

CHAIR'S REPORT OF
THE ICANN HIGH LEVEL GOVERNMENTAL MEETING,
LONDON, 23 JUNE 2014

by

ED VAIZEY, MP, UK MINISTER FOR CULTURE AND THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

I was privileged to chair the second ICANN High Level Governmental Meeting attended by Ministers and senior officials on 23 June 2014 during ICANN 50 in London. This meeting took place at an important stage in the evolution of the global Internet governance eco-system. It followed in particular the US Government's announcement in March of the decision to transfer its stewardship of the IANA functions to the global community, and the NETmundial global multi-stakeholder meeting on the future of Internet governance hosted by Brazil in Sao Paolo in April.

Furthermore, the final stages of the 10 year review of the implementation of the outcomes of the UN World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) agreed in 2005 provided the important over-arching context for the meeting's wide-ranging discussions relating to ICANN and its contribution to the evolution of the Internet governance eco-system.

Given the important opportunity afforded by this meeting for governments to review these and other major recent developments, I was especially pleased it was so well attended with representatives from 77 governments and territory administrations, and from 11 inter-governmental organisations. I was very keen to secure a wide range of views at the meeting from administrations across the world, in particular the least developed economies, and small island developing states. I was therefore very appreciative of ICANN's offer of financial assistance for travel to London for a number of participants and generally of their facilitating the meeting so effectively.

I am very supportive of ICANN's objective to become a more truly global organisation and believe that we as policymakers in our respective governments representing the world's citizens must fully match that

vitaly important objective: every person in every community must feel they have an effective voice in ICANN.

One of our principal objectives for this meeting was that it should be a two way process of information sharing and exchanging views. I was very pleased, therefore, that the President and CEO of ICANN, Fadi Chehade, and the Chairman of the ICANN Board, Dr Steve Crocker, were able to join the meeting throughout, both to present information on ICANN's objectives, achievements and current programmes, and to hear the views of senior representatives from governments and IGOs.

Governments and IGOs play an active role in the ICANN community and contribute to ICANN's policy development processes through membership of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). Increased recognition of the importance of the GAC's contribution to ICANN has ensured that membership of the GAC has steadily risen in recent years to over 130 members.

As ICANN's role in managing and coordinating the global domain name system has evolved and the organisation has matured, the role for governments in the ICANN multi-stakeholder community has become ever more important: we need to be an inherent part of the global ICANN community for the multi-stakeholder processes to work efficiently with full adherence to the public interest. One of my objectives for the High Level Governmental Meeting at ICANN 50 was that it should provide a further opportunity to engage those administrations which have not yet joined the GAC on the importance of contributing to ICANN's development as a key player at the centre of the global Internet ecosystem. I was pleased therefore that some of these administrations were able to respond to my invitation and attend the meeting.

The current major expansion of the domain name system has inevitably created some major challenges. This highlights the need for governments to be engaged with the other stakeholders to find the right solutions based on consensus. Given the inherent complexities of the programme for expanding the number of generic top level domains (gTLDs), it is not surprising that we may not all agree on every policy issue that crosses the GAC's table. However, the importance of governments and the IGOs being able to express views and explore

options in an open and inclusive manner remains vital for achieving consensus-based proposals which will have community support, and ultimately provide the basis for clear and unambiguous advice to the ICANN Board. I also strongly believe that the GAC's decision to engage much earlier in the bottom up policy development processes led by the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO) will help to overcome these challenges and avoid major differences of opinion.

I am very grateful for the contribution which the GAC Chair, Heather Dryden, made to the meeting as Vice-chair and for the assistance provided by the GAC Secretariat and the ICANN support team in ensuring such a smooth and well-managed meeting agenda.

The Secretariat has prepared the attached detailed report of the meeting and I believe we can inform the global Internet community of the following main conclusions from the High Level Governmental meeting. I hope these will be recognised in the forthcoming events when the future course of Internet governance will be discussed, including the Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul in September and in the UN General Assembly which will review in the next 15 months how to take WSIS forward beyond 2015.

Firstly, I believe there was universal endorsement at the meeting for the US Government's approach to globalising the IANA functions – and crucially – there were a number of statements of commitment by governments to contribute to ICANN's process for devising a successor community-based model of stewardship. We agreed that this is an important key stage in the evolution of the multi-stakeholder governance of the domain name system which also recognises ICANN's increasing maturity as an organisation that contributes to the stability and resilience of the Internet. The process for preparing a successor global community proposal is undoubtedly a major challenge and the timetable is a demanding one – but the timing is right and the resolve to complete this process is clear: governments will play their part, both as members of the GAC and individually through direct engagement in the cross-community consultations and deliberations.

