know their cultural identity beyond that given they have the oldest fish trap in the world is bizarre. And I think that is a problem that I think internet governance can support in resolving. And that also includes building digital access and availability. And I see the ways in which we can look after and revitalise Indigenous knowledges is through the internet, and I think it's important. I was a big - I was really against the idea of digitising our knowledges 'cause I did not see it as a safe space. But I think if we govern these spaces ourselves and are self-determining and sovereign, and it's also important to - like, I think, understand the Indigenous sovereignty is different to wider understandings of sovereignty, but I think if we're able to be sovereign in this place and space, you know, we won't have that issue of, like, young mob coming from one of the most sophisticated knowledges in this world. They would know their identity a lot deeper, and that's really important. That is really critical, I think. The internet can play such a pivotal role in resurgence of knowledges but also can be a space in which truth telling can occur and a place in which our futures can be imagined, and I think seeing the future as Indigenous is really critical for the survival of all. Given the climate emergency, yeah. That's...

>> Yeah. I think, you know, climate emergencies is absolutely critical to all of us but it's not about going out and say -- saying, "OK, we have to go out and grab all of these knowledges and take them and do something with them." I think I mentioned yesterday when the chief scientist said it's really important that we go out and get all of these knowledges and we cap Cher them all for the benefit of everybody. I'm working on a research project at the moment that is looking at building culture hubs but we're actually building them as stand alone systems that don't have access to the internet. We have a separate web -- separate web server that shows images of some things we're prototyping and they are separate physical systems if you want to transfer something from A to B you do it the old way. And the reason for that is at the moment wear Nat - we haven't designed the security enough and we want to be able to develop the system. We want the confidence in the elders to share their knowledges and the knowledge holders to share their knowledges on this platform so that we can develop our own AI internally that can us look at the knowledges to see what we have that might actually find - you know, we might actually be able to see and think about those knowledges in contemporary ways a that might actually have solutions for everybody but we make sure that we're thinking first locally then nationally and then - or regionally even. We're all part of a wider community. Our mobs, we've got bar kin a whole lot of other groups all around us that we'd like to make sure are OK, too, and then, you know, nationally, all of the people, not just Aboriginal people but everybody like with the mosaic burning, like with the spin fix plant. I don't if any of you know the sap of the spinifex plant, it's the strongest glue known to man and it's multitudes - over and over, I can't remember how many multi-indications it is stronger but it's very strong and now they've developed a partnership with UQ. It's just the Inadu... Sorry. Indanjali and a mob from cam wheel have got the IP on -- Camooweal have got to IP on this and they've created a partnership with UQ where thaw've got greater than 50% ownership of anything downstream since the partnership. Anything upstream is 100% goes back to the community. UQ are calling that a potentially multibillion-dollar business. All of that money is going back into the community to develop the futures of those people, all of those two mobs. That's the sort of thing we're doing with culture hubs. But at the moment the AI is not secure enough, the security is not of secure enough, the governance of the internet is not secure enough for us to think that that's going to be OK to put up on the internet so we're doing it as a stand alone. That's the only way I can convince the elders to share their knowledges and we're creating a structure that's a kinship security-relate sod that people who are downstream from that person, who's the knowledge sharer and some people are share AIG cross, others are not because of colonisation. There's so -- there's so much disruption so it's not necessarily purely traditional historical but it's going forward since colonisation. These - you know, it's really important. We want to be able to create entrepeneurial opportunities for these communities so we're having to do it in a very fragmented way, because the internet governance is not - and the infrastructure is not secure enough for our mobs. So we need - you know, we need to be here and I'm really grateful that we're here as part of the Internet Governance Forum and as a fellow, as a part of the fellowship, and I think we can actually influence the governance but it's about having the conversations and them working out what it is that we can contribute to. But before I move on, I just want to say that RAM mentioned yesterday one really good thing to do is to go out and create an elders advisory group. That's a great idea but at the moment we need to make sure it's a safe place for that to happen. So, for example, there was - I was on a phone call and somebody said, "Oh, we were asked by an Aboriginal group to do some research around something" And then I thought -- thought, "Oh, that's interesting. We've got three Aboriginal fellows here. Why weren't we invited to be on that?" That's what I'm talking about when I say there needs to be a safe space. Really simple but it's really important. If there's research being done and we're here, involve us, and that is a way to open space and to bring Aboriginal people into that space as well.

>> Yeah, why not?

>> Why not?

>> I do work in the healing or wellbeing space soy just wanted to quickly mention that. When I talk to young people they tell me that their aunties are on Facebook all the time. If they want to find them they'll go look on Facebook and they're on there 24 hours a day. If you talk to old or people they tell you what's wrong with the world 'cause young people are on TikTok. Basically they're on different platforms doing the same thing. So that is a big certain for wellbeing especially for mental health. And I noticed that in other countries, like - or in Los Angeles, for example, they have detox clinics where you can go and deal with your internet addiction. And so, you know, we all have addictions and we all focus on different things and some things are way more harmful than others but they still manifest, or the internet still manifests. And I personally call it internet brain. I'm not talking about developmental brain. I'm talking -- talking about when we're on the internet and we go outside, we still have the internet brain. We're still thinking about it, it still consumes us. So, I just wanted to put it out there, I'm hoping that we can also have detox clinics and I personally run Indigenous women's retreats, and I hope that somehow these retreats could be supported better for people to spend time on, you know, in the wilderness on their own country which is actually difficult these days for a lot of Indigenous women because they're the ones holding up society. Like, they're the ones teaching the kids, looking after the old people, and it's actually very hard for me to get people to come to retreats 'cause they say, yes, they will and then something happens, there's a funeral or whatever, that I always have to have a list, a back up list. If they're coming someone else -- else can slot in. So, yeah, it's just ways that we can manage the internet or our internet use better. And also there's a bit of an elephant in the room. No-one has talked about it in this forum yet. But these are bomb that is can be detective flated by remote control. That's what we have found - it's what's happening in Palestine right now. So the less we can distance ourselves from technology and the more we can reconnect with our own land for food sovereignty and things like that, it's gonna be better for us as human beings just to find some balance.

>> Yeah. That's really important. We were just talking about dosing, that being a thing. But it's also, like f we're thinking about the virtual - the internet being land-based as well, these women are acting like they are on land as well.

>> Yeah.

>> They need to know everything.

>> Taking up space.

>> Taking up space but also taking up space. I think this is one of the most critical things. And that is due to settler colonialism - well, settler colonialism requires the elimination of the native so. When we look at that physically in this country, it means there's a deficit of spaces for Indigenous people to exist or culture to exist. That's why I see the internet as a place in which which can operate. If it is land-based we can create spaces that are safe. We don't have that physically here. What is a safe space for mob physically in Australia? At home.

>> Yeah. Our homes, our country.

>> Not even -- not even that sometimes.

>> Yeah. We create spaces. Places, this country, and Aboriginal people create spaces and it's usually the cracks in place. So they're the spaces that we find ourselves. In a colonial-settler environment. And colonial settler environments is about - there were over 750,000 Aboriginal people living on these lands before colonisation. And we're now 3% of the population A I don't know what that number is, if anyone can tell me what the population is and say what 3% of that is. It's significantly less than 750,000. There was a huge attempt at genocide. And for us to be able to - like Gabbie says, exist in these spaces, like the internet, and we say culture is never lost because culture is in country. If we are disconnected from culture we can always go back to country, and that's what Gabby was saying when she was finding in the internet that she was disconnected from country. So she had to go back do country and walk land for a hundred kilometres. That's what need to continually do. But what Aboriginal people do when we come into these spaces is we create our safe space among us. But it's actually young people that are coming into spaces that are not recognising that this is not a safe space. They think of it as being on country especially people in mote communities. We really need to find a way to care for our young and to care for our culture. And care for our knowledges that are shared on line in an ignorant way. With a not knowing way. I mean that in the most nuturing way.

>> Yeah. Can I just say one thing on top of that as well that I think's really important and has been really important for me is people's like literacy around the ways in which - their rights on the internet. Particularly around image-based abuse and all that kind of stuff. These things happen within all communities and they happen within Aboriginal community. Too. I have actually had a family member impacted by this, and the way in which there was, like, no understanding of the rights in which she had to protect herself, and also a lot of people don't know the dangers of sharing image-based aloose. -- abuse. We would like to think it's not a thing but we do know it's a thing, sharing images online. And I know that the government has the commissioner now open. Safety, and I know that there's some stuff hatching there but it is critical that the Indigenous community prioritise I really feel, 'cause the violence which is being inflicted on young Indigenous girls is horrifying. And if it's not corrected by people knowing their rights it can really turn into something really horrible and damaging and traumatising.

>> Yeah. Back in the early 2000s one of my nieces was virtually raped and I know what a physical rape is, as a thriver and survivor of rape. And so I was fully aware of what had happened to her. She it to me. She didn't think it was problematic at the time. But what happened as a result of that was very clearly what happens to women when they're raped, young girls when they're raped. And these were all non-indigenous boys in a virtual space. In a well to do boarding school, and - in Brisbane. You know, at the time there was nothing. That's my big thing about understanding what a nuturing governance system S we need to care for people in a way that doesn't rule them but ensures the wellbeing and safety of everybody. It's Bute bringing an Indigenous value system forward. There is a whole lot of terms of reference that we use - collegiality, conjeanality, respect, there's about 20 words o I can't recall them all off the top of my head. If we all live by those, we can't force everybody to live that way obviously but there are things that we can do that help and guide people to live that way A and that we can enforce in a way that doesn't - that helps people when they do - like the school didn't know what to do. The school didn't think it was a bad thing 'cause it was all men. And - yeah. It was a really difficult time but now there are - there is the eSafety Commissioner, there is - you know, things have come along. What I'm trying to say is we need to be much more proactive in so much of the internet and technology. We need - I said yesterday we need strategists. We need forward-thinking people who are aware of what's - 'cause what happens in the real world happens online and can happen at a depth and breadth far greater than what happens in the real world. So, I think we need to think about that in terms of - you know, what are we doing when this pack mentality happens and it's far-right wing? It's abuse on women, it's abuse of people with differing abilities. It's a of - you know, all kinds of things. I think we need to be far more project active in the use of people who can think beyond bringing young people into the space and really - you know, bring people of all these differences who have the lived experience and the storying, storying, storying, as I said yesterday. They're the stories that can help us to articulate a governance system that we need.

>> That's a good way to end. think our time is nearly up. Adding to that, I just wanted to say that there's been a lot of discussion about how young people eels braines have changed. Like they're different from ours. I'm generation X. And I can see the impact of - that the internet's had on people, had on younger people, like they used to show videos of a little toddler and they give it a magazine and they were losing it like an iPad. They were trying to -- scroll.

>> Yes. Swipe right, swipe left.

>> So you can see from their formative years how much influence they have as well. And it's affecting the development of their brain. They're often saying lately generation X is the last one who is going to know the difference between how it was before and how it is now. I think Sue's right. We all need to be more proactive in a lot of different spaces and discussions that we're having.

>> Yeah. Yeah, I absolutely agree. But I think once again, like, you know, Indigenous women are the ones leading when it comes to protecting their people. I think one thing that people can get from our ways of being is the - our relationality and how critical - how critical the way we are in relationship to each other is for the success of the progress of everyone is really important. One other thing before we leave this stage is I heard of mad mob over in New Zealand called ta Hiku media. I don't know if you mob know them, but they are honestly really cool. They do the Indigenous media, but a lot of what they do is based around the idea that they have, like, I think an elders council which informs all of their moves. That trickles down, and I think that's really critical. People don't see elders in this Don't think that they're important. But...

>> Absolutely are.

>> But they absolutely are. And if we're really wanting to decolonise - the thing is with decolonisation is I think people think it in the most lit Cal sense. -- lit Cal sense. To decolonise is everyone has to leave here and it's only Black fellas which is just so... The idea of decolonisation is not to go back but to create a new elsewhere. And that's what we need to do. Once again that's hard conversations and that but courageous conversations. I can't think of anyone more courageous than elders. And people who really look after their communities. And I think if we're wanting to create a safer space for us all to exist in, I think elders have to play a critical role. Yeah.

>> Especially if they're activists.

>> Yes, staunch grassroots activists.

>> Thank you. Sorry. Yep. Any questions?

>> There's a mic.

>> She's got it first.

>> Look, I just wanted to thank you for two things in particular. I don't know if refreshing is the right word but the vulnerability that you show in sharing experiences is reflective of the reality for people online. And I think when we talk about internet governance and the things that impact people, that is whether it is Indigenous or non-indigenous members of our community. And I really appreciate that you have shared in the way that you do. The second is that you are, this is the second time I've heard you suggesting some mechanisms that we can collaborate externally to here. And tying that in with your ways of doing it. And I just want to endorse that I think that is great. I think that is what the internet is about. That's what the community is about, to have that ongoing engagement and that we can filter that into our community. So, thank you.

>> I think nature is evident in the internet. It's evident in the interconnectedness, the relationality. But we need to bring about the respect. And I think that's a part of a value system that is not as well honoured today. In families and in different groups. And I think that's something that we need to endorse or endorse but definitely try to bring about in different ways of governing the system.

>> I'd like to echo that. I think it's fantastic to have your views and perspectives as part of these discussions. It's critical if we're going to have a safe and a space that everyone has a sense of belonging. I'm Daniel Featherstone. I'm doing research in remote First Nations communities and have lived with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people for many years but I'm not Aboriginal. I'm wanting to just talk about that, a couple of things. First of all, the idea of governance and how we build the structures, the scaffolding to get to that? Because when we talk to elders in communities, they feel like they don't, they've lost their sort of cultural authority in the digital space because the young people have grown up with it. They're rapid adopters and very quickly are comfortable in exploring and using the space. I would say fearless in that space. And yet the elders feel like they don't have that ability to oversee or supervise in that space anymore. It's effectively unmanaged. And so how we build those structures and supports for elders to regain authority in that space, I think it's really critical going forward.

>> I think - not completely lost. We actually do have a say in what we see what everyone is doing. We watch what everybody is doing. My cousins at my age - I'm in my 60s now - my cousins and older cousins are there. It's actually watching and listening. And we're learning too but we're also letting the younger ones know that to pull their head in or that's not appropriate. Or I don't know to do the right thing. So it is happening, but at the same time, the governance structures of the internet itself do need to be improved to facilitate a way of allowing people to come forward in this, to come forward in this space so that we can actually have a better system that is respectful of all.

>> I think on top of that as well, if you're a young fulla with lived experience, a part of that is this internal protocol. I'm not going to say anything unless my grandparents are OK, I have a to check up on that. That's one thing. But we're talking about elders which held a really critical role in our own governance. However, within the settler state, elders aren't given the same weight. We've got to be very honest about that. If they did, they would, they would give them the roles in which they'd need, which they deserve in our society. They don't. Any weight that is, yeah, any weight that is given to old fullas is because of us and us alone. And I think if we are needing to - this is an opportunity for us to really shift the power dynamics when it comes to recognising elders as being significant. That's the government's responsibility. They can put the money there. They can treat them as the authorities that they are.

>> DANIEL FEATHERSTONE: I'll add quickly before I leave. The office of e safety doesn't have Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people working there in this space. And I think there's a really important place for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander elders at the office of eSafety and have an advisory group and people working within the office.

>> Especially because so many Aboriginal people have had the same experiences that are happening online in real life. Both transgenerationally and in reality. Can I ask, do you mind if we move onto the next person? Do you mind if I ask can we swap an order? Can we ask our Maori sister to come forward?

>> Ciaura.

>> -- kiora. (SPEAKS MAORI) I work at Internet NZ. I just wanted to circle back to the internet governance conversation. And talk around, ask around capability versus capacity, which is an issue that we're having in New Zealand. So I have no doubt that Indigenous peoples of Australia have really strong capability to have these conversations. But given the current context in this nation, particularly around the yes vote and things of that nature, I'd love to ask whether you think that there is capacity for Indigenous peoples to be in the internet governance space at the moment. And what the biggest kind of road block you see in there way of that engagement might be and what the solutions could be in that space?

>> There's a lot of talk about cultural overload. What I prefer to call colonial overload. But I absolutely think we have the capacity, as well as the capability. And we need to reach wider. People who say they're culturally overloaded are people who don't necessarily have the full connection to community. And when Universities Australia brought out the directive to embed Indigenous value systems, perspectives and knowledges within the university, across the university and within the curriculum, immediately I saw that as way to build capacity for our communities to come forward and to assist non-indigenous peoples to understand what that means, what are Indigenous value systems. And I thought there's great enterprise here for us to be able to think about building businesses that can guide people to do this the right way. But people who haven't got a lived experience of living in community and have that communal, so they might have lived as assimilated person, their entire lives, and maybe their parents as well, and generations, won't necessarily have that way of thinking. So they think it's up to them to do it all. I remember saying to a young group of engineers what business is that of yours doing the reconciliation action plan? When they didn't have any lived experience as an Aboriginal person. And there are businesses out there that actually do that. Aboriginal businesses that do this. So why not get your organisation to get them to do it and you get on with the business of being a really deadly Aboriginal engineer and learn what it means to be an Aboriginal person, as well as a great engineer.

>> And we don't have anything to reconcile.

