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1. **Introduction**

**1.1.** The eighteenth meeting of the CWG-Internet was held on 18 October 2023. The Vice Chair - European Region, Mr. Nigel Hickson, was Acting Chair on behalf of the Chair of CWG-Internet, Mr. Wojciech Berezowski, who joined the meeting remotely.

**1.2** ITU Deputy Secretary-General Mr. Tomas Lamanauskas welcomed participants to the eighteenth meeting of CWG-Internet. Noting that this was the first meeting of CWG-Internet following Plenipotentiary Conference 2022 and Council 2023, he also welcomed the new Chair and Vice-Chairs, reiterated the secretariat’s support to the Group, and highlighted the importance of the Group in facilitating global discourse on international Internet-related public policy issues and contributing to the WSIS+20 review process.

**1.3** The Chair thanked the ITU Deputy Secretary-General for his presence and support for the meeting. He welcomed the new Vice Chairs of the Group, emphasized the need for active participation and engagement of the members, and stressed on the need to reach agreement on topics for open consultation for the following cycle. He invited the Acting Chair to conduct the meeting.

**2.** **CWG-Internet-18/1: Agenda of the meeting**

The Acting Chair presented the Agenda (CWG-Internet-18/1(Rev.1)). The Agenda was adopted.

**3. Presentation of working methods and terms of reference of CWG-Internet based on PP Res. 102 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022), Council Res. 1336 (Mod. 2019) and Council Res. 1305 (Mod. 2019)**

**3.1** The Acting Chair presented relevant excerpts of the above-mentioned resolutions to highlight the working methods and terms of reference of the Group contained therein. These were noted by the Group.

**3.2** Memberstook the floor to welcome the new Chair and Vice Chairs of the CWG-Internet and commended the informational session organized during IGF 2023. A member highlighted the discussions on Res. 102 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) at the 2022 ITU Plenipotentiary Conference, noting the updated mandate contained in it.

**4. CWG-Internet 18/4: Secretariat report on ITU Internet Activities: Resolutions 101, 102, 133, 180 and 206**

**4.1** This report summarizes ITU’s activities related to Plenipotentiary Conference (PP) Resolution 101 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022), “Internet Protocol-based networks”; Resolution 102 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022), “ITU’s role with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses”; Resolution 133 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022), “Roles of administrations of Member States in the management of Internationalized (multilingual) domain names”; Resolution 180 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022), “Promoting deployment of Internet Protocol version 6” and Resolution 206 (Dubai, 2018), “OTTs”.

**4.2** One member suggested that future iterations of the Internet Activities Report should provide more information relating to implementation of ITU activities on Res. 206 (Dubai, 2018) on OTTs. A member commended the level of industry participation in ITU Study Groups, while another member emphasized the need for strengthening multi-stakeholder collaboration and increasing ITU participation in activities ongoing in other relevant forums.

4.3 The Acting Chair asked secretariat to take the comments into consideration in preparation of future versions of the Report. The Group noted the Internet Activities Report.

**5. Summary and Discussion of Contributions from Member States on topics for the next CWG-Internet Open Consultation**

The Acting Chair invited each of the contributors (in the order listed in the Agenda) to briefly present their proposals to the Group. The CWG examined the various contributions, which were noted by the Group. The summaries of the contributions (as submitted by the authors of the documents) and the corresponding discussions are provided below:

**5.1 Summary of Contributions CWG-Internet-18/3, CWG-Internet-18/4, CWG-Internet-18/6, CWG-Internet-18/8 and CWG-Internet-18/9**

5.1.1 **CWG-Internet-18/3: Contribution by Brazil (Federative Republic of), China (People’s Republic of), Cuba (Republic of), and Russian Federation**

This contribution proposes topics for the subsequent open consultation based on the latest modifications on Plenipotentiary Resolution 133 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) and Plenipotentiary Resolution 180 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022). Resolution 133 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) invites Member States and Sector Members to consider further promoting the adoption of universal acceptance in respect of IDNs, and Resolution 180 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) turns its focus to the deployment of IPv6, and invites Member States and Sector Members to exchange perspectives and coordinate on IPv6 deployment, conduct relevant training activities, and share best practices. Considering the above updates adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference, this contribution proposes the following two topics for subsequent open consultations:~~.~~

Topic 1 “Promoting and strengthening a truly multilingual internet” includes three aspects: (1) What more could governments and stakeholders do to ensure that the Internet becomes more multilingual in nature and thus accessible for more of the global population? (2) What problems (if any) have ITU member countries and sector members experienced concerning the lack of Universal Acceptance? (3) How ITU, working with ICANN and other interested parties, might help promote Universal Acceptance?

