|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Doc (22) 54\_rev1 |
| Web-meeting14 November 2022  |  |
|  |  |
| Date issued: | 14 November 2022 |
| Source: | Chairs of Com-ITU PTs PP-22 |
| Subject: | Report of PP-22 |

N

Password protection required? (Y/N)

|  |
| --- |
| Summary:  |
| Draft report of participation of CEPT members in the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference 2022 (PP-22). |
| Proposal:  |
| Com-ITU is invited to approve the report on the outcomes of PP-22.  |

**Report of participation of CEPT members in the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference 2022 (PP-22)**

**16 September – 14 October 2022, Bucharest**

* Romania hosted the first ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Europe since 2006, in an unprecedented year in which WTDC and WTSA had also taken place. PP-22 was chaired by Mr Sabin Sărmaș.
* All information about the Conference and the documents may be found at the PP-22 website: <https://pp22.itu.int/en/>
* CEPT gratefully acknowledges the excellent hosting by Romania and particularly the leading role played by our own Com-ITU Chair, Cristiana Flutur, as well as the conference chair and organising teams from both host country and ITU. We are also grateful to ECO and especially Mr. Vassil Krastev, for their great support during the preparatory process.

**1. Preparation for PP-22**

In 2021 Com-ITU established two project teams, PT PP22-Policy chaired by Mr. Oli Bird (UK), and PT PP22-FIMO chaired by Mr. Wojciech Berezowski (Poland), to prepare CEPT contributions for, and coordinate positions at PP-22, respectively on policy and financial/management issues.

The PTs held a joint first meeting on 2 March 2021, and PT-Policy went on to hold 11 meetings (plus two informal meetings jointly with CEPT PTB, to discuss the specific issue of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution regarding space issues); PT-FIMO held 10 meetings.

The Chairs of the PTs alongside the Com-ITU Chair participated in three Inter-Regional meetings to prepare for PP-22, as well as attending a number of meetings of other RTOs, to share updates on CEPT’s preparations. Other RTOs were invited to attend all PT meetings.

**2. CEPT participation at PP-22**

CEPT prepared a Vision for ITU (ECP1) and a further 26 ECPs as a result of the work of the Project Teams. Additionally CEPT prepared a Brief with European positions on a wider set of resolutions and issues, with additional background information and a list of coordinators. The final Brief was adopted during the first coordination meeting at PP-22 on 26 September 2022.

Daily coordination meetings were held during the PP, with use of a WhatsApp group to coordinate among colleagues in real time as discussions progressed.

The Com-ITU Chair and PT Policy Chair (as Vice-Chair of the PP) participated in some inter-regional discussions during the PP aimed at reaching consensus on some of the more difficult topics.

**2.1. CEPT participation in Conference leadership**

CEPT was represented in the main bodies of the Conference by the Chairs and the Vice-Chairs from the region:

Committee 1 (Steering Committee) Vice-Chair/Vice-Chair of the Conference:

* Mr. Oli Bird (UK)

Committee 2 (Credentials) Vice-Chair:

* Mr. Dirk-Olivier Vonder Emden (Switzerland)

Committee 3 (Budget) Vice-Chair:

* Mr. Wojciech Berezowski (Poland)

Committee 4 (Editorial) Chair, Vice-Chair:

* Chair: Mr. Christian Rissone (France)
* Ms. Nicole Darabian (UK)

Committee 5 (Policy & Legal) Vice-Chair:

* Mr. Johann Gross (Germany)

Committee 6 (Admin & Management) Vice-Chair:

* Ms. Blanca Gonzalez (Spain)

Working Group of the Plenary, Vice-Chair:

* Ms. Inga Rimkeviciene (Lithuania)

