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**1 Report by the Chairman of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues (Documents** [**C17/51**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0051/en)**,** [**C17/88**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0088/en)**,** [**C17/90**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0090/en)**,** [**C17/91**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0091/en)**,** [**C17/103**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0103/en) **and** [**C17/105**](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0105/en)**)**

1.1 The Chairman of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues (CWG-Internet) introduced Document C17/51, which summarized the results of the eighth and ninth meetings of CWG-Internet. The Council was requested to provide guidance on the topic for the next open consultation, CWG-Internet having been unable to reach consensus on the two topics under consideration, namely “Bridging the digital gender divide” and “Public policy considerations for OTTs”.

1.2 The councillor from India introduced Document C17/88, which outlined India’s support for public policy considerations for OTTs as the topic for the next open consultation.

1.3 The councillor from China introduced Document C17/90, which proposed that, when determining topics for open consultations, CWG-Internet should give priority to those listed in Council Resolution 1305 (2009), particularly those that had not yet been discussed; and that CWG-Internet might increase, as appropriate, the number of topics to be discussed at each open consultation provided that the quality of the consultations could be ensured.

1.4 The councillor from the UnitedStates introduced Document C17/91 and explained her continued support for the identification of a single topic for the open consultations. The United States proposed discussing SDG 5 on gender equality in a future open consultation, and specifically Target 5.b.

1.5 The councillor from Saudi Arabia introduced Document C17/105, which proposed that both topics under consideration should be the subject of the next open consultation, to be launched immediately after Council-17.

1.6 Councillors recognized the importance of both topics under consideration; however, views diverged. Some councillors and two observers noted that, while gender issues were a priority for ITU, the issue of bridging the digital gender divide had been repeatedly overlooked as a topic for the open consultations and it was now time to translate words into action. Moreover, significant work on OTTs was already being undertaken in ITU-T and ITU-D, and relevant studies should be completed before consideration of the issue by CWG-Internet. One councillor pointed out that the subject of OTTs was sensitive and sometimes went beyond the mandate of ITU. However, others observed that gender issues were addressed in many other United Nations forums whereas ITU was the only body in the United Nations system competent to discuss OTTs. Such services had a huge impact on domestic and international telecommunications, and public policy considerations for OTTs should be considered as a matter of priority, including such issues as security, privacy, and measures to prevent misuse. OTTs could also help to promote ICT uptake among women and were of particular importance for developing countries. The economic implications of OTTs must also be addressed, as should considerations relating to quality of service.

1.7 A number of councillors and two observers said that only one topic should be addressed in the next open consultation. Others, recalling the extensive list of topics set out in Annex 1 to Council Resolution 1305, suggested that, in the interests of expediency, both topics should be considered in parallel provided that such an approach was not detrimental to the discussion process. Some councillors cautioned against such action, which would set a precedent, and could shorten the time for discussion and affect levels of participation.

1.8 The Chairman of CWG-Internet, replying to a question from one councillor, said that no additional burden would arise if the working group was to consider two topics in the open consultation. It should be possible to consider both topics during the next round of open consultations.

1.9 Several councillors and one observer suggested that CWG-Internet should hold an open consultation on public policy considerations for OTTs before the open consultation on bridging the digital gender divide.

1.11 The Chairman proposed that the consultation on the topic of bridging the digital gender divide should take place from June to September 2017, and that the consultation on public policy considerations for OTTs should be held from October 2017 to January 2018.

1.12 Some councillors supported the Chairman’s proposal, and noted that the questions on OTTs should be refined further by CWG-Internet, not by the Council. Others opposed her proposal.

1.13 The Chairman proposed that the Chairman of CWG-Internet hold informal consultations and that the matter be taken up again at a later meeting.

1.14 It was so **agreed**.

1.15 The councillor from Saudi Arabia introduced Document C17/103, in which it was proposed that the secretariat provide a conceptual overall analysis of the issues addressed in the responses to online open consultations and of the points of agreement and concern raised, so as to facilitate careful examination by CWG-Internet of all views at its physical meetings and to enhance efficiency.

1.16 Several councillors and one observer endorsed the proposal, which in their view, was in line with existing United Nations practice.

1.17 Other councillors opposed the proposal. In line with Council Resolution 1344 (MOD 2015), all relevant inputs from stakeholders had to be submitted to CWG-Internet for consideration and all open consultation inputs made available to it. The only other document allowed was the compilation document. That arrangement was working well. While it might be useful to have a statistical analysis of, for example, participation by region, the current compilation document was the most efficient means of reflecting all points of agreement and concern.

1.18 A number of councillors stressed the importance of ensuring the active participation of all stakeholders. One observer noted that CWG-Internet excluded Sector Members and all other stakeholders, and that its proceedings were not transparent; that was not a good way to hold policy discussions.

1.19 Two speakers suggested that existing technological applications might be of assistance to the secretariat and CWG-Internet in extracting information from the inputs received.

1.20 In the absence of a consensus, the Chairman proposed that the divergent views expressed be recorded in the summary record and the matter submitted to PP-18 for decision.

1.21 Several councillors endorsed that proposal. Resolution 102 (Rev. Busan, 2014) instructed the Council to revise its Resolution 1344 establishing the modalities for open consultations. One observer, noting that Resolution 102 (Rev. Busan, 2014) reflected a compromise agreement reached at PP-14, added that any proposals to change that agreement had to be brought to the plenipotentiary conference. Other councillors and one observer expressed surprise that a simple matter pertaining to CWG-Internet's working methods should have to be referred to the plenipotentiary conference. Resolution 102 gave clear instructions so as to enable the implementation of Council Resolution 1344. Given the short amount of time allotted to CWG-Internet meetings, it made sense to ask the secretariat to produce factual analyses of inputs obtained during online open consultations. A decision on the matter should be reached by the Council.

1.22 The Council being divided on her proposal, the Chairman suggested that it might wish to request the secretariat to develop a method for conducting such analyses, for consideration by CWG-Internet at its next meeting, in September 2017.

1.23 That proposal was endorsed by several councillors, including the Chairman of CWG-Internet. The methods currently employed by other groups in ITU were cited as good models for analysis in multistakeholder consultations. Alternatively, the current compilation could be maintained and the secretariat asked to also produce a simple analysis. An observer, considering that there was no reason to question the secretariat's neutrality, proposed that it be asked to draw up a summary of the inputs received, for submission on a trial basis to the next meeting of CWG-Internet; if the product was not deemed useful, a decision to submit the matter to PP-18 could be taken at Council-18.

1.25 In the absence of agreement on the way forward, the Chairman proposed that the Chairman of CWG-Internet engage in informal consultations with councillors with a view to reaching a decision during the current session of the Council.

1.26 It was so **agreed**.

**2 Statement by the Minister of Communications of Nigeria**

2.1 Mr Abdur-Raheem Adebayo Shittu, Minister of Communications of Nigeria, delivered a statement available at the following address: <http://www.itu.int/en/council/2017/Documents/SR/Nigeria.doc>. He announced that his country would be putting forward a candidate for the position of Director of BDT.
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