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PHYSICAL OPEN CONSULTATION OF THE COUNCIL WORKING GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL INTERNET-RELATED PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES
(CWG-INTERNET)

Brief Summary of the Online Open Consultation and Physical Open Consultation
(February – September 2024)

# 1 Introduction

The 2016 Council instructed the CWG-Internet to produce a brief summary of the Open Online Consultation and Physical Open Consultation Meetings:

a) ITU secretariat should prepare a brief draft summary of the written contributions to the online open consultation and the discussions during the physical open consultation meeting,

b) Stakeholders present at the physical open consultation meeting should agree on the brief summary,

c) Submit brief summary, without edits, to the next CWG-Internet for inclusion as an Annex to the Chairman’s report.

d) CWG-Internet should consider and discuss the open consultation brief summary.

# 2 Online Open Consultation on "The developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet"

**2.1** An Online Open Consultation was conducted from February to September 2024 on the topic of "The developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet". During this consultation, 32 responses were received from a variety of stakeholders and regions. The responses provided rich inputs, sharing different views with regard to the three specific questions:

*“***The developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet**

1. How relevant multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, including but not limited to UN-based processes such as Summit of the Future, WSIS+20 and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development?

2. What are the challenges and opportunities, good practices and favourable policy environments to strengthen the Internet, including in areas such as:

 fostering meaningful connectivity

 equitable access for all

 promoting a secure and resilient Internet

 achieving universal access

 the deployment of IPv6

 using satellite communication to reach remote and underserved remote areas

 ensuring services are affordable for people

 promoting digital inclusion and skills

 fostering multi-stakeholder participation and

 encouraging public and private sector investment in Internet infrastructure.

3 How can we promote international multistakeholder cooperation on public policy issues that are focused on promoting the development aspects of the Internet?”

The meeting appreciated and thanked all stakeholders who responded to the online consultations.

**2.2** A compilation of the summaries received directly from the individual online submitters, including relevant comments made by participants during the meeting, can be found in the Annex of this document, as well as in the published compilation Document [OPCWGINT-11/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-OPCWGINT11-C-0002/en).

# 3 Open Consultation on “The developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet"

**3.1** The eleventh Physical Open Consultation, on the topic of “**The developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet**”, took place on 3 October 2024 with nearly 200 registered participants and nearly 100 in attendance in person and online.

**3.2** Mr Seizo Onoe, Director, Telecommunication Standardization Bureau, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. He thanked them for their continued support of the work of the CWG-Internet and highlighted the timeliness and relevance of the topic of this consultation. In his opening remarks, Mr Onoe also highlighted the importance of multistakeholder collaboration and urgent action to promote strengthening of the development aspects of the Internet.

**3.3** The Chair of the meeting, Mr Wojciech Berezowski, presented the draft Agenda of the meeting. He commended participants for their active participation and the rich set of contributions submitted by diverse stakeholders to this Open Consultation of the CWG‑Internet.

**3.4** The Chair also welcomed Dr Erica Moret, Director, United Nations & International Organisations at Microsoft, Dr Konstantinos Komaitis, Senior resident fellow, Digital Forensics Research Lab at the Atlantic Council and Dr Carlos Rey-Moreno, Co-Manager Local Networks Initiative at Association for Progressive Communications as special experts for a panel discussion on the topic of the open consultation. The multi-stakeholder panellists engaged in a robust discussion on the key focus areas, opportunities and challenges relating to developmental aspects for strengthening the Internet and also shared their perspectives on ways to leverage existing UN processes and mechanisms to promote multi-stakeholder participation on the subject. A participant thanked the Management Team for organizing the panel discussion and the panellists for their participation and insightful remarks, while commending specifically the work of APC and inviting their participation in future CITEL meetings. Participants also commended Brazil for Net Mundial+10.

**3.5** After the panel discussion, compilation Document [OPCWGINT-11/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-OPCWGINT11-C-0002/en) was presented to the meeting and the Chair invited various stakeholders to take the floor to present their submitted views.

# 4 Summary of discussions during the Physical Open Consultation

**4.1** Stakeholders present at the meeting agreed on the brief summary of the eleventh Virtual Meeting – Physical Open Consultation of CWG-Internet, as included below:

**4.2** Participants thanked the CWG-Internet for organizing this open consultation and for considering the contributions made to the consultation, while also commending the active participation of different stakeholders and the valuable inputs submitted to this open consultation.

**4.3** Some participants commented that overcoming the current barriers to connectivity requires concerted efforts from governments, civil society, and the private sector to ensure that connectivity leads to empowerment.

**4.4** A participant commented that limitations can be observed in some multi-stakeholder processes and approaches, including in areas such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.

**4.5** Some participants stated that active and robust multi-stakeholder collaboration, including across governments, the private sector, academia, civil society and the technical community, is critical, with a participant emphasizing that meaningful multi-stakeholder participation needs to be consistently inclusive from the local to global level.

**4.6** Some participants commended the ongoing work presented by several stakeholders during the consultation and invited them to also participate and contribute to relevant regional multi-stakeholder processes and discussions that are currently active on digital matters.

**4.7** Some participants expressed support for contributions that relate to digital capacity development, especially for developing countries, and encouraged all stakeholders to support poor and marginalized communities within their regions.

**4.8** Some participants expressed support for contributions that encourage ITU to play a more central role in multilateral discussions on Internet development, especially on cybersecurity, infrastructure development and standardisation, as well as contributions that proposed creating a policy framework for collaboration that is developed through multi-stakeholder consultation to reflect the needs of different sectors and regions.

**4.9** Some participants commented on the importance of understanding the role of multilingualism in strengthening the Internet through internationalized domain names and universal acceptance, and invited contributions on the next topic for open consultations to be launched in October 2024.

**4.10** The meeting invited CWG-Internet to have a substantive discussion on the outputs of the open consultation, and suggested that the Secretariat share the contributions and compilation Document [OPCWGINT-11/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-OPCWGINT11-C-0002/en) also with the relevant Study Groups and projects and programmes in the three ITU sectors and the General Secretariat.

# 5 Closing

**5.1** In closing, the Chair of the meeting thanked all stakeholders who sent submissions and participated in the open consultation discussions, and encouraged the CWG-Internet to consider the received responses and the fruitful discussions of this meeting. He also expressed his thanks to the Elected Officials for their presence and support and the Secretariat and remote moderator for their efficient assistance during the meeting.

**5.2** The participants thanked the Chair for his efficient management of the Physical Open Consultation. The participants also thanked the Secretariat for their effective organisation of the online consultation and of the physical open consultation and the remote moderator for the efficient support.