The High Level Governmental Meeting also provided the first major opportunity for governments to discuss the outcomes of the NETMundial

conference in April. I was very appreciative therefore that Professor Almeida, was able to review for us the principles and roadmap for action agreed in Sao Paolo, with a contribution from Kathy Brown, the CEO of Internet Society (ISOC), one of the leading stakeholder partners in the organisation of the conference. There was general agreement at our meeting that NETmundial had served several important purposes. Firstly, as a multi-stakeholder event it had successfully articulated the current challenges for the global community and its governance mechanisms. Secondly, it made clear that it was necessary to strengthen the existing multi-stakeholder processes, entities and fora, including the IGF and ICANN. This would in turn ensure that the responses to those challenges would be effective and fully inclusive. Thirdly, it identified some key issues such as net neutrality that needed further action.

The emphasis in our discussions was on the importance of all stakeholders being involved, as indeed was the case in the NETmundial process itself. I think it was valuable nonetheless that we heard at our meeting some expressions of support for supplementing or underpinning these multi-stakeholder processes with long-established multilateral mechanisms. This will require further debate in the UN and elsewhere but I believe that understanding alternative approaches through the kind of dialogue facilitated in Sao Paolo and in London is important for the success of future discussions. It can also provide one means of shaking out any complacency and testing the multi-stakeholder model in order to determine what is working well or what may warrant adjustment or selective revision.

That brings me to the most recent contribution to the evolution of the global eco-system provided by the report of ICANN's High Level Panel on Global Internet Cooperation and Governance Mechanism published in May. My sincere thanks go to Andile Ngcabe for presenting the main conclusions hot off the press. This provided much for me and my government colleagues - and for the community - to think about as plans now come together for operationalising these outcomes in tandem with the NETmundial roadmap through some form of global alliance of leading experts and organisations.

As an inevitably preliminary reaction at our meeting, there were several expressions of support for this new initiative in its overriding objective of

sustaining a wholly inclusive and inter-operable single global Internet. We recognised the urgency of finding new cooperative mechanisms that will build capacity and foster growth of the digital economy in all countries including least developed economies and small island states with limited resources and expertise. I believe the intersection of this initiative with the strengthened and more outcomes-orientated IGF will be an important consideration. The general thrust of moving from words to action was one which our High Level Governmental meeting had much sympathy with.

Finally, I believe the High Level Governmental Meeting was able to reflect on ICANN's achievements and the remarkable coming together of stakeholders from the various Internet constituencies and communities across the world, in record numbers at the milestone 50th meeting in London. The many and diverse numbers of stakeholders involved in the ICANN community underlines the vital importance of these processes being developed through sustainable commitment and trust. Our meeting welcomed the recently launched review of ICANN's accountability to be conducted in parallel with the IANA process as an important step in examining ICANN's performance on these key aspects of effective governance.

In conclusion, I believe we achieved much in terms of increasing the engagement of government policy-makers across the world with the ICANN community – as members of that global community. We were able to facilitate the exchanging of views on a number of key issues and developments and generally promoted a higher level of awareness. We also carried forward some timely discussion on the next steps in the evolution of global Internet governance, which I hope the ICANN community has found as valuable as I certainly have.

Finally, I want to express my deep appreciation to all my colleagues from governments and IGOs who attended and contributed to the Second High Level Government Meeting, to all the presenters who so effectively set the scene for our various discussions, to the interpreters who did such an excellent job in enhancing access to our discussions, and to all the members of the ICANN community who came to hear the opinions and proposals of their fellow stakeholders in government.

Ed Vaizey, MP

Minister for Culture and the Digital Economy

Government of the United Kingdom

Attachment:

London High Level Governmental Meeting 23/6/14: Record of Meeting
(GAC Secretariat)

London High Level Governmental Meeting 23 June 2014: Record of Meeting

This was the second high level meeting of Ministers and senior officials to be held in conjunction with meetings of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and the ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC).

KEY OUTCOMES

Exposure of Ministers and senior officials to the dynamics of an ICANN meeting and to the GAC.

Discussion of key strategic issues, including transition of the US stewardship of the IANA function and strengthening ICANN accountability.

ICANN and GAC outreach to developing countries and non-GAC members.

A hearing given to a wide range of views.

A focus on global Internet governance.

Key messages delivered to ICANN from governments and intergovernmental organisations.

PARTICIPATION

The meeting was chaired by the **Hon Ed Vaizey MP**, Minister for Culture, Communications and Creative Industries, United Kingdom.

