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# 1 Strengthening the regional presence (continued) (Document [C17/98](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0098/en)(Rev.1))

1.1 The Councillor from Belarus introduced Document C17/98(Rev.1), containing a contribution submitted by her country, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan requesting the Council to approve the proposal to raise the status of the existing ITU Area Office for the countries of CIS in Moscow to that of regional office. The authors of the contribution further requested that specific terms of reference be established for the regional office, taking into account the specificities of the region and the regional initiatives, priorities and conditions. Approval of the proposals would mean that CIS was no longer the only region without a regional office.

1.2 Numerous councillors supported the proposals. One councillor considered that creation of a D1 post for the proposed new regional office should be offset by suppressing a D1 post within the secretariat in Geneva.

1.3 The observer from Ukraine said that, even though his country was a member of the CIS Region, it had not been involved in drawing up the contribution put forward. He requested the secretariat to provide the next Council with explanations regarding the difference in status between an area and a regional office, the rules governing how countries were assigned to one region or another and the procedure to be followed by a country wishing to change region. The observer from Georgia said that his administration had not been consulted on the initiative or on the document deriving from it, and therefore reserved its position on the proposal, which was not supported by all the member countries of the Region and whose financial, logistical and other implications should be studied first. The observer from Moldova agreed with those two speakers.

1.4 The Secretary-General said that the Legal Adviser would provide precise answers subsequently to the questions raised by the observer from Ukraine.

1.5 The Councillor from Romania expressed that in case there are no legal implications for previous speakers from observer states who raised concerns (Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova), there would be no objection to the proposed upgrade of the ITU CIS Area Office to the status of Regional Office.

1.6 The Council **agreed** to approve in principle the proposal to raise the status of the ITU Area Office for the countries of CIS in Moscow to that of regional office and to request the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Director of BDT, and also involving the Directors of BR and TSB, to submit to the Council in 2018 specific terms of reference for an ITU CIS regional office, defining its structure and budget in order to get a final agreement and to finalize the transition to a fully operational CIS regional office.

# 2 Preparations for the 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference (continued) (Document [C17/5](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0005/en))

2.1 The councillor from the United Arab Emirates said that, further to the comments made by the secretariat and several delegations and having consulted his administration, he withdrew his request to modify the dates of PP-18. The Secretary-General thanked the United Arab Emirates for its spirit of understanding.

2.2 Document C17/5 was **noted**.

# 3 Proposed dates and duration of the 2018, 2019 and 2020 sessions of the Council (Document [C17/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0002/en))

3.1 The representative of the secretariat said that, as the dates proposed for the 2018 and 2019 sessions had already been approved by the previous session of the Council, only those for the 2020 session remained to be decided, namely Wednesday, 27 May to Friday, 5 June.

3.2 One councillor considered that the 2018 session should last nine days instead of eight, and should therefore commence on Tuesday, 17 April. That proposal was supported by all other councillors taking the floor. Two councillors nevertheless raised the question of the period of time required for processing documents between the end of the CWG meetings and commencement of the Council session. One councillor said that the 2020 session should also last nine days, and should therefore begin on 26 May.

3.3 The proposed changes of date were **approved**.

# 4 World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC-19) (Document [C17/27](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0027/en))

4.1 The Deputy Director of BR, introducing Document C17/27, recalled that in its Resolution 1380 Council-16 had approved the dates of WRC-19, but had left open the question of the conference venue pending the outcome of consultations with the Government of Egypt, which was offering to host the event in Sharm El-Sheikh. In the meantime, BR had sent the Administration of Egypt ITU’s minimum requirements for holding RA-19 and WRC-19, and the Egyptian Administration had committed to complying therewith. It was therefore up to the Council to reconsider that aspect of Resolution 1380.

4.2 The Councillor from Egypt confirmed his administration’s acceptance of ITU’s minimum requirements. Several councillors supported the adoption of Sharm El-Sheikh as the venue for RA-19 and WRC-19 and revision of Resolution 1380 accordingly. One councillor asked whether the secretariat could guarantee that the minimum requirements would be met.

4.3 The Director of BR said that Egypt’s commitment had been confirmed by a letter from the Ministry of Telecommunications, which meant that, if the Council agreed to revise Resolution 1380, the process of requesting the concurrence of the majority of ITU Member States could be initiated and completed within three months. The host country agreement would be signed before, or at the latest during, the 2018 session of the Council. There would be sufficient time between Council-18 and WRC-19 to fall back on the CICG option should unforeseen circumstances arise.