ANNEX

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Submitter(contributions hyperlinked)** | **Response** |
| 1. | March 10, 2024 | [IGF DC Data Driven Health Technologies](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=5) | Text provided in the comment boxThe internet is rapidly becoming the backbone for the cost effective, equitable, 24/7 support of a basket of services to citizens. The internet is no longer an option, it is a critical infra-structure for All. Access without attention to Accessibilities (disabilities, skills, economic reasons etc.) Is meaningless. ICTs without quality data management provides for only mediocre outcomes. For e-healthcare services using the internet, data quality is critical. Functionality, inter-operability, data exchanges, meta language use, etc. must be of the highest ethical standards. E-medicine must be zero error tolerant. An error can mean a life is lost. Cutting corners, doing best fits, etc can cost lives. Rigourous user testing and correction of faults, errors, remediations, missing data, logic, maintenance, continuous betterment and updates are essential. Not best practices but essential, that it may even have to be in the law when it comes to e-health. With AI, this reach to the ultimate in data quality becomes the only guideline by which operating systems can exist. It is important that the quality of the internet transmission be optimized if advanced medical internet services such as remote surgery are to become the norm. This is a very helpful service for hard-to-reach communities and other rural areas, including out of space. As the world becomes more dependent on each other to optimize service, the need for collaboration is a requirement. Sectors such as medicine can collaborate across nations, as can for say agriculture. Perhaps seed financing will be driven by these sectoral groupings. Innovations not just in the technology, but also in the finance and in the legal structures of arrangements are needed. It is also important to recognize the inventors so that they are encouraged and not dissolutioned. Collaboration to promote an ICT device or procedure must be encouraged. It is important to also include all and emphasize the importance of the benefit to the end user, including them in real analysis of feedback. In conclusion, data quality is at the center for a flourishing internet with AI for the future. Don't take data for granted. Inappropriate profiling, estimation and assumptions can lead to poor consequences. A critical and ethical mind with suitable audits is a requirement, however, costly or useless it may seem. Data quality also requires good logs and documentation to be kept for fact and fault checking etc. Especially with AI, data is dynamic and must be nurtured. Hence, training of all stakeholders on ethics is a must. |
| 2. | March 13, 2024 | [Association for Proper Internet G](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=7)overnance | Summary provided in the Contribution:All the topics of the present open consultation have been covered in detail in our contributions to previous open consultations, starting in 2013, that is, for the past ten years.Unfortunately, the substance of our previous contributions, as well as other contributions to open consultations, have not been explicitly discussed or considered by the CWG-Internet itself.It is to be hoped that this year, CWG-Internet will consider, and discuss, the substance of this contribution, which can be summarized as follows: • The benefits of the increasing use of ICTS, including the Internet, have not been distributed evenly around the world: developed countries have benefited relatively more, as have some of their major private companies. Key questions for governments include how to facilitate access for persons with disabilities; how to assign ownership and control over data; how to build consumer trust and protect data privacy; how to regulate cross-border data flows; how to build the appropriate capabilities for harnessing digital data for development; how to reduce the cost of connectivity. In particular, there must be appropriate policy frameworks (in particular anti-trust laws) that address the growing tendency towards centralization and concentration of key Internet services. • The key developmental aspects of the Internet are to reduce the cost of connectivity in developing countries and to maintain trust and security. Reducing the cost of connectivity can be achieved by fostering competition (which may include functional separation), funding infrastructure, taking steps to reduce the cost of international connectivity, supporting the development of local content, capacity building, and a proper governance system. Maintaining trust and security can be achieved by protecting human rights, protecting data privacy, combating spam, protecting consumers, enabling pervasive strong encryption, and curtailing unnecessary and disproportionate mass surveillance.• States can contribute toward building an enabling environment for access to the Internet by implementing the provisions of ITU instruments such as Recommendations D.50, D.156, and the 2012 International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs), and by appropriately funding infrastructure. The cost of international Internet connectivity can be reduced by implementing ITU-T Recommendations (in particular D.50 and its supplements). The environmental impacts of ICTs, including the Internet and spam, are serious and can be mitigated by implementing ITU-T Recommendations and contributing to ITU initiatives in this area. Spam can be countered by implementing the provisions of relevant ITU-T Recommendations, WTSA Resolutions, and the 2012 ITRs. • It must be recalled that policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states; they have rights and responsibilities for international Internet-related public policy issues. Multistakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge.• Multistakeholder models do not necessarily result in faster decision making. For example, it took over seven years for ICANN’s process to reach agreement on naming members of a standing panel of arbitrators, whereas arbitration centers (including the one operated by WIPO, an intergovernmental organization) typically establish lists of arbitrators within less than a year and can establish panels from such lists within weeks. |
| 3. | March 28, 2024 | [Audiopedia Foundation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=8) | **Summary provided in the Contribution:**The document "Achieving SDG5: The Critical Role of Meaningful Connectivity" underscores the pressing necessity for meaningful internet connectivity as a pivotal force in empowering women and attaining Sustainable Development Goal 5 (SDG5) by the critical 2030 deadline. It articulates that while access to the internet is foundational, it is the depth of this access —characterized by quality, relevance, and digital literacy— that truly enables women to harness digital technologies for empowerment and equal participation in all spheres of life. The text highlights existing impediments to such connectivity, including but not limited to accessible, culturally resonant content, educational gaps, and infrastructural deficiencies, which disproportionately disadvantage women. Central to this discourse is the acknowledgment of the SDG Digital Acceleration Agenda's role in identifying and spotlighting scalable, effective solutions aimed at bridging the digital divide for women. Audiopedia is showcased as a prime example of such innovations, offering accessible, culturally resonant content in local languages to facilitate women's education and empowerment. The document makes a compelling call for action, urging multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes to actively engage in supporting and scaling these identified solutions. It posits that without concerted, collaborative efforts to amplify the impact of proven initiatives, the global community risks falling short of the SDG5 objectives. Through strategic partnerships, policy reforms, and resource mobilization, the document appeals for a united front to ensure that meaningful connectivity reaches every woman, paving the way for a more equitable, sustainable future.Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance: We agree with this contribution, in particular the statement thatovercoming the current barriers to connectivity requires concerted efforts from governments, civil society, and the private sector to ensure that connectivity leads to empowerment. |
| 4. | April 04, 2024 | [EDIH Trakia](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=10) | **Text provided via email:** EDIH Trakia actively contributes to global Internet development through participation in multilateral processes like WSIS+20 and the UN IGF. We advocate for the integration of cybersecurity and privacy as fundamental elements in international digital development policies. By sharing Bulgaria’s success stories, we aim to inspire similar global initiatives that promote secure and inclusive digital ecosystems. Our focus is on co-creating policies that involve governments, private sectors, academia, and civil society, particularly for deploying secure infrastructure in underserved areas.We also lead capacity-building efforts, raising cybersecurity awareness and skills through seminars, online courses, and resource-sharing platforms. In addition, EDIH Trakia engages young people with innovative programs such as policy hackathons, summer schools, and research labs to prepare them for active roles in Internet governance. Partnerships with international organizations enable us to pool resources and expertise for joint research and projects aimed at enhancing digital security and access.Our initiatives aim to create a secure, resilient Internet that benefits all, especially remote communities. We believe that fostering collaboration and inclusivity is key to bridging the digital divide. Through these efforts, EDIH Trakia works toward a more equitable and innovative digital future.**Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:** we agree with this contribution, in particular the statement that implementing the ideas set forth requires collaborative efforts across educational institutions, governments, the private sector, and civil society. |
| 5. | May 06, 2024 | Bahrain | **Text taken from the contribution (no summary provided):**1 Addressing Internet Development through Multilateral and Multi-stakeholder Processes, including but not limited to UN-based processes such as Summit of the Future , WSIS and IGF, could address related to internet development ? The importance of multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes in addressing Internet development aspects is crucial. Initiatives like the Summit of the Future, WSIS+20, and the United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF) promote global cooperation, inclusion, and capacity-building in digital policy by posting a numbers of internet related topics . The Summit of the Future enhances global cooperation, addresses governance gaps, and aims to create a better present and future for humanity. It brings together world leaders to forge consensus on critical issues such as peace, security, climate crisis, and sustainable development. The summit's outcome is an action-oriented Pact for the Future, which aims to better prepare the world for the future.It is an indisputable fact that conferences, forums, and symposiums like IGF and WSIS have influenced the development of governments, private sectors, civil society, technical and academic communities, leading to the implementation of strategies to increase internet usage and improve people's quality of life. In developing countries like the Kingdom of Bahrain, the use of the internet is crucial for fostering sustainable development goals. From a government perspective, achieving governance transformation is important, and the internet plays a significant role in the economic development of nations.2 Challenges, Opportunities, and Policies for Strengthening the Internett, comprehensive strategies addressing connectivity, access, security, and inclusion are required. Here are the key areas of focus:• Fostering Meaningful Connectivity and Universal Access: Implementing Policies and strategies should aim to ensure high-speed, reliable internet access that enables users to benefit fully from online resources. Universal access policies need to be inclusive of remote and underserved areas, potentially leveraging satellite communications and promoting the deployment of IPv6 for a more scalable and secure Internet.• Equitable Access for All and Affordability: Ensuring that Internet services are affordable and accessible to everyone, including developing countries. This involves implementing regulatory frameworks that encourage competition among service providers and innovative technologies to reduce costs.• Promoting a Secure and Resilient Internet: Developing and enforcing robust cybersecurity frameworks, promoting the adoption of best practices among stakeholders, and fostering cooperation at national and international levels to combat cyber threats such as National cyber security of the kingdom of Bahrain.• Digital Inclusion and Skills: Implementing education and training programs to improve digital literacy and skills, focusing on underrepresented groups to ensure equitable participation in the digital economy.• Multi-stakeholder Participation: Encouraging the active engagement of all sectors in Internet governance processes to ensure diverse perspectives are considered, enhancing the policy relevance and effectiveness.• Public and Private Sector Investment: Creating a favorable policy environment that encourages investment in Internet infrastructure, including tax incentives, public-private partnerships, and regulatory frameworks that support innovation and competition.How can we promote international multistakeholder cooperation on public policy issues that are focused on promoting the development aspects of the internet?  bring international multiple stakeholders in support of internet related public policy issues, it is possible to. Enhance Existing Gatherings: Utilize platforms such as the “IGF, Summit of the Future and WSIS” to foster partnerships involving representatives from diverse sectors and geographic locations. Making Collaboration Possible: Ensuring that efforts are coordinated with other development goals by establishing structured ways to cooperate, which identify clear objectives, roles as well as responsibilities for all stakeholders. Encouraging Regional and Local Forums Formation: Assisting the establishment of regional and local networks on Internet governance for addressing some regional challenges or opportunities and inputting insights into global discussion Addressing Emerging Issues: By conducting active research, engaging in dialogue based on anticipatory research findings, and proactively formulating policies, we can effectively tackle new Internet governance concerns. |
| 6. | July 30, 2024 | [NetMission.Asia's Asia Pacific Policy Observatory (APPO)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=13) | **Text provided in the comment box:** Cultural Barrier to Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names: Linguistic diversity stands as an impediment to universal acceptance. Promotion of a multilingual Internet will be difficult in Melanesia due to its linguistic diversity. For e.g. Papua New Guinea has more than 800+ spoken languages, the highest in the world. Solomon Islands is also a multilingual society which has about 70 or 80 local vernaculars. Melanesian countries shared similar linguistic diversity and oral (spoken) history because they don't have a proper writing system that will facilitate their integration into Internationalized Domain Name system to promote an inclusive and multilingual Internet. Thus, it will be impossible to accommodate Papua New Guinea and other Melanesian countries like Solomon Islands into the Internationalized Domain Name system in the future. This presents a great hurdle for organizations such as Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) to achieve. The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers’ (ICANN) Multi-Stakeholder Approach model of promoting an inclusive and multilingual Internet hinges on the writing system of a country. For e.g. the Alphabets Aa – Zz in English script. Without a proper writing system for Melanesian countries, it will be almost impossible to assimilate such linguistically diverse society into the IDN system. There are also more than 60 IDN country code top-level domains (ccTLDs) representing global communities online in native scripts (e.g., .ไทย, .中国, السعودية.) (<https://www.icann.org/ua>). |