>> It's a non-indigenous person's role to reconcile. But the thing that's standing in the way, finances, structural racism, are not knowing and not willing to be courageous. Courageous conversations is really important. I'm not a person, I don't want to be an angry person. I really don't. I've spent 30 years being, attempting to be a better person. Because I don't want to carry anger through my life or share that to people. I might come across as being assertive or overassertive but I think it's important to be bold in this space. My father used to tell me all the time to be quiet because he was a man who liked to sit back because he suffered a lot of racism and he was very dark skinned. I follow the skin of my mother, my Irish blood. So I'm very lucky in the sense of I'm very privileged with my skin colour and I've also suffered the other way too. But I have suffered many things in my life and I think it's really important to be kind, generous, and courageous and have these conversations and I think we all need to be that way. And I don't want to blame anyone for anything. And I've got a lot too I could blame people for. But I think it's important to engage and move on and let's work together to do this.

>> Also localising stuff as well. We need to build capacity too. There is capacity but there's the overcolonial load that a lot of people have to do as well. So I think it's about building capacity. Do the hard work. Actually bring people in and look after mob and actually, a lot of it and validate people and their lived experiences and their actual qualification to do the work. There's this idea of there's no capacity but you're not allowing, you're not creating the safe space for this mob either. So there's so much to it. I think it's money and resources also.

>> The big thing is we don't have generational wealth. We don't have - I rent two houses because I can't live where my husband and I want to live. Where he does, he's permculture and all of that sort of thing. I live in Brisbane and we rent two houses. We don't own a house. My family don't, my sister owns a house. But she's always worked in the government. I worked in private business where I didn't get the same super. I have a really small super. Ridiculous things. My husband has always worked for himself, so he doesn't have super. Just things that are really different. I'm in my 60s. And I've always wanted to own my little space. But I hope I will one day. I have submitted a PhD. Maybe I'll get a pay rise.

>> But there's also, there's something that I call cultural jealousy. In mainstream society, Aboriginal culture is very attractive because there's a joke that Australia doesn't have any culture. So that is very difficult for people to give up any agency that they have from the mainstream in the Aboriginal space. And there's a lot of blocking that goes on. There's a lot of exclusion. And that is a form of abuse that people enact on Aboriginal people in this space. They'll be very threatened by people who are educated and who are on the same playing field as them.

>> Thank you. Good questions.

>> I'm a science communicator and I grew up on country. I'll have to squat actually. I was real interested in what you said about land-based understandings of the internet and about your secure computer with all of the knowledge on it and how you're going to build an AI from that and I'd be real interested to hear about any structural or logical things that you imagined for the internet in the future that would help protect knowledge. Whether that is play-based certificate or having servers or data on country. Anything in a technical sense that would help to protect people and knowledge?

>> I see all of those things. I just wrote something very early this morning, an email about data centres or knowledge hubs we call them, on country. But I also see that we're looking in to whether it is digital rights management or NFTs or something along the lines of block chain anyway. Around identifying where knowledge originated from? But associating some sort of perpetual royalties back to the community in which it came from. That's my heart. That's where I real want to make sure people are getting paid for their knowledge. Every time it's replicated, when Jen talks about an image that's shared, I want to see that's someone shared, my cousin, one of my cousins shared an image and I could right click and find out where turidginated from. Everyone was posting on Facebook what a beautiful photo, it is so reminiscent of NAIDOC. I'm like, "This was painted in India by some Indian woman. What are you talking about? What a load of rubbish." How can that be? Where is country in this? And I could see it and that's why I right clicked because I thought there is nothing Aboriginal in this other than dots. And I'm not from dots country. I'm from wavy lines and straight lines, whatever lines you want, that's us. We're not dots. I can see how art has been, you know, everyone thinks dots is Aboriginal. And it's not. Dots is from a very particular place on this continent. Aboriginal people can see the land in the painting. It's just like we can see the land in the internet. And we can see it in the governance structures. We spent so much time observing nature. I know I did and my father taught me to do that. So what we can see in systems. It's what we can see in everything. And so when I can see those patterns, we need to find pathways back to the community. Back to country. Back to that. All of those things need to find their way back.

>> Thank you. It's time, everyone. I wanted to thank all three of you. This has been a really interesting session. I hope this is the start of the conversation and it will stay as part of the IGF community. This is the place where we have the conversations between what's happening in the governance of the internet and governance of things that happen on the internet. IGF is the place to have those conversations brought together. So thank you. This has been a fascinating session. And just everyone please thank

>> Hi, everybody. It is 11:32 Eastern Standard Time, 11:33. I think I'll give it one more minute in the audience here in Melbourne nor people to arrive. We did run slightly over in the session before morning tea but I will get going in just under two minutes. Bear with us, please, those of you who are with us online.

>> If there's anyone from outer or anyone from AURGF could they let me know who the online moderator is for today's session or if you are online already if you can identify yourself. OK, we have an online moderator turning up in just a moment. I might just welcome those of you that have joined online. Thank you very much for your participation, and attendance online. It's always much more difficult that be being physically here in Melbourne. Providing a little bit of running commentary. We haved that a very little pumpkin fritata for morning tea and a jam biscuit which is probably why people are not coming back in. I will get going about now. My name is Sandra Davy, and I will be the moderator for the session that we have on this morning around digital rights and responsibilities. The challenge of online safety, and I have two of my free panellists here physically in Melbourne, and I will - we will be joined by Jenny online, who'll be participating virtually with us. I would like to just set the scene and give a little bit of an overview before we get into this. 1 -- it is 11:356789 we will be calling it just before 1:30 today. The frame forget the conversation that wear having today is around digital rights and responsibilities, the challenge of online safety. Online safety requires the balancing of that can often be in conflict. For example, the safety of children and young people, privacy, security and much more. How might we spike this balance in 2025 and beyond? I'd like to introduce my panellists and for the online moderator can we convert more that we can see Jenny and that our third panellist has joined us online. On my far right over here - Jenny, hi, you look fabulous, thank you, we can see you now. It's lovely to welcome you variety I'll start with you. We have Jenny Duxbery from online, the director of policy of regulatory affairs and research at the digital industry group, also known as DIGI. She brings a wealth of international experience across both the legal and policy space, and today will be bringing an industry perspective into our conversation. Immediately here on my right is Kiki Fong-Lim, and Kiki is a public interest technologist. She's also the vice chair of the electronic frontiers Australia. Kiki's bringing a civil society perspective into today's discussion. And over on my far right we have Deborah Welsh who is the executive manager of strategy engagement and research from the eSafety Commissioner's office, and Deborah will be share a government perspective. We've got a really nice cross section of perspectives for this topic. I don't really need to repeat the protocols of the last day and a half. But just in brief the aulGF Code of Conduct is upon the to us ask -- us and is at the hard of how we please pay attention to that. For nose online we'd love to see your first name and last I'm and name, and for those requesting a question -- asking a question in the physical audience or online if you could let us know your full name and where you're coming from or the organisation you're representing or employed by, that would be awesome. Let's kick this thing off. I want to give - the format is a few minutes for each of the panellists, five minutes to set the scene, share some overarching thoughts. I'm going to pose one or two questions just to get the conversation going but I'd be super keen to hear from the audience here in the room and equally from online. So, please think about some questions as we start to shape up this conversation. Jenny, I'd love you to kick us off. Just sort of pos sitting again that online safety requires the balancing of rights that can often be in conflict, the safety of children, young people, privacy, security and much more. How might we think about striking this balance in 2025? Jenny, perhaps some opening remarks from you and then I'd like to come back to the physical audience and kick over to Deborah. Over to you, Jenny, please.

>> JENNY DUXBERY: Thank you very much for that introduction, and it's great to be here today. Talking about such an interesting topic. I'd say at the outset that it's worth noting that how we think and discuss rights in an Australian public policy context is really connected to our legal and political framework and our particular social environment. So if we were going to be having this discussion in the United States or if we were discussing this topic in Europe, we'd probably be focusing on legal rights. Rights that an individual can actually enforce under legal and constitutional frameworks. So, famously, the very basic foundations of the United States political system as expressed in the Declaration of Independence rests on the idea na all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights and amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We know that the founders of the United States drew up a constitution based on those sort of principles and that included a bill of rights which was later interpreted to include additional rights like the rights to privacy, enforceable by individuals. So o in Australia, we have a very different relationship to rights. Our constitution is very mechanical. We have very few individual rights and those that we have are actually quite weak, such as the right to a jury trial for an indictable offence, which can be easily avoided by just making sure criminal offences are described as not indite obviously offences. As citizens we don't even have a right to reside in our own country. However, this doesn't mean that rights don't matter tore us. They matter a great deal. They are the very essence of many political debates including debates about safety and security, whether that's offline or online. So, for example, when the government published its exposure draft of the regulate mis- and disinformation it receive unprecedented number of submissions, many of which expressed concerns about how it would restrict Australians' rights to agree Dom of speech. So, in very high - highly polarised political debates it often does seem like these rights are in conflict. So, for example, in debates about the extent that digital platforms should take proactive detection to detect and remove harmful materials online the rights of adults and children to be safe and secure online can also seem to be in conflict with other rights like freedom of expression and privacy. Very often when we frame our arguments about these sort of contentious policy issues we tend to do so in quite absolute terms. So we either have privacy or we can have security, we can't have both. But, the thing about rights is that they are never absolute. They are always relative, and most importantly different people have different views about what rights mean, and this evolves over different eras. So, to take an example from another safety oriented policy space, at the beginning of aviation, at the turn of the centuries, flying on aircraft was a very highly risky activity that was undertaken by pioneer aviators. It wasn't a form of public transport. And so safety in that era was really focused on preventing a plane from crashing and injuring civilians on the ground and not on protecting passengers who flew at their own risk. So, the way that I like to think about rights in policy debates including online safety is it's often very much an argument about what rights mean and which of those interpretations should be given priority. I think of this as less a balancing exercise as a juggling exercise, or you could say an exercise in reaching workable, pragmatic compromises and trade-offs. So, to give an example of an issue in the online policy space, where this arises, industries -- industry's currently working on the development of enforceable codes if they're registered under the online safety act, and these codes aim to regulate a range of materialless write restricted to adults under the national classification scheme including online pornography, and materialless that advocate or instruct in self-harm, eating disorders and suicide. These codes have been released to the public they're out for public consultation. And one of the questions we have asked stakeholders is to think about the rights that have been factors into the design of the codes including consideration of young people's safety, security and privacy. Have we done that in a way that, you know, people think works? So, in relation to online pornography, there is a need to arrive at a compromise about the policy objective which is to prevent children and young people under the age of 18 from accessing and being exposed to foreign to pornography. Now, we also need to think about right the rights of citizens to privacy and security, and equality of access to digital spaces and also the rights, of adults to read and see and hear lawful material. So, where these rights become intention in these debates has a lot do with the expectations of government and regulatory bodies about the particular measures that will be implemented to achieve the objective. So, for example, implementing measures around age assurance that would -- require users to provide personal data, personal data which some more disadvantaged people may not have, and also implementing measures to detect and remove this material from online environments, potentially very private environments like email services or messaging services. So I think it's really important to acknowledge in these debates there's not necessarily a right or wrong answer to the question. And that these debates -- and these issues actually touch on values that we all share as human beings. We all want to be safe and secure online. We all value our privacy and we all value our personal freedom. So, the key to these pore debates is actually having a really good policy process -- polarisation -- hallised. Having debates in an open and transparent manner and also encourage willings as many people as possible with diverse interests and diverse perspectives to participate in these debates. -- polarised. That's probably - that's probably a good place to conclude.

>> Yeah, thank you. A lot of great opening remarks, thanks, Jenny. And if I could perhaps pass to Deborah now for some opening remarks.

>> DEBOARAH WELSH: Thank you. Is that - yep, you can hear me. Thank you, sand remarks it's great to be on a panel request Jenny and Kiki. For everyone my name's Deborah Welsh, time executive manager of strategy engagement and research at the office of the eSafety Commissioner. For those that don't know us eSafety is Australia's online regulator. We were established in 2015 as children's eSafety Commissioner with a specific remit around children's online safety. Over the last and past nine years our remit has expanded to cover online safety for all Australians with a new online safety act coming into force in 2022. The act is currently being independently reviewed to ensure et cetera fit for purpose for online harms that we face today. It's due to government this week so it's fair to say it's a dynamic space na we work in. In terms of your question, Sandra, about balancing the rights I think there's a number of fundamental and often competing rights at play online and it's incumbent upon us all to find ways to balance and protect them. For us at eSafety one vital consideration stands out: The right that we have all to be safe online which can lead to fulfilment of a range of rights like our right to participation and our right to freedom of expression. It's fundamentally important we have a voice both in the real world and online. But it just can't be those with the loud voices who hold the biggest mega phones who are heard at the expense of others. For example f a person experiences discrimination on social media through bully organise hateful comments it may negatively impact their emotional and mental health. It this could make their participation in online spaces more imagine and challenging and they nay and maybe less less likely to participate fat -- in the fuller term. It's not just their rights but it's also about their right to fully exercise their participation online. At eSafety we have seen when online discourse veers into abuse, hatred, misogyny and violence. It can have a violencing on the person or group on the receiving end which ultimately impinges on their fundamental right to have their voice heard and exist online free from such abuse. A parallel can be drawn with another fundamental right we all expect and deserve, which is privacy online. But we all need to acknowledge the fact there are those who choose to misuse measures designed to protect privacy to avoid harm and sexual abuse of children. The sheer volume of sexual exploitation and abuse material on the internet has reached epidemic proportions and I think we'd all agree more needs to be done by government, industry and at the comment level to tackle this. This might include looking a nut new technology, a greater deployment of existing technologies that preserve privacy while protecting the right children, live with dignity and free from sexual abuse. I think this an easy problem to solve we would have done it. I don't think in Australia we have all the answers butts it's an important conversation to be having and a conversation and panel discussions like these that may find lasting solutions. It's critical safeguards co-exist with freedoms and we believe alleviating online harm bolster human rights onlinement N relationship between human rights and online safety no single right transcends another. The future lies in a approach to regulation that respects all human rights. This involves government, regulators, businesses, service providers cooperating to protect online harm and enhance user safety and awe ton Myf while allowing freedom of expression to thrive. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Thank you very much, Deborah. Let's go to you, Kiki.

>> KIKI FONG-LIM: Look, is that OK? Can you hear me? Thank you up the look and back of the loom and room. Look, it's interesting that we have these discussions and I'm pleased and terrified to be on the panel with DIGI and the eSafety Commissioner 'cause I guess, you know, Jenny, you spoke about this contentious thing around safety, freedom of expression and privacy, you spoke about juggling. You've spoken about this balancing F this notion of privacy and safety and security for me, I don't see them as separate, you know know when we speak about rights and responsibilities as well, I think it's really important that we just come back a little bit - take a little bit of a step back. I just wanted to start by encouraging everyone to think about the concepts that we're talking about here. Privacy is always going to be contested. The nature of privacy is very personal. It's where we set our boundary between our personal sphere and public sphere. Totally unrelated but if you're interested in anth apology and lock picking there's some really great stuff around the history of where our society changed, from collective to individualist and setting those boundaries. Knowing that privacy is going to be contested I think it's something we can move forward a little bit from. Knowing that the freedom of expression, those type of arguments we have had a lot, even if we go back to the net things online recordings, there's some really great stuff there. Safety and security, both a psychological state, a feeling, am I TAFE? Am I secure? As well as a reality. Am I actually protected from harm? Are the things that I want protected actually protected? Safety and security. Privacy safety and security I don't see as separate if you don't feel safe f you don't feel secure, you know, in terms of your - in terms of that boundary, you know - we just need to understand that this is personal. It is not an online onset. Where we talk about rights and responsibilities, I just - Jenny, I'm really glad you mentioned the US context. In Australia it is different. We don't have a national human rights affect it does make it more difficult for individuals to taking action or for - I don't know, these are questions for my panellists perhaps, whether or not the options to explore experimentally are constrained because, you know - or are they, in fact, stepping over the line because we don't have the human rights act, you know, that we can - when we say, "What are our rights that we have? "A human rights act would define that. We are UN members. The hole GDC, everything that we are doing now, we've been focusing in in internet governance space about the UN. We have the UN convention for the rights of the child. We have the declaration of human rights of which we are a signatory, that is different from having a national human rights act. So, balancing those individual rights and considering those notions of privacy and safety and security personally, I believe in - individually we should all have agency and the means to decide what we consider and how we maintain those boundaries and that's offline or online. We should have the right to be informed about to practises of platforms in relation to their online activities, how we engage and what we are willing to do. Collectively, whatever stakeholders we have for this model in internet governance extends beyond that when we're talking about child sexual exploitation and abuse. But we all have a responsibility to keep focused on the best interests of the child. And in the context of making regulation or putting in place initiatives it is prioritising research that combines both academic integrity in conjunction with victim -- victim-survivors and their net of informal and -- formal informal supports. It's about learning from the past and recognising that abuse happens in our institutions and people with power, and we can learn from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. So, what is it that we're addressing here when we talk about child safety? I think that's good to be framed because, you know, you've just raised a lot of things there around, you know, the relational - between skids a -- kids and bullying and their experiences for participation, and participation is so important for us as a democratic nation. I hate the idea that people who have been discriminated against potentially are going to be not participating in those platforms in the future. I know what it feels like and I didn't glow to grow up with an online platform. So, for use of technology of - on the internet or of the internet or outside of the internet, to facilitate sexual abuse of achild, including production and sharing of child sexual abuse material, I think that we need to understand that the - and acknowledge the vulnerabilities and risks are not very different offline and online. You've raised a variety of things there and online child sexual exploitation, you know, it's a range of behaviours, it's a range of situations. Locally we have some incredible work happening a. I'm lucky enough that one of my colleagues at the university I work at is involved in a project called project barra dime. They have -- paradigm. They have a luge amount of research on their website, I highly recommend going there. Done by reach out IFYS, the university and others O what we're talking here is grooming, live streaming, the consumption of child sexual abuse material, the coercion and blackmailing of children for sexual purposes and financial gain. We see that, you know, locally. Project paradigm is concerned with South East Queensland, sex trafficking that happens there. When I was working over 10 years with the coalition of community board we were talking about localised sex trafficking in Western Sydney. There are some amazing work that is happening in our region in India, Asia-Pacific, which I encourage people to engage with on the APRA IGF streams. I won't go into that now but it is consistently talking about how children and parents are not prepared. They are hugely underestimating the negative experiences that their children can find themselves in, they're not prepared to understand the complexity of grooming that happens either through a relational, I guess, process or through leveraging opportunities for work to entice people to go to various areas where they're then exploited.

