

ITU PP-18
DUBAI, 29TH OCTOBER – 16TH NOVEMBER
ICANN REPORT

This Report is the outcome of a team effort by members of the GE Team, including Vera, Elena, Veni and Nigel.

Summary

This Plenipotentiary, as predicted, was not easy. Following the relatively calm meeting in Busan (in 2014), held in the wake of the failure of the WCT in 2012, and the somewhat antagonistic WTDC in 2017, it was expected there would be some significant and difficult negotiations, both on the governance of the Union and the work it should take forward. The meeting did not disappoint on either. On the positive front, the three weeks in Dubai were extremely well run, they did conclude with an overall agreement, there were no votes, the elections were well conducted and did, to great acclaim and for the first time, result in the election of a women, Doreen Bogden as director of ITU-T. On the other hand, there were few positive outcomes in terms of the transparency or openness of the Union, the proposals to allow non-governments a greater role were dismissed, and even UN accepted language on sustainability was rejected. More worryingly for the future, the negotiations, rather than reflecting the diversity of cultures and political systems in the Union, were essentially two sided, with, in the main, Europe and the Americas (along with Australasia), pitted against the Arab States, Africa and (in part) China and Russia. This resulted in protracted and rather predictable negotiations, with little being conceded until the last few days of the Conference. Indeed, was it not for good chairmanship, especially in the Working Group of the Plenary (WGPL) and the Plenary itself, we could have had a significant failure.

The Technical Community itself was effective, coordinating well amongst ourselves and making effective contributions, not least through having several members on government delegations.

Looking ahead, the ITU and the Regional Groups have some hard thinking to do. Several experienced “Plenipotentiary” veterans (including most notably the Malaysian Chair of the WGPL) opined that the current model (in the way proposed changes to Resolutions are negotiated) is no longer sustainable. It is too confrontational (as noted above), time consuming and does not facilitate sensible changes. Perhaps the ITU Council could undertake a serious review.

For ICANN, the overall result was generally positive, not least because of the well-received address made by Göran Marby in the Opening Plenary on the first day of the Meeting, this further exemplifying our excellent working relations with the ITU. The changes to the Internet resolutions were kept to the absolute minimum, with the negative language about ICANN, and on the ITU having a remit for policies on certain gTLDs and IDNs not being adopted. Conversely the positive proposals, strengthening obligations on the ITU to work with the Technical Community and opening up the Council WG on Internet to non-government stakeholders, were also not adopted. The new Resolution on OTTs

(including DNS players) will, effectively, limit the ITU's work in this area, and the proposals for a cybersecurity convention in Resolution 103 were not approved.

Of broader significance, a proposed Resolution detailing further ITU work on AI was not agreed, after a long and sometimes bitter dialogue (though this is unlikely to prevent the ITU working in this area) and proposals for a new WCIT (where new ITRs would be discussed) resulted in a compromise in the form of a new Expert Working Group on ITRs. This was probably the most significant achievement of the conference by the Arab, African and RCC Regions.

Facts and Figures

Some numbers concerning the Plenipotentiary

<https://www.itu.int/web/pp-18/en/>

- More than 2300 participants
- 180 countries represented
- 30% of participants were women
- The First woman elected to the administrative team
- 12,000 unique devices connected to conference network
- 80% less paper used in Dubai compared with Busan (which was also a "paperless conference")

Key Resolutions

The Final Acts (ie the compendium of all the agreed language) can be viewed at

<https://www.itu.int/web/pp-18/en/page/61-documents>

Internet Resolutions (101,102, 133 and 180)

These were the Resolutions of the main interest for ICANN, and where, the main concerns were. The proposals, from the Arab Group, included:

- that the ITU should play a role in ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee on behalf of Member States;
- that ccTLD registries should be run as public interest companies;
- that the ITU should be engaged in the development of policy on IDNs;
- that the Council Working Group (CWG) on Internet should make policy recommendations to Council on "international public policy;"
- that references to Digital Object Architecture and DONA be given similar status to ICANN, RIRs and ISOC;
- that the ITU should opine on the delegation of gTLDs which ITU members had concerns on.

In the end, none of these proposals were adopted, nor were proposals from CEPT and CITELE to open up the CWG to non-governments, or to mention ICANN, the RIRs and ISOC in the body of Resolutions (as organisations the ITU should engage with), rather than in the (current) footnote.

Cybersecurity (Resolution 130)

As expected Resolution 130 proved one of the most controversial and fractious issues of the conference. Proposals included:

- development of an international convention on cyberspace;
- update to the ITU's Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA);
- language regarding nation state attacks on CNI (the case for a convention);
- An Indian proposal on Data protection linked to Resolution.

After substantial discussion consensus was reached on a significant amount of new text tasking the ITU to develop an inventory of national, regional and international initiatives on cybersecurity and to look, for instance, at the relationship between cybersecurity and issues such as emerging technologies, institutional arrangements, and challenges faced by SMEs.

Development of ITRs and WCIT – Resolution 146

The Arab Group proposals (backed by Africa) for a new World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) did not find sufficient support so the debate focused on whether or not to continue the work of the Expert Group on the ITRs and what mandate should be adopted. The outcome was an agreement for the formation of an Expert Group with a mandate to be determined by the 2019 Council.

