>> Hi, everyone f you can just take your seats and we’ll get started in a minute. -- if you can just take your seats.

>> Before we kind of formally kick off this morning I have asked Astrid, our First Nations fellows, one of our First Nations fellows f she wouldn’t mind doing an acknowledge to country for us. Thanks, Astrid.

>> I’ll start by saying on Ghana country when we say Nina mani you say something back. Which means you’re well. Nina mani. We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land we’re on today, the Ghana people of the Adelaide plains and beyond. If you actually go to your computers you have in front of you or your phones I’d like you to look up a top graphical map of South Australia and look at the first photo, turn your camera or screen to your side and you’ll notice it looks like the red kangaroo. I shouldn’t have told you that, should have asked you to tell me. I recognised the land was never ceded, no treaty was signed and it was and always will be Aboriginal land. I pay my respect to the eldest past and present and to the young ones coming through. The future knowledge holders. I’m grateful to be here on the country that holds thousands of generations of story, language and ceremonial care. Thank you. (APPLAUSE) Speaks speaks --

>> Thanks very much. Welcome to day two, thanks for coming back. We have some important business to do here this morning. And this is one of the potential outputs and movement forward that we will do throughout the year. If there is agreement around the notion of - pursuing a... A paper on digital wellbeing. Yeah, anyway, Keith and Annalise will explain more later. I’ll hand it over to you, Keith.

>> Thank you very much. And good morning everybody. It’s a great pleasure to be up here once more. The three of us are members of the steering committee for this event and you will see on the program that we’re not actually separately identified, we’re just part of the collective group that’s to blame or for this occasion. -- or responsible for this occasion. We have two purposes this morning. The first is to get reactions to an updated position paper and for those of you who were here last year, one of the outcomes of last year’s auDA was a position paper which represented a consensus view of that occasion or ideas we thought should and be taken forward in the form of a position paper. Au IGF. This year I have updated and I’ll ask my colleague, Caroline n a moment to take us through the changes. We’re again going to talk about the proposal for a digital compact. We’re not seeking consensus today on the document you see, we’re seeking to initiate a process, and Annalis Williams will take you through that as well there. ’Ll be an opportunity for comment and questions as we go. With that, any further ado I’ll hand over to Carrow to take us through the changes from the position paper for last year.

>> Caroline: Thank you and -- Keith. For those who were at the auIGF last year this paper will be familiar. So what we have done this year is used it to formulate some messages that we believe would be useful if we can get consensus from this meeting to forward to the copha Tatars of the WSIS + 20 -- copha Tatars of the WSIS + 20. That deadline was Friday but I understand from this morning that’s been updated to 3 October, so more time for that, co- - facilitators. Basically, this paper has not changed significantly. It just updates facts that have changed since last October to accommodate what’s been happening in terms of the review process. But what it has done is that it’s picked up the calls for action that were in last year’s paper and formed those into key messages that could be useful - we believe would be useful to convey to the co-facilitators as the views of this group in terms of what we would like to see in the final outcome document of the WSIS + 20. You’ll also see that currently they are really reflected in what’s in the zero draft, so, you know, that’s a cause of some hope, that the final document will also contain those kind of aspirations and aims for the future of the WSIS. So I’ll just take you through them. There are four. For the first one, support strengthening the existing internet governance structures within the UN system rather than creating new ones. And largely that is because the UN does have a history of creating new entities and committees and organisations to deal with digital issues. That can be a dilution of focus and activity. It can cause duplication and a lack of transparency, and it also makes it increasingly difficult for the multi-stakeholder community to engage fully and properly in all of these processes that are going on. So we would prefer the focus to remain with the Internet Governance Forum. So that goes into the second message, which is ensuring the continuation, evolution and the adequate resourcing of the IGF, and that is to strengthen and enhance its value, efficacy and sustainability. So we do realise that the IGF, you know, has faced some challenges. It could be better. It could be managed more efficiently, and in terms of resourcing, both in terms of people to do the secretariat services and financially, it has struggled, so to have an assured source of funding would greatly en hurricanes its ability to do its job properly. The next one is to do with - I think the word here "meaning -- meaningful" is very important. Of course multi-stakeholder processes are important, importanting all stakeholders and we believe they’re essential to improve internet governance structures to effectively address the challenges of a modern internet. And that also feeds into the WSIS aims to ensure an open, free and globally secure internet and advancing achievements of the WSIS goal that is are people centric, inclusive and development oriented -- oriented. But we use the word meaningful to ensure that what the stakeholders come forward with with, in terms of their advice and opinions and views, is treated substantively and not just symbolically. The last one is calling on the 2027 UN high-level review of the global digital compact to commit to robust as well as meaningful multi-stakeholder inclusion in its implementation and to avoid overlap and duplication with WSIS mechanisms. We feel that’s very important. Because largely I think the global digital compact was adopted at the summit of the future last September, and there were concerns about that process. Which was multi-stakeholder. However, there were views that the inputs from stakeholders were not really properly listened to or included in a lot of the documentation. That came out of that process. So we would not like to see that repeated during this process for the review. So, with that, I give you those four messages, and over to Keith, and we hope to get your consensus to put those forward.

Keith: You now have the opportunity to raise questions about this document or make any comments you would like if you’d make and lake to make a tore ask a question could you please come down to the Mike eurozone -- make a comment. -- microphone. Do we have any online questions or comments?

>> FLOOR: Not at this stage.

Keith: Would you identify yourself, please.

>> FLOOR: Hello, Richie from the digital justice society. Yeah, really like the document. I’m just reflecting on the conversations from yesterday. So obviously learnt from the start of the day this fits importantly with, you know, global work around multi-stakeholder, but I suppose my concern I had listening to the final session was the backwards and forwards of what does it even mean multi-stakeholder and I could just hear in the panel just now, "There’s one that was achieved and it didn’t quite meet a more let’s say robust definition." So my suggestion would be that alongside this document maybe that the auIGF does a small piece of paper that - that names a term for a certain style of multi-stakeholder that is a good one. You know, so it’s like an integrative multi-stakeholder process or a Powerballanced multi-stakeholder something but uses a slightly more refined term that is the auIGF’s own term that can then be used throughout the document and eliminate that clear backwards and forwards argy-bargy that could happen with that term.

Keith: Thank you for the suggestion, it is an interesting and sometimes theological debate exactly what we mean by multi-stakeholder. I think Jordan addressed this in some of his remarks yesterday. We’ll take that on board. Does anybody else have any questions or comment they wish to make? If not, I’d like to basically say now that we will adopt this as a consensus document from today’s - this auIGF, and we’ll move now to the - well, I would like to express my thanks to Caro for the work she’s done, because I think that’s been quite an important addition, and I think has helped to augment the document. I know that our Australian government representatives find this process, and these documents, useful as much as anything else to be able to say, "Well, at home in Australia, we have a broad alignment of views around certain things." Which then form part of the Australian government position in the negotiations that are under way, and will be under way in New York. So, it’s a useful document from a government point of view. It’s also useful I think from our point of view to be able to articulate the direction that we wish to see things move. Having said that, I’d like to now turn to Annalise Williams and she’ll take us through a couple of slides discussing the development so far of the proposal for a digital social compact. So, Annalise. Annalis: Thanks, Keith. Do I have a few slides. I’m sure that everybody here has thoroughly read the paper but for anybody who would like their memory refreshed I will go through a few slides and I just wanted to apologise. I’m not in the Zoom room. I’m having some issues on the laptop and I can’t see anything on the phone. So apologies for that. So, the paper - it’s about a social contract for digital wellbeing. I guess we could call it anything, the social contract sort of label is building on the philosophical concept of a social contract that’s sort of agreement between a people and those that sort of govern them. So we have extended the concept to include citizens and individuals and communities, corporations as well as the government. So, we did publish a version of the paper and had it open for a couple of weeks for input from the community. We did receive some feedback on that which was broadly quite positive about the concept of exploring this idea further. And the paper was updated so the version that appears on the website has been updated to reflect the input that we received. So, briefly why we thought it was worth having this discussion is that it’s - you know, our lives have been revolutionised by the expansion of the internet and adoption of ding digital technologies. -- of digital technologies. But it’s undeniable that these - very convenient and we now rely on them but it has presented a whole Serie in complex public policy challenges. And we sort of thought it was worth exploring, you know, striking the right balance between enabling an environment that allows for innovation but that still protects the public interest. So the idea is about moving beyond individual responsibility, and all the problems that you experience online are your fault. Also, beyond industry self-regulation or government control. It’s sort of about finding the balance between those areas, and we thought one way of progressing this goal could be to articulate the principles and the rights and responsibilities of all stakeholders that should guide the further development, digital development in Australia, and one of our speakers on the panel yesterday, I think it was Zoe, sort of referring to that shared vision of building a digital future. You know, what is that shared national vision? There are lots of conversations taking place in lots of different forums about issues that are potentially related or are all part of the same bucket of issues, and we just wondered whether launching a national conversation and having a discussion about all of the issues might be a valuable thing to explore. So, the outcomes that we would be aiming for out of this piece of work would be better informed and empowered users. We want an environment where there are effective safeguards but balancing that with rights and making sure that rights are upheld. We’re sort of seeking increased trust and that’s sort of trust in technologies but trust in public institutions, all aspects of trust. As well as increasing competition and consumer choice. The paper does sort of touch on some of the policy concerns, makes the case for why we think it is worth having a discussion on these issues. You know, there is a lot happening, there is sort of a lot happening on the government level. In Australia it’s a fairly fragmented space for digital policy. There are lots of different government agencies responsible for lots of different aspectses. -- aspects. Yeah, just sort of looking for a conversation where it’s all on the table I think. So in the paper we said we would be testing two hypotheses. Just seeing what people think. So this is an opportunity to, you know, share your thoughts on the paper, on the concept, to ask questions. I did want to clarify, you know, sort of what we’re doing and what we’re not doing. The first hypothesis - we have - we’re not sort of seeking to test your views on whether you think technology should serve humanity rather than the other way around. We have assumed that if you are here participating in the auIGF that that’s what you think. So what we’re testing is whether people think a social contract or articulating that shared vision, that the principles, the rights and responsibilities would help to achieve that. Just a point of clarification on that one. And the second hypothesis was just to clarify that based on some of the responses when we had the public feedback on the first draft of the paper, just to clarify that - like, this is not - the committee doesn’t feel that we have the expertise to do this ourselves. We weren’t seeking for the auIGF organisers to be solvely responsible for this work. We feel that there is significant expertise in the broader Australian internet community and we have heard from - you know, we have some of those people here today, and yesterday, you know, the tech policy design centre is doing work that is closely related. We heard from some academics yesterday who are looking at other different aspects. So this is not something that the committee would be solely responsible for. So I might pass to you, Keith, for any questions

or... Keith: Thank you very much, Annalise. As you can see, this work is in an early stage. This morning we seek a couple of things from you. First of all, any comments or observations that you may have about what you’ve got before you and also the process that we’re describing. But, secondly, an indication of whether any of you would actually like to be involved in the further development of this document which I personally believe is potentially quite important for Australia. The thing which I think is mentioned in the document is that it’s partly reflective of work which is happening in other countries. I think it’s fair to say that there are a number of countries around the globe that are starting to see the need for something like this. So I don’t think we’re alone here in some of these concerns. So, the floor is open. If people would like to come forward and make any comments or ask any questions. Jordan.

>> FLOOR: Thanks, Keith and Annalise. My name is Jordan from auDA. Congratulates on everybody being in the room so early on a Wednesday. Thank you for the introduction. Just a couple of views about to hypotheses. I do think that a sort of statement of vision for the trajectory of the development of the tech sector could be a helpful one, grounded in a sort of broad and diverse community like the auIGF. In the absence of a kind of public shared statement, everyone is just pursuing their narrow section or interests or the government is left to try and balance the various trade-offs and so on. I was stuck by the assistant minister’s comments in the opening panel yesterday about the need to render trade-offs really explicit and visible and to work through the logics by which those trade-offs are resolved, and having some of those hard arguments in a community-initiated forum rather than one that is un -- that is run by the government or run by regulators. It seems to me to be something that’s a little bit novel in the Australian context, so I think - I don’t mean that’s disrespect to anyone in the regulatory or public policy space. I think on that basis it could be an interesting experiment. And I think that paper efforts - well, not this paper but such a compact could usefully - or contract could usefully set out thoughts about the roles and responsibilities of various actors and one of the hard parts will be to encourage those with the authority to bind to get involved in bringing about its recommendations or to decode that slightly it may be that such a social contract ends up defining some requirements that are needed in terms of legislation regulation and I don’t think we should shy away from that because I think part of what this is is it’s exercising the agenda-setting role of the auIGF and I think that’s really positive. On the second point about a representative group with relevant expertise, my own personal bias would be to put expertise first. I think that it won’t be easy to both write down the nice easy list of bits that you’d want to see in a compact like this, but to - in a really savvy and hard-headed way, put the trade-offs on the table and give the community all of us the kind of background material and thinking that will allow us to really effectively engage in the debate about those trade-off see if we can come to a consensus or equally valuable document the nature of disagreement and lack of consensus. So showing how a really rigorous work through of the trade-offs is then met by community responses. So I really - I heard the call for volunteers to be involved in the work. I think part of the work needs to be a very expert group of the right people to do that and part of the work needs to be ongoing community engagement between now and the next auIGF. It can’t just be something we come back to in a year. Overall I think it’s a worthwhile position that would be very interesting to see further work

on. Thank you. Keith: Thank you very much, Jordan. Can I hear from the next question, please. Could you let us know who you are.

>> FLOOR: Thank you. My name is Alexa. What I’m going to say is me as a member of public, however at the moment I’m representative of a technical community as well so I have to disclose that. I’m the president of... Next users Victoria, I’m also from the private sector. I’m glad Jordan came before as -- me as well, made really good points. This is a really great initiative. And I - I was more involved this nuanced conversation around governance and technical project calls overseas in Europe and the IGF community kind of help me get more connected there local wise. So I want to make a few observations given this is the infancy of this initiative. Observations from my side is as we all may - by the way if there’s something I say increate please tell me. I just express strongly but I lose these - hold them loosely. So IGF is one of the streams of conversations as such. From termly days of internet, as internet was evolving and getting more serious and more regulation and technical implementation, we had - well, early days ITF and ICAN and... A lot of like melting soup of organisations so IGF is one of them and there he’s a lot of voices out there that either have their own places in implementing those or those who joined the tech sector later on, a lot of people have absolutely no idea any of these things are happening. Also, because of the way certain organisations may have engaged with the - their own constituency over their decades, we may have lost the engagement from those constituency, they’re not following up. I can tell you there are very senior people in different sectors, academia and business that, have not -- have not even heard IGF what it is or it’s happening, and just some look brands and they don’t think - it’s just like anything is gonna come out of that. Whereas when you yes here and you attend you know that there is a very genuine intentions. Thinking about who is not in the room. There was a question yesterday they don’t think was well understood about resourcing. When we put out call for submissions and advertising we have done our job, but it is really important to recognize organisations,s specially for purpose organizations, and not-for-profits,s specially those, what they do is not directly visible to members of public. Some don’t even qualify for charitable status.

>> Could I interrupt? It seems to me you are asserting there are people who should be part of our conversation who are not in the room or not aware? I think we would accept that point. And I think what we would ask is, let us know who you think we should be including in the conversation. That is one of our purposes, to tease out this morning who is missing from the conversation. We seek expertise of a number of different kinds to help us craft this document going forward. I accept your point. We then need to know who are you talking about and now do we engage with them?

>> FLOOR: Thank you for making it practical. I’m more than happy to share what comes to my mind. I’m trying to address a systematic point moving forward. I think resourcing the active reach out to organizations is really, really important. Knock on doors. In the COVID-19 and lock-downs, a lot of small business that, they were eligible for funding, they didn’t know, they didn’t have resources to fill in a form. There’s a lot of this. So we have to actively reach out. I’m happy to share the names separately, not to take this time. I said all these things to get to the point of social contract. It’s got to get a bit nuanced and philosophical here. The way I heard social contract defined was an agreement between people and those who govern them. I believe - maybe this is what - do you want to correct? Maybe I’m wrong.

>> I will ask Annalies to respond.

>> So it builds on the concept. That is what is understood as is the social contract which is that implicit agreement between a people and its leaders. What we are doing, is we have said that in the paper we are building on that concept.

>> FLOOR: I’m thinking we don’t build on that, because there is another area, these are different schools of definitions and we live in a democratic society and it’s already taken care of in my opinion - because tech is advancing so fast, what is missing is the agreement bit between the people, for them non-binding so they have a clear picture, shared perspective of what they think is appropriate and that is absolutely missing because tech is moving so fast. Because of my private sector activities, and also the tech community, I know for sure there is a lot of frustration, confusion on the ground that have nowhere to express themselves and for - there are a lot of good intentions but when you running a small business you are in this tide of heavy forces, budgets, and who is procuring and you have to adopt those. Those regimes are getting more complex. If you have a reference point on the ground from what the members of the public expect or are OK with, then smaller players and industry players especially, they can build on that or refer to that in their own statements or submissions that they’re making. That’s the point I wanted to make. It’s not a strong opinion, but my point is at the moment, not just the internet necessarily, in other parts of democracies as well, there is no mechanism for that particular type of social agreement. That’s the point I was trying to make.

>> Thank you very much.

>> Before you start, I want to reiterate again. We’re not seeking to solve all the problems here. We are putting out the question - is this a national conversation that the aulGF should or could facilitate? Is this something that is worth a broader national conversation? I think if I understood your points you would say perhaps it is. There are people that aren’t here that should be included. That is acknowledged in the paper. We would be seeking to do community outreach with the relevant experts and potential opportunities for others not part of this meeting here to contribute.

>> FLOOR: People may remember me from yesterday. A founder and the Claire of Digital Rights Watch. I want to complement you, Annalies that you are the custodian and there’s a lot of people involved. I like the language of digital wellbeing among other things. I think Australia struggles because unlike other equivalent jurisdictions around the world, we are the only liberal democracy without an enforcable rights regime. That sets us apart from others in a very negative manner. So, that is a struggle. Compared to the Brazilian document that is quite direct and articulate about protecting fundamental rights, Australia sits apart from a negative way from some other jurisdictions. I think what that means is firstly, it is a negative because how do you talk about fundamental rights when they are unprotected in an enforcesable manner in law. Also a potential positive, because other organizations are campaigning for a human rights framework that could be pulled into this dynamic. There’s been other plans that look similar, including a plan for business and human rights developed a few years ago where industry was ahead of government, say, which I thought was an interesting dynamic. It’s unclear where this particular program of work might sit but there’s the potential to draw in others campaigning for those kind of things. You ask who is missing. That is one set of people that could be included and that draws me to the second point. The other component, or thinking of the social contracts an agreement between citizens to be governed and comply with relevant rules. I think the conversation yesterday that occurred between - where the telco industries, are defending their position, consumers feel they’re not listened to, highlighted some of the challenges when there’s not necessarily agreement from all the relevant stakeholders about the deficiencies in the... Sorry. Told to slow down. Not the first time I’ve been told. I’m sorry. I will slow down. Sorry. What I would say is, there’s a real need to bring in stakeholders, not just with expertise, as Jordan discussed but also with decision making, weight, actual representative capacity, particularly, I would argument, over industry because if they’re not prepared to use a forum like that to discuss what they are willing to do and not do, willing to comply with and not comply, we can do a lot of work, as civil society organizations, that will not have the impact that it needs to have. I think that is possibly also true of government, although they sit in a slightly different position. I remain concerns forums more focused on dialogue which have their merit, they have to have the weight of participants that have both expertise, but capacity to commit their relevant organizations and sectors, rather than just leaving this to be an initiative that others put together and then try to recruit input and buy-in from very powerful stakeholders. So, that would be my other feedback with great gratitude to our AUSLAN interpreters.

>> Thank you. We have the next comment.

>> FLOOR: 80% of what I was going to say was just said and very well said. I think there is a phenomenon when you try to define some kind of rights or bar that needs to be met, is that the community says this is what I’m not ray lowed to do, I will sit on the other side of that line. I think the principles in the paper does that, because you can do something but doesn’t mean you should. I think we need to think about how that extends culturally into the culture of the internet because if it is not enforcable by some kind of regulatory mechanism it has to be enforcable by the community. It will only be enforced by the community if there is a culture that exists. I think there is a danger of dropping a social contract and not thinking about how that extends into something that is enforcable but also not thinking of how it extends unto something that, I guess, is implicitly implemented, so, this comes to the point where it says in the paper that how the implementation, how this is implemented out in society is not considered. But I would say defining a social contract, the people need to, to take responsibility over how that is implemented cross-jurisdictionally because government always sticks within their remit and don’t want to go outside of it. That will be a massive problem. Since the internet is a global phenomenon, we need to take global approaches and I don’t think our governments will do that, so someone needs to. Yes, I would love to be a part of the development of this. I also think that it’s really important that a proper engagement and partiespation plan, is created. Make sure that first nations voice and voices of minority, both culturally, in terms of ability, age, all various, I guess, demographics of diversity and minorities is also included and that takes funding. So I think that’s to consider as well.

>> Thank you very much. Bruce.

>>

FLOOR: It is Bruce Tomkin. The approach of the document. I like the idea of setting out principles, rights and responsibilities. I think you have to be careful of not trying to boil the ocean. I hear comments that we will be at this for years. I encourage more an iterative approach, start simple and build on it. One area to think about building on it would be perhaps documenting what would be norms of behavior or norms for contracts with online providers and I will use a couple of examples. One is, if you drive a car into a car park it will generally have a set of terms and conditions. Most of us don’t bother to read it. We’re accepting that there’s some norms of behavior. If I park my car, the car park probably closes at midnight, if I don’t get there in time I have to pay a call-out to get the car, or pick it up tomorrow. That’s norms of behavior. If the terms and conditions said - if you don’t get your car by midnight, I get to keep the car, that would not be accepted norms. So, what I really want is not the long list of standard terms and conditions but I would like to know if there is something unusual, if it had a big sign saying, "If you don’t get out of this car mark by a particular time, I keep the car", then I’m really understanding what I’m consenting to. Similar for airline travel. You probably have an expectation - I think this is part of the consumer trust side - that you accept sometimes there’s operational problems and a flight might be canceled. You generally expect to get a refund if it is canceled. What you wouldn’t expect is, "It’s canceled, we will book you for next week." If I knew that, I wouldn’t be buying the ticket, because I need to go today. So it’s the difference from the norm of behavior that’s important. Ireland in the paper there was discussion about the concern that people provide things like dates of birth or your postal address, pretty common with a lot of online services. A reasonable norm of behavior would be you provide that information to help the supplier identify you if something goes wrong. If you lose your password and you ring someone, "I lost my password". They generally use this other information to help identify you. That would be a norm. I don’t need any special terms and conditions for that. What would not be normal is they on-sell my address and date of birth and if they’re going to do that, that should be called out as an exception, "We’re going to collect your date of birth and sell it, do you consent?" I think it is trying to establish coming back to principles, rights and responsibilities, but also what norms of behavior we expect with our online interactions and the consent is when you are consenting to something outside of that norm of behavior.