| 7. | August 14, 2024 | [Riding Up](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=14) | **Text provided in the comment box**Promoting a secure and resilient Internet: Abuse Elevation Control Mechanism. The Abuse Elevation Control Mechanism (AECM) plays a crucial role in promoting a secure and resilient Internet by preventing unauthorized users from gaining elevated access privileges. This research aims to present to the readers the primary ways in which compromised credentials may be exploited, and the principal key techniques that attackers are using. Then it highlights some strategies to reduce the risks of the AECM. At the end of this work, there are scenarios on what the future of that cyberattack will look like. KEYWORDS. Cyberattacks, standards, privileges, ethics, data. |
| 8. | August 27, 2024 | United Kingdom - [Department of Science, Innovation, and Technology](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=15) | **Text taken from the Contribution (no summary provided)**1 How relevant multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, including but not limited to UN-based processes such as Summit of the Future, WSIS+20 and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development? The Internet is a critical enabler of economic and social development, benefiting health, education, business and many other sectors. We are committed to harnessing the benefits of the Internet to help realise the Sustainable Development Goals. Multi-stakeholder processes have been critical in supporting the growth, development and accessibility of the Internet. It is only with the input and participation of all stakeholders – governments, the private sector, civil society, academia, and the technical community – that we can effectively support the Internet and its potential for development. The UK therefore views multistakeholder processes as vital for producing effective solutions to Internet development by drawing on diverse perspectives and contributions. There will be some limited areas where multilateral processes are appropriate, but it is still important that they are fully informed by stakeholder views. Multilateral processes are often ineffective, however, because they can lack relevant knowledge and expertise, they do not have the full buy-in of stakeholders or they neglect key issues. Multi- stakeholder processes include governments, of course, but they also bring the benefit of commitment, understanding and capacity of other stakeholders. The Summit of the Future can play a useful role in raising awareness of digital issues across the UN system and establishing high level commitment to a positive agenda aimed at development and inclusion. The IGF plays a critical role as a unique multi- stakeholder platform for ensuring Internet development benefits from the expertise, resources, and capacity of all stakeholders. The IGF’s National and Regional Initiatives (NRIs) and regional, national, and youth IGFs are making a huge contribution and helping to ensure that global governance is better connected to local realities. The WSIS Forum plays an important role promoting implementation of the WSIS Action Linesandhasbenefittedgreatlyfromtheparticipationofallstakeholders. TheWSIS+20 review should be an opportunity to bring together the stakeholder community to highlight the need for further multi-stakeholder collaboration on Internet developmental issues and to evolve and enhance the WSIS Action Lines to better address developmental needs. It will be particularly important to include marginalised and under-represented groups in those multistakeholder discussions. 2 What are the challenges and opportunities, good practices and favourable policy environments to strengthen the Internet? Strengthening the Internet depends upon a favourable policy environment that promotes sustainable development and an effective multi-stakeholder governance model that serves the global community. There are many examples from countries around the world which demonstrate that bringing together different stakeholders to share information and perspectives, build common goals and foster partnerships can deliver huge benefits for expanding internet access. We believe that expanding connectivity requires concerted efforts by governments, the private sector, and other stakeholders. There are a very wide range of good practices and favourable policies which can support Internet development, including in areas such as:  promoting innovation  fostering digital skills  enabling competition  maintaining transparent, predictable, independent and non-discriminatory regulatory and legal systems  ensuring that taxation and licensing fees are proportionate  providing access to finance  supporting public - private partnerships  allocating radio frequency spectrum efficiently  developing infrastructure-sharing models, and  supporting community-based approaches. Organisations such as the ITU, the IGF, the World Bank, UNESCO, UNDP, the Internet Society, the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation and many others can help provide advice and guidance in many different areas. Developing countries face significant barriers and challenges in accessing the Internet. Without connectivity, individuals and communities will be left behind and we will not be able to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Lack of affordable connectivity disproportionately affects specific groups of people including women, people in developing countries and people living in remote and rural areas. These communities face significant barriers such as poor local infrastructure and unaffordable broadband costs. Without concerted efforts to overcome these challenges, we will miss out on the opportunities afforded by a strengthened Internet. Initiatives such as the ITU’s Partnership to Connect are a great example of multi-stakeholder cooperation to help address these challenges. The WSIS+20 review should focus on addressing these challenges and making sure our digital development agenda is fit for the future. 3 How can we promote international multistakeholder cooperation on public policy issues that are focused on promoting the development aspects of the Internet? The UK believes international multistakeholder cooperation on Internet development is promoted by strengthening existing processes and making them more accessible to a variety of voices. Creating new forums or duplicating process has the potential to weaken and fragment existing processes and undermining inclusion by further complicating an already crowded landscape.The WSIS+20 review will be an important opportunity to promote multistakeholder cooperation. The WSIS has worked for nearly twenty years to promote connectivity and build an inclusive and development-oriented Information Society. We now need to build an ambitious digital development agenda for the future, working with all stakeholders, updating and modernising the WSIS Action Lines and ensure they are aligned with the Sustainable Development Agenda. The WSIS+20 review is also an opportunity to strength the IGF and strengthen its role promoting international multistakeholder cooperation. The IGF can firm up its commitment to inclusive participation by encouraging more diverse representation at the international level. The IGF should strengthen links between the annual global meeting and the over 155 national and regional IGF initiatives that have developed around the world. The IGF should also strengthen its commitment to developing a more focused agenda. In 2024, the IGF took steps to reduce the number of participation tracks, which will minimize repetition and make discussions more focused. Building on the IGF’s accomplishments will enable it better to fulfil its role as a critical space for all stakeholders to discuss on an equal footing public policy issues related to Internet development. **Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:** The contribution states: “Multi-stakeholder processes have been critical in supporting the growth, development and accessibility of the Internet.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 9. | August 28, 2024 | [Canada - Innovation, Science and Economic Development](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=16) | **Text taken from the contribution (no summary provided)**Canada thanks the ITU Council Working Group on International Internet Related Public Policy Issues (CWG-Internet) for its ongoing efforts to strengthen the developmental aspects of the Internet. Canada is pleased to respond to: **Question 1**: How relevant multilateral and multistakeholder processes, including but not limited to U.N. based processes such as the Summit of the Future, WSIS+20, and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development? The multistakeholder model of Internet governance has proven to be highly effective in fostering inclusive and representative participation across a broad range of sectors. It is an indispensable element of the effective administration of the global Internet. Since its inception, the online landscape has evolved rapidly, and the Internet has become a critical tool for daily life across the globe. While it is true that Internet governance processes and the organisations responsible for them need to continue to adapt and improve to ensure that they remain fit for the future, Canada strongly believes and reiterates that an effective Internet governance and its associated institutions and processes like the WSIS+20 Review, ICANN, and the IGF requires ongoing input from diverse stakeholders in order to positively contribute to the Internet governance landscape. As the multistakeholder community begins to engage in the upcoming WSIS+20 Review, Canada calls on all stakeholders to work together to strengthen and support the importance of the multistakeholder community, especially through extending the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum and its associated regional and national initiatives. The IGF remains a crucial mechanism to discuss common problems, address policy and governance gaps, and provides a necessary platform for open and inclusive dialogue on Internet governance issues –components, we believe, to be at the cornerstone of the development of the Internet. In addition to the IGF, ICANN’s role in managing the DNS involves coordinating the unique identifiers that allow the Internet to function smoothly, ensuring its stability and security. ICANN is Internet governance in practice. It actively and successfully demonstrates how diverse stakeholder participation across community groups can lead to effective global governance and operational success. Ahead of upcoming U.N. processes, valuable lessons from ICANN and the IGF should be used to further strengthen the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and ensure that the Internet remains a global, open resource, benefiting from the diverse perspectives and expertise of all stakeholders. Lastly, Canada would like to reiterate that the CWG-Internet should be open to all stakeholders, not only to Member States, and fully include the private sector, technical and academic communities, and civil society groups to collectively discuss issues and priorities impacting the global Internet today. It is only through the active participation of all stakeholders, and particularly by those who truly understand the Internet’s infrastructure, that we can ensure the effective development of the Internet well into the future.**Comment from China:**We would like to congratulate the holding of this OPC and wish it a success. We look forward to cooperating with partners from different sectors and different types of entities, towards a better Internet and a better digital future, which is articulated in the adopted GDC text. However, OPC might not be a proper occasion for discussion about the management of the CWG, which is clearly stated in relevant ITU resolutions, such as PP Resolution 102 and Council ResolutionS 1305 and 1336. To improve the efficiency of time, we suggest that OPC discussions adhere to the agenda and the agreed Questions. **Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:**The contribution states: “The multistakeholder model of Internet governance has proven to be highly effective in fostering inclusive and representative participation across a broad range of sectors. It is an indispensable element of the effective administration of the global Internet.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 10. | August 29, 2024 | [Bulgaria - Ministry of e-governance](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=17) | **Text provided in the comment box:**2024 is an important year for the EU to consolidate and spread its commitment to an open internet and a functioning multi-stakeholder internet governance model. Important events such as the Global Digital Compact (GDC) (part of the Future Summit), the preparations for the World Summit on the Information Society+20 (WSIS+20) in 2025, which will define the development of the Internet are coming Key Commitments - Strengthen multilateral and multi-stakeholder commitment to address discriminatory content as well as false and misleading content at all levels, particularly within the United Nations and with other international and regional organizations, for transparent and accountable content management frameworks, which protects freedom of expression and improves the availability of accurate and reliable information in the public sphere, while fully respecting human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Governance of Virtual Worlds Ensuring that everyone has access to all key public services online across the Union A key focus is building trust in the digital ecosystem Introduction of liability criteria for discrimination and misleading content Platforms must mitigate the risks Promoting digital literacy Promoting the regulation of artificial intelligence/AI Digital transformation in Bulgaria Confederation of employers and industrials in Bulgaria/ CRIB's opinion as a member of the ICT Community Advisory Board in the Ministry of e-governance. |
| 11. | August 29, 2024 | [International Chamber of Commerce](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=19) | **Summary provided in the contribution:**The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) believes in the power of the Internet to create positive, lasting and inclusive socio-economic impact. This potential can only be fully realised if the fundamental nature of the Internet as an open, interconnected, and interoperable network of networks is maintained. Promoting international multistakeholder cooperation on Internet-related public policy issues is vital for unlocking the full potential of the Internet, ICTs and digital technologies. To achieve this, a few considerations must be put in place. ICC encourages policy makers to: • Create policies that facilitate investment across the digital value chain • Improve digital infrastructure and its use • Foster trust in data and digital technologies • Ground policies in evidence and data • Embrace multistakeholder policymaking • Invest in digital literacy and skills development • Foster international cooperation.Ongoing processes discussing Internet related public policies should provide guidance on how to build such enabling environments and ensure meaningful multistakeholder input.**Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:**The contributions states: “Promoting international multistakeholder cooperation on Internet-related public policy issues is vital for unlocking the full potential of the Internet, ICTs and digital technologies.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 12. | August 31, 2024 | [Youth Internet Governance Forum Germany](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=20) | **Text taken from the contribution (no summary provided)**The Youth Internet Governance Forum Germany would like to make the following remarks concerning the developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet. 1 On the question of how relevant multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, including but not limited to UN-based processes such as Summit of the Future, WSIS+20 and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development? As a core rationale to answer this question, we emphasize that the multistakeholder approach is not multilateralism but rather multilateralism forms part of multistakeholderism. This idea should also be reflected in the WSIS+20 process and can and should be defended in all relevant UN fora. The IGF is an important realization of the multistakeholder approach, and the Sao Paulo Guidelines adopted at the Netmundial+10 conference serves as an important reference point in this regard. Another point we consider important when addressing the developmental aspects of the Internet is the role of Youth as a stakeholder. The young generation represents the largest user group of the Internet of today and at the same time young people are the ones most affected by a lack of Internet development as an even larger share of their lives depends on the Internet and connectivity. Furthermore, all the mentioned fora are discussion fora that can give an important impulse to initiatives in the developmental aspects of the Internet, but the people are needed in the real discussion and decision rooms. It is not enough to include stakeholders in consultations especially dedicated to them, rather they should be involved or at least it should be shown how their input reaches the drafting of the texts and processes. All relevant processes can and should strengthen Open Source, Digital Public Code which are accessible and transparent to actors around the world and therefore also serve Internet Development. Additionally, during these processes, AI capacity building can be enabled by strong Internet development. Regarding the Summit of the Future process the Internet as part of development should be included in the Pact for the Future. We should recognize that no one actor or country is perfect and especially rural areas need to be included. Ultimately, development only works with proper standardization which needs to be inclusive. 