New Resolution on OTTs

There were proposals for a new resolution on OTTs with the Arab Group and RCC proposing to deal with it as a public policy issue requiring ITU intervention led by the Council Working Group on Internet. Conversely, CEPT and CEPT proposals wanted to limit the role of ITU with respect to OTTs to, effectively, studies and reports.

The resolution was debated for over 30 hours with, finally, a text agreed that focussed on cooperation, studies, and dialogue.

New Resolution on Artificial Intelligence

Despite many hours of dialogue there was no agreement in the end for this proposed Resolution. As for OTTs, there was a fundamental difference in views on the extent to which the ITU should be involved in this important work area.

World Telecommunication Policy Forum

The Conference agreed that the next WTPF should be held in the last quarter of 2021 back to back with the WSIS Forum. The WTPF preparatory process will be as for previous Forums but also having on-line public consultation as an integral part. Council will decide the exact dates and themes to be covered, with AI a firm favourite.

Daily Summaries

Day 1; 29th October

Nothing too substantive in this first day of the PP-18. It was though, a good day for ICANN, with Goran Marby making a speech in the afternoon plenary session as a guest, the only one, of the ITU Secretary General. Was a significant moment for ICANN, the first time a CEO has spoken at an ITU Plenipotentiary and a recognition of the maturity of our relationship. We also had our own ICANN flag and seats in the second row....

The formal part of the Day (did not start until midday) saw speeches from the UAE (in the presence of the Prime Minister who did not speak), the Secretary General, the Prime Minister of Vanuatu and the CEO of Afghanistan. The overall theme of the needs to address connectivity through innovative technologies, investment and pragmatic ICT policies came through. though not sure the bulk of the Resolutions do this. The UAE were clearly, and rightly, proud of their achievements and the strides they are making in innovation.

We only had a handful of policy statements, and nothing that significant in them. This tends to be case prior to elections (Thursday).

With Goran, we had a number of informal bilaterals (such as with US, Turkey and Sweden) as well as several other courtesy conversations

Day 2; 30th October

Some more substantive discussions begin including, the holding of the first ad-hoc meeting; this one on Cybersecurity (primarily RES 130). The approach, exemplified in the first Session of the Working Group of the Plenary (WGPL) , was one of business like efficiency. Both Committee 5 (which will take the ITRs) and the WGPL (which takes all the Internet Resolutions, Cybersecurity and OTTs) will meet again tomorrow (Wednesday) with the aim of introducing all proposals, and thus setting up the ad-hocs, before the weekend.

While the process is more efficient than before, especially compared to WTDC last year, this does not mean the task will be any easier. Even in a two-hour discussion on Cybersecurity (see attached composite document of 56 pages) yesterday there was no “give” at all by any delegation. The Arab Group Call for a Cybersecurity treaty (backed by Russia and probably most of Africa but opposed by US/Europe) will be a major issue, as it was in Busan. This time, though, there is so much more evidence of harm. Added to this cluster is the Indian proposal on Data Protection; which also gained some traction (see attached).

The “Internet” Group will be introduced on Wednesday with the associated ad-hoc probably running during the elections on Thursday. On the latter, we had a I* coordination yesterday. While there was a good spirit of cooperation. For ICANN, there was agreement that Resolutions should not criticise or pass judgement on the governance models of other bodies.

Outside of the business Sessions the receptions and election lobbying continues. The US promoting Doreen Bogden (for ITU-D) and the UK promoting Malcolm Johnson. The elections, for the elected posts, Council and the RRB, are on Thursday after which normal service will be resumed.

Goran (with Theresa and team) had another busy day, with bilaterals and corridor talking with governments. We had a formal meeting with Minister Chen (China); a meeting with the acting SG of the CTO, a brief meeting with the Egyptian Minister and an excellent dialogue with the Chair of the Conference (Mr. Majid Al Mesmar).

Day 3; 31st October

The day when the rubber hit the road. While only the third day, the afternoon was dominated by the ad-hoc group on Internet issues; and the immediate focus (in Resolution 102) on the governance of ccTLDs and gTLDs. Over three hours of debate on this issue yielded no real common ground with Africa joining the Arab Group in calling for ITU management of domain names. ICANN and the role of the GAC (as an advisory Committee) was also debated at length. The debate in the ad-hoc will resume on Friday.

Away from the Internet issues some progress was made in the introduction of other proposals (such as on gender issues and role of youth in the ITU) while the delivery of policy statements continued. The minds of many, however, were on the elections with feverish campaigning taking place all day. The UK hosted a lunch hosted by two Ministers, to promote the candidature of Malcolm Johnson while there were receptions tonight from Nigeria (candidate opposing Doreen for ITU-D), Russia, Kuwait and Mexico.

The ad-hoc Group on the Internet Resolutions (101, 102, 133, 180 and 197) was established this morning after the myriad of proposals on the same Resolutions had been introduced. Fabio Bigi (Italy) was appointed Chair, as he had been in Busan in 2014. The first session in the afternoon made almost no progress, and contrary to advice of Secretariat, established two further (informal) ad-hoc groups to look at the disputed *Resolve* clauses. The first of these is essentially on the relationship between the ITU and the likes of ICANN, ISOC etc (the footnoted entities) and will consider the range of

proposals from the expansion of the footnote to include DONA, to the extent to which likes of ICANN have rights under Tunis agenda to discuss public policy issues. This followed a long discussion (see below) during which there was criticism (a lot of dis-information) on the GAC.