>> Thank you very much, Bruce.

>> We have a question from Kiki, who would like to address the room.

>> Oc Kay.

>> Can we hear from Kiki?

>> KIKI: Can you hear me?

>> We can.

>> KIKI: Appreciate this panel and the work that you are doing and what Lizzy spoke of. I apologize in advance if any of my questions cover something you have chosen. I had to work, so I have come in late. When I hear a few things over yesterday, and today, and as I was looking through the paper, I wondered why we chose this and not something else. As my ADHD brain generally lends to. I have workshoped it with a few people and I think this notion of the social contract is interesting. On one hand, I think that it does add value to some things Lizzy was talking to and adds some weight in the legal and policy sphere, but I wonder when we talk about social contract and that relationship within a community and governing bodies, whether or not the aulGF when we talk about silos or talking about needing to reach out more and having more representation, if we’re currently in a position to be able to say, hey, we have enough representation to feed into this. While I appreciate there are all these efforts to say, hey, who needs to be in here? What can we do? It’s not just bringing people in. There are structural issues and I think Alexa mentioned that. I look to Internet New Zealand and what’s recently happenend and previously their systemic racism report. I look at what just happenend in Nepal with the social media ban, the cut off of social media. I wonder where do we stand on these things now, let alone in the future? In a year’s time, a lot is going to happen. What it appears to me is that there does need to be some understanding from, I guess, the internal organizations that have that kind of more power, more resourcing, more paid commitment to the internet governance stuff that this is not just about policy, not just about conformance but performance. Internet governance policy have best practice forums, special interest groups and this is information available freely and participation is free. We need to do some community building. Community development clearly needs to be done with additional expertise from the community development sector, civil society, academia, because they have disengageed. Sometimes disengagement, sometimes low engagement and sometimes non-responsive is an answer. Dialogues are not just talk-fest, they develop community, deliver outcomes. For me I look at some of the feedback that happenend over the last couple of days. Over the last couple of years. Just here but within the internet governance forums and I’m hearing the same message. I feel the questions you are looking for have already been answered if you go back and listen and understand. Understanding comes from, I guess, what I get from here is that old Jahari’s window, you can’t know what you don’t know. There’s massive blind spots within the current make-up and there’s huge will, huge expertise.

>> Kiki, could I interrupt? You just said that you think all the questions we have in the paper have been answered. I’m not sure a lot of people in this room would necessarily agree with your statement.

>> KIKI: I agree with that statement also. I don’t believe, because we don’t have continuity of the information. People from civil society, academia, can put very clear interventions at these events, at these town halls, these things and it won’t bed up or acted on. That is that blindspot. The classic, you don’t know what you don’t know. That is a representation thing. I wonder - I do really like this, I do like what you’re trying to do here, though, it just feels the priority here is around supporting community building and community organizing, because you have a lot of things. I like Bruce’s intervention there, norms for contracts for providers. That is a really unique, tangible thing that I think people could get around but this broader social contract for digital wellbeing, (a) says, how do you define digital wellbeing? I know New Zealand has a Centre for Digital Wellbeing and indicators and that is good but that is a slightly different question and we could go to our policy as co-community, we talk about Indigenous rights and those conferences and those spaces exist. We have Ausnogt network operators group that share best practices and innovative things, into the performance sector and the Australian All Things in Moderation Conference, which gives a whole world on non-technical, non-policy ways we can help shape healthy online communities.

>> OK, Kiki, I will have to trust again. We have a couple more speakers.

>> KIKI: My last question is why this and not something else? For example, the internet universal indicators, put out by UNESCO to incorporate the ten processes of principles that Australia was a lead on. Thank you.

>> Thank you. I would like to acknowledge your comment about community building is one that I fully support. We will go on to, I think, Donna would like to make a comment?

>> FLOOR: Donna Austin. Thanks. I think, as I say, from little things big things grow. So, to start somewhere, we could be the group to do that. How that expands down the road, we don’t know yet. I think my sense from the room is this is something that is worthy of pursuing. We can take a first crack at it, as, I mean, as the aulGF. We can use the networks we have to expand a bit, to bring perhaps a broader group of people in. But at some point - I think this is probably a conversation that will need to happen early - is we need to be in agreement about what the purpose of the document is, what’s the problem we’re trying to solve with it and at least get on the same panel on that and then I think we would have a better chance of developing something that everyone will be comfortable with. I think Annaliese and others have done a really good job of developing something we can work with now and develop it and see where we get to in 12 months’ time. I don’t think this is a 12-month project given that it will be done by a group of volunteers on, kind of, an ad hoc basis, I don’t know how this will work. This could be a longer term project. It won’t happen in the next six months or 12 months but in my thinking, this is probably a minimum 2-year project. During that time we will overcome all those challenges about who we want to be involved, what is it we’re trying to do, what is the sign-off - do we want enforcement? There is a lot of conversations that will happen in that time that will get us to an end product. All we are trying to solve here is, do we get it started? I think that, I think I’m hearing there is support for that, thanks.

>> Thank you. Andrew. I think Andrew will have to be the last speaker, because we are running out of time.

>> FLOOR: Andrew, ACT Government, but speaking as an individual. There is great value, I think, in the social contract being developed and promulgated and shared with people. Two thoughts. The first is, in the first point it talks about technology and humanity almost as separate things but technology is a tool of humanity. There is no technology without humanity. When you get into the body of the document, it doesn’t talk about technology as a thing that needs to be managed. It talks about empowering humanity so they can make choices and they have agency in the use of technology and how technology is used around them. So, I think that is an important thought because it flows on to the second thought, which I think relates to some of the things that Kiki was talking about and Donna. This is a conversation that the IGF can have with the broader community. Kiki pointed out there’s so many things out there. If you read them and track them down, this is already answered. The reality is, no-one has time to track it down. It’s not in the same place, it’s not accessible to most people. So, I think the forum like the aulGF has an opportunity to broaden its community by making these concepts more understandable to people, by giving people agency, by forming a larger community who are participating in internet governance. I think the artifact itself, the social contract, will be good. I think the process of bringing in a community and more people and empowering them with knowledge that is simple and accessible and relevant to them will be as much the delivery of this process. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Andrew. I would like to draw this to a close now. We are getting close to our time for the next session. I would like to invite both Karo and Annaliese to indicate if they have concluding remarks they would like to make?

>> Thank you. Just to thank everybody who did read the paper and who were gracious enough to accept the consensus. We think that these kind of messages from communities like the aulGF are important to make because these are our voices and we want them heard in these kinds of discussions. These are principles and key messages that we feel are very important. So, thank you.

>> Annaliese.

>> Thanks, Keith. Thank you to everybody that did read the paper and who has engaged in this conversation. Just - the drafting committee - we didn’t think we were the first people to think of this. We didn’t think that this was - we’re not trying to reinvent the wheel. We are conscious there is a lot happening but the point is they are happening in isolation. They are happening in silos. We think that the conversation is all part of the one conversation. These conversations need to be being had in a more co-ordinated way and we think the aulGF could be the place and if we can develop a set of agreed principles, norms, whatever we want to call it, that could be a really powerful advocacy tool.

>> Thank you very much. For my part, I would like to acknowledge all the comments and questions we received this morning. I certainly found some very illuminating. We don’t have answers for all of the points that have been raised by you this morning. We are basically in a process we will take forward. It is our intention to report back to next year’s aulGF. Based on what Donna just suggested, it will possibly be a progress report rather than finalized document. Bruce, yes? The temperature of the room? OK. Could we see who in the room - could you raise your hands if you think it is a good idea to have the social contract? Sorry. Yes. That’s about, I reckon, 90%-plus of the room, so, thank you very much for that. With that, we will conclude and hand back to Donna.

>> DONNA: Thank you. We are going to have morning tea. We will be back here at 10.30. Thank you, folks. (Morning Tea).

>>

>> DONNA AUSTIN: If we could start our next session, please.

>>

>> Alright. So our next session is Flu Play New Rules - the Future of Child Digital Rights and Skills. I want to hand over to Abdul from Project You who will introduce himself. And the panel. Let’s go.

>>

ABDUL MATHEE: Guide morning, I’m the CEO of Projected You, a think-tank and a global am bass for for education at the UN and co-chair the SDG for the Youth Network for Vocational Education and Future Skills for Dignified Work. It is our pleasure and honor to be moderating today’s session. Because we Reg tos I want our teaching side to come out. Jamie, you can join me. For those who choose, if you could stand up for a second. Then give ourselves a bit of a stretch. A little bit up the top. Don’t crack your back a bit on the side. And then on the left. Now, thank you. Please sit down. Let’s get some energy back in the room. Alright. So, a very interesting earlier conversation, leading up into our session today. It is a very fundamental topic - what does the future of child skills, child digital rights and skills look like? One of the fundamental aspects we are walking into today is a lot of the legal and policy changes that we are seeing locally, and abroad, is in November 2024 the government of Australia passed the Online Safety Amendment Act which kept the minimum age for what social media access looks like. Non-compliance of this would lead to a $50 million fine, with platforms like Instagram, Meta, Facebook and X and all these other players, made responsible to enact this regulation. So, a lot of the initial discussions around this were based around the UK-based age check certification scheme. Now, there’s been multiple layers of systems. Whose responsibility is it? Is it us as educators in schools, is it parents, community members, civil society? Is it actually the platforms themselves this bill comes into effect in three months in December. Across the pond, we have our friends in New Zealand who have drafted a bill through the National Party which also is looking at banning social media platforms for under 16s. And back in 2011, they’ve been saying this for the last 14 years, they’ve had an education workforce select committee. They opened a public inquiry into the harm young New Zealanders face online and the roles that that the government and businesses should play in addressing such harm. A critical factor over here is child protection. Child protection, especially online protection, is a much discussed topic within the technical community. We spoke about social contracts. One of the questions is how do we localize those? We might have global principles but the local realities in Australia is very different to India or Indonesia, or Dubai, or Germany. How do we look at our society and what works for us? That is a very robust conversation we need at local, regional and international levels. The World Summit on the Information Society supported the value of Ros Childs online protection, largely through promoting the existing work -- child online protection, under the working group on child online protection. The Internet Governance Forum is increasingly discussing the important of child rights given the events in Norway around securing child safety and the age of the algorithms. Despite this, technology and in some cases domestic legislation is always playing catch-up. The advent of AI is another recent example and in the 30-plus year rat race we’ve had with technology and where policy and education needs to come into place. How do we actually meaningfully, holistically address this. On digital skills we’re told approximately 70% of the world’s jobs in the next 10-15 years don’t exist yet. What are we preparing our kids for? A ban on a ban of digital tools are we giving them the raw skills to create and prosper in a world where we don’t know what the future looks like? The pandemic revealed the level of importance of embedding digital competency into the lives of our children. We know that children at two years old are sometimes more competent than us. Despite this, the tech market which is balled at $160 billion in 2024 and we see the rising integration of AI in classrooms, the UNESCO Global Education Report identified there is inconsistent research and data concerning the use of technology in the classrooms. We can see that in Australia, what schools are, in Adelaide, is very different, AI and online experience as to Victoria or NSW. And despite 54% of countries now have a digital skills standards in their national curriculum, we still are facing vast gaps in have and have-notes. AI is just going to accelerate this widening gap, it won’t get easier. Lastly it has become incredibly necessary to discuss the intersection in relation to the children’s use of the and digital tools in relation to their family, education, employment and the wider community at large. More than 45% of our kids have more online friends than physical friends. Online friends from around the world. That is why even though we talked about localizing social contracts and localizing nance, how do we control when they talk to somebody overseas? And with this, we are quite excited to start our panel discussion today. To begin, I would love to get you guys to participate. So, we have a Menti set-up, if we can get that on the screen. I would love for you guys to answer some of the questions that we are going to be putting up. We have two questions. So go to menti.com and type out that code, or you could just scan this QR code right here. Give you guys a moment to do that. A few more seconds. Right. Talk about technical difficulties!

Our first question: (On screen).

>> A very liberal audience in the room that says we don’t need to ban anything, quite high. So that’s what we are seeing. We are seeing a good - how do you put that - 80-20, 85-15% split on what, whether social media ban works or not. Let’s go to our second and final question. (On screen). Oh wow, this gap has gone even bigger. Alright. So, this is almost a unanimous decision, where we are seeing that a ban will not necessarily prepare our young people for what we need them to prepare. So, just like how our audience is excited to hear, this is a very layered topic. A multiple facets and we are excited to unpack that. We would love for you to engage with us in the latter half of the session with our Q&A and I hope we get interesting questions. Without further ado, I will pass it on to my wonderful moderator, Jay Chew, a STEM educator in Melbourne, completed the teaching excellence program and teaching innovation fellowship. He was listed on the educators’ hot-list in 2024 for his work in sustainable education. He is working on the integration of AI and VR in classrooms and his team is working on using Minecraft and Ti in, kercard to teach students about crushing its and experimental design and is exploring how to help students to make the most of AI in education and empowering them. So, Jay.

>> JAY CHEW: Good morning to everyone. So, my name is Jay. I will begin the first session that we have for today. The first session is looking at engagement of social media ban across Australia and New Zealand. We have two wonderful presenters that we have. First, we have Michael. Who is from Netsafe New Zealand. And following to that, we have Ellen -- Noel. So, Michael, who is currently based in Wellington, has joined Netsafe after recently returning from the UK, where for the past 18 years, he worked in a number of legal roles in the public sector. He was most recently the deputy director of Cabinet office in Europe Legal Group and was a core member of the UK team that has successfully negotiated the UK’s post Brexit trade and relationship with the EU. For Noelle, she is the internet society’s portfolio engagement and this includes capacity building on issues, that are top of mind for the region. One of which is on online safety. In her role, she also represents the Internet Society in rec fora, working towards an open, global and secure internet. A couple of questions for Michael for his presentation. The question is on - how do Australia and New Zealand approach the position of children’s rights online? What is Netsafe New Zealand perspective on balancing participation for young people in the digital environment? How do we create the right balance between child and teenage freedom and the learning of digital skills verses online protection? I will pass you to Michael.

>> MICHAEL DE TOMBE: Good morning. Thank you for that introduction. So, just to add in a bit of my history. I have been at Netsafe for three years. I needed to update my biography. Netsafe, in case you don’t know, we are an online safety charity in New Zealand. We’ve been around for about 25 years. We have been advocating for providing advice on online safety issues over that time. Since 2016, we were appointed by government to administer in part the New Zealand piece of legislation called the Harmful Digital Communications Act. So, we have experience in dealing with online harms and safety and in particular how it affects children. The other thing to add is that we have over the past 20 years or so provided education on online safety, in particular to upskill teachers and parents on how to protect kids online. Answering the first question - how do Australia and New Zealand approach the protection of digital rights in respect of children? In a nutshell, differently. So, New Zealand were at the forefront of innovations in online harm pledge sleighs. In -- legislation. And New Zealand passed the Harmful Digital Communications Act which sets up a regime for individuals to pursue redress if they’ve been seriously emotionally distressed from a digital communication. Parents can apply for address on behalf of their children. So, while it’s relatively successful in providing redress for individuals, once an incident has happenend, it doesn’t place any pro-ago obligations on platforms and have not designed in achieving systemic change. Other than that legislation, New Zealand doesn’t have a regime that places proactive responsibilities on platforms. And has in a sense fallen behind similar jurisdictions. Unlike Australia, we don’t have an online safety act. There are no provisions on our statute book just yet that seek to protect children’s online experiences. So, we don’t have this overall comprehensive regulatory model like our friends in Australia and in a sense surprisingly we have fallen behind, in my view. So, jurisdictions like the UK, the EU, Ireland, many states in the US, do have comprehensive online safety legislation. New Zealand is starting to look a bit like an outlier in that respect. That said, we have been watching this debate in Australia and elsewhere, and there are now a groundswell in New Zealand for more to be done. So, as Abdul mentioned, there are private members’ bills proposing a ban on social media for children. There’s currently an inquiry anyone the New Zealand Parliament looking into harms experienced by children online and what appropriate responses should be and in parallel, the New Zealand Government set up its own policy team to consider what the New Zealand approach should be. I think we can expect some policy proposals to emerge in the near future. In terms of the second part of the question, so, that was - what is Netsaf’s perspective on balancing safety, access and participation for young people in the digital environment? So, Netsafe came out early on when the debate was just starting out in Australia, against a proposal to ban children from social media and we’ve maintained that position ever since. We don’t think bans or delays are the right response to what is a multifaceted and multidimensional issue. Bans don’t reflect the reality of how young people use technology. They risk cutting them off from opportunities that digital environments provide for learning, creativity, social connection and civic participation. But we also think there is a greater risk that bans will push children into parts of the online world that are unregulated and where people - they are not going to be protected. We are realistic. We don’t think there is a single silver bullet that is going to protect children, place burdens on or obligations on platforms and solve this issue quickly. We think the real balance lies in recognizing that children and young people... Sorry what was that?

>> JAY CHEW: Saying there’s 30 more seconds.

>> MICHAEL DES TOMBE: Quickly, we think the balance is recognizing children and teenagers are vulnerable and capable and any approaches to address both of those points. So, a comprehensive regime involving modernized regulation, investment and digital education, support for parents and teachers, funding of wrap around support services and efforts to foster global collaboration are much more likely to achieve the stated policy aims here.

>> JAY CHEW: Thank you very much. Alright, thank you, Michael. I will move on to Noelle, the Internet society is engaging capacity building for online safety, built upon various areas of your work including on encryption and an upcoming paper on edge verification. What did you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the current approach that Pacific nations are taking to young people being online?

>> NOELLE: Hi, everyone. Shall we start with the bad news first? It’s always good to end on a good note o the weaknesses. One weakness we see is there’s still a strong tendency and not just in Australia and New Zealand and the Pacific, but overall more broadly in the Asia-Pacific region, to think that we can somehow legislate our way out of a problem. In Australia we see this in the social media ban, in the wider Asia-Pacific region, we still see a not of notice and take-down regimes. The latest iteration of this is a licensing regimes for platforms for content providers. In countries like Malaysia, requiring content providers to register as a condition of them operating in the country to compel them to comply with take-down requests A related weakness is especially in, in small nation context, we see in policy discussions the tendency to lump online risks together in one bucket and to approach it as if we can solve everything with one solutions package. And there are similar discussions that conflate online safety with cyber community concerns. That’s something we need to be careful with. The third weakness that underpins both weaknesses is there is yet to be strong evidence to back these policies up. So, and please, correct me, I could be wrong, but we have yet to see robust long-term studies on, say, the impact of social media on children’s wellbeing. Evidence is very important as we know. This is not the first kind of, how to say, overly... We have seen similar measures over the years. One early example is in South Korea. So, in South Korea, back in 2011, the government implemented a policy restricting kids from using the internet from 11:00pm to 6:00am and the intention was to help them sleep better and longer. A few years after that policy, they did a study and they found that actually it only managed to lengthen children’s sleep by one minute-and-a-half and it had the unintendedive of intensifying children’s use of screen-time in the hours they could be online. Now time to go to the good news. I will be stopped soon, I know. Let’s go to the good news before I get cut off! One - overall, I think the positive side to this is that we are becoming more comfortable in having and adopting a whole-of-community approach, where we put children and children’s interests at the center of the debate. One important aspect to this is recognizing the role of primary caregivers in fostering a positive online experience for children. Equipping educators and parents and guardians with tools and skillsets because parents are at a loss. I don’t have children, but I have a lot of friends who have children. When they see their kids blued to the screen, they don’t know what to do. The tendency is to just say yes, yes, government control. We know it plays into political decisions as well with these policies because parents are a big voting bloc. The second dimension is the reference to children’s agency. We are seeing outreach to understand how children use and experience online environment, how they engage and interact with the different services that they use, both support bid the private sector, with corporate foundations backing initiatives like this, we see even the eSafety Commissioner and not-for-profits like the Internet Society. So we supported, I think last year, research done by the Reset Tech Australia, looking into datafication and finding children really care and have a lot of aware ness of their privacy and what they want to do with their data. Overall, I think it’s also not just understanding them, but also being...

>> JAY CHEW: Ten more seconds.

>> NOELLE: To have them codesign their skills, sorry, the curricula and the digital literacy programs that are meant for children. So having them part of the design and development process as well. Sorry, that was rushed.

>> JAY CHEW: Sorry. Thank we, will move on to question 2 - to introduce you to Ellen who will moderate the next session. So Ellen is an Intersociety Youth Ambassador from New Zealand, and has held appointments for the SDG for Education 2030, High Level Steering Committee Leaders Group, the UNESCO report and in the report in 2023. UNESCO IESCLC and IBM framework for education and supported the UNESCO Most Breaches Coalition in AI advocacy. She is currently completing a PhD and studies in digital technology. I will pass you to you, Ellen.