CEPT members also chaired several ad hoc and informal groups:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COMMITTEE 5** | **CHAIR** |
| Ad hoc group Res. 21 (Alternative calling procedures.) | Mr Phil RUSHTON (United Kingdom) |
| Ad hoc group on Res. 196 (Protecting users) | Mr Mihail ION (Romania) |
| Informal group on Radio Regulations Board: Res.119 | Mr Steve TALBOT (United Kingdom) |
| **COMMITTEE 6** | **CHAIR** |
| Ad hoc group on Res.48 (Human resources management and development) | Ms Blanca GONZALEZ (Spain) |
| Ad hoc group on Res.71 (Strategic Plan) | Mr Frederic SAUVAGE (France) |
| Ad hoc on Financial Matters | Mr Dirk-Olivier VON DER EMDEN (Switzerland) |
| Ad hoc group on scheduling and duration of conferences, forums, assemblies and Council sessions of the Union | Ms Blanca GONZALEZ (Spain) |
| Ad hoc group on world telecommunication/information and communication technology policy forum | Ms Blanca GONZALEZ (Spain) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WORKING GROUP OF THE PLENARY** | **CHAIR** |
| Res.137 (Next generation networks),  | Ms Biliana ZOLKOVA (Bulgaria) |
| Ad hoc group on Res. 198 (Youth) | Mr Mihail ION (Romania) |
| Ad hoc group on Innovation  | Ms Inga RIMKEVICIENE (Lithuania) |
| Res. 205 Technology-centric innovation |
| New Res (Digital platforms) |
| New Res (Bridging the data divide) |

**3. General overview and commentary**

Preparatory process

The **preparatory process** was particularly challenging for this PP, due to the coincidence of WTSA and WTDC in the same calendar year, the latter only a few months earlier. This made our work intensive at times, although it also enabled clearer links to be made between the three major conferences, which was not unhelpful. For example, the negotiations on AI benefitted from recent exchanges on this topic at WTSA, it was easier to come to consensus with recent knowledge about the objectives of some of the other regions. However, it also meant that the most recent outcomes of WTDC were discussed at some length, which for example in the case of the Kigali Action Plan informing the ITU’s Strategic Plan, meant that the three sectors of the Union were not always equally balanced in some discussions.

In terms of **timing**, CEPT presented its ECP proposals to the Conference significantly in advance of other regions. One possible consequence of this was seeing some of our proposals reflected in those from other regions, particularly CITEL. However, other regions presented proposals on or very close to the deadline for submissions, which presented a challenge to our preparation, as it has in the past.

In particular the work on the **brief** was completed at the last minute and we found that during the PP, there were some topics which required additional discussion, and in some cases there were no topic coordinators identified. Although this is partly attributable to late contributions from other regions, it would be good to consider what we can do to ensure that the Brief is better prepared for future conferences. In particular, if **topic coordinators can be identified at an earlier stage**, for all topics that could be discussed at PP, then we can ensure that CEPT does not have gaps in its coverage of issues, and we can be more proactive about monitoring other regions’ preparations as they evolve.

Some CEPT members played coordination roles at this PP for the **first time**. This was very welcome, and is necessary for our succession planning. We could consider how we can continue to encourage more members to play active leadership roles, and how we can better support those who do, including with specific guidance on the roles of coordinator and supporter (and how to deal with issues such as conflicts when leading on multiple issues, or playing multiple roles).

Our PT structure had a sound logic, but it did not mirror the three major committees of the conference (Com5, Com6 and WGPL), with the consequence that some members were dividing their time between these committees and facing challenges doing so. There could be merit in trying to **anticipate the conference structure** in our own processes, to enable a better fit of our roles to the conference structure.

During the PP

Outcomes on the ECPs are captured in **Annex 1**. Overall the Policy outcomes were very good for CEPT. Nearly all of our ECPs resulted in modified or new resolutions which reflected many elements of our proposals, and we successfully defended red lines on key issues including cyber and internet governance. There were some disappointments, notably the failure to agree a new resolution in industry participation.

It is proposed to **reopen the CEPT brief** as a shared document for topic coordinators to record outcomes and lessons-learned on particular topic areas, to aid our preparation for future meetings, as well as any proposals for procedural aspects.

In contrast to previous PPs, the **working patterns were much better managed**, with no meetings scheduled on Sundays, or after 2100. Still, the conference managed to finalize the work and the negotiations on time. These principles should be considered as the standard practice for future conferences of the ITU.