2 Challenges and opportunities, good practices and favorable policy environments to strengthen the Internet in various areas We recognize the importance of all the points mentioned and stress that the relevant actors’ voices in these should be included and listened to. For us as a Youth Non-governmental organization from Germany the topics of the deployment of IPv6 and fostering multi-stakeholder participation are especially pertinent. Concerning the deployment of IPv6, we believe that States need to take the lead. IP addresses are a public good that should be protected to enable secure and resilient Internet operations for all. We recognize ongoing efforts by the European Union in this regard and believe that a sunset clause for IPv4 could create a necessary impulse for further and accelerated IPv6 adoption. There is one key forum to foster multi-stakeholder participation which is the Internet Governance Forum. This forum is confronted with various challenges which include a lack of funding, more talking than deciding and a somewhat niche presence in the broader UN system. However, with processes like the Summit of the Future the IGF could be boosted to work on new tasks and evolve itself in:  encouraging public and private sector investment in Internet infrastructure.  fostering meaningful connectivity  equitable access for all  promoting a secure and resilient Internet  achieving universal access  using satellite communication to reach remote and underserved remote areas  ensuring services are affordable for people  promoting digital inclusion and skills.3 How can we promote international multistakeholder cooperation on public policy issues that are focused on promoting the development aspects of the Internet? International multistakeholder cooperation in this regard could be promoted by enhancing the IGF and improving its inclusivity to hear voices from countries and communities that are often underrepresented; Furthermore, it could be financially and institutionally strengthened and build stronger links with technical Internet Governance spaces to effectively tackle development aspects of the Internet. To achieve this, it is also necessary to promote multistakeholderism worldwide between and within countries. Cooperation on different levels of government (local, regional, national levels) horizontal and vertical engagement should also be promoted. Youth engagement needs to be strengthened Initiatives like the Sovereign Tech Fund or the Open Technology Fund are good starting points that more countries could join and see as an investment opportunity to promote developmental aspects of the Internet on a broader scale that is oriented towards a public common good.  |
| 13. | September 01, 2024 | [Bangladesh - Internal Resources Division (IRD), Ministry of Finance](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=21) | **Summary provided in the contribution**Bangladesh highlights the challenges and opportunities related to Internet development, including fostering meaningful connectivity, equitable access, a secure and resilient Internet, universal access, IPv6 deployment, affordable services, digital inclusion, and multi-stakeholder participation. The country emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multi-stakeholder processes to address these challenges. Bangladesh proposes solutions such as government initiatives for rural broadband development, digital skills training, cybersecurity capacity building, and promoting investment in Internet infrastructure. The contribution also highlights the need for regulatory reforms and public-private partnerships to create an enabling environment for Internet development. Overall, Bangladesh seeks to contribute to the global discourse on Internet development and share its experiences and best practices. |
| 14. | September 02, 2024 | [Netherlands - RIPE NCC](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=22) | **Summary provided in the contribution**On behalf of the *Réseaux IP Européens Network Coordination Centre* (RIPE NCC), the Regional Internet Registry for Europe, the Middle East, and parts of Central Asia, we would like to express our profound gratitude to the ITU Council Working Group — Internetfor providing this opportunity for private sector members to contribute to this extremely important Internet discourse. While multilateral processes, primarily driven by sovereign states, are essential for achieving global consensus and reflecting national priorities, they often fall short in inclusivity. The limited engagement of non-state actors—such as the technical community, private sector, academia, and civil society—can hinder the scope and effectiveness of these processes in addressing the complex technical challenges of Internet governance. Multistakeholder processes, in contrast, offer a richer and more balanced perspective by incorporating diverse expertise and viewpoints. This approach not only enhances the legitimacy and effectiveness of governance outcomes but also ensures that the policies developed are agile enough to adapt to the rapid pace of technological advancements. To develop and strengthen the Internet, multistakeholder processes should be leveraged to foster meaningful connectivity, secure and resilient infrastructure, and inclusive policy environments. Promoting the adoption of critical Internet technologies like the deployment of IPv6, enhancing routing security through RPKI, and offering capacity building are essential components of this effort. The RIPE NCC’s initiatives in these areas exemplify good practices in promoting robust Internet infrastructure. These include offering extensive capacity building, advocating for favourable policy environments, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders. Additionally, promoting international multistakeholder cooperation through shared goals, mutual respect and trust, and continuous dialogue and engagement can significantly enhance the developmental aspects of the Internet, ensuring a secure, stable, and inclusive digital future for all. Comment from the United States of America:We would like to thank RIPE NCC for its contribution and highlight one aspect of their contribution: a short list of good practices to enable multistakeholder participation in policy development processes. We also support the emphasis they provided on the importance of partnership with the technical community. |
| 15. | September 02, 2024 | [Belgium - CENTR](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=23) | **Summary provided in the contribution:**CENTR is the association of European country code top-level domain registries (ccTLDs), such as **.nl** for the Netherlands, and .no for Norway. All EU Member State and EEA country ccTLDs are CENTR members. CENTR members are at the core of the public internet, safeguarding its stability and security. The majority of European ccTLDs are non-profit organisations or SMEs, providing an internet infrastructure service in the interest of and in close cooperation with their local internet communities (e.g. registrars, end-users, Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRTs), law enforcement and other competent authorities). ccTLDs are responsible for operating and maintaining the technical Domain Name System (DNS) infrastructure for their top-level domain. The DNS is a network protocol at the heart of the internet infrastructure – commonly thought of as the “phone book of the internet”. It provides a navigation function to map user-friendly domain names to numeric IP addresses. ccTLDs only hold information enabling users to navigate the internet but do not store, transmit or enhance any content online. As part of the technical internet infrastructure community, CENTR proposes the following key recommendations in response to the consultation: 1 To ensure balanced and evidence-based policymaking that contributes to the global development of the internet, CENTR encourages more dialogue between policymakers and the technical internet infrastructure community. 2 Governments must support the multistakeholder governance of the DNS, which facilitates the development of common open standards and protocols supporting global interoperability. 3 With regards to public policy, policymakers must avoid addressing societal problems through interventions via the technical internet infrastructure, without a proper and publicly available impact assessment of these interventions on human rights and universal accessibility of essential digital infrastructure, such as domain names. 4 Policymakers must refrain from introducing unnecessary and disproportionate barriers to the domain name registration process via national and international legislation to maintain universal accessibility of essential digital infrastructure.**Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance**The contribution states: “The success of the DNS and the internet in general stems from the policy and technical development process in organisations functioning on the multistakeholder approach.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 16. | September 03, 2024 | [InternetNZ](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=24) | **Summary provided in the contribution**This submission is lodged on behalf of members of "A Technical Community Coalition for Multistakeholderism" - see specific signatories at the bottom of the attached submission. SUMMARY: Realizing the full social and economic benefits of the Internet is dependent on balancing a diverse range of interests. A multistakeholder approach will best reflect the needs of all stakeholders and is the most effective model of decision making to maintain the Internet as a robust and secure platform for innovation and sustainable development. This approach enables a level of diversity, accountability and transparency that cannot be replicated in intergovernmental environments alone. Internet development cannot properly be addressed in silos; solving complex, interlinked challenges requires a holistic approach. Effective, practical and credible solutions must be developed via multi-stakeholder processes, drawing on the expertise of a range of relevant stakeholders. The WSIS+20 Review is essential to upholding the strong mandate of the IGF and the multistakeholder frameworks that have shaped the Internet into a reliable tool for development. We encourage ITU to make representations in support of the WSIS+20 Review process being open, transparent and inclusive. Promoting the development aspects of the Internet requires mechanisms to better enable the participation of all stakeholders in multi-stakeholder Internet governance and public policy processes – particularly those from developing countries. Further financial support for multi-stakeholder mechanisms is one way to achieve this, including from governments and the private sector. In particular, we suggest further strengthening the role of the IGF. Comment from the United States of America:Congratulations on the launch of the Technical Community Coalition for Multistakeholderism (TCCM), which will assist us in understanding the perspectives of the technical community. We also thank you for highlighting several of the tangible benefits of the multistakeholder system of Internet governance. Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:The contribution states: “The technological success of the Internet—the reason it works seamlessly across the globe—is the direct result of the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance and its use in various fora and initiatives. This approach enables stakeholders to come together on an equal footing to discuss or make decisions about the Internet and to foster its ongoing evolution and expansion.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 17. | September 03, 2024 | [NetMission.Asia](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=26) | Summary provided in the Contribution:​As the Internet continues to evolve, unique challenges and opportunities will emerge and the role of multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes will be critical for shaping a sustainable and responsible Internet ecosystem. Issues on and of the Internet are multifaceted global matters and it is essential for multilateral processes to evolve and ensure that all regions, especially developing and less developed countries, and diverse stakeholders co-exist together in Internet-related public policy. To make the Internet accessible for all, challenges like the digital divide, human rights violations online, environmental concerns, multilingualism, cybersecurity threats, privacy, and regulation must be addressed. To overcome these challenges, novel strategies need to be adopted, such as promoting digital well-being, engaging and empowering younger generations, providing flexible learning options, promoting civic participation and redressal of grievances of netizens. Several strategies can be implemented to promote international multi-stakeholder cooperation on public policy issues related to Internet Governance. These include strengthening existing forums, fostering new partnerships and sustaining current collaborations, developing shared vision and principles, enhancing knowledge sharing, and addressing the digital divide. Supporting these strategies requires building trust among stakeholders, building transparency, and fostering transparency in multi-stakeholder processes. Implementation of these strategies could pave the way towards a more inclusive and participatory approach to Internet Governance and the future of the Internet.  |
| 18. | September 03, 2024 | [Association for Progressive Communications](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=27) | Summary provided in the Contribution:This submission outlines APC’s position on Internet Policy and discusses the need to strengthen Internet development through multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, particularly by addressing digital inequality, the gender digital divide, and environmental sustainability. It emphasizes the importance of including marginalized groups in global digital governance efforts, such as women, Indigenous communities, and those financially disadvantaged. The document also highlights the role of community-centered connectivity initiatives in bridging the digital divide, especially in rural and underserved areas. It advocates for appropriate regulatory frameworks, licensing, and financial support to enable these small-scale, social-purpose operators to contribute effectively to digital inclusion. Additionally, it stresses the need for international cooperation based on principles of social justice, human rights, and environmental responsibility to ensure equitable access to digital technologies.Comment from the United States of America:We would like to highlight a key insight from the APC contribution: To be meaningful, multistakeholder participation needs to be consistently inclusive at all levels – from local to global – and be accountable and transparent across the entire digital governance ecosystem.. |