>> ELLEN DIXON: Can you hear me? Thumbs up. Wonderful. Thank you very much to all of the previous speak LkJhLkJher s and Abdul and Jay for setting the scene particularly in the New Zealand con texts, for this big discussion, doesn’t seem to be there is an immediate fix when it comes to child rights online and digital use of tools. With ehave move in this session from looking at the Australia-New Zealand context to more broadly at the global context in terms of what is available in discussion and resourcing and how this very big topic is being addressed where we see these intersections of communities involved, parents involved, schools being involved, not just government and the tech sector as a whole, and how the intersection of all of these work together. Thank you to everyone in the chat who is sharing their perspectives, because all of this ties back to this big context that we have, which is digital tools and technology are essential for the future of young people in these spaces, but what does that mean when we are dealing with universised tools that don’t necessarily appeal to the developmental stages of a young person or child? the developmental stages of a young person or child. I have two welfare speakers who are will present on this topic and we are very grateful they’re coming here from overseas. I’m aware Ana is also coming from a very bad time in Paris, so my apologies for having you up in the middle of the night but thank you for being with us. My first speaker will be Rury, who I will introduce and then I will introduce Ana. Rury Demsey is a project officer at the ITU reamal office for Asia and and Pacific and is based in Jakarta, Indonesia. She is responsible for Nating and exploring partnerships for the implementation of initiatives for the Asia-Pacific under the smart islands, funded by the Asian development bank and a program in 23 through to 2025. She is also contributing to the implementation of projects related to narrowing the digital divide including girls and ICT, equals and tech, network of women ITUD, smart villages and smart islands initiative and child online protection. Very busy, so wear grateful to have her here today with us. Ana is an economist by background, has worked a senior policy analyst in the team at UNESCO in Paris. Ana worked at the OECD on a list of issues ranging from financial education and literacy and equality and poverty. Before joining the OECD she was a research process in Nike row metrics applied to labour market indicational issues. She has taught and carried out research at the university of Copenhagen, the Catholic university of la Victorian, another university and the Catholic of la Victorian lanuv. So we’re very grateful to have these two wonderful speakers with us here today. I’ll turn first to Rur. Y -- Rury. We have a question. "What are the key challenges and implementing of child onlike safety in the Pacific region and how can these efforts be aligned with global standards. Over to you.

>> RURY DEMSEY: Thank you so much, Ellen, for the questions. From our side, it is my great pleasure to be invited to this very special event together with the other speakers. We also wanted to thank first the organising team for their excellent work as well as coordination. I hope that I can make - I can take and make it in the time given. -- I can take and make it in the time given but before I start answering questions I would like to take this opportunity to speak briefly about to ITU or International Telecommunication Union. We are the UN special agency for ITUs. We are the oldest agency in the UN family which started in 18656789 our work are separated into three different sector including the ITR on radio radio, on... And last not but on development and each sector I mentioned earlier had different mandate. We work together to connect the world and beyond. The next slide. These are the latest ITU fact and figure, 5.5 billion people in the world are online. 2.6 billion people remain offline. The internet use has grown to nearly 70% of the world’s population, for the Pacific this means more children are online than ever. Often with limited safeguards which highlighting the urgency of strong online framework as the previous speakers also kindly raised this issue. Next slide, please. -- please. Digital growth must be inclusive, safe as part of the journey to achieving the sustainable development goals. ITU support digital transformation through four areas on theory, whole of government approach as well as Pacific Islands program, digital skills and inclusion and lastly ensuring resilience with protection and cyber security. Next slide. Now we are delighted to show with you about the village and island initiative which connects the rule and coastal communities to digital things that improve wellbeing and also life. Focus on woman, youth and person with disability, it also empowers children, parents, educators to build online spaces in line with the global development goals. Next slide please. Through these initiatives, smart island in the Pacific over 6,000 community member have gained digital skills through this program covering digital services, digital... And most importantly the online safety in some schools in the smart islands Pacific countries as mentioned on screen. Next slide please. To ensure online sift u ITU developed a child protection framework and this initiative provides global guidelines for governments, industry, educators, families, which help countries to build strategies that are internationally aligned by locally relevant. What makes the child section unique is its ability to be globally aligned yet locally adaped which is a model that the Pacific countries can adopt and contextualise for their specific needs. Next slide please. Move another slide please. Our online protection training, it helps to learn the risk apply to measures and respond to arms. It also supports the government in creating the multi-stakeholder national strategies and issues like online child sexual exploitation. Next slide please. Children themselves have benefited directly through the interactive learning tools we provided... Like... Which is the protection Mascot as we can see on screen from age 9 until 12 and app for age 13 to 17, created with Yunupingu and youth advisors. Move to the next slide please. Between 2023 and 25, child protection initiative movements has expanded in Asian Pacific including Bhutan, mon goal ya, Thailand, Indonesia, Pakistan, Timor-Leste and the Pacific Islands in raising awareness and also strengthening capabilities as policy and -- at policy and community level. These efforts have produced plenty of results including local guidelines, national assessments and also the UN agreements with the Yunupingu and having -- UNICEF. And with that we’d like under this initiative demonstrated the how global standards can be adapted. Move to the next slide. In 2025, ITU held a training for - trainers for the Micronesian countries on child protection. This activities engage educators as well as policy makers to build regional for child protection. Next slide. I believe this is my last slide. To conclude, the Pacific has made strong progress on our experience but challenge remain. Scaling the literacy and skills, deepening cooperation as long as aligning with the global standards we believe together we can ensure that every child is safe, resilient and empowered online. Thank you and I’ll pass the floor back to you Ellen.

>> Thank you very much. ... Wonderful presentation and thank you to everyone in the chat who’s been providing the links from Rury’s presentation. I can see you have a lot of supporters that -- of the work ITU is doing in child online protection. I encourage you to check out the resources but also the significant amount of work Rury and the team have done in the Pacific island, if you haven’t. Many of you are probably familiar with it but they’ve been doing excellent work creating standards and working with other stakeholders at the global level. Thank you go that comprehensive presentation. Ana, with your question, from your findings, with on technology and education, how can we ensure that the integration of technology and education supports, not compromises, the online rights and safety of children especially in underresourced and global context? What can the Pacific region, as in the Pacific report that you recently released, specifically learn regarding digital opportunities in the pass room. Over to you, Anna.

>> ANNA CHRISTINA D’ADDIO: Thanks a lot. I hope that you can hear me and it’s quite late in Paris, is 3:39am, so... (LAUGHS) But I’m still delighted to be with you. It’s very nice to be here to discuss this very important thing. So, I will go through a presentation and I hope that this will succeed in answering your question. We could start - we could really talk a lot about these issues, and the previous speakers have already clearly set the stage and say very important things that are also in the report. So, as you say know, we have published the global education monitor report, published different reports on technology and education, and the important point to make here is that technology is the new playground for the learners of today. And it’s important to say that the - just any playground, it brings opportunities but it also bring risks. When children play, they have opportunities to make friends and to really enjoy their time but they can fall, they can have problems, so I think that it’s important that - to remind us, as the general report did, that technology and education can expand access, foster innovation, and support new ways of learning and, in fact, if you move to the slides, technology has offered really a lifeline to millions of children. We know what happens during the COVID crisis but we know also that it left many behind, those that were not connected, those that were not having access to electricity. But it also offered, as I said, important opportunities for learning, like, for example, true supporting distance learning and here you have two example. In New Zealand and Tonga. For very, very young children. These are examples of early childhood, and I think that this also means that very young children are exposed to technology since their early years, so this discussion that we are having today is really something that matters. You see here we talk about correspondence school that provide early childhood education to children that live in the remote areas and in Tonga’s - there is this accelerated resilience program that includes the deliverability of multi-modal lessons from early childhood to secondary education level. Next slide. However, as I was saying, I think that as any playground when it offers opportunities, it presents risk so we need the rules. We need rules not necessarily as it can be interpreted to restrict but I think that we need to see the rules in terms of guidance and protection. And the important point here is that technology shouldn’t widen inequalities but it should help to close them. So what we have done when we were preparing this report we have also prepared counter profiles on legislation, and we have looked at many different issues, really screening the policies legislation of 211 education systems that are available on the web at the address, education dash profiles.org. And you can see here, when we think about 211 education system covering the whole work, so is not region, is entire world, we see that there are few countries that regulate the use of personal devices in school, that regulate equitable access to technology in school, and rules that guarantee privacy in educations. The other policies or the other issues are really more for inequity than mentions but it’s also important to say that very few countries have universal internet provision law, and also only half of the country engage in the improve of access to electricity. So, when we talk about the playgrounds, new playgrounds, new rules, we need to think that there are still many that are left behind, and we need to make sure that these issues do not concern just minority. I think that’s really something that is important. Technology, as I said, should not widen inequalities. The next slide. So the important point is that also excessive technology puts physical and mental wellbeing at risk. We know that technology uses grown -- has grown exponentially and, as I were saying, this is research that we are doing. Very, very young children are exposed, and - to electronic screens and often these screens merely serve as pacifiers, meaning that they just are parked in front of the screen. In -- in many cases to solve other issues. So you can see here the results on the level of exposure that has increased in many countries, and especially among those that have lower socioeconomic status. What’s important, because before we were saying we don’t know if the bans work, I heard that, and we don’t know if we have enough studies that has sound evidence, it’s very interesting to say that in the last few years, I will say the last five years, the number of start days, looking at -- studies looking at the impact of screen in the very... Way have increased and many showed that exposure to screens and also here is very difficult to talk about that because exposure to screen is not one thing, it depends on the content. It depends on the way children are exposed, it depends on the rue and -- duration and how, what and where and when are important question, but what is important is that studies have shown that there is a really risk on the brain of the kids especially when exposure is up and very, very, very early. And this, as we know very well, these issues consume late and compound to affect the entire life. Next slide. Because we talked about the ban. We look at this in the report in 2023, and we updated in January of this year. And we are still updating this work O but, as you can see, the number of countries that add a ban of mobile phones in school. We are not talking about here social media, we are talking about phone bans in school, we had 60 education system that have these bans, and by the end of 2024 there were 79. This is a trend that is going on, and continues because the number of countries still increase. Yes, it’s true that the report make very clear that bans are not sufficient and they cannot solve anything. Especially because you need young people, you need children, that knows what they are using and why they are using so, the digital is very task and... Parents, and communities and the students the themselves in these discussion are very, very important. However, we know also that schools are meant to be safe. Next slide. Safe and supportive environment for kids and for children, and even if we don’t need - I mean, it’s important not to mix everything. One in three learners is... School every month globally. Over 36% of learners experience a physical fight with their peers, and almost one in three has been physically attacked at least once in a year. Very often increasingly especially out of school. This is related to the use of technology. And we know that this kind of school violence can have long-lasting impacts on their safety, on their physical mental health, on the education outcome.

>> ELLEN DIXON: I have to...

>> ANNA CHRISTINA D’ADDIO: Two seconds. Yes, I have two seconds. So the way that countries have addressed these issues is different, as you can see here. Not just with restricting the use of phone or restricting social media but also through guidance or empowering young people and having legislation that protect against cyberbullying. Now in the Pacific region, just to conclude, next slide, is we have looked at this in the - in our most recent report on technology. And what appears is that there is still little awareness on the opportunity and risk deriving from technology use especially in the small islands state. And also there is inequity issue that is very important, not just because of the connectivity in terms both of school and of studentless but also in terms of the teachers. Teachers lack devices, the teacher do not know how to handle these issues. And then there is also the need of having clearer privacy child safety policies, and you need really to have plan for resilience that takes into account the technology and really take into account the perspective of the youth, the parents and the community in this decision. Really I think that to move forward we need to focus on competence and digital skills, political thinking, online safety and ethical use. This cannot be done by school alone so, that’s why parents and students need to be active participants in the debate that’s shaping the rules for this new playground, and if we build shared responsibility and trust we can ensure technology empowers rather than divides. Thank you.

>> ELLEN DIXON: Thank you very much, Anna, for another incredibly comprehensive overview in terms of digital education in schools and that space and also also thank you so much at coming to us for an awkward time. It’s my tomb or Anna’s time, one of us is in the middle of the night but thank you very much for your giving your time. I want to draw attention to - you were talking about the impact of the digital tools on train and brainless of a young child when being used in a pacifying way and I know that what we have heard in school spaces when it comes to digital upskilling a lot of educators have been saying base line literacy skills are not being hit in the early stages because a child has learnt to scroll as opposed to read so it’s an interesting dynamic. As we have seen in the chat which has been going off, so thank you everyone for contributing there. This is obviously a topic that really interests a lot of people because it’s related to our communities directly and many of the topics previously discussed within the Town Hall. Is that we’re really seeing the coincide of a multi-policity of issues to do with the architecture of the digital 2508s themselves, the legal side in terms of contracts and also the way that the community engages in general. There is no easy one answer, as we can see, and there’s a lot of passion in terms of this discussion as a -- discussion as a whole. I’m going to turn over to Abdul so we can collectively having bit of a discussion about this in the remaining time that we have left. Thank you very much again to Rury and Nan for the Hopefully we can make those available who attended the event to you can look at them again. Abdul over to you, thank you very much.

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Thank you, Ellen. In the short term we have we’d love engagement from the audience, in person and online. So please make your way up to the mics and we’d love to have your questions or thoughts and comments -- Rury and an. That

>> While we’re getting some people up on the mic there’s a really discussion happening online I have to say. I think over 150 messages in the space that we have had in the past 45 minutes or so O one of the themes that’s coming about is what’s practical and what can actually be done. Right? Our panellists mentioned this concept of holistic attitudes towards this topic. There’s a comment that says, "How do we potentially use things like credit card checks and digital IDs to verify people’s age and identity?" But we’re seeing especially now, within the last couple of months, with the Trump Administration in the US, how that’s being used to block people’s access and entry into countries even though they have all the legal documents -- documentation to do that. People are being checked on whatever they post on social media. Do we really want to see more of that in the world. That’s a fundamental question that we need to what does that mean for being a free liberal society? But, yes, please, your name and your occupation and question. Flock --

>> FLOOR: I’m Pat Keen and I’m speaking as a parent. 2019, until March 2020, we had - everybody went home. Everybody disappeared, everything shut down because of the pandemic. If it wasn’t for social media my 13-year-old son would actually have no social skills whatsoever for those two years. So I think it’s important that we understand what it can do but as we also have to understand that a computer is just a tool. I have a circular saw, I have firearms in the house. I can teach them how to use those tools, and so we as parents have to understand it’s our responsibility to understand how tools are used. It’s not... (LAUGHS) I am from Texas, yes. Firearms are a right. Thank you. OK? But...

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Speaking to the Aussies in the room but, yes.

>> FLOOR: But it’s our responsibility to teach them how to use these tools and, yeah, somebody earlier said children are capable. They understand how to work around things. That means that we have to be smarter and we have to learn just as much. So it’s not an obligation of the government to tell us what we can’t do. There’s age restrictions on alcohol, there’s age restrictions on voting, there’s age restrictions on cigarettes, driving a car and there’s reasons to do those things but it’s us as parents that have to say, "We need to understand the too manies just as well so we can help them navigate those issues." Thanks.

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Thank you so much. I’ll give a chance to our panellists, in person and online to answer but as a point. As an educator and folks that are working on this topic very keenly, a fundamental challenge that we have is what we experienced just now. What is normal, what is OK in different local contexts, right. The flinching that happens in the room when he said guns, my good. -- my God. But I think that’s interesting and that’s a critical factor of what’s considered OK and not OK. We alluded to that in our context earlier but please. Do you have any comments that you’d like to make?

>> NOELLE: To your question or...

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: To the question.

>> NOELLE: Not immediately. I would like to give the opportunity to...

>> FLOOR: So, when it comes to bans and, like I guess all of these different programs and legislation, I guess one of the key things to me is at what point do, like, actual people and children actually really get any say or participation in how this is done, aside from something that’s essentially just coming don from above. And, like, what are the other, like, parts of this outside of legislation and regulation? I guess it feels like it really goes against all the principles of digital sovereignty or a democratic internet, and especially, like, you know, there’s no under 16s in this room that are getting to have a say on any of this discussion. So how - how do people actually get any meaningful say or autonomy over any of this?

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Excellent question. Would you like to...

>> Yep. I’ll try to answer that question. I’m a high school science teacher based in Melbourne. And I do -- deal with students and young children every single day. I’ll give an example. So, in Victoria, I’m not too sure about the other states that, mobile phones are panned -- banned in the classrooms so students are not allowed to bring mobile devices into class which on paper it works but as you enter the classroom, as soon as we have all kind of different devices and why would they and to do video mobile phones they’ll use the top or iPad and doing the same thing but on a different device. So I fully agree with what has been said across to room. On the importance of parents and educators to actually teach our young children on what is wrong and what is right and really empowering them because getting them to have a say is also important. What’s the purpose of banning it if it’s not solving the problem.

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Thank you so much. We’ll have one last question as we are on time.

>>

>>

>> I hope this conversation continues in the break-out and the break as well.

>> FLOOR: I started using the internet really, really, very first early days very early on and in those days there was no idea of the dangers of the internet, nor of the eSafety in general. And I came across a lot of stuff that was really scary for someone who was young. I also learned there is some places I just don’t want to go on the internet. I found that a boundary for myself. I feel like if people keep on setting a boundary for other people that we don’t get the opportunity to set our own internal contours and test out our values as a person. We’re kicking that problem down the road, maybe to when they’re a bit old and a bit more prepared but they’re going to be prepared if they hit that point, where they go, "Who am I as a person? What’s my internal character? Where is my values and limits and personal boundaries?" I want to give an example of a non-digital...

>> JAY CHEW: We will wrap up there unless you have a specific you want to ask?

>> FLOOR: It is a statement, right. So kids are being taken advantage of way before the internet came along. It’s not something we saw before the internet came along. We’re trying to solve those problems now. Maybe we need to just look at how have children been taken advantage of throughout history and figure out whether it is on the internet or where it is not, how do we solve that problem rather than just thinking about digital?

>> ABDUL MATHEEN: Thank you, appreciate that. One of the contexts towards that issue - and I will wrap up with this - is are we accelerating negativity or accelerating positivity within the internet tools we have? One of the challenges we face as educators on a daily basis is the amount of mental burn-out that global issues have on young people and their kids and this really is, this whole discussion, over the last hour or so, was an introduction into this topic. We truly believe the conversations that we’ve had, especially online and in person continue. I hope we can bring in young people, educate them about the context we are facing and get them to be involved through legislation, through organizations, companies, platforms and the like seem as well as NGOs to have a more comprehensive, holistic view. I would love to thank our panelists, moderators, Ellen Jay and everyone. Thank you and stick around for the rest of the day, thank you.

>>

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, Abdul and to the panelists up early in the morning. A lot of us in the room are very familiar with that. A great session. I hope you get an opportunity to have conversations with people outside, so, thank you very much. We have our next session, we will be starting in about five minutes. First Peoples and Digital Equality in Global Internet Governance. If we can have the panelists up on the stage at 11.40. Thanks, guys.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, everyone. If you can take your seats and we will get the next session started.

>> Thank you, our next session is - how might approachs to digital inequities in the First Peoples of Australia and digital communities enhance global internet governance. I would like to introduce Rose Jamieson from InternetNZ to introduce her panel.

>>

ROSE JAMIESON: Kia ora, everybody. I will give a little background and then get the panelists to introduce themselves, rather than me doing it on their behalf. Then we will kick off. So, our topic looked at the question of global internet governance, and what it might learn from First Peoples and community approaches and lived experiences. Each panelist will bring personal community and work reflections on what they have seen working and how that might contribute to the internet governance model. I was reflecting on yesterday. We had some themes around resilience, trust and diversity and how they help a system to function well. So, in the context of impacts on Indigenous peoples globaly from colonization which haven’t stopped, colonization is now working in new territories of data and appropriation of cultures and knowledges. And often it is against us in terms of online harms. We were thinking about, if our voices are heard and understood - we are hearing a lot about support for various underserved communities - but often we are not part of the solutions that are being offered and quite often we are done this by well meaning groups so part of our conversation is about our role and voice in this context. First, I will hand over to the panelists and ask them to spend a minute introducing themselves. To my right, Simon.

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Simon O’Toole, CEO of Alliance ICT, co-founder of Dreaming Machines and the Leap Foundation. I am a traditional man, grew up in NSW and now I live on Ngunnawal country in Canberra. I have had a very long history with technology, which is unusual experience for First Nations People and really starting to move into leadership because you can only be what you can see, so, yeah, also making sure that we work towards bridging the digital divide for all of the underserved communities in the digital space.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Ana?

>>

ANA MCALLISTER: (Speaks in Maori). My name is Ana McAllister. I am Whakapapa, I with means atrace back to the North Island of Aotearoa. I am a community engagement and public policy manager at InternetNZ. I will leave it there.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: (Speaks in Language).

>> My name is Susan Beetson. I’m a person who grew up in far north-west New Zealand on the Bogan River, so you can call me a Bogan, but also on the Barwon River, outside the town before 1967 we were living on the river bank until the referendum and then living in the town itself, not, sorry, in the town itself, the three communities outside our town -(in NSW) built on the outskirts of town. Newtown, Billabong and Dodge City or what we know as Westbury. So, we still weren’t actually allowed to live in the town until after some time after, like, late 70s to the 80s when people started to migrate into the town. I’ve been working in the tech space for 40-odd years. I was setting up local area networks with IBM and law firms in 1985 or around that time. 1983-5. It was about 1985. Anyway. I’m now an academic. I lecture and research in computer science at the University of Queensland and I want to show a picture. For the purpose of this panel, and for what I feel is misunderstood in this space in particular, the representation and what people understand is a difference between equality and equity and we will be talking about equity on this panel as I understand it. There are a number of problems with this picture. It actually only shows what appears to be, if I am stereotyping, black males. I don’t know if anybody else noticed that. I’m sure there were lots of people who noticed it in the room but there is a lot of difference there and even with this picture, it doesn’t talk about everybody having a voice. It doesn’t represent everybody. I think we need to create positions for people to speak for ourselves in all of our diversity, not have other people speak for us. So, we want to see the diversity of everybody in these panels, not just for one panel to present but in each of these panels that are presented, there should be representation from all of the communities, even a child at the last panel would have been awesome. Especially in the digital space.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Can I goat, can I get Andrew to introduce himself, we’re now on the topic.

>> ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Thank you, I’m Andrew from Vanuatu. I work currently with the regulator service that looks after the regulator for telecoms and broad casting. I do also have - I grew up in the island situation a remote island. I remember we used to walk to one telephone - sometimes you make the call - up until 2008 and you could spent a whole day to make a call, otherwise you could not make that call. So, I come from that background and it is good to be here. Thank you. I look forward to the deliberations that we are going to have in this panel. Thank you.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Susan got ahead of the game. So a little bit of a personal reflection on what digital equity really means to each of you and maybe I will start with Ana.