There was attendance from 175 representatives of 77 governments and territory administrations, of which 10 are currently not GAC members. There were also 11 representative of intergovernmental organisations which are observers on the GAC.

A list of attendees is attached.

SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION TO ICANN

Dr Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board noted ICANN's commitment to globalization through hub offices in Istanbul and Singapore and engagement offices in Montevideo, Beijing and Geneva; and to regional engagement, including appointment of regional Vice Presidents. He noted developments in global Internet governance, including the recent NetMundial conference, the transition of the US Government stewardship of the IANA function and the high level meeting on WSIS+10 in 2015.

Fadi Chehade, President and CEO of ICANN, reviewed ICANN's development as a global institution, including at the operational level; in terms of strengthening accountability; and through transition of the IANA stewardship function.

Discussion from participants

China (Minister Lu Wei, Minister for Cyberspace Affairs Administration) - ICANN is fulfilling its duties as the core institution for global Internet management, and the GAC is the bridge between governments of all countries for dealing with ICANN. Internationalization of ICANN should proceed through establishing the IANA transition working team; drawing up reform plans for the Internet; drawing up the charter for the alliance of Internet governance; improving mechanisms for cyberspace management; gathering world experts to study Internet development; and promotion of dialogue and consensus from all sides.

France (Mme Axelle Lemaire, Secretary of State for Digital Affairs) - Concerns with delegation of dot wine and dot vin are emblematic of broader issues that ICANN must consider, including consumer trust, not favouring one business interest over another and preserving cultural diversity. Possible ICANN reforms might include accountability to a general assembly of stakeholders; and subjecting agreements to principles of international law.

European Commission (Neelie Kroes, Commissioner for Digital Agenda) - Clearly implementable and verifiable accountability and transparency mechanisms are needed for ICANN.

Somalia (Mohamed Ibrahim, Minister of Post and Telecommunications) - Core values are not easy to apply in a global space such as the Internet. Developments such as internationalized domain names are welcome but may create a risk of a fragmented Internet.

Bangladesh (Hasanal Haq Inu, Information Minister) - The Internet has outgrown its original operating structures and a new governance framework is needed to guarantee the rights of all users but particularly developing countries. There should be no unreasonable barriers to new entrants. The Netmundial principles and values are a good start.

Portugal (Nuno Crato, Minister of Education and Science) - Portugal has always participated in ICANN and in particular the GAC. GAC engagement with the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO) is welcome. However, the wine/vin issue shows that ICANN is at risk of capture by special interests, and should not be deciding issues which impact on complex international negotiations.

SESSION 2: TRANSITION OF NTIA STEWARDSHIP OF THE IANA FUNCTION TO THE GLOBAL INTERNET COMMUNITY

Larry Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Information and Communications at the United States Department of Commerce, noted that the decision to transition the NTIA IANA stewardship role to ICANN was based on ICANN's maturing as an organisation and international support for the multistakeholder model. He reaffirmed the importance of consensus in moving issues forward, especially in advice from governments to ICANN.

Theresa Swinehart, Senior Adviser to the President on Global Strategy, ICANN, gave an overview of ICANN's work to establish a process for developing a proposal on IANA transition.

Discussion from participants

Germany (Detlef Dauke, Director General, Ministry of Economic Affairs) - The public interest must be considered and ICANN should not be taken over by interests who

may benefit from ICANN future actions. The multistakeholder model is a key factor in a free and open Internet. UN bodies are not sufficiently fast or flexible in this area. The key drivers are business and technical expertise.

Namibia (Joel Kaapanda, Minister of Communications and Information Technology) – This meeting comes at an opportune time. The creation of the Internet was due to collaboration and this should continue. All countries are equal within ICANN and it should be kept that way. The way forward is to build on the NetMundial outcomes.

Mexico (Victor Lagunes on behalf of Jose Ignacio Peralta Sanchez, Undersecretary of Communications) – Mexico supports the multistakeholder model and will host the Internet Governance Forum in 2016. The ICANN processes for IANA transition should be supported, although flexibility on deadlines is needed and the GAC should be represented on the coordinating group.

Netherlands (Heleen Uijt DE HAAG, Ministry of Economic Affairs) – The NTIA announcement is welcome. IANA oversight should be a shared responsibility between the public and private sectors. Any new mechanism should be as light touch as the current one, and avoid domination by any one set of interests.

Republic of Korea (Kyunghee Song, Director of ICT Structure, Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning) – ICANN is to be commended for its commitment to a global multistakeholder model. As many governments are not yet participating in Internet governance discussions, ICANN should explore customized outreach mechanisms, particularly for developing countries. A more formalized GAC should be considered.