>> You can see me, can't you?

>> I can see you. I can see you. There is also some -- some fantastic research that I have been engaged with by the uni of NSW, the Australian human rights institute and... Social services. I think it was released late last year on identifying and understanding child sexual offending behaviours and attitudes amongst Australian men. We know there are - we now know there's certainly protimes of usage, we know there's certain profiles of behaviours, of family make up, of job and profiles and we know men who are engages in violent sexual online material, it includes bestiality. They're working with children. They're in families, they're active online, they're using encrypted acts a, they're likely using cryptocurrency and they're likely to have been abused as children. That is - it's not everyone but these are the likelies. But what was really interesting in this research is that the focus on men who had sexual feelings towards children but had not offended. That's real important when we're talking about interventions for online safety when it comes to children, that we're not just talking about law enforcement and intelligence as a response to catching offenders. There is a large amount of work that I think we can discuss and as stakeholders we could agree on that would address preventive measures. The - I'll stop there because we'll probably go into some questions where we'll cover that and otherwise I'll post that research. There are so many primary, secondary and tertiary interventions that are supported by research, that is done with academics and victim survivors and that also supports nonoffending partners, that supports people in front-line positions, where disclosures may happen, because disclosures in itself is really difficult. So I guess going back to the original question of the balancing and the juggling, I'm not sure about this because I can't juggle. And maybe because of these glasses, I don't know. We need to be working together on this. We all agree this is a principle that we agree on. And I just wants to reiterate these concepts that when we're talking about online safety, we're talking about offline and talking about the safety and security of our children through protecting their privacy, through empowering people and understanding that victimisation happens through people that are close to them on the ground.

>> Thank you. I would like to encourage both the audience here in Melbourne and online to get involved. Can I get an indication from in room if there are any emerging questions? OK. I'll kick-off with a couple of questions. For our online moderator, do we have anything coming through on the Q+A at this stage? No. OK. Let's unpack a little then around just how complex and subjective these issues are, particularly if they require value judgements to be made. And sometimes our values are aligned and other times they're intentioned. But we then make choices, perhaps often prioritising one key value over the other. I'm curious to hear from the panellists about how do we navigate online environments or navigate these tensions? Do you have insights in the policy work that you've done around navigating these particularly sensitive areas where we're talking about a lot of things that are subjective? Perhaps, Deborah, if I kick off with you and then to Jenny?

>> DEBORAH WELSH: You're right, there are value judgements. As a regulator we are bound by the act that we're given. The online safety act. When you think about things such as - and we-a few different regulatory levers, Jenny spoke about the codes and standards, you spoke about transparency being really important and we have a-a basic online standard. The vin complaints schemes and this one here, while there is value judgements in general life and in general policymaking, this one bounds by it and if it reaches the threshold and considered a safety net for Australians and they are things like online bullying, adult cyber abuse, image-based abuse and pro terror and extremist content. If it reaches the thresholds of that we would work with the social media companies. After you've reported with them, we will work with them. If it hits their terms of service or hits our thresholds for legislation to remove that content. I agree there's value judgements but when it comes to being a regulator, we're constrained or not even constrained but confined by the act and what our thresholds are under that.

>> Jenny, thoughts?

>> JENNIFER DUXBURY: Yes. And I definitely understand that perspective having worked for a safety regulator myself. I worked in the field of aviation on civil aviation regulation. When you work for a safety regulator, safety is your priority value. It's kind of baked into everything that you do. You still have to make value judgements because you have to interpret your statutory mandate but you are in a slightly different perspective than someone who is involved in a policy debate as an advocate or as a member of the public. I just wanted to give an example of how these rights do come in to tension, and to give you a sense of why value judgements do need to be made. From a child's right perspective, you might say it would be a good thing to introduce measures to proactively detect and remove pornography from private communication services that are widely used by people of all ages of the community, including whether they're encrypted. That might seem like a good thing. Or alternatively, you put in place measures where you require people to verify their age online and then joust detect and re -- just detect and remove that material from the accounts of children. That could be one way of dealing with this issue. That might sound great from a child rights perspective. But if I'm a survivor of technology facilitated domestic abuse, my partner has hacked into my messaging or email accounts or had me under surveillance by various means my own home, I might have very legitimate concerns about any measures that would require my account to be scanned and viewed by a technology provider. If I was sex worker, I also might be concerned that prohibitions on using a platform for the purposes of pornography would force me to work on the streets. And then I'd become extremely unsafe. So it really depends when you're looking at a particular policy issue, it really depends on the context on what the measure is that's being proposed to deal with the policy problem and where you stand. So the example I've just given I think shows different stakeholders will have legitimate differences of opinion about online safety measures. So the key to arriving at a workable compromise is actually, as I said, to get as many voices in the room as possible to make very transparent as to what those voices are. Ideally to provide opportunities where stakeholders can actually have and engage in an active dialogue with each other, so that they can share those perspectives and people can understand the complexity of the problem. Once you understand the complexity of a problem, you're kind of halfway to working out what a workable compromise might be. That is with any complicated policy issue. You need time. You need the time to be able to think about all of the different options, interrogate those solutions, and ultimately, as I said, what you might arrive at will not be a perfect solution because I don't think there are perfect policy solutions but it will be ideally a solution that people can live with.

>> Any thoughts?

>> I will take a slightly different approach to where we apply our value judgements and that's where our understanding of the trade-offs and who we are trading things off with? It's hard to have these discussions. When we're talking about child safety, we want children to be the focus. So it becomes hard to discuss any other cohorts that may be harmed unintentionally and you mentioned previously sex workers and there's some really great discussions on the previous recordings. But that's our digital rights defenders and domestically and within our region. But also when we're talking about values, I think there's a disconnect with what an offender actually looks like. I think there's a very limited view and the research I mentioned earlier also talks to that. This notion that family is always a safe space is not always a safe space. There's even, there's value judgements in how we distribute our public resources. And that is really important that we and totally agree, we need to open up this discussion. We need to be able to get more people involved in our democratic processes so that our regulation reflects our community norms or our community will. It does me when people say I don't care about this anymore because that is very problematic. But also I think there's value judgements in the expectation of the type of education and preventative things that we need. I'm going to float the milk shake consent ad as a slightly tangental example of a government produced education piece that was totally inappropriate. It was pulled shortly after. If you don't know what that is, please Google it or YouTube it. Whatever you do. But we really need to be considering that whatever our differences in values, the research is showing what people need and we need to be honest and have direct upfront information available to people, to individual users, to young people about what they're going to be experiencing, what they need to be watching out for, how to handle new situations. Understand the long and complex process of grooming and how that occurs. For parents, the research from Project Paradigm is showing they are completely underprepared for the risk that their children are going to be facing. When I talk about distribution of public resources, we talk about what should be detected and removed? Very difficult decisions. But there are absolutely things. I'd like to be able to report content. So just to clarify, this doesn't all, I'm not talking just on social media platforms where content is shared, messaging, transactional-type things, butpen PornHub a known site for revenge porn and a gateway to more violent material and also different avenues to engage with illegal child abuse. But yet super difficult to report. And content moderation, trust and safety teams, need to be appropriately funded to be able to do content reviews quickly so those negtevfects for some of those other cohorts of people can also be addressed. So I guess those value judgements probably lesser in kind of the regulatory space that I'm considering, but the overall how we, how we actually do the do and increase our ability to address this problem and a problem that existed before the internet, as we go further into the internet. And beyond child abuse, it would be a shame that people are not engaging in those platforms because they are really great sites of amazing things.

>> Jenny, I wouldn't mind back to you and talking about great process again. You mentioned many voices in the room making transparent voices, providing opportunities to engage in active dialogue. And it got me thinking do any of the panellists have a recent example of where the policy process was really great? Forgive me, I'm not involved in the policy process often these days but I do recall from the past you would submit a long document in, and you may or may not ever hear back, has the process changed? Are there really good examples of where we do have the voices in the room? Here is one platform potentially an example, but I'd love to hear from panellists, any recent examples of where policy and the policy process has been really fantastic because it ticks a number of ingredients for great policy development?

>> I could start. This is about our age verification roadmap. And this doesn't necessarily go to the age assurance trial at the moment. I'll touch on that a bit later. This is about the, this was parliamentary committee who asked e Safety to look into kid's access to pornography. The reason I'm touching on this of what I think is a good process is I think that we had all the voices in the room such as Jenny was talking. We had our child advocates and heard from them and had the people who, sorry, the adult workers. And we had everybody in between. We did huge stakeholder consultation and we also did a install trial of technology that was available. What we prepared and provided to government, this was 18 months ago, was a roadmap that was in my view, it was age considerate. It evolved. What you would want a child or don't want a child that is four years old seeing versus what a child or a young adult who is 16 to 18 viewing and seeking out is very different. So we did a huge range of consultation and did a bunch of research and did the technology trial and what we prepared to government was it was a recommendation to do a trial of technology. We didn't want to mandate it in the first instance because we wanted to test it a little bit more. It was a range of complimentary measures and they included really big areas in education and a lot in research as well. Of course, you probably heard more recently there is a trial. Government e safety isn't running that but that was sort of, this was the process that happened 18 months ago.

>> JENNIFER DUXBURY: I might jump in here because I would actually agree that the result, the end result of that process was a really good one. I think the age verification roadmap is an excellent piece of work. It does highlight some of the complexities around the issue. I think the research that was done in support of the roadmap was also incredibly useful and valuable and we're finding it very useful as we work through the issues in relation to the next round of online safety codes to protect children from pornography and other harmful content. I probably would have a few tips for e safety on how you might improve the stakeholder consultation that fed into that but I'll keep those to myself for the moment. I'm going to talk about something that I have learnt on the journey of doing codes work. And it's been a key learning for me. When I started doing code development, it was around the contentious issue of disand misinformation and now in online safety, and many people said to me don't get all of the stakeholders in the room in a round table. You need to divide the stakeholders and keep like groups together. And that happens a lot in government consultation. So you put the industry people in one room, you put the child safety advocates in another, you put the academics in another room. So what you get then is people pretty much singing from the same song sheet and they don't necessarily have an opportunity for dialogue. So what we experimented with when we developed the disinformation code, and we are, we also did this when we were developing the phase one codes and I'm hopeful we may do it for phase two, but we did take the approach of having round tables where we put really diverse perspectives in a room. And I was really scared when we did that. And people kept on warning me, it's just going to be a huge fight. And you will lose control. And it just won't work out. But actually it worked incredibly well. From the first one I did which was around disinformation, you could see kind of like little light bulbs going off. And people going, "Wait a minute, that is a valid alternative perspective." And that's why I'm saying that kind of process I think, it is important because it gives you an empathy for other people's perspective. Then you start to say actually, maybe what's right and wrong here isn't as clear as I thought. And it can help you on the pathway for bringing people along the journey towards a compromise solution.

>> It reminds me the very notion of the IGF, the multi-stakeholder process and model being that the heart of it being to bring diverse perspectives and different segments together. It also, it's a reinforcement your example there in a completely different industry that I work in, where it is now evidence-based that multi-disciplinary cross-functional teams are much, much, much more effective than a group of people of like-minded views. So I know that's a terrific example. We have a question from the audience. Two questions from the audience which is awesome. Can we please start with raising and then we'll go to Kate. In the room here in Melbourne we have Jordan Carter from auDA.

>> JORDAN: Hi. Thank you for the very interesting panel. I guess it's really a question for the eSafety and it won't bow a scary question. Don't worry. What would be the barriers for you in fostering that kind of really open multi-stakeholder dialogue in the work that you do? Or even are there any such barriers? Or would you say it is the style that the commission uses at the moment?

>> I would say a bit of a mix there. It depends on which body of work you're talking about. When it comes with the codes and standards, they're industry led. So the things that Jenny is talking about and that kind of model is being led by that area. I think some of the work that I talked about in terms of the age verification roadmap, where we're asked to do things that from government, I think we do a pretty good job. Jenny has tips on me from stakeholder consultation. We didn't run the same model Jenny mentioned. I probably had a view similar to the people who were saying it would be a dog's breakfast but it might be a model that would be useful in future. A lot of what would require stakeholder consultation for us, putting aside the research and the education arm we do consult with, is led by a policy agency. So the department of communications. So thins like the review of the online safety act, consultation on children's access to social media. All those things are led by that department and I couldn't comment on that. When it comes to our research, we do lots of different consultation and go through lots of different ethics processes. And in terms of our education arm, we have lots of different stakeholders that we talk to. We're starting to do some work with the behavioural economics team in the Prime Minister in cabinet to get a sense of what might work from what they do?

>> JORDAN: Thank you for the answer. From our point of view, as sort of internet governance practitioners, the difference between consultation and engagement and a multi-stakeholder development process, seems to be that it forces people out of their no compromise zones and it sort of suggests implicitly if people won't agree to the solution then there isn't going to be a solution and it can help make sure that the solutions are genuinely workable and genuinely force a trade-off or a balancing approach. So it's not quite the same thing and maybe a bit of a brain explosion to sort of think about it. But auDA talks a lot about the importance of multi-stakeholder process, not because it's some kind of totem but in the areas we use them they genuinely seem to work better in the long run. Something for us all to think about in the contentious policy areas I think.

>> Really quickly on that. Consultation where we're talking about community feedback through some of the specialist groups on ground, through civil society groups, may look different from our view. Just because we have participated doesn't mean necessarily that we've had the time or resources to participate meaningfully and on an ongoing basis. I am concerned about some of the outcomes and I think that we also through this need to continue to be mindful of our overarching system of government and the disparity of those, the different areas of responsibility and make sure we're getting the mix right and not just concentrating power on that just through various areas of focus. And largely the people who are working on the ground, that is their priority. The platforms play want safety but it's not their priority. Governments also have various mandates and we have discussed this previously in IGFs and there's so much on it and meaningful engagement and meaningful outcomes needs to change. I don't believe that it is as successful as it could be and again I'll go back to resourcing and where we distribute those resources.

>> Thank you. A question from the audience. We have two. We'll go to Kate first. If you could let us know who you are.

>> Kate, a consumer advocate and digital rights advocate. I think Kiki has partially pre-answered. I agree that things like child sexual abuse have been around for a very long time and the internet did not invent it but I think we can probably all agree there's a certain amount of scale that digital platforms in particular facilitate that means that the harms go wider and broader and happen much faster and are much more difficult to combat because of the onlineless of that type of harm. So my question is about platform accountability and particularly when we were talking about values alignment and this is where Kiki has answered it. When we're talking about dig tit platforms - and I'll include in this not strictly social media, but PornHub and other online forums - they're essentially profit driven. Where are the limits of what our values alignment might be as a community and as a society? Is there a disincentive for these profit-driven platforms to be truly accountable and actually motivated to make good judgements? Have we reached the limits of industry-led codes in dealing with this issue? What might it look like to instead have community-led codes or that true where all the voices at the table are equal? That's my question for the panel.

>> I'll refer you to the $1 Safe Rides initiative by Uber that provided no additional safety but a huge amount of money. I'll just go with that. Over to the other panellists.

>> Sure. I'll go next. So I think what if comes back to for e safety and I'd agree the trust and safety teams never in our view are big enough and they don't prioritise trust and safety. One of the biggest initiatives e safety has done is safety by design. It's not part of our regulatory schemes. I'll let Jenny touch on the codes. But it's safety by design and building in the safety features from the beginning. And we do a range of work and we have done one recently on a bespoke product with safety by design and done one also on gaming. And then we'll be doing others as generative AI is the next one, looking at the different things. We kind of agree that they don't have big enough teams but building in the safety measures from the start would alleviate some of those problems.

>> JENNIFER DUXBURY: I don't think that platforms, commercial interests are necessarily inconsistent with safety. There are many industries and I would say this industry is no different where providing a safe experience to their users is fundamentally part of doing business. It's not a, you can't have a successful business unless you can provide a safe environment for people. So in the same way, that's true of aviation and true of the nuclear power industry and there are many industries, the mining industry, where it's imperative to have both of those things top of mind. In relation to codes, as an industry, we don't have a view. So I think we are often misrepresented as advocating for self-regulation or co-regulation or a particular way of coming up with good legislative solutions. We're agnostic as to what is the best approach. One of the advantages of codes is obviously that you do get the technical experience of industry brought to bear on these thorny problems. It's not the only way of going about it. Whatever the approach is, and this goes to what Jordan was saying, whatever the approach is, I think of a good process are very much -- elements of a good process are very much the same and people really feel they have the opportunity to not only express their views but they are listened to. but they are listened to. And those views are given due consideration is, you know, is really important in getting the best possible outcomes.

>> Thank you, Jenny. I'm sorry, Kiki. I'm conscious of time. I hate running over time, certainly when there's just food between us and wrapping up. But I would 'cause I promised the third question from the audience. We might do the last question and we'll try and keep it tight and I'll get you out of here in a few minutes.