Related to this, the work in the committees and ad-hoc groups kicked off **early in the conference**, in parallel with elections. This had not been anticipated by many delegations and resulted in challenges. However, if in future we ensure that coordinators and others are present in the first week of PP, this can be avoided.

The coordination during the PP worked well, both in meetings that took place nearly every day, and through the WhatsApp group, building on effective coordination practices developed at WTSA and WTDC earlier in the year. WhatsApp seems to be a pretty invaluable tool, but it might be helpful to establish some simple **guidelines and expectations** for its use at future meetings, as this practice has evolved organically but without all members necessarily using it to equal advantage.

CEPT chairs of ad hoc and informal groups did great work at PP, but would have appreciated some **guidance on these chairing roles**, including clear instructions about the duties/rights of the Chair, main procedures.

ANNEX 1

**European Common Proposals for PP-22**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ECP No. | Subject | Outcome |
| ECP 1 | **CEPT VISION FOR ITU** | No direct outcome at PP: this was a broad framing exercise that proved helpful strategic context for all our work on ECPs, although this fed into early drafts of the ITU Strategic Plan.Next steps: consider updating our Vision for the next meeting (WTSA) and the next PP, in light of new ITU leadership’s ambitions. |
| ECP 2 | **Revision to Resolution 70**: Mainstreaming a gender perspective in ITU and promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls through information and communication technologies | Resolution was updated to reflect many of the CEPT proposals. Next steps: PP discussions suggest further progress still to be made, Council Members particularly to consider how to take forward. |
| ECP 3 | **Revision to Resolution 101**: Internet Protocol-based networks | Resolution was updated with a little more language on stakeholders added.Next steps: discussion will continue in CWG-Internet |
| ECP 4 | **Revision to 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 | This was the most challenging and long negotiated of the internet resolutions. Opening up the CWG-Internet and promoting or removing the footnote was the biggest point of divergence. But also increasing the role of ITU in Internet governance was at stake and much of the text remained the status quo. However, there were some positive points including sustainable development, inclusion of best practices and fostering cooperation. But also language on new and emerging technology was added.Next steps: discussion will continue in CWG-Internet |
| ECP 5 | **Revision to Resolution 133**: Role of administrations of Member States in the management of internationalized (multilingual) domain names | New language on connectivity, accessibility, women and children capacity building, digital skills and stakeholders was added. Furthermore, strengthening the need for reporting from GAC to the ITU Council was added.Next steps: discussion will continue in CWG-Internet |
| ECP 6 | **Revision to Resolution 180**: Promoting deployment and adoption of IPv6 to facilitate the transition from IPv4 to IPv6 | The biggest issue was the different between transition and deployment used in IPv6. There was extensive discussion about the RIR issue in Africa (indirectly) and also about the usefulness of multistakeholderism from the African region. In the end, new language on the private sector and investment, connectivity, multistakeholderism, best practices and fostering an enabling environment. Also new language on encouraging governments to run their websites on IPv6.Next steps: discussion will continue in CWG-Internet |
| ECP 7 | **Revision to Resolution 130**: Strengthening the role of ITU in building confidence and security in the use of information and communication technologies | Most of the ECP proposal was secured, including resolving to continue the ITU's Global Network Resiliency Platform, to promote the importance of effective qualifications and career pathways in cyber security, instructing the ITU to promote the employment of women in cyber security, an emphasis throughout the resolution on capacity building, new instructions on promoting cyber-hygiene, and on raising awareness. Next steps: Council will consider contributions from MS on the subject of the GCA.  |
| ECP 8 | **Resolution 162 (REV. BUSAN, 2014):** Independent management advisory committee | ECP proposals reflected in IMAC responsibilities in ToR.  |
| ECP 9 | **Resolution 167 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Strengthening and developing ITU capabilities for electronic meetings and means to advance the work of the Union | ECP proposals were successfully reflected: approach is now to agree a set of Guidelines in an Annex from which Council is required to develop a high-level Framework for the management and governance of virtual and physical meetings with remote participation. These would apply to all Sectors albeit still allowing some flexibility to cater for their specific circumstances. Next steps: guidelines at Council |