OECD (Andrew Wyckoff, Head of Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry)– 2014 is the third anniversary of the OECD Internet Policy Making Principles. An OECD Ministerial meeting is planned for Mexico in 2016 dealing with the Internet and innovation. The specific issue of protecting the online identities of IGOs has been under consideration within ICANN for two years and needs to be fixed.

Brazil (Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca Filho, Director, Department of Scientific and Technological Affairs, Ministry of External Relations)– The US announcement is to be welcomed, as is the commitment to a multistakeholder model. Development of a

new model must include stakeholders from outside ICANN, including governments who are not GAC members, and remain open to such stakeholders.

Norway (Torstein Olsen, Director General, Post and Telecommunications Authority)– The US initiative is welcome. It is important to maintain security and stability of the domain name system; ensure proper accountability; and not jeopardise national sovereignty of country code top level domains.

Australia (Marianne Cullen, First Assistant Secretary, Department of Communications)– GAC has had considerable success in getting public interest issues reflected in development of new gTLDs. A key strength has been conveying either consensus views or the full range of member views. It is critical that the transition process keeps to schedule.

Denmark (Finn Petersen, Deputy Director General, Danish Business Authority) – Globalisation of Internet governance bodies and the multistakeholder model are positive things. Maintenance of security and stability is very important. Denmark has put considerable effort into ICANN accountability work and want to see this maintained.

Switzerland (Philipp Metzger, Director, Federal Office of Communications) – The transition process needs sufficient time to reach the best, most carefully considered outcomes. Outreach to non-ICANN stakeholders is important and discussions could take place in other fora such as the Internet Governance Forum.

Russia (Igor Milashevskiy, Adviser to Minister of Telecoms and Mass Communications)– Internet governance mechanisms need accountability and transparency. The transition process must look at the full range of technical functions, and consider some form of external audit/oversight. It may be worth considering a model that separates some of the technical functions.

Iran (Kavouss Arasteh, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology) – Clear lines of accountability are needed for the various constituencies participating in the transition process. Separation of the ICANN policy making and implementation functions would be helpful. Consideration should be given to a role

for GAC that is more than just advisory. The transition coordination group needs a larger representation from the GAC.

Egypt (Hesham El Alaily, head of National Telecommunications Regulatory Authority) – The US announcement is welcome and the multistakeholder model should continue to be supported. The next stage must include non-ICANN stakeholders. The community should have an opportunity to comment on any final draft proposal. The transition coordination group needs a larger representation from the GAC.

Qatar (Hessa Sultan Al-Jaber, Minister of Information and Communications Technology) – The US announcement is welcome. Any proposals developed should ensure an open, secure and stable Internet

SESSION 3: GAC ACHIEVEMENTS AND ENHANCING THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS IN ICANN

This session was chaired by Ms Sue Owen, Permanent Secretary for the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Ms Heather Dryden (Chair, ICANN GAC) noted that the GAC has been a part of ICANN from ICANN's beginnings. For ICANN, engagement with governments enables early stage public policy perspectives on its activities, and specialist input at the working level. For governments, the GAC provides a common voice with a direct link to the ICANN Board, as well as access to ICANN policy making bodies dealing with issues in detail such as generic and country code names. GAC achievements have included principles for country code domain names; introduction of internationalized domain names; and safeguards for new generic names. The GAC must evolve with ICANN, retaining its core competencies and flexibility of operation.

Discussion from participants

Spain (Victor Calvo-Sotelo, Secretary of State for Telecommunications and Information Society) – Spain fully supports the multistakeholder model. There is a need for improvements in GAC's relationship with ICANN and in its working methods. Spain has been leading the working group on GAC working methods.

Mexico (Victor Lagunes on behalf of Undersecretary Ignacio Peralta Sanchez) - Human rights and fundamental freedoms offline should be available and protected online, in particular freedom of expression. The IGF and the Global Internet Policy Observatory foreshadowed by the European Union are important settings to discuss Internet issues.

Azerbaijan (Dr Ali Abbasov, Minister of Communications and Information Technology) – Azerbaijan welcomes the opportunities provided by the IANA transition process, and will continue taking an active role in all relevant fora. The GAC has done good work, in particular at the recent Singapore meeting, and should have more than two places on the coordinating group. The group should also have representation from the ITU.

Indonesia (Bambang Heru Tjahjono, Director of Information Security) – ICANN and GAC should be strengthened to deal with complex evolving issues. Bear in mind the principle of respect for other cultures. ICANN can play a role in global capacity building for Internet development.

