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1. **Introduction**

**1.1.** ITU Secretary-General Mr. Houlin Zhao welcomed the participants to the twelfth meeting of CWG-Internet. Noting that this was the first meeting of CWG-Internet following last year’s Plenipotentiary Conference in Dubai, he appreciated the goodwill and efforts made by the entire membership to come to a full consensus – after more than 80 hours of intense discussions in the Internet adhoc group, and in the plenary sessions – on the key ITU Internet Resolutions 101, 102, 133 and 180. He highlighted that PP-18 made important amendments to these resolutions, which will allow ITU to be more inclusive and ever more agile in responding to current and emerging needs. He invited all the Council Working Groups to reflect on how members can improve the efficiency of the ITU’s governance processes and better support the ITU Council. ITU Deputy Secretary-General Mr. Malcolm Johnson and BDT Director Doreen Bogdan-Martin also welcomed the participants to the meeting.

**1.2.** The Chairman thanked the ITU Elected Officials for their presence and support of the meeting. He recalled that PP decided to retain the mandate of the CWG-Internet without changes, while also recognizing in the summary record that the Rules of Procedure of the Council would apply, including Rule 14. The chairman therefore observed that that the ability of the Group to agree on an outcome is not in question and that the question is does the Group have the willingness to do so. He noted that this is something the Group will have to work towards in this current four year cycle.

**2.** **CWG-Internet-12/1: Agenda of the meeting**

The agenda was approved as presented.

**3. CWG-Internet 12/2: Secretariat report on ITU Internet Activities: Resolutions 101, 102, 133, and 180**

This report summarizes ITU’s activities related to Plenipotentiary Conference (PP) Resolution 101 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), “Internet Protocol-based networks”; Resolution 102 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), “ITU’s role with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses”; Resolution 133 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), “Roles of administrations of Member States in the management of Internationalized (multilingual) domain names”; and Resolution 180 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), “Facilitating the transition from IPv4 to IPv6”. The report was noted by the Group.

**4. Summary of contributions and corresponding discussions**

The CWG examined the various contributions (in the order listed in the agenda), which were noted by the Group. The summaries of the contributions (as submitted by the authors of the documents) and the related discussions are provided below:

**4. 1 CWG-Internet-12/4: Contribution by the Russian Federation: Practice of establishing OTT services regulatory mechanisms and proposals on the cooperation of all stakeholders on cross-industry and international level**

**4.1.1 Summary**

Russian Federation presented a contribution which stressed that Internet, in general, and OTT in particular, have a considerable impact on national and international telecommunications and will become an important part of the global digital economy. The wide use of OTT provides a lot of opportunities and, at the same time, creates new challenges for the telecom industry, including regulation of OTT services on national and international levels. In this regard, public policy considerations related to OTT should be reviewed comprehensively, including such issues as security, privacy, personal data protection, measures to prevent illegal use, economic aspects, etc. An important aspect that should be taken into account when considering the regulation approaches to Internet services is their cross-border nature which requires collaboration and coordination between the States and all stakeholders on an international level.

Realizing this fact, governments of many countries are actively adopting OTT regulation policies at the national and intergovernmental levels. In the contribution, Russian Federation presents the examples OTT services’ regulation by various countries as examples of Internet service regulation.

Russian Federation proposes to arrange the discussion of issues related to OTT regulation at the national and international levels within CWG-Internet under the following general plan:

∙             to invite state to submit best practices of OTT legislation regulation.

∙             to request ITU-D SG1, ITU-T SG3 and SG17 to submit to CWG-Internet their considerations on the issues related to OTT services requiring regulation;

∙             to arrange within CWG-Internet a wide discussion with Member States participation and develop, if appropriate, recommendations for ITU Council on the role the states in OTT services regulation issues at the international level.

Russian Administration notes in the contribution deep concern that the lack of regulation for Internet at the international level, particularly the OTT, can leads to internet fragmentation.

**4.1.2 Discussion**

Some Member States supported the contribution, recognizing the importance of the topic, bearing in mind the recent PP-18 resolution on OTT, also noting that the CWG-Internet had already conducted a successful open consultation on some aspects of OTT services, and should continue working on the matter as there is a need for more understanding on public policy and regulatory matters related to OTT services.

