

Joint EGTI/EGH subgroup on the ICT Development Index (IDI) 2025 work period

Summary of the subgroup's fourth virtual meeting, 3 July 2025

- The meeting was opened by **co-lead Winston Oyadomari (Cetic.br, Brazil)**, who welcomed participants and introduced the objectives. The discussion was then led by **co-lead Teddy Woodhouse (Ofcom, United Kingdom)**, who guided the detailed section-by-section review of the [first draft \(v0\) of the report of activity](#). The aim was to move as close as possible to an agreed text that could then be submitted to the expert groups for their meetings in September.
- Teddy introduced the section summarising the subgroup's background, its mandate under the relevant resolution, and how this work may feed into a possible revision of the index in accordance with PP Resolution 131.
- One participant proposed using the subgroup as an informal platform to discuss potential revisions to Resolution 131 ahead of the next Plenipotentiary Conference, suggesting that this be noted in the report. This was welcomed, recognising that the subgroup's role would remain informal. The participant offered to submit draft wording for inclusion.
- The group reviewed the section on working methods detailing the subgroup's terms of reference, resources and templates. No comments or objections were raised, and the section was accepted as drafted.
- The draft report included summaries of each of the subgroup's meetings and the main points of discussion, with more detailed records to appear in an annex. This approach was accepted without further comment.

The subgroup then reviewed the main thematic issues addressed during its work:

- **Fixed broadband penetration by household:** Recognised as conceptually important and mature but it was acknowledged that comparable data for the number of households, which is required to compute this indicator, would not be available for several years. Teddy noted the UN-wide initiative, led by ITU, to place this indicator at the forefront of the international statistical agenda. The indicator will be retained as a concept to monitor for potential future inclusion.
- **5G mobile network coverage:** There was broad support to identify this as a candidate indicator given improving data availability. However, a participant stressed that the language should remain conditional, to avoid committing prematurely if data gaps persist. It was suggested to add a table on data sources and methodologies, while it was clarified that data for this indicator comes from administrative (supply-side) sources, not surveys. The group agreed to adjust the language to reflect a conditional recommendation and to include references to existing methodological handbooks.
- **Quality of service and speed tiers:** The subgroup noted that proposals in this area depend largely on private-sector data, which does not align with the current preference

for official statistics. It was suggested that operator-reported data could eventually be used. It was agreed to include language encouraging administrations to improve data availability, which could enable consideration of these metrics in future revisions. As for using speed tiers of fixed broadband, Winston reminded that fixed-broadband penetration would be required before including such indicator.

- **Goalposts:** A representative from Qatar reiterated their proposal to standardise the use of an actual measured 95th percentile across indicators. Another participant expressed concern that a dynamic percentile could complicate year-on-year comparisons. It was decided to document the discussion, highlight both perspectives, and defer any decision pending further analysis in the next cycle.
- **Reconsideration of previously examined proposals.** The subgroup briefly revisited certain proposals that had not initially been examined in depth, as they were not substantially different from proposals submitted in previous cycles. India asked the group to consider including the Global Cybersecurity Index as an indicator, citing its importance as an enabler of meaningful connectivity. Second, the asked the group to consider replacing affordability indicators with costs of ICT services measured in purchasing power parity (PPP). After discussion, there was no support within the subgroup to advance these proposals, with members largely reaffirming earlier methodological concerns and noting the lack of consensus to integrate these elements at this stage.

Towards the end of the call, the co-leads outlined the next steps for the finalisation of the report.

- Co-leads will await the written proposals discussed during the meeting and any additional comments by 8 July.
- They will add clarifications and references, including links or references to existing methodological handbooks for precise definitions and data sources, particularly for coverage indicators. They will add language encouraging administrations to improve data on speed tiers and quality of service, to enable possible future inclusion.
- They will circulate a new version of the draft report for final review by late July. The aim is to finalise by mid-August when it needs to be shared with EGTI/EGH members ahead of their meetings in September to comply with the 30-day deadline.

Additional information

- New: All the documents related to the IDI subgroup are available from the [ITU document centre](#) and the dedicated Microsoft 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](#).