Even more focus on ICANN took place when the discussion turned to *Resolves 4* and the Arab Group proposal on asking the ITU to help member States with their management on ccTLDs and gTLDs (the latter being added to their proposal during discussion). Saudi said that the ITU having a role in management of particular gTLD names (*essentially those disputed*) was consistent with the earlier clause urging collaboration between ITU and ICANN. This approach was opposed by Europe, US, CAN, NZ, AUS and Brazil but backed by other Arab countries and some African states. The Chair seemed to be heading towards the logical conclusion that this *Resolves* had insufficient support, but instead set up a second (informal) ad-hoc group. During the latter session Veni (for Bulgaria) pointed out – in a very confused dialogue – the genesis of ccTLDs.

Day 4; 1st November

Election day, and not a lot else. The morning saw the re-election of the ITU SG (Houlin Zhao) who was unopposed for a second term of four years, and the Deputy SG (Malcolm Johnson) who soundly beat Mr Brahima Sanou. In the afternoon, we saw the historic election of the first women to be elected to the ITU leadership, with Doreen Bogden (US) beating her two African opponents to become director of ITU-D. The election to directorship of the Radio sector will be determined tomorrow as neither of the three candidates secured enough votes to win in the first Round, with Mario Maniewicz (staff) the favourite. Dr Cheasub Lee, ITU-T director, was elected unopposed. The elections to the ITU Council and the Radio Regulations Board (RRB) will take place on Monday.

Away from the elections, the WG of the Plenary (WGPL) witnessed the introduction of further proposals on IOT Resolution, on changes to the Resolution 179 (on Child on-line Protection) and new proposals on Artificial Intelligence and OTT Services. On both issues, the Chair decided to have ad-hoc Working Groups. Already the slate is filling up and we have not yet reached the Resolutions on WSIS and ITRs.

Expected ad-hoc Committee work on Cybersecurity (RES 130) did not take place because of the elections. A near normal service will be restored tomorrow.

The Elections are always a high point (at least for the human drama) of the PP-18 schedule; and those for Deputy SG and Director of ITU-D (Development) did not disappoint. Malcolm Johnson's re-appointment should not have been a great surprise, as challenges to an incumbent (who has four more years) are rare; but the scale was. He saw off the challenge from Brahima Sanou by 113 votes to 65 but was typically magnanimous and courteous in victory (not mentioning the tweet of congratulation from the UK Prime minister).

The highlight of the day, even for neutral observers, was though the election of Doreen Bogden as director to ITU-D and the first elected women in ITU history. She secured a majority of the votes and thus won on the first ballot, thus avoiding a further round. Her two African opponents did not secure

enough votes to force a second round. There was widespread applause when the result was announced and even some tears during an eloquent and emotional acceptance address by Doreen. She spoke about breaking through the glass ceiling and hoped her father, who died earlier in the year, would be proud of her. The Chair seemed somewhat taken aback by the real emotion of the moment, and even Mr Zhao was initially lost for words. No doubt there will still be celebrating in the UK and US camps at their respective victories.

Day 5; 2nd November

The end of the first week, and not a lot of optimism. Whether on Cybersecurity, Internet, or OTT, there is not a lot of meeting of minds. We may have had eloquent speeches from the elected officials about how we should all work together, but this cuts very little ice in the ad-hoc groups where the agreements have to be reached. Several hours were spent today, by the ICANN team, explaining (bilaterally) how the GAC works and gTLDs are considered. In retrospect was fortunate that over an hour was wasted in plenary this morning debating whether the second round of the election of the director of the Radio Bureau should proceed given that the Dubai Metro did not start until 10.00hrs (was a public holiday).

In the election, the front runner from yesterday, Mario Maniewicz, from Uruguay, was elected after the Lithuanian candidate withdrew. This marks the end of the eight-year tenure of Francois Rancy, who made a short but eloquent address to the Plenary.

In the Internet Ad-hoc the Chairs of the two informal discussions (looking at the “ICANN” resolves) said they needed more time. Little progress was also made in the ad-hoc working session on Cybersecurity, with a failure to agree on the “resolves” parts of Resolution 130. Consideration on the Indian proposal on Data Protection, bizarrely being looked at in same group, was again delayed. Meanwhile, in the Plenary, policy statements (*increasingly little listened to*) continued.

Today also saw the first ad-hoc sessions on the proposed new Resolution on Artificial Intelligence and OTTs. While the former was good natured and constructive (though with differences on whether there was a need for a Resolution) the latter was rancorous and unproductive with many saying that references to “OTT Services” were inappropriate, though for Europe this was not an issue (and indeed in title of proposal).

Day 6; 3rd November

The first Saturday of a PP is typically when the initial slew of ad-hoc working Groups meet and today was no different. The difference was that for the Groups on Artificial Intelligence, OTTs, Cybersecurity (RES 130) and the Internet Resolutions these were not the first sessions. Indeed, the Internet Group completed the first read-through of Resolution 102, albeit with lots of square brackets and probably

over 50% of new content devolved to three different drafting groups. In contrast, glacial progress was made on Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) with all the controversial parts sent to a drafting group that will openly meet on Monday or Tuesday. In these discussions, it was (at least informally) agreed that the Indian proposal on Data Protection would not be discussed.

Rather better progress was made on the new Resolution on Artificial Intelligence, though it is clear that if we agree a text it will be largely factual rather than operative. Sweden noted that essentially AI was out of scope as it was not a telecoms platform or service but an emerging technology that *relied* on Platforms. On OTTs, little progress, despite the best efforts of Brazil, was made.