Topic 2 “Promoting IPv6 deployment” intends to inspire countries and regions that have decided to deploy IPv6 and are experiencing difficulties in implementing it to catch up with others, and to help them fully enjoy the benefits of IP-based telecommunications/ICT networks and the global digital economy. This topic includes three aspects: (1) What enabling role can the governments/policy makers play in promoting IPv6 deployment within their sovereignty? (2) For countries or regions where IPv6 deployment still face challenges, what work can be prioritized, and which stakeholders need to prioritize in awareness raising and capacity building? (3) What are the good practices in mobilizing and supporting multi-stakeholder deployment of IPv6? Especially in the construction of multi-party coordination or communication mechanisms, as well as the capacity building of IPv6 personnel.

5.1.2 **CWG-Internet-18/4: Contribution by the United Kingdom**

For the next open consultation, the Council Working Group was invited to consider the topic: “The role of public policy in promoting Universal Acceptance.”

The proponents of the contribution highlighted that universal acceptance of domain names in different scripts is essential if everyone is to be able to have meaningful access to the Internet and enjoy the benefits it brings.

Universal Acceptance can help to bridge the gap between languages in the world and languages on the Internet, resulting in more meaningful access and potential new business and economic opportunities.

A consultation on this topic would be an excellent opportunity to bring stakeholders together, learn from one another’s experience, foster partnerships and identify the role that public policy can play in supporting this important issue.

The following questions were proposed in the Document:

* What is the impact of Universal Acceptance, or the lack thereof, on communities, economies, businesses and innovation?
* What is the role of public policy? What more could governments, with other stakeholders, do to promote Universal Acceptance, both in the public sector (such as in procurement practices and provision of public services) and in the private sector (in websites and other Internet services)?
* What problems (if any) have ITU member states and sector members experienced concerning the promotion of Universal Acceptance?
* How can the ITU and its members work to promote Universal Acceptance?

The issue of Universal Acceptance requires collaboration and cooperation. As a result, it was also proposed that the CWG-Internet invites a senior representative from ICANN to the CWG-Internet meeting itself to present and discuss directly with Member States the work it is doing on Universal Acceptance, and to consider opportunities for cooperation between ICANN and ITU Member States.

5.1.3 **CWG-Internet-18/6: Contribution by Russian Federation**

The Russian Federation has been consistently proposing for discussion during CWG-Internet meetings critical issues related to challenges in the system of international Internet governance, especially fragmentation of the global network. Taking into account the importance of inputs from representatives of all interested parties and open inclusive dialog, the Russian Federation proposes to hold each open consultation~~s~~ related to the main discussion between Members States at the CWG-Internet session.

During the Tunis phase of the WSIS, civil society set a number of important goals in the formation of the information society, in this regard, it seems appropriate to receive feedback from stakeholders and their assessment of the activities and achievements of Member States on this issue. In advance to the 19th meeting of CWG-Internet, the Russian Federation proposes to hold the next open consultation~~s~~ on the topic: "Assessment of the implementation by member states WSIS outcomes and analysis of implementation by member states the objectives set out in the Tunis agenda for the information society".

5.1.4 **CWG-Internet-18/8: Contribution by Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Morocco, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates**

The proponents of the contribution highlighted that cybercrime is a major global issue that is constantly evolving and growing in scale and complexity. This can include a wide range of offenses, such as identity theft, financial fraud, malware attacks, and data breaches and can have a significant impact on individuals, businesses, and governments, causing economic losses, disruptions to operations, and damage to reputations. The increasing number of Internet users and the growing reliance on digital technologies have made it easier for cybercriminals to operate and have increased the number of potential targets. Cybercrime is also a transnational crime, meaning that it can be committed by criminals in one country against victims in another country. This makes it difficult to investigate and prosecute cybercrime.

5.1.5 **CWG-Internet-18/9: Contribution by Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Morocco, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates**

The Document clarifies the importance of the developmental aspects of the Internet and the major role it plays in the development of societies and economies around the world. However, the benefits of the Internet are not evenly distributed, with developing countries facing challenges in accessing and using it. This is due to a number of factors, including limited technical infrastructure, poor connectivity, weak security, and international public policy issues. Efforts are underway to address these challenges and to make the Internet more accessible to everyone. Governments, businesses, and non-profit organizations are working to improve technical infrastructure, expand connectivity, strengthen security, and develop international public policies that support the development of the Internet.