| ECP 10 | **Resolution 177 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Conformance and interoperability | Resolution was modified to reflect developments in C&I in ITU SG 11 since PP-18. In addition, a new instructs the Director was added.Next steps: outcome to be reported to next PP |
| ECP 13 | **Resolution 119 (REV. ANTALYA, 2006):** Methods to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Radio Regulations Board | ECP proposals were not agreed, but some less definitive changes were made to the Resolution and text was added to the Plenary meeting minutes that reflected on the public interest in some of the decisions made by the RRB. These largely achieve the purpose of our proposed changes.  |
| ECP 14 | **Resolution 136 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** The use of telecommunications/information and communication technologies for humanitarian assistance and for monitoring and management in emergency and disaster situations, including health-related emergencies, for early warning, prevention, mitigation and relief | ECP was generally endorsed. The Resolution was revised highlighting the importance of undersea cables for early warning and disaster risk reduction, preparedness and response, including tsunami and earthquake early warning. The role of Joint Task Force (JTF) on SMART cable systems was also highlighted. |
| ECP 15 | **Resolution 137 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Deployment of future networks in developing countries | CEPT proposals around some language were broadly accepted, and attempts to recognise OpenRAN were diluted (as part of an overall compromise on the subject to get rid of a new resolution). No harmful proposals of the other regions were adopted either. |
| ECP 16 | **Resolution 139 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Use of telecommunications/information and communication technologies to bridge the digital divide and build an inclusive information society | Many of the proposed CEPT modifications to this resolution were accepted, including: more specific language acknowledging the causes of the digital divide, with a particular focus on the problems of affordability and lack of digital skills; an increased focus on the challenges faced by developing countries, and a stronger ITU role to coordinate action to bridge the digital divide (including a clear instruction to make repositories of best practice more prominent on the ITU website than they are currently).We were not successful in achieving a specific acknowledgment that certain social groups (including women and girls) are particularly badly affected by the digital divide, the resolution does indirectly acknowledge this by recalling WTDC resolution 37 which included a specific list of groups particularly affected by the digital divide. |
| ECP 17 | **Resolution 140 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** ITU's role in implementing the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as in their follow-up and review processes | The WSIS+20 is coming up in 2025 and there was much discussion and negotiation about the ITU’s role in that review process. On this resolution there was agreed new language on connecting the unconnected, infrastructure development through private investment, connecting marginalised and vulnerable and stakeholder involved in development and deployment was added. Language on the role of the ITU in the review was also added within its current mandate. |
| ECP 18 | **Resolution 146 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Periodic review and revision of the International Telecommunication Regulations | The work on ITRs will continue in the form of a Council working group. However, the ToRs, deliverables and its composition are for the next Council session (July 2023) to establish and approve. This outcome reflects the possible risk, if not continuing at this level, of calling for WCIT to be held. So this step is kind of a harm reduction. Moreover we can give a try to make it more meaningful this time trying to call for a case study approach, with an attempt to evaluate particulare cases (if any) when ITRs were used to mitigate any dispute between market players. |
| ECP 19 | **Resolution 175 (DUBAI, 2018):** Telecommunication/information and communication technology accessibility for persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs | All of the substantive modifications proposed in our ECP successfully agreed, despite moderate pushback. Our positive contributions included new requirements for consulting with disability experts in venue selection processes, disability inclusion considerations in ITU staff recruitment processes, and training and capacity building for ITU staff on accessibility awareness. |
| ECP 20 | **Resolution 179 (DUBAI, 2018):** ITU's role in child online protection | Objectives of avoiding links to cybersecurity, and a broader role for ITU-T, were achieved.  |