| 19. | September 03, 2024 | [Article19](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=28) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The Importance of multistakeholder processes A multistakeholder model of internet governance that facilitates informed, participatory and transparent engagement between sectors is integral for addressing public policy issues related to the internet. Promoting international multi-stakeholder cooperation on public policy issues related to the Internet requires a holistic approach that incorporates diverse perspectives and interests, including those of non-technical stakeholders. Such an approach must be underpinned by the following key elements: inclusive policymaking (ensuring that all relevant stakeholders - including civil society, marginalized communities, and smaller ISPs, are involved in policy-making processes - and have their views reflected in policy outcomes); meaningful participation, a human rights-based approach (grounded in international human rights law), transparency, accountability, and capacity-building and knowledge-sharing. Such an approach is also integral to overcoming the digital divide: strategies that include diverse technological solutions and community-based operators are able to better meet the needs of marginalized and underserved populations and expand Internet access more effectively and sustainably. Multistakeholder oversight mechanisms are also crucial in aligning the work of Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) with the values and priorities of the broader Internet governance community. II. Fostering equitable and inclusive internet development and regulatory models It is not possible to achieve the goals of universal access without a shift in understanding the relevance of Internet connectivity as a public good and its significance to human rights as part of non-discriminatory access to services, materials, facilities, and infrastructure. It is important to allow the development of diverse solutions for service providers. Small, local initiatives allow communities to exercise self-determination over pricing and services (keeping profits local), facilitates the provision of content in local languages that is aligned with local needs, and creates more decentralized and resilient networks. These networks prevent external abuses, such as censorship and throttling by external forces, and enable robust connectivity in ways that large operators often cannot achieve. Operators should therefore be allowed and encouraged to use and share the spectrum, utilizing wireless, fiber, and other relevant technologies with appropriate frequency ranges. Investment in Internet infrastructure is critical for expanding connectivity; however, it is important to ensure that such investments are not solely profit-driven and in the hands of a few powerful companies, but also consider the broader social impact and support local initiatives and tech autonomy. Good practices involve public-private partnerships that are aligned with public interest goals, ensuring that investments contribute to universal and meaningful connectivity and enable secure and affordable digital infrastructure.  Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe agree with portions of this contribution, in particular the statements that effective mechanisms are required to translate the outcomes of multistakeholder discussions into actionable policies that can be implemented at a global level; and that there are concerns about the perpetuation of digital colonialism and data extractivism. |
| 20. | September 03, 2024 | [Computer & Communications Industry Association](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=29) | Text provided in the comment box:​Voluntary interconnection agreements between content and application providers (CAP) and internet service providers (ISP) represent the best opportunity to foster meaningful connectivity, achieve universal access, ensure affordable service, promote digital inclusion, and encourage investment in internet infrastructure. First, CAP investments directly increase overall internet penetration, reliability, and usage, especially for underserved areas. Second, they stimulate the interlinked demand for online services and broadband, contributing to broadband connectivity and narrowing the digital divide. Third, they support ISPs, complementing their investments and lowering their costs by more than US$5 billion annually. Therefore, favorable policy environments should support voluntary interconnection and avoid excessive and unnecessary interventions in how CAPs and ISPs establish agreements. Multistakeholder cooperation has been a driving force in the evolution of the internet and in harnessing its development potential. Policymakers should maintain incentives for industry to continue investing in critical internet infrastructure, especially as it relates to closing digital divides.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceThe contribution states: “Multistakeholder cooperation has been a driving force in the evolution of the internet and in harnessing its development potential.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 21. | September 03, 2024 | [ICANN](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=30) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The Internet’s technical foundation is robust. Its technical design and the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance ensure that it continues to evolve. An open, globally connected, and interoperable Internet is critical for securing our digital future. The collaborative efforts of the technical community ensure that it will continue to be so. As part of the technical community, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and the ICANN community, are focused on multilingualism, particularly, the deployment of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). With billions of people across the globe now online and millions more expected to join, the majority of whom primarily speak languages other than English, the availability of IDNs promotes meaningful connectivity by allowing people to use domain names in their native languages and scripts. However, despite the availability of IDNs, many people around the world are still excluded from experiencing the full benefits of this growing, multilingual Internet because they cannot use a valid domain name or email address in their language and script of choice. Many software applications do not accept these valid domain names and email addresses created using new multilingual Top-Level Domains. Universal Acceptance (UA) of domain names and email addresses is now essential to enable users globally to experience the full social and economic benefits of the growing Internet. Specifically, UA means that all domain names and email addresses function properly across all Internet-enabled applications, devices, and systems. Stakeholders in the multistakeholder community can play a role in promoting, encouraging, and enabling Universal Acceptance. ICANN helps coordinate the Internet’s system of unique identifiers to ensure a stable, secure, and interoperable global Internet. ICANN promotes a secure and resilient Internet in several areas including Domain Name System Management, Root Zone Management and through Technical Advisory Committees such as the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). The Internet's development is fundamentally about collaboration. The multistakeholder model of Internet governance has helped create the Internet we know today. Principles such as inclusive and representative multistakeholder participation, consensus-based decision making, and open and transparent processes help promote multistakeholder participation. The U.N.’s twenty-year review of the implementation of WSIS (WSIS+20) should aim to strengthen the multistakeholder model and reaffirm the commitments made during WSIS 2003 and 2005, as well as during the WSIS+10 Review in 2015. The continuation of WSIS beyond 2025 and the renewal of the Internet Governance Forum mandate at WSIS+20 reflect a firm commitment by the U.N. Member States to the multistakeholder model, signalling that multistakeholder collaboration remains a vital force in the developmental aspects of the Internet.Comment from the United States of America:We would like to thank ICANN for its contribution and reiterate the importance of understanding the role of Internet multilingualism in strengthening the Internet, including through Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and the pursuit of Universal Acceptance. We look forward to future discussions on this topic, including through the next CWG-Internet Public Open Consultation, as decided earlier this year.Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance: The contribution states: “The Internet’s evolution depends on multistakeholder collaboration and consensus-based decision making.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet.  |
| 22. | September 03, 2024 | [Internet Society](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=31) | Text provided in the comment box:Making informed policy and regulatory decisions is crucial in fostering an enabling policy environment that bridges current and emerging digital divides, considering a third of the world remains unconnected. We believe this will not be possible unless all stakeholders can effectively participate in Internet development discussions. In particular, the technical community has a strong foundation of expertise based on a common understanding of the characteristics the Internet needs to exist and thrive. Ensuring the multistakeholder model remains key to countering emerging threats to the open Internet. These threats, such as Internet shutdowns and fragmentation, could negatively impact the Internet and its properties. Importantly, the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) has become an indispensable element of the Internet ecosystem and a platform that reinforces cooperation by reducing barriers between different stakeholder groups. We are at a pivotal time in connecting those not yet connected to the Internet and achieving universal connectivity. A starting point has to be that no matter the method of delivery—wires, wireless, mobile, or satellite—the networks must incorporate the critical properties of the Internet and its enablers. It is important to recognize that serious challenges remain in bridging the digital divide, achieving equitable access to ICTs, and the benefits that people can accrue from them. For example, some populations are currently offline and will continue to be so in the future unless new connectivity models are used, such as community-centered solutions, including community networks. To ensure the Internet community continues contributing to the vision, it is essential to address the challenges by sustaining the model of multi-stakeholder collaboration. Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:The contribution states that the multi-stakeholder model for Internet Governance has proven to be the best positioned to allow the community to come together to find solutions for mutual challenges. However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 23. | September 03, 2024 | [Internet Center - Communication, Space & Technology Commission](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=32) | Summary provided in the Contribution:Multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, including the UN's Summit of the Future, WSIS+20, and the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), are crucial in addressing various aspects of Internet development, such as policy-making, regulatory frameworks, and operational management. These forums facilitate inclusive dialogue among governments, private sector, civil society, and technical communities, helping to tackle issues like cybercrime, privacy, digital inclusion, and emerging technologies. To strengthen the Internet, key challenges include limited IDN adoption, security vulnerabilities, and slow IPv6 deployment, while opportunities lie in promoting linguistic diversity, enhancing security measures, and leveraging new technologies like satellite communications. Good practices include raising awareness, adopting advanced security protocols, and providing training. Effective international cooperation on Internet development requires building consensus, supporting capacity building, and ensuring full implementation of WSIS outcomes to promote a more connected and equitable global information society.Comment from China:We thank Saudi Arabia for the contribution, and believe the matters mentioned by Saudi Arabia and some other contributors, such as capacity-building and linguistic diversity on the Internet, are important. We support strengthening digital capacity-building, ensuring the right of developing countries to the peaceful use of Internet resources and technologies, and helping developing countries to have affordable access to the Internet.We also encourage all stakeholders to help the elderly, women, minors, people with disabilities and the poor in their access to and usage of the Internet through investment, education, training, innovation and application of technologies.Finally, we wish the 19th Internet Governance Forum in Riyadh a success. |
| 24. | September 03, 2024 | [NTIA, U.S. Department of Commerce](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=33) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The Internet’s resiliency and unyielding growth are a testament to the success of the multistakeholder system of Internet governance. The multistakeholder system has addressed and will continue to address questions related to the development of the Internet through collaboration among governments, with the technical community, and including all stakeholders. Multilateral processes can facilitate cooperation on the adoption of these solutions. Multilateral processes can also support cooperation on issues adjacent to the development of the Internet, including fostering meaningful connectivity and digital inclusion.  Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:The contribution states: “The Internet’s resiliency and unyielding growth are a testament to the success of the multistakeholder system of Internet governance.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet. |
| 25. | September 04, 2024 | [Layer 9 Technologies](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=34) | Summary provided in the Contribution:Layer 9 Technologies’ contribution to the ITU Council Working Group on International Internet Public Policy Issues outlines various strategies for strengthening the global Internet infrastructure. It defines "strengthening the Internet" as enhancing its robustness, reliability, security, accessibility, and functionality. This effort requires both local actions by individual networks and global cooperation within both the multilateral and multistakeholder model of Internet governance. The document emphasizes the importance of voluntary cooperation, collaboration, and trust among the numerous independently operated networks that make up the global Internet. It also highlights that these efforts should focus on reinforcing existing standards and structures while avoiding a "one size fits all" approach due to the diverse challenges faced by different regions and networks. To strengthen the Internet, the document suggests improving infrastructure through diverse, locally driven efforts, and enhancing governance structures to increase resilience, inclusiveness, and transparency. It also discusses the need for coordinated global actions, such as supporting the multistakeholder model and harmonizing policies to prevent fragmentation. Additionally, it discusses the challenges posed by state-based cyber activities and the necessity of global cooperation to maintain Internet reliability. The document stresses that improving Internet security may require a shift from traditional approaches to a more holistic, collective security mindset, akin to the public health model. Finally, it underscores the importance of making the Internet more accessible, particularly by investing in infrastructure and embracing multilingualism and technological enhancements for users with disabilities.  |
| 26. | September 04, 2024 | [ACT | The App Association](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=35) | Summary provided in the Contribution:ACT | The App Association (App Association) appreciates the opportunity to submit views to the International Telecommunications Union’s (ITU) Council Working Group on International Internet-Related Public Policy Issues (CWG-I) on developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet. The App Association represents the global small business technology developer community. Alongside the world’s rapid embrace of mobile technology, our members have been creating innovative solutions that power the Internet of things (IoT) across modalities and segments of the economy. For more information, please visit <https://actonline.org/>. The App Association offers detailed viewpoints on ways to support the multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance and urges ITU-T to focus on addressing core issues squarely within its mandate. We also discuss how vital the free flow of data and information is to empowering small business innovators around the globe and call for ITU's support of these priorities. The App Association further comments on privacy and security issues and recommends next steps for ITU-T in these issue areas. Please find attached the App Association's comments in full.Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:The contribution states: “We believe that the continued use (and augmentation) of the multi-stakeholder model, which allows for input from the wide range of diverse communities that rely on the Internet, is essential to the growth and prosperity of the global Internet.” However, the evidence of the development of the Internet over the past 20 years actually shows that multi-stakeholder processes have not been able to deal with critical issues, in particular many of those identified as priorities in paragraphs 14-17 of the 2005 Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, such as interconnection costs, security, spam, freedom of expression, data protection, consumer rights.Further, multi-stakeholder processes have been unable to prevent the emergence of phishing, disinformation, and concentration, that is, the emergence of large players that dominate portions of the ICT environment and are able to dictate terms and conditions and prices. The emergence, and undesirable effects, of such concentration have recently been recognized by anti-trust and competition authorities in Europe and the United States, who are beginning to take action.In fact, as shown in our 28 August 2017 [contribution](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-June2017.aspx?ListItemID=63) to the [June-September 2017 CWG-Internet Open Consultation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/consultation-june2017.aspx), there are serious limitations in multi-stakeholder approaches. In essence, multi-stakeholder approaches work well when the stakeholders desire a shared, negotiated agreement. In other words, if all stakeholders share common goals, and hence there is a win-win situation. They do not work well when the interests of the stakeholders diverge, as is the case for many of the critical issues of today’s Internet |