>> ANA MCALLISTER: Sure. When I wrote this, I did write the catastrophic recent floods and googled it and realized it was in 2023 which is not that recent ago, but in 2023, there were really horrible floods from Cyclone Gabrielle, in sborne, where I whakapappa to, and my worldioning to a terrifying question - where my nanna and sister safe? I couldn’t called. The cables all failed. This wasn’t just an inconvenience but a profound isolation, in a crisis, a digital connection is a lifeline. We talked about this yesterday as well. For my whanau living in areas vulnerable to climate change and for thousands in regional and Indigenous communities that lifeline is very fragile. This is isn’t an abstract issue, digital inequity has a human cost and deepens existing vulnerabilities. Tom Tom

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Yesterday we talked about digital inclusion. They measure it across access, affordability and skills. It is easy to conflate access of devices and I guess applications to access of services and experience. An example -I often give is, as a first nations filmmaker, if you wanted to access some of the tools that allow you to make AI generated film, what is the likelihood that you can generate someone that looks like someone from an Australian First Nations community? There’s, I guess, some ethical questions that are still being talked about, whether that is good for not, but I can say it’s definitely not equal because if you are a Caucasian person or an African person or Asian person, you can definitely do that, so, having access to the infrastructure is incredibly important but we need to be thinking about equity of the whole total experience as well.

>>

ROSE JAMIESON: Andrew, you started with your day to do a phone call. Do you want to add to anything to a personal reflection on digital equity?

>> ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Yes, I think for Vanuatu, the landscape of communication has changed not too long ago, 2008, that we suddenly have mobile coverage into the islands. That is when the regulators were put in. Government developed policies, one of which the Universal Access Policy and then the rollout of broadband but I think the quality of service to these remote areas is also an issue. I had an experience just last year. I went to, on a work trip, to another island, which is a center, also a commercial center and found out I couldn’t get on the internet, even though it was supposed to be there and that experience - we have been receiving computer -- complaints from people, I experienced it firsthand but people were not so vocal about these things. They just lived with it and I believe, I think there’s some injustice there but what I did was I went back and spoke to our consumer team and told them about the issue and they followed up on that. I eventually, it was resolved a few months down the road but the experiences that people in remote areas have are different and we have these places where you can climb a tree to make a call or to access the internet. So it still exists there, thank you.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Susan?

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Yes, I live in a rural area. I’m from a remote area, a very remote. And 25% of Aboriginal people in rural and remote areas access the internet on a daily basis. When I am at home in my transient place, my rural place, I have to have the phone close to the doorway where I get two bars of 5G. I have to run through a couple of rooms to get to my laptop to enter the numbers. That’s the sort of access that I get at home and I’m an academic. I work at the University of Queensland and when I’m living or staying in Brisbane to be present in Brisbane, I have full access to everything. When I’m out home in my remote area, people - not everybody - but there are people in the town itself that need a car to turn on the electricity in their homes and they have to take that (card) card out, and have to have it padlocked so it doesn’t get stolen and have to take that card out when they leave the house which is out in a public area. So, access, like Andrew just said, is not always available to and we need to understand if we’re going to bring access and availability up to something that is equal there needs to be a true understanding of what equity is.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Thanks. So, I guess a couple of themes from there were digital connection really does have a human cost and is a lifeline. It is also a connection point but yes, I was recently on holiday in Samoa and I had one phone that worked, though there was a giant sign down the road saying "Digicell is here" and the other phone did not work. We know that lots of people have very unreliable access despite what the coverage actually says. I liked your point, Simon, about conflating devices and infrastructure with access. So, I guess if we could spend a couple of minutes each to outline some of the different contexts or barriers, whether that is exclusion by design or those things that make it hard for First Peoples and Indigenous communities to access the digital world. I might start with you, Simon.

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: I think there’s definitely been exclusion by design for a long time. I think Australia in terms of the access of digital resources is - particularly government services - is a great example. There are a lot of barriers to being able to access Australian government digital services for people, from First Nations communities, particularly ones that have low level documentation or find it difficult to get to locations of government services to be able to sign up for the services or get help from them and also the lack of trust with government caused, I would say by the government, for breaching that, what little trust there was, is a major barrier to the adoption of digital identity which is - we’re rapidly moving towards being a prerequisite to access digital services and the government knows this is a problem. I know they know, because I’ve had conversations about it with them and particularly With Services Australia but there’s not a lot of holistic thinking going in this space to fix these issues and the more, I guess, the lack of holistic solutioning is in fact breeding more exclusion by design. So this is a problem that is constantly ongoing and will continue unless people change.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Andrew, would you like to, maybe give some specific reflections on barriers?

>> ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Yes. Vanuatu has an Indigenous population of about 95% of the total population, and about 80% live in the rural and remote communities without any proper essential services, not to mention access to the internet but one of the key issues to do with the connections is consistent grid power that plays a major role in development in all aspects of development. Most communication devices require continuous power, as we know, to be used extensively. Today Gridpower only exists in a few government places leaving the majority to fend for themselves. Most resort to domestic solar solutions. Even the internet issue is affecting the service providers as well as they rely on solar power in these remote areas. in these remote areas. The other one is digital literacy is also an issue. As people do not really know what to do with the internet for a start. Because when it was rolled out, we don’t go - something is coming and we informed them and people informed, the providers would have the obligation to inform them of what is coming. So there’s a gap, knowledge gap, there as well. Yeah. So, a lot of them resort to social media as the only way of, you know, getting - getting through the families and without the knowledge or the - of the cyber security risks that posed through these channels of communications in the social platforms. Yeah. We became vulnerable as well in this regard. Thank you.

>> Susan, would you like to?

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Yep. For me, the biggest barrier to station inclusion is the term inclusion -- inclusion is the phrase inclusion. I grew up in a mission town, we had the longest running mission, the Brewarrina mix, and the idea of one Hodge honourable member -- homogenous group for Aboriginal people to come into one mission and to then learn English and Christianity and be educated to be housemaids and farm hands was very - continues today in systems that are built by predominantly middle class white males. Or by a colonial settler perspective. I won’t go into academic space, getting lots of nods from people who understand the terms. But for those that don’t, it’s really important that you explore it. And we’re looking - these systems are designed by people who are completely unaware of their unconscious bias in this space. And so we need to bring diversity, we need to bring things such as Indigenous governance, and, I mean, Indigenous peoples globally, I was born on the lands of the people whereby the fish traps were created, the largest and oldest man-made structure in the world, and that technology was designed with the principles of regenerative thinking. So, when the fish are swimming up stream we’re not allowed to catch the biggest fish, they have to be allowed to go via the fish traps - sorry, around fish traps and all the smaller fish, smallest fishes, continue to grow, so we’re always thinking, what about the communities upstream? We were always able to feed people beyond, and we think, from a 7 generations into the future and from 7 generation past. We think with equity, we think with diversity and we think about the future and we think about to whole environment, all living things. So, when people talk and think - and that’s a collective way of thinking. A systems way of thinking, and when we think from an individualist perspective, from a middle class white male sitting in the room, runsing -- understanding I’ve been given a task, I interpret it this way and I do it, it does not think about everybody. I baulk at the term "inclusion" right alternative the beginning. -- at the beginning.

>> An national parks would you like to...

>> ANA McALLISTER: Sure. If we’re going to talk about inclusion by design I’m going to take us back 250 years, all of these things are interrelated and we cannot separate ourselves from our history. So, the foundational issue here is really one of power versus partnership. The Crown’s obligation is outlined in our nation’s finding document, to actively protect Maori interests. This is incredibly absent from many different forms of policy and digital policy is no different. And it has meant we have a legacy of top down, one-size-fits-all infrastructure rollout that bypasses any idea of true partnership and frequently ignores Maori land rights. As well as community-specific needs. I also want to briefly touch on this idea of cost and afford object -- affordability again. And Aotearoa, we’re gonna go back 150 years for that, and how that’s presenting today is a really clear direct barrier in terms of data poverty, where low-income households, which are disproportionately Maori if our nation, are having to choose between are we getting data, are we getting wi-fi or are we getting food? In the end I’m sure we all know which will win out in that. Last thing I wanted to mention on this point is a bit more on the content layer. And that’s about the idea of how safe are these online environments for Maori in my case. And I can absolutely attest that they are incredibly unsafe, particularly if you are a Maori sticking your head above, you know, the rest of the crowd and saying what you believe and know is right. That is a massive barrier for people even wanting to engage in a digital space, and I know that’s present across other diverse groups as well. So when a digital platform or a digital world more broadly doesn’t represent your language, your values or your culture and is at times violent towards you, why would you want to engage? And I’ll just close on this particular point. That the example I shared before, around Cyclone Gabrielle, is just a symptom of a wider issue. Infrastructure is not being built with, by or for Indigenous communities and that makes it inherently less resilient for all, thank you -- Cyclone Gabrielle.

>> I’m going to wrap up some of our themes in terms of barriers. There’s themes around one, we need power to make this stuff work. Two, essential government services are now online so that presents -- presents some problems, definitely a lack of trust as Simon mentioned in government generally. Susan’s talked about the use of terms, and I’m conscious bias of designed into our system, and Andrew mentioned digital literacy. I think, Ana’s point on the power imbalance and power versus partnership is probably just an ongoing theme and barrier not just about the digital world. So I guess why don’t we turn our minds to what have we seen work and sort of what are the enablers that you know of that have worked and seen within your communities and maybe share a couple of examples if you’ve got them. I might start with you, Susan.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: um, I know that Indigenous data sovereignty and Indigenous data governance works for our communities. I know that developing systems with communities to ensure that Indigenous integrity and Indigenous validation. So we’re currently developing AI that considers elders understandings of how we should be organising these and designing these algorithms and when does it need cultural validation. When does it need elder input so. We’re slowing the systems down. Proprietary systems are not where we want to be. Because they are far more costly but they’re where we need to be for our Indigenous knowledges. But for me what we need is we need to think about helping grow our skills base, not just in the underlying levels of, you know, the base ache skills, we need to grow people’s understanding of what --en elder said to me, "Oh, you make me feel real good, you do." I said, "You need to understand that our knowledges are of value to everybody." And the chief scientist said, "We need to go out and collect all of these Indigenous knowledges for the benefit of all." And my response tweet was, "We need to leave those knowledges where they are and and facilitate ways for all of these Aboriginal communities in -- and these lands and Indigenous communities globally to understand the context of those knowledges in the digital space that will benefit the local nations." And then think about where we might go nationally and globally with those. One example of that is Colin’s work with mobs who looked at the - and patented the spin fix, the nano structure of the spinifex glue, which know is the strongest glue globally. But they’re now looking at that. They’ve partnered with UQ and nano technologists and according to UQ it’s potentially al multibillion-dollar business. But -- potentially. All of that money - well, not all of it because they do have a percentage share, but over 60% of that money is going back into that community and now that community has intergenerational wealth for the future and they’re the sorts of things we need to be thinking about with our knowledges going forward and where governance benefits Indigenous peoples. Instead of seeing these knowledges go and spread globally and people taking them and running with it.

>> Simon, would you like to... What have you seen work?

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Um I guess more broadly self-determination works. When, you know, we are empowered to be able to solve these issues ourselves, really it doesn’t matter what these issues are, for our own people we get better outcomes. And those outcomes are largely good for not just First Nations people but for everybody, as First Nations people are custodians - hold that custodianship role. For, you know, kind of the - you know, our ecological spheres that we live in. Investment is something that I have seen work quite well. Lately there’s been a shift to more kind of non-traditional investment models, allowing essentially equity ownership of infrastructure for First Nations communities. While there is a return on investment for the investor that, you know, that puts up that money, it’s - comes other ways than just forever equity, which allows not only that building into generational wealth and outcomes, you know, in the short term, but also perpetually as well. And that’s all compounding. What we also need is the - just the infrastructure there to be able to innovate, because we think differently - we all think differently. Every different community out there on the planet thinks differently to everybody else and thought is important and is going to bring value to everybody.

>> Ana, would you like to comment on some of what you know works well?

>> ANA McALLISTER: I might jump off some of things Simon side in terms of funding. InternetNZ is a philanthropic funder within the digital space. One of the funds we have really seen work in terms of digital equity is we know digital equity and equity issues generally are very specific to the geographical region that they take place in. So what we have done in the last financial year was we partnered with a local - a really good kind of contributor and organiser and - in the Gisborne community actually, not favouritism, just because I came from there I swear. And they - we basically said, "Here’s this grant round. We know you have a very wide community, people working generally in the digital equity space. We’re gonna let you decide how you distribute the money amongst ourselves and -- yourselves and to what kind of projects." Taking away all of the power from us as a funder was vital in seeing that community having the control and power to actually do what they wanted to do and what they knew would work in that space. I also wanted to touch on what you spoke to briefly around the sovereignty space. There’s a few really good examples in New Zealand. There’s an organisation called our net, which is our.net.nz which is a marvel-run ISP that is running a pretty revolutionary model in terms of ISPs. They provide affordable fast internet to low households specifically and the they are also solving the device barrier we often see in terms of ISPs and wi-fi, and they’re managing the router service for these households as well. There’s -- these kinds of solutions are practical. There’s other things I could get into like sovereign cloud services or iwi-run GTLDs but there are lots of things happening in New Zealand in terms of us getting sovereignty and the -- in the digital space that I think are really exciting and important.

>> Andrew.

>> ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, I think... For us in Vanuatu the economics, as you know, is the key to - you know, any extension of the network to such places. I have been in the regulator’s office for quite some time, and I - we keep having the same comments coming in. There’s no money there. We can’t can go there. So I think the government made a very good decision to have a policy in phrase, which I have mentioned earlier, the universal access policy, where they op -- where the operators provide at least 4% of their income towards - go towards the extension of the network so, this was managed by the regulator, so this was a plus, where a lot of things are happening and we pulled out more around the alliance through this policy and has extended the coverage. The government also has 15 years energy roadmap that - it’s been 10 years already, not much progress, but it’s there. We’re not directly - directly there is not in that roadmap, but we have seen it progressing. But I’m not sure whether - how far it can go in the next five years when it lapse. However, having said that, the satellite coverage in Vanuatu is 100%. Like any other place, from two major players. We have the Pacific light network and the recent star link which sort of provided some comfort to the rural areas in terms of connection. It’s a plus for the schools, small businesses and other government services that are within the rural context. We also have new laws that are being enacted now, to have... Crime and content, another social media -- and other social media controls are that in place. For us in the regulator service, there is seam registration exercise law, a regulation that has been trouped a couple of years ago. That’s a major step in sort of connecting identity to the - to communication. As I said earlier, literacy is still there, but we - but from our perspective we go into this communities every now and then to educate them in various technologies and the challenges, and you know, the risks that are there. So that is something that we do on a face-to-face interaction within the community. So I think that’s sort of what’s happening currently, thank you.

>> What I’m taking from some of our themes about what works is like sovereignty is important. Cultural validation isle always important. -- is always important. Having a good skills base, in particular thinking about self-determination in the custodian role that Indigenous peoples quite often play. I’m interested in the sort of models of equity ownership and reinvesting back into community and having community-led solutions. So, you know, we found in New Zealand those do seem to be working quite well for us. We’re not the centre of attention in terms of giving funding out. And in particular a number of Indigenous-led and first people’s led businesses and solutions is working quite well. Sort of closing up now. So we’re coming back to the sort of internet governance question. So if we’re thinking about the multi-stakeholder model, rather than being part of existing multi-stakeholder groups, such as civil society, academia et cetera, what might it look like for Indigenous peoples to have their own recognised multi-stakeholder group. So rather than being at somebody else’s table, we’re our own table I guess is what we were thinking. If I could ask each of you to sort of reflect on, one, how do you think Indigenous perspectives enhance internet global governance and do we need our own table? Start with Ana.

>> ANA McALLISTER: Yes. Well, yes, absolutely. To answer this question I wanted to talk about three particular concepts from Tehan. -- Teoreo Maori. We love a metaphor, we love something that evokes emotion in Maori. (SPEAKS IN MAORI) As well as engagement and modelled off our beautiful new Queen. In terms of (SPEAKS MAORI) Or the sovereignty space, for Maori it’s really non-negotiable at this point. We don’t want to get involved unless we can control it and do it ourselves. It’s not a political concept. It’s a practical right to control our own digital destinies, our data, our infrastructure and our narrative. Globally this translates to community-led connectivity models and recognising locally led by Indigenous people or First Nations data sovereignty movements and directions as a fundamental right and governance frameworks. In terms of (SPEAKS MAORI) It’s not just this government to stakeholder model that we’re often seeing particularly in internet governance. It’s about a meeting of leaders with the autonomy to negotiate and decide on things. For a global IG this means creating formal structures and seats at the table, not just for nation states but for Indigenous nations that have a rightful claim to partnerships and policy making. And lastly in terms of (SPEAKS MAORI) I think that the idea of the Maori ISP, our net, and that model is really not about maximising -- maximising profit. I’m not going to get into capitalism and issues like that here but if you want to later I’m happy to. And it’s about lifting a collective digital wellbeing. This isn’t - this kind of concept can really challenge the global IG community. To measure success by not only the kind of standard metrics that we have but include equity as a metric and even further liberal is a -- as a metric. As well as resilience and community benefits. Just to close off I’ll say that the pathway to true inclusive digital future is not just about laying more cable. It’s about embracing, at a governance layer, Indigenous models of sovereignty in partnership and building an internet that not only connects us but is also resilient and reflects all people.

>> Thank you. Andrew, I know you’ve been involved in internet governance for a number of years, so be interested in your reflections.

>> ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Thank you. Yes. Yes. The technology keeps changing, as we know, and, as I believe with other islands, what is lack behind in policy and regulation, the discussions around this were not - non-existent at some stage back then. But 7 years ago, after the Asia-Pacific IGF that weed in and NAD in Port Vila, -- that we had in Port Villa, a few of us got together and said, "Maybe we need to look at the national initiative or an NRI." And that translated into reality when the government supported it and the regulators - with the regulators office to have the initiative set up. It’s like, you know, in... We say... (SPEAKS IN LANGUAGE) It is a place where we get together traditionally and sit and, you know, we share but it’s like a meeting. Then we talk about to decisions, the opportunities, in rural settings and then we agree and then we move forward. So, the Vanuatu Internet Governance Forum was - initiative was set up in 2018 unfortunately, it has had some issues and it’s still there, hopefully we’ll have it sort of going where - by 2026 again. But -- but we used to have - we used to run what - Vanuatu regulatory internet forum, similar to the Internet Governance Forum, and this is where we bring together different voices from different communities, from the government and from the private sector, and civil society discussed matters of internet. And I believe it is important that this is a channel as well for national initiatives, so that the user experience at the grass root can - and their voice can be heard at the global stage. So, yes, I think there is some opportunities. There’s work in progress in our communities, and I believe we’re heading properly in the right direction. Thank you.

>> Simon.

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Um, two major camps in the First Nations community are before the Voice to Parliament referendum largely sat on, you know, the model’s not great but let’s get it in, we’ll fix it after. Or, you know, no, no we’re not going to compromise. I either get a right or I don’t do it at all. And I think large lay what was wrong with that model we have, what was it, 17 the representatives from over 250 First Nations and bringing all of that information together through - as a set of representatives that don’t fully represent those language groups is going to homogenise those voices that are from different cultures into one kind of mass of, you know, Indigenous voices. These are problems that aren’t really well understood by, you know, the people that designed these structures. While we have people that don’t understand the problems and are not involved in the problems and not a part of those problems, we’re always going to see poor solutions emerge, and that’s why I think it’s absolutely 100% mandatory that we have our own multi-stakeholder group, because not only do we know how to design such a multi-stakeholder group effectively for the needs of First Nations people, but the solutions that come out of that is going to be, you know, effective. We haven’t seen effective solutions come out for a long time. And we’re still, you know, Australia’s still trying to bridge the gap by throwing useless targets at them and always saying, "I’m sorry we didn’t meet those targets", you know. When’s it gonna stop?

>> Susan.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Indigenous women’s governance is - has worked in communities, in business, in Indigenous business, since millenia. And we continue to work in that way. Bringing those voices into these spaces can be problematic. It can be empowering but it can also be oppressive and so a global Indigenous internet governance I space is fully supported by me and I think we should be looking at similar opportunities for all of versety. I think now that we have -- all of diversity. Now we have four fellows of the Australian Internet Governance Forum, we would like to see how our ways of understanding governance across this entire continent and I know Jenny and Michael and I have been talking and talking also with our new fellows about how we can progress something along those lines. What we also need is to think beyond basic digital skills and think about how the internet is not just goating people to engage in the internet, but getting people to understand what the internet can do for us and how the internet is problematic for us. So that is critical to get to word out and to get people to understand how engaging with internet governance policy is important for all of us. The economic opportunities for Aboriginal people and for Aboriginal people to grow in our economic space and create intergenerational wealth will benefit all Australians. It will see not just our way of surviving and thriving but our way of governance and what that actually means socially and on a holistic level for all Australians.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: We are happy to take questions. If people want to line up and I will wrap up themes, some around sovereignty and controlling our destinies. A definite yes to some formal structures within internet governance, really thinking about equity as a metric and traditional ways of governance that might enhance internet governance. Ly leave it there. Astrid first?

>> I have two online who have questions.

>> ANA MCALLISTER: We will do Astrid.

>> FLOOR: Sort of leaning in on what’s been discussed, from a personal perspective but people in the room who maybe want to enter the space where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and other first nations. What policy mechanisms can be embedded within the governance framework to ensure that meaningful inclusion of Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and First Nations voices while also recognizing and reducing the incredible cultural load that arises from repeated demands for cultural labour, often free or tokenistic?

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Who would like to take that one?

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: I think we both should.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: After you.

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Look, I think that first nations people have got - does everybody understand the concept of cultural load? I thought I might ask - shall I briefly.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: Colonial load, by the way.