>> Thank you very much. I'm from the internet society accessibility group. Followenen -- following on from the discussion about the multi-stakeholder process, I'm interested in - from the point of view of victim with disabilities. Women with disabilities Australia have done previous research talking about abuse of women with disabilities, and it's on a large scale, and that could very well be reflected on the on-Lion Air ya as well. So, I'm wondering, from the eSafety Commissioner, has there been discussion about -- from the on-Lion Air ya as well. Has there been discussion about women with disability and people with has there been regard to harm online (SECOND QUESTION N REGARD TO THAT TECHNOLOGY PLATFORM YOU MENTIONED, HAS THAT BEEN DESIGNED WITH ACCESSIBILITY FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITY IN MIND SO THAT THEY CAN GAIN BENEFIT FROM THOSE RESOURCES? THANK YOU.

>> SORRY O I HAVE TO GET CLARIFICATION OF THE SECOND QUESTION. WITH THE - DID YOU MEAN THE TECH FACILITATED GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE?

>> YES.

>> THAT'S ACTUALLY A RESOURCE. THAT'S NOT ACTUALLY A PLATFORM. THIS IS SAFETY BY DESIGN, IT'S A RESOURCE THAT WE PROVIDE TO - PROVIDE ACCESSIBLY ON OUR INTERNET SO PLATFORM - AND WE DO ENGAGEMENT SO PLATFORMS CAN UNDERSTAND THE SAFETY FEATURES THEY COULD BUILD INTO THEIR PLATFORM TO PROTECT FACILITATE -- FACILITATED GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE. WOMEN WITH DISABILITY, YES, WE HAVE A -- I HAVE A WHOLE RESEARCH TEAM IN MY BRANCH. WE WILL BE DOING SOME MORE RESEARCH INTO DISABILITY LATER THIS YEAR - PROBABLY NEXT YEAR NOW, BUT IT IS COMING DOWN THE PIPELINE. I WOULD SAY WE ARE VERY WELL AWARE THAT WHETHER IT'S DISABILITY OR MARGINALISED GROUPS IN WHATEVER FORM THEY ARE, DISPROPORTIONATITY AFFECTED ONLINE. THERE IS A BUNCH OF RESOURCES THAT WE HAVE IN OUR EDUCATION SPACE. I HAVE TO CHECK WHETHER IT ACTUALLY GOES TO WOMEN WITH DISABILITY. IT DOES. I'M GETTING NODS NOT AUDIENCE, IT GOES TO WOMEN WITH DISABILITY. I'M SHEEP AND HAPPY TO SHARE WITH YOU AFTERWARDS AS WELL IF YOU'D LIKE.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU BOTH. ONE QUICK WHIP AROUND. PUTTING JENNY ON THE - YOU'VE DONE SUCH A GREAT JOB ONLINE. I'LL KICK OFF WITH YOU. THERE'S ONE -- THERE'S ONE THING FROM EACH OF YOU, YOU'VE GOT LESS THAN 30 SECONDS. SHARE YOUR PIECE OF GOLD THAT YOU WOULD LIKE THE AUDIENCE TO TAKE AWAY WITH. JENNY, WE'LL KICK OFFER WITH YOU.

>> JENNY DUXBERY: WHAT I WOULD LOVE TO SEE IS GOVERNMENT BE WILLING TO EXPERIENCE -- EXPERIMENT A LITTLE BIT WITH THE POLICY PROCESSES THAT IT ADOPTS AND I'D A LOVE TO SEE AN EXPERIMENT IN THE ONLINE SAFETY FIELD WHERE, YOU KNOW, THE REGULATOR BRINGS TOGETHER DIVERSE STAKE HOLDERS IN A ROUND TABLE ENVIRONMENT TO DISCUSS SOME OF THOSE THORNY POLICY ISSUES.

>> KIKI, I'LL PUT YOU ON THE SPOT.

>> KIKI FONG-LIM: OK. 30 SECONDS. NO. OK, SO, I THINK...

>> ONE THING.

>> KIKI FONG-LIM: WE NEED TO HAVE THESE CONVERSATIONS MORE, WE NEED TO ENCOURAGE MORE PEOPLE TO BE ENGAGED IN THIS BECAUSE THAT IS HOW OUR GOVERNMENT WORKS O IT SHOULD REFLECT OUR COMMUNITY EXPECTATIONS. PLEASE - I WILL PUT THIS - I DON'T KNOW HOW WE PUT THIS STUFF TO THE GROUP, ONLINE OR SOMETHING, THROUGH THE WEBSITE. BUT THE PROJECT PARADIGM, THE IDENTIFYING... CHILD SEX OFFENDING BEHAVIOURS AND ATTITUDES AMONGST AUSTRALIAN MEN. THAT RESEARCH HAVE VERY SOLID RECOMMENDATIONS THAT PLATFORMS CAN MAKE NOW INCLUDING REDIRECT TO SUPPORT SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE WANTING HELP BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE SEXUAL - THEY HAVE THE THOUGHTS BUT THEY HAVEN'T OFFENDED, AND WE CAN DO THAT ABSOLUTELY NOW. ... DOES NOT WORK.

>> THAT'S IT.

>> KIKI FONG-LIM: DOES NOT WORK AND PLATFORMS HAVE BEEN CONSISTENT IN NOT PRIORITISING SAFETY.

>> THANK YOU, KIKI. FINISH WITH DEB

>> DEBOARAH WELSH: TWO QUICK POINTS, PRIVACY, SAFETY AND SECURITY. IF ONE BREAKS WE AULGF FALL OVER. SECOND, SAFETY BEDESIGN. BUILDING IN THE SAFETY FEATURES FROM THE START IS) Paramount.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Deborah, Jenny for joining online and contributing to the conversation. The folks here in the room, thanks again for your participation. Online, we break now for an hour and thanks very much. See you back at 1:30. (LUNCH BREAK) This is a test caption this is a test caption for auIGF

>> ZOE HAWKINS: I will give everybody a minute to take their seats so we can kick off our session. Good afternoon, everyone. A few more people joining us, please take your seats. I am pleased to welcome you to this afternoon's session on supporting security by design through Internet environment. My name is Zoe Hawkins, from the tech policy design center. I am pleased to be moderating this session. Before I introduce our panel, a few house-keeping remarks. Just to remind everybody that we are conducting the auIGF with a friendly code of conduct. Please adhere to the code and we do reserve the right to have unfriendly participation removed as required. I am sure that won't be necessary. We have lots of friendly faces in the room and online. Speaking of the hybrid nature of this event, keen to make sure that everybody online feels included and able to participate but in doing so, log into Zoom using your first name, last name and organization affiliation as well and when we go to questions, which I am hoping we will have time and engagement to do, introduce yourself by name and affiliation before we kick off the conversation. With that I am pleased to introduce the members of the panel. I will start online. We have Michael Wallmannsberger who is dialing in from New Zealand and she from Trust Hound Limited. We have Jordan Newnham from CyberCX and Anne-Louise Brown from the Cyber Security CRC. An excellent panel for our conversation today on security by design. I thought to kick off the conversation, I thought it would be great to give us a level set on the conversation. Security by design can mean a lot of different things to different people. What I will do is throw to each of the panelists to share a bit of an opening, maybe a few minutes to tell us what the concept of security by design means to each of you from the perspective you are coming from and share color to that perspective and background you bring to the conversation. Maybe also to talk about what it isn't? Sometimes defining something is easier to do in the counterfactual. Feel throw in myth-busting as to where you think the conversation can get a little broad. I will throw to Michael who is online first, Michael, do you want to give us your opening remarks on security by design, thank you.

>> MICHAEL WALLMANNSBERGER: Thank you, good afternoon everyone. My perspective is currently I am a cyber security consultant and I work with small clients and large clients in New Zealand mostly, helping them to improve their cyber security. How I to that place was by being firstly a security consultant and enterprise architect for large organizations and a chief security officer. When I think about security by design, it takes me right back to when I was an architect working for a financial services organization and security by design was one of a handful of principles that we really used as our tool set, our stock and trade. What that means to me is that it reflects the observation that if you try and address security early in the life cycle of a product or business process, the cost of doing so will be dramatically cheaper and the outcomes will be much better than if you try and bolt it on at the end. As a consultant, I have seen lots of attempts to bolt security on at the end rather than bake it in from the start. They are usually not particularly successful or particularly elegant. One of the challenges with that is you are not always there at the design of the thing, so we didn't get to be part of the design conversation for the fundamentals of Internet. Sometimes security by design has to be about thinking how you work with what you have got and achieve secure outcomes, when you can't change the fundamental underlying architecture. There are some good techniques for doing that. We can wrap security around things in elegant ways if we think about that at the design point.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: Thanks, Michael. Maybe Anne-Louise Brown do you want to pick that up?

>> ANNE-LOUISE BROWN: I agree with everything Michael said. It was a great summation of what security by design is. In a way, I would almost go the way we are looking at it now, as opposed to we were even two years ago, is actually before something is even built, before it is created, that security is part of that thinking and it is embedded from the moment that that idea actually comes into being. When we're talking about digital products, or digital devices it is a really interesting nexus with the Internet which was never designed with security in mind and we're playing a lot of catch-up there the at moment. The other thing that is evolving in relation to the thinking around security by design is actually it's not just about the device anymore, it is about the people who are using it and how it's used. Right back to where the components that make up that device are produced. It is broad but always at the fundamental level, it's about before something is created, we're thinking about security and we're actually thinking about every element and component that makes that thing up and that will support it through its life cycle.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: Jordan, what do you think?

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: I will steal the analogy around this when it comes to building a house. Without security by design, you are going to end up with a house that has no locks on any of the doors and windows and the materials that have been used have been cheap to use, to get the house built quickly, to get people buying or renting it but those tenants or owners occupies soon find issues around the materials that have been used, the windows fall out and the door doesn't have a lock on it or just sticks and won't open. To play that analogy out, security by design means, not just a bolt-on by building a door that also includes a handle with a lock, but it is actually the materials that have gone into it, that is going to be a secure front door. No-one will kick it open or the wind won't blow it open and I leave the analogy there. I want to rewind because for my sins, I used to be an advisor for the eSafety Commissioner and that is Julie Inman Grant...

>> ZOE HAWKINS: That is where we originally met.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: Good to see you again all these years later. She has been banging the drum on safety by design for her whole tenure and she has been in the job for eight years now. I saw her recently and said "You're doing such a great job with safety by design" and it is now being talked about in the highest level in the OECD and other international forums are getting an idea that safety measures need to be baked into products and services and software and so on from the outset. She said it is only taken me eight years to come an overnight success. That speaks of the fact that this is not a new conversation but it feels like finally it is starting to get some traction. We have seen nine different countries get together, including all of the Five Eyes last year and publish a bench white white paper published in the US around these are the things we think are going to move the needle to get security by design from an aspiration, a philosophy to practical outcomes for end users and companies and anyone who doesn't want to have to deal with security as a bolt-on but has - has - putting some of that pressure back on the designers and manufacturers and creators of the technology we all rely on, it is not going to have inherent vulnerabilities to be exploited or doors left without locks on and that the wind can blow open. I could go on and I think we will anyway. It will be a really good discussion.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: That is great. Your point about this as a conversation, whether it is safety by design or security by design and how the narrative has got more traction over the last few years and it opens the door for us to have these conversations which is always positive. Talking about this in practical terms and getting this rolling out on the ground where it counts - Michael maybe you could reflect and you spoke about the engagement earlier on in the processes with a lot of the firms you represent? Presumably that requires an understanding at an organizational leadership level and that is an important part of the design flow. How many reflections as to how that is changing and how you have seen that change well? That is a leadership culture question as much as anything to bake in that - doing the baking rather than the bolting?

>> MICHAEL WALLMANNSBERGER: Firstly. It is a fantastic observation. When I am talking to organizations and managers about security, one of the first conversations I try and have with them is a conversation about understanding their business and their business value and where the risk lies which is also where their value lies. Often when you take a technical perspective, you could be forgiven to think risk arises because of the technology and it is not the case, it wasn't computers that created risk, it was the fact that someone decided to use them for something important. If there's nothing important that your business does, you have probably got bigger problems to worry about. If your business does something that is valuable to your customers and you use computers in your business, then you have got an element of business risk. One of the other challenges with applying cyber security to an organization is there is a never-ending list of things to do. It is virtually impossible to do all those things and it is not possible to do them all at once. We get lots of guidance from talking to standards bodies that tell us about all the things we should do, but understanding how you prioritize those things and where you start is challenging. The only way you can sensibly do that is to think about, in the business context, where is the value? Where is the risk? When I think about designing for security, at a management level, at a consulting and leadership and management level, we have to think about what are those things in our business that are valuable to us or to someone else and what are the bad things that we can never let happen and focus our security controls on those things first and then do all the other stuff.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: That is a great point. In the question of how to prioritize understanding what your value is and how to prioritize that is super helpful framing. It goes to a narrative we have been hearing in Australia around cyber security and security by design is an attempt to preserve the economic value we are seeing lost through cyber crime and issues like this. That has been a lot of the driving force behind the new cyber security bill that has been introduced into parliament. Jordan, would you reflect from the perspective of cyber CFs or yourself as to key things you would like to call out that you think is interesting about that proposal and what it means for security by design?

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: I will begin by talking about something Michael said. Effectively, when it comes to cyber security, largely you are mitigating the old. You are dealing with big companies that have large legacy systems, some of which were never designed to be connected to the Internet in the first place and companies that are racing to continue on an acceleration to digitization to take advantage of the way we all prefer to consume goods and services. In that race they are potentially willing to invest or prioritize their limited resources in new bits of kit - like apps and things that will potentially generate new sales and new users and so on which becomes a bolt-on, they are building this tech debt stack where the legacy that is underpinning it all - you have banks and Telcos and other large critical infrastructure that have core systems that perform their core functions that are 30 or 40 years old. Those are way past the life cycle that they were designed for. You then have to invest in security teams or people like CyberCX to come and help you mitigate that environment and build a stronger perimeter around potentially a weaker internal environment. All of that speaks to the fact that that is a losing game. If the defender's dilemma you can do a thousand things right and the attacker will find the 1001 thing and make you look like an idiot. The only way is to say sure, we will never convince everyone to go back and replace the 30 or 40-year-old technology overnight but how do we start to put it in place, some different thinking and steps, whether it comes to the way large businesses and government do procurement, how are they thinking through - are they thinking about security by design which could be a market signal to the manufacturers and designers of the software. That is the market side. In terms of the government side to finally answer your question, the government has seen this and I mentioned the report that came out a year ago. Some of the criticism I have noticed in industry or in response to the white paper has been that it is too aspirational and it is like government setting the bar too high and expecting too much, when in reality, if the market is failing, that is clearly the job of government to step in and figure out how do we redesign the Four Corners of the particular get so it works better for our consumers? We are seeing that play out in the cyber security act and the part around internet of things and connected devices. It is small fry, and I will explain why, because it is starting at the shallow end of the pool. Not all change will be revolutionary in this space, it has to be sustainable and be able to have some successes and bed down some processes and those incentives with the market, or whether it is a stick or carrot to get the market corrected but starting with the Smart devices that we have in our homes - the average Australian had 24 connected devices in their homes, and that is projected to be 48 by the year 2032. Almost every device - toothbrushes are now connected to the Internet. It is getting ridiculous and washing machines. I don't know why I need an app to remind me that my cycle has finished while I am at work. There is no known massive cyber attack that has been pep petated by a washing machine that has been hacked, however, we do see - and I think there is a really interesting case just recently - last month in September, where the NSA outed a massive - attributed to a Chinese nation state actor, a bot network that was weaponising all the connected devices we have in our home. We might think they are monitoring our washing or it is a Smart TV or fridge. There is a minuscule bot in there and there are thousands of devices that can be coordinated and you can do all sorts of things that we don't realize that are happening in these digital devices. The cyber legislation that has been introduced in Australia and it is before the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security, has a part specifically aiming at improving the security by design or by default on Internet-connected devices. If you are going to sell a baby cam or Smart fridge in Australia that is connected to the Internet, it shouldn't have pass word as the default pass word.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: Does this include EVs as well. I will say it is a perfect moment to acknowledge Dr Ryan Payne who is also online. Apologies, I wasn't aware we had a bonus panellist joining us today. Apologies for the oversight Dr Payne. This seems like an awesome moment for you to jump in and say do you think tooth brushes should be connected to the Internet?

>> RYAN PAYNE: I thought maybe because I was at the other university I was being excluded. (LAUGHTER) I apologize, I got stuck, I was in Paris yesterday and I was worried about making it back on time. There was confusion there. When you stop and think about what kind of security are we trying to talk about - we think about the core principles is establishing a system, are we trying to make it corruption-difficult or are we trying to make the compromising and this corruption easier to detect? One of the things we are seeing is cyber security budgets are ballooning and the capacity of smaller organizations to keep up with what is required is actually keeping them out of such a thing. A tooth paste manufacturer like Colgate might be able to have cyber security but the local tech entrepreneur in Canberra or across Australia, there is no way they will have that infrastructure to do such a thing. I am curious if we are actually going to see a principles - or some sort of social responsibility by the government to provide code to allow for security. The basics code security that you can now put into your businesses.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: That is an interesting question and maybe I will throw to Anne-Louise Brown to comment on this. Should we accept it as a basic cost of doing business if you are going to create an Internet-connected device, or a normal device, is it essential? If you are going to do that you have to take on the business cost of that minimum security. What do you think about that, Anne-Louise?

