

## **Joint EGTI/EGH subgroup on the ICT Development Index (IDI)**

2025 work period

\*\*\*

## **Summary of the subgroup's third virtual meeting**

28 May 2025, 13:30-14:45 CEST

The third meeting of the joint IDI subgroup focused on advancing the preparation of the subgroup's activity report and discussing three substantive proposals submitted by a participant.

### **Drafting of the activity report**

The co-leads began by presenting the proposed timeline and outline for the subgroup's activity report, which will summarize the work carried out during the 2025 period. They emphasized the importance of starting the drafting process early to allow sufficient time for feedback and finalization. The outline, shared in advance, includes sections on discussed topics, proposals received, and recommendations to the parent expert groups (EGTI and EGH). Participants were invited to provide comments on the structure and suggest refinements as needed.

### **Discussion of participant proposals**

The second part of the meeting focused on three interrelated proposals aimed at strengthening the conceptual and methodological basis of the IDI:

#### **1. Setting goalposts for indicators without policy targets:**

The participant questioned the use of arbitrary or statistically driven goalposts for indicators like data traffic, which do not have internationally agreed policy targets. They proposed using a more deliberate and consistent approach to setting goalposts, potentially grounded in observed distributions but subject to normative review. This was seen to prevent distortion in scoring and improve the interpretability of results.

#### **2. Rethinking the role of traffic indicators:**

A broader discussion followed on whether traffic-based indicators should be included in the IDI at all. The participant argued that increased usage does not always equate to positive outcomes and may, in some cases, correlate with social or health harms. Several participants acknowledged these concerns, noting that the IDI should strive to reflect meaningful connectivity rather than mere volume of use. However, no consensus was reached, and the issue was flagged for further reflection.

#### **3. Reclassifying fixed-broadband penetration and mid-cycle introduction:**

A proposal was made to move fixed-broadband penetration – once measured per household – from the universal connectivity pillar to the meaningful connectivity pillar. Additionally, the participant suggested reserving a slot for this indicator in the IDI structure and introducing it mid-cycle, if the necessary household data becomes available before the next scheduled revision. It was noted PP Resolution 131 (Rev.

Bucharest, 2022) currently prevents mid-cycle changes. It was suggested that an updated text could have a provision for the inclusion of candidate indicators mid-cycle, but this would be at the expense of comparability over the validity period.

### **Next Steps**

The co-leads concluded the meeting by encouraging members to submit additional inputs for the draft report and reiterated the value of documenting the rationale for all decisions. The next meeting will focus on reviewing the draft report in detail and formulating final recommendations for EGTI and EGH.

\*\*\*

### **Additional information**

- New: All the documents related to the IDI subgroup are available from the [ITU document centre](#) and the dedicated Teams channel
- New: Contributions to EGTI and EGH subgroups can be submitted via the [dedicated BDT submission tool](#) or by email to the co-leads
- Contact:
  - [Teddy Woodhouse](#), International Policy Manager, OFCOM, United Kingdom (co-lead representing EGTI)
  - [Winston Oyadomari](#), Senior Survey Analyst and Head of Innovation Lab, Cetic.br, Brazil (co-lead representing EGH)
  - BDT Focal Point: [Thierry Geiger](#) (for inquiries and participation requests)
- More information about EGTI and EGH available on the dedicated [webpage](#).