The Internet ad-hoc group met for nearly four hours (without a break), completing a read through of the consolidated text on Resolution 102. ICANN was again in the spotlight in consideration of the Saudi proposals for ITU to be involved (in some undefined way) in considering release of gTLDs as well as secondary names (of a territorial or geographic nature). Again, there was some confusion in the room in whether the AG were addressing ccTLDs or gTLDs (was the latter) and what the role of the GAC was. None of these matters were resolved and will be considered in a drafting group led by Brazil (meeting on Monday). Another drafting group (led by Saudi) will consider the myriad of clauses addressing the scope, membership and governance of the Council Working Group.

At this stage, it is difficult to tell where discussions may lead to. The WGPL Chair (Malaysia) has let it be known that she wants an agreed text on the Internet RES by this time next week or she will put existing texts to Plenary. A lot may rest, on all of the above Resolutions, on her determination and skill.

Day 8; 5th November

A long and difficult day. Starting with discussions on Cybersecurity at 08.00hrs and finishing with ITRs and Counterfeit devices (where DOA comes in) at 21.00hrs. During the day, we also followed the ad-hoc drafting sessions on OTTs and the Internet Resolutions; as well as having CEPT Coordination and the elections for the ITU Council and the Radio Regulations Board (RRB).

Overall the day was disappointing on two counts (which may bode ill for progress during the next 10 days or so). Firstly, the ad-hoc sessions are drifting (especially on the Internet) and the Chair of the WGPL (who is extremely competent and pleasant) was rather lenient when they reported back today. She has indicated that the ad-hoc sessions are supposed to complete their work this Thursday but all know that that will not happen. The situation was made worse with further ad-hoc sessions set up on WSIS and Broadband Connectivity. Secondly, as expected, there was a fundamental difference of Opinion across the ITU membership on the ITRs when the regional proposals were introduced this afternoon in Committee 5. In an articulate and serious discussion for over an hour, perhaps with up to 30 or so speakers, was clear that while CEPT/CITEL/APT are not going to be tied to a WCIT in 2020 or beyond, the African Group/ the Arab Group and RCC are not going to accept the status quo. Thus, to avoid a vote (which would be close) there will have to be a compromise, possibly in the form of another Expert Group.

The Cybersecurity discussions continued this morning and made glacial progress. The Chair asked for sessions every day this week; but it seems unlikely, at this point, that any radical changes to the current text will be agreed. This will not please many in African and in parts of Asia / Latin America who look to the ITU for guidance on these issues.

The ad-hoc on OTTs had a similar feeling to it; while progress had been made on Saturday, and Brazil had worked tirelessly to produce text, today we went backward, mainly because of Africa, not there at weekend and thus impervious to building any form of consensus. Quite possibly there will not be a Resolution as they, and Saudi seem intent on talking it out rather than working to secure an outcome.

The Internet ad-hoc was also not that productive. We have only completed Resolution 102 (with RES 101, 180 and 133 still to do) and on 102 the only drafting group to report was Brazil on the "ICANN" texts (see below); here it looks as if some compromise could be possible; though Saudi continues to insist on their own texts, which go beyond the ITU *assisting* member States and oblige ITU to assess certain types of gTLDs.

The Council and RRB elections proceeded; with the full results given at <https://news.itu.int/council-rrb-elecs/>; the breakdown is also given in the text below. The APT and CITELE Regions did not have competition; in contrast to Africa who had 13 candidates for 8 places.

The WGPL (see attached Agenda) completed introduction of proposals in addition to hearing about status on ad-hoc groups. Apart from WSIS the other main interest (and one to watch) is Resolution 64 (Non-Discriminatory Access) where RCC and Africa Group want to amend so that would cover Internet Services. You will recall it was this discussion that caused the vote at WCIT.

Day 9; 6th November

A day of ad-hoc negotiating sessions with little progress on the key dossiers. Was noticeable that the various ad-hoc chairs were becoming more assertive in seeking agreements and less willing to put up with pointless suggestions for text. The meeting of the WG of Plenary tomorrow will be crucial in determining where some of the dossiers go. There seems little point in progressing with the new Resolution on OTTs (where unrealistic expectations from Africa and Saudi are likely to kill what could be a useful Resolution) or the changes to Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) where realistic changes from Africa and elsewhere simply meet with blunt opposition from Europe and North America.

With little progress here, coupled with the real difficulty and complexity of the Internet Regulations the talk at the water cooler is now on ITRs / WCIT and whether the expected showdown in Plenary next week will lead to a vote or a deal. The smart money is on a deal (perhaps with the continuation of the Expert Group) but there is still a long way to go, and the Internet Resolutions (and thus ICANN interests) could be caught up in this power play. The dynamic today was well summed up by a newcomer to ITU who asked me, at close, why in the four, different ad-hoc groups she had been in, there were always the same sides lined up against each other.

What little progress there was today, in our area, was actually on the Internet Resolution 102. In a drafting group, on the ITU/ICANN axis, where at last ICANN could speak, Saudi back pedalled on their proposal to effectively *remove* the GAC and instead tried to agree text under which ITU would represent the interests of countries, who so requested such help, on it. This was not acceptable but looks like a compromise (see attached) may be in site. Other issues (Council WG and gTLDs) remain, however, and we have to get to RES 180 (Ipv6) or RES 133 (IDNs) yet.