Some Member States did not support the contribution and stated that there is no need for international regulation in the area of OTT services, and noted that the 2018 Plenipotentiary conference asked the Study Groups to work on the topic, and there is a risk of duplication of work. Some Member States stated that some of the issues mentioned in the contribution are outside the remit of ITU.

Some Member States commented that the Study Groups deal with technical and related aspects and the role of CWG internet is to identify, study and develop public policy aspects which is not covered under SGs. Hence, the CWG should continue to deliberate the issues.

Some Member States commented that OTT had already been discussed as a topic for open consultation in 2017, therefore the group should move on to other topics as a better use of its time.

Some Member States suggested that Member States should continue to submit updated information to the Repository of Experiences and Best Practices in International Internet-related Public Policy Issues , which maintains a section on OTT services, as part of the previous CWG-Internet open consultation on the topic.

The Chair invited Member States to send/update their submissions to the Repository of Experiences and Best Practices in International Internet-related Public Policy Issues, as appropriate, on the previous topics including OTTs on which the CWG-Internet open consultation have been carried out.

Upon the suggestion of the chairman, the secretariat was asked to include OTT related activities conducted in the Sectors in the Secretary-General’s Internet activities report to CWG-Internet.

**4.2 CWG-Internet-12/8: Contribution by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia - Matters on international Internet-related public policy issues for bridging the digital gender divide**

**4.2.1 Summary**

Saudi Arabia submitted the contribution WG-Internet 12/8-E on the development matters international internet-related public policy issues for bridging the digital gender divide, after the excellent work conducted by the CWG-Internet related to the issue of bridging the digital gender divide. The Saudi contribution include key elements for bridging the digital gender divide, allowing women to enhance their social and economic integration and to serve as developed matters related to international Internet-related public policy issues.

*"MATTERS ON INTERNATIONAL INTERNET-RELATED PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES FOR BRIDGING THE DIGITAL GENDER DIVIDE*

*Recognizing the benefits that the Internet can bring for women and girls, their communities and the entire society,*

*The following serves as a key element for bridging the digital gender divide, allowing women to enhance their social and economic integration:*

*1 to ensure the availability of measures that protect women and girls against online abuse and harassment;*

*2 to support and promote female role models as leaders in ICT;*

*3 to ensure that digital literacy and education initiatives consider women and girls’ needs and interests;*

*4 to encourage the development of strategies for achieving affordable Internet and broadband access for women and girls."*

**4.2.2 Discussion**

The topic of bridging the digital gender divide was widely supported by several Member States, also recalling the successful consultation that was carried out by CWG-Internet on the topic.Some Member States noted that the topic was discussed at PP-18 where the related resolution was updated. They also noted that an ITU Council Res. 1327 also exists on the topic. Some Member States stated that the recommendations in the proposal was the next concrete step, based on the output of the gender-related open consultations. These Member States endorsed the recommendations contained in the proposal.

One Member State suggested that the Group could endorse sending of the recommendations to relevant ITU-D groups for agreement.

Some Member States suggested that the recommendations included in the proposal to be included in the report as agreed by the Group.

Some Member States sought clarification of the intent of the contribution, as it was not clear what the purpose or intended action from the contribution was.Some Member States stated that the recommendations were not a complete list, and not in a format where specific action can be taken in terms of endorsement. They encouraged that the proponent could make an appropriate contribution to Council.

**4.3 CWG-Internet-12/3: Contribution by the Russian Federation: Proposal to hold open consultation on "contributing to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries"**

**4.3.1 Summary**

The Russian Federation proposes the following topic for the next open consultation, carried out by the CWG-Internet with stakeholders, which will take place prior to the CWG-Internet meeting in autumn 2019:

“Contributing to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries" (according to § 9 of Annex 1 of Council Resolution 1305).

It is expected to exchange information and discuss the following issues under the proposed subject:

* challenges of the transformation from a voice-centric to an IP-based data-centric telecommunications ecosystem;
* establishing favorable and competitive market environment stimulating this transformation;
* the practices of Internet governance in developing countries, the aspects of operators and service providers’ operational activity in the midst of such transformation;
* exchange of the best practices regarding the aspects of Internet governance in developing countries taking into account the experience of developed countries;
* cooperation at the international level aimed at developing the international policies on Internet governance.”