>> ANNE-LOUISE BROWN: It is a nuanced issue and we have seen it play out a lot through the security of critical infrastructure legislation where a lot of private industry are like you want us to reach these particular cyber security standards but you're not going to help us. More to point, in terms of what has happened in terms of reflections from industry as well as being well hang on, the Auditor-General's report in relation to government cyber security haven't been particularly shining. If you expect us to do this, then surely there must be an expectation on you to be doing this as well. That is reflected in the cyber security strategy that was released in November last year where there is a discussion around governments going to do better. In terms of what that looks like in practice I am not sure at the moment where that sits. I do believe there are best intentions there but government is a large siloed beast that is affecting that change and it is going to be interesting. In terms of small businesses, which is the real soft underbelly of the economy and they don't have the time and resources, there has to be some sort of incentivization for this to occur. I have had these discussions with government myself where it is like is there a way that you could actually promote the instant asset write-off scheme? Promote it as something thaw can use that to actually upgrade your cyber security, so it is not just about buying new tools, so if you want that scriber security boost for your business. It can be used for those purposes. It is not well communicated, so communicating that a lot more clearly for small business so they go OK, there is an incentive for me to do this. I can write it off on tax. As part of that, public private partnerships play a large role. Especially in relation to the Telcos, there is a key role that the Telcos can play in this as well, in terms of providing particular services or cyber security uplift to organizations in return for being customers of that Telco. That can be basic stuff, that can be MFA. I know Amazon in the US has a great scheme where they give MFA programs to small businesses that use Amazon services. There is a way to do it, it is just - I think in the last panel there was a big discussion around getting a lot of different stakeholders at the table and having different conversations, bringing them together and going what can we actually achieve? How can we work together in a way that's going to actually create public good and savings in the long run to make this happen?

>> ZOE HAWKINS: You had a reaction, Jordan?

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: I wanted to re wind on bringing the role of government into the conversation because that is vexed in this space. I have outlined previously what I think government's role should be in terms of where there is market failures intervening and trying to create regulatory standards or compliance or incentives. It is a vexed thing and I am keen to hear what the other panelists' views are, in other jurisdictions, not just Australia, the Smart device component of the cyber security act that has been put to parliament starts as the shallow end of the pool and consumer devices, those are easier to audit. There is basic firm ware, it won't be difficult for any kind of regulatory body, whether it is home affairs or some other body to check whether or not they are meeting a standard. There is a broader conversation that that is fine for now and there is good reason to do that. If we are going to achieve a security by design in the fullness of time, do you think government has sophisticated enough capability to understand the millions of lines of code in the software being developed by the likes of Microsoft or Google? Apart from - there is lots of models that have been proposed and that is the provocation, in terms of what is the biggest barrier to security by design being achieved?

>> ZOE HAWKINS: So the question of government capacity and capability to actually interrogate some of the standards and make sure they are being implemented, that feels like a great question for Michael. Across the ditch, how does that question look for you? The difference between maturity on the industry side of conversation and how well placed government can be to be part of that security by design process?

>> MICHAEL WALLMANNSBERGER: The first distinction I would draw is a difference between things that are fundamentally consumer IOT devices, whether it is a home router or a washing machine. Those are manufactured goods and if you compare them to other elements of quality and I think you can think about security as being an element of quality and manufactured goods and there are expectations and regulations around quality. We don't let manufactures produce cars without seatbelts and brakes anymore. We have solved this problem before in other domains and even where it is technical. We are right to be skeptical about the capacity and capability of governments to understand the immense complexity that can arise in technology products. A prescriptive approach from government is one that I would be skeptical about. I think we can have, with the prospective products, performance-based expectations but we have to understand that a lot of the products and technologies develop internationally. It is difficult for a single government to prescribe how cyber security should be done and expect that to work. We have seen that and some other challenges and in New Zealand around government procurement requirements. You might have a government saying that certain elements of cyber security should be done in a particular way but when you are trying to buy a global CLOUD service from a vendor that is not hearing of New Zealand, trying to say we have a government standard you must adhere to is a challenging thing to do. I draw that distinction between products and enterprise security. It is very difficult to apply a single standard to something as complex as a company the way that you might do to a product. Companies are very different. We are very good at standardizing requirements in cyber security. It is harder for us to standardize solutions to security because each organization is so different. If you look at that comparison, it is easier to standardize a solution and some expectations are under product like an IOT device, it is harder to say for a bunch of organizations that operate in very different industries, that their approach to cyber security should be the same.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: That is an excellent distinction that we should take away from today is secure by design is a different question when talking about products. We can dig into that a bit more. Ryan, I would love your reflections on this conversation but partly that question of capability and the skills and knowledge question we were speaking about on the government side. That is not where that conversation ends. If we are picking up on the product security question, consumers are involved so I would love to get the panel talking about we can work as hard as we like between government and industry to set the technical standards and security there but it is till happens then, Ryan? to hear your thoughts.

>> Ryan and I think ending a bit on a --

>> Ryan: I'm glad we tack it -- took it on. I started thinking about quantum cutting and what that's going to thank -- change in terms of cyber security. We talk about this prescriptive idea but if the government doesn't do something before quantum takes over all these legislations will be like what social media was. It's been around for 20 years and we're still trying to figure out how to legislate it. I think the Australian governance forum, the infrastructure of the internet itself. We're seeing everybody putting on these security packets of data and tacking on to everything. That's clogging up the infrastructure of the internet itself. Trying to see the infrastructure of the internet when we get into the IP4 versus IP6 infrastructure set up a lot of these are take an up by security protocol I think in terms of going to the government perspective, looking at how we legislate like a diet code or some idea of restricting the amount of code that's going through in the name of security or safety, and that maybe something Australia can legislate to help not only industry but also to the retail component. Talking about in terms of the retail customer, you know, I think it's one of those conversations we have to stop and question if that's what we should have. We always seem to put security on the individual instead of require you understand the terms and conditions of what you're doing but I think it's very obvious nowadays if you don't accept the terms and conditions to operate in society, it's actually really exclusive and you can't actually participate a lot of the time. By my access you can tell I'm Canadian. If I don't have a cell phone I can't access myGov but if I don't have to have a cell phone I have to go to Telstra which I means I have to go to the data. You have to give the passport to get to myGov, then Optus security issues, Medibank, universities being attacked, going to university I kind of start joking, you know, attack number 6, attack number 7, which one's gonna get you? I sort of think we have to take they're a bit faster. But also what expectations we have on the consumer to understand and how many we protect them from things they may not understand.

>> I think that's really great question. To the panellists in the room, would you like to reflect on how much is reasonable to expect of consumers, shared responsibility or should it be higher up the food chain?

>> I think - look, I think it depends on which consumers you're speaking about. Generally when we're talking about young people, we do expect them to have possibly a higher understanding, at least of the way technology works, not necessarily security. And with - older members of the community. They will not have that same understanding of how these things work and why they work. But on the flipside, when we actually look at the stakes, young people are much more likely to be victimised through cyber attacks. They're the single biggest and if anyone's sort of interested in na, the Australian Institute of Criminology's cybercrime in Australia report 2023 is a fantastic resource. I was really personally quite shocked when I read that because we have these assumptions.

>> I think there's strong narratives around older Australians being the key target.

>> They're more vulnerable to particular things but the main risk factor for younger people being online is the time they spend online. It's about time and it's about the different sort of platforms they're using. Gaming is a really big one, where victimisation can kind of occur or take root. But I think that as well maybe it's about range and changing some of those perceptions that we have in our mind about who is a cybercrime victim and why they're a victim.

>> Yeah. For me, this is where the comfort starts to overlap with safety by design. Especially when it comes to young people there's distinction between a product or a service or a piece of software being subject to a cyber attack through exploiting a vulnerability or something in order for a threat actor to get into an environment, whether to collect data or get in the ransomware or per pet situate a strategic outcome per suss the cybercrimes that occur predominantly with young people because they're more likely to indulge in risk taking behaviour, spent more -- spend more time online other than other cohorts. I think it comes down to risk and ripping off what the original sort of provocation was from Dr Payne. I think there is a responsibility for all users of any product to kind of understand on some level how to use it safely. There's a difference between knowing like most people should what the safety features are of your car, wearing your seatbelt and so on. If you're driving not wearing a seatbelt and you're injured, I'd argue it's not -- not the manufacturer's fault. If you're using the safety features and still subject to a negative outcome using that product or service, then I think the sort of burden of responsibility shifts back to the manufacturer or the provider, because they didn't outline what those safety features were properly in the first place. Yes, education clearly plays a role but I'm a bit jaundiced about to sort of education and consumer empowerful side of the argument because I've kind of been, like a lot of people, been hearing it for a decade or longer from industry lobby groups and interested bodies. Sure - if you want to talk about social media there's all sorts of resources and settings available to use. How many are secure by default? I'd argue not enough.

>> It getting is to the point about the by design early in the process, that sort of upstream consideration of these things and not leaving it to the last minute. I think the other thing - we've been talking about security by design N all these comments we've been talking about if and when something goes wrong who's liable, who's at fault. I think that really asks the question if we're expecting things are going to go, is security what we should be striving for? With is -- where is resilience this this question? How do we reframe how we're thinking about these things to account for the fact that things will go wrong and we'll be ready for that. Would love to throw to the online panellists, would either like to jump in as resilience as a potential framing for this conversation, thoughts and feelings.

>> MICHAEL WALLMANNSBERGER: I'll take that one. I think it's a beautiful frame. I think both quality, resilience, these frames are all useful ways to think about what really are the outcomes of security. I think to sort of - the earlier point, we expect way too much of users. I mean, it is possible to take a product that is safe and secure and misuse nit way that is dangerous or undermines the intent of a product. But I think we let suppliers off the hook far too easily. There is a lot more that can be done to fundamentally build quality, resilience, safety, all these things are really about meeting the intended purpose of the product or service or IT system. Are it's unusual even - IT and software, it's one of the few domains I can think of where we really accept that it's on the end user or the consumer of a product to apply security, to apply resilience and quality to it to make up for what are fundamentally limitations in the ability of the producer to produce a reliable, secure, safe resilient product.

>> What do you think, Ryan?

>> Ryan: Yeah, I agree. I feel going off Jordan was talking about we have to figure out where we are in what we're trying to accomplish. We can try and build up the resilience of people downstream and say, "Idea any, protect, respond and recover." I think is the five pillars of cyber resilience and we can try and build up through consumer education and aware answer acts, those ideas, that's a downstream approach. Upstream, what kind of legislation do we have governing to make sure those things are in place? I laughed when talking about toothbrushes. My fun example is if my fridge knows I've having a bad day or on a panel, you need some ice-cream, the it -- is it my fall when I end up asbestos because I love and Ben and Jerry or is it my fault.

>> No, it's my fault. Ryan: Is it my fridge to know my emotions and encourage me to buy a product. Thinking about the consumer and starting to full multiple different data forms together to the create aware of what your mechanisms are. You know, vacuum cleaners in the past, yes, they could suck up leg gee and prevent your feet from being destroyed but we never had a vacuum cleaner thinking about when to work and breakdown to spend more money to repair irand use your car and voice recognition and other aspects of data being gathered to perform a sort of profile on you as a person to then target you going forward. My background is in online profiling through fashion. People used to laugh. Then we saw Cambridge at and an tick - I did voting preferences based on how you shop. We don't think about but unintended consequences have a big impact and packet going forward. I start thinking about what's the level of consent we expect from a person and what kind of tracking awareness legislation, do we need to have the vacuum that now creates a floor plan of your layout and shows the video of what's going on in inside of your house, does the ROM have to tell me that or am I expected to read nit a manual and hope on page 35 or 126 that I caught that little sentence, "This is video recording you at all times." Where do we sort of govern those

>> I think that - Ryan, thank you. I think what you've helped us do is zoom out a bit from the more technical concept of security and view it in a broader framework of consumer harm. All these things between privacy, resilience but talk about safety as well E and profile all interconnected. Either of you like to comment on...

>> Definitely interconnected, and certainly I think - we saw this through major data breaches - not so recent now. But when something affects individuals, people, that's when they care about out. Until that point no time, they couldn't really care less about their data being out there in the wild and will very happily give their data away to many organisations. I think that - that's always - if we are ultimately selfish creatures, and until the thing touches us, we don't care. Obviously off the back of those breaches we did see a huge political reaction to that. It really does take those kind of watershed moments for those reactions to occur and for, I guess, a policy that - you know, security design, you know, something we've been talking about for years, as you said before. But - you know n relation to privacy act reform, that started back in 2018.

>> Yeah.

>> Yeah, and so we're now only seeing the first tranche of that reform legislation. So what it takes is something big to happen in the world for these shifts to actually occur.

>> Sometimes a crisis - you need to use a crisis for that.

>> Don't waste time.

>> OK.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: When it comes to a crisis, COVID I think was a really instructive example of individuals but also companies and governments taking a different risk-based approach to the conversation around resilience when it comes to cyber. They realised that - I know of a major bank here in Australia that had to fast track an 18 month digital transformation program into six weeks. You can't do that without taking some shorts cuts in lots of areas including Khyber security. They figure out in order to keep operating as a business that's our number one prior.

>> No, point being number one if you're not trading.

>> Not operating.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: Not talked about much but a long tail to COVID where companies had to go back and do to bolt on piece, re-examine the rapid digital transformation thing. They didn't want to walk it back because they saw the productivity Dwaynes or people liked the flexibility of working from home. Going back and understanding how many security did we leave in the wake of that huge digital pivot was a clear-eyed decision they made. It was in the best interests of the business to take that risk. They had pleasures in place to try and mitigate the risk and being resilient through that crisis. There's lessoned to be learned from that I think in the boarer conversation if we had another sort of game-changing crisis that occurred, that everyone said, "What's the government doing about this?" had to have a rapid response how much easier would it be if security by design was the norm and already bake in and not to bolted on to this stuff that we suddenly had to PIF in the way we're using or itchmenting...

>> As in if we had the systems, processes and practices already so you could rush but doing that process. Not skip that scope. So you could just move...

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: Make it as much because it's already there, it's already normalised in...

>> Everything you're doing.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM:

>> Yeah.

>> It's a good challenge to us. I hope we don't need another COVID to learn the lesson. We have 15 minutes left and I do want to allow room for questions. We have hand up mics in the room and I'm sure a moderator that is V8ing -- moderating the online conversation so they'll tell me if there's any questions. Please stand up to bring a question to the floor. I can see we have our first one. How exciting. Do you want to introduce yourself by name and affiliation, thank you.

>> Cal, speaking for myself and sorry for anyone who's heard me. I'm not going to dominate the microphone. I had a lot to say in previous sessions. I have had bit of a security background especially securing government agencies that have experienced attacks, and that's made me quite familiar with some of the advice that the government provides to those agencies and the - you know, the contractors and the companies that they communicate with. And I'd say it's adequate without being particularly good. It's good enough. I think the government does actually need to improve it's understanding of why it's writing those documents, because often the purpose seems academic but the usage is applied in a very different manner by those people on the ground. So I think understanding the day-to-day usage of some of its documents and PSPA comes to mind but a lot of general advice which it publishes which I've been part of in a few cases, the actual intent of those documents is very unclear which means they're a little wishy washy and they're hard to interpret. But what I wanted to talk about now is if we want people to be secure by design, I think a list of guidelines is not going to deliver that. They're helpful and people will find them in their own way but that's not going to change the industry. I think setting the context within which those people build the systems in the first place is probably the key. What I mean by that is a that if you know that you're not supposed to store data you will build a system that doesn't store data. If you know you must plead it -- delete it after a certain period of time you'll build that system if you've are leave that in a grey area or you leave open opportunities to maybe reuse that for another purpose from which it was originally collected f you can you will. If we're clearer on what people are entitled to use our data for, and increase those punishments, we don't necessarily need to be really helpful when it comes - as a government regarding the security methods. They'll find them because that's the price to have doing business. Even a small business today, if we said, "Deploy MFA" They don't have to do deploy that structure. There's a tinying tole can add to their website and it costs them almost nothing to do. -- these sort of things are easy to implement if you're motivated and government advice is clear.

>> Thank you so much for that. I think - what I'm hearing is this point about guidance is one thing but how do we change the incentives. This is a great direction to take the conversation. Thank you. We wanted to talk a bit about the role for government in terms of setting that incentive, those guard rails, policies and regulations to actually drive this behaviour and the raising of the bar in industry. We were expecting before we expect too much from consumers, this is a role for industry, they need to step up and what we're hearing from this comment is - and government has to create that incentive for industry to step up if it's not doing it itself. To the panel - and please feel free to jump in. The proposals in the Australian Parliament are they sufficient to do that, to move the dial in terms of industry incentives to taking action? Who wants to jump in.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: I'll direct in. To open the can of worms up further. One is that the worst... What would be good to avoid is regulation in any space but certainly in this space that just is kind of - no offence to any lawyers in the room but great for lawyers where a whole bunch of regulations are brought in, they have certainly intentions by government and by the different people who have been involved in developing the policy U but when nay touch reality, businesses even government agencies themselves don't quite know how to implement them to be in those guidelines and frameworks and avoid any sort of impact or fines or whatever. That's - lawyers get a lot of great work in that space because they then play the interpretation piece to say, "You're in kind of kind of business, this is what these gains -- guidelines mean. This is how you implement them." That would be great. If more intelligent policy design - we have some great policy design people in the room. Government can do it in a way - this is the second point. What you're saying chimes with a lot of criticism that have been levels at countries and -- companies and countries that joined together on the security by design white paper last year. These are lofty ambitions but what do they mean in a company of different stage of maturity or different sector of the economy. Maybe it's not just the design piece but the shop front window of government to some kind of service that might mean less legal fees for some firms but where companies can go and get advice on, "This is where I'm at. Am I on the right track?" Kind of a...