The day started with a negative and pretty hopeless session on the new Resolution for OTTs. This affects us as a definition for such includes DNS players, thus if the Resolution invited policy development this could effectively undermine our own processes. This, though will not be case as on present form we are unlikely event to have a Resolution.

The Ad-Hoc on Artificial Intelligence also risks talking itself out unless compromises are made. Again the “regulatory” word is the main sticking point, with the usual parties slugging it out. Somewhat ironic that after CEPT/CITEL had argued that any form of mandate on standard setting was premature, that the ITU Secretariat confirmed that such activities were *already* being taken forward in a number of different Study Groups.

On Cybersecurity, there was glacial progress with the contentious parts of the dossier (the Arab Group Call for the SG to initiate talks on a cyber Convention) untouched. Instead we argued for an hour on whether the Global Cybersecurirty Index should be updated or not. Was here where the alliance of CITEL and CEPT seemed to be most negative; relying on grounds of *cost* to deny the updating of guidance that already exists and which many on developing world said was useful. This disagreement has been shifted back to Plenary.

On the Internet Resolutions, apart from the useful exchanges in the drafting Group (re ICANN) the read through on RES 101 was not that fruitful with several issues shunted into now or existing drafting groups or put in square brackets. The Saudi proposal for adding DONA (here on a IP Resolution) was effectively shot down by Veni (Bulgaria). No decision on whether to have a WTPF in 2020, this likely will be part of any grand bargain at end.

Finally, we saw the first ad-hoc on Res 140 (WSIS) which was both good natures and reasonably productive. There are differences in approach on the degree to which the CWG should be focusing on the SDGs (and indeed whether the focus should be solely now on SDGs).

Day 10; 7th November

Another long day (though they will get longer). We started early this morning with a reasonably articulate, well chaired and polite discourse in an ad-hoc group on ITRs.

The optimism of the first week has all but disappeared. The myriad number of ad-hoc sessions is already causing scheduling issues, and in a meeting between the Conference Chair and Regional heads, it was made clear that not enough flexibility is being shown as regards finding a compromise position. Regions were asked to identify their “red lines”. In the WGPL the Chair has insisted that she

wants all ad-hoc to conclude by Sunday, but then she said Thursday (tomorrow) only a couple of days ago.

On the various ad-hocs, some progress was made towards an outcome on Artificial Intelligence, with a growing realisation in Group that for a Resolution to be agreed, the thrust would need to be on collaboration rather than Standard setting (which became clear that ITU were already doing in Study Groups). On WSIS the second ad-hoc on Res 140 (WSIS) was again reasonably productive. The ad hoc managed to go through considerable part of the resolves with issues such as whether the report (supported by US) or the output (supported by Saudi) of the CWG-WSIS will be referenced for further consideration. The ad hoc is scheduled to resume tomorrow for two more hours.

In contrast, the ad-hoc on OTTs made little progress due to continued Saudi insistence that substantive policy should be debated. Now seems likely there will not be a Resolution. Cybersecurity had three hours this evening but made little progress. Two significant developments, the first being an outright rejection of the Arab Group proposal for the ITU to work on a Convention (with RCC not giving support) and a wasted hour discussing the Indian proposal on Data Protection. Here CEPT, CITELE and several other countries argued this was out of scope for ITU.

We also had a brief discussion on Internet Resolutions with completion of a read-through of RES 101. Was here that one government launched a vitriol on US sanctions, accusing ICANN (as a US organisation) of denying Cuba GAC membership as well as ISOC Chapter membership. Much work will be needed to rescue anything from this ad-hoc.

Away from technical issues, we had the first ad-hoc on the ITRs; which saw a fascinating dialogue (see below) addressing the fundamental of the ITRs and whether there was a case to amend them at all. CITELE was the most articulate, arguing the pointlessness of having an Expert Group (given the known divisions) and urging delegates to have a pause until the next PP in 2022. This was unacceptable to several in Africa and in the Arab Group, but will they have the courage to press for a (damaging) vote? RES 64 (non-discriminatory access) was discussed for the first time (see below). This is potentially significant as if expanded (like Arab Group would like) would extend the concept of non-discriminatory access from telecoms networks to all Internet /DNS players; a sort of "Net Neutrality" plus. It took some persuading before I* folks saw significance.

Finally, there was also the WG of Plenary. Here the Chair urged enhanced progress in ad-hocs, noting she had her last meeting next Tuesday to pass through dossiers to Plenary.

Day 11; 8th November

The two ad-hoc group (and accompanying informal) meetings, which were relevant to ICANN, were the ones on the Internet-related resolutions and on cybersecurity. On Cybersecurity (res. 130) there was not much progress since the days before, with most of the issues moved to be coordinated by regional leaders like Brazil, Europe, US, etc.

The Internet resolutions (101 – IP-based networks, 102 – ITU's role and management of Internet

resources, 133 - IDNs, 180 – IPv4 to IPv6 transition) were discussed in an ad-hoc session chaired by Italian representative Fabio Biggi.

These are the resolutions, which in 2010 at the ITU-PP in Guadalajara recognized for the first time ICANN (and other i* organizations), in a footnote, This time around the proposals, as explained in previous days, are focusing, among other general items, more narrowly on ICANN.

The big discussion on Day 10 was around Res. 133 – IDNs. And ICANN was the most mentioned name during the *ad hoc* meeting.