| 27. | September 04, 2024 | [NTRA](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=36) | Summary provided in the Contribution:​• Preserving the Internet as one common resource necessitates continued efforts and coordination among stakeholders, in order to maintain and develop the Internet as an unfragmented, interoperable public utility, while effectively addressing threats and drawbacks that come with technological evolution. Moreover, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), as the specialized UN agency for telecommunications, is positioned uniquely to influence multistakeholder and multilateral processes due to its mandate, technical expertise, and broad membership, which includes government, private sector, and academic entities. The ITU is responsible for coordinating the global use of the radio spectrum, developing international technical standards, and improving telecommunications infrastructure in developing countries. Given the ITU's experience, it can help establish technical standards and policies for the Internet that ensure security, interoperability, and accessibility globally. Also, as a multilateral organization with wide membership, the ITU provides a platform for diverse voices, including governments, private sector, and civil society, to contribute to policy discussions. This multistakeholder model aligns with the goals of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) and the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), both of which emphasize inclusive participation for sustainable and effective Internet governance. Additionally, the ITU focuses on improving global telecommunications infrastructure, positions it to play a pivotal role in bridging the digital divide, which remains a significant challenge. Efforts in this area are crucial to ensuring that Internet development benefits are equitably distributed, especially in rural and underserved communities, as highlighted by the WSIS+20 review. • It is worth noting that both multilateral and multistakeholder processes need to complement each other in order to achieve the desired digital governance goals. To avoid duplication and ensure cohesive policy development, there should be better alignment between the WSIS/IGF, the GDC, and other relevant processes. Coordinating the roles among the various processes helps streamline global digital governance efforts and make them more impactful. Maintaining the significant global value offered by the Internet, also requires that the sovereignty of countries online be respected and maintained. Sovereign states have the right to devise rules for Internet usage by their citizens as per their national legislations, norms and values. Areas subject to national policies and legislations, include national security, data protection, data provenance, as well as issues related to privacy, online content, competition and governance of emerging technologies. Egypt re-iterates the importance of utilizing existing structures and processes. The WSIS 20-year review, the IGF, the WSIS Forum, and other related efforts and events, besides the UN specialized agency ITU, provide an effective, dynamic, and responsive framework upon which to build a successful post-GDC strategy. Comment from South Africa:The Republic of South Africa has expressed its appreciation and support for NTRA's contribution, particularly in response to the question of how relevant multilateral and multi-stakeholder processes, including UN-based processes such as Summit of the Future, WSIS+20, and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development. The Republic of South Africa emphasized that the ITU should play a more central role in multilateral discussions on Internet development, especially in areas such as cybersecurity, infrastructure development, and standardization as suggested by NTRA.Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:We agree with this contribution. |
| 28. | September 05, 2024 | [Radio Research and Development Institute](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=37) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The contribution addresses one topic: how relevant multilateral and multistakeholder processes such as Summit of the Future, WSIS and the IGF, could address aspects related to Internet development. Summarizing the main ideas of the document, we can say that the development of the Internet is no longer possible without solving the issues of international governance of the global network. One year remains until the UNGA High-level meeting on the overall review of the implementation of the WSIS decisions, including international public policy issues related to the Internet, it`s time to prepare proposals to improve the Internet governance process and tools. |
| 29. | September 09, 2024 | [Germany - The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=40) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The Internet is a powerful tool for economic growth and social inclusion, yet its benefits remain unevenly distributed, particularly among marginalized communities. To strengthen the Internet's role in sustainable development, internet governance requires a holistic approach that addresses all relevant topics from different perspectives – legal, technical, and ethical and responses to acute risks for the fulfilment of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Thus, regulation is needed while being intricately intertwined with human rights concerns, including but not limited to data protection, hate speech, freedom of expression, literacy, access and control of digital infrastructure as well as access to liable and independent information while protecting against surveillance and censorship. It is crucial to focus on inclusive and just digital governance, which ensures equitable access, digital literacy and other forms of capacities to harness opportunities and mitigate risks, as well as robust regulatory frameworks. What framework conditions does the governance of the internet need to leverage its potential for meaningful participation, prosperity, and peace? What framework conditions are necessary to reduce risks affiliated with biased algorithms, surveillance, digital bot armies and cyberattacks, for democratic, inclusive societies and sustainable development? Which partnerships are needed to respond to these challenges? These questions should be at the center for future discussions on “developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet” in order to foster an internet valuable to all users. To find the best answers to these questions, a multistakeholder approach on national, regional, and international level is pivotal, setting up participation structures that enable actors from a wide variety of capacities, interests, sectors and geographies the same opportunities to shape the future of internet. Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:We agree that regulation is needed in certain areas. |
| 30. | September 10, 2024 | [United Arab Emirates - TDRA](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=41) | Given that the global and diverse nature of the Internet, multilateral and multi-stakeholder approaches are essential for addressing different elements of Internet growth. Experts have consolidated a comprehensive response to the questions in the attached document. |
| 31. | September 24, 2024 | [Rwanda](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-feb2024.aspx?ListItemID=45) | Rwanda’s Contribution to the open consultation of the ITU Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues (CWG-Internet) Comment from South Africa:The Republic of South Africa has expressed its appreciation and support for Rwanda's contribution, particularly in response to the question of how we can promote international multi-stakeholder cooperation on public policy issues focused on promoting the development aspects of the Internet. The Republic of South Africa emphasised the need for creating policy frameworks for collaboration. These frameworks should be developed through multi-stakeholder consultations to reflect the needs of different regions and sectors as suggested by Rwanda.  |
|  | Date | Submitter(Contributions hyperlinked) | Response |
| 32. | October 29, 2021 | [Association for Proper Internet Governance](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=6)  | Summary provided in the Contribution:As an OCED report states: “ICTs, including the Internet, are having profound environmental impacts, both positive and negative.” ICTs, including the Internet, have greatly improved the efficiency of production and transportation processes, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions. However, increased efficiency has resulted in lower costs and higher demand. It is not obvious that increased demand would have occurred without ICTs, and it is not obvious whether the efficiencies realized thanks to ICTs have been offset by the greater demand. Thus, it is very difficult to quantify the net impact of ICTs on the environment. The direct negative effects of ICTs and the Internet on the environment are essentially their contributions to environmental pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. E-waste constitutes a significant, and worsening, environmental issue. It is being combated by a number of programs, including in ITU. In our view, states should consider acceding to the 2012 International Telecommunication Regulations, whose article 11 states: “Member States are encouraged to adopt energy-efficiency and e-waste best practices taking into account the relevant ITU-T Recommendations.” As far as we are aware, this is the only treaty-level provision relating to e-waste. While certain (mostly OECD) Member States support ICT-related proposals in trade agreements (including in WTO), we are not aware of any proposals regarding e-waste in trade agreements. We note in passing that the very same states that support ICT-related proposals in binding treaty-level trade agreements object to discussing such proposals in ITU, on the grounds that treaty-level provisions are not necessary, cannot be sufficiently flexible, and could hamper innovation. This appears inconsistent. Regarding greenhouse gas emissions, it appears that the ICT industry’s contribution is comparable to that of the aviation industry, and that the Internet accounts for a significant proportion of global energy consumption and the consequent greenhouse gas emissions. ITU Recommendation L.1470 provides guidance on how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the ICT sector. A small number of web sites, including adult entertainment sites and gaming sites, account for a significant proportion of web traffic and thus of greenhouse gas emissions. News also accounts for a significant proportion, but a significant proportion of news is misleading (fake news). This is due to the current advertising-driven revenue model. A tax on digital advertising could reduce the volume of collected data, and thus reduce the consumption of electricity Data centers and content delivery networks also account for a significant proportion of greenhouse gas emissions (for example, it has been estimated that Bitcoin consumes as much electricity as countries like Indonesia or Sweden). International data flows also account for a significant proportion of greenhouse gas emissions. Undesirable international data flows can also be reduced by enabling users to control what data are collected and stored, as is done by the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Unnecessary international data flows can also be reduced by promoting data localization, and customs duties on international data flows, including for e-commerce. Consequently, the current WTO moratorium on customs duties for e-commerce should be abrogated, and there should be no international agreements limiting data localization requirements, or preventing national limitations of cross-border data flows. While robocalls (which are facilitated by the Internet) do not account for much traffic, most of them do not appear to provide social or economic benefits, thus their suppression would seem to be a priority item and indeed many countries, and the ITU, are taking measures to combat illegitimate robocalling. At present, the Internet is a “best effort” network, that does not allocate priority to any particular type of traffic, so reasonable quality of service is achieved by allocating the bandwidth that will likely satisfy peak demand. Use of a signaling network might achieve higher efficiency, and thus less use of electricity for the same throughput. It is suggested that studies be initiated on the use of signaling networks to improve the efficiency of Internet traffic. The respective roles of stakeholders are clearly set forth in paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda, however, we suggest a refinement that would more clearly specify the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders. |
| 33. | November 12, 2021 | [FAO](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=7) | Summary provided in the Contribution:Environmental sustainability is a global priority and digital technologies, including geospatial tools and applications, have revealed over the last decades their full potential to play a critical role in targeting, monitoring and evaluating environmental and climate change risks mitigation and adaptation investments. As highlighted by the most recent and current events, and forums at the highest level, enshrined by COP 26, it is now clearer than ever that we can only rise to environmental challenges that include climate crisis by working together and FAO´s work over the last years has been concretely contributing to meeting these challenges.FAO´s mandate includes supporting and assisting countries in their transformation towards more efficient, inclusive, resilient and sustainable agri-food systems for better production, better nutrition, a better environment, and a better life. The organization´s Big Fours, leaving no one behind. Through its new and strengthened focus on Digital for impact, especially with its Hand in Hand geospatial platform and subsequent agro informatics tools, FAO´s work aims at enabling digital capabilities for decision makers in our actual world challenging context, strengthening collaboration with people, academia, business and other international organizations to achieve common goals for environmental sustainability worldwide. |
| 34. | November 20, 2021 | [Association for Proper Internet Governance](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=8)  | Summary provided in the Contribution:While spam does not account for much traffic, it does not appear to provide social or economic benefits, thus its suppression would seem to be a priority item in order to reduce electricity consumption which has a negative environmental impact. Developed countries who previously opposed treaty-level provisions regarding spam are now promoting such provisions in WTO. Since more countries are members of ITU than of WTO, it would appear logical that developed countries should now promote similar anti-spam provisions in the ITU’s International Telecommunication Regulations. |
| 35. | November 23, 2021 | [United Nations world food programme CERFAM KEPT](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=10) | Text provided in the comment box: The innovative ideology product solution is titled "Accessibility and inclusive development in the food value chains". The activities of the food value chains is interlinked to the innovative ideologies of the subject areas of the accessibility and inclusive development. Particularly, the persons with hearing impairment, visual impairment and so on and so forth are included in the supply demand management of the food systems and the food value chains |