Sweden (Henrik Ishihara, Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications) – The current scope of the GAC seems about right. A range of interests, including public policy, need to be balanced across ICANN activities. Too heavy a government role would be a disincentive for innovation. The multistakeholder model is the only one able to deliver Internet innovation, but it is not perfect and must keep improving.

International Committee of Red Cross Red Crescent (Charlotte Lindsey-Curtet, Director of Communication and Information Management) – The protections given to Red Cross and Red Crescent terms by international agreement need safeguards for domain name purposes. This is a long running issue within ICANN and should be resolved as a protection from misuse rather than an intellectual property issue.

Netherlands (Heleen Uijt De Haag, Ministry of Economic Affairs) – The GAC has had successes but needs to address the fact that less than half of its members regularly attend meetings; and that only a few actively participate in discussions. Progressing the outcomes of the working group on GAC working methods will help, as will the establishment of a professional secretariat.

Argentina (Dr Olga Cavalli, Adviser for Technology, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) – Argentina has established a National Commission on Internet Policies for national coordination. The GAC should be more significantly represented on the IANA transition coordinating group to ensure a diversity of regional views.

Switzerland (Phillip Metzger) – GAC must develop its capabilities to advise on global public interest issues. It can do so through internationally agreed standards, particularly on human rights; support for smaller countries to more actively participate; and more effective working methods, including self-discipline.

Italy (Dr Rita Forzi, Ministry of Economic Development) – Italy supports a global multistakeholder approach. The .wine/.vin issue has been a problem for the GAC. There is a need for a new mechanism of accountability and transparency to support a “GAC 2.0.”

Pakistan (Anusha Rahman, Minister for Information Technology) – The multistakeholder model is important. The GAC has made significant progress in expanding membership and capacity. Some issues that need to be addressed for new gTLDs are: auctions for string contention; checking the bona fides of community applications with public authorities; and the high fee structure.

Canada (Pamela Miller, Director General, Telecommunications Policy Branch, Industry Canada)– The current Internet governance framework is sound, and multistakeholder bodies have worked well for the DNS. The GAC has had significant achievements on new gTLDs, and its best future is one where it is anchored as a consensus-based institution within ICANN.

Japan (Yasuo Sakamoto, Director General of Global ICT Strategy Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications)– The Internet can help economic and social growth but only in a global, not fragmented, space supported by the ICANN multistakeholder model. It is best to use the experience and know-how of existing mechanisms that have succeeded. Any new governance mechanisms must not restrict flexibility and innovation.

Chinese Taipei/Taiwan (Chung Shu Chen, Ministry of Transport and Communications) – The key value of the Internet is openness and ICANN has consistently worked for

this. GAC has been valuable as a bridge between ICANN and governments, enabling governments to play a role of involvement rather than interference or dominance. ICANN could consider a greater role for GAC, for example a voting role on the ICANN Board.

Russia (Igor Milashevskiy) – The role of GAC within ICANN and the role of governments within the multistakeholder model are not exactly the same. Many IGOs develop Internet-related policies which are not directly linked to ICANN but they are part of global Internet governance.

France (Mme Axelle Lemaire) – The number of problematic cases is on the rise, for example the Red Cross issue. The GAC could explore some form of rough consensus (as used at NetMundial) to avoid a minority of members blocking consensus and real outcomes. There is a role for the GAC in identifying the more politically sensitive issues, and in finding ways to assist developing countries, for example in the cost of applying for new gTLDs.

Iran (Kavouss Arasteh) – Any modification of the IGF terms of reference is a matter for the UN. The views expressed by the GAC Chair are personal ones and not the view of the GAC. GAC representation on the IANA transition coordinating group should be five nominees for broad regional representation. The GAC should have a stronger role than merely advisory.

SESSION 4: REVIEW OF OUTCOMES FROM NETMUNDIAL MEETING

Professor **Virgilio Almeida**, National Secretary for Information Technology Policies, reviewed the origins, operation and outcomes of the NetMundial conference held in Sao Paulo on 23-24 April 2014.

The conference had more than 900 participants from 110 countries, supplemented by remote hubs in 23 countries. Some of the key dynamics were between the multistakeholder and multilateral approaches. The meeting was successful because it had a focus (the principles and roadmap); had the support of the multistakeholder Brazilian Internet Steering Committee; and because there was a long lead-in enabling participants to start well-informed and motivated.

Key lessons learned were: the need to tailor the event to different stakeholder needs (government, business civil society); the value of committing to an open, transparent, participatory and multistakeholder approach; the need for better decision-making procedures across a wide range of views; and the need to construct narratives for global Internet governance, for example economics, free flow of information, human rights.