Day 12; 9th November

The Internet resolutions discussed today made slight progress – by moving around the most difficult parts, which are traditionally designated for informal discussions.

The informal meeting on resolution 102, a few paragraphs of which should serve as founding principle for all the Internet-related resolutions, was not productive, with many heated arguments. Participants and speakers included Russia (chair), USA, Bulgaria, UK, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, Israel and Uruguay. Arguments were very heated, especially around the desire of Arab Group to include DONA at the same level as the RIRs, ICANN, IETF, W3C.. All Internet-related resolutions will be discussed again tomorrow afternoon.

Resolution 64 (Non-discriminatory access) also made little progress, the ITRs were not discussed, and the OTT discussion might go on all night (or until the chair decides).

The day marked conclusion of the discussions around resolution 140 (WSIS). It is now a temporary document, waiting to be approved by the plenary session tomorrow. An item of consideration for ICANN is that there will be another WSIS High Level event, where we traditionally participate.

Resolution 180 (IPv4 transition to IPv6) has made strides and has almost reached a conclusion. Some contentious issues remain such as differentiating between *transition vs adoption and deployment of IPv6*. The inclusion of references to the DONA Foundation (again!) was suggested to be removed from this resolution, given that its scope is IPv4 to IPv6 transition.

Resolution 130 has also been making a little progress. Consensus has been reached about SMEs need for more support in their cybersecurity approach, and about including an iterative risk-based approach in defending against cyber threats and vulnerabilities. The rest of the contentious issues have been delegated to informal meetings led by member States. Discussions will continue tomorrow morning.

Resolution 64 has made a little progress concerning some of the proposed changes by RCC. The main contentious point, taking out references to “recommendations of ITU-T and ITU-R” throughout the document, has not been discussed. The Inter-American region has introduced a new proposal to not make any changes to the resolution, although they might agree to update the references.

The newly proposed OTT resolution is about to reach a conclusion tonight, as the chair is flying home. The question remains whether there should be a resolution at all, but opponents have agreed to discuss it in good faith for the sake of consensus. Chairwoman of the WG Plenary Sulyna Abdullah is in the room lending a helping hand.

Day 13; 10th November

Today, no progress was made about work directly mentioning ICANN. Any mention of RIRs, ICANN or RIRs, IETF, W3C and the DONA Foundation has been relegated to informal working groups to be convened tomorrow morning.

Out of the Internet resolutions, only resolution 102 (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) was discussed today, but almost no progress was made. Most parts which were contentious were pushed to informal or different ad-hoc groups for further discussions or taken out of the text altogether. Informal discussions are scheduled tomorrow at 11 am, but there will be another pre-consultation for the leads of the region.

Resolution 180 (Facilitating the transition from IPv4 to IPv6) has been discussed in an informal group today, and some compromise seems to have been found. The words "transition" was problematic, and has been replaced in several places in the text by "deployment and adoption." The text still needs further approval by the ad-hoc.

Resolution 64 (Non-discriminatory access to modern telecom/info and communication technology facilities, services and applications, including applied research and transfer of technology, and e-meetings, on mutually agreed terms) did not make much progress today either. RCC compromised on many small things, but the bigger question of keeping references to recommendations of ITU-T and ITU-R. The resolution will go to the Plenary WG.

Resolutions 137 (Next-generation network deployment in developing countries) and 203 (Connectivity to broadband networks) completed their work. They have become temporary documents waiting to be approved at the plenary session. The term "NGN" has been mostly replaced with "future networks," and the UK has kept the resolutions technology neutral without any reference to costs. On the other hand, compromise has been found on costs relating to affordability.

Resolution 146 relating to the ITRs has also been almost concluded. It has so far been discussed in an ad-hoc, and if the regional consultations succeed on Monday, will be heading to Committee 5. Regions still wish to confirm the language "to conduct a comprehensive review of ITRs with view to achieve consensus on way forward related to ITRs." The compromise would be the formation of a new Expert Group with new ToRs, which would report their finding at the next Plenipotentiary in 2022. A new term "digital gap" has also been introduced, to be used instead of 'review' as the words "review" and "revision" are interpreted differently by the Member States.

The new resolution about OTT seems to be landlocked, but discussions might last into the morning (the Chair of the WG said they could have the room until 7am). In fact, session went on to 4am with no agreement. The European delegation (CEPT) formally withdrew from negotiation; accusing RCC of bad faith.

Day 14; 11th November

Internet resolutions

Almost all the Internet resolutions were discussed today in the ad-hoc group, with many smaller informal sessions. A lot of progress has been made, but contentious issues remain, including the DONA Foundation and ICANN.

Resolution 101 saw some progress, with references to the WTPF being removed and a compromise has been reached to replace “frontier technologies,” which was considered too broad by CEPT and CITELE, with “emerging telecommunications/ICTs.”

Resolution 102 was barely discussed. The Arab group has stated their two options: to have a list of organisations cited in the resolution they think are relevant to IP-networks, including the DONA Foundation and the Multi-Primary Administration (MPAs) of the Global Handle Registry, or have no organisations listed at all. CEPT, CITELE and APT are intransigent about not including these two. CEPT lead, the UK, has offered to remove the list from the operational part of the resolution if it would be included elsewhere, but it has been refused.