| 36. | December 2, 2021 | [Sustainable Digital Infrastructure Alliance (SDIA)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=11) | Summary provided in the Contribution:Digital technologies have a profound impact on the environment, yet is an area that has largely been ignored by policymakers and regulators. Given the breadth and complexity of the digital infrastructure ecosystem, which spans more than 30 industries globally, it is critical that the relationship between digital technologies and the environment receives greater scrutiny so that we can truly foster a sustainable digital economy. With our replies below to the four questions that the CWG-Internet poses, we seek to highlight the knowledge gaps that exist while also highlighting important resources and recommendations. As the ITU examines the relationship between digital technologies and the environment, we encourage Member States to work with digital infrastructure and ICT industry members, the rich community of academics, technical community members, and nongovernmental organizations working on ICT sustainability issues, and local and regional governments to holistically and collaboratively address the challenges we face across silos and stakeholder groups. Specifically, we recommend that Member States commit to creating a more enabling policy and regulatory environment for sustainability, in-line with Paris Climate Agreement commitments, SDG targets, and other relevant international frameworks, and assist in making the business case for sustainability by demonstrating the value that it brings to people and communities, the planet, and economic growth. An important step in realizing this would be to facilitate the creation of a global, unified, and transparent reporting scheme capturing the most important metrics to measure the environmental impact of the Internet and the supporting digital infrastructure.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe largely support the comments in this contribution. |
| 37. | December 7, 2021 | [AICEP](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=13) | Text Provided in the comment box:ICT has been always seen as an important ally in the global effort against climate changes because of its disruptive capacity to transform processes and practices in every economic sector. With the internet and the different digital devices which surround us nowadays, many people is able to work from home, without going to their working places, and as such, without contributing to the increase of global heating. However that potential has not been fully used and the digital infrastructures as well as digital products of high energy use, are growing without control. The energy consumption related to ICT’s has been increasing 9% year after year, with consequent effects in the greenhouse emissions. ICT sector is seen of paramount importance to mitigate the causes and to adapt to climate changes. However in general terms the direct and indirect environmental impacts related to the growing use of digital equipment are constantly being undermined due to the small dimension of the devices and the invisibility of the related infrastructure. Therefore the changes of consumption patterns towards a digital sobriety, especially in developing countries, may give rise to a digital transition aligned with the global concerns with climate changes. A balanced digital transition has to do basically with the purchase of low energy consumption devices, which do not need to be charged often, and to reduce the unnecessary use of high energy consumption devices. To-day the digital transition generates a strong increase of the ICT’s carbon footprint, seen in the energy used to produce and use of equipment (such as servers, networks and terminals) which have been growing at an yearly rate of 9%. Yet the digital consumption is highly uneven. The excessive digital consumption is not a global phenomenon, it is caused by the rich countries, which use more digital devices and more energy to operate them. If we change our relationship with digital technologies, from an excessive consumption to a more balanced use, one may reduce the energy consumption by 1,5% yearly. All of us like to buy broadband plans, and other internet connection without even considering their impact on our environment. This is getting serious as the use of the internet is becoming more common compared to the past times. All of us need to be conscious about this fact and start educating ourselves along with the creation of awareness from those who are ignorant about it. We all use the internet to communicate with others, to use the same for hosting video conference calls or just to call one’s family. The fact remains that we all use the internet increasingly more these days on account of the fact that we can now carry out several tasks from being online. And thanks to IOT, or internet of things, the ways and means through which we can use the net to control our immediate environment has grown tenfold in the last few years. Although we are not yet living in a dystopian world, we may as well be there given the sheer amount of time that each one of us spends online. Given this, it is time that we took a closer look at some of the positive and negative impacts of the internet and the way it is being utilized today.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe largely support the comments in this contribution. |
| 38. | December 7, 2021 | [Association for Proper Internet Governance](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=14)  | Summary provided in the contribution: We present here elements take from the European Green Party report Digital technologies in Europe: An environmental life cycle approach. Digital technologies have a considerable environmental impact, and this impact is mainly material. 40% of the environmental impacts of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) are due to the depletion of metal resources and the use of fossil resources, mainly to manufacture the devices. Digital technologies for European use alone accounts for 40% of the sustainable GHG emissions budget of Europe to stay below 1.5°C. Almost 10% of European electricity consumption is devoted to digital technologies. Key recommendations include fewer, longer lasting and more sustainable digital devices. To reduce the number of devices, make them multifunctional. Fight all forms of obsolescence by extending the legal duration of software update periods to a minimum of 5 years. Increase reuse rates by moving from proprietary systems to interoperable and open ones and making the right to return compulsory. Incentivise the durability of products, second hand purchases and refurbishment with consumer protection. |
| 39. | December 8, 2021 | [U.S. Council for International Business (USCIB)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=15) | Text provided in comment box:The U.S. Council for International Business (USCIB) is pleased to participate in the CWG-Internet’s Open Consultation, “The Environmental Impacts and Benefits of the Internet.” USCIB is a trade association composed of more than 300 multinational companies, law firms, and business associations from every sector of the U.S. economy, with operations in every region of the world. In particular, USCIB Members include a broad cross-section of the global companies in the information and communications technology (ICT) sectors as well as leading users of ICTs. We welcome this opportunity to offer a multi-sectoral perspective on this very timely issue. We note that USCIB tackled the question of how existing and emerging digital technologies may be mobilized to address climate change as part of the 2020 Internet Governance Forum (IGF). Specifically, this workshop, “Tech for the Planet”, explored how technologies that have enabled and sustained the digital transformation of the economy have been leveraged to mitigate damage to the environment and reduce the carbon footprints of consumers, business, and governments. The IGF published a workshop report that provides a useful summary of the key policy questions and recommendations resulting from the workshop that may be useful to the ITU CWG-Internet as part of this consultation. Data Collection and Data Flows -- It goes without saying that the Internet has enabled the continued innovation of digital technologies and their transmission to address a broad array of environmental challenges. In terms of improving the impact the Internet has on the environment and taking advantage of its potential to help address climate-related issues, experts have underscored the importance of data collection and appropriate Internet platforms and technologies (e.g. Artificial Intelligence) to house, understand, analyze and aggregate data to address specific environmental challenges. In addition, the OECD noted that “…transborder data flows can also facilitate collaboration between governments to improve their policy-making at international level. They can help strengthen collective commitment and efforts across borders to support greater public sector transparency, contribute to addressing global challenges as defined for instance by Sustainability Goals (SDGs)…” Accordingly, it is increasingly important that global policy makers recognize that criticality of the free flow of data across borders, subject to legitimate security and privacy concerns. Policies and regulations that impede cross-border data flows or mandate the localization of data undermine the potential to tap Internet-enabled technologies to address environmental challenges. Harmonized and Complementary Standards – Experts have underscored that both technical and corporate standards are needed to ensure both technology interoperability and access to and use of the Internet as a transmission mechanism as well as to promote “green” best practices. Each set of standards complements the other, it has been emphasized. Such corporate standards would complement the technical work underway in non-governmental international standards-setting bodies like the ISO and IEEE, both of which are helping to ensure interoperability of digital technologies designed to reduce carbon or protect oceans, rivers, or other water sources. Accordingly, USCIB strongly encourages governments to support policies that allow the free flow of data across borders, subject to legitimate security and privacy concerns. Harmonized technical standards are best realized through existing international standards-setting bodies, such as the ISO and the IEEE, not through top-down governmental mandate. The promotion of common corporate standards should be encouraged as part of a broader, cross-sectoral effort by business to realize COP 26 climate change goals. Multistakeholder Approach – USCIB has emphasized in statements before various global forums that the the multistakeholder model for Internet governance continues to be the best method to enable whole-of-society/whole-of-government consideration of Internet policy issues that is grounded in democratic values and the principles of transparency, accountability, and consensus. Given the rapid pace of technological change, governments need the perspectives provided by business, the technical community, and civil society to better understand what policies are commercially viable, technically feasible, offer adequate user protections, and avoid unintended consequences. The contributions of all stakeholders produce a flexible policy environment critical to empowering the rapidly evolving digital economy. The highly disruptive impacts of environmental degradation suffered by people throughout the world makes such multistakeholder participation even more important to ensure that the Internet functions in a stable, secure, and resilient manner to facilitate technology solutions to climate change. Governments play an important role as they set and agree on regulation, legislation, and international treaties and agreements that address environmental challenges. Local nongovernmental organizations representing civil society are essential participants as they are effective in furthering the understanding of governments about local culture and related concerns. The business voice is critical to inform deliberations about what is technically feasible and commercially available. The synergy of the multi-stakeholder process is needed to bring all parties together and achieve maximum impact. Examples of Internet-enabled Innovations – We provide several examples of how business is using or promoting the development of digital technologies, including through partnerships with customers and other third parties, to help mitigate the environmental challenges threatening our planet.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe do not agree that free flow of data will help to reduce the environmental impact of the Internet. On the contrary, it likely exacerbates it, for the reasons set forth in our contribution.We do not agree that the current Internet governance arrangements (the so-called multi-stakeholder model) are appropriate. On the contrary, we find that they have at times failed to result in appropriate outcomes, as set forth in our previous contributions to CWG-Internet, see in particular:  <http://www.apig.ch/CWG-Internet%202017-2ter.pdf> In fact, multi-stakeholder models are generally not fit for purpose, see:  <https://www.msi-integrity.org/not-fit-for-purpose/> And they have not worked well for specific aspects of Internet governance, see:  <http://www.apig.ch/Chatam%20IG%20formatted%20final.pdf> And:  <http://www.boundary2.org/2021/03/multistakeholder-internet-governance-still-doesnt-live-up-to-its-pr-review-of-palladino-and-santaniello-legitimacy-power-and-inequalities-in-the-multistakeholder-internet-governance/> |
| 40. | December 9, 2021 | [United Kingdom - Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=16)  | Summary provided in the contribution:Both a vital tool for climate action and a key contributor of greenhouse gas emissions, the Internet has a range of positive and negative impacts on the environment. The Covid-19 pandemic in particular has shed light on some of the benefits the Internet can offer. With interactions ranging from international meetings to social gatherings and school classrooms going online, the Internet has proved itself to be a critical alternative to in-person interactions and thus an effective way of reducing high-emission travel. At the same time, the Internet continues to be an important tool for directly monitoring and responding to climate change, be it by optimising energy use in homes, forecasting extreme weather events or facilitating research on sustainable energy sources. However, despite the Internet’s positive contribution to environmental issues, it must not be forgotten that the Internet itself, or at least the Infrastructure supporting it, is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. According to a 2020 publication by The Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, ICTs account for about 4 percent of global electricity consumption, and 1.4 percent of global carbon emissions. Furthermore, the growing quantity of E-waste, also known as waste electrical and electronic equipment, is another major threat to the wellbeing of our planet. An Open Consultation is an excellent opportunity to build knowledge and develop strategies to address these issues, thus harnessing the potential of the Internet to build a greener future for all.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe fully support the comments in this contribution. |
| 41. | December 10, 2021 | [Latin American Institute of Terraforming](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=17) | Summary provided in the contribution:According to a November 2021 survey of IPCC scientists, a large majority believe that we are heading for a 3,0°C global temperature increases due to political inaction. In this context, it is urgent to rethink the role of digitalization and its contribution to global warming, according to the scientific evidence. It is risky to assume that the new efficiencies enabled by ICT will suddenly start creating significant carbon savings in the economy at large, without a strategic role for governance. Therefore, the catalytic role of the ITU must be even more critical, assertive, and decisive for the challenge of the climate crisis so as to be able to drive digital environmental justice. To this end, we suggest five actions (of many others that can be implemented), based on scientific evidence, that can be considered by ITU around greenhouse gas emissions due to ICT use: 1. Adopt the precautionary approach on the contribution of ICTs to energy efficiency and, consequently, to their supposed contribution to reducing CO2 emissions from other sectors. Until scientific consensus indicates more unambiguous evidence for action (which relates to our proposal number 2), the precautionary principle should be standard for ITU, industry, and States. 2. Promoting multidisciplinary and independent scientific research, both empirical and theoretical, on the environmental impact of ICTs (especially the digital rebound effect and the intensive use of other natural resources). 3. Encourage States and the ICT industry, as well as industrial sectors benefiting from the innovations of digitization, to produce standardized open data on energy use and the environmental impact of technologies in their production areas. This is key for our proposal one and two. 4. Promote with the States standardized methodologies and incentives that encourage ICT sector companies, differentiated according to their size and sector, to commit to achieving net-zero or carbon-negative emissions before 2050, and establish a detailed roadmap of sectoral targets.5. Promote initiatives for enterprising States to stimulate innovative, socially acceptable, and sustainable technological developments and policies with all stakeholders. Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe largely support the comments in this contribution. |