Discussion from participants

Internet Society (Kathy Brown, CEO) – NetMundial was an excellent example of collaboration and genuine dialogue across a wide range of interests. While there is no one-size-fits-all multistakeholder model, the Internet has always benefited from bottom-up innovation and governance rather than traditional top-down processes.

European Commission (Neelie Kroes) – NetMundial showed that the multistakeholder model works and can produce outcomes, but it must be defended as well as championed. A model based purely on government control would be very dangerous. The role of the IGF could be strengthened by improving linkages between its national, regional and global levels. ICANN must continue its efforts to be more accountable to the global community, including on outcomes that affect public policy.

Colombia (Diego Molano Vega, Minister of Information Technologies and Communications) - Countries need to fix their national Internet governance arrangements in accordance with NetMundial outcomes. Developing countries would welcome assistance from major players to build their capacity to participate in global Internet ecosystems.

Bangladesh (Hasanul Haq Inu) – New Internet governance mechanisms need to be anchored in a formal legal framework and have a clear place in the UN system.

Egypt (Hesham El Elaily) – NetMundial outcomes reflect to a great extent the consensus of the community. The momentum should be maintained leading in to the next IGF in Istanbul.

SESSION 5: REPORT OF ICANN'S HIGH LEVEL PANEL ON GLOBAL INTERNET COOPERATION AND GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS

Andile Ngcaba, Chairman and founder of Convergence Partners and a member of the ICANN High Level Panel, reported on the major recommendations of the Panel's report. These are: adoption of the principles of the NetMundial statement; a collaborative, decentralized Internet governance system supported by enablers including forums and dialogues, expert communities and toolkits; and implementation action that includes support for ICANN accountability and IANA globalization.

Discussion from participants

Council of Europe (Jan Malinowski, Head of Information Society Directorate) – Protection of human rights is an area where governments have primary legal and political responsibility. ICANN should be a facilitator rather than gatekeeper. Human rights could be brought into the ICANN ByLaws; the meaning of public service and the public interest in the context of ICANN could be elaborated; and ICANN should avail itself of early engagement mechanisms in respect of international law and human rights.

United States (Christopher Painter, Coordinator for Cyber Issues, Department of State) – The panel's recommendations are generally to be welcomed, particularly those that support a unified Internet that is unfragmented, interconnected, interoperable, secure, stable and resilient.

Iran (Kavouss Aresteh) – The only new part of the panel's work is that dealing with a decentralized approach. The remainder is already dealt with in the work of other bodies, including the IGF and NetMundial. The focus now should be on actions rather than words.

Thailand (Surunkana Wayuparb, National Electronics and Computer Technology Center) – Human rights and privacy are terms easy to accept at a high level, but in practice their interpretation will vary across regions due to differences in culture and history. Some more effort is needed to ensure this is understood.

Macedonia (Ivo Ivanoski, Minister of Information Society) – As Iran stated, it is time to move from words to actions. There are opportunities in many fora in the next year to focus on implementation. It is a positive development that many governments at this meeting have shown a commitment to the multistakeholder model.

SESSION 6: CONCLUDING REMARKS

Fadi Chehade noted that, while governments are becoming more involved in structures such as ICANN, the practical challenges facing them continue to grow, for example in determining and enforcing relevant jurisdictions. The Internet is the space we live in and this includes governments and their services.

Since the ITU WCIT in Dubai a more positive middle ground and pragmatic approach based on collaboration has been emerging, evidenced in the NetMundial meeting. President Dilma Rosseff of Brazil must be given significant credit for the positive spirit of NetMundial.

A range of parties – governments, private sector, civil society, the technical community – will be coming together in the near future to form the NetMundial alliance. This will have a focus on implementing a model of distributed collaborative Internet governance.

For its part, ICANN is fully committed to an accountability roadmap.

Ed Vaizey concluded the meeting by stressing the importance of trust from all parties to enable ICANN to move to the next phase of its development.