**5.2 Discussion on Contributions CWG-Internet-18/3, CWG-Internet-18/4, CWG-Internet-18/6, CWG-Internet-18/8 and CWG-Internet-18/9**

5.2.1On the proposal contained in CWG-Internet-18/4 relating to the invitation of an ICANN representative for attending a meeting of the CWG-Internet, some members expressed support for the Group to issue such as invitation, while some members emphasized that the Group is limited to Member States and an invitation could be issued for an ICANN representative to attend an Open Consultation meeting instead.

5.2.2 Each of the topics for open consultation as listed in the aforementioned Contributions was discussed by the Group.

5.2.3 After a discussion on the different contributions the Acting Chair also requested interested members to hold informal consultations to try and reach agreement on a topic for the next consultation or two topics for the next two consultations. He also noted that consideration should be given to the potential for merging two or more of the proposals.

5.2.4 Following informal discussions, proposals on a way forward (including a merged text) were made by different members during the meeting , but the Group could not reach any agreement on a topic.

**6 Summary and Discussion of other Contributions from Member States**

6.1 **CWG-Internet 18/5: Contribution by the Russian Federation**

**6.1.1. Summary of the Contribution**

The Russian Federation proposes to discuss in CWG-Internet the problem of fragmentation of the Internet as a result of uncoordinated regulatory action concerning certain aspects of the Internet. The Russian contribution includes a proposal to consider possible steps to coordinate such action in order to prevent the fragmentation of the Internet and the transformation of the global network into a series of loosely connected national fragments, and to foster internationalization of the Internet governance system.

In this regard, within the framework of the topic "The security, safety, continuity, sustainability, and robustness of the Internet", established by Council Resolution 1305 (Mod. 2019), the Russian Federation proposes to:

* discuss the issues related to the ITU Member States’ regulation of aspects of the Internet concerning critical infrastructure elements/public core at the national and international level;
* call on Member States to share their views on the preparation of international legal instruments that can be used to meet the challenges and address the risks that currently exist in the critical Internet infrastructure governance system and guarantee the integrity, robustness and security of the public core of the global Internet, and prepare, if necessary, recommendations to that effect for the Council.

**6.1.2 Discussion on the Contribution**

* The Group thanked the Russian Federation for submitting this Contribution.
* Some members of CWG-Internet expressed support for the contribution noting its relevance. Some members suggested that the activities proposed by the contribution are beyond the mandate of ITU and this Group, that a multi-stakeholder approach should be the basis for efforts relating to the Internet, and that international law is already applicable to cyberspace.
* The Group noted the Contribution.

**6.2** **CWG-Internet 18/7: Contribution by the Russian Federation**

**6.2.1 Summary of the Contribution**

The Russian Federation proposes to discuss the implementation of the WSIS outcomes by Member States and analyze the implementation of the objectives set out in the Tunis Agenda and confirmed by subsequent UNGA resolutions. There are two years left until the UNGA high-level meeting dedicated to the overall review of the WSIS outcomes implementation, and it is necessary to assess the fulfillment of the objectives set by the Tunis Agenda.

In this regard, within the framework of the topic "The security, safety, continuity, sustainability, and robustness of the Internet", established by Council Resolution 1305 (Mod. 2019), the Russian Federation proposes:

* to organize a discussion in the CWG-Internet with the participation of Member States and all relevant interested parties (through the open consultations, see Document CWG-Internet-18/6) in order to assess the results related the activities/responsibilities of States achieved during the implementation of the Tunis Agenda;
* to define during the discussion priorities for international cooperation of the Member States in the implementation of the Tunis Agenda for the period up to 2025;
* to discuss the development of strengthening cooperation in the future after 2025, according to paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda;
* to propose other actions that Member States in cooperation with other interested parties could take for the process of implementation of the Tunis Agenda;
* to summarize the views expressed during the broad discussion for publication on the ITU official website in the CWG-Internet section and for transmission to the ITU Secretary-General for consideration in preparation for the overall review of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes in 2025.

**6.2.2** **Discussion on the Contribution**

* The Group thanked the Russian Federation for submitting this Contribution.
* The Group noted the Contribution.

**7 Presentation of Chair’s Report**

7.1 Due to time constraints, the Acting Chair informed the meeting that the draft meeting report would be prepared offline and published in advance of the nineteenth meeting of the Group for approval at that meeting.

**8 Any other business**

8.1 The Group thanked the Acting Chair and secretariat for their effective organization and management of the Group.

**9 Closing of the Meeting**

9.1 In closing, the Chair thanked all the ITU Member States who made contributions and participated in the work of the Group (including those who participated remotely), the Acting Chair for his leadership and other Vice-Chairs, the ITU Elected Officials and the secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting.

Mr. Nigel Hickson **(United Kingdom), Acting Chair, CWG-Internet**