Substantive progress was made on Resolution 133. Negative language about ICANN has been transformed and now only reflects that some member states are experiencing difficulties when implementing IDNs. Germany also suggested to balance this statement out by acknowledging some of the successful implementations of IDNs. ICANN was also taken out from the list of organisations addressing IDNs, which now only includes UN organizations, but a new paragraph was added referring to relevant organisations. In exchange, the text referring to increased security issues due to the introduction of IDNs now only refers to a specific threat.

Resolution 180 has almost reached a conclusion, with the DONA Foundation being taken out of the list of organisations dealing with IPv6. It has been replaced with text directly taken from the WTSA 64 and now refers to support and best practice available “by ITU and relevant organizations (e.g. Regional Internet Registries (RIR), network operator groups and the Internet Society(ISOC)).”

Other resolutions

Some progress has been made on Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) but the main contentious issues still remain. The concern the Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA) and whether to update it, the creation of an ITU Cybersecurity Convention, the development of international Internet related policy and the creation of a voluntary fund to carry out the work.

Discussions about Resolution 197 (IoT) were still on-going late into the night.

Day 15; 12th November

Internet resolutions

Some good progress was made on the Internet resolutions, with Resolutions 101, 133, and 180 having mostly been cleaned up. Most of the contentious text has been moved to Resolution 102, and the other three resolutions have seen their text refocused explicitly on their subject matters.

Compromise was found on Resolution 133, removing the list of organizations but adding text about the role of other stakeholders.

Some progress was made with Resolution 102, yet lots of text remain in square brackets. Disagreement remain with regard to role of non-governmental stakeholders in public policy issues, in addition to the other contentious text such as the DONA Foundation, text on the role of the ITU on Internet Governance proposed by the African and Arab region, and the role and membership in the CWG-Internet.

Other resolutions

The WG-P approved Resolution 140 (WSIS) without any objections.

Resolution 203 (Connectivity to broadband networks) had another paragraph added and will go to the WG-P with Resolution 137. The addition was easily accepted. Delegates had been determined to keep a balance between mentions of satellite and terrestrial access to broadband, and they were satisfied with the final balance.

Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) has not made any substantive progress. The same four contentious points remain, and is unlikely to be solved in the ad-hoc WG. Africa and Arab regions are pushing for an update of the GCA, denying it would duplicate the work of the UN's UN-GGE that had its mandate recently renewed. Instead, the ITU could focus on technical aspects only.

No progress was made on Resolution 64 (non-discriminatory access). No compromise seems possible between the NOC positions of CITEEL, CEPT and most APT countries, and the Arab, African and RCC proposals.

Resolution 146 (ITRs) has almost been finalized, with CEPT holding out until further regional consultations. The compromise that has been reached would see the creation of a new Expert Group with new ToRs, and which would report its findings at the next Plenipotentiary in 2022.

Day 16; 13th November

Internet resolutions

Resolution 102 was extensively discussed with some progress, but some significant text remains in brackets: ICANN and the GAC, MoU with the DONA Foundation, Internet Governance and the CWG-Internet of the ITU.

CEPT was willing to make compromises about the CWG-Internet, and remove negative language about ICANN and the GAC, but their suggestions were not received by Africa and Arab regions, and Cuba. References to the MoU between the DINA Foundation and the ITU are not relevant to the resolution according to CITELE and CEPT, as it is more an application than a service. The Arab and African groups insist on having the references included. The Arab region was willing to let go of their proposal on Internet Governance, but Africa, led by South Africa wanted to keep it until further regional consultations. Lastly, no progress was made on the Arab and African regions' proposal to expand the mandate of the CWG-Internet on international Internet policy, but text about the Tunis Agenda and the WSIS Action line Facilitators were deleted. It was decided that these would be discussed at the WG-P the next day.

Other resolutions

After a last-minute change to Resolution 203 (Connectivity to broadband), it has been approved at the WG-P, along with Resolution 137 (Next generation networks).

Two new resolutions have also been finalized and approved at the WG-PL. The Resolution on OTTs and another Resolution on ITU's role in fostering Telecommunication/ ICT centric Innovation to Support the Digital Economy and Society. The Resolution on OTTs recognizes that there is a very diverse and broad ecosystem in which OTTs are an opportunity for innovation and economic growth. The main contested points when drafting the resolution were the sovereign rights of Member States when it comes to defining public policy and introducing regulations for telecommunications.

There was agreement reached on Resolution 139 (Bridging the digital divide). The main issue was about the role of states in providing universal access to broadband to their citizens, the importance of broadband affordability and the private sector community networks that have been successful models to bring connectivity. The latter part about community networks remains in brackets and will be discussed at the Plenary.

Resolution 197 (IoT) has been finalized but still contains square brackets. It still recognizes IPv6 role for IoT strategies and urges states to deploy it. It does not list relevant organisations but highlights the need for cooperation between them, SDOs and the ITU. Two options are presented in square brackets, both containing contentious language. The text will be presented tomorrow morning at the WG-PL.

Three other resolutions that we had not been following had been approved today, Resolution 70 (Mainstreaming a gender perspective in ITU and promotion of gender equality and the empowerment

of women through information and communication technologies), Resolution 179 (ITU's role in child online protection), and a new Resolution on The role of ITU in supporting the use of ICTs to combat trafficking in persons.

Day 17; 14th November

Internet Resolutions

All contentious text concerning ICANN has been taken out of Resolution 102, alongside references to the CSTD's Enhanced Cooperation Working Group, following an unofficial informal session between regional leads. CITELE and CEPT argued that ITU resolutions should not comment on or instruct other organisations in their resolutions Text concerning the CWG-Internet, the DONA Foundation, and ITU's role in Internet governance remains unchanged and will be discussed at the Plenary.