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: It is the expectation put on people from certain cultures to be able to educate and represent those cultures. Typically, at least in the Australian context, how that is expressed is you are always asked to participate in things like areas of policy in your employment diversity programs. Being a seen figure to attract more first nations people in that space and it’s important. Part of reconciliation that people participate in those kind of activities but the burden needs to be mostly on non-first nations people to be able to reduce the cognitive and conscious and unconscious biases they have to be able to achieve a level of cultural competency, understanding and learning about our shared histories so that you are coming into the conversation with a level of prerequisite knowledge you should have before doing that so you are not expecting us to come 98% of the way. That is where cultural load is a problem. At the moment, first nations people are expected to come 98% of the way.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: For me it’s colonial load and it’s an additional load that is imposed by colonizers on Aboriginal peoples who require us to take away from our actually employed position and do the research for you. So, what Simon is saying is that that 90% of load of helping people understand what things mean - the information is out there and we would ask you to do that yourselves. That’s rather than have us as the employed person paid to do a particular job and we’re not doing our job because we’re spending most of our time doing the colonizers’ research. In terms of policy, the question. The question was about - my response to the question was about engaging - we can create policy that ensures that we are looking beyond the people in front of us so that we need to think about how we are connecting with Aboriginal peoples, communities and how that policy works I would need to think about writing that but we can do that together if that is something you want to do. I think it needs to be about broadening. Where do we go? What do we do to engage or connect with Aboriginal communities to bring the voice us to these forums, to these - to understand internet governance, to ensure we are embracing all diversity. It’s not just Indigenous views but all the peoples, not just the people in the room, the people designing policy from all of the past, it’s about creating Pomcies that embrace all peoples and living things. An know we have questions online. I don’t think we will potentially get to them but we will try to answer them after. From a New Zealand perspective, I think that. Government and policy makers will research the same thing every time in different election cycles and start interest the beginning every single time. Read what you have already researched, because we have often said it multiple times. And I know Kiki mentioned the internet systemic racism review, which we paid an academic to do and then followed those recommendations accordingly. I would also say, I’ve been in the rooms many times when government has come to Maori asking for various different advice and there have been Maori in that very room who have been upset and we were paid for the pleasure of explaining how upset we were. So pay them for that pleasure and be grateful that you are getting it. That’s what I would add. Thank you.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Do you have time for online questions? One online question?

>> Yes, there were two but I will pick one. Does the current thinking - I think that may be about exclusion by design - incorporate innovation, advancement and solution/service/product capabilities designed by the industry or business technology providers?

>> ANA MCALLISTER: Was there an end?

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: Could you repeat the question? I know it was long.

>> Yes, sorry. "Does the current thinking incorporate innovation, advancement and solution/service/product capabilities designed by the industry or business technology providers?

>> ANA MCALLISTER: I can have a go. I would say in terms of the current environment for innovation in the technology space in New Zealand, which I am thinking the question is around that - that sovereignty is our key position, our key ask, so having that ability to in no rate, - innovate, find solutions specific to our community requires not only funding but that which disrupts power between the funder and the fundee. I think that is the key thing. There are lots of Maori communities that will never ask for money from the government and will never want money from the New Zealand government and in those particular cases, having an intermediary that has a positive relationship with the community is really vital, someone that is trusted. I think that answers the question?

>> SIMON O’TOOLE: I think there are massive gaps in funding for innovation, which disproportionately affects first nations innovators. Not sure about elsewhere, but in Australia we have thinking around early stage innovation funding that ensures that you can only get funding grants from the various programs if, under a matched funding arrangement, which means essentially you need to put up 50% and they need to put up 50% and they say that that is to ensure that you have skin in the game. But if a First Nations person is inspired enough to do something about a particular problem, it is likely because that problem is a very close one to their heart, to their community and that is our skin in the game. The skin in the game is the experience that we have had generationally and intergenerationly, that is creating a solution for.

>> SUSAN BEETSON: On that. When we talk funding, the majority of Aboriginal funding or Indigenous funding in Australia goes to the multilevels before it gets to the people on the ground. So I know in my community back in, around 2010, I was looking at the amount of funding that goes into the community every year, supposedly. $30 million was given towards the Bruwarrena region every year and nothing changed for people on the ground. All of the services running were non-indigenous charities. Nothing changed for my family and my people on the ground. So, when - the problem that we have today, when we fund - when we request funding is that the money goes to the big corporations, the non-indigenous corporations who know how to develop technology for Aboriginal people as opposed to the money going to Aboriginal organizations or peoples who do know how to develop technology with people.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: Thanks Susan. We have to wrap up as a panel but I’m sure everybody is happy to answer questions and we can answer the other online question if possible. I will thank my panel for taking the time to share their lived experiences which as you say, quite often is a cultural tax on people, so recognizing that and thank you very much.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks to Kaurna people and we have a traditional owner in the room. Thank you for being here. Cheers. Thanks, Rose. Do we have Matt Healy in the room? So, we are going to break for lunch now, but starting in about ten minutes’ time Matt and his team will be seeking input, have a conversation, around a revision of auDA’s licensing rules, so if folks are interested, you come back in then. Matt, do do you want a minute to give people an overview of what that is now? Ten minutes’ time come back in the room? Alright. Yes. Alrighty. So about ten minutes’ time, folks, thank you. (Lunch). (Lunch)

>>

>> ...

>>

>> Hi, everybody. We’re going to get started again in a minute. So, Sylvia, --. If you could bring your panel together.

>> hopefully the room will fill back up again soon. Alright. So our next session is fostering trust online for Australians, the human element. And I’m going to hand over to Sylvia, in the -- from the World Wide Web consortium who is to moderator for the next session. Thanks, Sylvia.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you very much. Hi, everyone. I hope that you have your coffee and all your calories are getting all the juices flowing so we can have a big conversation on trust in Australia. I’m super honoured to be in in panel with great women that have sharp and smart and super committed with the development of the internet in Australia. So I’m very happy to be able to moderate this panel today. So, I’m going to do a very short round of introduction based on - the team was so helpful to provide and then start with the panel list. We have Rachel joining us online so thank you so much. Rachel, for your participation. Ael joining us online so thank you so much. Rachael, for your participation. Thank you for your patience as we go through this. First of all, this panel is follow-up of this beautiful report that that I encourage you to download and explore and read appropriate and also to promote as widely as possible in the future iterations. It’s been going on for quite a few years. This is the fifth edition, so it’s also to comment for keeping that research going and to kind of share with us what the status of the society in Australia is in particular points in time. It is always good materials to refer to and see the progress that we are are making and the things that we cannot address or have not addressed correctly. My name is Sylvia, I am the chief development officer of the World Wide Web consortium. I been on that job for just a year. Last week it was a year after 17 years working elsewhere. So it’s really nice and concentrated in the Asia-Pacific region. So this job now has a global scope and I’m super glad to still be able to have my toes in the Australian community, and I really value this couple of days with you all here. So if anyone is interested in opening web standards and would like to have that conversation separately I’m here, I am just an email away. My panellists, I am going to start with Rebecca on that end. Rebecca is the director of... Communications. Rebecca is responsible for elders corporate corporation and her and her team to help Australians be their online presence with a trust website or au addresses that.ery the lead on the annual lead for digital Australia series. Digital liveless of oftens research series, helping internet users, business professionals and professionals help the experience of Australians. She has a background of telecommunications and focus on strategy communications. Welcome. Then I have Rachael Falk, maybe I’m pronouncing the surname wrong but please correct me. Rachael no, that’s fine.

>> SYLVIA: Rachael is one of Australia’s leading experts in cyber security and regulation, former CEO of the a research productive centre in Australia for over six years and her advice has been sought by global companies, organisations, government parliamentarians and big bodies. She frequently comments in the media on cyber security for on regulation and policy and has played a central role in the collaboration between government, industry and research institutions aimed ate lifting Australia’s cyber security capacity. She has been at the forefront of the response to recent major cyber security incidents. Thank you, Rachael, for joining us today. Finally I have Lizzie, she is a lawyer and author and speaks regularly about law, technology and human rights. Her writing has appeared in the New York Times, guardian, Sydney Morning Herald and in my feed - my screen almost daily. She is founder in the chair of the Digital Rights Watch which advocates for Dom, fair answer rights in the digital age. She sits opt board of blueprint for free speech and she works with lawyers, journalists and activists to establish a program for which she was recipient of the Davis projects for peace prize in June 2019 she was named a human rights hero by access now. There you go. Go, Lizzie. Without further ado I’m going to just post the first question to all the panellists. I’m going to start with Rachael. Knowing that Rachael needs to leave early I want to give you as much time as possible for you to participate. According to the digital lives research, almost all Australians, 99%, report the internet adds value to their lives, with 78% of small businesses saying that they couldn’t function without it and is increasingly valued for community connection. Is the critical role that this internet plays in enabling our digital lives of oftens low trust in the online environment a contradiction. What do you reckon? Rachael: It’s a really good question, it’s good not to refresh myself. I think without a doubt the internet has revolutionised our lives when we think of all the things we can do online without ever leaving the house or the tracksuit and I think COVID proved you can buy clothes from overseas, order tickets, do banking, purchase travel arrangements so it is pretty incredible but I think the juxtaposition is cyber criminals or criminals generally have been very - are very adapt easily and very innovative and have found a way to exploit I think some of that trust and not just I’m talking about cybercrime purely but it’s also in the mis- and disinformation space we see and also with young children particularly and young adults being particularly vulnerable to not just scams but truly in various serious and horrific crimes. So I think we’re now ending an age where we realise that those of us often do realise that not everyone who says they’re, you know, Sally and they’re a young adult are really Sally and a young adult. So I think we recognise there is a degree of criminality behind it and people who do have pure intent to cause harm. I think the rise of mis- and disinformation and that left unchecked sews the seeds of discontent in not just our communities but we’re seeing that now in broader communities, we saw that last year with the riots in the UK. We saw that particularly influential online identities or not just people online on various social media platforms, all it takes is one or two posts and people conform in a particular town, and they form for the purpose of violence. It might be anti-immigration, it might be anti-asylum seekers staying in hotels. So I think there is an element where we are now living with the wonderful opportunities of making our lives easier in so many facets but wear also now grappling with this almost bizarre world, where harm can come upon us and you have in the UK - I mean Keir Starmer, who is a former prosecutor in the UK, former Crown prosecutor, he stood up 24 hour yours to process people who were taking part in violent - I won’t call it protests, in violence in the UK all incited on various social media forms through certainly disinformation. So we’re living with that I think and that is a strange and strange time to be in. I’ll sort of leave it there maybe for others to build on that.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you, Rachael. We’ll go to Rebecca next. can: Thank you, and thank you for the introduce -- Rebecca: And Rachel for your great opening remarks. Before I jump to my response I want to thank the committee for having this session on. I’ve also got a copy of our report, I have a couple floating around. We’re very proud of our research and digitalised research. And many people know that that obviously runs the dot au which is important to Australians online but this piece of research is really about helping us understand the challenges and the opportunities that Australians and Australian small businesses have online. So, now in its fifth year, we opportunities like this to make sure that we can share that research as far and wide as we can so that it actually flows through to initiatives and policy that can help Australians and really uplift their experiences. Thank you for that opportunity, and if you want to learn more, have a flick through the report, please come and find me afterwards. I do enjoy talking about out. But in terms of the question, which was around is it a contradiction to have this low level of trust yet this high reliance. I don’t think it necessarily is but it’s certainly not ideal. It’s not the situation that any of us want to find ourselves in. The research shows that almost all Australians do get value out of the internet, and Rachael spoke about some of those examples and some of those really important ways that it connects communities and societies, fuels our economy, but another piece of finding in the research, that I think we will touch on a little later in more depth but it shows that there are people who are actually opting out of some online activity because of their fear of the online environment, because of their fears of cyber scams and being a victim of cybercrime essentially. And so we know that if we’re going to be able to take advantage of the full benefits we can’t have people opting out. It’s going to reduce the impact of the internet and all of the opportunities we do have, so I think it’s really important that we can dig in and understand what are those trust drivers, where is the system currently not meeting those needs and how can we as an internet community help uplift.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you.

>> I thought that was also one of the most interesting things I think in the research. People opting out around certain kinds of concerns because I must admit I didn’t necessarily anticipate that. I wasn’t entirely surprised bot the high usage, but lower levels of trust. I think there are some obvious explanations for that. You know, so much of digital engagement occurs through platforms, through services, through infrastructure providers, which feels like it should be a public resource but end up being private corporations that are often very large, very hard to deal with as an individual consume sore there’s that power differential aspect that I can come out or I think explain some of that discussion have to use the internet because it does bring you these benefits but you’re sometimes frustrated because it doesn’tn’t always work to plan and you can’t do much about that. It that could be the mis- and disinformation plan Rachael spoke about, how you use social media platforms to advertise your business, lots of different aspects, it’s not just the traditional human rights things around freedom of speech or privacy. There’s lots of ways in which I suppose that unaccountability, that lack of transparency and that power differential, can give rise to feelings of concern around engaging in online environments but then what I think is really interesting is an appetite for reform. That’s the other finding that comes out from this research that I’m sure we’ll get to talk about in a minute. But opting out in the absence of that trust is a problem but what is also quite clear from here is that there’s a mandate for strong regulation from everyday people who want to make use of the internet but want to have a reason to trust the companies that they have to engage with in order to do that work.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you so much. I mean, I’m taking some of the takeaways from each other questions as we move into the next ones. So I’m going to take on the positives following something that Noelle said before and tried to focus on the positives. I’m trying to remember when was the first time that opting out was introduced and how much there was kind of like doubts that people will actually go through the process of thing out of a particular something. So, in my book it is actually really great that people are opting out because it taking they’re some, at least a minimal level of control that they can have about their own digital lives so I guess now it’s more on what’s next, right. How do we help people to take last move that control, you know, from their own agency forward.

LEE PAPWORTH: REBACCA

PAPILLO:

>> Usually the way it’s is-s voice or exit if you -- framed is voice or exit. Sometimes discussions around using either digital services or particularly in the context of AI, trust is a problem other people have. The starting point for convincing people to use these services or products is that you’re wrong to mistrust them. I don’t think you convince anyone with that. Trust is something to be earned, not demanded or sought. And that is, I mean, I’m taking up more time than I should, but what I would say is I did do an interview on my podcast. If you want to you can. With Damian of the Tech Council. He talked about it’s better to regulate outputs than design because it’s easier to do. And to me that’s not privacy safety by design but it’s also not engendering of trusts. Things shouldn’t have to go wrong in order for us to understand that processes and transparency and accountability are important. So I do, I think it’s a valid point you raised exiting may be the only option available to people and our job is to listen, not treat them as the problem.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. A strong majority of Australians say online privacy is a major concern and believe cyber criminals are getting smarter. Many are actively avoiding certain online activities as a result. What’s the one thing that we should be prioritising to rebuild public trust and confidence with online privacy and security? I’m going to start being a moderator and say one thing. So Bec, to you.

>> REBACCA PAPILLO: There are many things and they may go into the regulatory and policy space. The area I will talk about, the one area is the culture of cyber security, I think. It can be really overwhelming as an individual or as a small business owner, to work out where to start or what should I do? I feel like my data has been leaked. Is there knepoint, but of course there is a point and it’s really important for the entire Australian population to have an uplift in our cyber security. And so I think what we wanted to start talking about security through the cultural and people lens, not just the technical, there is a lot that’s technical. We’re always going to need those technical experts and have them stay at the forefront of emerging risks and technology. But there’s a lot of things that as individuals that can be quite cultural or governance processes that small businesses can put in place. Talking about cyber security with your staff, pointing them to trusted resources like cyber.gov.au. Our CEO Bruce has an example he likes to talk about which is if you have a physical premises, and you’re leaving the work site at the end of the day, if you’re a small business, if you have a lock on the gate you’ll put that lock on the gate but a lot of people aren’t using something as sittal as multi-factor authentification. Those tools are there and so it’s about educating people that it might take a little while to set it up but actually not that long. But it’s really important and it’s going to give you an added layer of security. And this isn’t a novel idea but some sort of national awareness campaign. We talk about the seatbelt safety or the slip, slop slap of when I was growing up for sun safety. Really thinking about bringing everyone’s baseline level knowledge up and I think that will become more and more important for small businesses but everyone working in the work force. I know the Home Affairs Minister was talking about human firewall. Humans are definitely at the forefront of needing to be that first line of defence for cyber security. So talking about it more, breaking it down, simple solutions for individuals and small businesses is one place we can do it.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Back to you, Rachel, if you want to add a point.

>> RACHAEL FALK: Sure. It’s always hard when you’re confined to one answer. Absolutely, personal, we do in the realm of our own space have to protect our own data where we can. So I break it into what I can personally do to protect myself but also when I’m sharing data, where do I want to share data and when must I share data? There’s a grey area. I encountered this the other day, checking in to a resort and this is the stuff that I often want to write op-eds in. They said you could download a photo of your driver’s licence to make the check-in process easier and if you could give us all this data. Can we get a photo of your face? I was seating because they don’t need that. And you can never consent to their data policies. You wouldn’t even take the time. They say things like when you get to the resort you can line up at the check-in desk and do it but it’s all presented under the guise of convenience. But that is just a massive data collection exercise. It might be convenient for you in the moment but also data collection. Do I want to know but might I do it for convenience or I have to? It’s very difficult in the have to space, where you have to share your data. Government services, Medicare. You have to trust government. You have to trust that they will protect the data. But my thing is where you don’t have to give data, don’t give it. Examples would be the checking in to the hotel or find ways around where you don’t have to share loyalty programs. A great way for data collection. Stores love it. You become the product and I freely admit in some cases I don’t mind being the product. But going into it with open eyes. As Rebecca said, it can bow overwhelming for people and we probably talked to our grandparents or parents about what they need to do when they’re being safe online. Patching and passwords are the two things personally and in business too, always keep your operating system up to date and that’s your own IOS. Passwords have a password app. It is actually a gift when you use it. It’s great to have a password app. Never, ever reuse passwords. Once they crack one, they’ll have access to all your other sites. Use biometric data, your face is already stored in your phone to get into sites because it saves having to remember passwords. It’s important that you become a harder target to Rebecca’s example with Bruce Tonkin, you have to make sure you have quite good cyber security hi-Joan so you’re not the victim of a scam and don’t click on a link. We all make mistakes but you don’t leave yourself vulnerable to that. There’s lots of ways around it so you can get good advice but you’re protected in terms of what you’re doing online and going to safe places. If you click a link it’s not the end of the world. What do you do when you click a link? It shouldn’t be overwhelming. It can be but one step at aptime and there was a great thing at auDA when when you get an email purporting to be from Sydney Weather or whatever, you hover over it and see that Sydney Water doesn’t have a Gmail address. Is it coming from the right domain. My mother thought it was revolutionary but it’s one small thing that can help make people secure and that’s really important. Thanks.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. I will take from your points the connection between what a culture of cyber security is in our organisation and what as a person how you adjust that culture in to cyber hygiene practices, that we take, I always remember loudly the voices of past that saying cyber security is a shared responsibility. It is one thing that the businesses that engage with you can do. Their part, you do your part, the employer does their part and the government does their part and things tend to work a little bit better. The next question...

>> One thing we can do is help people make better decisions. Help companies behaviour better by introducing strong privacy reform. This is on the table. It hasn’t been advanced and it should. Some reforms were introduced. 100 recommendations the government has accepted still are on the table. That includes I think a regime that would orient us closer towards a program of data minimisation and give people the right to delete information. These are all very normal things in other parts of the world and we should be able to do it. There’s talk of removing the small business exemption which I think would bow a huge improvement for install business which is often a side of experimentation for off the shelf products. There’s benefits to small business. I’d like the political party’s exemption removed but that’s just me and I think we’re going to be up against that. What I would say is that is a clear rights respecting reform that would make it easier for individuals to have good cyber security and would incentivise good behaviour among industry and some discipline among government officials who often try to instil regimes of data collection that are excessive and create further cyber security risk. And I think that is a program of reform that is achievable. It is also immensely popular. North of 90% of people when they’re asked about this through the OARC and similar who runs a regular survey of individuals about their attitudes towards privacy support strong privacy reforms. These are all reasons to advocate for that.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you, Lizzie. I will probably plug this in. When you say about making better decisions from the start, we have talked privacy by design, user centred principles and things. I want to look at the actual standards, recommendations that they have around privacy and security, that people can, small businesses can uphold when they’re developing their own websites, to try and use credentials and you give agency to the user to see how much data they share. But looking at the decentralised systems, as a way to make the better decisions so not everything needs to be regulated. There are other ways in which consensus can be made and agency and people are not looking at the standard stack as one of those ways of making a better choice. The next question is about artificial intelligence. More than half of Australian consumers in small businesses use AI. Many Australians don’t believe AI companies have appropriate data protections in place. The majority want stronger regulatory safeguards. A potential barrier. Can regulation bridge the trust gap when it comes to using AI? What else is needed? Whose responsibilities is it? I’m going to start with you, Lizzie.

>> LIZZIE O’SHEA: As I foreshadowed earlier, I think what this piece of valuable research does tell us is that there a strong appetite for reform. Many people want strong regulation of artificial intelligence. And that’s also backed by other research. People may be familiar with the survey already but KPMG ran a global survey where Australia ranked either deadalist or second last on optimism about artificial intelligence. There’s a lot of talk from industry about the high rates of usage in this country but clearly people feel that it’s something they shouldn’t feel optimistic about or haven’t yet trusted. What comes out in the research is very large numbers of people think that regulation is important. In the KPMG report, specifically there question was asked about international insurances and regulation that complies with international standards. 83% of Australians said they’d be more inclined to use artificial intelligence if they knew those things were in place. There’s different kinds of questions but very similar in this research that backs that idea. So that’s I suppose a little frustrating in an Australian context where we’ve had a safety standard created in the last administration. Now that looks like it will not become mandatory. It will just be a guardrail. But not a mandatory one. Whatever that means exactly. I think that is disappointing. I don’t think that’s the only way in which artificial intelligence can be regulated. We’re talking about a very diverse set of technologies. So there’s still a lot of scope to -- lot of scope to enforce existing laws. And I should say I do think it would be beneficial to have specific legislation and it will be a disappointment if that doesn’t proceed. But I think we should be looking to regulators with remits in the -- regulators with remits in this space to find more work, elevate and discuss instances of harm so that people can turn it in to sacomplaint, a form of feedback, that can be fed into the system through existing channels of regulation. And empower regulators to do their job. I think there’s lots of other avenues for agitating around these things. I’m a campaigner in my heart in some respects. I think there’s work that can be done by civil society organisations to do that kind of campaigning work. It would be great to see industry come to the table and offer forms of compliance and assurances without the need for hard regulation. And I think that will be the way in which they get better take-up of their products over the long term. So that kind of leadership from industry is something I’d welcome. And it remains to be seen will be forthcoming.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: I will go to Rachel for your on that question -- input on that question.