4.4 The Council **agreed** to amend Resolution 1380 to designate Sharm El-Sheikh as the venue for RA-19 and WRC-19.

# 5 Schedule of future conferences, assemblies and meetings of the Union: 2017-2020 (Document [C17/37](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0037/en)(Rev.1))

5.1 The Chief of the Conferences and Publications Department, introducing Document C17/37(Rev.1), said that the dates of the WSIS Forum had been modified so that the event would not take place during Ramadan. One councillor having requested that the dates of the Forum be put back a week, he explained that that would depend on when CICG was available. The schedule would also be completed by adding the CWG meeting dates agreed to by the present Council session.

5.2 Document C17/37(Rev.1) was **noted**, subject to the indications given by the Chief of the Conferences and Publications Department.

# 6 ITU Internet activities (continued) (Document [C17/DT/5](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-170515-TD-GEN-0005/en))

6.1 The Chairman recalled that at its third plenary meeting the Council had noted the report on ITU Internet activities (Document [C17/33](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0033/en)) and that the ITU Secretary-General had to transmit the aforementioned report to the United Nations Secretary-General along with a compilation of the views of the Member States on it and the official summary record of the Council’s related deliberations. The Council was therefore invited to approve, not the report, but its transmission along with the aforementioned related documents, as contained in Document C17/DT/5 (Package of documents concerning ITU Internet activities under Resolutions 101, 102, 133 and 180).

6.2 It was so **agreed**.

# 7 Report by the Chairman of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues (continued) (Documents [C17/102](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0102/en), [C17/103](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0103/en) and [C17/DL/7](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-170515-DL-0007/en))

7.1 The Chairman of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issuesintroduced Document C17/DL/7, containing the outcome of the informal group on the topics for open consultation. Document C17/DL/7 was **approved**.

7.2 The Chairman of the Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues, reporting on the outcome of the consultations held on Document C17/103 following the fifth plenary meeting, said that, since there was no consensus on the matter, it was proposed that the CWG continue to follow its current procedure and practice in carrying out the online and physical open consultations.

7.3 It was so **agreed**.

7.4 The councillor from Saudi Arabia introduced Document C17/102, containing a contribution from his country on adopting international public policy on access to the Internet for persons with disabilities and specific needs, and including a draft resolution and annex on the subject. He stressed that Resolution 175 of the Plenipotentiary Conference (Rev. Busan, 2014) dealt with ICT accessibility within ITU, whereas the proposed draft resolution advocated policy at international level.

7.5 A long debate ensued in which two positions emerged. On one hand, several councillors argued that the Union already had various texts, produced by different bodies, which, like Resolution 175, dealt with the important topic of accessibility, and those speakers therefore saw no reason to adopt a new resolution on the subject. If there were things missing in the texts already adopted, the texts could be revised and completed. If there was no agreement on the matter, it could be revisited at the next Council session. On the other hand, several councillors maintained that the scope of the draft resolution under consideration was broader than that of the existing texts, and that lack of consensus did not signify that a matter should be dropped. They considered that if agreement was not found in plenary, consideration of the text could be entrusted to the CWG or another group. Some councillors objected that the CWG on International Internet-related Public Policy Issues did not have the terms of reference required for the purpose.

7.6 At the suggestion of the Chairman, it was **agreed** that the Chairman of the CWG would discuss the matter informally with interested councillors following the meeting and report the conclusions reached to a subsequent meeting.

# 8 Follow-up report on possible improvements of the roll-out of the plenipotentiary conference (continued) (Documents [C17/70](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0070/en) and [C17/DL/8](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-170515-DL-0008/en))

8.1 The Vice-Chairman of the Council, speaking as moderator of the ad hoc group set up at the sixth plenary meeting, introduced Document C17/DL/8 containing the conclusions reached by the ad hoc group on possible improvements to the plenipotentiary conference. It was also proposed during the meeting of the ad hoc group that the Council invite the Secretary-General to develop ethics guidelines for internal candidates. Document C17/DL/8 was **approved** and theCouncil agreed to invite the Secretary-General to produce ethics guidelines for internal candidates.

8.2 The Chief of the IS Department introduced Document C17/70, which summarized the findings of a study on the introduction of e-voting in plenipotentiary conference elections.

8.3 Councillors concurred that, for reasons of cost, confidentiality and security, it was preferable to maintain the paper-ballot voting procedure.

8.4 The Secretary-General said that the secretariat would therefore not pursue its tests on e‑voting at PP-18. It would nevertheless follow technical developments and report back to the Council any significant technical developments and experience within the United Nations.

8.5 Document C17/70 was **noted**.

# 9 List of candidatures for chairmen and vice-chairmen of CWGs (continued) (Document [C17/55](https://www.itu.int/md/S17-CL-C-0055/en)(Rev.2)

9.1 The Secretary-General introduced Revision 2 to Document C17/55. He said that the post of chairman of the CWG on Child Online Protection was still vacant.

9.2 The Council **approved** Document C17/55(Rev.2), and thus **confirmed** the appointment of the vice-chairmen of the CWGs and the Expert Group on ITRs.
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