ATTACHMENT
LIST OF ACCEPTANCES TO THE LONDON HIGH LEVEL GOVERNMENT MEETING
Europe

| | Country | Minister/ Vice Minister/ Official | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|----------------|--|----------------------|---|
| 1. | Austria | Official | Dr Christian SINGER | Klaus Parrer |
| 2. | Belgium | Official | Séverine WATERBLEY | |
| 3. | Croatia | Official | Zdravko JUKIC | |
| 4. | Czech Rep. | Official | Jan DUBEN | Marketa Novakova |
| 5. | Denmark | Official | Finn PETERSEN | Julia Katja Wolman |
| 6. | Estonia | Official | Karmen LAUS | |
| 7. | France | Secretary of State for Digital | Ms Axelle LEMAIRE | Dorethee Stik Bertrand Paihes |
| 8. | Germany | Official | Detlef DAUKE | Hubert Schottner Cathleen Berger |
| 9. | Hungary | Official | Peter MAJOR | |
| 10. | Iceland | Official | Sigurbegur BJORNSSON | |
| 11. | Ireland | Official | Richard BROWNE | |
| 12. | Latvia | Official | Elina VOLKSONE | |
| 13. | Luxembourg | Official | Claudine KARIGER | |
| 14. | FYR Macedonia | Minister | Ivo IVANOSKI | Vladimir Milevski |
| 15. | Moldova | Deputy Minister | Vitalie TARLEV | |
| 16. | Montenegro | Official | Marija ŽUGIĆ | Milica Vučinić |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 17. | Netherlands | Official | Heleen Uijt DE HAAG | |
| 18. | Norway | Official | Torstein OLSEN | |
| 19. | Poland | Official | Emil KEDZIERSKI | |
| 20. | Portugal | Minister | Professor Nuno CRATO | Pedro Carneiro; Anna Cristina Neves |
| 21. | Romania | Official | Mrs Diana VOICU | |
| 22. | Russia | Official | Igor MILASHEVSKIY | Russia |
| 23. | Serbia | Official | Mr Sava SAVIC | Milan DOBRIJEVIC |
| 24. | Slovenia | Official | Peter STERLE | |
| 25. | Spain | Minister | Victor CALVO-SOTELO | |
| 26. | Sweden | Official | Henrik ISHIHARA | |
| 27. | Switzerland | Official | Phillipp METZGER | Frederic Riehl |
| 28. | Turkey | Official | Binali YILDIRIM | Dr.Tayfun Acarer |
| 29. | European Commission | Vice-President of the European Commission | Neelie KROES | Pearse O'Donoghue, Michael Niebe,l Camino Manjon. |
| 30. | Holy See (Vatican City) | Official | Mauro MILITA | |

Africa

| | Country | Minister/ Vice Minister | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|--------------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| 31. | Central African Republic | Minister | Assane ABDALL-KADRE | |
| 32. | Ivory Coast | Minister | Bruno KONE | Tandi Amy |
| 33. | The Gambia | Official | Lamin CAMARA | Khadijatou Tambajang |
| 34. | Kenya | Minister | Dr. Fred MATIANGI | Michael Katundu Sammy Buruchara |
| 35. | Libya | Deputy Minister | Dr. Atef Elbahei | Housam Abouelhol Ala Elsheref Khalel Elswehli |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------|-----------------------|---|
| | | | | Mahmud Elnaas |
| 36. | Mauritania | Minister | Ismali Ould BODDE | |
| 37. | Namibia | Minister | Joel KAAPANDA | Henri Kassen Stanley Shanapinda Namandje Amunime Marichen Luiperdt |
| 38. | Somalia | Minister | Mohamed Ibrahim ADAN | |
| 39. | Swaziland | Minister | Dumsani NDLANGAMANDLA | Andreas Dlamni |
| 40. | Tunisia | Official | Moezz CHAKCHOUK | |

Asia-Pacific

| | Country | Minister/ Vice Minister | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 41. | Afghanistan | Deputy Minister | Aimal MARJAN | |
| 42. | Australia | Official | Marianne CULLEN | Peter Nettlefold |
| 43. | Armenia | Minister | Gagik BEGLARYAN | Gagik GRIGORYAN Hamik MKOYAN |
| 44. | Azerbaijan | Minister | Dr Ali ABBASOV | |
| 45. | China | Minister | LU Wei | FU Cong ZHAO Li |
| 46. | India | Official | Dr Ajay KUMAR | |
| 47. | Indonesia | Official | Bambang Heru TJAHJONO | Mariam Fatima Barata; Ashwin Sasongko Sastrosubroto; Rudi Lumanto; Rizki Ameliah |
| 48. | Japan | Official | Yasuo SAKAMOTO | |
| 49. | Korea (Republic of) | Official | MS. Kyunghee Song | Hwayoung Cheon |
| 50. | Malaysia | Official | Dato Mohamed Sharif TARMIZI | Rafidah Mat Isa Ruzamri Ruwandi |
| 51. | Marshall Islands | Official | Rommel NATIVIDAD | |
| 52. | Mauritius | Official | Vimalen J. REDDI | |
| 53. | Nepal | Minister | Minendra RIJAL | |
| 54. | New Zealand | Deputy High Commissioner | Rod TAYLOR | Nicola Treloar Frank March |
| 55. | Niue | Minister | Pokotoa SIPELI | |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| 56. | Pakistan | Minister | Anusha RAHMAN | |
| 57. | Singapore | Official | Charles CHEW | Angela Tey |
| 58. | Sri Lanka | High Commissioner | Chris NONIS | Jayantha Fernando |
| 59. | Chinese Taipei/ Taiwan | Official | CHEN Chung Shu | Chinese Taipei/ Taiwan |
| 60. | Thailand | Official | Surankana WAYUPARB | Wanawait Ahkupultra; Kacida Meerotham; Khemika Sasulpas |
| 61. | Timor-Leste | Minister | Pedro LAY DA SILVA | |
| 62. | Tuvalu | Minister | Monise LAAFAL | |
| 63. | Vietnam | Vice-Minister | H.E. Le Nam THANG | Hoang Minh Cuong; Le Thi Ngoc Mo; Nguyen Thanh Chung; Nguyen Thi Thu Thuy. |