>> This is great. We were speaking before - isible to expect this of small business and what is the role of government in a them, maybe it's not funding them but advice and support. Ryan, did you want to comment? I could see you before.

>> Ryan: Summarising your question a little bit. I think you're saying what would happen to corporations if they were financially responsible rather than pushing that to the consumer. If op 'tis or... If theyed that and had to financially compensate everyone I think we'd see a much and different cyber security I think with the I think I would lie to incentivise by corporations that do collect that data rather than trying to force to education perspective or the reasonable consumer to make the assumptions. Assuming they would know that they're choice affects their freedom of something or -- or something as ludicrous as that. I was term that was in the Nike or history. They said they don't use slave Labor and labour but contract company who contracts to a company who contracts to a company. That's what we're seeing with the of data, collected and sold to a third party and sold to a third up and party. I think that cloak, sort of show game that's going on, might remove some of the ambiguity. That could be one of those design by security principles the government could adopt so the consumer has a chance to go forward. Going backward, we talked and kind of going with John was serving I think we also have to serve stop and say in what context are we trying to government there are so many parts and we're along this joint of the cyber -- cyber security perspective. I think us at the very top trying to put guidelines and principles on but they're going to be reactive. At the same time we have protection mechanisms at the end to try and protect the consumer. Those are also maybe not aligned with what's coming down the pipeline. I think there's incongruencity. -- incongruence multiple silos of looking at the perspective. Yeah, I totally appreciate the question. I kept thinking about privacy risks benefit.

>> If I could respond to both comments. I think the complexity that's added when people try and introduce, you know, reduced storage of personal information, it's not because you're reducing it. It's because you're finding excuses to not reduce it. The general principle if you're providing a service and I'm collecting information connected to that service and I'm storing that for the lifetime of that service, that's my product life cycle. There not a lot of complexity in there other than whatever is inherent in what I'm doing. Where that's breaking down is where the government said, "Can you keep this for a little longer because we might come along." That length of time is not clear or you think, "I can get away with selling this and making more money." The complexity is not with the advice or the principle. It's because we have allowed wriggle room for companies to get away with it. Occasionally for our own benefit.

>> Thank you so much. I think the point about wriggle room. Anne Louise.

>> Yeah. We have lots of moving parts in this space. We have a cyber security bill, we have privacy act reform going on, we have an AI bill in the works as well, one would assume. And security - there's all of those different moving pieces. One - I think one of the major issues we're having at the moment is they're not being necessarily brought together that well and in the sort of more - the conversation that the government's having with the community, they're not joining those dots necessarily very well. In relation to your point around data and data retention, you know, it is actually - there is very little clarity in relation to data retention laws in Australia. There's no central repository where a company can go, "I have this data, how long do I have to store it for?" Then you've got the complexity of federalism where we have our state and territory systems that interact with that. I think that's one point of that. So, data... Data I think - you know, a lot of companies probably would want to get rid of it but they -- they're not sure and they can't separate Italia out. It is a difficult task. I just wanted to - one of the sort of - I think the interesting tensions we have at the moment, 250 with AI and organisations wanting to use AI a lot more, is the fact that to make AI work we need data AI, AI is powered by data. Companies will naturally be wanting to keep more da and the make an AI work for them.

>> Absolutely. I think again - a theme that's come out a new time in the remarks from the panellists, how do you zoom out 24 and see it from the big picture. It's easy to see security in a narrow way but this is plugged to the AI profiling, resilience, how do we paint that pick -- picture. We have three minutes left so a fire round to the panel. Your key takeaway from the conversation as to how we can drive this security by design conversation forward. I might start with Michael.

>> MICHAEL WALLMANNSBERGER: Thanks, it's been an interesting thing to be part of. I'll take away. This is hard. There's been a lot of detail but I think there's been some great points made in the last segment. Incentives is really important. I give and receive cyber security advice as a professional. As I have received more and more advice I have thought a lot more about how you give advice that is useful in practice. I think governments do need to set the rules of the road and the standard but there's no illusion that this is easy. I think there 'll be a lot of complexity for us to work through as conversation with government, with regulators and as users of technology as well. I'd continue to advocate the principle that we should focus on security by design, think about security early as we can in the process, and - yeah. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Michael. Ryan, any closing thoughts?

>> Ryan: This is a really good panel to be on. Thank you so much for being here first of all. I don't envy anybody in government trying to legislate and govern in perspective because there are so many moving parts. Not only are we trying to react to what we know about we have international large conglam rats who are trying to scapegoat or get around such legislation so they can operate and the idea of surveillance capitalism. In terms of closing mark, trying to figure out where we put the responsibility and advocating corporations share a little more financial perspective of their consumer data. But help provide some sort of basic code and database or registry to help organisations. Small and medium enterprises have a way of getting infrastructure without having to "Copy code" Off of somebody on the internet to be able to be scalable or rely on code being copied from things going forward, that's where we'll see large securitying flaws going forward.

>> Thanks. It's a practical suggestion. We'll see if the lumpy skin disease. we have to remember is it is not a conversation for island Australia to have, it is a conversation that has to be had globaly. This needs to be intro operable, there needs to be global interoperability with whatever regime we create domestically. We could create wonderful standards but if everyone else goes - it is not going to be useful to us. Yes, we can think about this domestically but whatever actions we take, we really need to think about the global community.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: Jordan.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: I have had the longest time to think about it and everyone has said illuminating things and I feel on the spot now. It has been a great panel. I agree with the comments earlier, it has been an engaging discussion and hopefully for everyone as well, not just the five of us. The thing that I was hoping to get a Hans to circle back to in my brain and I will freestyle it right now. It is something Michael or Ryan said in terms of transparency. We have had a good discussion about standards, like how you design them to be realistic and enforceable and auditable and all that sort of stuff but I think there is a flip side to that around encouraging transparency so if companies who are developing products or services and are striving or being compelled by legislation or other means to strive for security by design or by default in their processes and practices, if they are willing to have a level of transparency with the consumers who are consuming the products and services, that will go a long way toward building trust for the consumers so they understand things like your vulnerable disclosure program, how many bugs have you found and how quickly did you patch or fix them? Having an open and honest conversation with consumers and government and everyone so there is less of a black box around the complicated tech stuff. That might go some way to solving what we discussed earlier, where no government in the world has the world's best coders, they all work in the private sector, so how do you leverage that capability in a way that will incentivise and encourage the coders working in the big tech companies to develop products and services that are secure by design and some of that might just be good old sunlight is the best disinfectant.

>> ZOE HAWKINS: I love that point. It is how to empower consumers and also not leave the responsibility with them and government has a role to incentivise industry to step up. That is a fascinating conversation. Thanks for joining, everyone. Please join me in a round of applause for the panel.

>> JORDAN NEWNHAM: And for Zoe, well moderated. (APPLAUSE)

>> Welcome - oh, that's very loud. Welcome back, folks. For this last session before the closing plenary. The purpose of this Town Hall conversation is basically to reflect a little further on the output document which we provided to you yesterday. And also the additional food for thought document, and I'll just remind you that the general sense yesterday was quite a bit of support for the document, some suggestions that perhaps we could be a bit bolder in some of the things we might say A I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Jordan Carter now, who's going to talk a bit about what the process looks like from here, so, Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Keith and good afternoon everyone. I would say I am standing between you and drinks but I'm not today, so we'll carry on with it. The program committee sort of met and distributed a sway over the past couple of hours to various circular conversations to sort of absorb a bit of the feedback that came through yesterday morning and to work out a way forward, and it's based on a couple of assumptions. One of those is that there does seem to be general contentment with the position paper. None of those assumptions people wanted more input and chance to see each other's input and tease out ideas about the route ahead and what we do next. The way we're proposing to tackle that, and remember we're all learning by doing. So this is the first time we have tried this process, is to do the following. We'd like to test again whether that assumption around broad consensus around the position paper, sort of first released one that had had a chance for input exists and we'll use the Google forum to do bit of a poll on that shortly. Your'll get the QR code in and bit and see if that does achieve consensus, you know, it's good enough. We'll sort of publish it as that. We didn't see much benefit - at the start of it says "We the undersigned" But we hadn't ever developed a sign on process and thought it's probably easiest to leave the document as a stand alone artefact that achieves consensus which we'll test shortly or it didn't and it can stand as a document that didn't achieve consensus. Then to take the food for thought paper, the more slightly provoking document, to share it with the community as a Google doc, as I think Susan and others suggested yesterday and today, and to open that out for comments and input either on what's in it or what isn't in it. You know, one oaf those quite open chance add some thoughts. -- to add some thoughts. Then we thought about the time frame for all of that and what it might be useful as input for. Various parts of Team Australia are going to be participating at the Internet Governance Forum in Riyadh in December, this kicks off I think on 15 December. What wear proposing is to have a 10 December cut-off for comments or a milestone is probably a better way to put it than a cut-off and then the team will try and do a little bit back on a one or two page - depending on what come unless and the feedback is, either a summary of it or a reissue of that food for thought document, whatever seems most beautiful based on the kinds of input na it gets. Then in the environment of the IGF, we'll have a paper that either has consensus or not, the broad position paper, and we'll have an enriched and supplements and -- supplemented and changed food for thought addendum that advances other ideas including things like how to improve the IGF, which is one of the discussion topics at this year's IGF. So that's the process in essence. To try and summarise it again. Based on the assumption that there were no loud voices against the position paper, to do a test and call for conSensis for that, and fit passed that threshold in the room today to issue it as it is in that way except without the "We the undersigned" Bit at the start because we didn't see the value for the sign up -- sign on. Then almost immediately afterwards share a link to the Google doc to put it on the website, the food for thought paper, the formal title for which was... Ideas for the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, wear calling it a food for thought paper, put that on the website and invite your feedback and engage with that content, due 10 December, at which point we'll do another version of it or write a summary of what came up and everyone can further reflect on that, and whatever processes the steering committee develops for 2025. Chair, back to you. Chair, co-chairs, whichever of you.

>> You wanted to go? OK. So you've got the QR code opt screen there if you'd like to with your devices and you're -- access -- the QR code on the screen there if you'd like to en -- to access that and see if you're endorsing the paper.

>> As long as it doesn't go green.

>> What was that? We might just give it another couple of minutes. We've got 37 responses. I think there's just over 40 people in the room. We'll just give people another minute or two.

>> We do have quite a few online as well, so...

>> Interpreter's raised a hand.

>> I think they just swap over.

>> OK.

>> KEITH: Not quite sure what's happening now.

>> The QR code is there if you would like to still submit your answer on this. I think we are trying to have a look at the responses. We're now at 43 responses. (INAUDIBLE).

>> KEITH: Can the technical support tell us what's going on, please.

>> They're telling you, Chair.

>> KEITH: Well, I can't access the chat, I'm sorry. Oh, OK, thank you.

>> Which is this one that we're looking at, 46 responses. That's today, right now? Yep.

>> Based on these results we do have, you know, one or two who don't agree with endorsing the paper. We'd be really keen to hear from you whether that's today or - now at the microphone if you wish or afterwards. We are keen to hear where it's gone wrong from your perspective.

>> KEITH: And if you don't want to do that in front of the whole room, perhaps you can get in touch with us separately to suggest ways that we might improve it. I think on the basis of what we're seeing in front of us, we've got a fairly strong endorsement in the room and online. So, I think what we'll do is proceed to release this as a broad consensus, not a full consensus, a broad consensus document, is the term we used to use in my OECD days. Does anybody wish to make any comments further or ask any questions about to process from here? Because if not we might bring this Town Hall to a conclusion. We've got an online hand raised.

>> Discussion about the other paper.

>> KEITH: Yeah.

>> I think we are...

>> Thank you. Thanks a lot. I'm one of the participants that's...

>> We have a question from online.

>> KEITH: Yeah.

>> Can you hear me? This is from Anjude Alwis. "Hi I would like to pose 24 question. I ham a PhD researcher from an Australian university. Distributed... Technologies poised to significantly impact individuals. They are driving the development of diverse ecosystem a, new digital asset economy and a token andised system. Given these advance a you plan to extend intergovernance framework governance to encompass these emerging technologies?"

>> KEITH: Thank you for the question. I think that is something that we should respond to consequent to -- subsequent to this meeting. Beyond it's directly Germaine to the current issue, which we're considering. But it is certainly an interesting one for us to consider further. It's certainly our intention that these conversations and these annual gatherings will continue. So, it may well be something we can take up with you a little bit further down the track. We might now just move to a consideration of where to next with the second paper which, as Jordan has indicated, we are proposing to provide n a widely available format, which can incorporate comments. Did anybody have anything they wished to raise today with regard to the food for thought document? And I would put that in the context of the conversations yesterday morning where several of you encouraged us to try and be a bit more - with bolder, I think, was one of the expressions which was used. We're certainly happy to take on board those thoughts and see if there are ways in which we can perhaps strengthen what's being proposed in the document. If you do have any comments, could you please come to the microphone?

>> Now I have the comparison.

>> KEITH: Oh e we now have the comparison, yes, I see. Which we just lost.

>> We just lost the comparison. Thank you.

>> KEITH: OECD.

>> Oh. -- oh.

>> Oh. It is showing in the Zoom room if you are there. What it looks like - oh, there it is. We've had a shifting on the strongly agree. Maybe a slight shift on neutral and it doesn't look like much of a shift on disagree. Did you want to speak, Kiki? Yeah, go ahead.

>> I know you'll do work to more work on this, which is great but I did notice in the food for thought while we talk about multi-stakeholder model and referenced different stakeholders there's a preference for - well, not a preference, the number one, absence coordination talks to and cooperation function between the different internet governance bodies can damage close working relationships and Di minute the internet technical community's voice. I think some context around that would be great -- Di minute. Because it fears that it could be raises the technical community voice within this. Not saying it does, just some context there. Further down, establish a cross community coordination communication body to serve as the internet communicate bodies external point, internal organisation strategic home, which is also great but again how do we build those same kind of coalitions for our civil society here? How do with we focus on funding and resources and coordination for civil society to engage in these spaces also.

>> OK, thank you. OK. If there are no other questions - oh, we do have one.

>> Hi. This is from... It's really more about the food for thought paper. Are we there?

>> Yes.

>> OK. My commences -- comments is that I would like for our community to think about or discuss more what they mean when they say they want to strengthen the IGF. So, I'd like to hear some ideas actually articulating what is meant by that. I think there are many ways to think about strengthening and I can throw one idea out as a straw man. I think part of strengthening the IGF and this is coming from my experience as a former IGFmag member and the work that we were put through, and I think Jordan can attest to that, being a current mag members that there are a lot of parts of the auIGF that I think of as bloat. It's a bit bloated in the sense that the IGF sometimes - or rather simultaneously does too much but yet also does too little. So it's bit of a conundrum, a paradox. One example I can give is there are 31 dynamic coalitions which have been approved over the years. And it's practically impossible to the ones that are in -- sunset the ones that are active and one that are active of the dynamic coalitions I would count five or less out of the 31, and yet there are still, you know, resources sessions being allocated to them. So there's a lot about the IGF that I think we can very specifically talk about, the bits that really aren't working very well, and the ones that I think we should maintain and, of course o things that we should improve. I'd like for us to have this discussion. I haven't heard much the past two days about specific ideas regarding that. So I want to encourage those of you who have been thinking about this to step up and share your ideas. Thanks.

>> Thanks very much, Joyce. I think it is certainly our intention to use the consultation process for the paper to deliberately tease those things out, and I say that as the pre-dominant author of the food for thought paper. It was simply an attempt to get the conversation going, which - and I think it has succeeded in doing that, but you could easily say, well, the document is very vague. Yes, it is. It lacks day. Yes, it does. Here is an opportunity now for the people in this room, the people online and other interested parties in the Australian - and other internet communities to put some thoughts down as to the ways in which you might make the IGF more effective, perhaps better funded, perhaps more sustainable, perhaps to even give it a somewhat augmented role. I use the -- used the term the other day, a non-paper, and I used that advisedly, because often in international negotiations a paper which sets out some thoughts that are there to kick around, to consider and basically to see if there is some sort of consensus of support is the purpose. It may come to nothing or it may actually produce something more sustainable. I guess we'll just have to wait and see.

>> Just to add on to what Keith has just said. Like, the two papers are related but different purposes. It's - the draft position paper is a specific input to a specific process in a specific point in time. You know, I think most of us who support the multi-stakeholder approach would like governments when they get to the wh -- WHISIS next year to agree to continue the global IGF's mandate, so for that's for that purpose and the food for thought paper is, you know, we all recognise that the governance - internet governance processes and institutions, you know, do need to evolve. Our use of the Internet has changed significantly since the auIGF and since the Internet structures were put in place. This could be a longer term piece of thinking about what Australians think - what ideas we have for evolving it.

>> Correctly identified. Cheryl and I am to pick up on Joyce's point if I may. When we are making suggestions, such as the one you just gave as an example with the dynamic plethora of dynamic Coalition, it would be really welcome for any examples that any of you might have for example, the Internet society over recent years has now found a way of including its chapters and members writ large to choose which, in this case, is not dynamic Coalitions put special interest groups are going to be resourced and focused over a period of time because let's face it, if you are passionate about this whole Internet thing, you will probably say yes to just about anything you want to be supporting at all. That doesn't work in a practical sense. One or two particular topics have been given enduring status and their support is under review but is secured for a length of time. On a biannual basis, but we could do it in any number, pick one and pop it in as an idea, the rank and file vote on what they want to have focused on for their supported special interest groups for that upcoming period. That is the type of example that I think, if we could pop that into the paper, would be very, very valuable indeed. Welcome other good ideas but there is one to start us off.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you, very much. We have a hand raised over there. Do you want to come - you have a microphone.