Resolutions 101, 133 and 180 have remained unchanged, with brackets around what used to be the footnote, still including text about DONA Foundation. They will be further discussed at the Plenary session.

Other resolutions

Resolution 64 (Non-discriminatory access) has been approved to go to the Plenary, with the same brackets remaining as during the informal discussions.

Resolution 139 (Bridging the digital divide) has also been approved to go to the Plenary containing one last set of brackets around "community operators" in the non-operational part.

An ad-hoc session was held this morning for Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity), and an informal session was also held between two sessions of the WG-PL. Some progress has been made, but the same two points are still contentious as they have been since the start of the conference: The Global Cybersecurity Agenda and the creation of a new convention by the ITU on cybersecurity. Following the informal session. It was agreed that the text should be moved to the plenary containing several brackets.

The new Resolution on Artificial Intelligence has also been finalized after many long hours of discussion and is going to the Plenary with a few brackets remaining in the operational parts of the text. The first relates to the organization of a global summit on AI, what role should the ITU play in its organization and how should it collaborate with other stakeholders. The other two points are about the word 'governance' and a study for an AI Index.

A new Resolution on Big Data has not been presented to the WG-PL and won't move on to the Plenary. As it had originally a proposal from the RCC, Russia will prepare a note to be included in the Chair's Report.

Day 18; 15th November

Internet resolutions

The Plenary approved all four Internet Resolutions (101 Internet Protocol-based networks, 102 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, 133 Role of administration of Member States in the management of internationalized (multilingual) domain names and 180 Facilitating the transition from IPv4 to IPv6).

Following the intervention of the Chair of the Plenary, all references to DONA Foundation have been struck out everywhere, and Member States have reverted to the original text concerning the Council Working Group on Internet, and the Summary Record of the Conference will include a reference to Council Rule 14. The reference to the rule indicated that instructing the CWG has been deferred to the next Council meeting. Text about the African proposal on the role of ITU in Internet Governance was also taken out of the resolution.

Other resolutions

The plenary approved a number of resolutions.

Resolution 146 (ITRs) and Resolution 188 (Combatting counterfeit devices) were approved without debate.

Resolution 197 (IoT) has also been approved, but has a few clauses pending the approval of

Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) and the Resolution on AI.

Resolution 139 (Bridging the digital divide) was also approved, after CITEC agreed to withdraw its proposed text about community networks from a non-operational section. This was originally a proposal made by Mexico and supported by CITEC and CEPT, as well as some APT countries. The Arab, African and RCC regions were the ones against the inclusion of the text in the resolution, arguing it might infringe on their national sovereignty.

Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity) was extensively discussed but was eventually shelved by the Chair. The same four sets of bracketed text remain, concerning a Global Cybersecurity Agenda update, the creation of an ITU cybersecurity Convention, the development of international Internet related policy and the creation of a voluntary fund to carry out the work. The debate had two clearly defined camps, with CITEC, CEPT and many APT states wanting to delete the clauses in brackets, and the Arab, African and RCC regions insisting on including them.

Day 19; 16th November

The last day of the Plenipotentiary 2018 went on all night, with a marathon session of the Plenary ending at 5:25 am. The Internet resolutions had already been discussed and only three resolutions

remained on the table: Resolution 130 (Cybersecurity), Resolution 64 (Non-discriminatory access), and the new Resolution on AI.

Other resolutions

Resolution 130 was updated with an extra *resolve* with text to use the ITU Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA) as a framework, without any mention of updating it. Overall, eight new *resolves* were added to the resolution.

Resolution 64 remained a NOC and references were not to be updated, with the exception of the title to read “Dubai, 2018” rather than “Busan, 2014.”

The new Resolution on AI was rejected at the Plenary. There was no consensus on the scope of the mandate given to the ITU, given that the scope in the field of AI is much broader than the telecoms that support it. It was the on the suggestion of the Chair that the resolution was finally let go, explaining that the lack of resolution on AI won’t prevent the ITU pursuing work in this area. CEPT and CITEEL did not support the draft resolution, arguing that it is too early for such a resolution and that it was not necessarily the role of the ITU to take on this subject.

Closing ceremony 20th Plenipotentiary Conference of ITU

The closing Ceremony saw the Final Acts signed by 140 countries out of the 193 Member States (some of the Member States did not have delegations in Dubai today). The signing was followed by a series of speeches by the host country’s Director of regulatory authority, His Excellency Hamad Obaid Al Mansoori, The Secretary General of the ITU Houlin Zhao, the President of the Conference His Excellency Majed Sultan Al Mesmar, as well as certain members of the ITU staff.

H.E. Mansoori talked about the UN Development Goals and the pillars under which they apply at the ITU, digital divide, social integration, gender balance, digital literacy, enhanced international collaboration, digital commerce, electronic security, emerging technology, among others.

Mr. Zhao also talked about how the implementation of the Strategic and Financial Plans were guided by the Agenda for Sustainable Development. He also drew attention to the election of the first woman to the administrative team of the ITU, and that 30% of the participants were women, which he said could still be improved upon.

Member State interventions thanked the organizing country, the United Arab Emirates, the ITU and several individuals, including newly elected officials, and people who have either contributed to the organization or the success of the conference. No delegation expressed their discontent with the results.

ICANN, GE; December 2019