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I have the honour to transmit to the Member States of the Council a contribution submitted by the **Federative Republic of Brazil.**

 Houlin ZHAO
 Secretary-General

CONTRIBUTION FROM THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL

IMPROVING THE OPEN CONSULTATIONS OF CWG-INTERNET

**INTRODUCTION**

The open consultations and the work of CWG-Internet could improve significantly if each Council Session was mandated to decide on the topics for the open consultations. CWG-Internet and all stakeholders would also benefit from deciding on only one topic per open consultation.

With these changes, Brazil aims to increase the time for substantial discussions on each topic, both during the physical consultation and in the actual CWG-Internet meetings.

**DISCUSSION**

Resolution 102 (Rev. Busan, 2014), Resolution 1336 (C11, last amended C15) and Resolution 1344 (C12, last amended C15) all clearly instruct CWG-Internet to conduct debates and decide on the international Internet-related public policy issues for open consultations.

However, the 9th meeting of CWG-Internet held in February 2017, after lengthy discussions that took most of the time of the meeting, could not reach a consensus on the topic for open consultation for its September meeting. In fact, the meeting even discussed holding two topics in one consultation. Without consensus, the meeting forwarded the two topics to the 2017 Session of Council for decision.

Council 2017 reviewed the topics and the questions and decided to hold:

• the 5th Physical Open Consultation of the CWG-Internet on 18 September 2017 on “Public policy considerations on OTTs,” and

• the 6th Physical Open Consultation of the CWG-Internet on 22 January 2018 on “Bridging the digital gender divide.”

Brazil participated actively in the discussions at Council 2017 and believes that Council took the best decision possible. By deciding on one topic per consultation, Council allowed full attention from every stakeholder (i.e., ITU secretariat; ITU membership; external stakeholders) to each topic, and allowed the maximum amount of time for discussions at both the physical consultation and the CWG-Internet meeting.

The most important facts to realize in this process are:

• the 9th meeting of CWG-Internet could not reach a consensus on the topic in 1.5 days of meetings;

• Council 2017 took almost its entire length to discuss and reach a delicate compromise on the issue;

• it took more than three months for the ITU to reach a conclusion on this issue, from the beginning of CWG-Internet on February 6 to the 8th Council plenary on May 24;

• the 10th meeting of CWG-Internet ended early half a day before the schedule, partly (or fully) because Council had previously decided on the topic for the subsequent consultation.

Considering that CWG-Internet has had on average 1.5 to 2 days of duration, and that the 2-week clusters of CWG meetings are completely occupied with meetings from all CWGs, it seems that CWG-Internet could benefit from having more time to hold substantial discussions on Internet-related public policy issues. Increasing the time could be achieved by two mutually exclusive measures:

1. Either CWG-Internet continues to discuss and decide on the topic for consultation, but has its duration increased;

2. Or Council is mandated to decide on the topics for open consultation for the subsequent CWG-meetings, allowing CWG-Internet to focus on discussing the outcomes of the public consultation and other Internet-related public policy issues.

Brazil also believes that the fact that CWG-Internet is mandated to discuss topics for open consultation, and that these discussions usually take a considerable time, lead to the notion that the topic for consultation is the only issue that will be discussed, and therefore Members are discouraged to present substantive contributions and proposals on other issues.

In summary, if the consultation topics were discussed and approved by Council, it would provide the following benefits:

1. More efficient use of time for discussions at CWG-Internet;

2. Full dedication of each consultation and CWG-meeting on a specific topic;

3. More time for discussions on the topics for consultation due the longer duration of each Council session;

4. A much more informed and inclusive decision on the topic, given that Council attracts around 300 participants from all regions in every session, much more than CWG-Internet.

**PROPOSAL**

Brazil proposes that the annual sessions of Council are mandated to decide on the topics for open consultation at CWG-Internet. This decision should be taken by PP-18 in its revision of Resolution 102, and with subsequent revisions in Council Resolutions 1336 and 1344.