**4.3.2 Discussion**

Several Member States supported the topic, with some noting that the topic was included in the Annex of Council Res 1305.  
  
Some Member States suggested that some of the questions could be modified to be clearer to facilitate stakeholders in responding to the consultations.  
  
After informal consultation among some Member States, these Member States presented a revised set of questions to the Group.

*“****International public policy related to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries***

*- what are best practices for capacity building for Internet governance in developed and developing countries?*

*- what are the challenges for capacity building in Internet governance and how can they be overcome?*

*- what role can governments play in capacity building in this area? what role can other stakeholders play in capacity building in this area?”*

Some Member States supported the topic with the revised set of questions.

Some Member States suggested that though Capacity Building is an important area, the ‘best practices’ aspect should get covered under D sector and not part of the engagement under CWG Internet, which should more focus on public policy issues involved.

However, there was continued divergence of opinion on these revised set of questions.

**4.4. CWG-Internet-12/5: Contribution by Canada: The role of Community Networks in advancing connectivity to remote, unserved or underserved communities**  
**4.4.1 Summary**

Canada submitted contribution CWG-Internet-12/5-E on “The role of Community Networks in advancing connectivity to remote, unserved or underserved communities” as a theme for the next ITU CWG on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues open public consultations. The purpose of such a consultation would be for stakeholders to share best practices, describe challenges and learn about innovative approaches to connectivity for users not within proximity of major networks. The experiences of Community networks could offer new solutions to stakeholders who wish to improve access to broadband, empower all users, in particular women and girls, so they can meaningfully contribute in social, economic, cultural and environment developments of society. Closing the digital divide and providing broadband for all remains an unachieved yet critically important strategic goal for the ITU’s work, and for the attainment of the 2030 SDGs. A consultation on this topic would move us closer to our goal.

**4.4.2 Discussion**Topic 1 of the UK proposal (CWG-Internet-12/6) was on the same topic and therefore discussed together with the Canadian proposal.   
  
Some Member States supported the topic, highlighting the importance of community networks in advancing connectivity to remote, unserved or underserved communities. They noted that the topic was closely linked to the mission of the ITU.   
  
Some Member States requested more clarity on the definition of community networks.   
  
Some Member States noted that the topic was discussed at length at PP-18, and there are sensitive issues involved which require attention at the national level such as issues related to spectrum. They stated that the topic was premature for open consultation.

Some Member States noted that there are hundreds of examples of community networks in countries across the world.

Some Member States stated that the reason for divergence of views was because it was not well understood, while some other Member States stated that the reason for the divergence was rather the sensitivity of the issues concerned, not a lack of understanding, and that it's considered as a national matter.

**4.5 CWG-Internet-12/6: Contribution by the United Kingdom: Future Work Programme of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues**

**4.5.1 Summary**

The contribution from the United Kingdom proposed that the Group should identify a number of topics for future open consultations. This would provide greater certainty and allow members of the Group and stakeholders to plan their contributions. It made five proposals, all based on the list of topics in the annex of Resolution 1305:

1. **The use of community networks for Internet connectivity**

The topic of community networks was widely discussed at the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2018. Many countries described their own experience. Others were uncertain about how community networks worked. A discussion in the Council Working Group would be an opportunity to promote better understanding. It was proposed to set the following questions for consultation:

* *How can community networks help connect the unconnected?*
* *What are the challenges in promoting community networks and how can they be overcome?*
* *What role can governments play to promote community networks?*

1. **The adoption and deployment of IPv6**

The adoption and deployment of IPv6 was a key issue at the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2018. The Council Working Group (Internet) can provide an important platform to learn more about the perspectives of different stakeholders and to raise awareness of the challenges and possible solutions. It was proposed to set the following questions for consultation:

* *What are the challenges for the adoption and deployment of IPv6?*
* *What can governments do to help overcome these challenges?*
* *What can other stakeholders do to help overcome these challenges?*

1. **The cost of Internet connectivity for land-locked developing countries**

Land-locked developing countries face particular challenges in securing affordable Internet access. There are more than forty land-locked countries that face these issues and most of them are developing countries. This subject is also relevant to the role of the ITU as a Specialised Agency in the follow-up to the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries. It was proposed to set the following questions for consultation:

* *What particular challenges do land-locked countries face in securing affordable international Internet connectivity?*
* *What can governments do to overcome these challenges?*
* *What can other stakeholders do to overcome these challenges?*
* *How can the ITU and its Members best support the Vienna Programme of Action?*

1. **The development of local and regional Internet Governance Forums**

Since the first meeting of the United Nations’ Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in 2006, more than 110 IGF national, regional and youth IGF initiatives have been established. These IGF initiatives have developed a wealth of knowledge, expertise and good ideas and the Council Working Group can play an important role in sharing that experience and best practice. It was proposed to set the following questions for consultation:

* *What are the benefits and opportunities offered by national and regional IGF initiatives?*
* *What challenges do national and regional IGF initiatives face and how can they be overcome?*
* *What role can governments play to encourage national and regional IGF initiatives?*

1. **Effective public awareness campaigns for Child Online Protection**

Child Online Protection is a critical public policy issue. Plenipotentiary Resolution 179 encourages the CWG (Child Online Protection) to liaise with the Council Working Group (Internet). It was proposed that the two Council Working Groups should liaise with one another and undertake a joint consultation on the issue of public awareness campaigns. It was proposed that the Chair of the Council Working Group (Internet) should write to the Chair of the Council Working Group (COP) and suggest the following questions for a joint consultation exercise and a physical open consultation meeting:

* *What are the key critical elements in effective public awareness campaigns for Child Online Protection?*
* *What roles can governments play in promoting effective public awareness campaigns?*
* *What roles can other stakeholders play, including communities and civil society organisations?*

**4.5.2 Discussion**

a. Concerning the topic on *Adoption and deployment of IPv6*, several Member States supported the topic.

Various Member States noted its importance and some also recalled the opinion of WTPF-13 on the matter.

It was suggested that the issue of investment in migration from IPv4 to IPv6 should also be included in the set of questions. Also, it was suggested that the issue of the new gTLDs programme to be included to cover both domain names and addresses.

Some Member States suggested that the questions posed should be more precise as there are existing resolutions and ongoing work on the topic in ITU.

The chair noted that there was general support for the topic, with the understanding that the questions need to be further refined.

b. Concerning the topic on *the cost of Internet connectivity for land-locked developing countries*:

Some Member States stated that the cost of transit is an obstacle for land locked countries

A suggestion was made to ask secretariat to provide a base document for the benefit of stakeholders indicating the current situation on connectivity, needs and barriers.

Some Member States stated that other fora within ITU such as GSR, Study Groups, EG-ITRs etc are also discussing the topic, and it’s important to ensure that the work is well coordinated and not duplicated.  
  
Some Member States stated that the topic of Internet connectivity was covered in the consultation carried out in 2016 on Enabling Environment for connectivity, though other Member States noted that the 2016 topic did not specifically address the cost of connectivity for land-locked developing countries.

c. Concerning the topic on *The development of local and regional Internet Governance Forums*,   
  
Some Member States stated that they consider regional IGFs to be an important part of the dialogue on Internet governance.  
  
Some Member States noted that the process for IGF was already being carried out in other UN agencies.

Some Member States suggested that this topic be converged with the topic proposed by the Russian Federation in CWG-Internet-12/3.

A suggestion was also made to include Enhanced Cooperation in order to have a wider consultation on Internet Governance. Some Member States did not support this proposal.

d. Concerning the topic on *Effective public awareness campaigns for Child Online Protection*

Some Member States suggested that CWG-COP is a more effective platform to discuss the topic, and to bring this proposal to CWG-COP in order to avoid duplication.

Some Member States suggested that CWG-COP could inform CWG-Internet about its activities on COP.

Some Member States supported the topic, stating that it was important not to work in silos and that it was important for the two working groups to cooperate and reinforce each other’s work. It was noted that two CWGs collaborating on a topic would assist with the profile of the topic and was not duplication of work.

Some Member States suggested that secretariat could include COP related activities in the Secretary-General’s Internet activities report to CWG-Internet.

Some Members suggested that the CWG-Internet Chair could convey the proposal to the Chair of CWG-COP for the group to consider collaboration on this matter, and to keep the topic on the agenda for future consideration.