>> RACHAEL FALK: I think it’s a hard one. What are Australians mistrustful of when it comes to AI? Are they mistrustful their data will be used in ways that they can’t contain or will be used for a great LMM and lost and sucked into a great machine. Absolutely. Because we don’t have regulation but we don’t understand where data goes, instantly makes and rightly so, I’m not criticising this view at all, makes people suspicious because you have no control over the data flow or the confidentiality and integrity of the data, and I went into the GP the other day and the GP said to me I’m trialling software, do you mind if I have a recording device and it’s just used boy AI? I said that I do. I don’t mind if you want to record it but I don’t want you using my name. I don’t if -- mind if you record parts of it. I said, "You don’t know where that goes, where it’s stored or what will happen to that data." That’s a big question for all of it. To the point about new law, from what I’ve heard, we will not go down the EU route of an AI act. It seems to be too complicated and once heralded as a big thing. I hear discussion around analysis being done around existing laws and seeing whether they’re fit for purpose. But the challenge here is very similar to the challenge we had in cyber security a few years ago. Existing laws might be fit for purpose but it takes the common law a long time to catch up and we’re dealing with that now when it comes to regulation of certain aspects of cyber security. We don’t actually have a case at the moment. Any common law decision on what reasonable steps and cyber security looks like under APP11. It takes time. I think the challenge is - and I don’t like this expression that technology gets ahead of the law - but that’s in a common law jurisdiction. You don’t have case law to help make those norms what’s acceptable. I think it’s government’s responsibility here, it needs to come out and say why they think certain acts are and what would the use cases be that fell into it and have public discussion about that. I’m assuming that’s in the pipeline. Because if we believe the competition and consumer act is where certain aspects of this conduct or how we regulate data. To me one of the things with 35acy we haven’t quite got right either is consent is amazing. If you were to have open consent at the start like the GP did with me, but if you were to ask people, people would opt in or but we would educate people that you might want to opt in to this particular AI program because it does X, Y and Z. Demystifying and importantly understanding what it does and doesn’t do. But understanding where your data goes and where it doesn’t go and who will not use it? My experience is unregulated and in every context here, organisations do things with data because it’s valuable to them. And that’s not me criticising organisations because they do. It’s enormously valuable for business to drive sales and understand your customers and that is a good thing. Just done with consent. So having that transparency and commitment to some principles, and I know some organisations do have transparency and A sort of governance principles -- AI sort of governance principles they use, is helping to consumers understand and organisations become accountable for how they use AI.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. Bec?

>> REBECCA: I think Rachel touched on an important thing which is the public conversation that needs to be had and it will come as a no surprise as a member of auDA that obviously it is a complex area. So our position is always around that multi-stakeholder engagement and making sure the community does get an opportunity to provide feedback, whether it is on I think the opening panel. Yesterday we were speaking about it. Minister Brown saying understanding the problem, and then coming up with what potential solutions could look like. So having that opportunity to have that dialogue and that feedback in any discussion around AI and regulation. I think the other thing that we’ve seen is we know in the research that people are saying I want regulation. But what is maybe an area that we can look in to a little bit more in future research and in conversations that we’re having in multi-stakeholder engagements is what do they mean by that? Going the next level down. Which areas of AI are particularly uncomfortable for them and what would make them feel more comfortable?

>> SYLVIA CADENA: The opportunity to share what’s going on in other national forms and when the global IGF happened in Norway, there was quite a big display of the national AI models that are starting to pop up. And I don’t know if the team from the auIGF might be able to share links with the people that registered for this meeting. I guess the Norway event, model and how they are doing with the safeguards in a sample that’s only for Norwegian use and Norwegian companies in Norway and those languages, and the Swiss model that Alberto that opened a couple of days ago, I think those examples might help see how it can be used for local purpose within the local laws that make it fit for purpose. And demystify some of those concepts that are out there that are a little bit far removed. So maybe there is something we can do in terms of sharing information from national IGFs into this, into this forum, this discussion? So conscious of the time. We have a couple of more questions. But I would want to leave a few minutes for your final remarks. So I will ask all of you to just try to be more succinct in the next couple of questions. We only have 21 minutes. An uptick in multi-factor identification in 2025 is likely in part attributed to more digital platforms and services making multi-factor authentification a requirement. How can industry work together to create a baseline of online security standards that protect consumers and build trust? So we’ll start with Rachel on that one.

>> RACHAEL FALK: I think it’s a really good question and I think back to Lizzie’s point around small business, the small business exemption perhaps wasn’t there too. Small business are a really important part of the ecosystem when it comes to multi-factor and puttingen various cyber security principles. I think everyone has to do their part. And if it’s multi-factor and not retaining data and having data purchase but I think the pont thing for all of us to remember for all businesses is woe are all part of an ecosystem. That’s our data that’s been dealt with. We rely on small businesses, also rely on other suppliers. Implementing small initiatives but my suggestion will be something like essential aid in some way, just helps make the ecosystem stronger. Even small businesses who aren’t bound by the privacy act can data perch. In my previous organisation, we took a decision to not keep CDs or data of applicants for roles if they aren’t successful applicants. You don’t need that data on your system anymore. Small things make a big difference and not having excess personal information. Having personal information of people on your system is great. So small things and small steps, even as I said before, patching and passwords and having small steps you can take in your organisation just makes all the ecosystem better. Everyone agreed to do one or two things. It’s getting to the small businesses so they also understand they might not have to do it but they need to do it because it’s the right thing to do.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. Bec.

>> REBECCA: Over those five years, the top concern that we’ve seen from individuals and small businesses has remained the same. And it’s always around cyber security and data privacy. So over five years we haven’t really seen any movement in that so it’s obviously an area of great concern. It’s not going anywhere and not going anywhere particularly quickly. If anything in this year’s research, there’s been evidence that in some ways it’s getting a little bit worse. Poem are saying cyber criminals are getting smarter. And that percentage of people who say they’re actually doing less online or choosing to not do certain activities online has increased since the last time we asked that question. So there’s definitely a role for industry. I spoke earlier about culture. And trying to uplift what people can do. But we certainly can’t leave individuals to work it out on their own. The onus should not be on individuals to solve these problems and so I think as Rachel was saying, it’s looking to industry to make these improvements. Sylvia mentioned privacy by design. The privacy by design, and I think woe need a greater push to get those taken up by industry so that those solutions are built in to technology from the outset.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. Lizzie, short?

>> LIZZIE O’SHEA: I’ll be short. It’s a very interesting observation. I’m grateful for this data because it’s useful and supported by research that comes out of the OARC in various polling. And the numbers of people, one of the reasons that comes to my mind is the number of people affected by data breaches continues to go up. I will find the stat and report it. More than half of people will have experienced a data breach over the last 12 months. It’s going up and up and up. There is not a plateauing of the occurrence of these things. That’s a problem that needs to be fixed because it’s not something we can solve while the real world experience is one of cyber insecurity. And that’s as much an industry problem as an individual one and that’s our kind of, our job to do. I would just say one more thing quickly is the of artificial intelligence products into existing business services has been encouraged immensely by the government but it does come with cyber security risks. People are possibly familiar with McDonald’s, and using a chat bot for applications for jobs and the entirety of the contents that had been provided to the chat bot and everybody’s CVs who had applied for a job and personal information, this is in the US. There’s an assumption outsourcing to third parties that provide artificial intelligence is something the government wants us to do but also that it might not come with cyber security risks where it clearly does. That may be a question of broader reform about attribution of liability with developers as opposed to say deployers so there can be clear lines of responsibility for ensuring cyber security as we integrate the sophisticated technology into our daily lives.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Thank you. We have only five more minutes for the last question and then I’m going to leave 10 minutes for questions from the audience. So just wait there for a second. Or unless your question is about a specifically this point, are you OK to wait? Or we can skip that question. Is that OK? Let’s keep the question.

>> FLOOR: I was recently at a meeting of the Australasian Institute of Digital Health.

>> SYLVIA CADENA: Would you mind introducing yourself.

>> FLOOR: They were presenting some work currently ongoing by a team at the Women’s and Children’s Hospital here in South Australia in integrating AI tools for raising text notes in a hospital context. They already have a lot of regulation on data privacy and it’s like can’t be shared with anyone without explicit consent. So they’ve done lots and lots and lots of research on how to manage user trust in the efficacy of their tools. It’s that within the context of the digital lives research.

>> REBECCA: We speak to individual consumers and small businesses of the internet. We haven’t looked at kind of big case studies in organisations and things like that. When we were setting up the research we really wanted to dig down into that perspective of the use of and how they find their experiences.

>> Efficacy a consumer concern.

>> The efficacy. So we haven’t looked at efficacy. What we have looked at - I think I’m getting this right, is the use of AI, so what are people using it for, how much are they using it and - yeah, what they’re using it for and how they feel about it in terms of - yeah, the - sorry. I have just lost my train of thought. Sorry. But, no, we haven’t really looked at that but each year we do take on feedback and look at what is the next layer that we want to look into and understand at a deeper level. Yeah, definitely open to ideas on things like that.

>> There is a little bit of research that I know about which I can share with you where they’ve dipped into use case. There’s trust when it’s a low-stakes use, which makes sense to me but the higher the stakes it comes to the use the more concerns there are about using the product and I can - I infer that’s around efficacy and the like but it could be for multiple reasons but it would sort of align with perhaps what’s underlying your question but I think this is an interesting field of research because I think what you’re describing also highlights the challenges with using data sets to train models that are historical that can involve biases of their own which only become obvious once it’s deployed and the other reason I think this is an interesting example to raise is there’s lots of people involved in the regulation of these kinds of technology or so that you could draw upon. You don’t necessarily need an AI act to deal with - or potentially start to unpick the problem you here describing. There’s the TGA, there’s medical associations and the like, I’m sure you probably know this but there’s a move in the United Kingdom to require medical transcription services to be registered under the equivalent of the Therapeutic Goods Administration here. So it maybe a whole of economy exercise at points of deployment rather thanks say, some of the inherent challenges with using historical data to train models that then give non-transparent answers because that may not be available in the proprietary ecosystem F we only have the capacity to understand these problems through outputs maybe we have to go to specific regulators to do that work as a way of building confidence in their use.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you. I want to look if we have any comments or question from the remote participation.

>> Thank you. We do have one questions to Bec. "Can auda -- auDA address some diversity in the selection fast year, it’s only M/F and two out of threeish are from metro areas." That’s from Kiki.

>> Yeah, it’s an important consideration and it is for auDA as well. When we work with our research partner, I did mean to give them a shout out at the start, it’s new gate we work with, to produce the research. We have a lot of conversations about the importance of diversity at auDA. We have a role for doing what we do for the benefit of all Australians so it’s certainly front of mind. The conversations we have had with them and the way the survey is designed is to ensure we have a representative sample. - so we have marketing panels that people participate in, and we make sure that we get those key demographics. In terms of gender, I do believe that we do give people the option to provide - to other options than male and female. But certainly it’s something that we can take back on board and look at and discuss with our research partner.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you, Bec. Any other questions from the audience? No. OK. Then we can have time for the last question that I have prepared. The digital lives research indicates there is a lot of confusion around digital ID in many -- and many people are sceptical that digital ID will keep their data more secure than providing personal documents to a range of providers and businesses. What needs to be done to help Australians trust in new technologies such as digital ID and how will this contribute to greater trust in the online environment overall? We have five minutes for the three of you to go through that question. So you can have one minute for a final remarks. And I have the timer on.

>> OK. So, I guess I think similar to what I spoke about before. I really think digital ID comes back to awareness and understanding. It’s a big change for people to get their head around, what digital ID -- is and certainly in the research people weren’t aware of it. The people that were aware of it and that were using it generally thought more favourably of it so getting that education out to people. But I think there’s really a trust gap there for people. And it’s around where people trust, so a lot of -- lot of people trust what they know, which is giving da and their data to a lot of small organisations. Rachael give us -- gave us some examples before, but trying to educate people that, yes, putting all your data into a centralised digital ID might feel a little bit daunting, but the risk is exposure through a lot of smaller organisations. So, again, awareness and uplift of education around what it’s there to do and how it can protect people I think will be really important.

>> SYLVIA: Rachael, one minute to you.

>> RACHAEL FALK: great. Thank you. I think - so, yes, document verification system does exist. It is used by many organisations that might be a surprise, and it is where nay can actually verify your identity by documents being lodged and your identity being in the DBS already rather than you having to give, as Rebecca said, individual pieces of ID everywhere. It requires two things. It requires government to make it known and make it so organisations take part in it. And for it to be generally raised and have awareness of it. And so organisations that use it then I think we found through some of the big breaches a few years ago, they don’t need to store disparate bits of ID in their organisation, they just need to use DVS to verify customers legitimately and that can be done that way. A high level of getting the standard, getting it to work, the system to work for everyone and getting a high level of awareness about it as well as the federal government’s own sort of ID verification tool. And the - ultimately it comes down to what are the advantages of using it and encouraging adoption so that we can get people to move to a safer level of digital verification?

>> SYLVIA: Thank you, Rachael. Lizzie, win one.

>> LIZZIE: With the introductions regime, one of the stated objectives of the government was also to reform the privacy act in support of this regime. That should be followed through on that promise in my view because these things go together and then, of course, there is some discussion around changing some of the guidelines around it. What I think would be most helpful for a digital ID scheme is to say that the government provider provides the best quality, most safest form of digital ID available and that’s how you build confidence. I think potentially deviating from that to encourage take up, to encourage private providers into the market does come with quite significant perils and risks and does undermine the mandate for which it was originally passed that. Remains a concern for us.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you for those 15 seconds.

>> LIZZIE: Thank you. Against all odds.

>> SYLVIA: Now we have five minutes for the final remarks from all of the panellists so I’m gonna start with Rachael then Lizzie and then Bec. Rachael. Go ahead.

>> RACHAEL FALK: OK. Thank you. That’s five minutes between us right.

>> SYLVIA: Five minutes for the three of you.

>> RACHAEL FALK: I will be efficient and quick. I think there is no doubt as we have heard today and through research, we now have digital lives and there is no going back to the library where you research or a world where you went into a bank teller and there was no such thing as A. The Ms or internet banking, it has truly changed the way we certainly in first world countries conduct our lives. But with that comes a dark side and I don’t think we can ever be blind to that either. As I think we mentioned earlier, cyber criminals and nation states are incredibly innovative. They find different ways to exploit people. It’s not a set and forget. It’s important we protect our own information as best question can, our own devices and our own identity but we also make sure those who are responsible for being custodians of our da tasks organisations and large and small, also have the responsibility to protect the data and I think we should demands that of them. I will still continue to have my rants when photos want to take photocopies of my licences which they can’t do, there’s no legal basis for them doing that, my children roll their eyes and get embarrassed and walks off -- walked off. I think it’s important to have agitators to remind people, although it’s not the fault of the person front of house, it’s important organisations are held to account and it can’t just be that organisations blindly follow a process they may have followed for years. Bit by bit we will make it safer but it’s a role and each and everyone both through to large organisations and government all have a role to play to continue to make it both flourish and be a great world. We live in a connected world but also just keeping one eye to the potential downside so they don’t lurk as large in our lives and they’re just an annoyance and something we learn to effectively manage. Over to the next panellist. Thank you.

>>

SYLVIA: Thank you. Rachael. Bec, a minute. Bek Air of course. Pick -- Bek Air --

>> REBECCA: Of course. I think Rachael has done a great summary on what we talked about. From my perspective I want to say we do this research annually. We’re really interested in feedback and comments on it so please come and grab me or one of the other people wearing these T-shirts afterwards if you’d like to chat more about it. You can find it on our website, and I do encourage you to read it and share it and - yeah, disseminate it widely because that is why we produce it. We’re really committed to looking into trust and upholding trust in dot au, those who were here doing the lunchtime session that’s something we’re continuously working on, making sure that we do hear the views of the Australian public and can uphold trust through dot au and in a blooder digital setting. A great way to stay connected with auDA and keep across our information is by becoming a dot au member, there’s information about that on our website and you can get access to our research and many other things we do when it becomes available. Thank you.

>> SYLVIA: I will be closing this panel now and thank all the panellists for their participation and contribution, remote contribution, and honestly to encourage auDA to keep doing this report for the foreseeable future, and probably go back and check on questions and - that were asked before to see how we compare progress and change and how we move forward or we don’t, probably we move backwards sometimes but to keep the ball rolling and to engage as many individuals and small business leaders in the process as many people cannot participate in this more high-level discussions. And I guess you will be taking feedback from others about how to move forward this research. But I guess it’s also a bit of homework for all of us to do in terms of what our role is in make lives better for people in this digital world of ours and how Australia participates in this process and as Rachael say being the agitators when need be and being the warriors of reason when there is a requirement to do so. Because it is very important that we - all the discussions that happen here and the conversations and the points that people make f you -- if you are in another setting when some of these issues emerge maybe point to them and point them to the research or point them to the session so that they know that they’re not alone in this - you know, quest for understand we are, in and there is a lot of -- understanding that we are in and there is a lot of work to be done. It is an ongoing conversation. I thank you for your patience and your participation today. And I do look forward to the coffee and if next conversation coming up. Thank you. -- and the nexts conversation coming up. Thank you.

>> Thanks very much to Sylvia and your panellistings. We’re moving into afternoon tea now. We’re on the home stretch. We’ll come back here at 3:15. 4:15? Yep. 4:15? 3:15. Thank you. Sorry. Can’t do the math. We’ll come back here at 3:15, get bit of an overview from the relationship territories for the sessions and then we’ll rows -- reponter and then close out with a panel, thanks. (AFTERNOON TEA)

>> Bennett

>> Please take your seats so we can get started on the last session of the day.

>> thank you. OK. So we’re going to cover off three things in the session. Each session had a rapporteur and Rohan will organise to bring them up and I’ll give a couple of minutes just to give an overview of their session. And that will form the basis of a report that we will put out after this event. Hopefully some time soon after the event. Following that we’ll have an open mic session. If you want to come up and say how wonderful this was or how not so wonderful this was or make a general statement, that will be a time to do it. Then we’ll have a closing session which Jordan will moderate. We will have a few people who will form a panel and give us some feedback and views on the last two days. With that I’ll hand it over to Rohan to bring his crew up.

>> ROHAN: Thank you, Donna and everyone for coming in after the afternoon tea. We have done all the sessions and everything but now this is our time to reflect on what we have discussed. And who is the better person other than our rapporteurs who have done the hard work to take the notes. And all the backend work. So now I’d first like to invite Zane to give us a brief on the first session which was our opening plenary. Just from that mic.

ZANE: The opening session started off with a excellent welcome to country by Uncle Mickey. He reminded us technology intersects with living cultures and this land was once without divides. We’re an oral people and forced to dopt a written form of communication and that has similar to what’s happening today with tech policy. One of our plans is to address online harms, and keeping the internet open and usable for all. The discussion that followed in the opening plenary, panel, involved around four teams. Building capacity, strengthening trust, broadening inclusivity and agreeing to a shared vision of digital wellbeing. Australia needs a shared vision of dintle wellbeing -- digital vision of wellbeing, rather than more legislation. Grounded and transparency and inclusive of youth, Indigenous and regional communities, beyond capital metro areas. These priorities should carry through into the auIGF paper and more regional and global forums. That is a summary of the opening ceremony.

>> ROHAN SACHDEVA: Thank you. Dale is rapporteur for the Commonwealth in Conversation. This is some reflections.

>> DALE: Discussing the 20-year review of the world summit on the Information Society. A you say framework which reflects the multistakeholder approach to internet governance and sets the UN’s digital development agenda. Some of the key points discussed in this session were that the Australian Government has been engaging with the multi-stakeholder community with a working group to develop Australia’s positions and welcomes ongoing engagement with the community through the end of the year when the review will take place. And raised some barriers to participation, some of the barriers raised included capacity, funding, awareness of the process, and the time zones when meetings are held which are often bad for the Asia-Pacific region. At this stage the zero draft that’s been released for WSIS+20 reflects Australia’s support for the multi-stakeholder approach as well as the support of other governments. Other priorities for Australia which were discussed included gender equality, human rights and closing digital divides. There was a discussion of how references to Indigenous people could be improved and meaningful inclusion of Indigenous people could be included in the conversation. As the process shifts towards the end of the process, it’s important to support negotiators from all countries with technical expertise and knowledge from across the community. The community should continue to engage within Australia and also within global networks, to make sure we have a positive outcome. Thank you.

>> ROHAN SACHDEVA: Thank you so much. Next on our line and she is joining us online and hopefully woe have her online. And she was from the session No-one Left Behind Digital Inclusion and AI Equity.

>> Thank you so much. This was chaired by moy co-convener of the Australian Digital Inclusion Alliance, Tim Marshall and we heard from Good Things Australia, the Digital media Research Centre, QUT, Telstra and the NSW Telco Authority. The discussion was quite wide ranging and I’ll only scratch the surface here but essentially around one in four Australians are currently digitally excluded. So that’s 6. 6 million Australians lacking capacity to properly participate in work, learning and life. And there’s a real -- complexity to the challenge. The emergence of AI raises new questions about how we equitably share opportunities, while mitigating risks. The panel also discussed how digital inclusion is highly intersectional with social and economic disadvantage and other characteristics. And as a result, responses tend to be highly fragmented with resulting inefficiency, duplication, delivery gaps and foregone potential. So in all of this, there is a unique opportunity for governments to lead a national approach to digital inclusion and we can see NSW has done some great work there. And really digital inclusion was discussed as needing to be the foundation of digital capability and equity agendas. The session explored the imperative for national action, covering strategy, leadership, opportunities for policy, and alongside national accountability and coordination. The panel discussed the fact that there’s a lot of opportunity in the digital skills and literacy space. And the opportunity for Australia to lead in this space and be an example to regional neighbours. Thanks.

>> ROHAN SACHDEVA: Thank you so much. Really valuable insight. Next on our list is Cameron. He presented at the digital platform ownership, diversity, resilience and trust session.

>> CAMERON MCTERNAN: Thank you. The session was chaired by Dr Victoria Fielding from the University of Adelaide. And then joined by myself, Cameron McTernan and joined by Ram and we presented the findings of a panel discussion that followed. The report showing that the digital platform economy is highly concentrated with our indexing showing a due opalistic or near monopolistic market structures that are significantly less competitive than traditional media and telecommunication sectors within the platform economy. We spoke of the political influence of large technology companies as a growing concern, as they’ve been observed to align with new political agendas. We argued diversity is needed for a resilient and stable internet. And protecting the network’s integrity. We also said that a lack of diversity in the digital space also leads to negative economic outcomes for consumers, including higher costs and limited choice. We said that trust the internet is multifaceted. Encompassing the technical reliability of systems and the human factor. And built on three pillars, expertise, transparency and concern for users. And finally we argued to ensure the internet’s future resilience, a shift in mindset is needed from a fix it as it happens approaches to more proactive measures better funding, supply chain mapping and formal training for network operators. Thank you.