| 42. | December 13, 2021 | [Global Rus Trade](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=19) | Text provided in comment box:Technological development and digitalization, which are huge trends nowadays, have a controversial impact on the environment. On the one hand, the development of ICT leads to the appearance of “green” technologies and tighter connectivity in the world’s society. On the other hand, digital infrastructure and consumers’ utilisation of the equipment significantly increase our carbon footprint. But I believe that future technological innovations will help to significantly reduce the damage done to the environment. To take advantage of the Internet's potential to help address climate-related issues now 1) we need to ensure equal access to the Internet 2) give people opportunities to learn basic knowledge of the Internet and some digital skills and 3) share information about climate-related issues and raise awareness. Also, it is important to 1) bring all the stakeholders together to elaborate joint solutions and recommendations and 2) develop a public-private partnership to reach common goals. |
| 43. | December 13, 2021 | [IBIS](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=20) | Text provided in comment box: Contribution of Intellectual Property in Ecological Solutions is very important. |
| 44. | December 13, 2021 | [State Corporation "Rostec"](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-sep2020.aspx?ListItemID=15)  | Summary provided in the Contribution:Internet and environment – both play a big role in modern society. But, the more we focus on the internet and its potential, the less attention we pay to nature, climate, and environment. To bring things back to the balance, we have to recognize real opportunities to use internet applications for enhancing environment we live in.As for our company, we lead and execute a project in the area of Internet of Things (IoT) with close collaboration and support from Russia’s government. We believe, that combining our knowledge and products in sustainable solutions (water quality monitoring, air pollution sensors, manufacturing management & optimization IT-systems and etc.) with the IoT technology could bring a tailored tool for reducing negative impact on environment and climate to the majority of industrial facilities in Russia.But we suppose, that one-sided initiatives can’t last long without a reliable support of other stakeholders. We believe, that true success can be achieved in the satiation, where:1) Policy makers set up an obligatory frame for transition to sustainable solutions;2) The government has a clear view on what have to be achieved and supports the most relevant initiatives;3) There is a confirmed demand from partners, which share a common view on environment problems and the need to solve them. |
| 45. | December 13, 2021 | [PJSC Rostelecom](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=22) | Text provided in comment box:Damage to the environment by Internet is defined as all digital activities that generate greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, this is a negative impact of external use of new technologies that usually remains unknown to consumer, while the digital world significantly adversely affects the environment creating a sizeable carbon footprint: 4% of all greenhouse gases. Owing to their intangible external appearance, digital technologies are usually considered as a tool that has no direct impact on the environment. However, digital technologies are indeed tangible and depend on a physical infrastructure such as data centers and kilometers of cables used for transmitting antennas.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe largely support the comments in this contribution, in particular the reference to the 2012 ITRs at the end of the contribution. |
| 46. | December 13, 2021 | [Government Offices of Sweden](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=23) | Summary provided in the Contribution:Governments and policy-makers need to find urgent answers to protect populations already affected by climate change and its effects on everyone’s lives. Using digital technology and data is necessary to develop competitiveness and create climate benefits - both in the short and long term.It´s urgent to act swiftly in order to reduce the carbon footprint of the digital economy as well as the need for accelerated digitalization in order to grasp the full potential in reduced co2 emissions. |
| 47. | December 13, 2021 | [Telefonica S.A.](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=24)  | Text provided in comment box:Digital technologies and services are key for the decarbonization of other sectors. In particular, modern connectivity and high-capacity networks are important enablers of more efficient and greener economies. We believe it is vital putting in place policy and regulatory approaches (including sustainable financing) that would incentivise investment in fibre roll-out and 5G deployment by: • Reviewing policies to bring down the cost of deployment of 5G and fibre networks. • Reducing barriers to develop and deploy of digitally-enabled services. • Promoting voluntary network sharing agreements. • Providing incentives like tax benefits, fee reductions and more, for environmentally efficient ICT solutions. • Ensuring all sustainable finance instruments support digital solutions and networks. • Promoting Big Data storage and analysis functional to the achievement of carbon neutrality. |
| 48. | December 13, 2021 | [Association for Progressive Communications (APC)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=26) | Text provided in the Contribution:We cannot afford to underestimate the environmental impacts of the internet and digital technologies. The large-scale extraction of raw materials, such as lithium, have devastated natural ecosystems and deepened ecological crises, particularly in the global South. Communities in the global South are disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and air and water pollution caused by the production, use and disposal of electronic devices. Moreover, the internet and digital technologies are increasingly being used to censor, surveil, threaten and attack environment defenders, and to spread disinformation about the science of climate change. At the same time, the internet and digital technologies are being harnessed to raise public awareness and to advocate and act collectively for meaningful change. There is enormous potential for the internet and digital technologies to contribute to environmental justice and sustainability; however, this potential will be unrealised without addressing the root causes of the environmental impacts of the internet, and substantial investment in local community-led initiatives to monitor changes in ecosystems, collectively prepare for extreme weather, and mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change. Regulation of the information and communications technology (ICT) sector can help to address the worst environmental impacts of the internet. Mitigating the negative environmental impacts of the internet and digital technologies requires precautionary approaches, greater transparency and accountability across the ICT sector, and shifting priorities towards durability, repairability and sustainability of ICT infrastructure. Innovation and collaboration to reduce the negative environmental impacts of the internet must centre the experiences of environmental rights defenders and communities most affected in order to uphold the right to a healthy environment for everyone, everywhere.Comment from Association for Proper Internet GovernanceWe fully support the comments in this contribution. |
| 49. | December 14, 2021 | [Mauritius Ministry of Information Technology, Communications and Innovation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=27) | Text taken from the Contribution (no summary provided):What effects does the Internet have on the environment and vice-versa? The Internet has helped reducing paper wastage through online services. The Government has implemented over a hundred e-services to facilitate citizens and businesses transactions, and in doing so, has helped to reduce paper usage. E-commerce has also helped to reduce demand for utilities (power, water etc.) that would have been needed to run physical stores. On the other hand, the Internet consumes huge amounts of electricity. The carbon footprint is mainly a result of the power required to keep necessary infrastructure running. Mobile phone antennas, the devices used to access the Internet, and data centres require large amounts of electricity. Data centres contribute around 0.3% to overall carbon emissions, whereas the information and communications technology sector (including digital devices, mobile-phone networks and televisions) accounts for more than 2% of global emissions[[1]](#footnote-1).  Intricately associated with the Internet is e-waste. As most devices have a limited lifetime, many of these devices have a negative impact on the environment if they are not properly disposed.How can we improve the impact the Internet has on the environment and take advantage of its potential to help address climate-related issues? Use of green (renewable) energy to power Internet infrastructure and services. E.g. Use alternative cooling mechanisms for data centres. Mauritius is surrounded by sea water and cooling systems can be developed using deep ocean water. The Internet, through website, blogs, social media etc., provides an easily accessible platform to sensitize the population about environment protection. Online petitions are becoming more popular and can be used as a tool to advocate for environmental causes. The Internet provides numerous avenues for collecting, distributing and analyzing environmental information, making it available to greater numbers of researchers, reducing redundancy and increasing capacity to understand the complex global ecosystem. Thus, the Internet can be used to monitor the current state of the environment. Using emerging technologies like IoT (Internet of Things), drones, artificial intelligence etc., various monitoring can be carried out e.g. air quality, water quality, imminent disaster like earthquake, floods detection etc. Digital applications through the Internet can help in supporting implementation of environmental laws, through data capture and monitoring. The Internet has the potential to help the Government accelerate into an eco-friendly, low-carbon economy. For example, Korea has initiated a Green New Deal and a Digital New Deal which aim to propel the country into a Green Digital economy. Some key projects identified under these initiatives are: o Green and smart schoolso Promote digital innovation of urban and industrial spaceso Digital twin – Create high-resolution 3D maps for the country and build smart management systems for old underground public utilities facilitieso Digital SOC: Adopt C-ITS (an intelligent transportation system that implements environment-friendly transportation) to major routes, install IoT sensors on railroads and build 4th generation wireless networks for railwayWhat role should stakeholders play in shaping the environmental impacts and benefits of the Internet? Government can impose regulations that can force the Public to adopt better technologies that can help to decrease emissions. The Energy Efficiency (Labelling of Regulated Machinery) Regulations 2017 provides for mandatory energy efficiency labels on certain types of domestic appliances and provides clearer energy savings information for the Public.  Government has already taken initiatives towards green environment through the procurement of greener equipment with features like registration with EPEAT/EU Ecolabel, Energy Star compliance. Private companies are also tapping on the use of the Internet to provide online services and digital communication. Many companies have reduced paper statements and use email communication instead. The Government also provides many online services. As an example, all tax filings for the Mauritius Revenue Authority have to be submitted online. Government is also making accessible open datasets on the Open Data Portal which includes data regarding environment.What are the policy, regulatory and other relevant matters associated with the environmental impacts and benefits of the Internet? Legislations/policies can be enacted to:o Promote adoption of greener appliances related to the use of Internet (PCs, laptops, network devices etc.).o Limit paper use in favour of online communication and services.o Compel labelling of raw materials used in the manufacture of equipment for better recycling and disposal decisions.o Promote e-waste recycling e.g. enforcement of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) which is an environmental policy approach in which producers take responsibility for the management of products after becoming waste.Comment from Association for Proper Internet Governance:We fully support the comments in this contribution. |
| 50. | December 14, 2021 | [EMEA Satellite Operators Association (ESOA)](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=28) | Summary provided in the Contribution:The Pandemic provides a good backdrop to the topic of this consultation. With lockdowns across multiple countries, the need for universal connectivity has become very clear and real in a way that policymakers perhaps did not realise. Similarly, the positive effect lockdowns had on the environment also did not go unnoticed. Hence, connectivity and climate are both important considerations; they are not unrelated and as noted in this submission, should be given greater consideration together. |
| 51. | December 14, 2021 | [Centre for Global IT Cooperation](https://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/display-oct2021.aspx?ListItemID=29) | Text provided in comment box:Internet, being inherently an information technology, provides the information and decision medium for monitoring and information support of natural resource management systems, such as those at municipal and utilities level. The improvement of information systems currently opens up opportunities for more efficient allocation and use of resources, such as transport, water, electricity. Just like in agriculture, monitoring the environment is an important application area where new opportunities for more granular and detailed monitoring and management emerge from innovation in ICTs. Implementation tests for real0life smart cites are underway in Australia and China, transforming the city environment with a number of important and possibly ambiguous technological components: - "smart" street lighting; - urban Wi-Fi network, covering most of the urban open space, with the ability to inform the public, and anonymized monitoring of the situation; - video surveillance systems combined with video analytics systems, face recognition based on AI technologies to ensure a safe urban environment and the suppression of offenses; - microclimate sensors for monitoring the situation, analytics and decision-making on the operation of microclimate management systems; - parking sensors and payment systems; - a big data platform that integrates multimodal data from various sensors to improve decision-making on city management. A few other areas to be shortly transformed by internet application include: - sensor networks using LPWAN family of technologies, providing cost effective way to reduce environmental footprint of agriculture and infrastructure projects by more efficient allocation of scares resources; - digital transformation of global value chains, enabled by internet connectivity can improve efficiency of use of environmental resources; - sharing economy enabled by the internet can reduce the total resource consumption. Regulations generally, need to protect the right to safe and healthy living environment, with minimal constraints to innovation to prevent unmitigated unacceptable harm to persons, society and the state. Clear and predictable management of responsibility of technology providers is also essential for innovative enterprises to mitigate the uncertainties inherent with new technologies.  |
|  |  |  | General Comments received from Canada:1. Full support for the Multistakeholder Model of Internet Governance 2. Full support for the IGF 3. Request for CWG-INT to be open to all stakeholders in particular the Internet Technical Community 4. Full support for the interventions of ICANN, ISOC, Article 19 and others 5. Special support to APC |
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