>> This is from Sarah. Highly endorse the point, reform participation structures and create path for new potential leaders, while also removing structures or positions that reinforce the status quo to ensure more equitable access and influence at all levels but specifically highlighting the need to provide on ramps for subject matter experts to contribute to the conversation. There are many segments of the community that are not at this conversation that need to be.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: I think we can certainly accept those points. Who was the question for? I don't have the chat in front of me?

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: I think it is a comment.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Any other before we conclude?

>> One brief thought that came to mind in hearing Joyce's original point. There are very few people who have delved into the depths of how some of these processes work and sometimes it's easy to underestimate how inaccessible finding that out is from the outside. Even as someone who has almost finished the first year on the MAG, I didn't know only five of the DCs were active. There will be other people in the room with an equivalent depth of knowledge and understanding of different processes. I would encourage you to share as much of that granularity as you can into this Google document, not because it means everyone is going to agree with you, but it means that everyone who reads it will learn a lot and then might have some data to support reckons they may have had or just be able to get a more realistic sense of what is actually going on in some of these processes. It's not to put you on the spot, particularly, Joyce, but we know lots of stuff about something and people forget other people don't. If we are happy to share that in writing, it enables a whole lot of other people to learn it.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Yes, it does.

>> From Internet society accessibility standing group. It might be a replicating references to the Sao Paulo multistakeholder statement but the original Netmundial+10 statement, the initial few paragraphs talked about human rights principles and I am wondering if we can either specifically refer to that Netmundial statement in regards to the human rights principles or just mention that the human rights principles are a significant part of the multistakeholder process? Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Another online question. Do we have another online comment?

>> It is Judith. My question is a clarification. When - Judith, we aren't getting any audio, did you want to type your question into the chat?

>> KEITH BESGROVE: I will go to Sandy while you sort that out, Judith, if that is OK?

>> Can you hear me now?

>> Thank you. We can hear you Judith.

>> Great. Now people can hear me, sorry about that. My question was I wonder, there was a question about the DC dynamic coalitions and someone said only five were active, that is not correct. There is about 15 or 20 that are active. Some of them are extremely active and some of them are not as active - active only a couple of times a year but I would not say only five are active. There are many others that are very active in different parts. We would be happy to talk to anyone about this and if you come to one of our monthly meetings, you could actually see that was the case. I wasn't sure how you got that statistic that only five dynamic Coalitions were active. I was hoping for a clarification about that? Thanks so much.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. We will take that as a comment but we will bear it in mind. Sandra Davey. Over to you.

>> Internet end user, no affiliation. I am curious to understand the consensus process. The lovely thing about consensus is we get to hear all voices. The downside is God almighty it drags on and it can whittle down to almost nothing of substance. I am super interested, if we get to all put stuff into this document, does everybody have to agree to everybody for it to be consensus...

>> KEITH BESGROVE: No.

>> Or will the coordinating committee make some authoritative positions so we can move forward? That would be helpful to understand that process. There is a lot of new people in the room. It would be really great for us to understand how we can - you will synthesize this into what I know is going to be a document of substance. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: If I can respond to that. Consensus does not imply 100% unanimity, it never can. We talk about broad consensus, where the substantial majority of a group appear to have at least substantial agreement to something and that is how it should be characterized. We are not suggesting that we are going to achieve 100% unanimity. We're not pretending that for a moment. What we are endeavouring to achieve is an articulation of a broad consensus on a range of issues here and that may mean mentioning some outwriters or opinions as outwriters rather than as a collective view. At the end of the day, the drafting committee, which is a subset of the steering committee, will have to make some judgments about what that looks like.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: To add to that, this is another experiment, we haven't done anything like this before. It is an opportunity to start a conversation and potentially move to some ideas for solutions that we might want to put forward. We have been, as my former colleague said, admiring the problem for long enough. Everybody recognizes that things need to change but we need to start thinking about putting forward some ideas, like what do we want to see instead of what is there now? How can the processes change? What do we need to do to shift the conversation along from recognizing that there's a problem?

>> I think the experiment is fantastic and it is a really accessible way to get fast contributions. Go the experiment.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you.

>> My name is Stacey, some of you have seen me taking photos which I am also here to do in supporting my daughter who is producer of media for the IGF. We were asked last year to form a dynamic Coalition for teenagers and we did and we have teams from around the world who have contributed directly repeatedly to the Global Digital Compact. We were involved with the summit of the future. We were involved with the pact. We have literally not stopped producing real effects, real contributions, both verbally and in writing and I just want to say that it's important that the MAG understand what we have and that we sit on waiting for people to appreciate what these teams have actually contributed, which is far in excess of anyone else at the IGF that I am aware of. It is important to us that people - not me, I am just trying to keep them together and facilitate. People here would recognize Minna who is one of our teams who participates in the DC meetings every month for the most part. Please pay attention to us. We would like to do more. We don't have enough access to human beings because we are busy doing other things. We would love to use channels that we don't know of, particularly if we can start in a country we happen to be in. Anybody that is willing to put some time on youth, we have mentors that sometimes participate, kids that have gone out and done policy network, formal contributions, pen holding. It is incredible, these teenagers what they are capable of. They are actual youth, not institutional youth, they are actual youth, right. So help us. We really honestly are here for that and we are also here to produce media to help you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you, very much.

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Can I just for anyone who is not in the Zoom room. It relates back to sap sandy's point but Jordan has noted in the chat, there is no process for inter sessional testing of consensus which is why the draft position paper was the only item put forward for consensus here. The thought piece we won't be trying to get consensus on that intersessionally. I do encourage people to - many of you have extensive knowledge of Internet governance, share that in the document to help other people but also many of you come from diverse backgrounds, problems maybe being solved in other forums or in other sectors that we're not aware of that could be applied - solutions may be available in other places.

>> Good job Annaliese advancing this conversation from last year. I noticed the richness in it. Interesting that last speaker that was something that was said through the GDC discussions and - I don't know whatever it was called, digital cooperation streams over in the UN. It is not necessarily that all stakeholders need to have decision-making power and certainly I don't necessarily want to but it is important that feedback loop that we see what we have contributed matters and that's kind of highlighted in this work and that we share it. That was a good point. I think we also need to prepare that the IGF may not be that model. If whatever forces that be across the world, but I don't think that has to stop what we do. I don't think it gets in the way. I think we can have models without necessarily naming things. We can build a strong stakeholder group that works well together that can be adaptable to however that looks and I just think we could prepare ourselves for that. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. Jordan?

>> JORDAN CARTER: This is a slight pivot. I will tell you what it is and you can tell me whether it is allowed, to give a two minute spiel about the charter of the auIGF. Is that allowed?

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Yes, sure.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. ECOWAS a bit odd. One of the things that we did this year as well as the experiment of the position paper was to write down a bit about how the auIGF might work as it moved from being NetThing and the MSSC pulled together a charter and at one point we had great visions of a community engagement session at this auIGF about the charter and getting feedback on how we had written down how the auIGF would work and then we remembered that people usually don't come to events to talk about processes that led to the events, so much as to talk about the subject matter of the event. We didn't put that on the agenda. Nonetheless, I want you to know that there is a charter for the auIGF, that it started to operate under. It is posted on the web site under the about section. The web site is auigf.au. We are evolving into working with it. One of the things that it does proposes the multistakeholder steering committee that takes over the responsibility for the event, the Multi-Stakeholder Steering Committee. If you want to volunteer on that committee and Annaliese will say this better than we will - she will make an ask for people that want to get more involved in helping this event happen. I want to focus on the charter, in case that has escaped peoples' attention. One or two of you might be interested in it, if you are, have a read, send some thoughts to the committee through the email address. I will put that link in the chat. Thanks for indulging me.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you.

>> Albin. I want to clarify one thing because I thought we are talking about the position paper and does it mean we have rich consensus now, because I think we are...

>> KEITH BESGROVE: We have concluded that we have sufficient consensus on the position paper that it will go forward. The discussion for the last few minutes has been focused either on the second paper, or there have also been some other comments made by other people about related things.

>> Thanks. My comment on the paper is I think one of the reasons why Internet needs to be governed from a more bottom-up model is because the Internet is really fast and government regulation does not work in such kind of circumstance. There are many areas in the Internet issues that are actually not covered by the existing body at the moment and IGF should be a really good avenue to address those issues. In that sense I would support one of the first points brought out in the paper, where IGF might become more advisory in nature. I can't comment on all the other proposals because understanding the proposal itself may require some discussion to actually understand what it means. At the very least, at the moment if IGF is being purely discussion-only, it may not be able to serve the purpose of a bottom-up governing model where we want to move things along quicker. More advisory might be good. I can foresee there might be some problems as well. In principle, I think it might be a good direction to go, not being too structured but a little bit more guidelines for different government to actually take the consensus of coming out from IGF to do some kind of local implementation or even the local IGF to take back and discuss how to bring it on in a more localized context. That will be my comment.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you for that comment. That tends to reinforce the sense I had in drafting the document. Joyce.

>> I am going to stand here in the capacity of two roles. First, I will put on the former IGF MAG member hat to say there is a reason why it is the multistakeholder advisory group. My understanding of the history it was always meant to have an advisory role, exactly for this sort of purpose that you would like to see, but over the years it hasn't happened. I am not going to dwell on the why, there are various reasons. More conversations maybe over drinks but this is the reality it is today. If we would like the MAG or for the IGF at large to have a more advisory nature, that has to be loud and clear from the community this is what you want. Then how do you transmit that message over to the IGF so the people who actually would be in power to make some changes? That is my response back to you on the advisory bit. There are some people who talk about the IGF should have recommendations. That is another word that is a bit problematic in the IGF space as well, this notion of recommendations and then at some point I GF is going to have outcomes. That frightens some people in the community. There is a diversity of views of the nature of the IGF, should it be more output-driven, outcomes-driven, how do we think about it? I want to point to the fact that the IGF does have an output document, every year - I am not sure since when - there is an output document that captures all the main points from that IGF, that might be some sort of an advisory recommendations thing for you to take back. I will leave that there. I put on my other hat. Another issue that I want to bring up for discussion here is the funding problem and the resourcing problem of the IGF. We hear that a lot during the Global Digital Compact. Member states disagreed around how should we frame the voluntary financial contributions to the IGF? Should we have stronger language that tries to enforce some sort of funding mechanism to the IGF? The hat I am wearing is for the IGF supports association, and I want to demystify the process. The IGF has a trust fund for which member states can put their voluntary contributions, not many member states do that and the ones that do don't really give a lot. The IGF is extra budgetary in the UN, meaning they have to source their own funding. Part of the problem is that the IGF being part of the UN is it cannot easily accept donations or funds from any other organization outside of member states. This problem is compounded. The IGF was set up as an outside of the UN mechanism to feed into the trust fund to help other organizations to channel their donations that would eventually go through the IGF. Look at the IGF as a potential funding source for those organizations that want to actually put money on the table and say "Yes, I want to strengthen the IGF by providing voluntary contributions and here is the money". Another thing that I would like to share is part of the IGF trust fund is also to provide funding to NRIs. Because there is such a huge funding problem at the IGF, this year they have not been able to fund any NRIs, which is quite shocking. The only association - the only IGF that has been able to provide this funding to support NRIs to continue running the events, doing the work, so I want to put all these issues out there for you to think about so you have context when people say "What is this financial resourcing problem?" There is a tangible problem here that we can look at. Thank you.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you, Joyce. We look forward to your comments - further comments on the paper. I think some of that is quite useful to be aware of. In response to some of the suggestions about perhaps detail missing from the document, because we haven't done it before, we weren't actually sure how much to put into the paper, so there are lots of holes. We welcome all of your contributions over the next few weeks. I think I would like to draw all this to a close now. I think we have rehearsed the issues. Please, can you make it quick, we are running out of time.

>> A quick thought on the last comment. Maybe organizations that are - I will just have some water. Organizations that are already supporting and have administrative capacities, maybe there could be projects that are defined within those organizations and those projects could be funded so those organizations are receiving the funding to get those projects done so we don't have the challenge of who is receiving the funding? Just something that came to my mind.

>> KEITH BESGROVE: Thank you. I think we might - with that, draw this session to a close. I will hand over to my colleagues to conduct the final plenary. I might sit down.

>> I want to say thanks to everybody. (APPLAUSE)

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Ian has just popped outside. Andrew, did you want to come up to the stage. For the last session today, it is unstructured. We have time to hear some reflections about the conference overall the last couple of days, the conversations you have heard or been part of. We asked a few people to be part of it. Everyone is shy today. We asked a couple of people to help kick off the conversation. Just to offer a concise two or three minutes on your reflections of the last couple of days, your observations, anything you would like to share and also if you have them, any thoughts about where we go to next? Who wants to start, Joyce, would you like to start?

>> JOYCE CHEN: Sure. Hi, everyone, I am Joyce Chen from APNIC. Sorry for always taking up the air time. Just a few comments. I think this auIGF has a breadth of issues. We tried to cover everything under the sun as part of the program committee, so everybody would have a bit of space to discuss your issues but what I was really happy with is I thought there was a depth of conversation in these discussions and you brought some of these conversations out into the corridors as well. I really appreciated that. This being the second in person meeting, last being NetThing and now being auIGF, I see that there is a hunger for people to regroup, reconnect, build these relationships again. I think that is very clear that you like to have the space so we should continue it. The thing we have heard about the different UN processes happening, that will happen 2025 and if you still haven't heard about these processes by now, please come and talk to me. I think my main point here is let's not sleep walk through these processes. They really are very important. I could not emphasize that enough and if you struggle to understand where your role is, how you might fit in, how could you participate? I think there are a number of us in this room alone that can help you to find your way, we would be very happy to support that.

>> I think as well because of these -- all these different things happening, it's not the time anymore to be reflecting and to be introspective and to do the post-pandemic kind of, "Oh, wear just coming out of this." No. Right? Now is the time where we need to taking action. We need to have specific ideas for specific change. That's what we're looking for. And the reason I say this is because there's a lot of - there's a lot at stake, and if we are not the ones taking the initiative to suggest these ideas and to push for change, other people are going to do it. They will take the initiative and they will define our future and the future of the internet for us. So I'll stop there.

>> Thanks, Joyce. Pat, would you like to go next?

>> Path: Sure, thank you. My name eels Pat, I'm from identity digital. We're in our second year of being a principal response the -- of the auIGF. We really enjoy being a part of it, hearing all the quality discussions from the different sectors here. It's a multi-stakeholder itch is all about. I also enjoyed hear from a lot of the members this year. There's a lot of different perspectives. It happened last year as well but this year it really seemed to be a lot more participation in that regard. -- regard. Whey enjoyed in the whole sponsorship thing, a lot was being part of the steering committee as well as the program committee, seeing how everything unfolded in the lead up into this. I want to thank the steering committee too's here, special cue Donbas to Anna Louise and Michael. I don't know if he's here -- kudos to an loo and na Louise. Thank you for that. I -- Anna Louise. I'd like to thank the other sponsored that contributed to the conference. It's not cheap to put this on. If you're an organisation that has the means to be able to contribute to this, we'd greatly appreciate it if you gave us a call next year. I guess the last thing is I'm really glad that - you know, not knocking... But I think the auIGF has meaning and I'm really glad we changed to it this year, so thank you.

>> Thanks --

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks, Pat. We do have - we have Briony Daily online. Briony, we might pass over to you, now.

>> Briony: --

>> Do we need to come back to Briony?

>> Briony! Hello, can you hear me now?

>> We can.

>> Briony: I'm back in Canberra but it was absolutely lovely to meet so many of you yesterday. And I do think that one of the great values of this conference is the networks that we make and really talking the -- walking the talk of multi-stakeholderism of inclusivity, and I think that's one of the most important things that we can take out of this conference and take it going forward. Thank you so much, Annaliese and Jordan and rosemary for a really valuable conversation across so many different aspects of internet governance but also the things that sometimes are connected but not necessarily what we think about when we talk about internet governance. I had a - I found it really interesting in the privacy conversation that we had yesterday as well. There have been a lot of conversations about regional interconnectivity which I think is one of the most important points of this conference and these networks, is that we are in the alone and we are not just talking about Australia in isolation. We are very much talking about the connections with our region and our world and taking that forward in a way that keeps the narrative positive. We definitely have defensive interests across the spectrum of internet governance issues but it's been hardening to hear some of the positive stories stories -- stories coming out of what Australia is doing, what our region is doing and we have an opportunity now to take so much of that forward into the next year and a half of very crucial internet governance work going forward internationally. Thank you so much and it's been a pleasure to meet so in of you over the past couple of days.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks very much, Briony. I might now invite Andrew, who's the chair of the Pacific IGF. Thank you for - thank you for joining us but the thank you for -- firstly, thank you for joining us but thank you four sharing some of our observations.