**4.6 CWG-Internet-12/9: Contribution by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia - Topics for consultation**

**4.6.1 Summary**

Saudi Arabia submitted the contribution WG-Internet 12/9-E which proposed topics for future open consultations. The contribution included two topics that they consider of high importance and relevant to the work of CWG-Internet:

1. **The impact of the emerging telecommunications/ICTs on socio and economic issues**

* What emerging telecommunications/ICTs examples together with the internet will create significant impact on socio and economic aspects?
* How emerging telecommunications/ICTs will transform both the Internet and the digital economy?
* What actions by policy-makers need to be taken to keep pace with change in the Internet to harness the benefits of the digital transformation?
* How can all stakeholders work together to ensure inclusive development by utilizing emerging telecommunications/ICTs

1. **Harnessing AI and IoT for global good**

* How Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Internet of Things (IoT) will transform both the Internet and the global economy?
* What are the best practices that guide the development of AI and IoT?
* What polices, guidelines, or principles needed to maximize the benefits of AI and IoT?
* What actions can be taken by all stakeholders to accelerate the development of AI and IoT?

**4.6.2 Discussion**

a. Concerning the topic on *The impact of the emerging telecommunications/ICTs on socio and economic issues:*

Some Member States suggested that the topic is an important topic for CWG-Internet to consider, especially public policy aspects.

Some Member States stated that social issues may not be relevant to the work of CWG-Internet and the topic could be more appropriate for CWG-WSIS&SDGs or WSIS Forum.

Some Member States suggested that the topic could be refined to focus on the impact of the emerging telecommunications/ICTs and future developments of the Internet, and its impact on public policy issues.

b. Concerning the topic *Harnessing AI and IoT for global good*

Some Member States suggested that ITU-T SG20 and the AI for Good Global summit are already looking at the topic, and therefore this topic would be duplicating work already going on in other areas of the ITU.

Some Member States stated that the focus of CWG-Internet would be on public policy issues, therefore different from what is being discussed in other groups.

Some other Member States noted that the theme for WTISD-18 was on enabling the positive use of Artificial Intelligence for All.

It was noted by some Member States that during the discussions on a proposed new resolution on AI at PP-18 there was no consensus reached.

**4.7 CWG-Internet-12/7: Contribution by Brazil - Topics for the next Open Consultation of CWG-Internet**  
  
**4.7.1 Summary**

Due to a lack of time and lack of contributions from Member States on the topic for the next open consultation of CWG-Internet, and thus lack of contributions and proper discussions both within Administrations and in CWG-Internet, Brazil proposes that the 2019 Session of the ITU Council decide on the topic for the next open consultation of CWG-Internet, to be held before the 13th meeting of CWG-Internet during the September/October 2019 cluster of Council Working Group (CWG) meetings.

**4.7.2 Discussion**

Some Member States noted that in a previous instance, due to lack of consensus despite a lot of discussions in the CWG-Internet, Council had indeed determined the topic for consultations.

Some Member States noted that as per PP. Res 102, it is the task of CWG-Internet to decide the topic for consultation.

Some Member States stated that considering the heavy agenda of 2019, it would be difficult for Council 2019 to address the matter of deciding on the topic for the next open consultation.

**5 Any other business**

**5.1** No specific issues were brought up under this agenda item.

**6 Actions  
6.1** The Group invited Member States to send/update their submissions, as appropriate, on the previous topics including OTTs on which the CWG-Internet open consultation have been carried out.

**6.2** The secretariat was asked to include OTT related activities conducted in the Sectors in the Secretary-General’s Internet activities report to CWG-Internet.

**6.3** The Chairman will highlight to Council that no consensus was reached on a topic for open consultation, and therefore seek Council’s guidance on the matter.

**7 Summary of the Meeting**

**7.1** In closing, the Chairman thanked all the ITU Member States who made contributions and participated in the work of the Group (including those who participated remotely), the Vice-Chairmen, the ITU Elected Officials and the Secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting.

**7.2** Deputy Secretary-General Malcolm Johnson thanked the Chairman and the Group for their efforts.

**7.3** The Group thanked the Chairman and Secretariat for their effective organization and management of the Group. The Group also thanked the remote moderator.

**Mr. Majed Al-Mazyed (Saudi Arabia), Chairman, CWG-Internet**