>> ROHAN SACHDEVA: Thank you. Next we have Sophie. She was the rapporteur for the multi-stake-holder ways time prove trust in Australia’s ecosystem. And the organiser of the session with Jordan.

>> The panel session was a very lively and timely discussion, allowing for stakeholders from consumer advocates, telco industry, academia, the technical community, and government to offer some time shared but also at times conflicting perspectives on the relationship between trust and regulation in the telecommunications sector, when trust in telecommunications seems to be at an all-time loaf. The session grappled with provocative questions and dilemmas, including comments from participants in the room and online about the different elements and layers of trust, whether that’s seen from the lens of infrastructure, versus community expectations and community perception of trust. The expectations for reliability and consistency and then the importance of transparency and communication when things do go wrong in telecommunications because of the technical realities as a key element in maintaining trust. The power imbalances between the different but also even within different stakeholder groups, and the difference between multi-stakeholder consultation and multi-stakeholder input versus multi-stakeholder decision-making or multi-stakeholder regulation. The trade-offs that might need to be made to ensure a regulatory framework that fits for purpose, keeping in mind the focus is regulation that is effective, not necessarily what form regulation may take. Thank you.

>> ROHAN SACHDEVA: Thank you. We have the town hall paper and the key highlight was as we gather at auIGF, by consensus we endorse proposed methods through the review, co-facilitators, the auIGF by consensus and proceedings with the work to develop a social contract for digital wellbeing. The feedback we had from the community today will be taken into account by the MSE members and all the members involved in the developing papers. Thank you for chairing the session. And this is going to be a long process. Probably we would have to work on it for two years and when we can be next year, convene next year, we might have a progress report that we can present on that. Thank you. And for next one, we have Alan Dickson, joining us online for this session. New playgrounds, new rules. The future of child digital rights and skills. Thank you so much. We had a very engaged panel with two separate sessions. One of those sessions is focusing on Australia and New Zealand and the context of children online and the second part of that session was looking at the international context and that discussion we had presentations from Net Safe New Zealand, the Internet Society, Asia-Pacific, the ITU Asia-Pacific and the UNESCO report. A lot of the discussion in the first part of the session focused around the legislative structure that happens within those spaces in terms of how we engage collectively from a governmental way of engaging and then also collectively as multistakeholders in the space. Talked to the importance of the groundswell that’s happened recently for action against online harm that we’re seeing in Australia and New Zealand but have said in the context of New Zealand for example there’s a misalignment between the sort of legislative structures that are available for comprehensive regulatory bodies in terms of dealing with issues such as harm and key regulation. And then we also see the element of legislation taking centre stage because we have these examples of the take-down models in the Pacific of digital tools and then the licensing regime from Malaysia and the bands and in South Korea. Both of these examples that we have from these representatives identify that sort of lumping in together of social issues regarding online harm and the wider issues concerning the child online does not necessarily deal with the complexity of the and that we are not addressing the sort of technological and architectural issues behind internet engagement or the developmental ages of the child and how it relates to their personal context. The second half we had a discussion in which Rory and Anna brought a more global context. moral global context. Rury and their stakeholders and also the building capacity methods that they’ve been utilising, working with young people. And then Anna also related this in the context to the classroom specifically and the use of digital tools and how to online classroom now is sort of the new playground, indicated by the title of this presentation. With the digital tools have sometimes in some cases become a pacifier for the child which is impacting the educational experience and has future workforce development skills. And then also thinking about how this is tied into things such as the smartphone ban in relation to issues such as cyber bullying and how there’s been a prominent discussion in the West all to draw it towards the fact that the impact on the child or the young person and their digital world is very much related to their material world and their lived experience, which one of the speakers identified in the Q&A is something sometimes we miss from this conversation, talking to those stakeholders themselves, young people only what their agency is but also balancing that with protection. I have also put in there the mental questionnaire results of which we have seen some interesting responses to the controversial questions where we are currently with the bans and might be in the future concerning digital skills. But I think one of the things this causes us to look at in this particular panel and the discussions from this panellist is the aspect of universality, which is something we support Anne open accessible internet but balancing what does it mean for children online, both for themselves and the community and parents within those spaces and looking further what is does it also mean to be free in terms of protection, not just freedom to access but also freedom from harm, that being two sides of a very important conversation. Thank you very much U

>> ROHAN: Thank you much. El ledge was also the organiser of the -- Ellen was also the organised of the session and was expected to join but she could not travel because she was unwell. Ellen, thank you. Next we have Rose Jamieson from InternetNZ. How might approaches to digital inequalities from the first peoples of Australia and Indigenous opportunities enhance global internet governance.

>> ROSE JAMIESON: We asbestos our rapporteur so I’m --

>> We lost our rapporteur so we’re doing both roles. Our session, as Rowan said was about Indigenous and first peoples and how they can enhance internet governance and we concluded that probably need to be our own group within a multi-stakeholder model. So we talked about exclusion by design, continues, we talked about Indigenous systems of knowledge and how they offer other ways and how community-led works best. Some of the conclusions the panel reached were what matters is sovereignty, growing a skills-based a trust, self-determination, community-led Indigenous solutions and some traditional models of debate in governance. What can be done. Equity mesh shirts, thinking about meeting Indigenous and first peoples where they are, so we had a bit of a conversation around culture -- cultural labour and understanding that being clear that they want to have control over their own destiny. Our conclusion was different world views might offer something different to the formal roles and structures that currently exist in the multi-stakeholder model and internet governance.

>> ROHAN: Thank you, Rose and also for organising the session. Next we have last but not least, Hayley, rapporteur for fostering online for Australians the human element.

>> Thank you. Apologies in advance, I haven’t had a huge amount of time to prep this given we were the last session which wrapped not long ago. And I guess it marked the end of an incredible 2025 auDA so thank you everyone. We had a really interesting panel discussion hosted by Sylvia from WD30. She was joined by Rebecca, Lizzie from Digital Rights Watch and James Faulkner from -- Rachael Falk from risk advisory. Our discussion was a topic of fostering online trust for Australians and what that looks like in terms of the human element. Some of the key points we discussed were the fact that the internet provides many incredible bin fits to our lives but it also has a bit of a dark side. With cyber criminals easily adapting and becoming more innovative at finding ways to exploit our trust online. That many Australians are opting out of certain online activities and the fact that this has both negative and positive elements, and in terms of those pos aspects it really comes from the perspective that people are refusing to use platforms that they actually do not trust. We also, or they also spoke about uplifting cyber security program. The fact that this can seem overwhelming but that it’s essential for the benefit of the Australian community and that this can start at an individual level with the basics. And it can also be reinforced by nationwide campaigns such as the slip slop slap example that Bec used. They spoke about the fact that more needs to be done at an industry level so that online users are able to trust the platforms that they are using, and that the pressure of keeping secure online shouldn’t just sit with that individual, that privacy by design principles with are a great way to ensure security from the outset. When it comes to building certain technologies online. Lastly, they also spoke about new technologies such as digital ID and the way that na helps to improve security and data privacy. But also that there’s a low awareness and understanding of that technology. And that government needs to make these benefits known so that small businesses and individuals are able to beverage some of these benefits.

>> ROHAN: Awesome. Thank you so much. Hayley and thank you to all rapporteurs for doing the hard work and I will pass it back to Donna. Thank you.

>>

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Rowan and thanks very much to the rapporteurs, and I think it’s kind of a handy reminder of what we’ve been through in the last two days, which has been a pretty diverse-ranging, in terms of themes and content and views. If we go back to when we - the MSSE went out for expressions of interest, our theme for this meeting was global visions local impact, the future of Australia’s digital governance. And there were three subthemes we had under that. The future of internet governance, digital trust and resilience and sustainable digital inclusion and I think we really did cover off each of those subthemes so congratulations, everyone. I think we actually achieved our objective. Which is pretty satisfying. So, before I forget, I just want to say thank you to our Auslan interpreters who done a fabulous job over the last two days. So thank you very much for that. Also, to our tech team, which Gabrielle la’s been heading up over there. Thank you again for the seamless nature of tech support. And what is much unseen is that we have volunteers who have been monitoring the sessions online so na we ensure that we get the questions or comments pertinent to discussions that are read out in real time, and I think that’s really important to ensure that we’re engaging with those that are interacting with us online so thanks to the moderators. And a big thank you to Rachael, who’s the event organiser and looked after all the logistics and all that stuff just - you know, we’re very thankful just happens. Sorry about the long walk all the way around the venue, but at least you got your steps in today. Alrighty. Thanks, Rachael. OK. So, we’re going to have - I’ll give 20 minutes, but if we end up with a long line out the door we’ll extend it. We’ll have an open mic session. The mic’s open. If you’ve got any comments f you want to give the SSE some feedback on how we could do things better or have we thought of this, have we thought of that, what was your favourite session and why during the two days. We’d really welcome that need back. If people wanna start to line up. Or if you’ve got nothing that means we get out earlier. Thanks, Christine. Ask anything. Anything. We don’t care. Yeah, open mic.

>> FLOOR: Hello, Christine, internet society. Just what I was saying that you probably couldn’t hear was I wasn’t going to do feedback, I was going to do something else but let me say it’s been a real pleasure to be here at the Australian IGF so thank you. I just wanted to raise something that I didn’t get a chance to earlier because we were so busy. I was really taken by the session about first peoples and Indigenous governance. It was a great learning experience for me. I still have a lot to learn, so I apologise in advance if I don’t put this appropriately. But it made me reflect because at the same time I -- time I’m very conscious that the zero draft for the WSIS -- WSIS + 20 review is out for consideration and submissions and thankfully we have an extension to the 3ered of October which gives us a little more thyme. During that session I went, "OK, I wonder what it says about Indigenous peoples." And I founds three references by doing a search and then I looked at those references and I went, "Hmm, maybe it’s just me, but they don’t look like the kind of things that the people on the panel were looking for." They were more about, "What can we do to protect these people?" And I thought that’s a little bit paternalistic, if I may be so bold as to say that, speaking on my personal capacity, not as an intersociety person. So what I was thinking is it would be really amazing if among the Indigenous community in Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands, if you could bring your very powerful voice to that discussion. I think it’s really missing, and I’d really love to see it so thank you.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Christine. Christine, just a follow-up on that, do you have any practical ways in which they could do that? Christine: Absolutely. And I really appreciate the opportunity. I’m very happy, after this session, to open my laptop and show you how the UN, the co-facilitators are handling the process and handling the input from the non-government stakeholders to show you how to put in that input easily, and myself and all of my colleagues are very happy to help in any way that we can to make it easier.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: OK, thanks, Christine. We’ve still got Jen in the room but maybe you can get the word to Susan and Astrid and - yeah, OK, great, thank you. Thanks, Christine. Sylvia.

>> SYLVIA: Thank you. Just, you know, thanking everybody for participating in this and especially the ones that structured the -- instructed the program in how early the program was put forward that, help also to justify coming, and, you know, prepare myself for what kind of people was I going to meet, which I hope was also the same case for others. So I think the earlier that process is done, the easier it is to engage, and I know that the Australia IGF and other is always very committed to promote the outcomes and the reports that are coming but I hope that there were different topics covered on cyber security, on AI, a bunch of others, my suggestion will probably be try to and figure out if it’s possible to share not only with IGF but into forum where is all those other topics are discussed so that is possible to amplify the voices of the Australian community is very hard for individuals to follow the separate processes. So if that is an option that would be, I guess, a very useful for other people.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: OK, thanks u

Sylvia. Na role. Narelle: I don’t know if I properly introduced myself yet but I’m Narelle Clarke, the CEO of the internet association of Australia. We’re a not-for-profit industry association that works for the benefit of the people who build and operate the internet so we run - we’re actually a licensed telco, a not-for-profit telco, yeah, who’s have thunk. We’re a licensed telco that operates internet exchanges across Australia and New Zealand on behalf of the New Zealand internet exchange. What I wanted to do was to thank you all for participating in this. I think this is a really vital and important forum for making better regulation, that pertains to the internet. Yesterday in the session I went through and enumerated all of the different regulators that have a role to play in regulating the internet in Australia. The department of Treasury, the different privacy commissioners across Australia, the Attorney-General’s Department, the department of home affairs, the department of communications, the Australian communications and media authority, an I missing anybody here, Sofia, help me out there there’s probably a few more and now of course with the big push towards making the internet an essential service that brings into play all of the state regulators that reckon they can tell you all how to do essential services. What I want to point to are all the missing people in this room. A lot of other industry players, and I take some responsibility for not bringing some more of them along, some more industry players, some more of the regulators, some more of the other interested parties to all of this and of course, you know, the hoi poll lie, more of the folks that use it and love it and do it, and rely on our services. So I think in the future we have to keep the IGF not only Australia but globally as a vital way to share ideas, to cross pollinate, to thrash things out in practical and sensible ways so I urge you all to keep this up. Bring some friends alongle and, of course, help yourself to this because you might wanna take it home.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks very much, Narelle.

>> FLOOR: Bruce from the dot au Administration. Donna, I want to thank you as Claire of the program committee. I know you’ve done this in a voluntary capacity and commend the program committee as a whole because I think it chose the right topics because these are all topics that we have heard in the last couple of days, they’ve all been mainstream topics in the community about, you know, the internet and regulation associated with it. And I think the contents of the panels have been very good. By and large we’ve got a range of perspectives from people that you would regard as experts in their fields. So I think - I have seen a noticeable lift f you like, in the quality of the program in year. I think - sort of picking up on Narelle’s comments but the landscape shifted dramatically. 20 years ago, none of those government departments were involved in anything to do with the internet. It was great. (LAUGHS) But now it feels like a lot of the regulation is coming from governments, and we - what I want to move away from is this being a forum where we talk about how we’ve all been regulated. (SILENCE)

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Hang on, Bruce.

>> One moment. I will provide a secondary microphone.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Bruce, can you just repeat your last - yeah, you faded away.

>> FLOOR: My last sentence was what I hope is that, you know, this forum and the outputs of this forum can be captured and actually help provide inputs into the sort of evolving regulatory landscape and make a difference.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, thanks, Bruce. I think for the - you know, when people... Internet Governance Forum about, I think we all had different views on that, and even in the steering committee, and I think it’s something that we’re probably still evolving, but it’s good to hear Bruce, at least wear evolving in the right direction. So we’ll - and I guess just a plug. It’s a good committee to work with, because it’s like old friends. We’d like some new friends to come into the mix and help us out so we’ll be doing a little bit of a plea for that later, I think. Ritchie.

>> FLOOR: Yes, Ritchie from digital justice society. You’ve seen me up here a come to couple of times. That’s probably because I feel welcomed or most welcome -- mostly welcomed today. We’re from a group, like, many of you care about the internet and the digital impact on our lives, and we actually weren’t sure what this forum was about except for - you know, internet November And have had such great conversations with everyone, and I suppose the first thing I wanted to say is how much I appreciate all the work that’s gone in to make this group happen, and just the passion I see in the room here and around this. I think that it’s such invisible work. Like, a lot of people want - they understand their tangible devices or their apps but they actually don’t see how much governance affects their lives. Yeah, that’s the first thing I wanted to say, thanks for everyone seeing the invisible and how important this stuff is.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks.

>> The second thing is the second conversation we had about the multi-stakeholder approach or approaches. Coming as a web developer I have always been inspired by how, broadly we’re on an open internet. We have these big mega players to worry about but I can spin up a little website and stick it up there, and the way that internet has built around open standards and is broadly someone lays down a rough proposal with some others that care and others come on board and evolve that forward broadly very collaboratively, and I think that it heartens me that those practices have then somehow been adopted in the UN and these other things, you know that, we saw at the start of the conference. And I see that as the conversation to have to regulators is, I think, in our Australian context we’re used to doing regulation and we’re used to doing government a certain way and that’s a big process that six -- takes six months or two years and everyone gets a quick say and you land it at the ends but I think this multi-stakeholder piece looks a lot more like editing a Wikipedia article. You lay down a crappy article, and make it good enough and others come on board and over the same two years that whole story is told together. So, that’s, you know, I think the message to get through - this collaborative way does work globally and we want that to keep working for us here. And the final part, I suppose, I you know o I come with a POC identity, sadly, you know, even in this town I have lived experience of racism. You know, there’s definitely certain pubs I can’t comfortably go into. That’s my experience on the ground but that’s not the experience for most of the people I connect with. And unfortunately we all know spaces where, you know, everyone has the same old school tie on or is from the same sports club or whatever and it’s very hard to change the culture or change a policy in that space. So, my sort of suggestion around this multi-stakeholder and creating space for First Nations voices is also creating space for all the voices that aren’t here. You know, we talked about the younger people, more younger people.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah.

>> FLOOR: Disabled folk, queer, you know, whatever group that is are sort of more - they need it to be safer before they come. If they’re not here it’s because they’re not safe enough yet. My suggestion is for - when you’re putting those multi-stakeholder groups together that you make sure that the people that are - don’t have normative power make up at least 50% of the group. If you do it that way you’ll find a very different conversation.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. I guess to that point on what we mean by multi-stakeholder, if you want to applause - sorry, didn’t mean to interrupt that. Thanks, Ritchie. What we mean by multi-stakeholder in the context most of us come of is the ICANN context and those multi-stakeholder groups when we talk about government, technical, community, civil society, whatever, I mean, they were constructs that were developed probably 20 years ago. And we have used them - we have used them to our advantage to ensure that there is inclusion predominantly of the technical community in a lot of these conversations that we have had. But as Bruce said we’re re-evolving and we’re now talking about different things and technology and how it’s influencing our lives. Ritchie, our construct isn’t meant to be - to leave anybody on the outside. And perhaps the auIGF we don’t need to be confined by those constructs anymore. This is meant to be a welcoming space, and I’m - you know, really pleased to see all of you guys here, it’s been great. And I just have one other question before we move on. How many people are from Adelaide? I’ll put it another way. How many people are here because you live in Adelaide? OK. Terrific. So this is the first time that this forum has been to Adelaide, and I think just on the basis of the show of hands it was worth the effort so, thank you. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Kiki has one final one. She was raising her hand previously. One moment.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, go ahead.

>> FLOOR: Sorry, Jordan. Thought you may have been in line. A couple of things I’d like to ask or request of the committee. One is to open up that feedback on the position pail and paper for a few weeks after this forum. And possibly a very, very big wish is to time stamp the recordings like the 2019 one. Thank you, Sandra, baby, for your intel lent stuff, I love it. It does help us share it with our networks, and provoke additional conversation and inputs. After this session. So that’s one. The other is whether the policy or subcommittee can consider the internet universal indicators. It is - it attaches to the UN system. It is aligned with the SDGs and where we’re going with the WSIS stuff, so that would be great. I do note, again, what Narelle said and absolutely advocate for this forum. This season NRI technically, but the Australian Internet Governance Forum coordinating with the sin that sis documents of the APR IGF and the greater IGF would be fantastic and I think that maybe what Bruce was alluding to in terms of those outpet documents. The policy design institute holds its friends of tech round table I guess it is, so I think if we could imagine what those people, what those policy makers, what those government people, were - if we did have their attention because they do have their attention what would the auDA like them No know and this is the type of thing I’d love to see if an outcomes things that could be shared and used in other spaces as well as the other forums that I mentioned. And then lastly we covered - and thank you, Christine, for raising the systemic racism, the Indigenous session and things that I have mentioned before about internet New Zealand but which do have a responsibility in the region. It’s part of our government mandates to be cooperating and participating in Asia-Pacific and the global region. Again - please do look up this, Nepal. I think we’ve had - my numbers are wrong but I know some students have died from the protests that occurred there was a social media Battalion and ban. That is not if reason tore to protest but there is a whole ecosystem of things there. And just this week I’d just like to draw attention that - Abdul Fattah has been released from imprisonment, a British Egyptian citizen. Jailed for spreading misinformation. He’s a political advocate, pro-democracy advocate, and these are the things that are happening. They are happening currently. They will happen in Australia. If we don’t set as a culture speaking up for people who are maybe not the majority. So please do. Educate yourself, consider how we may participate in those conversations. ICANN, the I star organisations all have codes of conduct, they all have missions, nay all have mandates. We should be reviewing those and making sure... My final words what -- supports what Ritchie says F people are not here then it’s a really big indication it’s not a safe place. And having nice people, having nice conversations does not equal a safe space. And when we see things being repeated year on year, when we see people being missed in the Asia-Pacific region, in the global forums, that is an indicator that we’re not taken seriously. And that’s not safe. But, thank you very much for the committee. It has been enjoyable. You have done an excellent job especially for you as chair, I believe. And the Auslan interpreters have been on fire so thank you to the department for sponsoring those.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you very much, Kiki, and thanks for your, I guess, input throughout the last two days. I know et cetera always difficult to do when you’re participating online so thank you for that. Jordan.

>> FLOOR: Thanks. Jordan, one of the, I don’t know, MSSC secretariat people. Just to let you know that during the event we have had a template going with the rapporteurs, who started to pull together both the slide pack of quick summaries that we did just now, and I have put a link to that in the Zoom chat. I don’t know how else we’ll get a chance to distribute it but they’ve also started writing session reports for each session and the idea is that we’ll then publish that in a kind of summary outcomes document. I think the next step is for all of us as a community to use that resource and input those ideas where they might be relevant because there’s no huge machine behind the auIGF that can do that but we can all do that in the day to day work. I wanted to let you know that is coming. None of us are prepared to stake our lives to a time frame when that report will be published. It is going to come. That’s another innovation in making the information and dialogues at the forum more accessible to people who weren’t here. The second observation I’d just make is we have 100 or 200 people max participating in this in a country of 27 million people. I dare say if you ask most people who heard about the auIGF they’d say no. A second challenge for us all is to tell other people about it and to bring the energy of what people might think and maybe it isn’t a safe space. Maybe it isn’t a known space. Maybe for a lot of people it isn’t a relevant space. All of those things can be tackled if we know they need to be tackled. That’s the second thing. The third thing, a personal observation, there were a couple of sessions putting challenging issues on the table or if tension happened. I think it is important to see that you can have discussions like that and not lose your shit. Not have a Tweet-off and go and shoot someone. And it sounds a bit daft to say it but long may be continue to fost arspace where at least -- foster a space where we can put difficult things on the table. Thank you for that.

>> Thank you. Alex.