| ECP 21 | **Resolution 182 (REV. BUSAN, 2014):** The role of telecommunications/information and communication technologies in regard to climate change and the protection of the environment | Most CEPT objectives were met. CEPT worked hard with US and ATU to clarify some issues and to avoid repetitions within the text. There is more to do on some of our objectives re environment and negative/positive impact of ICT. We might revisit this resolution at next PP.  |
| ECP 22 | **Resolution 188 (DUBAI, 2018):** Combating counterfeit telecommunication/information and communication technology devices | Resolution was expanded in scope, following CITEL proposals that CEPT was content with. We were unable to removed existing text on Digital Object Architecture, but a number of CEPT members joined a Declaration co-signed by 35 countries in the Final Acts of the conference recording opposition to this. |
| ECP 23 | **Resolution 189 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Assisting Member States to combat and deter mobile device theft | NOC as per ECP. |
| ECP 24 | **Resolution 196 (REV. DUBAI, 2018):** Protecting telecommunication service users/consumers | We did not concede any of the CEPT red lines, including the addition of "cybersecurity" and other proposals to expand the ITU's mandate to address legal or regulatory consumer protection frameworks. We protected the ITU-D's lead role and diverted proposals that would specifically highlight OTT issues to accept more general language, i.e. "issues related to international telecommunication/ICTs". We successfully diverted proposals to create a new "centralized digital tool" to focus on supporting existing tools and mechanisms. |
| ECP 25 | **Resolution 197 (DUBAI, 2018):** Facilitating the Internet of Things and smart sustainable cities and communities | Res 197 was not contentious, and the DOA issues that made this resolution problematic at PP18 did not surface at PP22. Some amendments reflected the increasing role and benefits of IoT and SSC&C. CEPT succeeded in adding text (from WTSA-22) recognising that there is a wide variety of use cases and applications, and that it is important for IoT to be open and adaptable. We also added some text providing greater recognition of the roles of other standards bodies in this area and the importance of collaboration with SDOs and stakeholders and avoiding duplication (although RCC successfully rejected inclusion of some of the specific examples we wanted to use). |
| ECP 26 | **Resolution 205 (DUBAI, 2018):** ITU's role in fostering telecommunication/information and communication technology-centric innovation to support the digital economy and society | CEPT proposed changes to bring the issue of high import tariffs on ICT hardware in developing countries to the attention of the ITU. In the end we agreed to less specific references than we proposed but other language on the work of other international organisations was endorsed. The proposals of other regions were largely agreeable. |
| ECP 27 | **Draft new Resolution [ECP-1] (Bucharest, 2022) “INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT”:** Encouraging the participation of Industry in the work of the Union | The proposed new resolution was not agreed due to conference politics as a number of countries tried to use the negotiation of this resolution to trade on other resolution outcomes, and ultimately it was blocked. However, Recommendation 5 was agreed for incorporation into the COM 5 meeting report to Plenary requesting the ITU Secretary General and the directors of the three bureaus to continue looking at industry engagement issues. Next steps: consider issue at WTSA? |
| ECP 28 | **Draft new Resolution [ECP-2] (Bucharest, 2022):** Artificial Intelligence technologies in support of telecommunications/ICTs and the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda | PP-22 successfully agreed on a new resolution that largely reflected our ECP. Discussions focused the ITU’s cooperation with other UN entities, on multistakeholders’ involvement and on the contribution of the three sectors. Some compromise language could be found on these different issues, which satisfied CEPT’s positions and expectations for this new resolution, i.e. to have a high-level text, in line with ITU’s mandate, which highlights the need to cooperate with other UN entities and the value of multistakeholders’ inputs.  |
| ECP 29 | **Draft new Resolution [ECP-3] (Bucharest, 2022):** Clarification on the invocation of Article 48 of the ITU Constitution in relation to the Radio Regulations | New resolution COM5/1 (Use of frequency assignments by military radio installations for National Defence Services) was agreed, to prevent future misuses of article 48. If a frequency assignment for which Article 48 has been invoked is used for non-military radio installations, all relevant provisions of the Radio Regulations shall apply to the frequency assignment. The BR may seek clarifications from Member States that invoked article 48. It is also recommended to split frequency assignments into military and non-military. This is considered as a positive result for CEPT. |