>> Andrew: Thank you, thank you for inviting me and another. It's Andrew from Pacifika. It was an honour. I think Jordan is also to be thanked because I must say that the connection with Jordan made a lot of difference to not only outer but to the IGF as well and I want to thank him. (APPLAUSE)

>> Andrew: I just say a few things that could be take aways for us in the Pacific idea. I think there's a lot of reach content that we have seen over the last two-days and we were fortunate to be sitting here and listening and absorbing some of the things that are very new to our region and to us, and it was an honour to be here. But I - probably two or three things that I just wanted to reflect on as takeaways. I think session 1.1, where we discussed 2025 and 2024IGF, there were some contributions from Pablo, Browny and Jordy that sort of gave us some, you know, some idea and some highlights. The first is that a technical community does not have a say in the - wishes process and also there's a risk that Browny brought up across the multi-lateral systems. That is also something that is important for us to take away, and also that leads to geopolitics. Also... You know, the internet may be restructured, the possibility that it may be... But in that Pablo say if something is not broken then don't fix it, a term which is so important. And again Shorty mentioned that this could also lead to internet fragmentation. Then the solutions that we picked up there, Shorty just say that we need to tell the story, and Browny said one of the solution is to go back 20 years and look at what has happened. That can lead us into the future. The other session that I think is important was the session on local to global. And one of the statement that was important in the session was the - to focus on the commonality, recognise the values and advocate globally. I think this statement was made by Joanna. And then we also see the negative part of which is a total disconnect between open, free and secure. Yeah, and then the threat of geopolitics and the internet infrastructure, we have seen that. So, the global and local or local to global, how can we - you know, sort of define that? There should be equal footing. They also - as we know, there are divides within the civil state. But, there should always be a local and global cooperation. And what - and this can be done in the arena through the NRIs that we currently V and then I think yesterday I mentioned the - one phrase that the Pacific Islands and Australia is sort of a stepping stone to global, I say that, and Australia needs to lead the way. I think that was a statement made in those sessions as well. And one of the ways to lead is to be a stepping stone for other, like the Pacific Islands. And finally, I think it was an interesting discussion on the position paper that concluded not too long ago. For us, for Ryan and myself - I think it is important for us to look at where probably our community can put up a position as well. We want to go and advocate to our countries a nation stage to see if they can also put up a position paper for its country in the paper. Thank you. I think those are my reflections, thank you.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks, Andrew. Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thanks, Annaliese, thank you, Andrew, that's lovely and embarrassing all at once. Look, a few thought. As the two days have gone on. One is that the geopolitical and Col -- policy context for the internet looks a bit bleak really and it isn't friendly to the multi-stakeholder which came out of a different era and balance of power and forces and so on and that's why each debate and decision point could Louise to its replacement by something else. It isn't a case of crying wolf and no, each time it would have been fine. That came to me and I thought that was a really telling observation. I can't remember who made it unfortunately but it really is the case that at regular points as well as being contested and is at risk of replacement, so we need to be in the fight all the time and that's partly why we also need to build and strengthen our local internet community in Australia, to be able to contribute to that work in all the spaces that it happens. It isn't just that the government can make it or another can. We all have our role, we all need to engage. The second one is there's a lot of insight and interest in the internet community that allies to policy debates and issues that have never heard of, that have never heard of multi-stakeholderism. I which think -- think we need to work at building better policy things. Particularly the multi-lateral ones. It isn't we need to demand a seat at the tame and pretend wear a state. We could say look, we have an often something up in the way in processes not blithely assuming that they should come to and understand us. It's part of that trance pollution and thing. The third point I'd make is the important of engaging with and engaging with Pacific countries to shape the internet in the way that them, to solve policies in the region and engage in those global debates as well. The stepping stone analogy is a nice one. Holding forums and support people's en gaugements is something that should come naturally to us. A fourth observation is that in Australia we have a lot to do to keep building and strength.ing our internet government to government institutions like the auIGF. Generally speaking run by volunteers run on very limited resources and perhaps lacking the depth of engagement they need to do the job as well as possible which is a common fee occur of internet governance in other countries, regions and so on. How to involve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities unless - on terms to meet their needs and aspirations is a growing area of conversation from the last two days. Thank you to Susan and Jenny and the others who have brought na really power play into the room. I think we also need to keep exploring practical actions and solutions as Joyce and others have said. Sometimes there's a problem that needs ton solved and rather than getting hung up on the way you can solve it you can get a bit grubby and solve it. We had a mini example of that with the position paper we dead. Let's try to focus on practical action arising from dialogue and story telling. My last point is there is a lot of power in the method of multi-stakeholder engagement which is you can sum up as putting all those with issues in an room enabling the kind of consumptions that lead to a work obviously us. It's a method that could help deal with a wide array of problems but even in areas where there are no multi-stakeholder institutions or processes to help solve those problems. For a multi-stakeholder approach to help in those areas, we need to do a better to job of telling the story. The narrative, as we mentioned a lot of times, making sure it's clearly directed at what it can help achieve, not seeing it as an end in itself, not seeing it as a mantra or a token, -- seeing it as something nice itself. There was a mon year 10, which goes out how to go multi-stakeholdering again which I hope people never use again. I'll stop at those five plus points of observation.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks. Sheryl is going to make her intervention from the microphone. After that, I will invite anybody who would like to contribute to the conversation. Thanks, Sheryl.

>> Thank you. Sheryl and starting off with again the internet society hat. --

>> Shorthand writer. The internet society aspect of this is internet Australia, which is a strategic partner in this thrilling and exciting exercise we've had over the last couple of years is the Australian chap tyre of song. As such I want to make very clear that we didn't drag four of our five serving directors here for the sheer joy of being in Melbourne on a rainy and miserable couple of days. The only one missing is swimming with turtles at Heron Island. For some reason he didn't think this was the better deal that. Being said, we are taking our commitment to being part of this process very seriously indeed. We have previously served as an entity as the home of net thing up until a new name and a new splash of colourful paint but it's a lot deeper than that. It's not just a rebranding a. What we are doing going forward and internet Australia is absolutely supportive of this, is building an effective model which is uniquely Australian in how we look towards having essential conversations including the courageous ones to quote Susan from the panel this morning. That need to happen if our representatives, wherever we are, whether we're talking policy in ICANN or talking, you know, government bilaterals or whatever it is we're doing, you know, down the street, over the barbecue, it does not matter. But that we can say we have heard, wave we have listened, we have discussed doesn't necessarily mean we all have to agree, although it is nice if we can get some general consensus and I really want to applaud the work that put together the documents, both the food for thought document and the I think - it seems a simple thing but it's quite extraordinary to have a deliberate, intended outcome document to be out for public comment well in advance of a national initiative. This is actually a very exciting experiment. Let's celebrate that. I want to now take off my purely Australia hat and act in a far more personal capacity in as much as how I serve in the organising committees of this and a lot of previous similar activities. It has been an utter joy to work with our fellow committee members. The work we have had - and thank you to to to Rosemary, and I sincerely hope Bruce is listening so he doesn't change it a ever, the fantastic support that we have had with one stepping up as secretariat. It simply worked. Worked safely, worked well. We and been able to just trust the magic's gonna happen, and it has. It's been a real pleasure and kudos to everybody who's been involved and there's a lot behind the scene, it's just the couple of people whose names get recognised. I also wanted to recognise the program committee and the committee that pushed those test -- put those test papers together. They've worked long and hard over making apparently simple outcomes look good but any particular I wanted to recognise the organising committee, who have met weekly since February. Weekly since February. A huge amount goes into this. We couldn't have done it without a serious commitment of human potential and it's a bunch of human hope I'm around to work with again in future years. But if you can join and contribute, even if it's not weekly, just the monthly organising committee calls, please do join us 'cause we need fresh thoughts. Dare I say, even young thoughts. We can have youth on our committee, remember. So o let's make sure we continue positive conversations. There's an awful lot of we could have done more in our sharing and story telling and information sharing that we have done in this last couple of days. Let's not drop it and not pick it up again until next year. Let's plan for how next year it becomes a next step. I'm going to stop now otherwise I'll prattle on for too long. Thank you. And thank you, Annaliese in particular.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thank you. I have a long list of people - I do have a long list of people to thank when we get to the close but now. I'll invite anybody who would like to share their thoughts and observations. Ian.

>> Ian g'day. :(INAUDIBLE).

>> Ian: Ian Sheldon, department of infrastructure and friends. Look - yeah. I just wanna say I thought it was an excellent conference. I have seen this return to form from the virtual conferences over COVID to the first in person again last year. We've got an excellent set of speakers, just to reiterate Pat's point, I thought we had excellent audience engagement. It felt people were happy to come up to the mic, have robust conversations. I wanted to thank the planning committee, I wanted to thank outer but I also want to particularly thank you, Annaliese. I know how much you've personally invested into pulling this all together. It's been a herculean effort and you've done it for a second time in a row.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks, Ian. Are you still going, Ian? Go ahead. No. --

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: No. Please continue. Anyone else, thoughts, come and speak. Go ahead, Ian.

>> Ian: I just wanted to provide a couple of extra reflections on the conference itself. To reiterate Joyce's point, it felt like we were just getting going on a bunch of really important discussions. I urge this community to push deeper. There's a lot of really big things happening over the next year or so, pick up the food for thought document. Jump in. Write your ideas. We in government will use it. There's a lot of things happening and we very much rely on the input and the thoughts from this community. We'll take them like Briony said, shamelessly plagiarise your ideas including interventions. I'd also urge this community to think about growing this community as well. You know, I think it's fantastic the turnout we have seen over the last two days but I know each of you know a lot of other people in a lot of other spaces. Let's grow in community. Let's work out how we can find other interfaces between internal governance and the breadth of other issues and start to pull others in. Finally I just also wanted to say that I know myself and my team have absolutely loved having a booth outside. It's a personal highlight of mine to come, talk to the community, hear your thoughts, work out where our blind spots might be, and it's incredibly valuable for us to have a space to test some of hour thinking and our ideas. Thanks for giving us the space and the time, and I genuinely hope it's not another year before I see all of you lovely people again. Let's keep the conversation going. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks, Ian and thank you to you and to your team and Briony as well. I did just want to really recognise not every country has their government come and ask them they think, comes gauges on an equal footing -- and asks them what they think. I think we should take a moment to appreciate the Australian government and their commitment to make stakeholder internet governance. Pablo.

>> Pablo: I just want to say a few things. I would like to reflect on the roles that brought us here to the best auIGF ever really. Sheryl O'Keefe, you know what I'm talking about. This has been hell of a joy ride. Sandra, is she here? Rosemary. This is all to your investment on a good cause, and I just want to - all of us in this -- see this room and reflect on the truth in multi-stakeholder itch. How many the government -- multi-stakeholder itch. How much the government agency has come as friends, how many industry has sponsored and collaborated, how much different players in Australia have come with interest and for the first time engaged, like talking and contributing and speaking. This is absolutely awesome. It's growing slowly. I mean, most of the room here are known friends. Some are new friends. Welcome, welcome, welcome. Please keep on. This is much-needed, and tell your friends as well. It's growing slowly, but steadily. That's so beautiful to see, and I think we are into something, and I hope that continues. Lastly, I just want to reflect as well on those that follow these remotely. Particularly my colleagues in the boardroom. They have been here for the whole duration of it, and I think there are plenty more and these will remain in YouTube as well to re trace and remember, you know. So, thank you. This is awesome. (APPLAUSE)

>> Angus --

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Thanks, Pablo. Sands

>> Sandra: -- Sandra: Thank you. Sandra Davey for the record. I think this is my fifth year so I'm still relatively new and the acronyms still overwhelm but the observes I can share are this time around I really noticed an incredible diversity of voices, and new faces. Which is really exciting, and I hope that you come back next year. There was some real quality of content, and I knowsed -- noticed some of the MCing and moderating superpowers have really shaped up. So I just want a plus one on Zoe Hawkins. If she's in the room, she's my favourite moderator. We should vote and she'd win. She was amazing, and takes a really difficult topic and turns it into a conversation. I think high stakes for us to copy next year. The outcomes paper. There's a lot of people online. That's just getting voted up. There's actionable outcome artefact for those that are new to this process. You're probably thinking, what? But, you know, to produce something seems like everybody's really rated that up. So well done for coming up with the experiment, whoever - I think it was the organising committee. I want to acknowledge Andrew Mora is online. For those of you that don't know, Net Thing was just a working title, but the damn thing got stuck. And it was a really important name at the time because there was such tension in the community and nobody wanted - we just needed to have a new name, so it's really lovely that netThing has done its job and awe -- auIGF is now standing on its own. If Andrew Mora can hear this, he needs to be really proud because he was the chair I think in its first year. That leads me to Annaliese. I think you've chaired it now for three years.

>> ANNALIESE BROWN: Two.

>> I did two, and we should not ask her to do three unless she wants to. It's a really, really big ask. Annaliese, you've done an exceptional job. So... (APPLAUSE)

>> My last two things are really important. Firstly, the food and the venue and the logistics, like just a big up, awesome to whoever put that on. The last one - nowhere in the world can you go out and talk to the Feds in the hallway and add sticky notes to their visual. We are really lucky to be able to not only have a government turn up but turn up with sticky notes and a picture and be open to the fact that their picture can be its rated on. I just feel really blessed to an Australian right now and thank the department for turning up and being so committed. Love and hugs, thanks, bye. (APPLAUSE)

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Sandra. While you are on that, I was going to mention it at the end but thank you, you were the inaugural chair of NetThing. I noticed Andrew online and Bronwyn Mercer who I don't think is online, she also chaired for a year. Thank you to everybody else who has got us to where we are. I think we are on the way now. Beginning - still at the beginning of the conversation but a lot of hard work has gone before. Thank you to the previous chairs.

>> I just think that applause to Annaliese was not warm enough. I think she deserves a longer and bigger and harder one. (APPLAUSE)

>> ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. That seems like a good moment to move into my list of thanks. I don't want to cut the conversation off is there anything that any of the other panelists would like to say as closing words or reflections of where we go to from here? This is just the beginning of the conversation. If you are interested in being part of the steering committee, you can find out more information, if you just email info at auIGF.au and we will tell what you is involved and how you can help and share more information. Any final words from our speakers? No. I do have a long list of people that need to be thanked. I wanted to start with thanking all of our speakers who took time out of their days to share their insights and expertise with us. They did this - it is a volunteer effort, this auIGF, the committee is volunteer, the speakers, the moderators have all donated their time. I wanted to thank the moderators as well who were volunteers and especially thank you, Sandy, Zoe, Mercedes and Anne-Louise who stepped in late to help out. Thank you for that for the last minute contribution to the success of the auIGF. I wanted to thank Pirate and Stacey, I am not sure if they are in the room. Hello. You may have seen them or spoken to them doing vox pops. Thanks for that contribution. The dynamic teen Coalition is a formal part of the global IGF structure. It is great to have that connection and also bringing that valuable and much-needed youth perspective. Early days of our collaboration but it is great to have you here. A huge shout out to my auDA colleagues who have provided the secretariat and logistical support for this event. All of these people were helping us out on top of their day to day jobs. A special thanks to Mike and Rachel and Jordan but thanks to all of my auDA colleagues who have been here putting up signs, helping people register, putting out the pens and paper and doing things behind the scenes. We appreciate that. Thank you Rosemary for allowing so many of the team to be supporting this. A huge thank you to the Multi-Stakeholder Steering Committee, it is a lot of work and everybody else has other things that they do, so we appreciate the time that the committee members have dedicated to bringing this conversation together. Thank you to Cheryl, Keith, Holly, Pablo, Joyce, Melody, Pat, Greta, Ian and Veronica. Sophia, Terry, Chris, George and Sandy. I hope I haven't missed anyone. If I have, accept my apologies. Appreciate you, it has been fantastic working with you again this year. None of this would have been possible without the support of our sponsor and partners and supporters and we really appreciate them. Our principal sponsor Identity Digital thank you again, not just for sponsoring the event but for your multi-year commitment to supporting the Indigenous fellowship as well. We appreciate that. Thank you for your patience. It is a volunteer effort. There have been some bumps along the way. Some of the collateral was supposed to arrive and didn't. We appreciate your patience with that. Also, to Verisign. Pat, we welcome your support of the Australian Internet Governance Forum and they were the sponsor of the event last night. A shout out to the department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development Communications an the Arts. Did I miss anyone? Thanks for their sponsorship, accessibility sponsor, we have Auslan in every session, captioning is available. These are not cheap and it is something that other IGFs, when we look to cut costs, don't do. We really appreciate the department's contribution for making us to be as accessible as we can be. AuDA thanks for being our strategic partner for the last four or five years. This year, the secretariat and logistical support but before that, it was financial support and contribution to the secretariat and we really couldn't have kept going without auDA's contribution. On behalf of the committee, Rosemary, thank you for your support and it has been invaluable, we would not have limped along without auDA's assistance. Other long term sponsors, Internet Association of Australia, the pen and paper sponsor. They have been one of the sponsors of NetThing since the start. We appreciate that long term relationship. Internet Australia. Cheryl in particular for your effort on the committee but Internet Australia has been the home of NetThing, NetThing and the auIGF aren't legal entities, so Internet Australia has done some of the critical behind the scenes things, boring but important, Cheryl, things like insurance and things that just need to happen. Thank you to Internet Australia. More sponsors that have been here since the very beginning, APNIC and the APNIC Foundation, we really appreciate your support, financial support, in kind support and your moral support. Thank you to the APNIC AV staff who have been here for last couple of days helping this to happen. (APPLAUSE) We have a few more sponsors. Go Daddy has also been there since the beginning. Thank you to George. IC ANN and the Internet Society, we appreciate your support. A shout out to our media partner ComsDay. Thank you for the nice write up you gave us yesterday. I think we are ahead of schedule but let's call it a day. Thank you everyone. This is the beginning of the conversation, not the end. It has been a fabulous couple of days. It has been probably the most engaging national IGF we have had so far. So thank you all for your contributions. Thank you for coming and thank you for actively participating and being so respectful in your engagements. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)