>> Thank you. Seems like I always follow Jordan. My name is Alex. I’m here on behalf of Linux Victoria and the first year I was at the IGF as a delegate when it wasn’t called auIGF. I was turning 18 and it’s been amazing for me to observe how the conversations happened in a very organic way. We were invited to be part of that conversation and how year to year it grew to this point. Of course we had the COVID as well in the middle of that. Since then, my passion for open source small businesses have grown stronger because when you have a small business community, it makes it great, resilient economy, especially in the digital space and larger organisations that are going to be owned by members as a community. I’m pleased to hear Internet Australia. I didn’t know that. Melbourne PC was a service internet provider. And a member base under an example. So where I’m going with this is now that I see IGF has proper branding established and for the first time the convention centre, it’s ready to go to the next stage. I’m inviting, everything I suggests something I’m more than happy to be part of and take the burden of. That we look for making it happen by Australian providers and using as much as we could open source technology. So with low resource and low budget it’s really reasonable in understanding why we would use Zoom as video conferencing or like no particular communication channels. We run community groups as well. However, if, I’m inviting everyone and I put myself in front as well, that we look at using the tools that are very solid and work since 2020 we have been running all our meetings on open source software we host in Melbourne. We have Australian domain providers. We can use, I’m sure, maybe put the call out there would be more than happy to provide the service without putting the name out there. For the communication channel we can use services like matrix that are federated. Different communities over time can set up their own service and participate in the conversation. And this way every time we use technologies like this, more and more we give exposure to different parts of the ecosystem about the fact this kind of conversations are happening. And the second point I wanted to mention on the back of this. The second point is now if we could have a budget for hiring professional facilitators, similar to how we did in 2018 at the beginning, a lot of conversations that might be hard, confronting, to put in front of a microphone to put someone’s name in front of, could happen in smaller scope and be brought up at the end. And that’s one way of breaking down conversations on the diof the sum. The third suggestion I have is I had a few other people I mentioned too, breaking down the conversations throughout the year. Doesn’t have to be the steering committee that does it. I for sure would do it, even leading to the event and previous ones, we held events to invite people to submit and I’m inviting all the groups to hold their own IGF. It could be anything in the same vibe. Do it on their own resources. If we do the hard work of running throughout the year, we turn up and next year, we have something of our own constituency so to speak to present. I work on everyone.

>> Thank you. OK. So this will be our last intervention before we get to the closing panel. Thank you.

>> FLOOR: Thank you. I just wanted to do a thank you to our Indigenous people and First Nations people in this land and thank you especially for those in this room. Thank you for your presence here. I think it’s important to have your voices even in challenging conversations and I hope it continues to be supported and I hope you find this space safer every year. I wanted to thank you for sharing the room with me.

>> Thank you. This will be our last intervention.

>> I’ll keep it really quick. Thank you, Alexis, for marketing this event. To his community, which is why I’m here. I hadn’t heard of this before. So I feel I’m learning a lot today. It’s been really valuable. I think one of the takeaways - I come from a city space where we’re working towards a smart city and we often think about infrastructure but one of the major I guess keys to implementing smart technologies from an internet perspective is humans and people in the community. So that education and I’ve heard it a little bit today around campaigns for digital trust and safety so that we can all be a little safer online. I thought that was really useful. I really liked Alexis’s point around Australia’s data sovereignty and sovereign capability and I think that’s something obviously the state of South Australia is doing. From an Australia perspective, whether that’s intelligence, defence, and the data infrastructure piece, but I was also I guess from community perspective, I run a little think tank called AI and Society. And I think this today shes me that the converse -- shows me that the conversation wasn’t about technology, it’s about human elements and trust and equity and accessibilities and I guess how we as people interact and have that interface with technology. Thank you so much, everybody. And I’ll finish up.

>> Thank you. Jordan, you ready to bring your panel together?

>> A tough act to follow. But our job as a panel here at the closing panel of the closing plenary of the 2025 auIGF is to try and inspire you and provoke you, as I may have said yesterday morning which feels like a lot longer ago than yesterday morning. I’d like to welcome to the stage from the other end Ian Sheldon from the Australian Government. If I try and say your department’s name, I’m going to get it wrong. I know it has the word ’sport’ in it. Cameron from the University of South Australia, Pat Kane from Verisign and Lizzie O’Shea. These have all ben around here involved with sessions and are looking forward to doing a bit of start the reflection process because obviously a big event like this, a big dialogue, we’ve all got lots of ideas floating around in our heads and sometimes it helps to hear other people’s reflections as you start the reflection process yourself. So this closing reflections pan will tackle three quick questions. A quick thing the operative word as the second last thing and before Dona Donna’s closing remarks. What are you taking out of the auIGF this year that you’ll do differently, more of, less of, some, something that’s different, something that will change for you? Thirdly, what do we collectively as an internet governance community all the context about what that means, need to do next? That will be the quickfire last round and then we’ll hand back to Donna. Something that caught your eye. What it was. What the implications are? What has got you going? I’ll start with you, Pat. What are your thoughts?

>>

PATRICK KANE: Of all the conversations we had, what is it that we know about our role? And how do we think about our role? What popped into my head was my boys at home, they play a North American Indigenous game known as lacrosse. I don’t know if you’re familiar with it. It’s called the creator’s game. But my oldest son plays a position where he transfers the ball from the defensive side to the offensive side. When he would get close to the goal, my wife would always jump up in the stands and say, "Jake, shoot." He would come over after the game and say, "Mom, know your role." When we talk about the shared vision and Zoe Hawkins talked about this yesterday in the shared vision, what is it that we’re trying to have a shared vision around? When we think about internet governance, we have the technical layers and technical coordination, internet governance which is kind of about the evolution of the internet. What do we do around encryption and what do around blocking those types of things. What is digital governance? How do we interact with the internet? It’s not just about the internet itself but some of the processes and the outcomes that come into the community and how we engage with that? When we talk about a shared vision, what are we focused on in terms of which layer of the internet? You can decompose it even further around, the technical space and the technical coordination layer between the fibre, between the protocol layer and the domain name system. What are we talking about and what is the shared vision around the items. When you think about how it gets worked on, what is the multi-stakeholder model? How do we view that? In the area we work in, Verisign within the ICANN space, multi-stakeholder is a bottom-up consensus-driven policy outcome in terms of what we do. It’s bottom-up. It’s not a government handing us something. But more and more what I hear from governments is it’s a multi-stakeholder consultation. So governments are going to present something, go to the multi-stakeholder to get their feedback and I don’t think that’s the same thing in terms of what multi-stakeholder is. And then how big should the multi-stakeholder model be? We had a lot of conversation about access to multi-stakeholder. Where is Ritchie? He talked about the safety in terms of those kinds of and how do you participate and how does that model develop? Maybe it’s too small. Then the model might be too big because the more voices you have in a consensus building process, the less gets done. So when we think about that, what is the decomposition of the problem we’re trying to solve and how do we build the model around that? I took away was know your role.

>> A nice quick summary. Turning next to Cameron.

>> CAMERON MCTERNAN: Thank you. I want to quickly build upon this know your role dimension. I think I feel like a bit of an interloper and don’t normally engage with these kind of forums. Academics tend to have their own little universe we interact with and don’t maybe spend as much time talking with the wider community as we should. I was really concerned maybe I’d come here and it would be about that technical layer and I know some of the higher level kind of governance organisations are focused on that, even on the first day, a comment or a question, is this within our remit or actually what we’re concerned with? And it was really reassuring to so as the presentations went on that our idea of internet governance was much bigger than that one layer and many of us are facing the same mountain but approaching it from different angles. In particular a lot of our stakeholders shared the same concerns the academic community has about the future of the sector such as how safe and reliable and secure Australia’s internet? How power has very quickly become contrated in just a few and the need to ensure the internet serves everyone and not just needs of a privileged view. I wanted to highlight two very kind of different sessions that kind of spoke to that shared vision. I think the first one was the sovereignty in the digital age session during lunchtime yesterday. Coming at the grassroots kind of level. The business section and voices from it from a multistakeholder 4:00 session. And businesses, diversity is an issue. Even at the really kind of powerful end of town, and people recognise there’s actually community issue here that everyone’s shared in as well. I think that was kind of my big takeaway. Thanks.

>> Thank you. Nice to see something seeming more relevant than you might have thought based on the label perhaps. Lizzie?

>> LIZZIE O’SHEA: Often when we talk about the multi-stakeholder model there can be trepidation because sometimes there’s a feeling of powerlessness or at least a differential that becomes quite plain when you participate in those forums. What I would say is what was evident to me from this discussion is a real interest and commitment to working out how to make some of those regimes really fit set of modern problems that we now face. That involves thinking about how to address perhaps some of those power differentials and disagreements in constructive manners that can then result in other kinds of more unified policy positions. Creating artefacts that we can try and agree on. I think these are, or also I was very taken in terms of the idea that came from the rapporteur, summing up the conversation that took place by various representatives of Indigenous communities, about the interest of them having their own kind of stake within the multi-stakeholder model. I thought that was an interesting potential itrision of that as well. Trying to make it as multi as possible. I take the point there may be some limits on that or there may be some utility in narrowing the scope for particular purposes. But what really I guess took my eye over the last couple of days is the commitment to making it relevant and that is something that will perhaps fulfil some of the challenges that we identified in the first session of how you get more people in the room interested in being involved in this form of governance because if we don’t continue to modernise and to bring people in, we will lose the benefits of that very important contribution to innovative technology that comes from participatory governance.

>> Thank you. Ian, fourth and lucky last in the first round.

>> IAN SHELDON: Thank you. It’s hard to go after such a distinguished panel who have picked up most of the things I wanted to say. For me one of the key reflections is I think a point you picked up on and what Lizzie just referred to, it’s the point of disagreement in this community. Lookingback at the last couple of years of auIGF, I have seen the robust discussion grow. This community is growing from coming together and agreeing on a lot of things. A lot of the same people coming together, talking about the same issues and finding ways to pat ourselves on the back. This forum across the last two days, I found the disagreement, the discourse, the creative friction to be fantastic. It is really enjoyable to see the community stand up and have a robust discussion to have the confidence to say I disagree with-w you and here is why? That shows maturity and shows my this community is going in the right direction. The things we’re grappling with are difficult. You talked about the WSIS in New York. The government communities, the global multi-stakeholder community are grappling with lot of the same issues that we’re talking about here. We aren’t alone in having those disagreements and aren’t alone in finding those constructive and creative ways to find a way forward on these issues. And so for me lookingback at the last couple of years and looking where we are here today, I think we’re on the right path and that disagreement is something I’d very much encourage. I’d love to see more of it both at next year’s auIGF and the intervening year. So that for me was a big takeaway and quite interesting to see this community mature in that regard.

>> Thank you for all four of you for putting set of interesting issues on the table about what caught your eye. One of the things that caught my eye to randomly impose myself on the panel as well was the craving that some more decision-makers were here. There are some decision-makers here from important organisations and layers of government and on. And have been during the two days. There will be more of them, that would be great. Politicians involved. More of the big tech firms. It’s grit we have disagreements and it would be great if some of the people participating in that conversation were the people who could about easily on them. Not to devalue what we’ve got here, but a next layer and engagement. The second question that we put in front of you. Is there something that you are going to take out of this that you’re going to do differently? Individually? You as a person who has been here for two days? And we’re going to start with Cameron.

>> CAMERON MCTERNAN: Next time I’ll put less numbers on my slides. But honestly I was actually really blown away by how effective the communicators in the room are and I consider myself a professional communicator but not always. And I was just really, an amazing thing about this community is that part of it if you’re driven by passion you can find a lot of clarity in your ideas anyway. There’s a lot of really experienced people and that’s a motivation for me to keep wanting to come to things like this as well. Not hearing new ideas but expanding out upon our practice as a part of that. The other thing I want to say is it came from talking about diversity. On the panels, I really struggled and this is just such a perfect example of academia for you, I struggle to actually get that diversity on my panel when I was setting it up. There were rules around kind of had to pay people from different stakeholder groups, not everyone could be an academic. How do I find someone who is not an academic? And coming here, just spending two days here, I found people who were interested in the exact same things as me who are academics. I come and do a panel next year and it will be easier to find someone to talk to, rather than in my own zone.

>> Some really practical ones there. Appreciate that. Lizzie?

>> LIZZIE O’SHEA: I probably should have chimed in about the disagreement point. One of the things I’ll try and do better is disagree -- differently is disagree better. I end up in environments I I’m advocate and up against people that don’t share my interests. That is a mode of operating that works in some contexts but not others. Taking the opportunity to find structured disagreements is incredible and valuable because you learn how to talk to people who are on the same side of you and try and find the common ground. They’re quite rare opportunities. And so I’m also going to be trying to be someone who creates them as well in the same way they’re kind of created here, rather than just being dictatorial shall we say if I’m being ungenerous towards myself.

>> There’s a middle class middle of the road white people podcast called The Rest is Politics. Their tag phrase is disagreeing agreeably.

>> That makes me feel worse.

>> That can dissolve and so we need to get something that’s both got edge and is approachable and is something that people want to be part of. So I think it’s a difficult alchemy but when you get it right it’s awesome. If you can help make it happen, that will be pretty awesome.

>> LIZZIE O’SHEA: I’ll do my best.

>> IAN SHELDON: My team are often the ones at international meetings representing the Australian Government or representing Australia more broadly. It’s quite important for us to be challenged on a lot of those positions we hold internationally. So we’ll be looking, my team and I will be looking to lean into the disagreement, testing a lot of our positions, making sure that we find those hard edges and making sure that our local community here feel comfortable coming and telling us that they disagree with some of the things we might be championing overseas and internationally. It’s critically important that we represent the Australian community in the work that we do on the international stage. So we’ll be looking to seek out those points of disagreement and try and roll them up into the work that we do overseas. That might backfire on us but happy to have the constructive conversation.

>> It gives you more of a rapporteur to take into the conversations if people might disagree from you. Pat, you have the last one on this. What will you do differently?

>> PATRICK KANE: Part of that first question that we put out there was what are you going to take with you? What I’m taking with me is optimism from this. The reason I say that is the original IGF which came out of the Tunis agenda was designed to drive just a talk shop. Designed as a protective layer at that particular time which was CANN because it would take over management of the core functions of the internet around names, numbers and protocols. So designed to be non-decision making, non-outcome based. But a true talk shop. After 20 years it’s become disappointing. And people don’t participate in the global IGF much anymore. From a business perspective, because it’s not decisional. There’s no outcomes. There was hope around IGF plus which was supposed to drive more outcome documents that could become true, multi-stakeholder consensus driven documents that regulators could take and be informed by community like this as they make decisions around regulation. It was refreshing to hear what can we do more and the question that came out of the two days was really how can the Australian IGF and they prefer that. But how can the Australian IGF do more to try to drive some adoption and drive some things because we have not had an Internet Governance Forum USA in three years. So what I’m going to do different is I’m going to see if I can’t inspire folks in the DC area to actually have an IGF USA come 2026.

>> Cool. Invite us all. Had

>> IAN SHELDON: Everyone is invited.

>> Good luck with that one. You have doubts?

>> No. That was not meant to sound like that. I’ve heard they’ve been good in the past. You’ve got this wonderful period of stability in which to organise it. Sorry. It’s OK. You don’t have to say anything back to that one. Woe have a bit of space before the rapid fire one. Is there anything you have said that any of the other you would like to opine on just briefly? It doesn’t have to be. It’s OK. We’re standing between everyone here and their exit. And that’s a pregnant pause. Looks like people might say something and might not. I’m just going to go into the last round I think. Which was what do we need to do next? This is your chance to put out your stall and might be something you haven’t said already, a repeat message or just come to you, but what do we as an internet governance community here and in Australia need to do next? We’re starting with Lizzie. I did have the panel where we we’re talking about the digital lives of Australians but I think going to meet meme where they r to understand their concerns, to understand what opportunities exist to talk to them about problems that we as a community are trying to solve is very important because they’re not in the room. But we stand here to talk about them and we want to hear from them and involve them in the conversation. I think a lot of people assume that the internet is a kind of ungoverned space, that it’s governed by power, dominance or monopolistic markets, whatever it may be. They may not realise there’s a whole set of people working to make it accessible and real for people. I think it is going to meet with them, talking about what has worked and hasn’t and using that research is what an obligation if we want to participate in this forum with some authenticity. I will take the opportunity, which is a bit cheeky, hopefully Jordan won’t interrupt me. We are going to do that, we’re about to hold -- Town Hall meetings how we think democracy and society can survive AI. We’ll invite as many people as possible into the room. In any of you want to come you’re welcome. We’re doing it in all the major cities of Australia, inviting them into the discussion, to see another set of people who might be wanting tore involved in par tri governance, where discussions -- decisions are made but different views are able to be ventilated. That’s the kind of work we’ll do but it’s based on things coming from these forums like research, forums, panels, where I can learn but our organisation and lots of other organisations can learn about the dynamics of honourable member these issues that are moving so quickly that, are difficult to grass app can be slippery but are so fundamentally important to the few of -- future of many billions of people that it be-Hove us to do as much as we can to ensure that it remains people first and that’s our mission.

>> JORDAN: That wasn’t too bad a promo.

>> LIZZIE: Didn’t even interrupt.

>> JORDAN: Not this time. Ian, you’re next, what do we need to do next.

>> IAN SHELDON: It’s probably going to be similar to the things I said at the last conference. I think this community needs to grow. I think we need to increase diversity, I we need to reach out to marginalised communities, find ways to bring into this room. I think that work needs to occur outside of the conference. I think we have a fantastic work and we can do it across the entire year but I also think this community needs to resolve some of its identity. AuIGF is grappling with that tension. Sit traditional internet governance, is it technical matters or is it everything on the internet? I think as we work through those identity issues we need to work out how we can structure that conversation and make sure we have the right people in the room when we have those broad and disbursed discussions because I think there were some really good conversations happening across the week and I think it would have been fantastic for more of my government colleagues to be not room to address some of those connectivity issues, some of those and tall inclusivity issues -- digital inclusivity. The sooner we can start organising parts of the community to be brought together to discuss those topics. No small feat but I think we have a fantastic starting point.

>> JORDAN: Cool, thank you, Ian. Pat, you’re next up. Path: I think what’s next for this group is the execution on the social contract. I was really pleased to see what was put out there, and what it’s trying to resolve but to take a little bit offer of - what Ian was talking about, is this IGF is probably not to body to solve all of those problems. But it might well be the body to facilitate the solution to have those problems, taking a look at different multi-stakeholder models, different groups, how do you get different issues resolved whilst somebody’s managing the overlap, managing the conflict. Where are people like minded that you can bring together and get different bodies, different multi-stakeholder groups to engage on solving the problems under a broader umbrella.

>> JORDAN: Cool. Thank you, Pat, and Cameron.

>> CAMERON McTERNAN: I have a short cheeky one and then a nice one. Am I allowed to give both? Is that alright. Have we got time?

>> JORDAN: Why not.

>> CAMERON McTERNAN: Short cheeky one. Firstly I want to say all of the above. I think it’s a bit hard to follow some of the acts up here today but the cheeky one I will say is there’s a lot of symbolic power in being up on a stage like this and being able to talk about something like internet governance but there’s also symbolic power in actually asking questions afterwards and I want to give a shout out to the digital justice people in the front row who have been asking questions after every panel, seriously amazing and they’re not to only people doing it. Yeah, give them a map. (APPLAUSE) They’re not the only ones asking questions but it’s a way that shows you’re engaged, listening and value the things the people are saying up on the stage as well. Maybe that’s something for few fewer -- future IGFs S your stakeholder community asking questions not just making statements. And the nice one, I want to say keep doing this. Keep doing this. And I know it sounds obvious but the multi-stakeholder approach really is borne out of history, a time in history where people really optimistic about what the internet was and what it could be and in a lot of spaces right now you don’t see that optimism or that utopian view anymore. There is a lot of pessimism, there is a lot of scepticism borne from some of the things my panel and a few other panels spoke about this weekend but I did see - and part of it actually in the people asking the questions after the session as well as the people on the stage that there is optimism here and that’s really special and that’s really valuable and important and I think that’s in its own right a good reason to keep doing what you’re doing so keep doing what you’re doing.

>> JORDAN: Cool, thank you. That’s a lovely wrap of practical and optistic -- optimistic things we can do. One of the characteristics of the internet, doesn’t get talked about so much is the idea of permissionless innovation if you want to use the common name space and ute the protocols you can do the service without asking anyone else. of us can do internet governance without having to ask anyone else. Maybe one thing that’s been said today at some point or a conversation you’ve had has inspired you to keep doing this. Whether it’s through the Felix Auger-Aliassime framework or something else, give it a go because that’s how things get better and changing. With that, that’s our don’t and we’re going to hand back to don natural to close us all up. Thank you very much panellists. (APPLAUSE) -- to Donna to close us all up.

>> DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks again to Verisign for sponsoring that session. Alright. We’re almost out the door. So, that’s - couple of slides to put up for me. Alright. So, when we talk about what’s next from a practical perspective of the MSSC, we would like some new people to get involved. So if you’re interested, there’s an email address info at auIGF au which will take you to the secretariat and take you - as the MSSC we’re not actually closing up shop now, and opening up in February so we can start doing this again. We’ll continue on to do some follow-up from this event and work out what the next 12 months is gonna look like. So if you want to get involved, please send an email to that address that’s on the screen. Do we have our sponsor slide? So once again I want to thank all of our sponsors because really a lot of the committee is doing this on a volunteer basis. And we couldn’t put on this event without to sponsors. They really are important to what we do. Identity digital, Verisign, outer, internet society, the department of long name, internet society foundation, ICANN, IGF FSA, apnic, internet association of Australia, go the communication state. Thank you to each and everyone of you. You serve a very important role to ensure that we can do this again in the next 12 months. Well, hopefully, we have to get back to you on next 12 months. I’d just like to thank everybody for your time, and showing up for the last two days. It’s been fantastic. This is the first time I have been the chair and I think it’s exceeded my expectations, which makes me happy. We will be - the survey will be going out pretty soon, which is basically, you know, how was this - you know, how do you think about this and all the rest of it and then we’ll put out a report. But what we do hope to do not near future is having a webinar to work out how we can continue this event or these conversations moving forward. So thank you, everybody. (THE CONFERENCE HAS CONCLUDED)

>>

>>

DONNA AUSTIN: small public announcement if you’re at bit of a lose end and you want to have a drink -- one small public announcement. We’ll be at the intercontinental bar. Is that right? We’ll be at the intercontinental. Please join us. (CONFERENCE HAS CONCLUDED)