North/ Central/ South America

| | Country | Minister/ Vice Minister | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 64. | Argentina | Official | Sofia FERRARIS | Eugenia Migliori Dr Ola Cavalli |
| 65. | Barbados | Official | Reginald BOURNE | |
| 66. | Brazil | Official | Prof. Virgilio ALMEIDA | Prof. Hartmut Glaser |
| 67. | Canada | Official | Pamela MILLER | |
| 68. | Colombia | Minister | Diego Molano VEGA | Verena Weber Santiago Amador |
| 69. | Dominica | Official | Bennette | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|---|
| | | | THOMAS | |
| 70. | Grenada | Minister | Alvin DA BREO | |
| 71. | Jamaica | Minister | Julian ROBINSON | Minister Philip PAULWELL |
| 72. | Mexico | Official | Jose Ignacio Peralta SÁNCHEZ | Víctor Martínez Vanegas |
| 73. | Peru | Official | Carlos Paredes RODRIGUEZ | |
| 74. | Trinidad and Tobago | Official | Richard MADRAY | |
| 75. | USA | Official | Larry STRICKING | Daniel Sepulveda (Ambassador); Julie Zoller; Andrew Harris; Christopher Painter; Liesyl Franz; Seth Bouvier; Suzanne Radell; Fiona Alexander |

Arab States

| | Country | Minister/ Vice Minister | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 76. | Egypt | Official | Hesham EL ALAILY | Manal Ismail Christine Arida Mohamed Salah |
| 77. | Qatar | Minister | Hessa Sultan AL-JABER | Howaida Nadim, Thamer Al Thani Mohammed El Bashir |
| 78. | Iran | Official | Kavouss Arasteh | |

Addendums

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------|----------|-----------------|--|
| 79. | Italy | Official | Dr. Rita FORST | |
| 80. | Bangladesh | Minister | Hasanul Haq INU | |
| 81. | United Kingdom | Official | Sarah Taylor | |
| 82. | Greece | Official | Panagotis | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|----------|------------------|--|
| | | | Papaspiliopoulos | |
| 83. | African Union | Official | Moctar Yedaly | |

IGOs

| | IGO | HoD | Name | Name of other supporting officials |
|-----|--|---|---------------------|--|
| 1. | OECD | Director, OECD Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry | Andrew WYCKOFF | Ms. Alexandra EXCOFFIER-NOSOV. Mr. Matteo MAGGIORE. Dr Sam PALTRIDGE |
| 2. | Commonwealth Telecommunication Organisation | Secretary General | Professor Tim UNWIN | |
| 3. | Council of Europe | Head of Information Society Department | Jan MALINOWSKI | Lee Hibbard |
| 4. | Economic Commission for Africa | Senior Regional Advisor on ICT Policy | Makane FAYE | |
| 5. | CERN | Deputy IT Department Head, CERN | Dr David FOSTER | |
| 6. | European Space Agency | International Law Division | Gisela SUSS | |
| 7. | New Partnership for Africa's Development | Acting Head: NEPAD e-Africa Programme | Dr Edmund KATITI | Dr. Towela Nyirenda-Jere |
| 8. | International Criminal Court | Head of Information Security | Roeland STOUTHART | |
| 9. | Organisation internationale de la Francophonie | Director, Digital Franchophonie Department | Pierre OUEDRAOGO | Emmanuel Adjovi; Rachida Fakhri |
| 10. | International Telecommunications Union | Secretary-General | Hamodoun Toure | |
| 11. | Caribbean Telecommunications | Secretary-General | Bernadette Lewis | |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|--|
| | Union | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|--|